

European Space Agency project: EO4OG onshore and offshore

**Webex teleconference 26 Mar 2014
Minutes**

OTM Consulting Ltd

Minutes_ESA001_0.1

Meeting Details:

Webex Teleconference

Date: 26 Mar 2014

Host / Chair: Ola Grabak (ESA)

Minutes: Andy Bowes-Lyon (OTM)

Attendees:

- Ola Grabak:ESA
- Geoff Sawyer: EARSC
- Andy Bowes-Lyon: OTM Consulting Ltd
- Andy Dean: Hatfield Consultants
- Jeff Clark: Hatfield Consultants
- Barry Peirce: Hatfield Consultants
- Olivia Tsui: Hatfield Consultants
- Thomas Puestow: C-Core
- Des Power: C-Core
- Maureen Coat: CLS
- Marc Lucas: CLS

1 Preliminaries

1.1 Objectives of meeting

Ola Grabak opened the meeting stating the objectives as:

- Run through 'geo-information needs' template documents, and agree detailed format of these.
- Agree on methodology of collecting information, and how it is to be linked with OGEO.

Hatfield requested a further objective of:

- Agree dates for interim deliverables and dates for posting of findings on the portal.

1.2 Introductions

Thomas Puestow (C-Core) introduced himself, having been absent from the KO meeting. Thomas is the Senior EO manager from C-Core and their project manager of this project.

1.3 Meeting documents

OTM introduced the key documents to be used during the meeting, and explained that data would be captured on the Excel document, enabling analysis and filtering of results. The word document could be used as a format for the output which could be easily digested by information users.

2 Making the data user-friendly

Lengthy discussion was had on how the data could be both captured and analysed effectively, together with how it could be easily accessed, digested and commented on by the end user.

Summary of discussion:

- Excel is considered the best way of capturing the data, however we need to ensure there is a means of commenting on each challenge (Hatfield)
- An overview matrix would be useful. Ultimately, a searchable database of challenges would be ideal. Whatever the way that the data is organised, an info architecture / index is needed to identify relevant documents (Hatfield)
- 'Real time' ability to comment on each 'challenge' is needed for the duration of the project. There is also the need for the ability to continue to comment after the close of the project.
- The portal is a discussion forum, and comments relating to particular challenges need to enable iterative discussions.
- We can embed a spread-sheet to the portal, but still need a 'word' page, or 'page per view' to add comments on. (Comments should not be added to the excel format). (EARSC)
- It is important to minimise unnecessary transcribing between excel sheet and 'word' pages. A means of merging the data from excel into a one-page format would be valuable.

Agreed format:

- Each consortium will use its own version of the excel sheet for data capture, and analysis.
- Each row in this spreadsheet will represent a discrete 'challenge'.
- All spreadsheets will be compiled into one master sheet periodically.
- Hatfield will suggest a means by which each row in the spreadsheet (i.e. each challenge) can automatically populate a word document, for ease of review and reference.
- On the portal, an index / matrix will enable reviewers to identify challenge IDs of the challenges they are interested in.
- On selection of each ID, the word format will be displayed, and will enable comments to be added to it.

Action 1 (Hatfield): Hatfield offered to explore how to import excel data / merge data into a word document. The output would be an individual word document for each row (i.e. each discrete challenge) in spreadsheet. Each individual page can then be commented on.

Action 2 (OTM): Word document to capture the version number and a date field to ensure that the latest comments are captured.

Action 3 (All consortiums): Reviewing of challenges is to be organised by 'challenge' authors. This is considered to form part of the 'Solicit Feedback' task stated in the Statement of Work.

[Geoff Sawyer followed the meeting with an email giving detail on how this data can be managed, and how users can be alerted to new comments being added. All consortiums were included in this email sent on 27/3/2014 at 08:10.]

3 Template content

OTM talked through the template which they had developed and explained the detail of each information field.

Summary of Conclusions:

- Each 'Challenge' recorded is to be focussed and specific.
 - If (for example) a particular challenge has different requirements at different lifecycle stages, then this should be recorded as separate challenges.
- The 'Challenge Description' questions, which lay out the problem statements need to focus on the problem itself, and not steer towards solutions. References of potential EO solutions should be avoided where practical at this stage.
- The challenge classification included some categories which would need tailoring.
- References to 'Morocco' should be changed to 'Morocco / Western Sahara'.
- It was noted that the input under 'Urgency' differs from 'Timeliness'. Urgency was anticipated for most challenges as 'now', however, given the long horizon under which some O&G activities are planned out, the technology need might not be immediate in some cases.
- Tolerance to accuracy / error could also be captured. C-Core offered to suggest how this could be captured.

Action 4 (All consortiums, especially Offshore): Relevant inputs for the 'Offshore classification' to be given to OTM for inclusion in the spreadsheet.

Action 5 (C-Core): Thomas from C-Core to email OTM with suggestions on how accuracy data could be captured with example inputs.

Action 6 (OTM): Specific content issues captured above, and suggested by email to be incorporated into an updated excel model.

4 Data collection coordination

To avoid bombarding the same people in industry with repeated info requests, it was agreed to provide ESA (Ola Grabak) with proposed interviewees for him to de-conflict. [As agreed at KO meeting, this list of names would be kept confidential unless clashes are evident].

Action 7 (All consortiums): Each consortium is to provide an initial list of targets for interviews / consultation to Ola Grabak. This can be continually updated as the project progresses.

The value of getting feedback from the wider industry was also discussed.

- It was agreed that a lighter questionnaire should be developed which can be posted out / 'survey monkeyed' to a very wide audience enabling identification of other potential challenges.
- If these challenges are of interest more in-depth consultation can then be conducted.
- The proposition was that this survey should focus on the 'problem statements' and be thematically focussed.

Action 8 (TBA / Volunteer): A draft version of a light questionnaire needs to be produced.

5 Interim deliverable schedule

With the workshop deliverable having been brought forward, as discussed at KO, it was noted that the D1 deliverable would sit with the original timetable. (i.e. due at KO+4). Milestones during Task 1 were thus agreed as:

- Bi-weekly teleconference between all partners. Next one to be on or around Wed 9th April.
- Final version of template - to be agreed by Wed 2nd April.
- 80% of challenges ready to be uploaded to portal - End of May.

Action 9 (ESA): Doodle poll / schedule bi-weekly teleconferences.