

Summary of Block 3 Responses

Hans-Peter Plag

3. About a network of networks

- 3.1 What coordination and collaboration interfaces do you have with other networks?
- 3.2 Is your network contributing to GEO(SS) and if so, what is this contribution?
Could ConnectinGEO help to enhance your contribution to GEOSS?
- 3.3 Are there additional interfaces that would be desired and what would be the main benefits of these interfaces?
- 3.4 Do you think that your network could benefit from the existence of an ENEON or a similar network?
- 3.5 From you point of view, how should an ENEON be organized and managed?

3.1 What coordination and collaboration interfaces do you have with other networks?

ICOS: CarbonTracker; some disciplinary coordination is happening.

TCCON: integrated into the global carbon observing system.

NDACC: is an association of research institutes globally; endorsed nationally and internationally; has a number of signed agreements with other networks.

GAW: Interfaced with other WMO networks and world data centers, in some cases MOUs.

AMAP: Global, regional and institutional collaboration; SAON; many advantages (including funding).

GTN-H: Joint effort of WMO, GCOS, GTOS. Interfaces mainly on national scale, also GEO Portal and WMO; is the observational component of the GEO Integrated Water Cycle Observation CoP.

EUREF: Many interfaces with relevant networks who use products;

EUMETNET: Manages network of networks with 31 members.

EUROGOOS: Coordinates with 15 GOOS regional alliances; many agreements, overarching agreement with its 39 members

EUROARGO: With ARGO and Copernicus through Coriolis

SEADATANET: input from ARGO and other networks; output to UNESCO et al.

EMEP: Coordinates many disciplinary networks;

ECAS: Networking is an important activity

3.2 Is your network contributing to GEO(SS) and if so, what is this contribution?

Could ConnectinGEO help to enhance your contribution to GEOSS?

ICOS: Aims to be a GEO Flagship Initiative

TCCON: Not clear

NDACC: could contribute; is mentioned in the GEO WP; no formal links yet

GAW: Is registered in GEOSS

AMAP: SAON is viewed as the Arctic node of GEO

GTN-H: On European scale, interfaces with EEA and perhaps Copernicus would be desirable

EUREF: Implicit through IAG, IUGG, and EPOS; information on GEOSS is not reaching;
more direct link with European part of GEOSS

EUMETNET: Through WMO standards

EUROGOOS: Observer in GEO High Level WG at EC level; ConnectinGEO could help to
strengthen GEO link

EUROARGO: Unknown

SEADATANET: aggregated obs meta data through GEO-DAB

EMEP: No comment

ECAS: Engaged in a GEO wiki; aims for a Citizens Observatory Portal

3.3 Are there additional interfaces that would be desired and what would be the main benefits of these interfaces?

ICOS: Unclear

TCCON: No comments

NDACC: No Comments

GAW: better coordination (meta data, naming conventions, vocabularies) of all networks

AMAP: Maybe; could improve funding.

GTN-H: its federated data centers could benefit from ENEON or a similar network

EUREF: More representation in global initiatives; more formal recognition

EUMETNET: Not currently; full WIGOS implementation is a challenge

EUROGOOS: stronger interfaces with policy formulation and implementation instruments

EUROARGO: proper spatial data infrastructure standards would be welcome

SEADATANET: international framework for platform identification

EMEP: aim towards centralized steering and funding

ECAS: dedicated GEO portal

3.4 Do you think that your network could benefit from the existence of an ENEON or a similar network?

ICOS: No suggestions

TCCON: No suggestions

NDACC: could ENEON produce derived dataset of EVs? Facilitate data center interoperability

GAW: Yes, harmonization of metadata, data search and discovery, and data exchange; increase visibility. Help with data format harmonization. Missing question: Capacity building, which could be an important objective. Technology transfer. Fellowship programs.

AMAP: Yes, could improve partner by-in; financial resources

GTN-H: Could help to develop community of support partner to develop integrated data and information products

EUREF: Improved visibility; some clarity in jungle of organizations; coordination across country borders

EUMETNET: No comment

EUROGOOS: Is developing EOOS as a forum for in-situ marine OS in Europe; ENEON could be helpful in promoting a sustained system.

EUROARGO: see next

SEADATANET: ENEON could do transdisciplinary reference services (thesauri, directories, standards, ...) and tools to manage these.

EMEP: no comment

ECAS: no comment

3.5 From your point of view, how should an ENEON be organized and managed?

ICOS: No comment

TCCON: No comment

NDACC: Not clear what ENEON is/will be

GAW: ENEON could have representatives from major networks on board.

AMAP: Emphasize added value, avoid duplication; focus on buy-in, acceptance; starting with top-down directions to networks may not work; promoting mutual benefits might;

GTN-H: No comments

EUREF: No comments

EUMETNET: No comments

EUROGOOS: No comments

EUROARGO: see next

SEADATANET: Understanding ENEON's role in a complex landscape is an issue

EMEP: No comments

ECAS: No comments