

SDN-2 Advisory Board Perspective (2012)

SDN-2 annual meeting
Rhodes, 19-21 September 2012

Based on plenary reporting

- These are presented in no particular order
- They require no comments since they are our perspective on what we heard.
- One of our AB members withdrew.
Consider seeking new one from say
IMOS

▪

- We continue to be favourably impressed by parts of the work. Examples are cooperation with MyOcean, generally with the new development work.

- We are not clear that the operationalization is in as good condition.

-

- A few deliverables have slipped past target dates. We have concerns that this may impact SDN2 meeting its goals by the end of the project.
- We have concerns about partner obligations being met in the project. We think this needs attention.

- We wanted to hear an update on the conversations between EMODNet and SDN2 on the long term sustainability of SDN2.
- We congratulate the initiative to cooperate with MyOcean. This will challenge both partners to make adjustments in operations to arrive at mutually agreeable solutions.

- We perceive impacts of MtOcean cooperation. Timelines get shifted, priorities are adjusted to meet other requirements and this has potential to delay PP deliverables. Some care must be taken to minimize these as much as possible.

- The WP on international cooperation lacks well defined deliverables. SDN is missing an opportunity to lead the global data management effort.
- We understand the need of IPR, but we caution that rules that are too protective impede developing partnerships with external partners.

- Products, such as climatologies, need to have an associated document that describes its generation what are appropriate uses and which are not – in catalogue (good).
- We encourage additional documentation on issues such as what are the obligatory actions for data centres when anomalies are reported.

We have heard of changes to the project plan. We recommend an update to the plan to reflect these changes.

- We recommend documentation of best practices in creation of CDI records for different kinds of data, and different variants of data collection.

- We understood that the User Panel activities are unfunded. We believe that this conveys a message that user concerns are not important to SDN2.
- We applaud tightening up deliverables for some of the more vaguely worded WPs. This should be reflected in the updated Project Plan.

- Meeting reports need to have a few comments on each agenda item. This will set the context for an action list with people and dates.
- This meeting (and others) is full of technical discussion. We suggest a session that “reminds” attendees of the end goals of SDN2. Suggested extending meeting not compressing.

- We would like to see some high level metrics on the state of the project.
 1. Table with Deliverable (separate components?), target date, time stamped status
 2. Data centre vs state of operational status
 3. This meeting report to state priorities for coming year, and then report on status of these at next meeting.

- The agenda sub-items might have been organized by work undertaken for each deliverable.

- The AB will produce a written report of our perspectives here to give some further explanation. We will distribute this to all partners.
- If SDN2 chairs wish to add responses to our perspectives, they may do so.
- What do you require of us?