GIGAS
www.thegigasforum.eu

GIGAS 2nd Stakeholder Workshop
Ispra, Italy 26/27 January 2010

Parallel Session 4 – Cross Initiative Scenario + Interoperability Testbed

Feedback from the session

Caroline Heylen, GIM/OGC

George Percivall, OGC

Johannes Brauner, TU Dresden

Attendance

- Many participants attend the session because they want to understand whether and how their organisation / project can participate in the interoperability testbed or test harness.
- Geoland 2 / Runder Tisch GIS Germany / Annex II/III data specification team / ESDIN / …

Cross-scenario initiatives and interoperability

- Alignment of Service taxonomies across initiatives will enable higher reuse of services across initiatives.

- Feedback
  - Feasibility for the selected scenario's: Sufficient information from INSPIRE, GEOSS, Geoland. Further information required on G-Mosaic and Safer.
  - No authority that addresses overall architecture for GMES service architectures and the long distance to GMES-decision makers is considered as a concern.

Cross-scenario initiatives and interoperability

- Data availability increases with access across initiatives

- Feedback:
  - GMES Service projects: data and product specifications are well defined, but global data products are not available. Test products might be available.
  - Feasibility for selected scenario's:
    Access to datasets for testing is a critical item for a successful testbed. Having the data definitions is not sufficient. Issues to get actual data in place need to be addressed, e.g., input in-situ data. For some data, agreements need to be signed.

Cross-scenario initiatives and interoperability

- Commonality of engineering components supports reuse

- Feedback
  - There is certainly a need for reuse. Facilitating reuse could be an element of Business Plan.
  - Reference implementation is required, source code made available for reuse. Not necessarily as open source strictu-sensu.

Cross-scenario initiatives and interoperability

- Implement Cross-Initiative Scenarios in GIGAS Persistent Testbed

- Feedback
  - General agreement that implementation is necessary to demonstrate the results of GIGAS analysis. Innovative ideas come from collaboration of developers. "running code wins".
  - Best practices for testbed implementation need to be made available to implement other scenario's. The Business Model identified indeed that these are needed.
  - Reuse of existing practices for testbeds should be considered (eg OGC).

Persistent Test Bed

- Questions:
  - Do you agree with approach?
  - Who should fund these activities?

Persistent Test Bed

- Approach:
  - General agreement about the approach. Testing is considered essential. Source of innovation.
  - Good idea to split into Testbed and the Harness -> technology maturation
  - Some remarks on the Business Plan:
    - 'Openness' should be better and more clearly defined.
    - Business plan defines low budget and addresses operational and technical risks. Larger funding could overcome some of the risks.
  - Governance and controlling: neutral steering is needed (policy makers / paymasters)
    - Business plan foresees a steering commite but it should be extended to elaborate on independent governance and control mechanism.

Persistent Test Bed

- Funding:
  - Suggestion to develop several scenario's to carry out the Persistent Test Bed in function of the funding (amount and origin).
    - Within GMES Service projects
    - Through FP projects (make results persistent and use common infrastructure)
  - Some MS are already providing tools for testing (e.g. France/Germany/Suisse). Can they be shared and reused? Action: to follow up. Funding could then be limited to coordination activities and not building the test suites themselves.

Persistent Test Bed

- Approach
  - INSPIRE Data specifications team: approach is realistic. Testing activities for data specifications for Annex II.
  - Suisse: approach is reasonable
  - Low budget identified. Operational and technical risks addressed. Bigger funding could overcome some of the risks.
  - Openess: not sufficiently clear defined and conditional. Needs to be clarified.
  - Good idea to split up into testbed and harness.

Feedback session CI-scenario / testbed

- Funding
  - From who sees/has interest: stakeholders: data providers, software vendors
  - Question related to another question: who is controlling the activities, because the controlling organisation has also a huge control over the standardisation proces and results -> guarantee that tests are carried out in a neutral way => policy owners and pay mastesr have interest in neutral conduct and thus should fund => testplan forsees steering committee
  - INSPIRE: some MS are already providing tools for testing (e.g. France/Germany/Suisse). Can they be shared and reused? Action: to follow up. Funding could then be limited to coordination activities and not building the test suites themselves.
  - GMES service projects are serving users. During project they realise that interoperability is important to serve users. They need this learning process-> funding should come from funding already allocated in these projects.

Feedback session CI-scenario / testbed

- Business model ?
  - Funding? Are there scenario's for the business model and the funding. E.g. different scenario's depending on the kind of funding.
  - FP project results made available through testbed: but legally possible? But it would be a good idea because this type of work is anyway done within these projects and there is also the reuse aspect (effectiveness)
  - Good idea to develop a number of funding scenario's and related business models.
  - DE: looking at innovative and implemented projects – 'working' systems
    - project PortalU: specific site devoted to the environment
    - Baden-Wurtemberg: distributed system
    shouldn't we look at other implementations that are operational/innovative

Feedback session CI-scenario / testbed

- Business model ctd
  - Ex. business model: FP projects: commission gives additional small funding at the end of project to keep demonstration active for some period so it can be used by other people (data and service sharing policy important)
- Experience Munich Testbed
  - Operational since 8 years
  - Results are only available to members of the testbed, not for common use
  - Motivation of members to continue: needs continuous effort
  - Open to join with the Persistent Testbed platform

Feedback session CI-scenario / testbed

- Many participants attend the session because they want to understand whether and how their organisation / project can participate in the interoperability testbed.
- GMES services projects: architectures/service
  - Geoland: well-known and similar approach
  - Safer: little information
  - G-Mosaick: very little information, no partner participation in GIGAS, MoU required to get access to information
  - No authority that covers overall architecture for GMES service architectures
  - GMES bureau: Hans Dufourmont
  - GMES coordination: Francesco Pignatelli
  - Long distance to GMES decision makers
  - Feasibility for the selected scenario's: Pretty sure about INSPIRE, GEOSS, Geoland. Further information required on G-Mosaic and Safer

Feedback session CI-scenario / testbed

- Data availability and access
  - GMES Service projects:
    - availability of 'data definitions' and models, production processes, but: not the data itself except for test data, example products.
    - Global products can not be made since input data on global scale are not available (or not accessible?). EO data not so much a problem, but rather socio-economic and in-situ data and related data. Data policy is there for EO data (freely available when registered)
    - Feasibility: actual data products need to be available, not only the product specs. This may require license agreements with input data providers. Sufficient and compatible test data should be available.
  - GEOSS has guidelines policy for data sharing
  - INSPIRE has IR for policy for data sharing.
- Commonality of engineering components supports reuse
  - Capacity building required ?
  - Reference implementation in open source required ? Propriatary companies can improve and make it a selleable product.
  - There is certainly a need for reuse. Reuse maintains also interoperability.

Feedback session CI-scenario / testbed

- Commonality of engineering components supports reuse
  - Suisse has experience in enforcing standards by developing/supporting/financing open source that proprietary companies can reuse to build their own added-value products. But funding is required.
  - There can be more than one component of the same kind to be reused (not necessarily open source strictu sensu – pieces of available code)

- Testbed
  - Results should also provide methodology for other user scenario's or for other components -> generalisable for other scenario's
  - Actual GIGAS project will not provide testbed methodologies, these are however already available at OGC, GEOSS and other initiatives.