Advisory Board Observations
SeaDataNet 2 Kick-Off Meeting
Athens, October 19-20th, 2011

Congratulations on what was accomplished in
  SDN1

We are looking forward to the increased
capabilities that will be SDN2 (larger user base,
new data types, etc…)

□Questions / suggestions: 1

□? Do you know your target audience (users) and their
□   expectations for SDN services?

□ Align your performance indicators to measure success
□ against expectations.
□ Suggest a "feedback" button on user interface and a
□ public, moderated log of exchanges with users
□ Have a non-EU data manager on User Panel
□ Watch users using the system
□ How to test for unused or new services needed?

□Questions / suggestions: 2

□Promotions (WP6)

□ Be sure to credit work of partners. In newsletter, other
□ ways to encourage good behaviour
□ Provide system use stats graphics in newsletter, on
□ user page, etc.
□ Actual joint work with non-EU countries/projects is
□ important for SDN2. Leading role and alternate
□ solutions
□ Contributions of standards to wider community

Questions / suggestions: 3

Promotions (WP6)

- Project is strongly Eurocentric
- We are happy to see inclusion of experts with OGC,
- SensorML, and other broad community efforts
- Continuation of IMDIS series is good
- Deliverables related to IODE ODP is good
- Collaborations with similar projects outside Europe is
- encouraged
- Careful consideration of Creative Commons License

Questions / suggestions: 3

Technical (WP8, 9)

- Ambitious targets
- Distribution of roles (e.g. metadata production) requires
- partners deliver and standardization of results
- Exact duplicates are important to resolve (you know)
- Inexact duplicates or changes in data pose the
- question if versioning is needed. To what purpose?

Questions / suggestions: 4

Advisory Board

We understand our role in steering the project:
- Comments at annual meetings,
  before actions are decided (e.g. metrics),
  on overall and/or technical details and before final decisions?
- SO: reports of meetings must be available within days
- Program review process?
- AB may wish to have place on Extranet to place comments.

Interoperability

- Move ODV default from ASCII to netCDF (is v4
- ready?)
- Consider OAIS model
- Use of 19115 to 19139 to larger community
- Interoperability to ODP is very important outside
- Europe

Wider collaboration

Experience outside (e.g. Machine-machine transfer,
sensorML, other technologies of value. Need a
mechanism to interact.
"Editorial board" to review documentation is advised

Details: 3

Technical

Maintenance / scalability is impacted by how well
modularized software is developed.
Metrics should rather be fewer and targeted to purpose
Sustainability cannot be through projects, must
become part of EU infrastructure. Encourage this
A purely distributed data model has weaknesses (less
responsive partners)
Be sure all catalogues are linked.

ODV, DIVA, WP10

User tests need documentation and tighter coupling of
information on what was done to the data
CRC might provide an avenue to help with duplicates
identification.
Log of processing with each product – sounds like this
is mostly (completely?) done
Versioning of data aggregations and feedback – good
to see this is included