



Report after JERICO Meeting in Brussels

26-27 feb. 2014

Grant Agreement n° 262584

Project Acronym: JERICO

Project Title: Towards a Joint European Research Infrastructure network for Coastal Observatories

Coordination: P. Farcy, IFREMER,
jerico@ifremer.fr, www.jerico-fp7.eu:

Authors: Puillat I., Petihakis G., Sparnocchia S., Farcy P., Morin P.

Involved Institutions: Ifremer

Version and Date: Version 25 April 2014



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	4
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
3. ATTENDEES	6
4. PROGRAMME OF THE MEETING	7
5. REPORT AFTER MEETINGS	9
5.1. Selection panel meeting	9
5.1.1. Overview of TNA after the three calls (S. Sparnocchia, CNR).....	9
5.1.2. Discussion and formal approval of the results of 3rd Call.....	11
5.1.3. Conclusions and actions	11
5.2. Jerico Label	12
5.2.1. Presentation of the deliverable.....	12
5.2.2. Discussion of “Hot issues”	13
5.2.3. Conclusions and actions	13
5.3. JERICO strategy for the future	14
5.3.1. Debriefing after discussions	14
5.3.2. Conclusions and actions	14
5.4. Discussion on next H2020 infrastructure call	15
5.4.1. Debriefing after discussions	15
5.4.2. Conclusions and actions	16



1. Document description

REFERENCES

Annex 1 to the Contract: Description of Work (DoW) version of the 22 Feb. 2011

Document information	
Document Name	Report after JERICO meeting in Brussels
Document ID	
Revision	Final version
Revision Date	25 april 2014
Author	Puillat
Security	

History			
Revision	Date	Modification	Author

Diffusion list				
Consortium beneficiaries	X			
Third parties	X			
Associated Partners	X			
other				

This document contains information, which is proprietary to the JERICO consortium. Neither this document nor the information contained herein shall be used, duplicated or communicated by any means to any third party, in whole or in parts, except with prior written consent of the JERICO Coordinator.

The information in this document is provided as is and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at its sole risk and liability.



2. Executive Summary

The objective of the workshop was to address main issues of JERICO project:

- TNA: overview and formal approval of the selected proposals after the 3rd call
- The JERICO Label document: content and issues
- The JERICO strategy for the future.

The document reports hereafter the synthesis of the discussions.



3. Attendees

Names	Institutes	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Section 4
P. Farcy	Ifremer	x	x	x	x
I. Puillat	Ifremer	x	x	x	x
R.Nair	OGS		x	x	x
S. Sparnocchia	CNR	x	x	x	x
G. Petihakis	HCMR		x	x	x
E. Svendsen	IMR		x	x	x
D. Durand	For NIVA	x	x	x	x
W. Petersen	HZG		x	x	x
A. Iavin	S Panel	x	x	x	x
H. Dalhin	S Panel	x	x	x	x
L. Mortier	S Panel	x	x	x	x
K. Sorensen	NIVA		x	x	x
A. Gremare	CNRS		x	x	x
J. Tintore	CSIC		x	x	x
D. Mills	CEFAS		x	x	
P. Morin	CNRS	x	x	x	x
G. Nolan	IMI	x	x	x	x
P. Gorringe	SMHI	x	x	x	x



4. Programme of the meeting

Place: CLORA meeting room, 2nd floor

8, avenue des Arts,

B – 1210 Brussels

Tel : 00.32.2.506.88.64

Fax : 00.32.2.506.88.93

Program

When?	what?	Who (PI)?	Annexed documents		
26 Feb. 2014 9:30-12:30	Section 1: Selection Panel meeting only for the members of the panel				
9:30 – 10:15	Overview of TNA after the three calls	S. Sparnocchia			
10:15 – 11:00	Discussion and formal approval of the results of 3rd Call	Selection Panel	Annexe 1-Third TNA Call Evaluation Synthesis Document		
11:00 – 12:30	Discussion	All, moderator: P. Farcy			
12:30-14:00	Lunch (on site)				
14:00-18:30	Section 2: Label and future strategy				
14:00-17:00	LABEL	STATUS OF THE LABEL G. Petihakis	Annexe 2-LAST VERSION OF THE DELIVERABLE		
17:00-18:30	FUTURE STRATEGY DIRECTIVE/DESCRIPTORS	D. Durand, D. Mills	Annexe 3-DRAFT FUTURE STRATEGY		
27 Feb. 2014	Section 3: Future strategy (continuation)				



9:00-11:30	FUTURE STRATEGY: Monitoring GAPS (IMR) Integrating observations (Willy and Joaquin), Trans-boundary observation (Dominique), Innovation process (Joaquin), Access to data (ALL)			
11:30-12:30	MULTI PLATFORM COASTAL OBSERVATORIES (ALL)			
12:30-13:30	Lunch (on site)			
13:30-16:00	Section 4: Discussion on next H2020 infrastructure call			
13:30-14:00	EMBOS Objectives	H. Hummel		
14:00-16:00	H2020 INFRAIA-1	P. Farcy	Annexe 4- Draft proposal	



5. Report after meetings

5.1. Selection panel meeting

5.1.1. Overview of TNA after the three calls (S. Sparnocchia, CNR)

S. Sparnocchia remembered the TNA objectives, calls for proposals and selection procedures. Slides are presented at the end of the section. Several discussions rose during the presentation and are summarised here after.

The TNA Calls received 24 proposals, approved 20 of them and finally 19 were scheduled.

The global offer included 7 fixed platforms, 4 Ferrybox lines, 4 glider fleet and 4 laboratories.

The demand by users totalizes 3 approved proposals for ferryboxes, 10 out of 13 proposals approved for fixed platforms, 6 out of 8 proposals approved for gliders and 4 out of 5 proposals approved for access to calibration facilities. More successful platforms were fixed platforms (also offered in a great number) and gliders.

Looking at the thematic sector, 11 out of 24 submitted proposals planned to respond to a scientific problem, 4 proposals to a technological issue, and 9 were cross-cutting the two sectors.

Countries more involved in requesting access to JERICO facilities are Italy and Spain. Non EU countries have also members in the user groups (Algeria and Tunisia).

Use of forecasted access costs: 471 k€ were forecasted, until now 441k€ are being consumed (to be assessed with the completion of ongoing and to be started TNA projects).

The budget assigned to TNA projects (travel and subsistence costs plus shipping of equipment if applicable): Call 1&2: assigned 64 042 €. The requests by proponents in Call 3 are under evaluation, and approximately they account for 30 980€ (call 3.1: 5500€, call 3.2: 6100€ call 3.3: 6200€, call 3.4: 4680€, call 3.5: 5000€).

Total 93 000€ to be confirmed.

User groups are submitting their project reports as soon as the access is concluded, but the production of papers and conference communication is still limited.

At the end of the presentation, S. Sparnocchia highlighted some major issues, that were also discussed with the Selection Panel members.

Major issues:

- 1) Agreements: too many parties involved, took a lot of time to prepare and share for signatures.

S. Sparnocchia suggests it would be better to let the beneficiaries manage the relationship with the user themselves, including the TNA grant distribution.

- 2) Problems in managing the access to the glider: shipping costs, insurance ...



-
- 3) Problems in managing procedures with some user groups and facility operators (late – or no – replies, misunderstandings, etc.)
- 4) Present procedure doesn't account for possible merging of complimentary use proposals, limiting efficiency/cost effectiveness (this is a direct consequence of limited access time to a specific facility and the non-eligibility rules).
- 5) Productivity is low at the moment, but many projects are still running or have been just concluded.
Discussion on the opportunity to plan a journal special issue after the TNA scientific workshop at the last GA of JERICO follows.
- 6) 50% of applications is from Bodies of the Consortium, of which half from people directly involved in JERICO (25% of the total).

Discussions:

Hans Dahlin commented that JERICO TNA is a way to start and has to be promoted more in the future, He also suggested to focus more on the interest of equipment sharing. Example: Finland and Sweden share their monitoring research vessels. Money through TNA is few but the interest should be in sharing the resource (i.e. the infrastructure). Laurent Mortier also stressed the two strengths of TNA: sharing equipment and networking activities. Regarding the use of TNA for long term monitoring, the problem is that it's only possible to launch the monitoring at the beginning, and not possible in the long term.

As regards the reduction of the offered facilities numbers between the 1st call and the 2nd call, S. Sparnocchia thinks it is due to the fact that the access cost/unit was consumed at the end of the first call. Moreover, the decreasing of the submitted proposal can be due to a lack of interest/enthusiasm from partners, promoting less the available infrastructures and call for proposals.

With regards to major issues:

1) Agreement signatures: too many parties involved, it takes too much time. The first call was the longest to prepare because of the organisation of all procedures

I. Puillat explained that there is no need to circulate only one page gathering all signatures on a single and unique page. Parties can send their own page with their signature independently.

2) Problem in managing procedures with some user groups and facility operator. It is suggested to organise a dedicated short meeting aside from other meetings, involving both potential users and operators to explain the procedures, in the frame of the JERICO 2. It is also suggested to organise a 2 steps selection process in order to eventually merge the complementary user proposals.

3) Problem in managing the access to the gliders: shipping costs, insurance: Most of the problem comes from the underestimation of insurance and shipping costs, more specifically when shipping is over a long distance, which is not possible to forecast accurately. Concerning the charges to users, a debate took place about whether the access will be free of charge or paid by operators. But this is not suitable with current rules.



4) Low productivity at the moment with regards to publications. A journal of special issue after TNA is discussed. It is discussed of launching it after the TNA scientific workshop at the last GA meeting, but I. Puillat suggested to open the SI to JERICO in general and to start earlier because such a management is taking time.

D. Durand pointed that it cannot be compulsory from the EC because it is not taken as TNA selection criteria. I. Puillat enhanced that fact that we cannot force users to publish in a special issue; we do not have power on that.

L Mortier reminded the possibility to publish data sets in Datasite and also via ISSD.

P Farcy concluded that it is important to have publications at high level and that JRA activities are more suitable for that. Nevertheless TNA also needs to show that a good job has been done and to give more visibility towards EC and national ministries.

H. Dahlin expressed that TNA are not making science, so it would be difficult to publish only science, a report stating how TNA helped scientific projects would be more suitable. We have to show that TNA is a good mean to improve science in Europe. L. Mortier also explained that stating the quantity of data made publically available and how would also be appreciated.

5.1.2. Discussion and formal approval of the results of 3rd Call

The following table summarizing the results of the evaluation was presented to the Selection Panel, and it was approved (the same was also sent by email to the other members wh also approved).

SCORE	REF. No	TYPE	OPERATOR	PROPONENT	PROJECT TITLE - ACRONYM
78.6	CALL_3_3	GL	CSIC-ES	Giorgio Budillon - IT	Algerian BASin Circulation Unmanned Survey – ABACUS
78.0	CALL_3_2	FP	CNR - IT	Jacques Piazzola - FR	Marine Aerosols Properties Over the Mediterranean –MAPOM
76.7	CALL_3_7	GL	INSU/CNRS - FR	Daniele Iudicone - IT	Multi Sensor Investigation in the Channel of Sardinia – MUSICS
74.8	CALL_3_4	CAL	HCMR – GR	Bozzano - IT	New Tools for Oxygen, Fluorescence and tUrbidity sensors testing and intercomparison – TOFU
67.9	CALL_3_1	GL	CSIC-ES	Olita - IT	FRontal dynamics Influencing Phytoplankton Production and distribution during DCM period –FRIPP

5.1.3. Conclusions and actions

Regarding immediate actions, the first step is communicating the results of the third call and then to start with the agreement signatures and the implementation of the projects. Ingrid and Stefania should start to think about the special issue, to announce at the GA in Oslo.

The next deliverable, D1.10 Second report of the access activity, is planned at M42).

Report after JERICO meetings in Brussels –



5.2. Jerico Label

According to the agenda, the afternoon of the 26th was devoted to the discussion of the JERICO LABEL deliverable, which is behind schedule. Previous to the meeting, version 1.2.5 of the deliverable was distributed by G. Petihakis to the participants in order to be as organised as possible considering the already acknowledged associated difficulties.

This updated version includes all key points discussed during the previous meetings as well as comments sent by partners in the past few months. Thus a “fit for purpose” approach has been adopted paying particular emphasis on the wide variability found in coastal observing systems in terms of technology, approaches and methods used.

The discussion was organised in two parts, the presentation of the deliverable at its present form followed by a presentation on “hot” issues that seem to attract most of the discussions.

5.2.1. Presentation of the deliverable

Version 1.2.5 was presented to the participants in order to have an overview of the various sections. More detailed the main part of the deliverable is separated into:

- The Definition of the label, which includes the Criteria laid, and the Classification Scheme through which observing systems will be classified in the various categories.
- The Infrastructures already included as well as those that will be included in the future
- The Rules applied
- The Nomination of the Label describing both the mechanism as well as the sustainability of the action
- The Protection of the Label
- The Update of the Label in order to ensure an up to date view considering the fast technological evolution.
- The mitigating measures
- The Environmental impact
- The Recommendations which incorporate all acquired experience of the JERICO partners and in a way are part of the JERICO legacy to the scientific community. These stem from the WP3 and WP4 deliverables paying emphasis on the agreed best practices. Effort to cover all-important aspects such as Sensing technologies, Specific recommendations for different platforms, Qualification and testing etc. is invested.



5.2.2. Discussion of “Hot issues”

Following the current version of the deliverable a presentation of the “hot issues” was done discussing points slide by slide. More detailed:

- Grading system. There are objections as to whether a grading system should be adopted considering that a Label is something that you comply or not. A question was raised: Should the label establish the consensus or the consensus should establish the label? It is not clear for outside partners who would want to integrate their infrastructure. However adopting the “fit for purpose” approach a system could have more parameters covering other scientific purposes, which could require a grading scale. Furthermore a grading scale can set the target or in other words where a system must aim to go.
- The role of the Label with Stakeholders. Although there were several discussions on the issue it was agreed that the Label will act as a recognition mechanism for the observation systems and the associated community.
- Specifications. Although the Label cannot get into standardization and accreditation issues it is thought that it can lay a set of technological specifications and minimum performances that manufactures should follow. The question is "is the label for the platforms and/or sensors?". Observatories are complex structures that are difficult to define precisely and it highly depends of the scientific question you addressed.
- Parameters. The discussion focused on what parameters should be included and if they should be categorized into Primary and Secondary or into a more detailed list according to the discipline (physical oceanography, biogeochemistry etc.). David Mills brought the idea of the UK-IMON list where Physical, Chemical and Biological core parameters are separated according to the purpose.
- Target group. Considering the wide variability of systems involved in coastal observations – from a single sensor to a multi sensor multi-platform observatories – a Label must be general enough to include all operating systems and at the same time detailed enough in order to have some value.
- Newcomers. Observing systems interested to join the Label will undergo an audit.
- Sustainability of the Label. A JERICO Label council could be established after the end of the project similar to ESONET. Furthermore links with related efforts (ESONET, FixO3) were also discussed by Patrick Farcy.

5.2.3. Conclusions and actions

Regarding future actions, it was decided to update the deliverable with the outcome of the discussion and circulate it within the JERICO community for comments. A final version will have to be ready by the GA meeting in Oslo in May.



5.3. JERICO strategy for the future

5.3.1. Debriefing after discussions

Another highlight of these meetings was the discussion regarding the JERICO strategy for the future.

D. Mills stated that it could be good to interact with the OSPAR convention and to make sure that the work undergone will follow this framework.

Regarding virtual service access and policies requirements, I. Puillat emphasized that all descriptors can't be accessible so we need to choose which descriptors can be measured.

To do so, WP10 developed semi-automatic measurement methods in order to meet the Directive's criteria and objectives.

The topic of data availability has also been discussed among partners. Physical data are available during 60 days and chemical data are stored but not available. No big problems with near RT physics data but not the case with other data or with delayed-mode data. Data must be distributed freely when having a European funding but problems appear when having national funding. There is also a difficulty with biological data, which requires longer time to acquire data.

As explained by D. Mills, near real time quality assessment is possible. We must be precise in what we are able to propose and not oversell our work. Scales are complex to observe in the coastal areas, so we need to integrate modeling.

5.3.2. Conclusions and actions

The following conclusions and actions were discussed to start thinking of the JERICO strategy for the future:

- 1) For policies requirements, we have to clearly show the type of indicators we have and which descriptors can be measured.
- 2) It is important to show what the project does in terms of time and spatial scales and adding dimensions with its platforms of a much bigger system. We have to explain the importance of ferryboxes and fixed platforms for a better sampling at time and space scale rather than with classical oceanographic cruises.
- 3) We need to well-address science and society needs by, for instance, choose the place of moorings carefully.
- 4) The role of funding is crucial for this type of project. We have to think of a regional level of funding (i.e. structural funding) of research and infrastructures. As funding is only possible for member states, we must contribute to MSFD.
- 5) Regarding the data availability, it is important to follow the recommendations for data access agreed by the JERICO partners within the label. Moreover, we



must have contacts with the ROOSs and EMODNET to take into account the results from optimization of the future network using modeling OSEs and also with WP9 task leader.

- 6) We have to improve the visibility in MyOcean and EMODNET, for instance through the JERICO website (with JERICO logo, index for the project in metadata). We have to decide if it should be done for each data.

5.4. Discussion on next H2020 infrastructure call

Herman Hummel, coordinator of EMBOS, presented EMBOS and links with EUROMARINE+ (including MARBEF and marine genomics communities) and EMBRC. Then discussions were led to assess how to share the next JERICO project with the MARS/EMBOS community.

5.4.1. Debriefing after discussions

Main discussions pointed out several important issues to be addressed by the upcoming proposal:

- ✓ Need to express the need of in situ automated measurements in coastal waters to address several issues:
 - experience from open sea research
 - Economics and societal issue in coastal environment: decreases in catches and inter-annual variability, example of unexpected eutrophication events, harmful algal blooms, jellyfishes, flooding and coastal erosion...
 - Policy requirements: MSFD & WFD
 - The hidden scientific challenges in coastal environment: hidden means that to solve the here above issues some scientific challenges are to be addressed. These challenges are to be explained in the proposal.
- ✓ Need to express that a scientific strategy should be established for each region, and that the label should come after. In other words scientific strategies should be established regionally.
- ✓ How can we merge the biology on the coastal observatory network? The 50/50 requested by EMBOS is not a strategy.
- ✓ How can inshore and offshore observations be linked?
- ✓ We can identify EMODNET biology as a data provider for biological parameters.
- ✓ TNA: in the future project the partners must propose a Trans National Access (TNA) to new infrastructures offering measurements in the biological components.



-
- ✓ Virtual service access: the idea is to offer access from archived data to products (ex: time series of indicators, derived maps, or integrated products with modeling, satellites and data) to a service recognized by Copernicus (MyOcean? Mercator?)
 - ✓ The idea is to deliver products as prototypes coming out from cases studies, not to develop an operational chain from measurements to products. So the purpose of this WP is to make available a flow of topical products to the consortium and so demonstrate that it works
 - ✓ JRA: news tools and new techniques in biological and bio-chemical compartments are to be identified. Coupling observation and models is expected. It is propose to work on case studies in order to keep a working flow from the sensor to the data analysis and use.
 - ✓ The main question is how the observation can answer to the scientific objectives involving physics, chemistry and biology?

5.4.2. Conclusions and actions

JERICO partners will propose to EMBOS a roadmap of scientific questions and challenges that we can share together. End of March will be great.

