

Meeting Minutes	
<b>Subject</b>	Project progress meeting #3
<b>Date</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> Oct 19
<b>Minute Taker:</b>	Anne-Laure Beck
<b>Agenda:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction</li> <li>2. End-User Requirements &amp; Requirements Baseline Document update.</li> <li>3. Feasibility update and plan.</li> <li>4. AOB</li> </ol>	<b>Attendees:</b> <p>Mark Hennen <b>(MH)</b>                      Francois-Regis Martin-Lauzer <b>(FRML)</b> (also representing Arctus &amp; AdwaisEO)</p> <p>Andreas P Garcia <b>(AG)</b>                      Albert Garcia-Mondejar<b>(AG-M)</b></p> <p>Craig Jacobs <b>(CJ)</b>                              Martin Jones <b>(MJ)</b></p> <p>Anne-Laure Beck <b>(ALB)</b>                      Xavier Monteys <b>(XM)</b></p> <p>Jara Martinez Sanchez <b>(JMS)</b></p> <p>Apologies: Thomas Jaegler <b>(TJ)</b></p> <p>Luke Bateson <b>(LM)</b></p> <p>Ekbal Novellino <b>(EN)</b></p> <p>Alessandro Novellino <b>(AN)</b></p> <p>Brief attendance by:</p> <p>John Rees, Director of Science for Earth Hazards, Observatories</p> <p>And Holger Kessler, BGS Technical Advisor to Geospatial Commisison</p>

Introduction:

1. The two co-chairs, AG & FRML, welcomed everyone to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Progress Meeting and FRML highlighted that the meeting wasn't so much a look back at what we have achieved, but more of a "kick off" meeting for the next component of Phase 1, **the Feasibility Study**.

2. The aim therefore would be to confirm the User Requirements and Baseline work and then agree a plan for the Feasibility work.
3. It was also identified that the award of Phase 2 of the project should not be taken for granted and that the consortium would be judged on its approach and deliverables within phase 1.
4. The User Requirements and Feasibility Study of phase 1 should then lead to an Implementation and Production with Validation and Service Evaluation in Phase 2 accompanied by a Roadmap for a future service based future phase.

The “Selling Point”:

5. **The project is based upon selling the value to Coastal Erosion from the Copernicus Sentinels and historical EO missions. It is NOT about replacing current in-situ and ground based practices performed by competent institutions and authorities, more one of providing complimentary evidence using EO.**

Feasibility Study:

6. The Feasibility will identify specifications and a test plan. Phase 1 will consist of sample products for some 200 km and +/- 25 years, and a validation of the products and a future evaluation of the services, ie asking if they are useful to the consumer.
7. It was pointed out that the User Requirements and Requirement Baseline tasks took 6 months, however the feasibility task has only 3 months to deliver a considerable work package.
8. How the feasibility products will be used and identifying their uncertainties will all be vital work to enable the specifications of a service to be determined.
9. The ATDB work is on track, however each ATDB requires an Expert User from the partners to “sponsor” each ATDB and provide vital feedback on their utility, providing amendments where appropriate as specified in the proposal. There is no Data Procurement Plan for phase 1, however each User is aware of the Auxiliary Data required from them and this is listed later. The project is also missing a Product Validation Plan, and this must be delivered within Phase 1. However, it was further emphasised that this component of phase 1 was a feasibility and as such representative products are required and not a full finalised production.
10. The hours assigned to the Feasibility Study over the next 3 months were highlighted:

ARGANS	1400 (ca 10 man x months)
IH Cantabria	800 (ca 6 man x months)
GSI	400 (ca 3 man x months)
BGS	(had an error, however AG identified that he had resource)
Arctus	125 (ca 1 man x month)
AdwaisEO	240 (ca 2 man x months)
isardSAT	560 (ca 4 man x months)

There is a considerable amount of work to do, however, there is enough resource.

11. The requirement for a Marketing style website was identified as essential for showing the value of the project and the value of the Sentinel missions supporting Coastal Erosion monitoring, it shall stress the objectives, the expected value of the results, and relies on individual pages per partner (URD).

**ACTION: ARGANS to update [coastalerosion.argans.co.uk](http://coastalerosion.argans.co.uk) by end Dec 19.**

12. Functional Requirements were discussed from a top-level perspective identifying:

- Coastal Zone Management which leads to the “risk of local damage” and “the maps and shorelines” required.
- Erosion Science which leads to “identification of local processes”.

13. An International Workshop was also discussed, and it was identified that planning for such an event must start now for an event in a years’ time. (See later action).

14. Discussion followed on the URD work and it was agreed that the huge amount of stakeholder engagement must be correctly reflected and marketed both in reports, presentations and on the website. Despite the great effort applied it was also recognised that the URD is a means to an end as well as the justification for those ends, ie the correct products and services.

15. To support the marketing the website ARGANS Satellite Derived bathymetry portal was discussed;

**ACTION: ARGANS to give access to the partners of the ARGANS. Post meeting note; It can be reached at; [sdb.argans.co.uk](http://sdb.argans.co.uk)**

User Requirements Update:

16. AG showed the presentation that was given and the ICE conference. The presentation will be made accessible via the [Coastalerosion.argans.co.uk](http://Coastalerosion.argans.co.uk) website

17. Discussion centred on good sites to be selected from an “ease of showing EO advantage” versus problematic sites (ie Norfolk of other wet delta like sites) where lines would be difficult derive. It was agreed that this is a question of describing uncertainties and if too large then alternative methods would be required. It was clear that the different “types” of coastline needed to be classified in a standardised manner. This classification would be reliant on the expertise of the user group.

**ACTION: User Group to provide the narrative and classify what is useable as far as coastal types. By 18 Oct.**

**ACTION: ARGANS/IsardSAT to provide feasibility feedback, by 25 Oct.**

18. The RBD was discussed and requires the User Group to confirm or amend immediately that it meets balance of what was asked versus what can be achieved.

**ACTION: User Group to provide RBD feedback to BGS by 18 Oct. Nil response will imply consent.**

19. Further stakeholder engagement was discussed, and it was agreed that this would be needed to update the next version of the URD, which would be especially important for site selection and verification work within phase 2.
20. Discussion on the International Workshop followed, and the consensus was that attaching it to an existing conference would be beneficial. The Scientific Council for Oceanographic Research (SCOR) was mentioned, as was the American Geophysical Union (AGU) and the European Geoscience Union (EGU). It was also identified that ESRIN has a conference supporting capability and the 14<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Hydro Science and Engineering in Turkey late Sep 20 was identified as an opportunity too. A proposed name “**Global Observation on Coastal Erosion**” was floated. It was agreed that the workshop must have occurred before the last six months of Phase 2 in order to gain maximum marketing opportunity and potential follow on work.
- ACTION: All to provide workshop opportunities, either stand-alone or within another conference by end of Oct.**

Auxiliary Data:

21. These data sets have been requested from the User Group partners, however it was identified that this data is now a vital component on the critical path and as much data over the relevant Phase 1 sites as is possible will be required. Additionally, the auxiliary data (volume, accuracy, type etc) will become instrumental in addressing the uncertainty budget that needs to accompany any coastal erosion process, product or service. The precise list of what is required, especially in terms of periodicity, granularity, time length etc was discussed. It was agreed that this discussion will remain fluid over the next two weeks (the delivery window identified within the plan) and so bi-lateral discussions will be required between each site “owner” from the User Group, ARGANS and AdwaisEO. It was agreed that ARGANS would provide a single point of contact for Auxiliary Data Collection and each of the User Group/Service Provider Group members do the same.
- ACTION: All to provide Auxiliary Data “facilitator” point of contact by 16 Oct. Post Meeting Note: ARGANS Data Coordinator will be Dr Steve Emsley [SEmsley@argans.co.uk](mailto:SEmsley@argans.co.uk)**
22. The routine periodicity of Auxiliary Data required would be agreed between each Site Facilitator and the Data Coordinator, however within that negotiation it was agreed that the User Groups would be responsible for defining the “events” (both manmade and environmental) that would drive non routine Auxiliary Data need.
- ACTION: User Group Auxiliary Data “facilitators” to agree and define “event” by site at time of delivering data.**
23. Site selection was discussed, and it was recognised that the site chosen within Ireland might prove problematic. It was therefore agreed that the current sites would still stand, however during the Auxiliary Data provision (by end of Oct) if it became obvious that Wexford was a bad choice then GSI would advise soonest and provide an alternative site with appropriate Auxiliary Data to meet the data provision planned timeline.
- ACTION: GSI to assess the appropriateness of Wexford and advise an alternative to meet the data provision timeframe of end of Oct.**

24. Next Progress Meeting. It was agreed that the next (and final for phase 1) Progress Meeting will be conducted via webex in early December, most likely between 9-12th. Exact date to be agreed in due course.
25. The Mid Term Review (Phase 1 final review) will be held late January at ESRIN. Dates will be determined by negotiation with ESA TO.  
**ACTION: ARGANS to liaise with ESA and provide date by end Oct.**
- 26. If no comments/amendments are received by end of Oct, the minutes will be considered a true reflection and recorded.**

ACTIONS SUMMARY			
No	WHO	WHAT	WHEN
1.	ARGANS	Update <a href="http://coastalerosion.argans.co.uk">coastalerosion.argans.co.uk</a>	Dec 2019
2.	ARGANS	Give Partners link to SDB website	Incl. in Minutes
3.	User Group	To provide the narrative and classify what is useable as far as coastal types.	18th Oct 2019
4	ARGANS isardSAT	To provide feasibility feedback on Action 3	25 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2019
5.	User Group	To provide RBD feedback to BGS	18 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2019
6.	All	To provide workshop opportunities, either stand-alone or within another conference	31 <sup>st</sup> Oct 2019
7.	All	<b>To provide Auxiliary Data “facilitator” point of contact</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> Oct 2019
8.	User Group	User Group Auxiliary Data “facilitators” to agree and define “event” by site at time of delivering data.	31 <sup>st</sup> Oct 2019
9.	GSI	To assess the appropriateness of Wexford and advise an alternative to meet the data provision timeframe	31 <sup>st</sup> Oct 2019
10.	ARGANS	To liaise with ESA and provide date for the end of Phase 1 Review scheduled for end Jan 2021	31 <sup>st</sup> Oct 2019