Coordinating and integrating state-of-the-art Earth Observation Activities in the regions of North Africa, Middle East, and Balkans and Developing Links with GEO related initiatives towards GEOSS



D3.4 – Maturity Indicators and country (G)EO Profile (II)

Contract Number	H2020 SC5-18b-2015, Project GA number: 690133	GEO-CRADLE					
Full title	Coordinating and integrating state-of regions of North Africa, Middle East, a related initiatives towards GEOSS.	Coordinating and integrating state-of-the-art Earth Observation Activities in the regions of North Africa, Middle East, and Balkans and Developing Links with GEO related initiatives towards GEOSS					
Project URL	http://geocradle.eu	http://geocradle.eu					
EC Project Officer	Ms Gaëlle LE BOULER						

Deliverable/Document	Number	D3.4	Name	Maturity Indicators					
Work package	Number	WP3	Name	Gap analysis, Indicators and Priorities					
Date of delivery	Contract	ual	M33	Actual 11/09/2018					
Status	Final	Final							
Nature	Report	Report							
Distribution Type	Public	Public							
Authoring Partner	EARSC								
Prepared by	Mónica I	Miguel	-Lago						
Quality Assurance	Lefteris I	Mamai	s (NOA)						
Contact Person	Mónica I	Miguel	-Lago	go EARSC executive secretary					
	Email s	ecreta	riat@earsc.org	Phone	+34 639584684	Fax	N/A		





Executive Summary

GEO-CRADLE has introduced "Maturity Indicators" as an independent, up-to-date and replicable methodology for the assessment and monitoring of EO maturity at national level. The aim of this approach is to establish an analytical tool that allows quantitative measurement of the current EO capabilities of a given country and their evolution over time.

To that end, we have defined a set of indicators across three main fields: "Capacities", "Cooperation" and "National Uptake and Awareness". For each of the indicators, we have developed a methodology to allow the assessment of its maturity level. In parallel, we have established a standardized process for the collection and analysis of the necessary data ("Information Requirements and Analysis Methodology Specification"). This entails primary research by organisations with deep involvement in national and international EO activities, enhancement through publicly accessible data sources and a cross-validation of findings by renowned national experts.

This approach was tested over a period of 15 months, through the mobilisation of the GEO-CRADLE country partners, covering 11 countries from the Balkans, Middle East and North Africa. After analysing the collected data, we have developed a standardised visualisation in the form of a "maturity card" and we present the results of this methodology in this deliverable.

The Deliverable has been prepared in two stages:

- (1) the first stage (M1 M9) focussed on the establishment of a robust methodology and some preliminary assessment of few countries as a model for the maturity indicators.
- (2) the second stage (M1 M26 M30) was devoted to the analysis of indicators for all the countries and the presentation of the results in the form of maturity cards. It also includes a presentation of lessons learned from the application of the proposed methodology and proposals for further improvements in the future.

The methodology was presented to and discussed with the project team and other stakeholders in several meetings:

- July 2016 in Novi Sad
- November 2016 in Limassol
- April 2017 during the Industry Workshop in Brussels
- June 2017 through the GEO European projects in Helsinki
- October 2017 in Washington during the GEO plenary
- June 2018 during the 3rd South-Eastern Europe Workshop

The initial results of the implementation of the methodology have been presented in the first version of this deliverable and were highly appreciated by the GEO Secretariat, country representatives and other stakeholders from organisations such World Bank in Washington or European industry. The feedback we have received was very positive and supportive of both the objective of the research and the specific methodological design.

The key messages from these stakeholders were that they:

- consider the work done novel, absolutely relevant to their activities and a prime example of how a project can align its activities to the needs of GEO
- are keen to pick up the methodology and its implementation as part of GEO activities beyond the end of the project
- are willing to mobilise the GEO offices network to implement the methodology beyond the region covered by GEO-CRADLE also during the project's lifetime
- endorse the idea of publishing a paper around it
- will motivate regional initiatives (<u>AfriGEOSS</u>, <u>AmeriGEOSS</u>) to see the benefit of this approach



All in all, the maturity cards have proven to be a powerful tool to highlight strengths and weaknesses, communicate on identified gaps, understand the level of uptake of key initiatives such as Copernicus and GEO, and guide future EO activities.

Nonetheless, there are limitations to the implementation of this approach which should be underlined. First, there is a need for the definition and application of a parallel "benchmarking" methodology that will allow to establish more robust reference points against which to measure the current status of a given indicator for a given country. This extension shall be explored in the future.

Moreover some "thematic" limitations have been identified. For example, while this study includes some discussion of meteorology, we concluded that meteorological services are so broad that a dedicated study should be conducted to assess this properly. Similarly, it should also be noted that while local modelling capacities have been considered, there is a focus on space-based observations in the choice of the indicators. While some weaknesses remain, the methodology has made considerable progress in developing an index for a concept for which there is little existing information and we look forward to working further and iterating with other stakeholders to further develop the methodology.



Table of Contents		_
Acronyms and Abbr	reviations	vi
List of Figures		
LIST OF LADIES		
1. Introduction.	+	1
1.1. Context	objectives	1
1.2. Project	dology: Contribution to project objectives	1
1.3. Method	ent structure	······1 2
2 Methodology	/	2 Д
2. Wicthodology 2.1 Starting	z nhase	4
211 Pr	ractices included	4
2.1.2. A	pproaches declined	
2.2. Constru	iction phase	6
2.2.1. In	ndicators	6
2.2.1.1.	Capacities	9
2212	Concention	22
2.2.1.2.	Cooperation	23
2.2.1.3.	National Uptake & Awareness	32
2.3. Deployr	ment phase	
2.3.1. Fr	rom data collection to maturity card	
2.3.2. As	ssigning maturity levels	
2.3.2.1.	Capacities	
Table 12. Mat		
Table 13: Mat	Connerstion	
2.3.2.2.		
Table 14: Mat	turity Level: Cooperation	51
2.3.2.3.	National Uptake & Awareness	56
Table 15: Mat	turity Level: National Uptake & Awareness	
2.3.3. Ex	xample of collection of data	60
Table 16: Exa	mple collection of data for Greece	60
Table 17: Exa	mple collection of data for FYROM	61
3. Visualisation.	· ·	64
Maturity Cards		64
4. Insights		79
4.1. Method	dology Validation	79
4.2. Assessn	nent	80
4.3. Recomm	mendations	96
4.4. Conclus	sion	98
Annex 1: Maturity l	evels – short version	
Annex 2: Contacts in	n the Rol	104
Annex 3: Spider dia	gram per country	
Grouping of c	countries	
National In	nfrastructure	
(a)	Space Agency / Space Authority	
(b)	Own space-borne capacity	
(c)	Ground-based facilities	107
(d)	In-situ monitoring networks	
(e)	Modelling / Computing capacities	
(f)	(G) EO data exploitation platforms	
Critical ma	ass of EO researchers	



	(g)	Number of public organisations	
	(h)	Number of researchers	
	(i)	Courses offered	
	(j)	Relevant publications	110
	Industry base	110	
	(k)	Number of companies	110
	(I)	Employment numbers	111
	(m)	Resellers / Representatives	111
	(n)	Clusters	111
	Collaboration	through GEO	112
	(o)	Participation in GEO/GEOSS initiatives	112
	(p)	Specific actions on SDGs	112
	(q)	Designated GEO office	113
	(r)	Provision of data to GEOSS	113
	Impact of Cop	pernicus	113
	(s)	Organisations involved in Copernicus projects	113
	Participation	to other international efforts	114
	(t)	ESA	114
	(u)	Meteorological (WMO, EUMETSAT)	114
	(v)	UN system (UN-GGIM,)	115
	(w)	Infrastructure for Spatial Information	115
	(x)	Standardisation activities	115
	Availability of	EU funding	116
	(y)	EU R&D participation	116
	Networking ir	nitiatives	116
	(z)	Networking initiatives	116
	(aa)	Data Portals	117
	National Polic	ies Implementation	117
	(bb)	Policy	117
	(cc)	Internal Budget & Investment	118
	Penetration	118	
	(dd)	Use of Geo-information	
	(ee)	Capacity building EO focused actions	119
Annex 4	: Example of Sp a)	pider graphs and Conditional formatting per country Albania Spider graphs and conditional formatting	120 120
	b)	Bulgaria Spider graphs and conditional formatting	124
	c)	Cyprus Spider graphs and conditional formatting	127
	d)	Egypt Spider graphs and conditional formatting	131
	e)	FYROM Spider graphs and conditional formatting	135
	f)	Greece Spider graphs and conditional formatting	



g)	Israel Spider graphs and conditional formatting	142				
h)	Romania Spider graphs and conditional formatting	145				
i)	Serbia Spider graphs and conditional formatting	149				
j)	Tunisia Spider graphs and conditional formatting	152				
k)	Turkey Spider graphs and conditional formatting	156				
Annex 5: Contrasted a	ssessment for the Rol	160				
Annex 6: Definitions		180				
Annex 7: Bibliography						
nnex 8: Benchmarking						
Annex 9: Geospatial re	eadiness index	186				



Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym	Description
DoW	Description of Work
CEDARE	Center for Environment and Development for the Arab Region and Europe
CERT	Research and Studies Telecommunications Center
CUT	Cyprus University of Technology
Dx.y	Deliverable number y from Work Package x
EARSC	European Association of Remote Sensing Companies
EC	European Commission
EO	Earth Observation
ESA	European Space Agency
EU	European Union
EUMETSAT	European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites
GEO	Group on Earth Observations
GEOSS	Global Earth Observation System of Systems
GI	Geo-information
GIS	Geographic information system
(G) EO	(Geoinformation / Geospatial) and Earth Observation
INCA	Institute for Nature Conservation in Albania
INOE	National Institute for Research and Development in Optoelectronics
INO	InoSens doo
IP	Intellectual Property
NOA	National Observatory of Athens
SBA	Social Benefit Areas
SRTI	Space Research and Technology Institute of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
STAR	Space Technology and Advanced Research (Romania)
UZAY	Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey Space Technologies Research Institute
Rol	Region of Interest
ROSA	Romanian Space Agency
WP	Work Package



•	
List of Figures	-
Table 1: Indicators by strategic groups (capacities, collaboration, uptake)	7
Table 2: Model of table sent to country partners as guideline for the Indicators	8
Table 3: Capacities Pillar	9
Table 4: Cooperation Pillar	23
Table 5: National Uptake & Awareness Pillar	32
Table 6: Experts validation	39
Table 7: Example of level indicator assessment (Serbia> Space authority)	40
Table 8: Example of level indicator assessment (Tunisia> Space authority)	41
Table 9: Assigned level for space authority	41
Table 10: Example of level indicator assessment (Turkey> data portal level 3)	41
Table 11: Example of level indicator assessment (Egypt> data portal> level 1)	42
Table 12: Assigned level for data portals	43
Table 13: Maturity Level: Capacities	44
Table 14: Maturity Level: Cooperation	51
Table 15: Maturity Level: National Uptake & Awareness	56
Table 16: Example collection of data for Greece	60
Table 17: Example collection of data for FYROM	61
Table 18: Assessment from Greece	62
Table 19: Assessment from FYROM	62
Table 20: Countries placed in the maturity line from (+) to (-)	82
Table 21: Maturity cards (Σ of all 32 indicators)	84
Table 22: Maturity cards (Σ of indicators representing each of the pillars > representation)	85
Table 23: Country indicators summary table	90
Table 24: Maturity levels (short version)1	.00
Table 25: List of main partners contacts1	.04
Table 26: Stakeholders in the respective countries1	.04
Table 27: Comparison Geospatial CGRI / GEO-CRADLE maturity indicators methodology1	.86



List of Tables	
Figure 1: Methodology process steps	38
Figure 2: Methodology process (level)	43
Figure 3: Example comparison ranged version vs rounded (Albania)	64
Figure 4: Example comparison ranged version vs rounded (Greece)	65
Figure 5: Maturity card model	66
Figure 6: Maturity card Albania	67
Figure 7: Maturity card Bulgaria	68
Figure 8: Maturity card Cyprus	69
Figure 9: Maturity card Egypt	70
Figure 10: Maturity card FYROM	71
Figure 11: Maturity card Greece	72
Figure 12: Maturity card Israel	73
Figure 13: Maturity card Romania	74
Figure 14: Maturity card Serbia	75
Figure 15: Maturity card Tunisia	76
Figure 15: Maturity card Turkey	77
Figure 17: Spider chart (all indicators)	84
Figure 18: Maturity representation in Radar chart (3 pillars > capacities)	85
Figure 19: Maturity representation in Radar chart (3 pillars > collaboration	87
Figure 20: Maturity representation in Radar chart (3 pillars > uptake)	89
Figure 21: Greece Maturity Indicators	91
Figure 22: Israel Maturity Indicators	91
Figure 23: Turkey Maturity Indicators	92
Figure 24: Romania Maturity Indicators	92
Figure 25: Serbia Maturity Indicators	93
Figure 26: Tunisia Maturity Indicators	93
Figure 27: Bulgaria Maturity Indicators	94
Figure 28: Cyprus Maturity Indicators	94
Figure 29: Egypt Maturity Indicators	95
Figure 30: Albania Maturity Indicators	95
Figure 31: FYROM Maturity Indicators	96



1. Introduction

1.1. Context

In view of the implementation of GEO vision, a number of concrete steps for the effective involvement of member states across the globe are required. This includes the creation of national focal points, the formulation of commitment in terms of contributions to flagships and initiatives, the development of platforms for data exchange, collaboration and capacity building, and the establishment of support mechanisms for regional coordination. Tightly connected to this – as Europe's primary contribution to GEO/GEOSS, Copernicus was conceived as a programme to bring a more coherent and efficient approach to the development of Earth observation capacity. More recently, it has also been recognised as an instrument for economic policy; therefore, it has the defined goal to generate economic growth and jobs in the European EO services downstream sector. It represents a great opportunity for Europe to take a lead in the market to deliver EO services.

In this context, mapping the "EO maturity" of each country seems to be an imperative first step towards establishing the right channels for know-how and best practices exchange between countries. To that end, GEO-CRADLE helps to construct an accurate picture of the state-of-play of EO activities in the Balkan, North Africa and Middle East regions. This is achieved through the implementation of the novel "maturity indicators" approach.

1.2. Project objectives

Alongside the profound changes occurring globally in the EO sector and the corresponding changes in national priorities around this sector, this project's aspiration is to constitute the "cradle" of sustainable, coordinated EO activities and capacities in the Region of Interest (Rol). This has been pursued through the exploitation of synergies amongst key EO partners and the creation of an ecosystem and a toolbox to address the region's needs within and beyond the project's lifetime, supporting the implementation of GEOSS and Copernicus in the Rol.

GEO-CRADLE has defined four objectives that have been driving the respective activities carried out in the project:

- I. Support the effective integration of existing EO capacities (space/air-borne/in-situ monitoring networks, modelling and data exploitation skills, and past project experience)
- II. Provide the interface for the engagement of the complete ecosystem of EO stakeholders (scientists, service/data providers, end-users, governmental orgs, and decision makers)
- III. Promote the concrete uptake of EO services and data in response to regional needs, relevant to the thematic priorities of the Call (adaptation to climate change, improved food security, access to raw materials and energy), and
- IV. Contribute to the improved implementation of and participation in GEO, GEOSS, and Copernicus in the region.

1.3. Methodology: Contribution to project objectives

The analysis of the maturity of the various countries in the Rol is an integral part of the overall scope and approach of GEO-CRADLE, contributing to the success of its objectives by:



- Providing an independent, up-to-date but also replicable methodology to assess the level of EO uptake (in particular GEOSS and Copernicus) at national level, thus allowing decision makers to make informed decisions on which activities to undertake and which gaps to fill.
- Providing information that can help regional stakeholders across the complete EO value chain to intensify their cooperation and seek collaborative actions.
- Evaluating awareness in EO and the engagement with Copernicus projects or GEO activities, thus informing both initiatives at programmatic level.
- Performing a maturity card of existing EO capacities, enabling the definition of a roadmap for future GEOSS implementation and Copernicus uptake.
- Weighing the readiness and maturity of each country to be integrated at the GEO-CRADLE roadmap (D5.7: Roadmap for future implementation of GEOSS and Copernicus)
- Identifying country challenges and setting country priorities which will feed the exploitation plan (D7.6: Sustainability Plan), providing the means (if adopted) for continuous and efficient reports maturation of participation in and contribution of countries to GEO, GEOSS and Copernicus.
- Integrating information from other project tasks such as the inventory (D2.2: Inventory of in-situ instrumentation and regional networks, D2.3: Inventory of numerical modelling and computing facilities, D2.4: Inventory of Spaceborne capacities) and reviewed the gap analysis (D3.1: Gap Analysis Report)

This report aspires to build adequate knowledge of the level and progress of GEO and Copernicus implementation in each country, integrating results from previous tasks, especially the inventory and the gap analysis. It highlights the critical indicators to lead to successful (G)EO strategy implementation feeding the GEOCRADLE long-term roadmap.

1.4. Document structure

The document allows for a comprehensive, yet concise, analysis of the level of maturity of a given country in various areas related to Earth Observation activities.

The methodology has been defined in two stages:

Stage I: The first part of the **deliverable D3.2 (I)** outlined the methodology and its boundaries and presented a preliminary assessment of the maturity indicators for a few countries. The interim document (delivered in month 9 – December 2016) was devoted to the formulation of appropriate indicators of (G)EO maturity at the country level. These indicators have been completed for all participant countries in the Region of Interest (Rol¹). The indicators were grouped under three main categories "Capacities", "Cooperation" and "National Uptake and Awareness" and have been measured throughout the whole project.

Stage II: For the elaboration of this **deliverable D.3.2 (II)**, we have worked closely with project partners and experts in the countries to implement the methodology and fine-tune it with a view to long-term sustainability. The results of this effort have been seen as a useful contribution to understanding and measuring EO capacity at the country level. In that regard, we have also introduced comments from stakeholders such as the GEO secretariat².

The report presents the findings in the **5 sections** described below:

¹ Rol: Region of Interest: Middle East, North Africa and the Balkans

² GEO: Comments received from GEO secretariat: A. Mlisa, W. Chu and C. Larlee



- (1) **Introduction**: Introduces the context of the methodology, reviewing the objectives and context of GEO-CRADLE and the contribution of the deliverable to the project.
- (2) **Methodology**: The core of the deliverable document. It provides an overview of guidelines defining the methodology that was used to perform the assessment of the (G)EO maturity, understanding the elements to construct a consolidated list of indicators to be measured by all participant countries.
- (3) **Visualisation**: For each representation of the maturity: by countries or by indicators, we provide a synthetic description.
- (4) **Insights**: Drafts and early ideas of the main findings gathered during the validation with stakeholders including a discussion of the future steps.
- (5) **Annexes:** Includes detailed definitions for some elements of the indicators, contacts in the countries, and spider graphs for each of the countries for further analysis.



2. Methodology

There is a very little documentation on how to develop a maturity model that is theoretically robust, tested and widely accepted in the (G)EO domain. Therefore, the development of such a methodology is based on a novel approach proposed by GEO-CRADLE and realised in four phases:

- During the **starting phase**, the possible methodological steps to design the maturity assessment approach were analysed.
- In the **construction phase**, the tools to measure the maturity levels of the countries were built and the procedures for the deployment and management of the overall approach were defined, including definition of specific indicators.
- Finally, during the **deployment phase**, the maturity model and assessment tools were validated.

The results of the implementation of the above phases were summarised and visually projected in the **visualisation phase.**

2.1. Starting phase

The starting phase was concerned with the **design of a maturity assessment method** to measure the (G)EO readiness of the countries. Based on the data gathered by the GEO-CRADLE project at country level, we proposed five practices to set the ground for the investigation of country maturity. The latter was cross-checked by country partners participating in the project. Some of these approaches were rejected, and others kept, as discussed below.

2.1.1. Practices included

Below we present methods and actions selected for inclusion in this methodology. The approaches identified in this starting phase, were contemplated in the subsequent phases.

- Integration of information from other project tasks: This step evaluated and interpreted the country capacities from the inventory (Deliverable 2.1-2.4) and reviewed the results of the gap analysis (Deliverable 3.1) to help tie the maturity indicators with the rest of the GEO-CRADLE project findings. This allowed us to design and test ideas for the assignment of value to the indicators.
- **Desk research by country partners**: All desktop research conducted during the realisation of this project was based on available literature and publications. Other main sources consulted were the websites of institutions and companies. Finally, the country partners contributed their insights and expertise into the topics to feed into the report.
- Semi-structured interviews with country partners organisations and validation of findings by experts: In order to collect first-hand data and information on perceived impacts, trends and challenges, semi-structured interviews have been carried out with country partners. For the interviews a flexible approach was used throughout the project duration and taking advantage of project events for face to face discussions. To assure the overall quality of the report and to avoid the inclusion of incorrect findings, a feedback round took place. Firstly, country partners provided feedback on the methodology of the report. Secondly, some recognised research organisations such as National Contact Points (NCPs), companies or entities part of ministries in the country validated the findings (corrections and improvements). The consolidation of these enhancements was undertaken by EARSC (as task leader of T3.1) guided through the experience of country partners who mainly facilitated the setup of the necessary interfaces.
- Additional Analysis in relation to incomplete data or N/A: This was considered for cases where we had insufficient responses from country partners against a particular category; for example,



the number of EO institutions per country, or in some cases where we wanted to provide a complete response even if this was not possible with the information gathered; for example, the total number of employees in public but also private organisations. The extrapolation potential was assessed estimating data on the basis of current information provided by country partners.

• **Comparative assessment**: Based on the previous approaches, the methodology allowed for an interpretation of findings (country level analysis) represented in the form of maturity cards.

2.1.2. Approaches declined

Whilst some other approaches may add value to the overall maturity indicators methodology, at this point in time and within the available resources of the project, they have been reviewed but not incorporated. These are:

- Normalisation: Each country performs differently in various aspects which can distort country level comparisons; such as economy, population, investment, competition, legislation and regulation, industry & innovation or public-sector involvement just to name a few. Furthermore, countries are all in different stages of development in terms of economy, environmental, population, health as measured for example by the Social Progress Index or UN Human Development Index³. This may affect the metrics used to evaluate the EO sector performance but are not typically taken into account in performance assessments. We considered the possibility to build more complex models to run effective country comparisons such as normalising by GDP or economic performances to produce a more realistic view of rankings. During the second stage of work, we concluded that this was outside of the scope of this deliverable and that we should rather focus here on developing a coherent and justifiable methodology for reviewing individual counties performances.
- **Benchmarking:** Following some of the steps from OECD research work⁴, using the benchmarking approach, the assignment of values to the various indicators for a given country should follow as much as possible an objective approach and allow scrutiny/comparison against countries with well-mapped capacities. The benchmarking implementation follow these steps: (i) planning and selection of the maturity indicators (ii) collection of data from countries of the Rol (iii) selection of benchmarking reference (iv) comparison and evaluation of data collected (v) monitoring of the evolution of the maturity of each indicator (iv) implementation of improvements for future activities. The first three of these phases, aiming to set up reference indicators, have been defined based on a model country with a strong EO sector. With this perspective, all countries within the Rol are then compared against these reference values and this activity is shown in Annex 3. But here the difficulty lies with the selection of a given reference country as the one having the best performance against a given indicator. As can be easily understood, this task is highly complex in itself.

A thoroughly implemented benchmarking approach requires an array of considerations and resources (establishing benchmarks that are applicable across countries with different GDPs, income levels, different populations and, of course, different EO needs). Taking this into account, we have decided to confine our efforts to simply organising the process of benchmarking in order to pave the way for more robust results in future studies. The benchmarking is explored as a method to fully compare the performance of the geo-information processes and products with the best performances of other countries in future activities.

Alternatively, for some of the indicators, we also introduced a section to identify the **best practices leading the best performance**, studying the scope of various countries with well-known

³ The Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite statistic of life expectancy, education, and income per capita indicators. Source . 2016 Social Progress Index.

⁴ OECD research work

D3.4 Maturity Indicators and country (G)EO profile (II)



capacities. This activity will allow a more robust comparison of values for the different indicators, answering essentially the question: "Where does this country stand with regards to this indicator in comparison to the best-performing country?". Nonetheless, this experience shows that it takes a lot of effort to gather and organise information to solve comparability problems. Comparability of a given sector is also a difficult issue. Even if two countries are providing the same type of geo-information services, different outcomes from the selected indicators may result depending on social and economic factors that the country has no control over. Thus, performance measurements alone are not sufficient to explain different levels of performance in each country. A test has been included in the Annex 3.

Based on the scope and relevance of the market for Earth observation services, global challenges, achieved growth rates, anticipated trends in the needs for geo-information, the existing knowledge and expectations in the supply of suitable satellite data, a **reference country selection** can be characterised as one of the most promising for the development of the EO sector. This selection should be made considering not only the market-based approaches outlined above, but also the national space-policy agenda as it is seen as "accelerator" that will increase the competitiveness of the sector-specific business. It can be difficult to identify one single nation to represent this benchmark as no single country is likely to demonstrate best practice for all dimensions of performance. So, if one country is chosen, it is important to focus on overall performance and not just on certain aspects, where there will always remain a broad scope and variance in national capabilities. More information on Benchmarking can be found in Annex 8.

2.2. Construction phase

2.2.1. Indicators

In this phase we have defined the indicators that will allow us to capture the EO maturity levels of a given country. This was accompanied by a detailed explanation of each indicator's parameters and an overview of boundaries for their application. Through the measurement and monitoring of these indicators we should be able to document the state and health of the Geoinformation and Earth Observation sector of the target country first within and then beyond the GEO-CRADLE project. They will help to understand where the capabilities of the country are, and which way is the country going (projection and prospects). To support the definition of the indicators we are providing additional reasoning for the analysis that was undertaken. This provides assurance that the indicator is valid. We have grouped the indicators into strategic groups or strategic questions.

For each indicator, information has been gathered against a range of parameters. For some indicators, the parameters and the relationship to the indicator is clear. For others some explanation is needed to ensure a consistency of the analysis and that the indicators can be successfully compiled. The table below summarises the **major three pillars, Capacities, Co-operation and Uptake**, and indicators failing in each category.



Table 1: Indicators by strategic groups (capacities, collaboration, uptake)					
Pillar	Group of indicators	Indicators			
Capacities	Infrastructure	Space authority			
		Own space-borne			
		Access 3 rd party mission			
		Ground base facilities			
		In-situ monitoring networks			
		Modelling / computing facilities			
		(G)EO data exploitation platforms			
	Public EO R&D	No. public organisations			
		Employment public sector			
		Courses			
		Publications			
	Industry base	No. companies			
		Employment private sector			
		Resellers			
		Clusters			
Co-operation	Collaboration GEO	Participation in GEO			
		Actions SDGs			
		GEO office			
		Data to GEOSS hub			
	Impact Copernicus	Actions on Copernicus / projects			
	International Cooperation	ESA			
		Participation meteo agency			
		UN ecosystem			
		Spatial Infrastructure			
		Standardisation			
	EU Funds	R&D participation EU projects			
Uptake	Networking	Networking / events			
		Data portals			
	Policy	Policy			
		National budget investment			
	Penetration	Use			
		Capacity building			

Where appropriate, the corresponding indicators will have different parameters (information resources/variables) which will describe the necessary elements required to assess the maturity (i.e. the actual state, the impact, response etc.).

To support the definition of the indicators we are providing additional reasoning (see *Error! Reference source not found.*) for the analysis that was undertaken for each of the country partners. This information has been sent to all partners to request inputs for each of the maturity indicators. This table helps to ensure that country partners would obtain the necessary information guaranteeing the basis for maturity analysis. The set of indicators acted as the major tool to get a compact, illustrated overview of country status in major issues related to the EO sector. Those are based on systematic descriptions of the national capabilities collected within GEO-CRADLE project.

The maturity indicators sections include both quantitative (involving numerical measurements) and qualitative measures which are described in the deployment section. A descriptive table has been sent to all country partners to gather the information. The table below presents for each indicator, its description, the information resources as parameters, constraints and the analysis. The table also includes a column as a reference for the Gap analysis (Task 3.1.) and Maturity indicators (Task 3.2.), where the task leader is requesting country partners what type of information is missing to complement the assessment of each



maturity indicator at country level (describe the situation in their country). It is also marked where the information is provided by Q=Questionnaire or R=Knowledge of local partners/desk research.

Table 2: Model of table sent to country partners as guideline for the Indicators

Ref.	Indicators	Description	Parameters	Constraints	Q/R	Gaps analysis (Task T3.1) Check-list for inventorying: additional inputs & questions to complement the information from survey	Maturity indicators (T.3.2.). Data required to assess each indicator at country level	Comments

Once the country contact submitted information related to maturity indicators, a preliminary **maturity card** was produced presenting an initial assessment of a country's performance against the various indicators. This first assessment was established by **indicator ranges** which related the country performance assigning score to each of the indicators. Specific guidelines and tables have been prepared to allow for the application of the methodology for each country.

The suggested boundaries on country performance (translated into maturity levels) assign scores to each indicator. The current proposal follows the scale score from 0-4 and after discussion with several stakeholders in the GEO community, the ranges were considered as appropriate and its applicability was evaluated by task leaders & project management.

The assessment of countries' maturity includes information provided in two rounds with country partners as during the course of the project more information became available, and we needed to re-evaluate the maturity scores and better define the guidelines.

We have identified some **benefits** in using a defined group of indicators and we have applied them to our case:

- providing quality feedback to drive direction of involvement in the EO sector per country
- supporting future decision-making and focusing attention on what matters most
- providing a common language for communication and helping understand performance
- providing a way to see if the investment in the EO sector is working
- Serving as risk triggers and early warning signs

Constraints need to be also quoted:

- Availability of data and literature for selected indicators
- The limited sample of interviews (budget constraint)
- Comparison of countries is challenging and has to be conducted across a limited set of dimensions.

The tables below provide the information distributed to partners for data collection.



2.2.1.1. Capacities

Focus on country and regional EO activities. What does the sector using EO in the area covered by GEO-CRADLE look like?

Table 3: Capacities Pillar

Ref.	Indicators	Description	Parameters	Constraints	Q / R	Gaps analysis (Task T3.1) Check-list for inventorying: additional inputs & Qs to complement	Maturity indicators (T.3.2.) Data required to assess each indicator at country level	Comments
1.1.	National Infrastructure This will capture the stat	e of an Earth Observation	Strategy by countr	y. The goal here is t	to ge	t a wide picture of the eng	gagement in the area	of Earth
	observations, the number and geographical distribution of EO service public and private organisations within the GEO-CRADLE region. Additional information will be provided by looking for the total number of employees for each country (public/private) and where possible classifying the companies by size (See Annex 1.2). It will also help to identify the national collaborative EO projects and if there are partnerships for implementing EO tasks and activities. It will answer questions such as where does the data discovery, access, and interoperability in the countries currently stand. This component focuses on supporting willing national and regional institutions to develop monitoring capacities through the use of Earth observation and modelling. Until recently, EO satellites used to be built and operated by governmental organisations. However, the launching of private sector owned commercial remote sensing satellites, which are capable of capturing high resolution imagery, not just started a new era but also encouraged some countries to have their own							
1.1.1.	Space Agency or	Name of any			Q	Is there a national		
	designated Space	organisation				space policy or		
	Authority	responsible for space				strategy, a space		
		This dimension will look at the key players involved in space activities at the				agency:		



		national level (policy organisation)						
1.1.2.	Own space-borne capacity	Get a wide picture if countries are operating their own space borne capacities (EO satellites, ground segments)	-N. of satellites operated by the country.-Type of mission	Lack of response at country level	Q / R	Requested additional inputs. For each sat capacities, it has been requested (i) title (ii) geographic coverage (region) (iii) catalogues (iv) web server (year collection of data (v) temporal resolution of data acquisition (vi) data availability policy (vii) data policy applied	Request to country representative space borne capacity operated by the country.	It will provide information on the space -borne infrastructure: number of organisations but most important the type of satellites and how those are operated up to date.
1.1.3.	Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	Operating under contract to a satellite operator or other 3rd party.	-Total number of space missions	Lack of response at country level	Q	Requested additional inputs	Request to country representative and thematic experts in the country but also in the region if he knows who operates the ground station	
1.1.4.	Ground-based facilities	It will give information on the number of organisations operating the equipment necessary to control and to acquire data from EO satellites enabling the control of the	-Total number of Organisations with ground based/in-situ capacities	Lack of response at country level	Q	 -Requested additional inputs & details such as: (i) Additional capacity in number of meteo stations, more details 		-The questionnaire also provides information on (i) Meteorological Facilities (ii) Atmospheric Composition Facilities (iii) Hydrometric



	spacecraft, and	-Number of	provided for water	Facilities (iv) Soil
	distribution of payload	stations	quality stations	Attributes Facilities
	data and telemetry			(v) Energy/
	among interested	-Location &	(ii) Besides owning or	Radiation Facilities
	parties on the ground.	region	providing raw data.	
			does the institute also	-Gaps analysis has
			process/model data.	requested also info
			provide GIS/mapping	on: Which are the
	FO satellite acquisition		services. is it an end-	measured
	stations & antennas		user?	attributes? - E.g.
	mirror sites of GSs			temperature,
	Core GSs. etc.)		(iii) What type is it	humidity,
			(meteorological/climat	precipitation for
			ic. atmospheric	meteorological/clim
			composition/profiling.	atic - E.g. aerosols,
			hvdrometric/water	clouds, atmospheric
			quality, soil	pollutants for
			attributes/spectra.	atmospheric
			energy/radiation.	composition/profili
			other)?	ng - E.g. water level
			,-	discharge for
			(iv) Is ΜΕΤΔΠΔΤΔ	hydrometric/water
			available?	quality - E.g. soil
				size distribution for
				soil
				attributes/spectra -
				E.g. radiation for
				energy/radiation
				-Are these users
				willing to be data
				providers, therefore
				helping to fill gaps



							with in situ & satellite data records?
1.1.5.	in-situ monitoring networks	It will give information on the number of organisations operating in-situ networks (active or passive remote sensors, meteo/atmospheric/ water sensors, etc.)	-Total number of Organisations with in-situ capacities -Number of stations -Location & region	Lack of response at country level	Q	 -Requested additional inputs & details such as: (i) Additional capacity in number of meteo stations, more details provided for water quality stations (ii) Besides owning or providing raw data, does the institute also process/model data, provide GIS/mapping services, is it an end- user? (iii) What type is it (meteorological/climat ic, atmospheric composition/profiling, hydrometric/water quality, soil attributes/spectra, energy/radiation, other)? (iv) Is METADATA available? 	-The questionnaire also provides information on (i) Meteorological Facilities (ii) Atmospheric Composition Facilities (iii) Hydrometric Facilities (iv) Soil Attributes Facilities (v) Energy/ Radiation Facilities -Gaps analysis has requested also info on: Which are the measured attributes? - E.g. temperature, humidity, precipitation for meteorological/clim atic - E.g. aerosols, clouds, atmospheric pollutants for atmospheric composition/profili ng - E.g. water level discharge for hydrometric/water



								quality - E.g. soil size distribution for soil attributes/spectra - E.g. radiation for energy/radiation -Are these users willing to be data providers, therefore helping to fill gaps with in situ & satellite data records?
1.1.6.	Modelling and computing capacities	Capacities for modelling and computing processing in GEO CRADLE are defined as: high- performance computer (HPC) facilities for their executions with multiprocessing systems and large external memory units.	-Total number of Organisations with modelling & processing capacities -Total number of models	Lack of response at country level	Q	-Does your organisation have sufficient available computing resources for the processing and exploitation of EO data and the models running (Server clusters, HPC clusters, Cloud infrastructure, Virtualization infrastructure, Processing power capacity – CPU, RAM, Storage Capacity)? -What is the source of EO data used in the model (geospatial	 -If organisations do have the modelling and computing capacity then they are asked to provide a short description of what it is used for. -It is important to have an overview on the number of models (ie. models for atmospheric modelling, what 	The questionnaire also provides information on (i) Total number of algorithms (ii) Models for meteo/climatic (iii) Models for atmospheric composition (iv) Models for hydrometric/water quality (v) Models for soil attributes (vi) Models for energy/radiation



						data, e.g. DTM; remote sensing data, e.g raw satellite high- level images; in-situ data, e.g. temperature, pressure, humidity; other)?	those are, what is the status and the research owner	-Interest to have thematic areas of interest per country
1.1.7.	EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	Coordinated monitoring networks, integrated analysis & modelling capacity	-Names of Organisations with data exploitation products -Type of organisation according to classification system	Lack of response at country level	Q	Requested for additional inputs		-GEO-CRADLE classification to be checked with EARSC classification and EARSC's own knowledge from industry survey (see Annex 1.1)
1.2	Critical Mass of EO resea Identification of the diffe	archers erent groups of researcher	rs both in research	institutions & unive	ersitie	es/academia and how big	these groups are.	
1.2.1.	Number of public organisations	It will show the number of public organisations in a given country and it will illustrate the geographical distribution of organisation	-Number and names of institutional, research/acade mic actors surveyed	-Limited number of responses in some countries -Accuracy will depend greatly on the number of answers	Q / R	-Besides owning or providing raw data, does the institute also process/model data, provide GIS/mapping services, is it an end- user? -What are the main thematic areas of activity of the	-The goal here is to get a wide picture of the number and geographical distribution of EO organisations per country. -Country partners should	-Additional Information on type of organisation by activity: (i) raw data producers surveyed (ii) value-adders surveyed (iii) GIS/mapping service providers surveyed (iv) End- users with in-house



				-Difficult to establish threshold groups or department sizes		organisation (climate change, food security, access to raw materials, energy, other)?	be able to provide the names of the organisations and what they do (the classification) -Note: it is assumed that these organisations do not go beyond in the value chain. So, any public organisation that represents more than end-users, will appear in section 1.1.	GIS surveyed and (v) End-users surveyed -Additional Information on the areas: (i) Actors active in climate change (ii) Actors active in food security (iii) Actors active in access to raw materials (iv) Actors active in energy
1.2.2.	Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	Distribution of researchers by country. It might indicate the level of training and expertise deployed	-Estimated number of researchers employed or granted -Organisation location -Grouped according to doctorate,	-Gaps in the data (n. of groups offering EO education). This parameter will be difficult to fill since extrapolation in each country will be less accurate.	Q / R	Hard to find out the number of researchers in using any EO and geo-information data. It will depend of departments, considering staff in Earth observation: researchers, doctorates, graduates doing some training, etc (% employees in EO and geo- information)	-Request to country representative more information on the number of departments & size of the research group (the number of people involved in it)	-How many researchers are employed in each country -Nice to have gender percentage (participation woman in the workforce)



			masters, degree?	-Grades could offer a dedicated subject in EO as satellite oceanography, EO for mining engineering, ecosystems.			-To be included at the score card - Try to understand consolidation of a research area – at the national & international level
1.2.3.	Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	N. Courses: Information about the quantity of courses and the investment in the future. It will give an idea on where the priorities of countries are in terms of education and the possible trend on the next generation of scientists. Diversity & Maturity: Most universities will also offer courses through a combination of lectures and specialized seminars. This indicator will understand where country priorities are.	-Number of courses offered -N. Years where courses have been first established -Type pf courses: Subject of Geo- information Science and <i>Earth</i> <i>Observation</i> , <i>C</i> ourses as for example: Remote Sensing, Photogrammetr y, Digital processing, GIS or specific courses as	-Hard to accurately determine, both because of a lack of knowledge and general sensitivity around funding questions. It also shows difficult to measure the academic performance (e.g. number of high-impact papers published, # of PhDs, etc.) or to industry/econo mic performance of	R	 -Request to country representative & desk research on the number of courses offered -Interview process needed -The country partner should provide a table including information on the courses related to EO / country. It will include the following parameters: (I) title (ii) type (master/post- 	Maybe we could get an idea on how resources are being concentrated in academia? will be possible to do some correspondence with the large research institutes? - Consolidation: we might have some information on the investment in the future? -Specific courses are expected to provide a better basis for recognition on the research work



	monitoring	students after	graduate) (iii)	-To what extend
	climate from	graduation	duration (iv)	does each country
	space,		graduation	support the
	Observing Earth	-Difficult to	requirements (v)	preparation of new
	from Space,	identify quality	start year (vi)	generations of
	etc	and date when	estimate n. of	scientists and
		was the first	students/course	engineers in Earth
		year where the	(vii) organisation	Observation? It will
		course has	partners	quantify the total n.
	-Oualitative	been in place	(lecturing or	of students who
	perspective		sponsoring) (viii)	have passed the
	P P	-Difficult to	academic	courses
		score relevance	performance	
		& quality level	(impact of the	-This information
		of courses	project)	could provide some
				idea if there is any
			-Request to	lack of
			country	infrastructure for
			representative &	Earth observation
			desk research on	education and
			the type of	training
			courses and for	
			how long those	-maybe it will raise
			have been	some points on the
			offered the first	quality of the
			time. Guidelines:	courses offered.
			the courses we	
			are looking for	-A benchmarking
			are those ones in	could be done with
			EO (SAR, Optical	other country
			sensors), RS &	taking space
			image	
			processing, GIS,	



						photogrammetry , etc	technology as measure -Diversity courses & how relevant are those courses. -Levels of evaluation: Results, transfer, learning, reactions
1.2.4.	Relevant Publications (in country only, not overseas containing word "satellite?", "GIS", "earth observation, "geo information",	- It might provide information on the involvement with scientific community. i.e. publications (including papers, articles, books, magazines) resulting from EU-funded projects and initiatives.	- N. of paper citations who have Impact factor (intensive reviewing procedures)	-Difficult to obtain and also check the relevance of papers that have been published in a large variety of magazines -Difficult to define relationship between research quality and group quantity.	R	Request to country representative & desk research about paper published in the last 5/3 years. Maybe reproduce a table with Title / Type (thesis research, article, scientific paper) / Publication (magazine, website, book) / N. citations / N. downloads	-Items to reflect: facilitation of communication (via papers) should form an important part of the research institutes which will show strengths of a research performing institution and the development of innovative research - Maybe interesting to have the number of citations of papers- the impact factor: Publishing in a journal (ie. Nature



				or Science has a high impact factor and is considered very prestigious for a marine biologist, however if paper is focussed on algorithm research or electronics and communications, maybe it is more relevant to publish
				in IEEE journals -If possible check "online page hits"? and track the number of visitors to the publications website from each research, academia, etc?.
				Generally, if too small and researchers have no one to bounce ideas off, they might have funding cuts while big groups normally bring fertile interactions and better-guality of



								work but it is clear that not necessarily big groups do better research than small ones. We should need to look for existing indicators i.e. university rankings, number of publications). This section will help to identify the excellence of the research (performance & competitiveness)
1.3.	Industry Base							
	The goal here is to get a	wide picture of the numbe	er and geographica	distribution of EO	com	panies per country.		
1.3.1.	Number of companies	"It will capture the number of companies active in acquiring and supplying data from satellite or airborne platforms and /or their conversion into geo-information products suitable and accessible for their clients. If possible, it might give some view on the evolution in the last years and any	-Number of commercial actors surveyed -Companies location		Q / R	Requested additional inputs	-To relate with EARSC classification on type of activity (see Annex 1.1) Where the industry is operation: Are the country partners aware on the quality management? or standard processes within	 Information on their activity: (i) raw data producers surveyed (ii) value- adders surveyed (iii) GIS/mapping service providers surveyed In future studies, this indicator will show an evolution of the industry by



		trends in the size distribution of companies				these companies? - Are the country partners aware on the quality management? or standard processes within these companies?	number of companies and any trends in the size of companies. -Maybe in future studies, should the subject in quality and standardisation be promoted?
1.3.2.	Scale of companies (large/medium/small/ micro)	Classification Small and medium-sized enterprises: -Micro: 0- 9 employees < €2 million -Small: 10-49 employees (includes micro) < €10 million -Medium-sized: 50- 249 employees < €50 million -Large: over 250 employees €50 million+	-Type of companies. -Split by size	Lack of information from companies responding the survey	Q / R	EARSC request to country representative & desk research. Maybe information could be under companies websites.	This indicator should follow the EARSC taxonomy to be comparable.
1.3.3.	Employment numbers, levels and changes	How many people are employed in each country	Total number of employees within the company	Lack of identification of companies and its existence	Q / R	EARSC request to country	-We could not be certain on the total number of



				through the years. Difficult to identify the total population		representative & desk research -estimated employees per company companies (company website)	companies by country. -It will be nice to know about the gender percentage
1.3.4.	Resellers or local representatives of European companies	Supplier relationship. How many partnerships exist in the sector and for how long they are existed.	-Number of partners or resellers -Country		Q / R	EARSC request to country representative & desk research on data providers resellers & partners	Will provide some idea of companies working as resellers in the region. -It could be extended to other companies
1.3.5.	Existence of Clusters	It provides a measure of the concentration and interconnection of business network, suppliers, and associated institutions in the geo-information field. Clusters are considered to increase the productivity with which companies can	-N. technology space, ICT clusters.			EARSC request to country representative & desk research on ICT clusters	-Clusters are considered to increase the productivity with which companies can compete, nationally and globally. It could be a measure of innovative performance and other related



compete, nationally and globally.			output of a knowledge-based
The clusters will operate within business groups providing to the value adding companies work by means crossover projects with the other type of businesses operating within said strategic sectors with the major goal to develop market-based 'next level of services.			-Might help to understand innovation & competitiveness.

2.2.1.2. Cooperation

Cooperation is defined in relation to programmes that promote scientific collaboration at the international level (International Cooperation & policies). It will review how countries are evolving within international initiatives such as GEOSS and Copernicus. It will provide information on which countries have benefited by Copernicus or GEOSS and to what extent.

A coordinated EO-related effort is required to address global challenges, e.g. coordinated systems, interoperability, data policies, etc. Subsequently, international cooperation can provide a country with momentum and know-how to coordinate EO-related activities also at country level.

Table 4: Cooperation Pillar

Ref.	Indicators	Description	Parameters	Constraints	Q/R	Gaps	Analysis	Maturity of Indicators	Comments
						(Task	T3.1)	(T.3.2.)	
						Check-	list for		



						inventorying: additional inputs & Qs to complement	Data required to assess each indicator at country level	
2.1.	Collaboration throug GEO's mission is to o indicators selected w Plenary Meetings & countries. Ideally the Indicators indicators supporting	th GEO connect the demand fo vill get information on t Ministerial Summits. It under 2.1 should be co GEO-CRADLE are meas	or sound and time the country relatio will also provide pordinated with th sures that will be to	ly environmental i ns with internation an indication of th e GEO Secretariat racked by GEO so th	nforma nal GEC ne exte as the nat cor	ation with the sup D Secretariat Genev ont to which the co GEO M&E Framew osistent data are av	ply of data and informatio /a and if the country is pre puntry has established stro ork is implemented. It wou ailable.	n about the Earth. The paring positions in GEO ng ties with other GEO ld be desirable that the
2.1.1.	Participation in GEO or in projects which are linked to GEOSS	Information if the country is maintaining close relations with international GEO Secretariat Geneva. What is the participation in GEO projects up to now? Do people from the specific country participate in GEO meetings and projects It will also reply to Qs as if the country preparing positions in GEO Plenary Meetings & Ministerial Summits. Has the country established	-Country member of GEO -Number of projects	Provide limited selection of projects	Q/R	-Has your organisation participated in GEO/GEOSS SBA tasks, community activities or initiatives? -Would the organisation be interested in contributing to a regional initiative of GEO (perhaps under specific conditions)?	Country partner could dig out on which is the organisation dealing with GEO in the country and the type of projects	We should aim to have the list of all projects in which a country organisation has participation linked to GEO. Measuring the extent of participation or evaluating the projects can help to measure the impact of past projects and advocate for future initiatives. It will give an indication of 1) the projects participation behaviour and the impact of participatory actions 2) articulation of goals for more than one stakeholders 3)



		strong ties with GEO countries?				identification of adaptive measurement techniques and evaluative process for the projects, what was the project life after the financial proposal	
2.1.2.	Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's)	Earth observations, geospatial information and big data support the implementation of the SDGs at national, regional and local levels, and the monitoring and reporting against the global indicator framework. This indicator will provide a view on the involvement of country organisations in the implementation of SDG's (at various levels) [it could also include additional points for countries whose orgs have contributed to the	-Number of participation occurrences in specific actions	Q/R	Has your organisation participated in GEO/GEOSS SDG's tasks, community activities or initiatives?		



		monitoring or				
2.1.3.	Designated GEO office	The GEO office will help to identify all national activities for possible integration into GEO. Information if the country has such office or department which links with GEO	-N. organisations with direct or at least indirect relevance to GEO/GEOSS -GEO office in a country -GEO focal point organisation	R	EARSC request to country representative about a country point of contact for GEO aspects and the number and name of organisations related to GEO activities per country. -Are there any other participating organisations members of the GEO community from each country?	Provide an assessment from the results of the Q: Would the organisation be interested to provide feedback to the GEO CRADLE consortium for establishing a roadmap for GEO and Copernicus implementation in the region?
2.1.4.	Provision of data to GEOSS	Information on the level of a countries uptake of GEOSS data sharing principles and the links (of its geo- portals – registered datasets) to GEOSS or their contribution to shared data, metadata and products	-number of resources brokered through GEODAB or number of n. of resources that can be directly accessed via the GEOSS Portal -completeness of metadata for	Q	-Info on data sharing: Country partners will provide an overview on the open exchange of data, metadata and products shared within GEOSS	-Access to data and information by GEOSS users is an integral part of GEO -part of the Data Sharing Working Group (DSWG) -Reference to the term "Open Data" ⁵ provides context for the interpretation of the use conditions pertinent to data shared as part of GEOSS Data-CORE, as well as brings GEOSS Data Sharing

⁵ "Open data" is not a measure of maturity. It is a useful information obtained gaps analysis and will be used accordingly.



							-	
			brokered resources					Principles in line with the relevant international, regional, national and organisational developments
2.2.	Impact of Copernicus There are 6 core servi Management, Securit environment, underst The service provision • The Copernic the Europea • The Copernic Medium-Rar • The Copernic the global oc • The Copernic the global oc	ces delivered under the ty, <u>Climate Change</u> . Th tand and mitigate the e of Copernicus services cus Land Monitoring Se n Commission Joint Res cus Atmosphere Monit nge Weather Forecasts cus Marine Environmen cean); cus Emergency Manage cus Security Service is curity and by the Europ	e Copernicus progr is section will eva effects of climate cl has been delegated ervice is provided b search Centre (JRC) oring Services (CAI (ECMWF); nt Monitoring Serv ement Service (EMI provided respectiv pean Satellite Cente	amme: <u>Land Monit</u> luate the type of hange and ensure of by the European C y the European Env for the global land MS) and the Copern ice (CMEMS) is pro ice (CMEMS) is pro s) is provided by th rely by FRONTEX fo er (SatCen) for Sup	coring, <u>I</u> engage civil sec Commis vironm d comp nicus C nicus C ovided I ovided I e Euro or Bord port to	Marine Environmen ment with Coperr surity per country. ssion to a number " ent Agency (EEA) fo onent; limate Change Serv by Mercator Océar pean Commission . er Surveillance, by External Action.	nt Monitoring, Atmosphere nicus projects to improve t Entrusted Entities", which a or the Pan-European and lo vice (C3S) are provided by t n (the French centre for and Joint Research Centre (JRC) the European Maritime Sa	Monitoring, Emergency he management of the ct as "service providers" ocal components, and by the European Centre for alysis and forecasting of ; fety Agency (EMSA) for
	Copernicus will bridge	e the gap between the o	commercial very hi	gh-resolution satel	lite pro	grammes and the e	existing national governmen	nt satellite programmes.
2.2.1.	Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus (projects using data from Copernicus	It will provide information on to which extent organisations have been users of products from Copernicus and maybe the type of Copernicus services they use (info about the involvement in	-N. Organisations -N. Copernicus Services/ organisation -Number of actions with Entrusted entities	Country partners to provide information on the projects involvement under Copernicus. This country information could be	Q	-Has the organisation participated in Copernicus service provision, Copernicus user requirements or Copernicus research and	 Country partner to inform which is the organisation/ministry dealing with Copernicus in the country and projects related Request to country representatives their activity with Entrusted entities 	


							,		
		Copernicus services)		contrasted via CORDIS - Ref GEO- CRADLE: There is a limitation if it is only concern to the four key thematic areas (adaptation to climate change, food security, access to raw materials and energy). -Countries have not the same level of involvement in Copernicus.		innovation action? -Would the organisation be interested in contributing to a regional initiative of Copernicus (perhaps under specific conditions)?			
2.3.	Participation to othe Level of internationa agreements recogniz territories, type of ob	r international efforts Il collaboration to ensu ed. It might help to un oservations as weather.	ure country access derstand if the cou climate. oceans ou	to essential globa untry is dependent r across all domains	l EO in on int	formation. It will period formation formation for the second systems according to the second systems are second so the second system and the second s	provide information on int to meet domestic require	ernational coord ments? observat	lination tions of
2.3.1	ESA	Participation as members or Cooperation partner	-Member		Q/R		Contrast with country partners the information obtained by desk research		
2.3.2.	Meteorological: WMO, <u>EUMETSAT,</u> <u>etc</u>	Participation in Meteorological Organisations such as World Meteorological	-Member		Q/R		Contrast with country partners the information obtained by desk research	How much involvement from organisat a given country	project coming ions in /.



		Organisation (WMO) and European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites (EUMETSAT)				
2.3.3.	UN system as UN-GGIM,	Participation at United Nations programmes: as Committee of Experts on Global Geospatial Information Management (UN- GGIM), Unesco (Global Ocean Observation system- GOOS), UN- OOSA regional centres	-Member	Q/R	Request to country partner an idea of country participation	
2.3.4	INSPIRE	Implementation of INSPIRE	-Report from countries	R	Contrast with Country partner, its involvement	-Implementing the INSPIRE Directive, MS have to report annually a number of indicators for monitoring the implementation and use of their infrastructures for spatial information. The information provided includes a



								list of spatial data sets and services belonging to those infrastructures. - MS reports: Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania, Candidate: Serbia, Turkey, FYROM
2.3.5.	Other International Standardisation organisations, e.g. OGC	Membership to i.e, Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC). It is an international industry consortium from companies, government agencies and universities participating in a consensus process to develop publicly available interface standards.	-Member		Q/R		Request to country partner an idea of country participation in other international organisations	
2.4.	Availability of EU fun	ding						
	Showcase the exploit projects, LIFE, IPA, EN	ation of European Con II and ESA programmes	nmission's funding also have some EC	, mainly in researc D-related projects.	h prog	rammes through H	2020 (Balkans, Turkey & Is	srael). EUROSTARS, EIB-
2.4.1.	R&D participation or other EU programmes Country partner to search through	Sources of funds. It will provide a general indication on the areas of	-ESA, EC budget contributions to EO programme	Some organisations do not make a distinction between	Q		-We shall try to obtain figures for R&D funds for EO services from ESA, EC, and National Institutes	Find out Statistics: EC figures of participation in H2020 projects for Earth



					-	 /	
CORDIS fo	or the	funding	-Budget	contracts and			Observation (REA, DG-
finite num	ber of	programmes.	received from	R&D			RTD)
Copernicus	related		the Copernicus	sponsorship			
projects	by		framework.				
country"							



2.2.1.3. National Uptake & Awareness

With the interest to advance the coordination of EO within the countries, how can a country establish sources of reliable, relevant and accessible EO information and products for its decision-making processes? What are the activities promoting national uptake and awareness?

Ref.	Indicators	Description	Parameters	Constraints	Q/R	Gaps Analysis (Task T3.1) Check- list for inventorying: additional inputs & Qs to complement	Maturity of Indicators (T.3.2.) Data required to assess each indicator at country level	Comments
3.1.	Networking in Events which market point biological syst activities or th	hitiatives examine and discuss the man of view. They could also inclu- ems via remote sensing techr nematic workshops	y different aspec de dedicated wor nologies, earth su	ts and application rkshops as Earth irveying techniqu	ns of th Observ Ies Th	ne Earth Observation a vation missions or spe hey will cover all activ	and geo-information field fro cialized events dealing with p ities including generic events	m the thematic or hysical, chemical, for dissemination
3.1.1.	Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	It will cover activities related to (i) Awareness: Create awareness of the benefits of making information and descriptions available (responsibility dispersed across different actors) (ii) Dissemination: Create opportunities for further project development (responsibility dispersed across different actors but	 -N. Events / activities -Focus for the events -Sector related 	Timeline for the activities Period under examination (last 5 years)	Q/R	Can the organisation name high-impact, EO - dedicated workshops organised in the country in the last five years?	-Country partner to provide more information on the related events/workshops and who organises them -Research on networking activities	Could provide insights on duplication of Earth observation capacity building efforts. Ongoing comprehensive training via thematic workshops related to using and developing new Earth observation products

Table 5: National Uptake & Awareness Pillar



		also linked to other projects) and (iii) networking activities: Increase the number of partners of the consortium resulting in a more wide-spread network (responsibility dispersed across different actors and necessity to coordinate with other levels: municipal, regional, national) Regular Workshops on specific topics related to EO? e.g. disasters, agriculture, GIS, ICT etc Some issues to consider: Regularity (annual, bi- annual) events organised at national/regional level. Focus of these events? – R&D, thematic, ICTetc.						
3.1.2.	Data Portals	Portal to distribute Earth observation data from diverse EO Missions or samples and auxiliary data from a number of missions and instruments	-Portal	Q/R	Provideanassessmentfollowingthe Q:Wouldtheorganisationliketheirprofilepresentedon	Research information on country portals to access to EO data	-The data and products available through data portals and other similar systems should reflect the needs of users, particularly the needs	



						GEO CRADLE portal (final approval before publishing)?		for near-real time data that could be utilised by the various user groups -Links to Data portals as ESA, Third Party
								Copernicus Space Component (CSC)
3.2.	National Polic	ies Implementation					turitle Naimintuine	
3.2.1.	Policy	Country policies linked to	-N. data	rt of the political	O/R	-What is the level	-Country partners will	Farth observation is
0.11.1	,	the supply side of EO	policies		~	of coordination of	provide information on	used to monitor and
		services. i.e. industry,	•			EO activities in	their country's level of	assess the status of,
		space policy, R&D	-N. of			your country	utilisation of EO data for	and changes in, the
			Ministries			(none, scarce,	monitoring the status of	natural and man-
			using these			basic, fully	the National/European	made environment.
			policies			integrated)?	policies.	Example policies could
								include the monitoring
						-What is the level	-Policies that might be	of the state and
						of interaction	using EO data (i.e. water	evolution of our
						between the EO	quality, air quality, land	environment, be it
						community and	monitoring)Which are	land, sea or air, and
						decision makers	the ministries using the	the ability to rapidly
						(none, scarce,	EU data.	during criscs such as
						basic, fully		evtreme weather
						integrated)?		events or during times



3.2.2.	Budget.	Budgets linked to national	-Budget	No budget	Q/R	Is there funding for	-EARSC request to the	- How important it the
	National	EO policies but also	information	figures		EO activities	country representative	investment in R&D in
	R&D	relevant R&D investment:	designated to			available in your	the total % R&D	your country?
	investment	while the EU Research and	national	It would be		country	investment in earth	
	(internal to	Innovation programmes	funds	ideal to		(infrastructure	observation.	
	the country)	have been pivotal in		separate the		development, EO		
		building GEOSS, this		budget from		market	-what is the space budget	
		question is focused on		policies and		development,	and which percentage	
		National research and		from external		R&D)?	goes to earth	
		development (R&D / RTD)		R&D.			observation?	
		activities in connection						
		with governmental					-If private companies	
		innovation. It should be					were investing in	
		situated at the front end					satellites/ground stations	
		of the innovation cycle.					etc) ask also for the	
		Innovation builds on R&D					percentage.	
		and also includes						
		commercialization phases.					-Country partners will	
		Specially those ones					also provide information	
		related to EO systems will					on the budget linked to	
		be relevant					these possible policies:	
							i.e. EC-CAP (Common	
							Agricultural Policy). It	
							could be presented as	
							table: Funds source	
							(National/ Regional), Type	
							(Space programme /	
							Educational & Outreach	
							programme / Categories:	
							-Cartographic agencies	
							-Civil Protection agencies	
							-Defence and Security	
							actors	



							-Cultural Heritage authorities- Environmental bodies				
							management bodies -				
							-Maritime authorities				
							-Transport bodies				
							-IT and communication				
							organisations -Research Institutes				
3.3.	Penetration 8	Capacity building									
	Penetration: It will provide information to Identify and coordinate possible execution of national activities at regional level. Beyond the weather, climate and disasters societal benefit areas, decision makers are quite unaware of EO and their potential use for sustainable development, particularly related to health and energy. How is this perception at country level? Capacity building: The fundamental goal of capacity building is to enhance the abilities of stakeholders to evaluate and address crucial questions related to										
	policy choices Ideally, Natior	and different options for dev nal Earth observation capacity	velopment; Hum v building efforts	an, Institutional, should be coordi	Infrast nated.	ructure capacity build	ling on elements of relevanc	e for Earth observation.			
3.3.1.	Use of Geo-	-Awareness of the	-Name of	Difficult to	Q/R		Country partners should	-It will give			
	information	capabilities of EO	agencies and	get the exact			get information (i) if	information on (i) gaps			
			domains	definition on			public organisations are	between Earth			
		-Use of satellite imagery	which they	the type of			generally aware of the	observation research			
		by government agencies	operate	data needed			capabilities of EO - Name	and operational			
			Natural States	indicators			of agencies (II) level of the	applications (II) lack of			
		-R&D Uptake activity	-Maturity of	inuicators			& how they use the FO	between providers			
			satellite data				satellite data by	and users of EO			
			and how the				Government agencies &	information (iii) lack of			
			information is				departments to support	awareness about the			
			used				vital operations (iii)	value of Earth			
							uptake activities specially				



			-Volume and regularity of use -Activation of international observation resources (i.e. EMS, <u>charter</u>)				by activation of programmes. -EARSC has done some preliminary research on the <u>charter</u> activation	observations among decision makers -The uptake activities could give some information on how to move from R&D to operational activities (from developing concepts into making them ready to be sold in the commercial market) -Educational outreach to decision makers reinforces the value of such a system as an environmental decision support tool
3.3.2.	Capacity building EO focused actions	Other EO actions on capacity building on the human, institutional or infrastructure level	-EO related projects	Open indicator	Q	Has the organisation participated in EO- related projects? How would you rate your organisation's level of collaboration with other EO actors in your country and abroad (none, 1-4 actors, 5-10 actors, >10 actors)?	We should like to better understand evolving information on capacity building activities from the Earth observation community	Info on access to capacity building resources. This point might seek to give lines for future coordination and build upon existing national efforts to increase the efficient use of EO resources



2.3. Deployment phase

The deployment phase is summarised in the steps below:

- 1) Indicators collection (1st iteration with country partners)
- 2) Preparation of country model maturity indicators spreadsheet (one per country)
- 3) Request for data missing & complementary information (2nd iteration with country partners)
- 4) Cross check inventory at GEO-CRADLE Networking Platform (D 2.2-2.4)
- 5) Integration of Gap Analysis information (D.3.1)
- 6) Elaboration of first assessment by level and presentation to country partners to get feedback (3rd iteration with country partners)
- 7) Request and contact experts in each country (min. 2 and max. 5 experts contacted per country from academia, research, industry & government)
- 8) Exchange with country experts on the maturity indicators. In some cases, a first assessment (maturity level) was delivered to open discussion and experts commented and provided views.
- 9) Interpretation of results and average score of the data obtained. media assessment
- 10) Elaboration of maturity cards per country

Figure 1: Methodology process steps



2.3.1. From data collection to maturity card

Collection of data

We have asked GEO-CRADLE partners to collect and provide the necessary, up-to-date information against each indicator for the three main groups (i) capacities (ii) cooperation and (iii) uptake, so the consortium continued a proactive approach to desk research initiated during the gap analysis phase (Deliverable (D.3.1.))⁶. The main categories used under the gap analysis (geographic, observational, structural, qualitative/quantitative and capacity) have been also included in one way or another in the groups and the corresponding indicators.

The information provided was under the responsibility of country partners. Contacting partners to validate certain responses was often necessary. Country partners adopted a variety of strategies to deliver results such as relying on existing networks, asking for referrals to other EO actors or organising workshops with key EO actors; however, Information holes still remained at the end of this phase due to failure of key EO actors to respond to the survey, and because of a lack of adequate capacity in a given country. Desk research filled in the information holes as best possible using the outcomes of the gap analysis deliverable. This was particularly done where some country capacities had to be validated.

⁶ Deliverable D3.1 Gap Analysis



In addition, we asked country partners to provide us with the names of at least two recognised experts in the country outside the consortium to ensure an independent validation/enhancement of the information we have received from country leaders in GEO-CRADLE. Despite all the measures, it often remained difficult to sufficiently engage regional stakeholders to the extent that the required level of detail was collected.

We have discussed with the different appointed experts in the RoI, explaining the context of the project but especially clarifying the use of the "maturity indicators" as the innovative methodology for the assessment and monitoring of EO maturity at national level. We explained the approach to establish an analytical tool that allows quantitative measurement of the current EO capabilities of the country and their evolution over time. The experts appreciated the introduction and clarifications on the validation process which helped them to better produce their assessment.

Experts did not have extra time to spend on preparing their validation inputs, the current EO/GI expertise was sufficient to provide the required feedback on the discussion about the different maturity levels (L0 to L4) for indicators & sub-indicators corresponding to major pillars related to Capacities, Collaboration and Uptake/Awareness of the EO activities in their countries.

Basically, the discussions were centred around their institutional, academic, research or industry perspectives and experiences in the country, which we utilised to complete a cross check of the methodology and the specific assessment of the country maturity.

The contribution of the different experts (see table below) was very important to help ensure that maturity indicators for the Countries in the Region of Interest were validated and met the objective to gather a comprehensive and accurate (G)EO picture in the Region. A range between 2-4 experts were contacted per country.

Experts	Validation by	Validation	Validation	Validation	Validation
validation per	Country Partner	Industry Expert	Member Govt	by Academia	by R&D
countries					
Albania (3)	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		
Bulgaria (3)	\checkmark	\checkmark			>
Cyprus (4)	\checkmark		\checkmark	>	>
Egypt (2)	\checkmark			>	
FYROM (3)	\checkmark			>	>
Greece (5)	✓	✓		>	>
Israel (4)	\checkmark	\checkmark			>
Romania (3)	\checkmark	\checkmark			
Serbia (3)	\checkmark			>	>
Tunisia (4)	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark
Turkey (4)	\checkmark	\checkmark			\checkmark

Table 6: Experts validation

Maturity Card

The **maturity card** characterises the Earth Observation capacity in the countries within the GEO-CRADLE area, providing concrete information on its EO activities. The cards illustrate the implementation of the maturity model assessment. By assessing the maturity of different aspects, it gives information on the country strengths and weaknesses and where improvements are needed.

Each card includes a concrete **set of indicators** that can translate information into a certain level of maturity. In other words, the maturity card allows an evaluation of country performance against the



indicators. For each indicator we created a mapping between the overall range of values (0 to 4) and a reasonable scale (sometimes quantitative others qualitative)⁷. This mapping dictated the final documented maturity level.

The **maturity level** provides a quasi-quantitative measure of how well a country is performing against a given indicator. The purpose of this maturity level is to provide a framework to semi-objectively classify each of the indicators and ensure a comparable usage of metrics (both across countries and over time). The aim is to translate the information collected against the various indicators into a value that falls within a certain range (e.g. 0 to 4), thus ensuring the ability to compare between countries. Some examples on how the assessment has been extracted below.

As an illustration, the table 7 presents the Space Authority indicator for the case of Serbia (Capacities pillar). The data collected during the deployment phase from left to right correspond to: [Indicators Reference | Indicator name | Iteration with country partners columns maturity indicator (i) (ii) and (iii) | Columns for iteration with experts | Iteration with experts | Information extracted from the gap analysis | first assigned level | FINAL assigned level | Description | Comments |. Combining the responses provided by country partners and experts, the insights from the gap analysis and the outputs of literature research, the Final column illustrates the Final assessment. For comparison, we have added the example of Tunisia. The reading for the space authority level is contrasted with table 9. Basically, this type of table collection reproduced all the methodology process steps introduced in the figure 1 about the process steps.

							Sig Space				
Ref.	Indicator	Maturity Indicators (I)	Maturity Indicators (II)	Maturity Indicators (III)	Maturity Indicators (EXPERT I) (Lazar Lazic lazar@ff.bg.ac.rs)	Maturity Indicators (EXPERT II) Ana Vuković - pazisadana@gmail.com	Gap Analysis	Level	FINAL	Description	comments
1.1.1.	Space agency or designated Space Authority	none	none		level 0	level 0	Serbia does not have a space strategy or a space agency. Most respondents did not voice an opinion about the national coordination of EO activities (54%) and interaction with decision makers (50%)	Level 0	Level O	no organisation, nor government ministry leading the space activity	EO in Serbia gravitates towards the public sector. In part, this is due to the fact that the public sector dominates the Serbian economy, particularly in industries where the application of EO brings clear benefits and the beneficiaries already have strong geospatial sectors. Furthermore, engagement of public institutions and research organisations with EO is growing, driven by financial and technical support from European actors. Ten commercial companies have been

Table 7: Example of level indicator assessment (Serbia> Space authority)

⁷ Initial: ad-hoc practices (guidance)

Basic: formally defined steps (early pilot)

Intermediate: managed result metrics (limited use)

Advanced: advanced process (deployed)

Optimised: fully consolidated activities in EO (integrated)



					identified that provide EO
					products,
					mainly to the
					public sector
					and to
					construction
					companies.

Table 8: Example of level indicator assessment (Tunisia> Space authority)

						<u>`</u>		· · ·			
Ref.	Indicator	Maturity Indicators (I)	Maturity Indicators (II)	Maturity Indicators expert (I) (Karem Ben Khaled > karem@3g- consult.de)	Maturity Indicators expert (II) (CNCT@defense.t n) > Thouraya Sahli Chaned (Centre National de la cartographie et la Teledeteccon)	Porf Zohra Lilli Chabaane >	Gap Analysis	Level	FINAL	Description	Commetns
1.1.1.	Space agency or designated Space Authority	National Centre for mapping and Remote Sensing CNCT (National). The CNCT is under the auspices of the Defense Ministry. For the organisation chart see the link : http://www. cnct.defense .tn/index.ph p/fr/site- map/present ation	National commission of Space Extra atmospheric under the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific research, the secretariat of the commission is under CNCT	level 3	ievel 2(no space agency io Tunisia)	level 2	several projects and studies using satellite imagery as a source of information is conducted within the National Center for Cartography and Remote Sensing with national partners in the main themes : coastal and marine environment ; • Development ; Development ; • Natural Hazards ; • Agriculture.	Level 2	Level 2	one ministry leading and few ministries interconnect ed to the space activities in the country	

Once we have the information, it is now time to designate the value as per the information below

Table 9: Assigned level for space authority								
CAPACITIES	level 0	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4			
National Infrastructure: It will understand the Earth Observation Strategy by country.								
Space agency / Authority	[no authority]	[1 ministry]	[1-various ministries]	[1 authority]	[1 operational authority/agency]			

Another illustrative example is using the gathering data for the indicator on Data portals (uptake)

Ref	Indicator	Maturity Indicators (I)	Maturity Indicators (II)	Maturity Indicators (III), consensed with expert (JEODIGITAL)	Maturity Indicators - Yucel Erbay <yucel@nik.com.tr></yucel@nik.com.tr>	Maturity Indicators - ozgur.acir@jade.org.tr	Gap Analysis	Level	FINAL	Description	Comments
3.1.2.	Data Portals	Especially the Turkish Research Community requests new satellites with more spatial resolution, more bands (speciality according to applications, for example red edge for vegetation). There is a need to develop strategies to increase the number of	level 3)	Especially the Turkish Research Community requests new satellite imagery data with higher spatial and spectral resolution depending on the application, i.e., red edge for vegetation. There is a need to develop strategies to increase the number of	level 2) Local data portalas are only open to either organisation staff or only for governmental staff not public or private sector in general	level 3		Level 2	Level 3	one country data portal established which implies a certain strategy to increase the number of users and types of	data sharing between organisations on the operational level is scarce, as most data collected and processed is

Table 10: Example of level indicator assessment (Turkey> data portal level 3)



	users and types of	users and types of			applications	kept in-
	applications in Earth	applications in Earth			in Earth	house.
	Observation. GEZGIN	Observation. GEZGIN			Observation	
	Geoportal should be	Geoportal should be				
	more developed by	further developed by				
	preparing online training	preparing online training				
	videos with some case	videos with some case				
	studies and by preparing	studies and by preparing				
	up-to-date example web	up-to-date example web				
	sites (e.g.: blog pages	sites (e.g.: blog pages				
	during disasters) and by	during disasters) and by				
	enlarging the service to	enlarging the service to				
	outside of Turkey. There	outside of Turkey. There				
	should be also synergies	should be also synergies				
	with Copernicus	with Copernicus				
	Programme, GEO	Programme, GEO				
	Activities and EURISY	Activities and EURISY				
	activities.	activities.				
	The aim of GEZGIN	The aim of GEZGIN				
	Geoportal project is to	Geoportal project is to				
	enable the easy access to	enable the easy access to				
	satellite images (RASAT	satellite images (RASAT				
	Satellite Images and	Satellite Images and				
	more satellites in the	more satellites in the				
	future) and receive new	future) and receive new				
	requests from	requests from				
	stakeholders. To provide	stakeholders. To provide				
	this end users must	this end users must				
	reach all archive data	reach all archive data				
	according to area of	according to area of				
	interest, must reach to	interest, must reach to				
	up-to-date data, must	up-to-date data, must				
	reach data without	reach data without				
	fighting many	fighting many				
	procedures, must be able	procedures, must be able				
	to request new image	to request new image				
	data for their needs.	data for their needs.				
	Website:	Website:				
	http://www.gezgin.gov.tr	http://www.gezgin.gov.tr				
	-Usage statistics as of the	-Usage statistics as of the				
	1601 mombars	1601 mombars				
	1001 members	1001 members				
	downloaded by	downloaded by				
	members	members				
	140 000 total visitors	140 000 total visitors				
	- Usage statistics for	- Usage statistics for				
	November 2015 – March	November 2015 – March				
	2016	2016				
	7192 new members	7192 new members				
	registered, and old	registered and old				
	memberships have been	memberships have been				
	cancelled.	cancelled.				
	5330 RASAT images	5330 RASAT images				
	downloaded by	downloaded by				
	members.	members.				
	52,000 visitors.	52,000 visitors.				

Table 11: Example of level indicator assessment (Egypt> data portal> level 1)

Ref.	Indicator	Maturity Indicators (I)	Matu rity Indica tors (II)	Maturity Indicators (II)	Maturity Indicators (EXPERT I) (Mohamed.e Iraey@Alexu .edu.eg, meIraey@g mail.com)	Maturity Indicators (EXPERT II) (saleh.me sbah@aa st.edu)	Gap Analysis	Level	FINAL	Description	Comments
3.1.2.	Data Portals	no		We assessed as level 1 (plans to develop a focused EO data portal, the country need to develop a strategy to increase the number of users and types of applications in Earth Observation. i.e portals: land surveys, geospatial information, open data, air quality, meteoetc) please confirm	level 1	level 1	Although there are global satellite systems that provide free and open access to data, the limitation of ICT infrastructures in the governmental sector possesses another marked barrier. These infrastructure limitations also limit the ability to exchange data between the institutions. In this context, a solution to overcome the problem of sharing the data is making a full or a partial exemption for EO access, especially for use by public sector actors and for research and education purposes. NARSS, as the leading EO data producer in the country, can provide ample data and other EO value- addition services to the public sector – particularly for pertinent national issues and/or situations. The organisation is also positioned to generate a strong link for research and education through universities and cooperation with other research institutions. This data could be provided	1	1	plans to develop a focused EO data portal, country need to develop a strategy to increase the number of users and types of applications in Earth Observation. i.e portals: land surveys, geospatial information, open data, air quality, meteoetc	data sharing between organisation s on the operational level is scarce, as most data collected and processed is kept in- house.



	and name few		most efficiently through a dedicated		
	examples >		geoportal.		
	There is a plan				
	to develop				
	national				
	geospatial portal				
	as SDI on				
	national level.				

Table 12: Assigned level for data portals

Uptake	level 0	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
Data	[no data	[plans data	[one data	[> one data portals in	[> one data portals in various
Portals	portals]	portals]	portal	various thematics]	thematics and fully integrated]

2.3.2. Assigning maturity levels

The tables below assign values from LO-L4 to the different indicators. The proposition for the generic maturity level is as follows:

- **LO Initial**: This value provides guidance to think about the country approach. The intention is to raise awareness and aid country partners in thinking about the status of the indicator and its performance (ad-hoc practices (guidance))
- L1 Basic: The value describes country practices that are in early pilot use and are demonstrating some successful results (formally defined steps (early pilot))
- L2 Intermediate: The value describes country practices that are in limited use in industry or government organisations for the EO sector (managed result metrics (limited use))
- L3 Advanced: The value describes country practices that have been successfully deployed and are in widespread use. Experience reports and case studies are typically available to evaluate this level (advanced process (deployed))
- **L4 Optimised**: The value describes practices that have been fully integrated and optimised by the country (fully consolidated activities in EO (integrated))

The description of the highest level of the index "optimised" seems perhaps overstated when considering the criteria used for the individual indicators. The criteria for the levels have been adjusted during the deliverable (II) to ensure that the values are applied consistently across the RoI.





2.3.2.1. Capacities

		level 0	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
1.1.	National Infr	astructure	·	·	·	
1.1.	Space agency or designated Space Authority	Space Agency or designated Space Authority: This dimension will look at the key players involved in space activities at the national level. Idea of the hierarchy, organisation chart and where does relates with other institutions.	no organisation / authority, nor government ministry leading the space activity [no authority]	one ministry leading and coordinating with space activities [1 ministry]	one principal & various ministries leading and interconnected to all the space activities in the country [1-various ministries]	an official governmental space agency, an operative /active (G)EO space authority in charge of coordinating the space activities [including (G)EO activities in the country) and other stakeholder's relations which are equally active in the EO domain] [1 authority]
1.1. 2.	Own space- borne capacity	Request to country representative information on space borne capacity operated by the country. (N. of satellites operated by the country and the type of mission)	no commitment towards space- borne capacity (generic) [no missions]	existing technical ability to possess this capacity but no actual activities [generic space-borne interest]	at least one satellite (EO satellite) operated by the country [1 EO mission]	more than one (EO) mission, future mission planning with improvement degree [2-5 missions]
1.1. 3.	Access to 3rd party missions (with own ground stations, inc. meteo)	Request to country representative and thematic experts in the country but also in the region if he knows who operates the ground station (satellite operator or 3rd party mission / including meteo).	no access to other missions [no access missions]	access to one 3rd party mission (not owned nor operated by the country) (*) - country has ground stations for EO satellites. country has ground stations for EO satellites. example of party missions: ie. Deimos, QuickBird, GeoEye, Worlwide, Oceansat, WorldView, IKONOS, TerraSAR,	access to more than one 3rd party missions (2-5) with capability for downlinked data from various Remote Sensing Satellites with (at least one) medium, high and very high-resolution imagery n. of institutions operating the party mission [access 2 to 5 3rd party missions]	access to several (between 5- 10) missions for EO satellites with capability for downlinked data from various Remote Sensing Satellites with (all) medium, high and very high-resolution imagery (meteo, active or passive sensors) [access between 5-10 3rd party missions]

Table 13: Maturity Level: Capacities



PLEIADES, SPOT, RADARSAT, Proba, RAPIDEYE, Landsat, COSMO-SkyMed, ALOS, GRACE, GOSAT, Aqua/Terra, DMC, Image206, IRS, TROPFOREST,SEASAT, Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT,	
RADARSAT, Proba, RAPIDEYE, Landsat, COSMO-SkyMed, ALOS, GRACE, GOSAT, Aqua/Terra, DMC, Image206, IRS, TROPFOREST,SEASAT, Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY Antartica overview;	
RAPIDEYE, Landsat, COSMO-SkyMed, ALOS, GRACE, GOSAT, Aqua/Terra, DMC, Image206, IRS, TROPFOREST,SEASAT, Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY Antartica overview:	
COSMO-SkyMed, ALOS, GRACE, GOSAT, Aqua/Terra, DMC, Image206, IRS, TROPFOREST,SEASAT, Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY_Antartica_overview;	
GRACE, GOSAT, Aqua/Terra, DMC, Image206, IRS, TROPFOREST,SEASAT, Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY_Antartica_overview;	
Aqua/Terra, DMC, Image206, IRS, TROPFOREST,SEASAT, Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY_Antartica_overview;	
Image206, IRS, TROPFOREST,SEASAT, Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY_Antartica_overview:	
TROPFOREST, SEASAT, Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY Antartica overview:	
Kompsat, ODIN, OrvView, SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY Antartica overview:	
SCISAT (ACE), FORMOSAT, IPY Antartica overview:	
IPY Antartica overview:	
https://earth.esa.int/web/	
guest/missions/3rd-party-	
missions/overview [access	
1one 3rd party mission]	
1.1. Ground- Requested additional inputs on no capacity for limited experience with at demonstrated capacity [2 to 5 demonstrated capacity of gro	nd
4. based the number of organisations ground-based least one ground station [1 ground stations] stations, mission control cen	ers
facilities operating the equipment control elements of station] and ground networks [6	10
necessary to control and to EO spacecraft stations]	
acquire data from EO satellites system [no ground-	
(active or passive remote based capacity]	
sensors, meteo	
/atmospheric/water sensors,	
etc.) (Total number of	
Organisations with ground	
based/in-situ capacities.	
Number of stations -Location &	
region)	



1.1. 5.	In-situ monitoring networks	Requested additional inputs on the number of organisations operating the equipment necessary to control and to acquire data from in-situ (active or passive remote sensors, meteo /atmospheric/water sensors, etc.) (Total number of Organisations with ground based/in-situ capacities. Number of stations -Location & region)	no capacity for in- situ monitoring networks to determine the spatio-temporal distribution of certain parameters in thematic areas [no in-situ capacity]	provide some access to spatial reference data and demonstrated capacity to one of the following facilities (cover by GEO- CRADLE project): meteorological, water, atmospheric, hygrometry, soil, energy/radiation. [at least one in-situ network]	demonstrated capacities in more than one of the following facilities (cover by GEO-CRADLE project): meteorological, water, atmospheric, hygrometry, soil, energy/radiation. [between 5 to 10 in-situ networks]	besides owning or providing raw data also process/model data (it covers full value chain). It could have open access of the in-situ data. [between 10-20 in-situ networks]
1.1. 6.	Modelling and computing capacities	If organisations do have the modelling and computing processing capacities (high- performance computer (HPC)) then they are asked to provide a short description of what it is used for. It is important to have an overview on the number of models (ie. models for atmospheric modelling, what those are, what is the status and the research owner (Total number of Organisations with modelling & processing capacities and Total number of models)	no modelling capacities (high- performance computer capacities to to efficiently turn massively large data into valuable information and meaningful knowledge (HPC) facilities) [no modelling capacities]	one institution with high- performance computer (HPC) facilities for their executions with multiprocessing systems and large external memory units. [one HPC]	multiple computing resources for the processing and exploitation of EO data for one or more institutions. [between 2 to 10 modelling capacities]	Models covering all thematics for GEO-CRADLE: for meteo/climatic, atmospheric composition, hydrometric/water quality, soil attributes and energy/radiation. Entities are responsible for the development and implementation of all numerical models for forecasting. [between 10-20 modelling capacities]



1.1.	(G) EO data	Request about coordinating	no involvement in	one organisation has the	more than one organisation (2-5)	5-10 organisations in the country
7.	exploitatio	monitoring networks,	exploitation	capacity to develop the	have the capacity to develop	have leading capacities to develop
	n	integrated analysis &	platforms	collaborative virtual work	collaborative virtual work (data,	and offer collaborative virtual
	platforms	modelling capacityNames of	(collaborative,	environment (data,	software, algorithms, etc) and	tools (data, software,
	(provision	organisations with data	virtual work	software, algorithms, etc)	offer VA products to others	algorithms) VA products: data,
	of VA	exploitation products (Type pf	environment	and offer VA products to	(mainly in more than one	processes, measurementsetc in
	services	organisation according to	providing access to	others. [one exploitation	capacity/area/thematic) [2-5	few thematic areas. Small
	and	classification system)	EO data and the	platform]	exploitation platforms]	dissemination and promotion of
	products)		tools, processors,			the commercial exploitation
			information and			results. [5-10 exploitation
			communication			platforms]
			technology			
			resources). capacity			
			to develop and			
			offer virtual work			
			environment			
			providing access to			
			EO data and the			
			tools. processors.			
			firstly, internally to			
			the country and			
			finally outside of it.			
			[no exploitation			
			platforms]			
1.2	Critical Mass	of EO researchers		1	1	•
1.2.	Number of	Country partners should be	no public	at least one public	at least the country has more than	apart from having different types
1.	public	able to provide the names of	organisation	organisation providing any	one organisation in government,	of organisations, the country has
	organisatio	the organisations and what	involved in EO	of these activities (i) raw	PSB, institute,	organisations active in a wide
	ns	they do (the classification -	related activities	data producers (ii) value-	academia/university that besides	range of thematic areas of activity
		information of those	[no (G) EO	adders (iii) GIS/mapping	owning or providing raw data, also	(GEO-CRADLE is focus on: climate
		institutions activity and areas).	research/Univ.	service providers (iv) End-	process/model data, provide	change, food security, access to
		It is assumed that these	departments	users with in-house GIS (v)	GIS/mapping services, etc.	raw materials, energyetc) but
		organisations do not go	centers]	End-users. [one (G)EO	[between 2-10 (G)EO	could be much more. With ref.
		beyond in the value chain. So		organisation]	organisations]	employment: usually the remote



					•	
		any public organisation that represents more than user they will appear in section 1.1.				sensing departments or laboratories dealing with EO activities are rather small, having around 10 employees as media. [between 11-25 (G)EO organisations]
1.2. 2.	Number of researche rs (in Univ. & R&D labs)	Request to country representative more information on the number of departments & size of the research group (the number of researchers) – How many researchers are employed	no significant number of researches in the EO domain [no significant (G)EO staff]	less than 5 groups of research communities in whole country. [less than 50 (G)EO employees]	between 5-10 groups of research communities which have between 1-5 staff / each. [between 50-250 (G)EO employees]	more than 10 groups of researchers which employ large group of staff. [between 250-500 (G)EO employees]
1.2. 3.	Courses being offered in universitie s, its diversity and maturity offered	Request to country representative & desk research on the number of courses offered: Information about the quantity of courses and the investment in the future. The country partner should provide a table including information on the courses related to eo / country. It will include the following parameters: (i) title (ii) type (master/post-graduate) (iii) duration (iv) graduation requirements (v) start year (vi) estimate n. of students/course (vii) organisation partners (lecturing or sponsoring) (viii) academic performance(impact of the project)	no courses being offered in the EO domain. no diversity of courses offered in the EO domain. [no (G)EO courses]	range of courses being offered in the areas of remote sensing, photogrammetry, digital processing, GIS. some training focused on specifics of EO data management. note: ideal courses / GDP. [between 1- 10 (G)EO courses offered]	wide range of courses being offered in the areas of remote sensing, photogrammetry, digital processing, GIS, but also specific courses as monitoring climate from space, Observing Earth from Space,etc. other examples: photogrammetry, digital processing, G.I.S., or specific courses as monitoring climate from space, observing Earth from Space,etc. note: courses / GDP (ideal by county's Gross Domestic Product) tbc. [between 10-50 (G)EO courses]	continuous courses being offered which will show some organisational training activity and investment plans at universities. continuous courses offered in the last years. Applications such as agriculture monitoring, crop water demands, surface water and flash floods note: courses / GDP (ideal county's Gross Domestic Product) [between 50-100 specialized (G)EO courses]



1.2.	Relevant	Request to country	no papers	between 1-25 papers	between 25-100 papers published	100-500 scientific papers (+ thesis
4.	Publicatio	representative & desk research	published. [no	published at department	that will provide some excellence	research) produced by research
	ns	about paper published in the	(G)EO publications]	level and which will	of the research resulting from	organisations and universities on
		last 5/3 years. Maybe		facilitate the	national projects related to EO	innovative topics (as the focus of
		reproduce a table with Title /		communication in other	funded by Government or other	Geo-cradle: adaptation to climate
		Type (thesis research, article,		scientific communities	EU funding (from those at least 25	change, access to raw materials,
		scientific paper) / Publication		(from those at least 10	paper citations who have an	water resource management,
		(magazine, website) / N.		paper citations who have	impact factor in the last 5 years)	food security and access to
		citations / N. downloads		an impact factor in the last	(for example: indexed in Elsevier's	energy. (from those at least 50
				5 years) (for example:	Scopus and	paper citations who have an
				indexed in Elsevier's	Compendiapublications in	impact factor in the last 5 years)
				Scopus and	journals ranked in IRC among the	(for example indexed in
				Compendia publications	top 30% of journals in the (G)FO	Flsevier's Sconus and
				in journals ranked in IRC	field should be taken into	Compendia publications in
				among the top 30% of	account) [25-100 naners]	journals ranked in IRC among the
				iournals in the (G)EO field		ton 30% of journals in the (G)EO
				should be taken into		field should be taken into
				should be taken into		account) [100 E00 papers]
1.2				account) [1-25 papers]		account). [100-500 papers]
1.3.	Industry Ba	se		1		
1.3.	Number	Request number the	no private	between 1-5 companies in	the country has between 6-25	the country has between 26-50
1.	of	companies and the number of	companies in the	the country serving any	companies serving at least 3	companies serving at least 3
	companie	commercial actors surveyed	EO domain [no	category in the EO value	categories covering the EO value	categories covering the EO value
	S	and its location. It should be	companies on	chain (Definitions in	chain [between 6-25 companies]	chain [between 26-50 companies]
		related with EARSC	(G)EO]	Annex) [between 1-5		
		classification on type of		companies]		
		activity: (i) Satellite operator:				
		defined as the owner of a				
		satellite system (ii) Data				
		reception and distribution:				
		owner or operator of a ground				
		station (EO). (iii) Data reseller:				
		satellite or other data from				
		non-EU sources (iv) Value-				
		adding services: company				



		using EO data to produce products (v) Downstream / GIS services: but with a satellite data element. (vi) Consultancy - studies / analyses not VA services. (vii) Hardware / software provision Where the industry is operation: Are the country partners aware on the quality management? or standard processes within these companies?				
1.3. 2.	Scale of companie s (large/me dium/sma II/micro)	EARSC request to country representative & desk research on the type of companies and split by size. Maybe information could be under companies websites. Classification Small and medium-sized enterprises: (i) Micro: 0-9 employees < €2 million (ii) Small: 10-49 employees (includes micro) < €10 million (iii) Medium-sized: 50-249 employees < €50 million (iv) Large: over 250 employees €50 million+	[no comparable]	the country has micro companies (Classification in Annex 1.2) [micro]	the country has micro and small companies [small]	the country has micro, small and medium companies [SMEs]



1.3. 3.	Employm ent numbers, levels and changes	EARSC request to country representative & desk research (estimated employees per company companies (company website)	private sector employment up to 10 employees [up to 10 employees]	Private workforce between 10-50 employees. Note: usually the EO companies are the small size ones. They have around 2-10 employees/company [10- 50 employees]	Private task force between 51-150 employees [51-150 employees]	Private task force between 151- 300 employees [151-300 employees]
1.3. 4.	Resellers or local represent atives of European	EARSC request to country representative & desk research on the number of data providers resellers & partners	no reseller activity, nor companies that are members of international specialized groups.	one company who is resellers (for software or data reseller) in the region. Examples of missions whose data are resold are	2-5 companies who are working as resellers in the region [2-5 resellers]	5-10 companies who are working as resellers in the region [6-10 resellers]
	companie s		[no resellers]	listed Annex [1 reseller]		
1.3.	Existence	EARSC request to country	no concentration of	at least one ICT cluster	between 2-5 professional cluster	Between 6-10 cluster in more
5.	of Clusters	representative & desk research	business activities	which could promote	organisations involved in	than one thematic. one cluster
		on ITC clusters	around geo-	innovation and	technological transfer and	with silver impact [6-10 clusters]
			information [no	technological development [1 cluster]	innovation [2-5 clusters]	
			clusters	uevelopinent [1 cluster]		

2.3.2.2. Cooperation

Table 14: Maturity Level: Cooperation

		level 0	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4	
2.1.	Collaboration through GEO						



2.1.1.	Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	Country partner could dig out on which is the organisation dealing with GEO in the country and the type of GEOS projects	no participation in GEO [no participation GEO]	participation at least in one GEO project from the Regional & Global initiatives (*) [participation 1 project]	participation in GEO and participation to more than one projects which are linked to GEOSS or contribution to EO for decision making through societal benefits areas (**) [participation >2 project initiatives]	designated representative in GEO actions and active contribution to GEO networks [designated representative active in GEO plenaries]
2.1.2.	Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's)	Request to country partners if they have participated in GEO specific actions such SDGs (also SBA tasks), community activities or initiatives	no actions related to helping with the monitoring/reporting of SDG's [no SDGs actions]	action at least in one SDG's [1 SDGs action]	more than one action in SDG's [2-5 SDGs actions]	active contribution to different actions in SDG's [5-10 SDGs actions]
2.1.3.	Designated GEO office	EARSC request to country representative about a country point of contact for GEO aspects and the number and name of organisations related to GEO activities per country. Are there any other participating organisations members of the GEO community from each country?	no designated office [no office]	plans for office / staff coordinating GEO activities in the country [plans for office]	one organisation which is taking care of GEO activities (apart form their own activities) [1 organisation supervising GEO activities]	Truly dedicated office. one organisation which already nominated own dedicated staff to take care of GEO activities [Truly dedicated office no staff]



2.1.4.	Provision of data to GEOSS	Info on data sharing: Country partners will provide an overview on the open exchange of data, metadata and products shared within GEOSS (data linked to GEOSS portal)	no data transferred to GEOSS. (no resources brokered directly through the GEODAB (accessed via the GEOSS Portal)) [no data to GEOSS]	plans for provision of data to GEOSS. some planning of data sharing at country level (plans for sharing metadata brokered directly through the GEODAB) [plans for data to GEOSS]	provision of one to five metadata types brokered directly through GEODAB (accessed via the GEOSS Portal) [1-5 datasets to GEOSS]	provision of 5 to 15 metadata types brokered directly through GEODAB (accessed via the GEOSS Portal) [6-15 datasets to GEOSS]
2.2.	Impact of Copernicu	IS				
2.2.1.	Organisations	Country partner to	no projects using	1-5 projects using	6-25 projects	25-50 projects related to Copernicus
	involved in	inform which is the	data from Copernicus	data from	(organisations) related	services. [25-50 projects using Copernicus
	Conernicus	dealing with	(no organisations involved) [no	(organisations	nrogramme (*)	servicesj
	copermetas	Copernicus in the	projects using	involved) [1-5	Copernicus services:	
		country and projects	Copernicus services]	projects using	Atmosphere, Marine,	
		related with EC and		Copernicus services]	Land, Climate Change,	
		Entrusted entities.			Emergency, Security [6-	
		Request information			25 projects using	
		on the type of			Copernicus services]	
		organisations which				
		have been users of				
		products from				
		maybe the type of				
		Copernicus services				
		they use.				
2.3.	Participation to oth	er international efforts		1		
2.3.1	ESA	Contrast with country	no cooperation	plans to establish a	participation of public	ESA European Cooperating State
		partners the	agreements with ESA	cooperation	organisations and	Agreement (cooperation agreement),
		information obtained	[no cooperation	agreement with ESA	industry under the ESA	strengthening its relations with ESA [ESA
		by desk research on	agreements with	[plans cooperation	programmes	European Cooperating State Agreement]
		participation as	ESAJ			



		member or cooperation partner		agreements with ESA]	[participation under some ESA activities]	
2.3.2.	Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT, 	Contrast with country partners the information obtained by desk research on EUMETSAT participation	no cooperation agreements with meteo organisations [no cooperation meteo]	participate at the National meteorological administration [participation national Meteo]	participation to international organisations through the National agency [participation National Meteo & sporadic Int. cooperation]	continuous participation to international organisations through the National agency [participation National Meteo & Int. Cooperation & one international membership: i.e: EUMETSAT]
2.3.3.	UN system as UN- GGIM,	Request to country partner an idea of country participation to UN programmes or relations with UN institutions	no membership of UN bodies related to Space activities nor participation in UN activities [(G)EO activities in UNITAR, UNOSAT, UN-OOSA, UN-SPIDER, UNEP,)] [no participation UN bodies]	participation in UN [(G)EO activities (events w/g´s) in UNITAR, UNOSAT, UN-OOSA, UN- SPIDER, UNEP,)] [at least 1 active participation in UN agency/organisation]	participation (between 2-5 activities) or plans for links to reference UN sites to focus international efforts, facilitate traceability and enable the establishment of measurement 'best practices' and active participation at one of the UN offices (UNITAR, UNOSAT, UN-OOSA, UN-SPIDER, UNEP,) [participation in 2-5 UN agencies/organisations]	active participation in more than 6 of the UN offices (UNITAR, UNOSAT, UN-OOSA, UN-SPIDER, UNEP,) [participation in >6 UN agencies/organisations]



2.3.4	Establishing an	Contrast with	Infrastructure for	Plans to establish the	One requirement of the	At least 3 of the Infrastructure for Spatial
	Infrastructure for	Country partner, its	Spatial Information	Directive (i.e:	Infrastructure for	Information Requirements. [2-3
	Spatial	involvement with	directive not	sporadic	Spatial Information	requirements for a directive for Spatial
	Information [ie.	Infrastructure for	established [no	participation at	Directive. [example the	Information]
	European	Spatial Information	directive for Spatial	INSPIRE directive	INSPIRE Directive (*)	
	Community	[for example the	Information]	events) [plans to	The Directive requires	
	(INSPIRE)]	INSPIRE directive		establish a directive	Member States: (1) set	
		(monitoring or n. of		for Spatial	up coordination	
		reports about the		Information]	structures and adopt	
		implementation and			and implement legal	
		use of their			measures to remove	
		infrastructures for			procedural obstacles to	
		spatial information)]			the sharing of spatial	
					data; (2)identify their	
					spatial data relevant to	
					environmental policies	
					and those actions with	
					an environment impact;	
					(3)document the spatial	
					data so that they can be	
					accessed on the	
					internet together with	
					other information;	
					(4)implement online	
					services allowing the	
					discovery, visualisation	
					and download of spatial	
					data; (5) gradually	
					organise and publish	
					the spatial data in	
					common data models.]	
					[one requirement for a	
					directive for Spatial	
					Information]	



2.3.5.	Participation in Standardisation organisations i.e. as OGC	Request to country partner an idea of country participation in other international organisations dealing with interoperability, standards, etc such as OGC	not following programmes on standardisation processes: compatibility, interoperability, safety, repeatability [no engagement with Standardisation discussions]	one public or private organisation participating in one of other international organisations dealing with standardisation, interoperabilityetc [one organisation engage with Standardisation discussions]	more than one organisation in the country which has fully implemented and developed technical standards for EO [2-5 organisations engage with Standardisation discussions]	between 6-10 public or private organisations participating in one of international organisations dealing with standardisation, interoperabilityetc [6-10 organisations engage with Standardisation discussions]
2.4.	Availability of EU fu	nding				
2.4.1.	R&D participation or other EU programmes	We shall try to obtain figures for R&D funds for EO services from ESA, EC, and National Institutes	no R&D participation [no EU R&D participation]	participation at least one line of research projects where EO could be used [one EU R&D participation]	participation in EU funded projects in the region [2-10 EU R&D sustained participation/sustained]	participation in (10-20) projects in the region sustained in the last 5 years [11-20 EU R&D participation/sustained 5 years]

2.3.2.3. National Uptake & Awareness

Table 15: Maturity Level: National Uptake & Awareness

		level 0	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
3.1.	Networking initiatives					
3.1.1.	Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	Country partner to provide more information on the related events, their focus, sector related and who organises them.	no networking events in EO activities [no networking]	1-5 planned networking events in EO activities [1-5 networking activities/year]	between 6 -15 networking events per year in EO activities, , for example Aerosols, integrated activities, water forecast, research infrastructures, etc [6-	between 15-25 networking events in EO activities. focus on dissemination to stakeholders. activities which helped on the dissemination [> 25 sustained networking activities/year]



					15 networking activities/year]	
3.1.2.	Data Portals	Research information on country portals to access to eo data (ie: ESA, Third Party Missions (TPMs), Copernicus Space Component (CSC))	no involvement in data portals [no data portals]	plans to develop a focused EO data portal, country need to develop a strategy to increase the number of users and types of applications in Earth Observation. i.e portals: land surveys, geopatial information, open data, air quality, meteoetc [plans data portals]	one country data portal established which implies a certain strategy to increase the number of users and types of applications in Earth Observation [one data portal]	more than one data portal in other thematics as described in level 2& 3 [> one data portals in various thematics]
3.2.	National Polici	es Implementation				
3.2.1.	Policy	Country partners will provide information on which are the countries using EO data for monitoring the status of the National/European policies (i.e. water quality, air quality, land monitoring). Information on which are the ministers using the EO data will be also requested	no national policies implementation [no national policy on (G)EO aspects]	at least one governmental authorities or ministries are using EO data for the monitoring status of the National/European policies. [one national authority/minister engage with on (G)EO aspects]	coordination of the space activities and collaboration in international space programs by at least one organisation. i.e: some monitoring of the air, land and water combining eo and in situ data. [2-5 national authority/minister engage with on (G)EO aspects & collaboration at international level]	list of > 5 Ministries that are actively using EO data (i.e: Ministry of Ministry of Environment, Water and Forests, Agriculture and Rural Development, Energy, Regional Development and Public Administration, Education and Scientific Researchetc) [> 5 national authorities/ministers engage with on (G)EO aspects & collaboration at international level]
3.2.2.	Budget &	National R&D investment	no budget planned for	at least one line of research	a dedicated budget line	EO research projects funded
	investment	(internal to the country).	national policies	projects funds in the domains	or programme for (G)EO,	but more than one line (2-5
	(internal to	EARSC request to the	implementation.	of Earth sciences (any) or	EO / geo-information	lines) of budget funded by
	the country)	country representative the	Ideally evaluate	tunding for applications	research projects funds	government but also regional
		total % R&D investment in	against the % of GDP	where EO could be used.	funded by government.	tunds. Ministry implementing
		earth observation. what is	ino budget line	ideally evaluate the % of GDP.	ideally evaluate the % of	the EO research programme.



		the space budget and which	designated to (G)EO	[one budget line designated	GDP. [one dedicated	Ideally evaluate the % of GDP.
		percentage goes to earth	activities]	in other domains where (G)	budget line designated to	[2-5 budget lines designated to
		observation?. If private		EO is used]	(G)EO activities]	(G)EO activities]
		companies were investing in				
		satellites/ground stations				
		etc) ask also for the				
		percentage. Country				
		partners will provide				
		information on the budget				
		linked to these possible				
		policies: i.e. EC-CAP				
		(Common Agricultural				
		Policy). It could be				
		presented as table: (I) Funds				
		source (National/ Regional)				
		(ii) Type (Space programme				
		/ Educational & Outreach				
		programme (iii) Categories:				
		a) Cartographic agencies b)				
		Civil Protection agencies c)				
		Defence and Security actors				
		d) Cultural Heritage				
		authorities e)				
		Environmental bodies f)				
		Forestry and resource				
		management bodies g)				
		Meteorological bodies h)				
		Maritime authorities I)				
		and a semi-section				
		communication				
		Institutos				
2.2	Depatration	institutes				
5.5.	Felletration					



3.3.1.	Use of Geo-	Country partners should get	no use of geo-	sporadic activities and pilot	at least one national	regular national activities in
	information	information on the	information within	projects where EO could be	activity where EO has	various thematic areas where
		Awareness of the	country policies [no	integrated in country policies	been integrated in	EO has been integrated in
		capabilities of EO and the	use (G)EO	[sporadic activities in (G)EO /	country policies (eo	country policies [2-5 dedicated
		Use of satellite imagery by	/penetration]	low penetration]	uptake in a defined	activities in (G)EO / advance
		government agencies (i) if			thematic area of interest)	penetration]
		public organisations are			[one dedicated activity in	
		generally aware of the			(G)EO / medium	
		capabilities of EO - Name of			penetration]	
		agencies (ii) level of the use				
		(volume & regularity) & how				
		they use the EO satellite				
		data by Government				
		agencies & departments to				
		support vital operations (iii)				
		uptake activities specially by				
		activation of programmes.				
		EARSC has done some				
		preliminary research on the				
		charter activation.				
3.3.2.	Capacity	We should like to better	no current EO actions	some national program for	capacity building funded	capacity building funded
	building EO	understand evolving	[no capacity building	capacity development in EO	projects/actions in the	projects/actions in the region
	focused	information on capacity	actions]	and geoinformatics [one	region [2-5 capacity	[6-10 capacity building actions]
	actions	building activities from the		capacity building action]	building actions]	
		Earth observation				
		community. Initiatives for				
		, Capacity Building: Human.				
		Institutional, Infrastructure				
		capacity building on				
		elements of relevance for				
		Earth observation.				



2.3.3. Example of collection of data

As indicated in the gap analysis (D3.1), certain elements of EO capacity are more easily measurable, e.g. geographic coverage whilst others such as the strength and coherence of the network of data stream are not. Measuring all these elements and their relationships requires a detailed network analysis befitting of a case-study and was considered beyond the scope of GEO-CRADLE, therefore the collection of data is based in key indicators.

As indicated earlier in the document, through several iterations with country partners & experts, we have collected the data for each indicator in single spreadsheets per country as shown in the tables below.

		Maturity Indicators (I)			Maturity							
						Indicators						
					Maturity Indicators expert	expert (ii)						
				Maturity Indicators expert (i)	(ii) (Evangelos Kosmidis	midis (g.kalousi@ter MaturityIndic						
			Maturity Indicators (II)	(xtsili@admin.grnet.gr)	<kosmidis@draxis.gr>)</kosmidis@draxis.gr>	raspatium.gr)	(iv) (Un. Patras)	Gap Analysis	Level	FINAL	Description	
CAPACITIES												All in all the
												ranged
												version
												seems much
												more realistic
												than the
												rounded one.
1.1.	National				the infrastructure level is			active in EO, with a high				
	Infrastructure				rather lower. Typically the			level of human capital,				
					infrastructure may be there			advanced space-borne				
1.1.1.	Space agency or	Space Committee under the	*Hellenic Space Organisation under the	Recently, in Spring 2018 the							a governmental space agency is	
	designated Space	supervision of Technology and	Ministry of Digital Policy,	Hellenic Space Organization							in charge of coordinating the	
	Authority	Research General Directorate	Telecommunications and Media	was incorporated. However							space activities in the country	
			* H2020 Space Committee under the	in preceeding years before	level 2) agree in principal but						and other stakeholder's relations	5
			supervision of Technology and Research	the HSD, Secretariat Genral	in practice this organization						which are equally active in the	
			General Directorate under the Ministry of	of Research and Technology	is not currently working and		level 2 > The governmemtn				EO domain	
			Education, Research and Religions	was the public Authority in	is not going to do so in the		space agency has just been					
				charge of Space activities	next 1-2 years due to the		established, no real work on					
				along with the ministry of	political situation.	3	space has began	in Greece, the survey	3	3		
1.1.2.	Own space-borne	None	None	2) Hellas Sat is a premium	level 0)	0	level 2 > HellasSat 3 /	reached four	0	1	no commitment towards space-	
1.1.3.	Access to 3rd party	3 Organisations in total with a	4 Organisations in total with a range of								access to several (between 2-10)	
	missions (own	range of missions: 1. NOA, Athens:	missions:		level 3)	3	level 3		3	3	ground stations for EO satellites	
1.1.4.	Ground-based	13 Organisations in total with	13 Organisations in total with significant		the semantics. It looks OK	4	level 4	Ground segment of ESA	4	4	demonstrated capacity with	
1.1.5.	In-situ monitoring	-			reversy reamsay rens closer to			The survey reached 19			besides owning or providing raw	
110	naturalu Madallan and	12 October 1997 and 1997 and	17 October 1991 And all and a	NOA NTUA semate sensing	level4. But 3 is a good	3	level 3	executed in a solution of the second se	3	3	data alea aragan lagadal data lit. Madala angela angla kanatian	
1.1.6.	Modelling and	13 Organisations with Modelling	17 Organisations with Modelling and	Inda, NTOA remote sensing				The survey reached 13			Models covering all thematics	
	computing	and Computing Processing	Computing Processing Capacities with at	laboratory, Harokopion				organizations in Greece			for Geocradie: for	
	capacities	Capacities with at least 14 models	least 11 models in all the following	University, Astronomy				with modelling and			meteo/climatic, atmospheric	
		in all the following categories:	categories:	Insitutes in various				processing capacities,			composition,	
		Meteorological/Climatic,	Meteorological/Climatic	Athens Threes Polytoshnia,				most of which are			hydrometric/water quality, soil	
		Atmospheric,	Atmospheric Composition/Profiling	Athens, Inrace Polytechnic				research oriented. 62%			attributes and energy/radiation.	
		Composition/Profiling,	Hydrometric/water Quality	Delegenders University of				or organizations with			Entitles are responsible for the	
		Hydrometric/water quality, Soll	Son attributes/Spectra	Peloponnese, university of				modelling capacities			development and	
		attributes/spectra,	Energy/Radiation	ratrasjan nave teams				that responded to the			Implementation of all numerical	
		Energy/Radiation . Please refer to	Please refer to 1.1.4 sheet.	Domain having assess to		Si		survey have taken part			models for forecasting, (between	
		1.1.4 sneet.		CONCTE LIDC facilities in			i i				10-20 modelling capacities)	
				principle: The Greek Personsh	lovel 2) It looks OV. There is a			31% of organizations				
				principle. The Greek Research	tendency (infractructure			participated in				
				provides high performance	wise) to move to lovel4	2	level 4	copernicus service	2	2		
117	(G) FO data	20 Organisations with FO data	24 Organisations with FO data	GRNET is deeply involved into	level 4) true in principle but		in the test of	In Greece, the survey	-		more than five organizations	
	exploitation	exploitation platforms (provision	exploitation platforms (provision of VA	e-science and virtual	as in 1.1.1 the organization is			reached 10			have a fully-fledged portfolio of	
	nlatforms	of VA services and products)- 5	services and products):	laboratories field, serving	bad and the imminent results			organizations with data			FO data exploitation platforms	
	(provision of VA	Institutional, 5 Research &	5 Institutional	Greek Universities and	are not well described or	4	level 4	exploitation capacities	4	4	capacities (EO data, tools	
		a construction of the first of a construction of the						I THE REPORT OF THE PROPERTY O			a new mean floor to be warray to be a	

Table 16: Example collection of data for Greece



			•							
		Maturity Indicators (I)	Maturity Indicators (II)	maturity indicators (expert SS. Cyril & Methodius University)	marija.vukelic.sutoska@gmail.com > Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopie	Gan Analysis	Level	FINAL	Description	
CAPACITIES										
11.	National Infrastructure					margins of research and operational activities. The sector is predominantly based on state owned/operated in-situ				
11.1.	Space agency or designated Space Authority		no	no	level 0	There is no National Space Agency or any relevant activity/strategic documents drafted. PROM does not have a space strategy or a space program	0	0	no organization, nor government ministry leading the space activity	
1.1.2.	Own space-borne canacity	FYROM has no space-borne capacities.	no	no	level 0	Space-borne capacities in the country are limited to an	0	0	no commitment towards space-borne canacity	
1.1.3.	Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	1	Satelite receiver DAWBEE supplied by Eumetstat. Owner is National Hydrometeorological Service of	Satellite receiver DAWBEE supplied by Eumetstat. Owner is National Hydrometeorological	level 0	and the second second	0	1	access one meteo missions	
1.1.4.	Ground-based facilities	6	The number provided is for in-situ	The number provided is for in-situ	level 1		1	1	no capacity for ground-based onctrol	ground base but
1.1.5.	In-situ monitoring networks		The ground-based networks: // 1. National Hydrometeorological	The in-situ networks: 1. National Hydrometeorological	level 2	Five organizations with in-situ networks were reached. Four are	2	2	demonstrated capacities in more than one of the following facilities (cover by	
116.	Modeling and computing capacities	7 to 9	If this should be related to High Performance Computing (support Performance Computing, Support computers) we have note. All modelers use normal computers.	If this should be related to trigh Performance Computing (supper computers) we have note. All modelers use normal computers.	level 2	Of the seven organizations reached by this save, three were identified as institutional, two as commercial, and two as research based. They are the the organizations specified that the previous EO-related projects while four have not. Modeling capacities exist unvirous institutions in the country and define duction and exearch institutions host most of the country's modeling capacities and most of its models. It operational is operational are. Operational the operational are. Operational	2	2	[between 5 to 10 modeling capacities]	All organizations have EO coapacities besides modelling and processing capacities. Sources of EO sources of EO sou
1.1.7.	EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	6 in total but 2 related to EO	Macedonian Forest Fire Monitoring Network use satellite data, combined with in-situ monitoring in order to derive forest fire risk indicators and maps	Macedonian Forest Fire Monitoring Network use satellite data, combined with in-situ monitoring in order to derive forest fire risk indicators and maps	level 2	Of the five organizations active in data exploitation reached, two are research-based and two are commercial. Two organizations have not taken part in EO-related	2	2		
1.2	Critical Mass of EO									
121.	Number of public organizations	8	University of Ss Cyril and Methodius in Skopje University Goce Delchev in Stip Real Estate Cadastre Agency	University of Ss Cyril and Methodius in Skopje University Goce Delchev in Stip Real Estate Cadastre Agency	level 2		2	2	at least the country has more than one organization in government, PSB, institute, academia/university that besides owning or providing raw data, also process/model data, provide GIS/mapping services, etc. (between 2-10 organizations)	

Table 17: Example collection of data for FYROM

Out of the data collection per country we have translated the levels into numerical values as shown in the FINAL column in yellow. The tables below include the level assessment obtained in the collection of data and the different steps to get the average per indicator set and pillar. The level A, B and C corresponds to three different steps to obtain the media of the set of indicators. See annex (maturity level short version)

Greece: Most of the indicators in Greece have advanced and optimised values which reflects a remarkable maturity on Greece in the Rol.

FYROM: Most of the indicators in FYROM have basic values which reflects an essential maturity.





Table 19: Assessment from FYROM

CMARDIN			Level	Level A	AA	AAA (ranged	AAA (rounded	AA	AAA	АААА	AA (ranged)	AA (rounded)	AAA (ranged)	AAA (rounded)	AAAA (ranged)	AAAA (rounded)	Level B	BB	BBB (ranged)	BBB (rounded)	Level C	CC	CCC (ranged)	DCC (ranged)
Coverna Coverna <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>-</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>26</th><th>1.125</th><th>1</th><th>1</th></t<>				-																	26	1.125	1	1
11.1 State <	CAPACITIES																18	1,2	1	1	30	1,122		
11.1 ipor gring disguing discription 0	1.1.	National Infrastructure	1,142857	8	1,143	1	1	1,214285714	1	1,33333	1	1	1	1	1	1								
12 0x-spec-hore age/y 0	1.1.1.	Space agency or designated Space Authority	0																					
1.1.1. Across Med Priority into (origonal data) 1.1.2 Across Med Priority into (origonal data) 1.2.2 Value	1.1.2.	Own space-borne capacity	0	-																				
1.4. Genale work fielding at comparing works 1.2. I.3. I.4. Genale works I.2. I.4. I.4. Meding at comparing works I.2. I.4. I.4. <td>1.1.3.</td> <td>Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	1.1.3.	Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	1																					
1.5. 8-membring starting on point grant	1.1.4.	Ground-based facilities	1																					
1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.	1.1.5.	In-situ monitoring networks	2																					
11.1. 10.1. <t< td=""><td>1.1.6.</td><td>Modelling and computing capacities</td><td>2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	1.1.6.	Modelling and computing capacities	2																					
12 Orical Mone of Descendence 1 1 0	1.1.7.	EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	2																					
1.1. Nuclei of plok organization 2 - <	1.2	Critical Mass of EO researchers	1,5	6	1,5	1	2																	
12.1.2. Number of inservices (a low, ak 24) also) 1 - <	1.2.1.	Number of public organizations	2																					
1.1. Consisting landing optimize, a diversity as functing optimize, a diversity as dinterrite diversity as diversity as functing o	1.2.2.	Number of researchers (m Univ. & R&D labs)	1																					
1.1. Akrosk Able kom 1 -	123.	Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	2																					
11. Nacher of computies 1	1.2.4.	Relevant Publications	1	4		1	1																	
13.1 Epoperar random levels as comparies 1 Image: second levels Image: second level	13.1.	Number of companies	1																					
13.4. Redien do darpresentaires of Excess constraints 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1</th1<>	1.3.3.	Employment numbers, levels and changes	1																					
1.5. Existence of Chairm 1 <td>1.3.4.</td> <td>Resellers or local representatives of European companies</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	1.3.4.	Resellers or local representatives of European companies	1																					
Collamont	135.	Existence of Clusters	1																					
CMLARXI CMLARXI <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>10</td><td>1.00000000</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>																	10	1.00000000						
1.1. Archingtoin In GRD or to projectivitations which are black to the line do t	2.1.	Collaboration through GEO		,	0.5	0		0.925	0.5		0		0		1		12	1/040404041						
Index Image: Constraint Development Gala (SDC') Image: Constraint Gala (SDC')	2.1.1.	Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to	49 0	-				0,023	40		0													
1.1. Despand GEO effice 0 1.1. Provision of data to closes 0 2.1. Provision of data to closes 0 2.1. Organizations involved in projects hink do Coperations 0 1.1. Organizations involved in projects hink do Coperations 0 2.1. Organizations involved in projects hink do Coperations 0 2.1. Organizations involved in projects hink do Coperations 1 2.1. Reconsignation (Marco Normalies) 1 2.1. Reconsignations in the Linear strained efforts 1 2.1. Reconsignations in the Linear strained efforts 1 2.1. Marconsignations in the Linear strained efforts 2 2.1. Marconsignations in the Linear strained in	21.2	Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's)	2	-																				
21.4 Provision of data to closes 0 0 0 0 22 Impact of Coperations 0 0 0 0 23.1 Organizations involved incipotes linked to Operations 0 0 0 23.1 Participation to other all projects linked to Operations 0 0 23.1 Reconsignation 1,4 9 1,8 2 23.1 Use version grant with the international offerts 1,2 2 23.1 Use version grant with the internation in the Larger main in t	213	Designated GEO office	0																					
Impact of Coparison 0 0 0 0 0 0 21.1 Organization involved in projects likeli do Copernicus 0 0 0 0 3.1 Participation introller do projects likeli do Copernicus 1.8 1 2.1 23.1 Dirac According Like Market Introller Likeli do Copernicus 0 1 2 23.1 Dirac According Likeli do Copernicus 2 1 2 23.1 Dirac According Likeli do Transmite Information In the Example 2 1 23.1 Dirac According Information in the Example 3 1 1 23.1 Dirac According Information in the Example 3 1 1 23.1 Dirac According Transmite Information in the Example 3 1 1	2.1.4.	Provision of data to GEOSS	0																					
221. Organization involved in projects linked to Operations 0 23. Participation to structurational efforts 1,8 9 1,8 1 2 21. SA 0 1 2 2 1 SA 0 1 2 23. Meteorological WMO, ELMATSAT, 3 2 1 SA 1 2 23. Meteorological in findrequires for spatial liberration in the Elementation of a participation of the Methodic organization in the Elementation of a participation in the Elementation of a participation in the Elementation of a participation of a partipation of a participation of a participation of a parti	2.2.	Impact of Copernicus	0	0	0	0	0																	
23. Participation to other international efforts (j,k) 9 1,k 2 23.1 ESX 0.0 0	2.2.1.	Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	0																					
23.1 ISA 0 23.2 Micronological WAO, IRUMISAT 1 23.1 Uit systema IS Micrological WAO, IRUMISAT 2 23.4 ExaMplica Influenzation for dynal Information in the European Examplication Standardization regulations in a structure 3 23.5 Micrological Structure in Standardization is a structure 1	2.3.	Participation to other international efforts	1.8	9	1.8	1	2																	
2.3.2 Meconological: WWO, ILMETSAT, 3 2.3.3 UN system an UW GGRM, 2 2.3.4 Esobhiding an Infrartschuter för Späral Information in the European Generation, UWERDI 3 2.5.5 Pherioping in Shanderdattoring organizations is as OOC 1	2.3.1	ESA	0																					
2.3. UK system at U/S-000M, 2 2.3. Backbilds an Influence for Spatial Information in the European 3 2.3. Putricipation Banderdization capatations in a OCC 1	2.3.2	Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	3																					
Comming a manufacture or vipual incontaison in the incorpoint Comming (VIORID) The standardization organizations in a strongen The standardization organizations in a strongen The strongen	2.3.3.	UN system as UN-GGIM,	2																					
2.3.5. Participation in Standardization organizations i.e. as OGC 1	2.3.9	Establishing an Intrastructure for Spanal Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	3																					
	2.3.5.	Participation in Standardization organizations i.e. as OGC	1																					
2.4. Availability of E2 funding 1 1 1 1 1	2.4.	Availability of EU funding	1	1	1	1	1																	
24.1. RAD punicipation or other EU programmes 1	2.4.1.	R&D participation or other EU programmes	1																					
	UNTAND																4							
UT ANX 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 0	3.1.	Networking initiatives	1.5	3	1.5	1	2	1	0.667	1,33333	1	1	0	1	1	1	0							
3.1.1. Networking initiatives (vento and flematic workshops) 1	3.1.1.	Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	1																					
11.2 Dan brah 2	3.1.2.	Data Portals	2																					
3.2 Various/Polices/mplementation 0.5 1 0.5 0 1	3.2.	National Policies Implementation	0,5	-1	0,5	0	1																	
12.1. Policy Instantian framework framework framework (market and the second seco	3.2.1.	Policy Reduct & insustment (internal to the country)	1																					
ana program (a transmission and a transmission) 0	3.3.	Penetration	1	2	1	1	1																	
13.1. Uze of Geo-information 1	3.3.1.	Use of Geo-information	1	-																				
13.2 Capacity building ED focued actions 1	3.3.2.	Capacity building EO focused actions	1																					



Summary Methodology chapter

The methodology is the principal chapter of this report. It introduces the elements for building a maturity assessment method to measure the (G)EO readiness of the countries. It also goes through the different phases: the starting approach where diverse methods have been considered and incorporated while other (most notably the benchmarking) may be pursued in the future; the construction phase where it is fundamental to identify the relevant indicators, for which the maturity assessment is performed, the explanation of their parameters and an overview of boundaries for their application; and finally the deployment phase describing the collection of data and how the data is transformed in the maturity cards which characterise the Earth Observation capacity in the countries within the GEO-CRADLE area, providing concrete information on its EO activities. The maturity level provides a quasi-quantitative measure of how well a country is performing against a given indicator. The aim is to translate the information collected against the various indicators into a value that falls within a certain range (e.g. 0 to 4), thus ensuring the ability to compare between countries and monitor over time.


3. Visualisation

Maturity Cards

Comparison with a baseline that ranks the maturity of EO capacities

"the maturity cards offer a visualisation based on a quasi-quantitative approach that will allow us to understand how well each country is performing against a given indicator"

We proposed two models of visualisation for the maturity cards.

- **Ranged version**: a strict way to visualise the data which will represent the values in the exact range they correspond (L0 > values between 0 to 1, L1 > values between 1 to 2). This approach will give only maximum values if the indicator has been provided by the maximum level.
- **Rounded version**: means making a number simpler for visualisation but keeping its value close to what it was.

PADLE						\lba	ania		CRADIT					1	lba	ani
ssess	ment (ra	nged)	I						Assess	ment (ro	unded)					
CAPACITY	h.		COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	•		CAPACITY	•		COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	-
core	card								Score	card						
maturity indicators	indicators	lavel	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicator
apacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	•	capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	cellaboration GEO	•	uptake	networki
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	0		policy	•		eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	0		policy
	industry base	0		international	•		penetration	-		industry base	h.		International	-		penetratio
				funding	-								funding	-		
nfrastructure		re space authority				monoarto			capacity	0	indicator.	level	cooperatori			
apacity						monoarto			capacity	0	indicator.	Invel	cooperatori			
structure	space authors	rity	•	collaboration GI	EO pa	rticipation GEO	SD0's		infrastructure	space author	irky	-	collaboration GE0	part C	icipation GEO	500%
structure	space authors space born access 3rd	ority 9 party missio		collaboration GI	EO pa	rticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of	SDG's		infrastructure	space authors access 3rd	party missions	0	collaboration GE0	D part spec desi	icipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO of	SDG's
sstructure	space authors space born access 3rd ground bas	ority 9 party missio ed	ons O	collaboration GI	EO pa sp de	rticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G	SDG's fice EOSS		infrastructure	space authorspace born access 3rd ground bas	nity a party missions ed	0 0	collaboration GEC	D part space desi	icipation GEO offic actions on gnated GEO of fision data to G	SDG's fice EDSS
astructure	space authors space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ	vrity 9 party missio ed	ons O	collaboration Gl	EO pa sp de pr cus pr	rticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G ojects	SDG's fice EOSS		infrastructure	space author space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ	inty a party missions ed		collaboration GEO	D part spec des prov as proj	icipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts	SDG's fice EDSS
sstructure	space authors space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling 8	rity e party missio ed computing	ons O	collaboration G	EO ps sp de pn cus pn ES	rticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G ojects A	SDG's fice EOSS		infrastructure	space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modeTing &	ed party missions ed computing		collaboration GEC	D part spec desi prov as prov ESA	icipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ects	SDG's fice EDSS
astructure	space author space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling 8 eo data exp	rity e party missio ed computing loitation	ons O	collaboration Gl	EO ps sp de pn cus pn ES mo	rticipation GEO eclific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G ovision data to G	SDG's fice EOSS		infrastructure	space author space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modeling & eo data exp	ed computing lotation		collaboration GEO	D part spec desi prov as proy ESA met	icipation GED citic actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts ecrological	SDG s fice EDSS
esearch	space authors space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling 8 eo data exp n. public on	rity a party missio ed computing loitation ganizations	ons O	cofaboration Gl	EO ps sp de pn cus pn ES mo UN	riticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G ojects A recordogical 4 / Int. agreemen	SDQ's fice EOSS		expand/ Infrastructure	space authors space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ mode/ling & eo data exp n, public on	ed computing partzetions		collaboration GE0	D part spec desi prov as proj ESA meto	icipation GED citic actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts corological / Int. agreement	SDG's fice EOSS
research	space auth space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling 8 eo data exp n. public on n. research	vity a party missio ed computing loitation ganizations rs	nns O A A A A A A	collaboration Gi	EO pas sp de pr cus pr ES me UN	rticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G opects A A teorological 4 / Int. agreemen SPIRE	SDG's fice EOSS		eo research	space born space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modeling & eo data exp n. public on n. research	enty party missions ed computing lotation ganizations ms		collaboration GEC	spec spec desi prov zs proj ESA meti UN INSI	icipation GED cific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ects ecrological / Int. agreemen PIRE	SDG's fice EDSS
research	space authin space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modeiling 8 eo data exp n. public on n. research courses offic	rity a party missio ed computing loitation ganizations rrs ered	>ns 0 >ns 0 • • • • •	collaboration Gi	EO pas sp de pn cus pn ES ms UP IN sta	rticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G ojects A, teorological I/ int. agreemen SPIRE underdization	SDG's fice EOSS		eo research	space born space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modeling & eo data exp n. public on n. research courses off	ed computing lotation ganizations ins red		collaboration GEG	spec spec desi prov as prov as prov as prov unv UNv UNv unvat stan	cipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ects corological (int. agreemen PIRE dardization	SDG's fice EOSS ts
research	space auth space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling 8 eo data exp n. public on n. research courses offic publication	wity a party missioned computing lotation panizations rrs weed i	Consider Construction	collaboration Gi	EO ps sp de pn cus pn ES mc UP IN sts sts	rticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G opicts A ateorological 4 / Int. agreemen SPIRE underdization D participation	SDQ's Ince EOSS		eo research	space auther space suff access 3rd ground bas in-stu modeling & eo data sing n, public on n, researchs courses off publication	rity party missions ed computing lotation ganizations rrs rred		collaboration GEG impact Copernicu international funding	D part spec desi prov s prov ESA meb UN UN INSI stan	cipation GEO ilfo actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ects sorological sorological vi fint, agreemen miRE dardization I participation	SDG's fice EDSS
estructure research	space auth space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public or n. research courses offi publication n. compania	rity a party missio ed computing loitation ganizations res red i s	A O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	collaboration Gl	EO ps sp de pr ES ms UN IN str R8	riticipation GEO eclific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G ovision data t	SDG's File		eo research Industry base	space authors space born access 3rd ground bas in-stu modeling & eo data exp n. public op n. rusearch courses off publications n. companie	e de la computing e computing e lotation ganizations ered e lotation se lotation	Image: Constraint of the second sec	collaboration GEG	D part spec desi prov ss proj ESA met UN INSI stan R&D	icipation GEO affic actions on gnated GEO of lision data to G exits aorological aorological (int. agreemen PIRE derdization i participation addento	SDG's fice EDSS
esearch ustry base	space authi space born access 3rd ground bas in-stu modelling & e. public or n. research courses off publication n. companie employment	rity a party mission sid computing loitation panizations ris red i t t	A O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	collaboration Gi impact Copernia international funding uptake networking	EO psi sp de pri cus pri ES mi ES mi tist sts sts	riticipation GEO ecific actions on ecific actions on ecific actions on subscriptions of the operation of the operation of the economic operation provided the provided operation provided operatio	SDG's SDG's EDSS E		epideling Hereasuuture eo research Hourty base	space autors space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling & e o data exp n, public on n, public on publications n, companie employment	ritzy poarty missions ed computing fotation ganizations res red is t t	0 0	collaboration collaboration GEG impact Copernics international funding uptake entworking	D part spec desi prov as proj ESA meb UN INSI stan PASC	icipation GEO affic actions on gnated GEO of lision data to G ects errological serrological (int. agreemen PIRE derdization i participation indicato rorking	SDGs fice EDSS
estructure research ustry base	space suffit space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modeling 8 e o data exp n. public on n. n:reeasedt publication n. compani employmen resafters, po	rity a party missio ed computing lotation ganizations rrs red t s s t t rtnerships	A O O O O O A	collaboration Gil	EO ps sp de pr cus pr ES ms ES ms ES ms ES FR R8	riticipation GEO ecific actions on ecific actions on ecific actions on system of the actions of the operation of the econological at the action of the actio	SDG's SDG's ECOSS ECOS ECO	Image: Control of the second	explosing Historiuscum en research Hobulty base	space bank space bank access 3rd ground bas in-situ modeling & e o data esp n, public or n, public or n, public or publication n, comparis engloymen restilers, pu	rity porty missions ed computing fotation ganizations ris red is totation tripanizations ris red t t	0 0	collaboration GEG impact Copernicu international funding uptake networking	parti species desi prov ss prov essA mete unv instan stan stan stan stan stan	icipation GED ific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts errological / Int. agreemen PRE dardization i participation indicato rocking portain	SDGs fice EDSS
astructure research ustry base	space suffit space born access 3rd access 3rd ground bes in-still eo data exp n, public on n, research courses off publication employmen reselfers, pa clusters	rity a party missio ed computing lotation ganizations ins ins ins is t t t t t t t t t renships	A O O A A A A A A A A A A A A A	colaboration Gl	EO para sp de protection protecti	ticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of vivision data to G opiects A A teorological I / Int. agroemen SPIRE Inderdization D participation Inderdization Inderdization Inderdization Inderdization Inderdization Inderdization Inderdization	SDG's Construction of the second seco	Image: Control of the second	e palading Hitesticulum epinearch Holustry base	space authors space authors access 3rd ground base in-stu modeling & n. public or publication n. compari- n. compari- n. compari- n. compari- n. compari- n. counters off publication n. compari- n. compari-	Interest Intere	0 0	colaboration GEC impact Copernics international funding policy	desi speceric desi provi si provi si provi si si si si si si si si si si si si si	icipation GED ific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts errological if int. agreemen PRE dardization i participation indicato profais profais py	SDGs fice EDSS
research fustry base	space authors access and ground base modeling & no data exp n. n. reaseach publication n. companie employmen emselitien, publication clusters	rity a party missio ed computing lotation ganizations irs ered i es t t tranships	nns O Nns O Nns O N N O N N O N O O N O	collaboration GI	EO passed approximation provide approximation provide approximatio	ticipation GEO ecific actions on signated GEO of ovision data to G opicsts A A deteorological 4 / Int. agreemen SPIRE indardization D participation indardization D participation indicato tworking ta portals	sbG's		explosing Hitestructure et research Holustry base	space authors space authors access 3rd ground bass in-stru modeling & or data exp or data	Interest P P party missions ed computing ioitation res res res t t t rtnerships	0 0	colaboration GEI collaboration GEI impact Copernics international funding cotoke reflacolung policy	desi spex desi prov as proj ssa proj essa meto un stan netv stan netv data stan netv data stan bud	cipation GED affo actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ects sorological sorological (int. agreemen PRE dardization sorticipation sorking uportatis participation sorking participation	SDG's fice EDSS ts
hrastructure h research dustry base	space auth space auth access 3rd ground bas in-abu modeling 8 e o data exp n. public on n. public courses off publication n. compani employmen resafters, pu clusters	rity aparty missio ed computing loitation yanizations irs red i s t t therships	nns O Nns O Nns O N N N N O N N N O O	colaboration GI	EO pase appoint of the second provide a provide a provid	thicipation GEO signated GEO of vivision data to GE vivision data to GE of the one one of the one of the one o	SDG'9 SDG'9 Fice EOSS S S S S		explosing Historiucium en research Hoturiry base	space autor space autor ground bas in-stu modeline, and eo data eng n. public or n. research publication n. courses of publication n. comparts employmen researces, pu clusters	ntrecov rrky a computing totation ganizations rs red is t t stneships	0 0	colaboration GEI colaboration GEI impact Copernor, international funding cottake prefacolung policy peretration	parti space desi prov meto ESA meto ESA meto UN Stan B&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R	icipation GED afforactions on gnated GEO of ission data to G ects acrosogical vi fint, agreemen PRIE dandaction indicato isorking a portalis participation pry isorking pry a portalis pry	SDG's fice EDSS fs

Figure 3: Example comparison ranged version vs rounded (Albania)

Maturity card Albania (ranged)

Maturity card Albania (rounded)

Experts in the industry side seemed to be more conservative. Their preference will be to present the maturity cards following the ranged visualisation, however some of the experts in the research/policy tend to have preferences showing the results on ranged visualisation.



Figure 4: Example comparison ranged version vs rounded (Greece)

PADLE					G	ire	ec	B	CRADUS						Gre	ec	G
SSessi	nent (rang	ged)							Assess	ment (rou	inded)						
CAPACITY	2		COOPERATION	2		UPTAKE	2		CAPACITY	2	•	COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	•	
core ca	ard								Score	card							
maturity	indicators I	level	maturity	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	level	maturity	Indicators	
capacity	Infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	٠	capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	۰	uptake	networking	
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	•		policy	2		eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	•		policy	
	industry base	•		international	2		penetration	•		industry base	2		international			penetration	i
				funding	2								funding	2			
		cator	level	cooperation		indicato	r	level	capacity	in	sicator	level	cooperation		indicato		
astructure	space authority	cator /	level	cooperation collaboration GE0	D partic	indicato	r	level	capacity infrastructure	in space author	sicator Ty	level	cooperation collaboration GEC) parti	indicato cipation GEO	*	
structure	space authority space borne	cator 7	level	cooperation collaboration GEC	D partic specif	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on	sDG's	level •	capacity	space author space borne	dicator By	Plevel C	cooperation collaboration GEC	D parti spec	indicato cipation GEO ific actions on	SDG's	
structure	space authority space borne access 3rd part	cator / ty missions	level	cooperation collaboration GEC	D partic specif design	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of	SDG's	level	capacity	space author space borne access 3rd p	sicator ty arty missions	level 7 N 7	cooperation collaboration GEC	D parti spec desi	indicate cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO of	SDG's	
istructure	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based	cator / ty missions	level	cooperation collaboration GEC	D partic specifi design provis	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G	SDG's fice EOSS	level • • • •	capacity Infrastructure	space author space borne access 3rd pa ground based	dicator Ity arty missions 1	Sevel 7 h 7	cooperation collaboration GEC	D parti spec desi prov	indicato cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G	SDG's fice EOSS	
structure	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & co	ty missions		cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu	D partic specifi design provis is projec	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G	SDG's flice EOSS	krvel • • • • •	capacity Infrastructure	space author space borne access 3rd po ground based in-situ modelling & d	dicator ity arty missions d	level 7 M 7 0 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernique international	D parti spec desig provi s proje	indicato cipation GEO ofic actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G icts	SDG's flice EOSS	
istructure	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & cor eo data exploit	ty missions mputing ation		cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international	D partic specif design provis is projec ESA meteo	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G ots orological	SDG's flice EOSS	kxel C C C C C C C C C C C C C	capacity infrastructure	space author space borne access 3rd pr ground based in-situ modelling & c eo data explo	sicator ty arty missions t computing sitation	10x01	collaboration GEC	D parti spec desi prov s proje ESA	Indicato cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G icts	SDG's fice EOSS	
esearch	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & con eo data exploit. n. public organi	ty missions mputing ation	ievel	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicu international	D partici specifi design provis projec ESA meteo UN / I	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G tts prological int. agreemen	SDG's filte EOSS	Evel 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	expectity Infrastructure	space author space borne access 3rd p ground based in-situ modelling & c eo data expto n, public orga	sicator ity arty missions d computing elation enizations	2000	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicu international	D parti spec desi prov s proje ESA mete UN /	Indicato cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G icts corological Int. agreemen	SDG's fice EOSS	
esearch	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & coi e o data exploit, n. public organi n. researchers	y missions mputing ation	ievel 	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international	D partici specifi design provis project ESA meteor UN / I INSPI	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G tis orological int. agreemen RE	SDG's fice EOSS tables for the second	Evel 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	expansity Infrastructure	space author space author space borne access 3rd p ground based in-situ modelling & c eo data exple n, public orga n, researcher	sicator ity arty missions. 3 computing sitation enizations 8	2000 7 1 1 7 0 7 7 0 7 0 0 0 0	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicu international	D parti spec desig provi 5 provi ESA mete UN /	Indicato cipation GEO affic actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G icts corological Int. agreemen IRE	SDG's fice EOSS	
esearch	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & coi eo data exploit n. public organi n. researchers courses offered	r ty missions mputing ation izations	ievel 	cooperation coflaboration GEC impact Copernicu international	D partici specifi design provis B projec ESA metec UN / I NSPI stand	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G its prological int. agreemen RE ardization	SDG's SDG's flice EOSS	Evel 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	especify infrastructure eo research	space author space author space borne access 3rd p ground baser in-situ modelling & c eo data explo n. researcher courses offer	sleator ty arty missions d computing mitation nizations a a	2000 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicu international	D parti spec desi provi s proji ESA mete UN / INSP	Indicato cipation GEO ofic actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G icts conological list. agreemen NRE dardization	SDG's flice EOSS	
esearch	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & coi e o data exploit n. public organi n. researchers courses offered publications	ty missions mputing ation izations		cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding	D partici specifi design provis spojec ESA metec UN / I INSPI stand R&D p	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of icon data to G its prological int. agreement RE ardization participation	stadis SDG's		copecity infrastructure	in space subtor space subtor space borne access 3rd p ground based in-situ modelling & c eo data explo n, researcher courses offer publications	sleator Ry arty missions. d computing situation s s s ed	10001 7 1 7 0 7 7 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicu international funding	D partii spec desij provi s projs ESA mete UN / INSP stam	Indicato cipation GEO afic actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ision data	sDG's ffice EOSS	
esearch stry base	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & coi eo data exploit n. public organ n. researchers courses offered publications n. companies	r ty missions mputing ation izations		cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding	D partici specifi design provis s projec ESA metec UN / I INSPI stand R&D p	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G its prological int. agreemen RE ardization participation	SDG's file		ouperchy Infrastructure on research industry base	space suther space suther space borne access 3rd p ground based in-situ modelling & c eo data exptr eo data exptr n, public orgi n, researcher courses offer publications n, companies	sleator Ry arty missions. d computing station nizations a d	icol 3 h 3 0 3 0	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicu international funding	D parti spec desig provi as probi ESA mete UN / INSP stam	Indicato cipation GEO dife actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ision data to G icita corological lat. agreemen PIRE dardization participation	SDG's ffice EOSS 65	
esearch stry base	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & cor eo data exploit n. public organ n. researchers courses offered publications n. companies employment	tottor ty missions mputing ation izations		cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding uptake networking	D partici specifi design provis s projec ESA metec UN / I INSPI stand R&D p	indicato ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G its roological int. agreemen RE ardization participation indicato erking	SDG's fice EOSS ts		eleventy infrastructure infrastructure infrastructure infrastructure industry base	In space suffice space suffice space borne access 3rd p ground based in-situ modelling & c eo data explo n, researcher courses offer publications n, companied employment	ty arty missions. arty missions. arty missions arty missions arty missions arty missions articles arty missions ar	5001 7 h 7 0 7 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicu international funding uptake networking	D parti spec desig provi s proble ESA mete UN / INSP stans R&D	indicato cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ision data to G icits sorological inct agreemen "RE dardization "participation indicato orking	SDG's Fice EOSS 65	
esearch stry base	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & con e data exploit n. public organi n. researchers courses offered publications employment resellers, partni	r ty missions mputing ation izations	Invest 7 8 7 9 7 9 7 9 <td>cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding uptake networking</td> <td>D partici specifi design provis projec ESA metec UN / I INSPI stand R&D p R&D p</td> <td>indicator ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G tris prological int. sgreemen RE ardization ardization indicato orking contals</td> <td>sDG's flice EOSS to state the state state</td> <td>text C C C C C C C C C C C C C</td> <td>expensity infrastructure eo research industry base</td> <td>In space suffer space suffer space bare access and p ground base in-situ modelling & c eo data expli- n. public orgi n. researcher publications n. companies employment reseiters, part</td> <td>ty restored to the second seco</td> <td>Statistical 7 8 7 0 7 0</td> <td>cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding uptake networking</td> <td>D parti spec desig provi s proje ESA mete UN / INSP stani R&D</td> <td>indicato cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ision data</td> <td>SDG's Sice EOSS 55</td> <td></td>	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding uptake networking	D partici specifi design provis projec ESA metec UN / I INSPI stand R&D p R&D p	indicator ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G tris prological int. sgreemen RE ardization ardization indicato orking contals	sDG's flice EOSS to state the state	text C C C C C C C C C C C C C	expensity infrastructure eo research industry base	In space suffer space suffer space bare access and p ground base in-situ modelling & c eo data expli- n. public orgi n. researcher publications n. companies employment reseiters, part	ty restored to the second seco	Statistical 7 8 7 0 7 0	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding uptake networking	D parti spec desig provi s proje ESA mete UN / INSP stani R&D	indicato cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ision data	SDG's Sice EOSS 55	
esearch istry base	space authority space authority space borne access Srd part ground based in-Blu modelling acc n, public organ n, nublic organ space authority nublic organ n, public organ n, nublic organ space authority nublic organ n, public organ n, nublic organ space authority nublic organ n, public organ n, nublic	r ty missions mputing ation izations	Incel N	cooperation cotaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding uptake networking policy	D partici specifi design provis projec ESA metec UN / I INSPI INSPI stand R&D p netwo data p policy	indicator ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G tris prological int, agreemen RE ardization ardization indicato wrking contais	sDG's flice EOSS ts	ived	clapsing infrastructure on research infrastructure	in space authors space borne cocess 3nd p ground base modeling & c n public color n, public color n, public color n, public color n, color publications n, color setters, part resetters, part clusters	ty arty missions g momputing mission nnizations s ed	out 7 A 7 0 7 0	cooperation cotaboration GEC impact Copernicu international organic networking policy	D partii speccession prov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov sprov speccession prov speccession	Indicato cipation GEO dife actions on gnated GEO of lision data to G lision data to G lisio	sDG's SDG's EOSS ts	
esearch estry base	space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & col e o data exploit. n. public organi n. crease/burs courses offeet publications n. companies employment ressilien, purtru	r ty missions mputing ation izations	Incel Image: Image and the second	cooperation containention GEC international international funding ceptake networking policy	D partici specification design provis provis ESA meteo UN / I INSPI stand R&D p stand R&D p data p policy	indicato ipation GEO Go actions on nated GEO of ion data to Go its prological int. agreement RE ardization participation indicato orking poortals	sDG's	ted 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	objectivy infrastructure in a state of message in of message industry base	space bare space bare access 3rd p ground base in-bit modeling & c e dital engly n, public orgi n, nasarchin course offer applications n, comparise engly engly n, comparise engly engly course offer applications n, comparise engly engly course offer applications n, comparise engly e	ty arty missions g omputing relation nizations s ed	cod 7 A 7 0 7 0 1 1	coperation cotabonition GEC impact Copernicu international funding optice policy	 partin spece designed designed provide <	Indicato cipation GEO dife actions on anated GEO of ission data to G ission data to G issio	sDQ's SDQ's EOSS ts ts	
research ustry base	space subortiy space subortiy space borne access 3d part in-stau modelling & co e data seption n. public organiza- n. public organiza- n. public organiza- n. public organiza- n. public organiza- n. comparison or public organiza- negative or public organiza- tive or public organiza- negative or public organiza- negative organiza- compariza- com	r ty missions mputing ation izations f	Incel 7 8 9 9 7 9 7 9 7 9 7 9 7 9 <td>cooperation containment of the second impact Copernicu- international funding policy policy penetration</td> <td>particic specific <t< td=""><td>indicate ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G its prological ardization nate GEO ardization nate GEO ardization indicate wrking soortals indicate at & investment</td><td>ts Days of the second s</td><td></td><td>elasticure infrastructure</td><td>space hours space hours access 3rd p grunn bases in-shu modeling & c e o data expl r, public org n, essearch causes offer publications f, n, comparis energian employment meeters, part clusters</td><td>scator ty arty missions. a computing station mizations a computing missions a missions a missions a a a a a a a a a a a a a</td><td>Over 7 8 7 0 7 0</td><td>coperation cotaboration GEC impact Copernicu- international funding policy policy perintiation</td><td>budge budge</td><td>Indicate cipation GEO affe actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ision data</td><td>sDO's SDO's EOSS 65</td><td></td></t<></td>	cooperation containment of the second impact Copernicu- international funding policy policy penetration	particic specific specific <t< td=""><td>indicate ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G its prological ardization nate GEO ardization nate GEO ardization indicate wrking soortals indicate at & investment</td><td>ts Days of the second s</td><td></td><td>elasticure infrastructure</td><td>space hours space hours access 3rd p grunn bases in-shu modeling & c e o data expl r, public org n, essearch causes offer publications f, n, comparis energian employment meeters, part clusters</td><td>scator ty arty missions. a computing station mizations a computing missions a missions a missions a a a a a a a a a a a a a</td><td>Over 7 8 7 0 7 0</td><td>coperation cotaboration GEC impact Copernicu- international funding policy policy perintiation</td><td>budge budge</td><td>Indicate cipation GEO affe actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ision data</td><td>sDO's SDO's EOSS 65</td><td></td></t<>	indicate ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of ion data to G its prological ardization nate GEO ardization nate GEO ardization indicate wrking soortals indicate at & investment	ts Days of the second s		elasticure infrastructure	space hours space hours access 3rd p grunn bases in-shu modeling & c e o data expl r, public org n, essearch causes offer publications f, n, comparis energian employment meeters, part clusters	scator ty arty missions. a computing station mizations a computing missions a missions a missions a a a a a a a a a a a a a	Over 7 8 7 0 7 0	coperation cotaboration GEC impact Copernicu- international funding policy policy perintiation	budge budge	Indicate cipation GEO affe actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ision data	sDO's SDO's EOSS 65	

Maturity card Greece (ranged)

Maturity card Greece (rounded)

The Indicators' Groups (detail evaluation) remain the same for both visualisations; the major difference applies on the score card value and the final assessment.

The model of the maturity card format is shown in the figure below. The complete set of maturity cards for each of the countries in the RoI are included in the next pages:

Albania	Egypt	Israel	Tunisia
Bulgaria	Greece	Romania	Turkey
Cyprus	FYROM	Serbia	

The following pages will introduce the maturity card model and the maturity cards per countries. We present the ranged version in the report while the rounded version could be found in annex 5. The assessment will be presented in the Insights section.



Figure 5: Maturity card model





Assessment

				-

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus			policy	
	industry base			international			penetration	
				funding				

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority		collaboration GEO	participation GEO	
	space borne			specific actions on SDG's	
	access 3rd party missions			designated GEO office	
	ground based			provision data to GEOSS	
	in-situ		impact Copernicus	projects	
	modelling & computing		international	ESA	
	eo data exploitation			meteorological	
eo research	n. public organizations			UN / Int. agreements	
	n. researchers			INSPIRE	
	courses offered			standardization	
	publications		funding	R&D participation	
industry base	n. companies		untelle	indicator	lausi
	employment		иртаке	Indicator	level
	resellers partnerships		networking	networking	
				data portals	
	Clusters		policy	policy	
				budget & investment	
			penetration	use	
				capacity building	

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 6: Maturity card Albania





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	COOPERATION	UPTAKE	

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus	0		policy	
	industry base	0		international			penetration	
				funding	-	_		

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	-	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	
	space borne	0		specific actions on SDG's	
	access 3rd party missions	0		designated GEO office	0
	ground based	-		provision data to GEOSS	
	in-situ		impact Copernicus	projects	0
	modelling & computing		international	ESA	0
	eo data exploitation			meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	7		UN / Int. agreements	0
	n. researchers	-		INSPIRE	-
	courses offered			standardization	
	publications	0	funding	R&D participation	-
industry base	n. companies		And the second second		
	employment		uptake	Indicator	level
	resellers, partnerships		networking	networking	
	clusters	0		data portals	
			policy	policy	
				budget & investment	
			penetration	use	-
				capacity building	2

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 7: Maturity card Bulgaria





Assessment (ranged)

2	2	2

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	0	uptake	networking	2
	eo reserach	3		impact Copernicus	3		policy	3
	industry base	2		international	3		penetration	3
				funding	3			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	3	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	2
	space borne	2		specific actions on SDG's	0
	access 3rd party missions	3		designated GEO office	2
	ground based	2		provision data to GEOSS	2
	in-situ	3	impact Copernicus	projects	3
	modelling & computing	3	international	ESA	4
	eo data exploitation	3		meteorological	5
eo research	n. public organizations	3		UN / Int. agreements	2
	n. researchers	3		INSPIRE	5
	courses offered	3		standardization	3
	publications	3	funding	R&D participation	3
industry base	n. companies	3		te di seten	lavel
	employment	3	uptake	indicator	level
	resellers, partnerships	3	networking	networking	3
	clusters	2		data portals	2
		2	policy	policy	4
				budget & investment	2
			penetration	use	4
				capacity building	2

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 8: Maturity card Cyprus





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	N .	COOPERATION	•	UPTAKE	
			4		

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus			policy	0
	industry base	0		international			penetration	
				funding	2			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority		collaboration GEO	participation GEO	
	space borne	0		specific actions on SDG's	7
	access 3rd party missions	0		designated GEO office	
	ground based	0		provision data to GEOSS	0
	in-situ	2	impact Copernicus	projects	
	modelling & computing	-	international	ESA	7
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	-		UN / Int. agreements	0
	n. researchers	-		INSPIRE	•
	courses offered	-		standardization	0
	publications		funding	R&D participation	7
industry base	n. companies			1	1
	employment		uptake	indicator	level
	resellers, partnerships	0	networking	networking	
	clusters	0		data portals	
			policy	policy	
				budget & investment	0
			penetration	use	7
				capacity building	-

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 9: Maturity card Egypt





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	COOPERATION	•	UPTAKE	
		1	Second	

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	0	uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus			policy	
	industry base			international			penetration	
				funding	-			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority		collaboration GEO	participation GEO	
	space borne	7		specific actions on SDG's	0
	access 3rd party missions			designated GEO office	
	ground based	-		provision data to GEOSS	0
	in-situ	-	impact Copernicus	projects	
	modelling & computing	-	international	ESA	
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	7
eo research	n. public organizations	-		UN / Int. agreements	
	n. researchers	-		INSPIRE	0
	courses offered	-		standardization	0
	publications	-	funding	R&D participation	-
industry base	n. companies				
	employment		uptake	indicator	level
	resellers, partnerships		networking	networking	-
	clusters			data portals	
			policy	policy	
				budget & investment	
			penetration	use	
				capacity building	-

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 10: Maturity card FYROM





Assessment (ranged)



Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	0	uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus	0		policy	0
	industry base			international			penetration	
				funding				

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	0	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	0
	space borne	0		specific actions on SDG's	-
	access 3rd party missions			designated GEO office	0
	ground based			provision data to GEOSS	0
	in-situ	-	impact Copernicus	projects	0
	modelling & computing		international	ESA	0
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	7
eo research	n. public organizations	-		UN / Int. agreements	
	n. researchers			INSPIRE	2
	courses offered	-		standardization	
	publications		funding	R&D participation	
industry base	n. companies				
	employment		uptake	Indicator	level
	resellers, partnerships		networking	networking	
	clustors			data portals	
	Clusters		policy	policy	
				budget & investment	0
			penetration	use	
				capacity building	

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 11: Maturity card Greece





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	2	COOPERATION	7	UPTAKE	•	

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	•		policy	7
	industry base			international	2		penetration	٠
				funding	2			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	2	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	٠
	space borne			specific actions on SDG's	۲
	access 3rd party missions	2		designated GEO office	٠
	ground based	•		provision data to GEOSS	•
	in-situ	•	impact Copernicus	projects	٠
	modelling & computing	2	international	ESA	•
	eo data exploitation	•		meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	•		UN / Int. agreements	٠
	n. researchers	•		INSPIRE	•
	courses offered	•		standardization	
	publications		funding	R&D participation	7
industry base	n. companies	٠	untako	indiantor	loval
	employment	•	иргаке	Indicator	lever
	resellers, partnerships	-	networking	networking	•
	clusters			data portals	•
		10000	policy	policy	•
				budget & investment	7
			penetration	use	•

LEGEND eo maturity card

O initial **b** basic \frown intermediate \bigcirc advanced \bigcirc optimized

capacity building

•



Figure 12: Maturity card Israel





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	7	COOPERATION	-	UPTAKE	•

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	-
	eo reserach	2		impact Copernicus			policy	
	industry base	2		international			penetration	٠
				funding	•			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	•	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	2
	space borne	•		specific actions on SDG's	2
	access 3rd party missions	•		designated GEO office	
	ground based	•		provision data to GEOSS	0
	in-situ	2	impact Copernicus	projects	
	modelling & computing	•	international	ESA	
	eo data exploitation	•		meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	7		UN / Int. agreements	
	n. researchers	•		INSPIRE	
	courses offered	•		standardization	7
	publications	2	funding	R&D participation	•
industry base	n. companies	2			1
	employment	•	uptake	indicator	level
	resellers partnerships	2	networking	networking	-
	elustere			data portals	7
	clusters		policy	policy	
				budget & investment	7
			penetration	use	•
				capacity building	•

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 13: Maturity card Romania





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	•	COOPERATION	2	UPTAKE	•

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	7	uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	•		policy	7
	industry base			international	7		penetration	
				funding	٠			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	•	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	•
	space borne	-		specific actions on SDG's	•
	access 3rd party missions	-		designated GEO office	7
	ground based	-		provision data to GEOSS	7
	in-situ	2	impact Copernicus	projects	
	modelling & computing	-	international	ESA	•
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	•		UN / Int. agreements	•
	n. researchers	2		INSPIRE	•
	courses offered	-		standardization	
	publications	-	funding	R&D participation	•
industry base	n. companies	-		1	
	employment	2	uptake	indicator	level
	vecellare nertherebine		networking	networking	7
	resellers, partierships			data portals	
	clusters		policy	policy	•
				budget & investment	7
			penetration	use	7
				capacity building	

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 14: Maturity card Serbia





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	COOPERATION	•	UPTAKE	
		1		

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	•		policy	•
	industry base	-		international			penetration	
				funding	-			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	0	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	0
	space borne	0		specific actions on SDG's	0
	access 3rd party missions	0		designated GEO office	
	ground based	2		provision data to GEOSS	•
	in-situ	•	impact Copernicus	projects	
	modelling & computing	2	international	ESA	0
	eo data exploitation	•		meteorological	•
eo research	search n. public organizations			UN / Int. agreements	•
	n. researchers	-		INSPIRE	•
	courses offered			standardization	
	publications	-	funding	R&D participation	-
industry base	n. companies	-			
	eo data exploitation n. public organizations n. researchers courses offered publications n. companies employment resellers, partnerships		uptake	indicator	level
	resellers nartnershins	-	networking	networking	-
				data portals	7
	Clusters		policy	policy	7
				budget & investment	
			penetration	use	
				capacity building	-

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 15: Maturity card Tunisia





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	COOPERATION	•	UPTAKE	•
-				

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus	•		policy	•
	industry base			international			penetration	
				funding	-			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	-	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	
	space borne			specific actions on SDG's	-
	access 3rd party missions	-		designated GEO office	
	ground based			provision data to GEOSS	
	in-situ		impact Copernicus	projects	-
	modelling & computing		international	ESA	
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	•		UN / Int. agreements	•
	n. researchers	-		INSPIRE	0
	courses offered	-		standardization	
	publications		funding	R&D participation	
ndustry base	n. companies			to the second seco	1
	employment		иртаке	Indicator	level
	resellers partnerships		networking	networking	-
	shisters			data portals	
	ciusters		policy	policy	
				budget & investment	-
			penetration	use	
				capacity building	7

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 16: Maturity card Turkey





Assessment (ranged)

CAPACITY	COOPERATION	•	UPTAKE	7	

Score card

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	7
	eo reserach	2		impact Copernicus	2		policy	2
	industry base			international	2		penetration	7
			_	funding	-			

Detail evaluation

capacity	indicator	level	cooperation	indicator	level
infrastructure	space authority	-	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	7
	space borne	•		specific actions on SDG's	-
	access 3rd party missions	2		designated GEO office	
	ground based	•		provision data to GEOSS	
	in-situ	•		projects	7
	modelling & computing	2	international	ESA	7
	eo data exploitation	•		meteorological	•
eo research	o research n. public organizations			UN / Int. agreements	7
	n. researchers	7		INSPIRE	7
	courses offered	•		standardization	
	publications	•	funding	R&D participation	7
industry base	n. companies	2			
	employment	2	иртаке	Indicator	level
	recollers partnerships		networking	networking	7
				data portals	7
	clusters		policy	policy	7
				budget & investment	7
			penetration	use	7
				capacity building	7

LEGEND eo maturity card



Summary Visualisation chapter

This section explored a visualisation card which can facilitate the understanding of the country maturity indicators. The proposed "symbology" should be able to represent the maturity cards effectively.



4. Insights

4.1. Methodology Validation

The implementation of the maturity indicators methodology allows a country to gain insight into the current situation of the implementation of (G)EO-related activities and how it should pursue the desirable situation (i.e. a higher maturity level). The methodology provides a tool to highlight the critical factors to lead to successful (G)EO strategy implementation and explores why some countries effectively implement their strategic plans. The maturity indicators are meant to help countries to mobilise resources, with their position on the card pointing towards the sort of measures that could be taken. Such measures will be also reflected in the form of proposed actions in the context of D5.7 "Roadmap for future implementation of GEOSS and Copernicus"⁸. This will weigh the readiness and maturity of each country to address the identified gaps and propose – where applicable – the means to cover the needs and exploit the appropriate practices. The roadmap will be identifying regional challenges as they result from the collaboration with the regional stakeholders during the implementation of the GEO-CRADLE project and will be setting the priorities for GEOSS and a potential regional initiative to cope with these challenges in an effective and collective manner.

The validation process requires the engagement of different stakeholders in order to consistently obtain repeatable results and to build a valid information feeding the roadmap. Below a generic description:

- Indicators were defined/developed relying upon EARSC experience in data models.
- Detailed information was collected by country partners and experts in the Region of Interest.
- **1**st **Assessment** using the maturity indicators was conducted and contrasted with the information provided by each GEO-CRADLE country partner, thus helping to identify gaps or contradictions.
- EARSC assigned the **level of country performance maturity cards** (based on interviews, data analysis, comparisons) and presented the scorecards to stakeholders.
- Validation country assessments has been repeated three to four times during the project and refined with information of recognised experts in the RoI, especially professionals outside the consortium. Country experts were requested, during a conference call in most cases, to supervise and validate the visualisation of the assessment of the maturity of the (G)EO activities in their countries. Discussion provided experts views on the different maturity levels (L0 to L4) for which indicators & sub-indicators were assigned. These experts (industry, academia, government organisations, research) provided an independent enhancement of the information and small adjustments have been made on the indicators to reflect new data.

Interaction with experts, especially during the **networking events** were essential to succeed on the maturity exercise. Face to face meetings facilitated during the GEOCRADLE country workshops provided with answers to some of the remaining issues. During the different discussions with partners and throughout the duration of the project, we noted that indicators under the uptake pillar progressed to a higher maturity status; this can be attributed to the extensive efforts in the region on networking activities and awareness at decision making level.

General insights were drawn from the review of the methodology with the experts and other external stakeholders, including:

Benefits:

• The maturity indicators are considered an essential tool, providing **quality insights to direct the implementation of EO activities in each country** and to assess if the investment in the (G)EO sector is working. These insights are backed by an extensive collection of quantitative data.

⁸ Generic elements for a roadmap: (i) status quo analysis (ii) strategic options generation (iii) options assessment and evaluation, (iv) articulation of a strategic roadmap, and (v) development of strategy.



- The maturity indicators can also support decision-making for future actions and help to focus attention on what matters most, serving as **risk triggers and early warning signs**.
- Relatively **simple indicators offer a useful 'initial step'** as they provide a common language of communication and help to understand performance in an immediate and visual way.

Limitations:

- **Comparison of countries is challenging.** A single set of indicators is not and cannot be used to uniquely decide the maturity of a country. Rather, the assessment provides the basis to decide upon a "defensible" level of maturity and provides a chain of semi quantitative evidence that can be used to support the assignment of given "scores" against the different indicators.
- In many respects, the **feasibility of collecting adequate information is a prerequisite for success**. In that regard, there is a need to push for sustained cooperation and networking engagement to have data updated and validated over time.
- There is a **steep learning curve for the implementation of the methodology**. This is directly tied to the availability of data, the capacity of the analysts/researchers to collect and analyse it and the ease of access to literature or experts to provide consistent validation. These elements may be a barrier to deployment of complex indicators. In the case of GEO-CRADLE partners, several noted that resources estimated to collect data for the maturity card were significant especially since the requested information is not centralised neither updated regularly. The volume of data collected was an issue in some of the countries and might contribute to the "bias" of some of the indicators).
- At the definition level, there **might be some subjective elements and room for interpretation**, therefore criteria for indicators might be reviewed in the future. The additional insight offered by more complex indicators will need to be considered in connection to a country's institutional capacity and data availability.
- The decision on the exact levels of maturity against a given indicator could be **made more robust through complementary approaches** such as benchmarking. However, as already discussed within the resources and scope of GEO-CRADLE this has not been possible to implement.

Overall, country partners and experts remarked that assessments of the maturity card per country, to their knowledge, looked quite realistic and reflected adequately the current situation in their countries.

Some experts were concerned that the indicators explored in this analysis were too (G)EO focussed and also questioned the exhaustiveness of the criteria collected. Others liked the idea of simplicity and considered the selection of indicators to be appropriate. A number of specialists suggested that this methodology could act as a lever and boost the adoption of the (G)EO in the countries especially at the governmental level. Concerns on the availability of funding to apply the methodology were discussed.

Generally, it has been appreciated that EARSC, an organisation representing the industry sector in Europe, was acting as independent analyst.

4.2. Assessment

Preliminary assessment

During this opening assessment based on an aggregate of all 32 indicators of the data collected but also checking with the gap analysis (D 3.1), we observed countries placed in different maturity levels. The visualisation of the maturity cards shows high level of maturity in **Greece** and **Israel** and the lowest level in **Albania** and **FRYOM**. A more extensive analysis was subsequently done.

There is a big heterogeneity with regards to the investment in the sector across the different countries. For example, in **Israel** there are robust institutional capacities with a strong space agency and government



taking care of the sector especially for defence and military use and at the same time shows an advanced commercial exploitation of EO in the country.

The lowest level of maturity is for **FYROM** which do not have a designated space authority and in **Albania** where recently a governmental agency is helping to coordinate the space activities in the country; this is the "State Authority for Geospatial Information (ASIG)" which is committed to taking the lead in developing the strategy and associated implementation plan. In generic terms, the Western Balkan countries; **Albania, FYROM and Serbia** have basic space-borne capacities and the countries are focussing more on meteorology and receiving stations; yet, the in-situ networks are in need of further development. The industrial component is basic to intermediate. **Serbia** has advanced on its capacities with the agreement to join the European Union (in the md term), it is increasing its interest in the Earth Observation sector, whilst the engagement of public institutions and research organisations with EO is growing, driven by financial and technical support from European actors.

Greece has the most developed capacities in those GEO-CRADLE countries which are part of EU. It has invested in the space sector in the last decades and the cooperation between ESA and the Hellenic National Space Committee led to regular exchange of information, workshops and studies in the space programme. These activities have, however, been paralyzed in recent years due the economic crisis period. Normally a greater maturity might push the commercial sector to differentiate from primarily serving the needs of the public sector to establishing new EO based products and this is also reflected in the capacities maturity of **Greece, Israel, Turkey**.

Bulgaria and Romania have capacity gaps but the EO sector is developing. While **Romania** has formed strong ties with defined space-programs internationally but also moving the private sector, the EO activities in **Bulgaria** are predominantly based on the requirements guided by public sector.

Cyprus is developing its activities under research and development activities and very few commercial companies have been identified in the sector. At present, the engagement of public institutions and research organisations with EO is growing, driven by financial and technical support from the EU.

While discerning about countries in North Africa, all of those have independent space programmes, but **Egypt** has been more conservative and oriented to research than **Turkey** where the R&D spending is growing much, and new SMEs emerged in each year with innovative ideas in RS, GIS, GNSS, sensor, application areas. In **Egypt** most of the use of EO is for their Governmental internal use and collected data is not shared in the form of products/services to other organisations. Both countries have launched their own EO satellites into space as part of a space program. On the other hand, **Tunisia** actively receives satellite data through ground-based segments but there has been a growing interest in integrating the use of EO data and information for helping decision makers.

Below is represented t	Below is represented the list of each indicator and its value per country Table 20: Countries placed in the maturity line from (+) to (-)											
	-	-										
OVERALL MATURITY	Greece	Israel	Turkey	Romania	Serbia	Bu	lgaria	Cyprus	Egypt	Albania	FYROM	
CAPACITIES						Tu	nisia		011			
National Infrastructure	Israel	Turkey	Greece	Romania	Egypt	Bu	lgaria Arbia	Tunisia	Cyprus	Albania	FRYOM	
Space Authority	Israel	Romania	Greece			Turkey Tunisia Egypt Bulgaria Albania	1 D Id		Cyprus	Serbia	FYROM	
Own space-borne capacity	Israel	Tur Eg	key ypt	Romania		Greece Tunisia Bulgaria			Serb Cypr Alba FYRC	ia us nia M		
Access 3rd party missions	Israel	Gre Tur	ece key		Romania Tunisia Bulgaria		E, FY	gypt ′ROM				
Ground-based facilities	G	srael ireece	Turk Serb	ey Dia	Romania Tunisia Egypt Bulgaria Albania				isia aria	Cyr FYR	orus OM	
In-situ monitoring networks	Turkey		Isra Gree Roma Cypi	el ece ania rus	Bulgaria Egypt Serbia FYROM					Tur Albi	isia ania	
Modelling / computing capacities	Israel		Greece Turkey Serbia		Romania Bulgaria Egypt Cyprus					Tunisia Albania FYROM		
(G) EO data exploitation platforms		ls Gr Tu Se	rael eece Irkey erbia		Romania Bulgaria Tunisia Egypt Cyprus FYROM						Albania	
Critical Mass of EO researchers	Greece	Israel	Turkey	Romania	Bulgaria Tunisia Egypt Serbia			Cyprus	Alb: FYR	ania OM		
N. of public organisations	Greece			Israel Turkey Romania Tunisia Albania					Bulgaria Cyprus Egypt FYROM Serbia			
N. of researchers	G	ireece Israel	Roma Turk	ania sey			E /	Bulgaria Albania Cyprus Egypt Serbia Tunisia			FYROM	
Courses		Greece Israel Turkey					Bulgaria Cyprus Egypt FYROM Romania Serbia Tunisia	a 1 a			Albania	
Publications	Greece	lsr Tur	ael key			Bulgaria Egypt Romania Serbia Tunisia			Cyp FYR	rus DM	Albania	
Industry Base	Israel	Greece	Turkey	Ror Se	nania erbia	Bulgaria	Tunisia	Egypt	Albania	Cyprus	FYROM	
N. of companies	Greece	lsr Tur	ael key		Bul Ron Se Tu	garia nania rbia nisia			Albaı Cypr Egyı FYRC	nia us ot M		
Employment	G	ireece Israel	Turk Roma	ey ania	Bulg Ser	aria bia		Alba Cyp Egy Tun	ania irus /pt isia		FYROM	
Resellers	S	srael Serbia			Bu E Gi Ro Tu Tu	Ilgaria gypt reece mania unisia urkey			Albania	Cyr FYR	orus OM	
Clusters	Israel		Turkey Romania Serbia			Bi G T	ulgaria gypt ireece unisia			Albania Cyprus FYROM		
	4									\rightarrow		
COLLABORATION	_											



Collaboration through GEO	Greece	Romania	lsra Turk	el ey		Cyprus Tunisia Serbia		Albania	Bulgaria	Egypt FYROM		
Participation in GEO	G Ro	reece omania	lsra Turk	el ey	Tunisia		A B (Albania Bulgaria Cyprus Egypt		Sei FYR	rbia IOM	
Sustainable Development Goals	G Ro	reece mania	Cypr Isra	rus el		FYROM Tunisia Turkey		Albania		Bulgaria Egypt Serbia		
Designated GEO office	Greece	Romania		Cyp Isr Sei Tur	orus ael bia key			Bulgaria Egypt Tunisia		Albania FYROM		
Provision data to GEOSS	G	reece erbia	Romania	Albania	Bulgaria a Tunisia Turkey				Cypr Egyj FYRC Isra	Cyprus Egypt FYROM Israel		
Impact of Copernicus	Greece	Turkey		Bulgaria Romania Serbia Tunisia				Cyprus Egypt Israel		Alb FYR	Albania FYROM	
Involvement Copernicus projects	Greece	Turkey		Bulg Rom Sei Tur	insia igaria Cyprus mania Egypt arbia Israel					Alb FYR	ania IOM	
international efforts	G	reece	Turkey	Bulgaria	Serbia	Israel	Cyprus	Tunisia	Albania	FYROM	Egypt	
ESA	G	reece omania		Bulgaria Cyprus Israel Turkey				Egypt Albania Tunisia Serbia				
Meteorological			Albania Bulgaria Cyprus Greece Israel Romania Serbia Tunisia Tunisia							Egypt	FYROM	
UN system	G Ro	reece mania	ce Serbia Inia Tunisia F Turkey F				rael ROM	Bulg Egy	aria /pt	Alb Cyr	ania orus	
Infrastructure for Spatial Information			Bulgaria Cyprus Greece Turkey Romania Serbia				All FY	bania ROM	Israel	Eg Tur	ypt Nisia	
Participation Standardisation	Israel			Albania Bulgaria Greece Romania Serbia Tunisia				Cyprus Egypt FYROM				
Availability of EU funding	l Ro	srael Imania		Cyprus Greece Turkey				Alb Bul Eg FYI Se Tu	aania garia gypt ROM rbia nisia			
R&D EU programmes	l Ro	srael omania		Cyprus Greece Turkey				Alb Bul Eg FYI Se Tu	pania garia gypt ROM rbia nisia			
	4											
UPTAKE								AIL	ania			
Networking initiatives	Greece	Turkey		Israel Romania Serbia				All Bul Cy Eg FYI Tu	garia prus ;ypt ROM nisia			
Networking	Greece	Rom Tur	nania 'key	Bulgaria	Egypt		Israel Serbia Tunisia			Albania Cyprus FYROM		
Data Portals	Greece		Israel Serbia Turkey			A C F Ro	lbania yprus /ROM mania			Bulgaria Egypt Tunisia		
National Policies Implementation	G Ro	reece omania	Turkey	Israel		Bulgaria Serbia Albania Tunisia			Egypt	Cyprus FYROM		
Policy	G Ro	reece omania		Bulgaria Serbia Turkey			Albania Israel Tunisia			Cyprus Egypt FYROM		
Budget & investment		Gr	eece		Tunisia		A	Albania		Cyr	orus	



		Is Ror Tu	rael nania rkey				B	Bulgaria Egypt Serbia		FYROM	
Penetration	G	reece srael	Turkey	Albania Cyprus Romania Tunisia					Bulgaria Egypt Serbia		FYROM
Use of Geo-information	G	reece srael	Bulgaria Cyprus Romania Turkev				Albania Egypt Serbia Tunisia				FYROM
Capacity building	G	reece srael		Albania Tunisia Turkey			Cyprus Egypt Romania Serbia			Bulgaria	FYROM
OVERALL MATURITY	Greece	Israel	Turkey	Romania	Serbia	Bul	lgaria Inisia	Cyprus	Egypt	Albania	FYROM

Other type of analysis production has been considered and included in annex

- 1) Σ of all indicators & media: [Σ 1,2,3,..., 32 / 32]
- 2) Σ of indicators per three main pillars (3) & media of each main section: [capacities (Σ 1,2,3,..., 15/ 15) + collaboration(Σ 1,2,3,..., 11/ 11) + uptake (Σ 1,2,3,..., 6/ 6)]
- 3) Σ of indicators per three main pillars & media each of subsections: [CAPACITIES [infrastructure (Σ 1,2,3,..., 7/ 7)+ research (Σ 1,2,3,4/ 4) + industry (Σ 1,2,3,4/ 4)] + COLLABORATION [GEO (Σ 1,2,3,4/ 4)+Copernicus (Σ 1)+ Int. efforts (Σ 1,2,...,5/ 5)+ funding (Σ 1)] + UPTAKE [networking (Σ 1,2 /2) + national policy (Σ 1,2 /2) + penetration (Σ 1,2 /2)]]

Using the visualisation described in the previous section, a level of contrasted assessment is extracted:

Greece	Greece
Israel	Israel
Turkey, Romania	Turkey
Serbia	Romania
Tunisia	Serbia, Tunisia, Bulgaria
Bulgaria, Cyprus, Albania, Egypt	Cyprus, Egypt
🗕 🔶 FRYOM	Albania
	FYROM
Assessment (ranged)	Assessment (rounded)

Representation (\Sigma of all 32 indicators): The table below represents the values for each of the countries taking the sum of all 32 indicators and establishing the media.

	Table 21. Maturity Carus (ators
	Maturity indicators (level c)	RANGED	ROUNDED
Albania	1,28		
Bulgaria	1,84		-
Cyprus	1,47		
Egypt	1,44		
FYROM	1,13		
Greece	3,50	•	•
Israel	3,03	•	1
Romania	2,84		1
Serbia	2,03		•
Tunisia	1,78		•
Turkey	2,88		1

Table 21: Maturity cards (Σ of all 32 indicators
--

LEGEND eo maturity card



Figure 17: Spider chart (all indicators)





In the previous table, red means action needed and dark green major level of maturity; therefore, FYROM is showed as the country less developed in the region while Greece is the one more advanced when taking into account all parameters. The spider chart is representing the same result than the conditional formatting showing the different levels of colours assigned.

Other representations are the (Σ of all indicators per three main pillars) which will be taking the mayor 3 pillars (capacities, collaboration and uptake) and sum the indicators in each of the category and establishing the media. While for capacities there are 15 indicators, cooperation and uptake have 11 and 6 respectively.

	capacities	RANGED	ROUNDED	cooperation	RANGED	ROUNDED	uptake	RANGED	ROUNDED
Albania	1,07			1,27			1,83		-
Bulgaria	1,80		•	1,91		•	1,83		
Cyprus	1,13			1,91		•	1,50		-
Egypt	1,80		-	0,91	0		1,50		-
FYROM	1,20			1,09			1,00		
Greece	3,20	7	3	3,73	1	•	3,83	7	•
Israel	3,60	2	۲	2,73	•	2	3,00	2	2
Romania	2,40	•	-	3,45	2	2	2,83	-	2
Serbia	1,93		•	2,09	-	-	2,17	•	•
Tunisia	1,17			1,82		-	2,00	-	-
Turkey	3,00	7	2	2,64	-	2	3,00	2	7

Table 22: Maturity cards (Σ of indicators representing each of the pillars > representation)

LEGEND eo maturity card

The table representing each of the pillars is very illustrative, flagging that **FYROM** will need some action to be upgraded in the three main pillars, while others such **Greece**, **Israel**, **Romania or Turkey** are in the green domain for the majority of indicators. Other countries such as **Tunisia** are suggested to mobilise more resources into the capacities as the other indicators in cooperation and uptake seems more advance at country level; **Egypt** needs more efforts in cooperation or uptake. **Serbia** and **Bulgaria** appear to stand at an intermediate development of the (G) EO maturity while **Cyprus** and **Albania** need more efforts to upgrade their capacities.

Capacities Assessment

Figure 18: Maturity representation in Radar chart (3 pillars > capacities)

[○] initial ▶ basic ● intermediate ● advanced ● optimized





For most of the countries it is important to stress that most of EO is covered by the public sector. **Israel** is the most advanced country, as highlighted by the existence of the Israel Space Agency (ISA), responsible for the coordination and supervision of all activities of the civilian space program supporting scientific research and development with real economic potential, such as the development of unique and innovative technologies. It has cutting-edge space-borne capacities. All organisations have sufficient computing and processing capacities for their needs using different models and algorithms depend on their needs.

As indicated before, **Greece** is the longest serving member of ESA in the region. The effect of its involvement in ESA's programs includes the realisation of opportunities to support the development of Greek capacities in the (G)EO sector as well as policies supporting the industry development and the research and development activities in the EO domain.

Turkey has made big investments in monitoring and supporting revisions for infrastructure, civil protection, agri-food or internal security using spatial policies. It is vital for the country to develop existing space related technology to ensure the continuity of the technological infrastructure needed to implement and pursue national space policies, and to catch up with developed nations.

EO capacities have also grown significantly in the last years in **Romania** supported by their Space Agency (ROSA), its space programme and R&D Innovation sources which also help to mobilise the private sector.

Bulgaria has increased its development potential for SMEs and has improved the prospects for investing in the space industry as a result of signing the European Cooperative Country Agreement and participation in the European Cooperative Country Plan 2015.

The EO sector in **Tunisia** is dominated by governmental services who are still working on the production and use of geospatial information in decision making. Currently, Tunisia has a lack of coordination between different institutions, leading often to duplicated research efforts in some areas.

Egypt has been placed at the middle level, with its own capabilities for processing and analysing images that are obtainable from international commercial satellite systems. The National Authority for Remote Sensing & Space Sciences [NARSS] is the pioneering Egyptian institution in the field of satellite remote sensing, which is also concerned with the development of sensors for earth observation to be mounted on satellites.

In **Cyprus** the ability of the public sector to develop EO capacities has been clearly limited. Recently, Cyprus has signed the European Cooperating State Agreement, strengthening its relations with ESA and there are



clear expectations to improve the capacities; since then however, there are large barriers to development of EO in the country.

Serbia is lacking in the major capacities indicators, space authority, own space borne and access to 3rd party missions while other indicators in the capacities are stronger, in-situ monitoring networks, modelling or (G)EO exploitation, therefore the intermediate level in capacities which is also compensated with the research and private sector which is emerging.

Recently, in **Albania** there have been some more developments in the engagement of public institutions and research organisations with EO, driven by modest financial and technical support from European actors.

FYROM in the basic level of capacities has very limited infrastructure but evolving in ground segment, modelling or the provision of VA services and products. Without a strategy nor authority with the mandate to lead the geospatial sector a risk of continuity is clear.

Cooperation Assessment



Greece and **Romania** have very good cooperation in all levels. Space agencies or authorities are fundamental in leading coordination regarding EO activities including the active participation to GEO sessions or active representation in other international fora. They also have active participation in Copernicus projects or a National authority which assures the INSPIRE Directive implementation into national legislation and operability of GeoPortals. The active participation with UN entities such UN-SPIDER; reporting to UN-GGIM, member or active involvement in UNFCCC, FAO, UNEP, UNESCO, UN HABITAT, ... are just examples of good international cooperation. ROSA, for example, as a government institution, has completed international agreements on behalf of the Romanian Government.

Regarding the engagement with GEO, only **Albania and FYROM** have not yet joined the GEO membership. The rest of the countries are improving the connections within the GEO secretariat to address priorities and some countries have a clear focus on SDG's.

Israel has a long EO tradition and has developed its own infrastructure needed for research and development in geoinformation. The Israel Space Agency is coordinating all Israeli space research programmes for scientific and commercial goals. Researchers in the country have been cooperating for many years in several European space science projects. Some efforts can be found on implementation of spatial infrastructure, collaboration with UN system or sharing of data produces medium ranking of Israel in cooperation.



In **Turkey** and with the coordination of TUBITAK, many EO bilateral relations have been signed. Just to name a few; (DLR-German Aerospace Center), BNSC (British National Space Agency) but also other cooperation's with UN, APSCO (Asia-Pacific Space Cooperation Organisation.

Serbia has medium level in cooperation with Copernicus; the country recently signed a Cooperation Arrangement with the European Commission. The agreement will enable the Republic of Serbia to benefit from the European Earth Observation and Monitoring programme and it will strengthen the collaboration between various Serbian institutions in the public sectors and with academia and private enterprises.

Most of the governmental structures in **Bulgaria** use EO derived information mainly provided on project basis. PECS signed with ESA is improving the collaboration, however some big steps need to be taken under cooperation with GEO but also with the UN system.

At the present, **Cyprus** has limited collaboration with GEO; the country is however making strong efforts in projects that help to monitor the SDGs. The cooperation with Copernicus is low, however due to recent agreement with ESA and a series of workshops on Copernicus, the expectation for collaboration will increase.

Albania, Egypt and FYROM are at basic levels for cooperation. It should be noted that Albania is making big efforts including robust projects supported by the World Bank and covering areas in capacity building but also infrastructure development. Egypt became recently a participating organization of GEO and has a very active participation under AfriGEOSS, however still to be prominent the cooperation with other entities at UN or European framework.

The coordination of the space activities in **Albania** and collaboration in international space programs is achieved through the establishment of the State Authority for Geospatial Information, within the Ministry of Innovation and Public Administration. ASIG, as a government institution, has completed international agreements on behalf of the Albanian Government. ASIG is responsible for creation of geodetic framework to European standards to enable the support of a unique map of the entire territory of the Republic of Albania.

Generally, there is an increased intention of the governments on implementing activities conforming the INSPIRE directive of EU. Normally all countries have assigned a representative responsible for the design, construction, maintenance and updating of the Geodetic Framework.

The level of engagement in standardisation is intermediate and the use of standards regarding EO data as well as the sharing of the regional datasets could be improved in the region.



Uptake Assessment



Figure 20: Maturity representation in Radar chart (3 pillars > uptake)

Being a member state of ESA increases the occurrence of networking events, as ESA organises dedicated EO workshops annually – often oriented to the country interests. Most regular events are in Agriculture, land/ forestry, crisis management domains, but could also focus on regional thematic areas.

In **western Balkan countries** there is a tendency from some private companies as well as NGOs to use satellite images in their studies and projects. GIS is becoming everyday more familiar in both private, public and government sector as well as to support some of the projects in the Environmental area.

On data sharing portals, many countries are making good progress; **FYROM** with its Biodiversity information system, the **Turkish** spatial data information system is also a good source for cooperation, the NSDI portal in **Serbia** or the cadastral portal in **Greece**.

All the countries progress with their "Institutional capacity building" fostering an environment for the use of Earth observations to enhance decision making. This engagement is more prominent in mature countries while education and training of individuals to be aware of, access, use and develop EO data and products are the main focus of less mature countries in the region. "Infrastructure capacity building" related to technology to access and use EO data and products are equally ingested in mature and not mature countries.

Still one of the major problems seems to be the lack of awareness of the larger EO picture. Basically, it has been noted that partnership of research institutions / private sector and decision makers for EO data development and implementation could be improved in the region and that indirectly reflected on the uptake of the EO services.

In most of the countries governmental budget does not include dedicated budget lines for the generation of EO data or their exploitation within operational services; instead, these activities are covered, to the extent outlined above, under other lines. Copernicus is seen as a game changer in that perspective and many countries seem enthusiastic for the potential uptake of EO services.

Largely, research fields of Earth observation are considered now matured and the capitalisation of existing knowledge and technologies is expected to allow progress in many different areas of application such as health, tourism, agriculture, cultural heritage, transportations, sustainable development, etc. The geospatial background of the public institutes in the region can promote and support public sectors uptake where EO application has clear benefits.



Maturity Indicators / Country

8		Tuble	25. 0001	itry man		minary	labic				-
6101 CT155	Albania	Bulgaria	Cyprus	Egypt	FYROM	Greece	Israel	Romania	Serbia	Tunisia	Turkey
CAPACITIES											
National Infrastructure	1,00	1,71	1,14	2,00	0,86	3,00	3,86	2,43	1,71	1,43	3,14
Space agency or designated Space Authority	2	2	1	2	0	3	4	4	0	2	2
Own space-borne capacity	0	1	0	3	0	1	4	2	0	1	3
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	0	2	0	1	1	3	4	2	0	2	3
Ground-based facilities	2	1	0	2	0	4	4	2	3	1	3
In-situ monitoring networks	1	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	1	4
Modelling and computing capacities	1	2	2	2	1	3	4	2	3	1	3
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	1	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	4	2	4
Critical Mass of EO researchers	1,5	2	1,75	2	1,5	4	3,5	2,5	2	2,25	3,25
Number of public organizations	3	2	2	2	2	4	3	3	2	3	3
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	2	2	2	2	1	4	4	3	2	2	3
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	1	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	2	2	4
Relevant Publications	0	2	1	2	1	4	3	2	2	2	3
Industry Base	0.75	1.75	0.5	1.25	0.25	2.75	3.25	2.25	2.25	1.5	2.5
Number of companies	1	2	1	1	1	4	3	2	2	2	3
Employment numbers, levels and changes	1	2	1	1	0	4	4	3	2	1	3
Resellers or local representatives of European companies	1	2	0	2	0	2	3	2	3	2	2
Existence of Clusters	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	2	2	1	2
COLLABORATION	Albania	Bulgaria	Cyprus	Feynt	EVROM	Greece	Israel	Romania	Serbia	Tunisia	Turkey
Collaboration through GEO	1	0.75	1.5	0.5	0.5	4	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	1	1	1	1	0	4	3	4	0	2	3
Specific actions on Sustainable Development	1	-	3	0	2	4	3	4	0	2	2
Goals (SDG's)		0									
Designated GEO office	0	1	2	1	0	4	2	3	2	11	2
Provision of data to GEOSS	2	1	0	0	0	4	0	3	4	1	1
Impact of Copernicus	0	2	1	1	0	4	1	2	2	2	3
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	0	2	1	1	0	4	1	2	2	2	3
Participation to other international efforts	1,6	2,8	2,2	1	1,2	3,6	2,4	3,6	2,6	2	3
ESA	0	3	3	1	0	4	2	4	0	1	3
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	0	1	0	1	2	4	2	4	3	3	3
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	2	4	4	D	2	4	1	4	4	o	3
Participation in Standardization organizations i.e. as OGC	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	2	2	2
Availability of EU funding	2	2	3	2	2	3	4	4	2	2	3
R&D participation or other EU programmes	2	2	3	2	2	3	4	4	2	2	3
UPTAKE	Albania	Bulgaria	Cyprus	Egypt	FYROM	Greece	Israel	Romania	Serbia	Tunisia	Turkey
Networking initiatives	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,5	4	2,5	2,5	2,5	1,5	3
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	1	2	1	2	1	4	2	3	2	2	3
Data Portals	2	1	2	1	2	4	3	2	3	1	3
National Policies Implementation	1,5	2	0,5	1	0,5	3,5	2,5	3,5	2	2	3
Policy	2	3	1	1	1	4	2	4	3	2	3
Budget & investment (internal to the country)	1	1	0	1	0	3	3	3	1	2	3
Penetration	2,5	2	2,5	2	1	4	4	2,5	2	2,5	3
Use of Geo-information	2	3	3	2	1	4	4	3	2	2	3
Capacity building EO focused actions	3	1	2	2	1	4	4	2	2	3	3
MATURITY INDICATORS						1000					
material indicators	1,29	1,85	1,49	1,43	0,91	3,52	3,00	2,85	2,04	1,80	2,88

Table 23: Country indicators summary table

The assessment done using the conditional formatting offers the following levels:

Greece Israel	Turkey Romania	Serbia	Tunisia, Bulgaria	Cyprus	Egypt	Albania	FYROM
4							_





<u>Greece</u> shows the highest level of maturity in the GEO-CRADLE region. The lowest indicators are included at the capacities pillar where own space-borne under national infrastructure and existence of clusters are flagged as areas to be improved. Under collaboration, the indicator reflecting standardisation could be also improved. In terms of uptake Greece has an admirable performance.

Figure 22: Israel Maturity Indicators



Israel displays an excellent maturity in terms of capacities, maybe the industrial base merits more resources but overall has been performing outstandingly. Collaboration is recommended to be enhanced, however still quite robust. The lowest indicator is referring to the impact of Copernicus and establishing an infrastructure for spatial information. Referring to the uptake, perhaps more events will help on the uptake and connected with increasing the policy support for the Earth Observation.

Israel Maturity Indicators





Turkey Maturity Indicators

Figure 23: Turkey Maturity Indicators

Turkey presents quite mature and regular performance in the three main pillars (capacities, collaboration and uptake), especially in the latest performs with brilliant and continuous achievements. The collaboration with GEO is recommended to be improved, however playing already a significant role. Issues with harmonisation and standardisation might also deserve more attention. While moving to the industry component, and perceiving that is improving, still an indicator that might increase through more resources into cluster collaborations.

Figure 24: Romania Maturity Indicators



Romania belongs to an advance country in the region. Collaboration is strong in all components, perhaps, the impact of Copernicus deserves more attention, but the country has big expectations for improvement in that area of exploitation. The lowest block of indicators falls into the capacities pillar, though on the intermediate area. National infrastructure will merit more responsiveness from the government and ROSA might help to mobilize resources in that direction, in addition to the industry indicators.



Figure 25: Serbia Maturity Indicators



Serbia fits in the intermediate maturity level. It has some very strong indicators but also others at the initial phase. The red flag corresponds to the national infrastructure (space authority, own-space borne and access to 3rd party missions) under capacities while the rest of indicators in this pillar are basic/intermediate. Serbia should improve through engagement with GEO or ESA and the recently formulated cooperation with EC under Copernicus programme.

Figure 26: Tunisia Maturity Indicators



<u>Tunisia</u> gives also has an overall medium position. Probably the stronger indicators are the ones referring to the engagement with the meteorology sector but also with the UN system, as well as capacity building or the EO activities in research institutions. Low values are concentrated in the Capacities pillar, specifically under the national infrastructure: ground-based facilities, in-situ monitoring networks or modelling and computing capacities. Likewise, Tunisia shall mobilise resources for the development of the industry sector in the country.



Figure 27: Bulgaria Maturity Indicators



Bulgaria Maturity Indicators

Bulgaria has a basic maturity, nevertheless, it is intensely improving in recent months through various actions motivated by the EU presidency but also thanks to increased engagement with PECS under ESA cooperation. The policy engagement seems quite strong and suggested at least to keep that level in the future and to mobilise resources in weak directions such as the area on collaboration (especially with GEO), which justifies more attention as the indicators feeding that group are rated quite low. The stronger position falls into the capacities pillar, probably thanks to past experiences in the space sector.

Figure 28: Cyprus Maturity Indicators

Cyprus Maturity Indicators





Cyprus merits attention in the capacities pillar where an important group of indicators is labelled as initial stage, incl. on the national infrastructure (own space-borne, access to 3rd party missions, in-situ monitoring networks) and the industrial component. The strongest values are for the collaboration, especially on the meteorology sector but also on the establishing the infrastructure for spatial information. It is also noted the engagement with the monitoring and reporting with some SDGs or the use of resources in the penetration indicators.



<u>Egypt</u> deserves attention in the collaboration pillar, where it has reached an intermediate level. This is thanks to have an independent space programme; in contrast, the lowest value falls into collaboration with GEO, Copernicus, UN while with meteorological organisations the cooperation is stronger. The industry section also deserves support of the private sector. The uptake pillar falls into the basic level with particular attention required for data sharing and the national policies implementation.

Figure 30: Albania Maturity Indicators



Albania Maturity Indicators



<u>Albania</u> is at the basic level. Comparing the three main pillars, Albania scores relatively high in the uptake where penetration (capacity building) has a high rate when it is plotted against the rest of indicators; contrary to that the country is quite weak on capacities where national infrastructure (especially on space-borne and third-party missions), research (publications indicator) and industry base are initial or basic. In collaboration, the impact of Copernicus ideally should be significantly improved, as well as the cooperation with GEO or the UN system.

Figure 31: FYROM Maturity Indicators

FYROM Maturity Indicators



FYROM is placed as the lowest maturity level in the region. Most of the indicators highlight the need of sources to help the country to move from initial to basic. The best pillar is the uptake but some individual indicators in collaboration are standing out: cooperation with meteorological organisations, participation with UN system entities or establishing the infrastructure for spatial information. Some small mobilisation of resources will bring important impact on the evolution of its maturity.

Detailed information on the individual plots are in annex 3

4.3. Recommendations

A systematic review during the discussion with country experts identified a large number of qualitative indicators that were used in the evaluations of the country capacities. The indicators are used in sets to create a multifaceted understanding of the institutional/private environment and its interactions with policy. These are drawn from various indicator sets and grouped according to the specific pillar that they are intended to represent. The list of indicators was not planned to be exhaustive, nor is it suggested that an evaluation of the capacities of the country should address only these indicators; rather it highlights the diversity of issues considered pertinent to capacities, cooperation and uptake.

The status of an indicator has important implications regarding the form of corrective actions required to be addressed by the countries. This exercise is expected to help towards gauging the necessity for more detailed investigation in the implementation of (G)EO, and thus could be valuable for countries facing decisions about how best to allocate resources for policy assessment. Generally, qualitative methods are well-suited because they allow detailed assessment, taking account multiple perspectives (assessment / country indicators or other countries RoI) to contextualise process deployment, however, such methods can be sensitive to subjectivity requiring an additional level of validation to minimise bias.



Below is a summary of the steps that will help the country's process to establishing the maturity indicators revision within the GEO-CRADLE region:

1. Outline:

- Characterisation: Overview of the GEO-CRADLE framework project
- Introduction to the maturity indicators methodology as model for assessment of the maturity
- Preliminary fieldwork and in-depth analysis is required to validate the use of indicators
- 2. Maturity design and population:
 - Maturity indicators are defined against three main pillars (activities on capacities, cooperation, uptake). For each indicator, the maturity levels are agreed (i.e. what does a certain value correspond to). At the end, following extensive gathering of data to substantiate the state-of-play of a country against these indicators, the levels will give a snapshot of current country capabilities.
 - Check incomplete data and analysis for the relevant data by indicators.

Those conducting the evaluation need to be aware that certain indicators should be introduced gradually over time as data availability improves. It is suggested that data availability would be improved partly as a result of the introduction of policy evaluation indicators.

- 3. Deployment:
 - Validation of country data by partners & experts (interviews assure overall quality). Experts from a number of academic, government and industry were interviewed to gain additional insights. Semi-structured interviews were used for this exercise
 - Indicators level assignation and maturity card representation
 - Visual assessment of indicators values
 - Support policies should be reviewed biannually. In many cases evaluations are made too late for any meaningful revisions to take place. Governments may not have sufficient funds to generate, monitor and evaluate these indicators. These need to be linked to institutional feasibility considerations.

Summary Insights chapter

This chapter highlights the critical indicators for each country to lead to successful (G)EO strategy implementation. The findings presented herein will feed into and be analysed in the GEO-CRADLE Roadmap for future implementation of GEOSS and Copernicus (D5.7).

The chapter also summarises validation elements for the application of the methodology which have proven to reflect quite adequately the current situation in countries where this has been tested.

It also provides a preliminary assessment in the three major pillars and outlines the actual status of the indicators in the countries. Finally, it covers some recommendations for future upgrades of the methodology.

The assessment can be used in the roadmap for the Countries in the Region providing a structured "guide" on how to improve the country's (G)EO readiness. Therefore, the maturity assessment has to be considered as a step of an overall approach describing in detail the actions to undertake in each country in order to improve maturity.



4.4. Conclusion

Conclusion

The implementation of the maturity indicators methodology allows a country to gain solid insights into the current situation of the implementation of (G)EO activities and how it should pursue the desirable a higher maturity level.

Report structure

1) context of the methodology and its objectives

2) process to perform the assessment of the (G)EO maturity and construction of a consolidated list of indicators to be measured by participant countries

- 3) description and visualisation of indicators
- 4) main findings
- 5) graphs support for future analysis and interpretation

Statement as Project Outcome

The vision of GEO-CRADLE is to pave the way for the sustainable and continuous uptake and exploitation of Earth Observation services in North Africa, Middle East and the Balkans. Through the elaboration of novel maturity indicators, the project aspires to build adequate knowledge of the level and progress of GEO and Copernicus involvement in each country. It highlights the critical indicators for each country to lead to successful (G)EO strategy implementation. It will feed with valid and instrumental information the GEOCRADLE long-term roadmap (D5.7: Roadmap for future implementation of GEOSS and Copernicus) that reflects on the concrete regional priorities.

Summary of the steps that will help the country's process to establishing the maturity indicators revision under GEO-CRADLE region:





- **Turkey** presents quite mature and regular performance. Issues with harmonisation and standardisation might also deserve more attention.

- **Romania** is a relatively advanced country in the region. The lowest block of indicators falls into the capacities pillar.

- **Serbia** fits in the intermediate maturity level. The red flag corresponds to the national infrastructure pillar.

- **Tunisia** holds a medium position. Low values are concentrated in the Capacities pillar, specifically under the national infrastructure.

- Bulgaria has a basic maturity. Collaboration indicators justify more attention.

- **Cyprus** merits attention in the capacities pillar where an important group of indicators on the national infrastructure is labelled as initial stage.

- Despite having an intermediate maturity at the capacities pillar, **Egypt** could place stronger attention to the collaboration pillar.

- Albania is at the basic level. It seems quite weak on capacities especially w.r.t. national infrastructure.

- **FYROM** is placed at the lowest maturity in the region. Most of the indicators highlight the need of sources to help the country to move from initial to basic.

Equipped with information, stakeholders in the region are more empowered to maximise the impact of EO activities, be it for informed decision making or boost of EO businesses. The status of an indicator has important implications regarding the form of corrective actions required to be addressed by countries. This exercise could help in gauging the necessity for more detailed investigation in the implementation of (G)EO, and thus could be valuable for countries facing decisions about how best to allocate resources for policy assessment.


Annex 1: Maturity levels – short version

CAPACITIES	level 0	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
National Infrastructu	re: It will und	derstand the Ea	rth Observation St	trategy by country	
Space agency or designated Space Authority	[no authority]	[1 ministry]	[1-various ministries]	[1 authority]	[1 operational authority/agency]
Own space-borne capacity	[no missions]	[generic space-borne interest]	[1 EO mission]	[2-5 missions]	[> 5 missions]
Access to 3rd party missions (with own ground stations)	[no access missions]	[access 1one 3rd party mission]	[access 2 to 5 3rd party missions]	[access between 5-10 3rd party missions]	[access > 10 3rd party missions]
Ground-based facilities	[no ground- based capacity]	[1 station]	[2 to 5 ground stations]	[6-10 stations]	[> 11 ground stations]
In-situ monitoring networks	[no in-situ capacity]	[at least one in-situ network]	[between 5 to 10 in-situ networks]	[between 10-20 in-situ networks]	[more than 20 networks]
Modelling and computing capacities	[no modelling capacities]	[one HPC]	[between 2 to 10 modelling capacities]	[between 10-20 modelling capacities]	[more than 20 modelling capacities]
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	[no exploitatio n platforms]	[one exploitation platform]	[2-5 exploitation platforms]	[5-10 exploitation platforms]	[> 10 exploitation platforms]
Critical Mass of EO re institutions & univers	searchers: In sities/acader	dentification of t nia and how big	the different grou these groups are	ps of researchers	both in research
Number of public organisations	[no (G) EO research/U niv. departmen ts centers]	[one (G)EO organisation]	[between 2-10 (G)EO organisations]	[between 11-25 (G)EO organisations]	[more than 25 (G)EO organisations]
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	[no significant (G)EO staff]	[less than 50 (G)EO employees]	[between 50- 250 (G)EO employees]	[between 250- 500 (G)EO employees]	[> than 500 (G)EO employees]
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	[no (G)EO courses]	[between 1-10 (G)EO courses offered]	[between 10-50 (G)EO courses]	[between 50- 100 specialized (G)EO courses]	[> 100 specialized (G)EO courses]
Relevant Publications	[no (G)EO publication s]	[1-25 papers]	[25-100 papers]	[100-500 papers]	[> 500 papers]
Industry Base: The goal here is to get a wide picture of the number and geographical distribution of EO companies per country.					

Table 24: Maturity levels (short version)



Number of companies	[no companies on (G)EO]	[between 1-5 companies]	[between 6-25 companies]	[between 26-50 companies]	[> 51 companies]
Scale of companies (large/medium/sma II/micro)	[no comparabl e]	[micro]	[small]	[SMEs]	[all types industry]
Employment numbers, levels and changes	[up to 10 employees]	[10-50 employees]	[51-150 employees]	[151-300 employees]	[> 300 employees]
Resellers or local representatives of European companies	[no resellers]	[1 reseller]	[2-5 resellers]	[6-10 resellers]	[> 10 resellers]
Existence of Clusters	[no clusters]	[1 cluster]	[2-5 clusters]	[6-10 clusters]	[>10 clusters]
COLLABORATION	level 0	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
Collaboration throug Geneva, GEO Plenary	h GEO: Infor Meetings &	mation on the c Ministerial Sum	ountry relations w nmits.	vith international	GEO Secretariat
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	[no participati on GEO]	[participation 1 project]	[participation >2 project initiatives]	[designated representative active in GEO plenaries]	[designated representative active in GEO plenaries & contributing to budget lines]
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG´s)	[no SDGs actions]	[1 SDGs action]	[2-5 SDGs actions]	[5-10 SDGs actions]	[5-10 SDGs actions last 3 years]
Designated GEO office	[no office]	[plans for office 1 staff coordinating GEO act.]	[1 organisation supervising GEO activities]	[Truly dedicated office no staff]	[Truly dedicated office with own staff/5 years]
Provision of data to GEOSS	[no data to GEOSS]	[plans for data to GEOSS]	[1-5 datasets to GEOSS]	[6-15 datasets to GEOSS]	[provision >15 datasets to GEOSS]
Impact of Copernicus actions (projects invo	: This sectic olvement) wi	on will evaluate t th Entrusted En	the type of engage tities	ement with Coper	nicus projects and
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	[no projects using Copernicus services]	[1-5 projects using Copernicus services]	[6-25 projects using Copernicus services]	[25-50 projects using Copernicus services]	[< 50 projects using Copernicus services]
Participation to other international efforts: Level of international collaboration to ensure country access to essential global EO information.					
ESA	[no cooperatio n agreement s with ESA]	[plans cooperation agreements with ESA]	[participation under some ESA activities]	[ESA European Cooperating State Agreement]	[ESA full member]



Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT, 	[no cooperatio n meteo]	[participation national Meteo]	[participation National Meteo & sporadic Int. cooperation]	[participation National Meteo & Int. Cooperation & one international membership: i.e: EUMETSAT, or WMO, etc]	[participation National Meteo & Int. Cooperation & more than one membership , i.e EUMETSAT & WMO]
UN system as UN- GGIM,	[no participati on UN bodies]	[at least 1 active participation in UN agency/organz ation]	[participation in 2-5 UN agencies/organz ations]	[participation in >6 UN agencies/organz ations]	[participation >6 UN agencies/organzat ions/10 years]
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information [ie. European Community (INSPIRE)]	[no directive for Spatial Informatio n]	[plans to establish a directive for Spatial Information]	[one requirement for a directive for Spatial Information]	[2-3 requirements for a directive for Spatial Information]	[full implementation for a directive for Spatial Information]
Participation in Standardisation organisations i.e. as OGC	[no engageme nt with Standardis ation discussions]	[one organisation engage with Standardisatio n discussions]	[2-5 organisations engage with Standardisation discussions]	[6-10 organisations engage with Standardisation discussions]	[> 10 organisations engage with Standardisation discussions]
Availability of EU fun	ding	<u> </u>	<u></u>	<u></u>	
R&D participation or other EU programmes	[no EU R&D participati on]	[one EU R&D participation]	[2-10 EU R&D participation]	[11-20 EU R&D participation/su stained 5 years]	[11-20 EU R&D participation/sust ained 10 years]
UPTAKE & AWARENESS	level 0	level 1	level 2	level 3	level 4
Networking initiative of the Earth Observa	s: Events wh tion and geo	ich examine and -information fie	d discuss the man Id from the thema	y different aspects atic or market poi	s and applications nt of view
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	[no networkin g]	[1-5 networking activities/year]	[6-15 networking activities/year]	[> 25 sustained networking activities/year]	[sustained 16-25 networking activities/year]
Data Portals	[no data portals]	[plans data portals]	[one data portal]	[> one data portals in various thematics]	[> one data portals in various thematics and fully integrated]
National Policies Implementation					
Policy	[no national policy on (G)EO aspects]	[one national authority/mini ster engage with on (G)EO aspects]	[2-5 national authorities/mini sters engage with on (G)EO aspects &	[>5 national authorities/mini sters engage with on (G)EO aspects &	[dedicated national institution engage with on (G)EO aspects &



			collaboration at international level]	collaboration at international level]	collaboration at international level]
Budget & investment (internal to the country)	[no budget line designated to (G)EO activities]	[one budget line designated in other domains where (G) EO is used]	[one dedicated budget line designated to (G)EO activities]	[2-5 budget lines designated to (G)EO activities]	[2-5 budget lines designated to (G)EO activities 7 last 10 years]
Penetration					
Use of Geo- information	[no use (G)EO /penetrati on]	[sporadic activities in (G)EO / low penetration]	[one dedicated activity in (G)EO / medium penetration]	[2-5 dedicated activities in (G)EO / advance penetration]	[> 5 dedicated activities in (G)EO / fully optimised penetration]
Capacity building EO focused actions	[no capacity building actions]	[one capacity building action]	[2-5 capacity building actions]	[6-10 capacity building actions]	[>10 capacity building actions / 10 years]



Annex 2: Contacts in the Rol

The study entails data collection provided by country partners, but also data collection from direct interaction, GEO-CRADLE survey and questionnaires.

Partners

Table 25: List of main partners contacts				
Country	Name	Contact		
Albania	Institute for Nature Conservation in Albania.	-daniela.godo@yahoo.com		
	INCA (Daniela Godo, Emirjeta Adhami)	-Emirjeta Adhami <emi_adhami@hotmail.com></emi_adhami@hotmail.com>		
		-enti Kromidha <gkromidha@yahoo.it></gkromidha@yahoo.it>		
Bulgaria	Space Research and Technology Institute. SRTI-	-hristo@stil.bas.bg		
	BAS (Hristo Nikolov)			
Cyprus	Cyprus University of Technology. CUT	-rodanthi.mamouri@cut.ac.cy		
	(Rodanthi-Elisavet Mamouri)	-athos.agapiou@cut.ac.cy		
		-d.hadjimitsis@cut.ac.cy		
Egypt	Center for Environment and Development of	-elaskary@chapman.edu		
	the Arab Region and Europe. CEDARE (Hesham	-elbadawy@cedare.int		
	El-Askary)			
Greece	National Observatory of Athens. NOA (Haris	-kontoes@noa.gr		
	Kontoes)	-alexiatsouni@noa.gr		
		-egera@noa.gr		
		-ellikalopesa@gmail.com, kstila@i-bec.org,		
		zalidis@agro.auth.gr		
FRYOM	University of Saints Cyril and Methodius. USCM	-cukaliev@gmail.com		
	(Ordan Cukaliev)	-dragi_dimitrievski@yahoo.com		
Israel	Tel Aviv University. TAU (Eval Ben Dor, Yaron	-bendor@post.tau.ac.il		
	Ogen)	-Yaron Ogen <yaronogen@gmail.com></yaronogen@gmail.com>		
Romania	National Institute of R&D for Optoelectronics.	-nnicol@inoe.ro		
	INOE (Doina Nicolae)	-luminita.marmureanu@gmail.com		
Serbia	InoSens ltd. and Institute of Physics Belgrade.	-gchatzikostas@gmail.com		
	INOSENS (Grigoris Chatzikostas, Vladimir	-Zoran Mijic <zoran.mijic@ipb.ac.rs></zoran.mijic@ipb.ac.rs>		
	Mrkajic)	-nickovic@gmail.com		
Tunisia	CERT (Hend Ben Hadji)	-hend.benhji@cert.mincom.tn		
Turkey	TUBITAK UZAY Space Technologies Research	-aziz.koru@tubitak.gov.tr		
	Institute (Aziz Koru)	-kaan.kalkan@tubitak.gov.tr		

The study has been complemented with data further supplemented and validated by experts in the Region (table 10) which ensure authenticity of the data assessed and evaluated

Experts contacted

Country	Name
Albania	-Albana Zotaj - National Agency for Territory Development, director of GIS directory
	(albana.zotaj@azht.gov.al)
	- Spartak Likaj - GjeoVjosa, manager (spartak@gjeovjosa.com)
Bulgaria	-CASTRA) Cluster for Aerospace Techjnologies, Research and applications Vesselin Vassilev
	(vesselin.vassilev@castra.org)
	-TAKT. Kamen Iliev (k.iliev@rst-tto.com)
Cyprus	-Department of Meteorology, Cyprus. Filippos Tymvios (ftymvios@dom.moa.gov.cy)
	-Cyprus Geological Survey Deparment. Niki Koulermou (nkoulermou@gsd.moa.gov.cy)
	-Agricultural Research Institute, Rural Development Section, Dr. George Papadavid, Research
	Officer (papadavid@ari.gov.cy)

Table 26: Stakeholders in the respective countries



Egypt	-University Alexandria, Department of Environmental Studies. Mohamed El Raey (melraev@gmail.com)
Greece	-Greek Research & Technology Network
Greece	(GRST) Dr. Xenonhon Tsilibaris (www.grnet.gr)
	-Draxis- Evangelos Kosmidis (kosmidis@draxis gr)
	-Terrasnatium Georgia Kalousi
	-University Patras: Andreas Kazantzidis (akaza@unatras.gr)
ERVON	Ste. Cyril and Methodius University
FRICIVI	Faculty for Civil Engineering Skenie
	Prof. Vance Ciercijev (vance @t. home mk & tijanasekuleska@gmail.com
	Pior. Valico Gjorgjiev (Valico@i-home.nik & tijanasekuloska@ginali.com
	Friedu of Department of Water and Erosion Protection. Faculty of Agricultural Sciences and
	Narija Vululia Chutaaka (marija vululia sutaaka @gmail.aams)
	Marija Vukelic Snutoska <marija.vukelic.sutoska@gmail.com></marija.vukelic.sutoska@gmail.com>
Israel	-IS Mapping - Ido Livne (livneido /5@gmail.com)
	-Daniel Barok – EO Consultant (danielbarok@gmail.com)
Romania	-Terrasigna- Florin Serban (Florin.Serban@terrasigna.com)
	-ESRI Romania-Andreea Anghel (aanghel@esri.ro)
Serbia	-Prof. dr Lazar Lazic, Head of the Institute of Meteorology, Faculty of Physics, University of
	Belgrade, Serbia (lazar@ff.bg.ac.rs)
	-Dr Ana Vukovic, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade, Serbia
	(pazisadana@yahoo.com)
	-HIDMET, Prof Jogoslav Nikolic (office@hidmet.gov.rs)
Tunisia	-Prof. Zohra Lili Chabaane, Specialist at Remote Sensing, GIS and Water resources
	management at Institut National d'Agronomie de Tunisie (INAT)
	Director of LR17AGR01 / GREEN-TEAM (Integrated Management of Natural Resources:
	Remote Sensing, Spatial Analysis and Modeling)
	- German Geoconsultants Group- Karem Ben Khaled
	- Centre National de la Cartographie et de la Télédétection-Adel Jehane
	(www.cnct.defense.tn)
	-Tunisia GEO Principal: Prof. Fethi Lebdi
Turkey	-Mrs. A. Yücel ERBAY, Director
-	NiK SİSTEM, Remote Sensing and Satellite Image (-sistem@nik.com.tr, yucel@nik.com.tr)
	-Mr. Hayati Koyuncu, PhD, Managing & Research Director, JeoDijital Bilisim Teknoloji
	Madencilik Ltd. Sti. (hayatik@jeodijital.com)
	-Özgür Acir, Association of Geological Researches-JADE, (ozgur.acir@jade.org.tr)

Information on the assessment and methodology was also distributed to experts in the BAMENA GEO members countries, mainly via the GEO principals. Some of them such Israel, Turkey were involved in the discussions. The purpose was to make awareness on the methodology.



Annex 3: Spider diagram per country

The 'maturity level' per country is also synthesized in a spider diagram in the following pages. This section illustrates the current situation of each country in the region with the help of spider charts.

Grouping of countries

Country-specific results vary widely among the countries in the Rol. Cross country comparisons among indicators must be made with caution. Although several countries report their maturity indicators under the same name, their methodology is based on in-country qualitative assessments. Accordingly, it is not possible to establish a direct comparison between indicators of different countries, even if these indicators have the exact same name. Despite this limitation, this methodology provides a good first step in assessing each country w.r.t. the selected indicators.

CAPACITIES

National Infrastructure



(a) Space Agency / Space Authority





(b) Own space-borne capacity



(c) Ground-based facilities



(d) In-situ monitoring networks





(e) Modelling / Computing capacities



(f) (G) EO data exploitation platforms



Critical mass of EO researchers





(g) Number of public organisations



(h) Number of researchers



(i) Courses offered





(j) Relevant publications



Industry base



(k) Number of companies





(I) Employment numbers



(m) Resellers / Representatives



(n) Clusters





COLLABORATION

Collaboration through GEO



(o) Participation in GEO/GEOSS initiatives



(p) Specific actions on SDGs





(q) Designated GEO office



(r) Provision of data to GEOSS



Impact of Copernicus

(s) Organisations involved in Copernicus projects





Participation to other international efforts







(u) Meteorological (WMO, EUMETSAT ...)





(v) UN system (UN-GGIM, ...)



(w) Infrastructure for Spatial Information



(x) Standardisation activities





Availability of EU funding

(y) EU R&D participation



<u>UPTAKE</u>

Networking initiatives



(z) Networking initiatives





(aa) Data Portals



National Policies Implementation









(cc) Internal Budget & Investment



Penetration



(dd) Use of Geo-information





(ee) Capacity building EO focused actions





Annex 4: Example of Spider graphs and Conditional formatting per country

Multi-dimensional charts of quantitative variables will present the country maturity per indicator

a) Albania Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Albania assessment	Albania
National Infrastructure	1
Space agency or designated Space Authority	2
Own space-borne capacity	0
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	0
Ground-based facilities	2
In-situ monitoring networks	1
Modelling and computing capacities	1
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	1
Critical Mass of EO researchers	1.5
Number of public organisations	3
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	2
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	1
Relevant Publications	0
Industry Base	0,75
Number of companies	1
Employment numbers, levels and changes	1
Resellers or local representatives of	
European companies	1
	0
COLLABORATION	Albania
Collaboration through GEO	1
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	1
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's)	1
Designated GEO office	0
Provision of data to GEOSS	2
Impact of Copernicus	2
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	0
Participation to other international efforts	1.6
ESA	_,.
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	0



Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community	
(INSPIRE)	2
Participation in Standardisation	
organisations i.e. as OGC	2
Availability of EU funding	2
R&D participation or other EU programmes	2
UPTAKE	Albania
Networking initiatives	1,5
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	1
Data Portals	2
National Policies Implementation	1,5
Policy	2
Budget & investment (internal to the	
country)	1
Penetration	2,5
Use of Geo-information	2
Capacity building EO focused actions	3

Albania Maturity Indicators









Albania Collaboration





b) Bulgaria Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Bulgaria assessment (conditional formatting)	Bulgaria
CAPACITIES	
National Infrastructure	1,714285714
Space agency or designated Space Authority	2
Own space-borne capacity	1
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	2
Ground-based facilities	1
In-situ monitoring networks	2
Modelling and computing capacities	2
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	2
Critical Mass of EO researchers	2
Number of public organisations	2
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	2
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	2
Relevant Publications	2
Industry Base	1,75
Number of companies	2
Employment numbers, levels and changes	2
Resellers or local representatives of European companies	2
Existence of Clusters	1
COLLABORATION	Bulgaria
Collaboration through GEO	0,75
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	1
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG´s)	0
Designated GEO office	1
Provision of data to GEOSS	1
Impact of Copernicus	2
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	2
Participation to other international efforts	2,8
ESA	3
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	1
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	
Participation in Standardisation	4
organisations i.e. as OGC	2



Availability of EU funding	2
R&D participation or other EU programmes	2
UPTAKE	Bulgaria
Networking initiatives	1,5
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	2
Data Portals	1
National Policies Implementation	2
Policy	3
Budget & investment (internal to the country)	1
Penetration	2
Use of Geo-information	3
Capacity building EO focused actions	1

Bulgaria Maturity Indicators



Participation to other international efforts









c) Cyprus Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Cyprus assessment (conditional formatting)	Cyprus
CAPACITIES	
National Infrastructure	1,142857143
Space agency or designated Space Authority	1
Own space-borne capacity	0
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground	
stations)	0



Ground-based facilities	0
In-situ monitoring networks	3
Modelling and computing capacities	2
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision	
Critical Mass of EO researchers	2
Number of public organisations	1,75
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	2
Courses being offered in universities. its	2
diversity and maturity offered	2
Relevant Publications	1
Industry Base	0,5
Number of companies	1
Employment numbers, levels and changes	1
Resellers or local representatives of	
Existence of Clusters	0
	0
COLLABORATION	Cyprus
Collaboration through GEO	1 5
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives	1,5
which are linked to GEOSS	1
Goals (SDG´s)	3
Designated GEO office	2
Provision of data to GEOSS	0
Impact of Copernicus	1
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	1
Participation to other international efforts	2.2
ESA	3
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	0
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community	
(INSPIRE)	4
organisations i.e. as OGC	0
Availability of EU funding	3
R&D participation or other EU programmes	3
UPTAKE	Cyprus
Networking initiatives	1,5
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	1
Data Portals	2
National Policies Implementation	0.5
	0,5



Policy	1
Budget & investment (internal to the	
country)	0
Penetration	2,5
Use of Geo-information	3
Capacity building EO focused actions	2

Cyprus Maturity Indicators







Cyprus National Infrastructure





d) Egypt Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Egypt assessment (conditional formatting)	Egypt
CAPACITIES	
National Infrastructure	2
Space agency or designated Space Authority	2
Own space-borne capacity	3
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	1
Ground-based facilities	2
In-situ monitoring networks	2
Modelling and computing capacities	2
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	2
Critical Mass of EO researchers	2
Number of public organisations	2
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	2
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	2
Relevant Publications	2



Industry Base	1,25
Number of companies	1
Employment numbers, levels and changes	1
Resellers or local representatives of	
European companies	2
Existence of Clusters	1
COLLABORATION	Egypt
Collaboration through GEO	0,5
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	1
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's)	0
Designated GEO office	1
Provision of data to GEOSS	0
Impact of Copernicus	1
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	1
Participation to other international efforts	1
ESA	1
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	3
UN system as UN-GGIM,	1
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial	
Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	0
Participation in Standardisation	
organisations i.e. as OGC	0
Availability of EU funding	2
R&D participation or other EU programmes	2
UPTAKE	Egypt
Networking initiatives	1.5
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	2
Data Portals	1
National Policies Implementation	1
Policy	1
Budget & investment (internal to the country)	1
Penetration	2
Use of Geo-information	2
Capacity building EO focused actions	2











e) FYROM Spider graphs and conditional formatting

FYROM assessment (conditional formatting)	FYROM
CAPACITIES	
National Infrastructure	0,857142857
Space agency or designated Space Authority	0
Own space-borne capacity	0
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	1
Ground-based facilities	0
In-situ monitoring networks	2
Modelling and computing capacities	1
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	2
Critical Mass of EO researchers	1,5
Number of public organisations	2
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	1
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	2
Relevant Publications	1
Industry Base	0,25
Number of companies	1
Employment numbers, levels and changes	0
Resellers or local representatives of European companies	0
Existence of Clusters	0
COLLABORATION	FYROM
Collaboration through GEO	0,5
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	0
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG´s)	2
Designated GEO office	0
Provision of data to GEOSS	0
Impact of Copernicus	0
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	0
Participation to other international efforts	1,2
ESA	0
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	2
UN system as UN-GGIM,	2
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	
Participation in Standardisation	2
organisations i.e. as OGC	0


Availability of EU funding	2
R&D participation or other EU programmes	2
UPTAKE	FYROM
Networking initiatives	1,5
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	1
Data Portals	2
National Policies Implementation	0,5
Policy	1
Budget & investment (internal to the country)	0
Penetration	1
Use of Geo-information	1
Capacity building EO focused actions	1











f) Greece Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Greece assessment	
(conditional formatting)	Greece
CAPACITIES	
National Infrastructure	3
Space agency or designated Space Authority	3
Own space-borne capacity	1
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	3
Ground-based facilities	4
In-situ monitoring networks	3
Modelling and computing capacities	3
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	4
Critical Mass of EO researchers	4
Number of public organisations	4
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	4



Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	
Relevant Publications	4
Industry Base	4
Number of companies	2,75
Employment numbers levels and changes	4
Posollars or local representatives of	4
European companies	2
Existence of Clusters	1
COLLABORATION	Greece
Collaboration through GEO	4
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	4
Specific actions on Sustainable Development	4
Goals (SDG's)	
	4
Provision of data to GEOSS	4
Impact of Copernicus	4
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	4
Participation to other international efforts	3.6
ESA	4
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	4
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial	
(INSPIRE)	4
Participation in Standardisation	4
organisations i.e. as OGC	2
Availability of EU funding	3
R&D participation or other EU programmes	3
UPTAKE	Greece
Networking initiatives	4
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	Д
Data Portals	4
National Policies Implementation	25
Policy	3,5
Budget & investment (internal to the	4
country)	3
	4
Use of Geo-Information	4
Capacity building EO focused actions	Λ





Ground-based facilities

Greece Maturity Indicators

In-situ monitoring

networks







g) Israel Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Israel assessment (conditional formatting)	Israel
National Infrastructure	
	3,857142857
Space agency or designated Space Authority	4
Own space-borne capacity	4
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	4
Ground-based facilities	4
In-situ monitoring networks	3
Modelling and computing capacities	4
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	4
Critical Mass of EO researchers	3,5
Number of public organisations	3
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	4
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	4
Relevant Publications	3
Industry Base	3,25
Number of companies	3
Employment numbers, levels and changes	4
Resellers or local representatives of European companies	3
Existence of Clusters	3
COLLABORATION	Israel
Collaboration through GEO	2
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	3
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG´s)	3
Designated GEO office	2
Provision of data to GEOSS	0
Impact of Copernicus	1
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	1
Participation to other international efforts	2,4
ESA	2
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	2
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	1
Participation in Standardisation	1
organisations i.e. as OGC	3



Availability of EU funding	4
R&D participation or other EU programmes	4
UPTAKE	Israel
Networking initiatives	2,5
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	2
Data Portals	3
National Policies Implementation	2,5
Policy	2
Budget & investment (internal to the country)	3
Penetration	4
Use of Geo-information	4
Capacity building EO focused actions	4

Israel Maturity Indicators





Space agency / Space Authority 4 (G) EO data exploitation 3 Own space-borne platforms capacity 2 1 Ó Modelling / Computing Access to 3rd party capacities missions In-situ monitoring Ground-based facilities networks Israel Critical Mass (G)EO Israel (G)EO Industry Base Researchers Number of Number of public... companies Existence of Employmen Relevant Number of Clusters t numbers 0 Publications researchers Resellers / Courses Represent... offered Israel Collaboration Participation in GEO /GEOSS initiatives 4 Specific acrtions on EU R&D participation SDG's 3 Standardization 2 Designated GEO office activities 1 0 Infrastructure for Provision of data to **Spatial Information** GEOSS UN system (UN-GGIM, Organisations involved in Copernicus projects ...) Meteorological (WMO, ESA EUMETSAT ...)

Israel National Infrastructure





h) Romania Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Romania assessment (conditional formatting)	Romania
CAPACITIES	
National Infrastructure	2,428571429
Space agency or designated Space Authority	4
Own space-borne capacity	2
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	2
Ground-based facilities	2
In-situ monitoring networks	3
Modelling and computing capacities	2
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision	
of VA services and products)	2
Critical Mass of EO researchers	2,5
Number of public organisations	3
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	3
Courses being offered in universities, its	
diversity and maturity offered	2
Relevant Publications	2
Industry Base	2,25
Number of companies	2
Employment numbers, levels and changes	3
Resellers or local representatives of	
European companies	2



Existence of Clusters	2
COLLABORATION	Romania
Collaboration through GEO	3,5
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	4
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's)	4
Designated GEO office	3
Provision of data to GEOSS	3
Impact of Copernicus	2
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	2
Participation to other international efforts	3,6
ESA	4
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	4
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	4
Participation in Standardisation organisations i.e. as OGC	2
Availability of EU funding	4
R&D participation or other EU programmes	4
UPTAKE	Romania
Networking initiatives	2.5
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	3
Data Portals	2
National Policies Implementation	25
Policy	Δ.
Budget & investment (internal to the	3
Penetration	3
Use of Geo-information	2,5
Capacity building EO focused actions	3





Ground-based facilities

Romania Maturity Indicators

In-situ monitoring

networks







i) Serbia Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Serbia assessment (conditional formatting)	Serbia
CAPACITIES	Jeibia
National Infrastructure	1 71/29571/
Space agency or designated Space Authority	1,/14205/14
Own space-borne capacity	0
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground	
stations)	0
	3
Modelling and computing capacities	2
(C) EQ data avalatation platforms (provision	3
of VA services and products)	4
Critical Mass of EO researchers	2
Number of public organisations	2
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	2
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	2
Relevant Publications	2
Industry Base	2 25
Number of companies	2
Employment numbers, levels and changes	2
Resellers or local representatives of European companies	3
Existence of Clusters	2
COLLABORATION	Serbia
Collaboration through GEO	1,5
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	0
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's)	0
Designated GEO office	2
Provision of data to GEOSS	4
Impact of Copernicus	2
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	2
Participation to other international efforts	2.6
ESA	0
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	3
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial	
Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	4
Participation in Standardisation	
organisations i.e. as OdC	2



Availability of EU funding	2
R&D participation or other EU programmes	2
UPTAKE	Serbia
Networking initiatives	2,5
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	2
Data Portals	3
National Policies Implementation	2
Policy	3
Budget & investment (internal to the country)	1
Penetration	2
Use of Geo-information	2
Capacity building EO focused actions	2











j) Tunisia Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Tunisia assessment	
(conditional formatting)	Tunisia
CAPACITIES	
National Infrastructure	1,428571429
Space agency or designated Space Authority	2
Own space-borne capacity	1
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground	
stations)	2
Ground-based facilities	1



In-situ monitoring networks	1
Modelling and computing capacities	1
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	2
Critical Mass of EO researchers	2,25
Number of public organisations	3
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	2
Courses being offered in universities, its	_
Relevant Publications	2
Industry Base	2
Number of companies	1,5
Employment numbers, levels and changes	2
Resellers or local representatives of European companies	2
Existence of Clusters	1
	L
COLLABORATION	Turtete
Collaboration through GEO	Tunisia
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	1,5
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG´s)	2
Designated GEO office	1
Provision of data to GEOSS	1
Impact of Copernicus	2
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	2
Participation to other international efforts	2
ESA	1
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	3
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	0
Participation in Standardisation	
Availability of EU funding	2
R&D participation or other EU programmes	2
	2
UPTAKE	T
Networking initiatives	Tunisia
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	1,5
Data Portals	2
National Policies Implementation	1
Policy	2
	2



Budget & investment (internal to the	
country)	2
Penetration	2,5
Use of Geo-information	2
Capacity building EO focused actions	3







Tunisia National Infrastructure





k) Turkey Spider graphs and conditional formatting

Turkey assessment (conditional formatting)	Turkey
CAPACITIES	
National Infrastructure	3,142857143
Space agency or designated Space Authority	2
Own space-borne capacity	3
Access to 3rd party missions (own ground stations)	3
Ground-based facilities	3
In-situ monitoring networks	4
Modelling and computing capacities	3
(G) EO data exploitation platforms (provision of VA services and products)	4
Critical Mass of EO researchers	3,25
Number of public organisations	3
Number of researchers (in Univ. & R&D labs)	3
Courses being offered in universities, its diversity and maturity offered	4
Relevant Publications	3
Industry Base	2,5
Number of companies	3
Employment numbers, levels and changes	3
Resellers or local representatives of European companies	2
Existence of Clusters	2
COLLABORATION	Turkey
Collaboration through GEO	2
Participation in GEO or to projects/initiatives which are linked to GEOSS	3
Specific actions on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's)	2
Designated GEO office	2



Provision of data to GEOSS	1
Impact of Copernicus	3
Organisations involved in projects linked to Copernicus	3
Participation to other international efforts	3
ESA	3
Meteorological: WMO, EUMETSAT,	4
UN system as UN-GGIM,	3
Establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)	3
Participation in Standardisation organisations i.e. as OGC	2
Availability of EU funding	3
R&D participation or other EU programmes	3
UPTAKE	Turkey
Networking initiatives	3
Networking initiatives (events and thematic workshops)	3
Data Portals	3
National Policies Implementation	3
Policy	3
Budget & investment (internal to the country)	3
Penetration	3
Use of Geo-information	3
Capacity building EO focused actions	3

Turkey Maturity Indicators













Annex 5: Contrasted assessment for the Rol

	PADLE						IDa	mia	
COOPENATION M UPTACE M COOPENATION M UPTACE M COOPENATION M UPTACE M COOPENATION M UPTACE M COOPENATION M M M M COOPENATION M M M M M Mathematication M Coopension M M M M Mathematication M Coopension M	Assess	ment (ra	nged)						
Core can can be and the control of the cont	CAPACITY	h		COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	•	
maturity sectors indicates total maturity sectors indicates indic	Score c	ard							
cquarty instancture in cqueention onlinearction in space in on memory in onlinearction in onlinearction in policy in industry base in onlinearction in in onlinearction in policy in industry base in onlinearction in in onlinearction in industry base in in in in onlinearction in industry base in in in in in in in enderling & comparing in in in in in in enderling & comparing in in in in in in enderling & comparing in in in in in in enderling & comparing in in in in in in enderling & comparing in in in <td< th=""><th>maturity indicators</th><th>indicators</th><th>level</th><th>maturity indicators</th><th>indicators</th><th>level</th><th>maturity indicators</th><th>indicators</th><th>leve</th></td<>	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	leve
e o mench impact contremench podry podry budsty base impact impact prestration budsty base impact impact prestration budsty base impact impact impact impact based impact impact impact	capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	•
Putury loss O Termstront Permittant Permittant <td></td> <td>eo reserach</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>impact Copernicus</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>policy</td> <td>•</td>		eo reserach			impact Copernicus	0		policy	•
Index Index Index Index State State State State State State State State State State State State		industry base	0		international	h.		penetration	-
Instruction					funding	-			
specs bore O specific spright and sp	apacity		indicator	level	cooperation		indicator		level
Non-sec: Normal Sec:	capacity	i roace a fre	indicator	level	cooperation	pad	indicator		level
ground based A pendion data bolicOS A in-sbu Na in-sbu Na O modeling Computing Na in-sbu O O endeding Computing Na in-sbu O O O endeding Computing Na in-sbu EA O O O ended registrations Na in-sbuckoris O	capacity nfrastructure	space author	indicator arity a	level	cooperation collaboration GED	part	indicator leipation GEO cific actions on :	SDG's	level
instatu Number Spect Cipernose pojetitis O modeling Locrupting Number International Statumer O edida regulation Number International Statumer O n.neisachurs O International O International O n.neisachurs O International O International O publicazione O International Number International O publicazione O International Number International Number quadratione Number International Number International Number quadratine Number International Number International Numer	capacity	space author space born access 3rd	indicator ority e party missions	level O O	cooperation collaboration GED	part spo desi	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on : gnated GEO off	SDG's	level
endering a comparison N Hermatianal ESA O e odda explorations N M <	apacity	space author space born access 3rd ground bas	indicator ority e party missions ed	level O O	cooperation collaboration GED	part spor desi	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO off rision data to GI	SDG's fice EOSS	level
existe explosition No memory explosition 0 s, public explosition C Uk1 /k suprements C public Courses direct No No No public Courses direct No No No No duary base Concreption No No No No No engloymet No No Instantion No No No duary base Courses/emerition No No No No No duary base Course/emerition No No No No No duary base Course/emerition No <	rapacity nfrastructure	space author space borni access 3rd ground base in-situ	indicator ority e party missions ed	level C C C C L L	cooperation collaboration GEO	part spo desi prov	indicator icipation GEO iffic actions on gnated GEO off rision data to GI acts	SDG's fice EOSS	
e result e, s, Add organization s, smaarchen s, smaarchen pabloatore pabloatore s, congranisa , congranisa s, congranisa s, congranisa s, congranisa s, congranisa s, congranisa s, congranisa s, congranisa s,	apacity nfrastructure	space author space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling &	indicator orby e party missions ed	level	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	part spe des prov ESA	indicator lopation GEO cific actions on : gnated GEO off rision data to GI sorts	SDG's fice EOSS	level
n. navadovin	apacity Infrastructure	space author space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling & eo data exp	indicator orby e party missions ed computing loitation		cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	part spec desi prov ESA met	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on : gnated GEO off rision data to GI acts i ecrological	SDG's fice EOSS	level
course dend Image: Course	apacity nfrastructure	space author space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public or	indicator prity e party missions ed computing lioitation ganizations		cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	part spec desi prov ESA met UN	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on : gnated GEO off rision data to GI ects. a ecrological / Int. agreement	SDG's fice	level
paleicators O Krdng Ridparticipation A duary base congressies A employment A duary esseles, patricentitips A duary base C duary base C duary base C duary base C patricentition C patrice	rapacity nfrastructure	space author space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling & eo data exp n. public or n. researche	indicator orby o party missions ed computing loitation ganizations irs	level	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	part spo desi prov ESA met UN	indicator icipation GEO ific actions on i grated GEO off rision data to GI acts corological / Int. agreement PIRE	SDG's fice EOSS	level
In. comparise Image: Comparise <td>capacity nfrastructure</td> <td>space author space born access 3rd ground bas- lin-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public or n. research courses offe</td> <td>indicator arby a party missions ed computing lioitation ganizations irs ered</td> <td>level</td> <td>cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international</td> <td>part spa desi prov ESA met UN INSI stan</td> <td>indicator incipation GEO cific actions on : gnated GEO off islan data to GI acts acts acts acts acts acts acts acts</td> <td>SDG's SDG's /td> <td>level</td>	capacity nfrastructure	space author space born access 3rd ground bas- lin-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public or n. research courses offe	indicator arby a party missions ed computing lioitation ganizations irs ered	level	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	part spa desi prov ESA met UN INSI stan	indicator incipation GEO cific actions on : gnated GEO off islan data to GI acts acts acts acts acts acts acts acts	SDG's	level
empoynent negative provided in the standard st standard standard stand standard standard stand standar	rapecity nfrastructure to research	space author space born access 3rd ground bas- lin-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public or n. research courses off publications	ndicator arity e party missions ed computing kiotation garizations aris ered s		cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international funding	parti special proj ESA met UN INSI starr R&D	indicator icipation GEO cilic actions on a gnated GEO off ision data to GI acts orological / Int. agreement PIRE dardization / participation	SDG's File EOSS S S	level
dutiers, partientryps clusters cluster	apecity nfrastructure to research ndustry base	space author space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public on n. researche courses off publications n. companie	indicator prity party missions ed computing kioitation ganizations ered s s s	Iood O O Iood	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international funding uptake	part species provides	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on s gnated GEO off ision data to GI acts acts acts acts acts acts acts acts	SDG's	level
patry policy events budget & investment.	ropecity infrastructure ao research industry base	space auffici space auffici space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling & no data exp n. public of n. nealerch courses off publications n. compania employment	indicator prity party missions ed computing kotation ganizations res ered s s s d d	locd	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copervicus international funding uptake networking	parti span desi prov prov prov ESA met UN V UN V Star B&D	indicator icipation GEO ific actions on i grated GEO off isison data to GI acts acts acts acts acts acts acts acts	SDG's Cost of the second secon	level
penetration use	copecity Infrastructure	space aufric space aufric space born access 3rd ground bass in-situ modeling & e o data exp n. public or n. research courses offi publication n. companie employmen remolers, p.	indicator party missions ed computing kiotation ganizations res ered s s s 4 artnerships	locd 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 N 0 N 0 N 0 N 0 N 0	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicul international funding uptate networking	parti spoi desi proj ESA met UN INSI starr R&C	indicator icipation GEO affo actions on 2 anatod GEO of isision data to GI acts acts acts acts acts acts acts acts	SDG's Coss Coss Coss Coss Coss Coss Coss Co	level
penetration use	ao research ndustry base	space aufric space aufric space born access 3rd ground bass modeling & eo data exp n, public or n, research courses off n, research n, norpani employmen reseliers, pr clusters	indicator party missions ed computing kiloitation garizations res ered s 8 8 4 4 authorships	lovel 0	cooperation cotaboration GEO impact Copernicus international funding uptake networking policy	parti spor desi proj ESA met UN INSI star R&C	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on i grated GEO off isison data to GI accts acorological / Int. agreement piRE edirection opericipation indicator working a portalis cy	SDG's Construction of the second seco	Ievel I I I I I I I I I I I I I
a construction of the second se	eopecity Infrastructure ao research industry base	space aufre space aufre access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling & e odata exp n. publication n. publication n. companie publication n. companie employment resoliters, pr clusters	indicator party visions ed computing dioitation ganizations rss ered 8 8 8 8 4 4 4 4	Lowd -	cosperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicut international funding uptake networking policy	parti spei desi proj ESA met UN INSI Star R&C	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on ci- gnated GEO off ission data to GI acts. acrosological / Int. agreement PIRE diddication 0 participation indicator working ci portals ci portals ci portals ci portals	SDG's	
	ao research ndustry base	space suffic space suffic access 3/d ground bas- in-stitu modeling & e o data exp n. public or n. public or n	indicator srity e party missions ed computing kotation garizations irs ered s s atherships	Joved -	Cooperation Collaboration GEO Impact Copernicus International funding update networking policy penetration	partitica partitica partitica partitica partitica providente provi	indicator icipation GEO iffe actions on i gnated GEO off vision data to GI occts ecrological / int. agreement PIRE dardization oparticipation indicator working t portals : ;;; ;; get & investment	SDG's	International Second Se

CAPACITY	h		COOPERATION			UPTAKE	•	
Score (ard							
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	leve
capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	cellaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	^
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	0		policy	•
	industry base	•		international	-		penetration	1
				funding	-			
infrastructure	space autho	irky		collaboration GEO	partic	ipation GEO		
capacity Infrastructure				cooperation				
	space autho	irity		collaboration GEO	partic	ipation GEO		h
infrastructure	space autho	irky 9	0	collaboration GEO	partic speci	ipation GEO fic actions on	SDG's	h
infrastructure	space borne access 3rd (irity) party missions	0	collaboration GEO	partic speci desig	ipation GED fic actions on nated GEO of	SDG's fice	•
infrastructure	space author space borne access 3rd ground base	nity party missions ed	0	collaboration GEO	partic speci desig	ipation GED fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G	SDG's fice EDSS	•
infrastructure	space author space borne access 3rd ground base in-situ	nity) party missions ed	• • •	collaboration GEO	partic speci desig provis	spation GED fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G ots	SDG's fice EDSS	 N O O O
infrastructure	space author space borne access 3rd y ground base in-situ modelling &	nty party missions ed computing	- 0 -	collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	partic speci desig provis ESA	ipation GED fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G ots	SDG's fice EDSS	
infrastructure	space autho space borns access 3rd ground base in-situ modelling & eo data exp	nty party missions ed computing foitation	- 0 - N N N	collaboration GEO	partic speci desig provis ESA meteo	ipation GED fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G ots onological	SDG s fice EDSS	 N O O<
eo rasearch	space author space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling & eo data exp n, public or p, meanthe	rity party missions ed computing lotation ganizations es	- 0 - N N N -	collaboration GEO Impact Copernicus International	partic speci desig provis ESA meter UN /	ipation GED fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G ots onological int. agreement IRE	SDG's fice EDSS	
eo research	space author space born access 3rd j ground base in-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public or n. researche course offi	rity oparty missions ad computing lotation ganizations ess ered	- 0 - 1 - - -	collaboration GEO Impact Copernicut International	partic speci desig provis ESA meter UN / INSP	ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G ots onological int. agreemen IRE landication	SDG's fice EDSS	
eo research	space author space born access 3rd j ground base in-situ modelling & eo data exp n, public org n, researche courses offe publications	rity party missions ed computing fotation panizations ins	- 0 - 1 - - - - - - - - - - - 	collaboration GEO	partic speci desig provis ESA meter UN / INSP stand	ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G cts otological int. agreement IRE landization participation	SDG's fice EDSS	
eo research ndustry base	space author space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling & eo data exp n, public or n, researche courses offé publication n, companie	rity poparty missions ad computing totation panizations irred irred		collaboration GED Impact Copernicus International	partic speci desig provis ESA mabs UN / INSP stand P&D	ipation GEO fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G ots prological Int. agreement IRE lardization participation	SDG's fice EDSS	 N O O<
eo rissearch industry base	space author space born access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling & eo data exp n, public or n, researche courses offe publications n, comparié employment	rity party missions ad computing totation ganizations rrs rrs red 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		collaboration GEO impact Copernicul international funding uptoke	partic speci desig prove ESA meter UN / INSP stand P&D	ipation GED fic actions on nated GED of sion data to G ots onological int. agreement IRE lardization participation indication	SDG's fice EOSS IS	
eo research industry base	space autro space born access 3rd j ground base in-situ modeling & eo data exp n, public org n, researche courses offe publications n, comparté employment modeling space	rky) party missions ed computing lotation ganizations rs red is t trinetships		collaboration GEO impact Copernicul international funding uptake networking	partic speci desig provis ESA mebes UN / INSP istand P&D	ipation GED fic actions on nated GED of sion data to G ots onlogical int. agreemen RE lardization participation indicator arking	SDG's fice EDSS IS	 N O O<
eo research industry base	space auffré space auffré space born ground bass le-stru eo data aup eo data eo da	rky) party missions ed computing totation partizations rs red is t trinerships		collaboration GEO Impact Copernicus International funding uptoke extworking	partic special design provision ESA meteric UN / NSP stand P&D network datas	ipation GED fic actions on nated GEO of asin data to G ots osological int. agreement IRE ardization participation indicatio oshing portals	SDG's fice EDSS 5	
eo research industry base	space author space author access 3rd j ground base in-shu modeling & n public or n, presearch ourses off publications n, comparé employmen mestime, pa clusters	inky interventions of the second seco		eataboration GEO Impact Copernicul International International International International International International International	partic special desig provin ESA meter UN / INSP Stanc R&D R&D	ipation GED fic actions on nated GEO of asin data to G ots osological int. agreement IRE ardization participation indication philog portals /	SDG's fice EDSS 5	
ed research	space author spaces born access 3rd ground base results and results and results access and results access and results access and results access and results access and results access access results a	inty view of the second	O O	eolaboration GEO Impact Copinnicus International International International International International	partic special design provin ESA meter UN / INSP stand P&D P&D network data policy policy	ipation GED fic actions on nated GEO of sion data to G ots onological int. agreement RE ardization participation indicato portals / /	SDG's	

Maturity card Albania (ranged

▶ basic ● intermediate ♥ advanced ● optimized

					D.	les	
CRADIT	ment (ro	unde	đ		D	IIYa	
CAPACITY	-	unuo	COOPERATION	-		UPTAKE	-
Score c	ard						
maturity	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	level	maturity	indicators

maturity indicators			maturity indicators			maturity indicators		
capacity	infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GEO	h	uptake.	networking	•
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus	-		policy	-
	industry base			international	2		penetration	
				funding	-			

Detail evaluation

			cooperation		
infrastructure	space authority	•	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	h
	space borne	•		specific actions on SDG's	0
	access 3rd party missions	-		designated GEO office	
	ground based	h		provision data to GEOSS	
	inestu		impact Copernicus	projects	-
	modelling & computing	-	international	ESA	2
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	
o research	n. public organizations			UN / Int. agreements	
	n. researchers	-		INSPIRE	
	courses offered	-		standardization	-
	publications	•	funding	R&D participation	-
industry base	n, companies	•		Indexter.	100
	employment	-	opnase	Indicator	ene
	resellers, partnerships	-	networking	networking	-
	clusters			data portais	
			policy	policy	2
				budget & investment	
			penetration	uso	2
				capacity is define	

Maturity card Bulgaria (ranged)

Maturity card Bulgaria(rounded)

160

Maturity card Albania (rounded)

Bulgaria

Assessment (ranged)

maturity indicators		level	maturity indicators		level	maturity indicators		
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	٥	uptake	networking	2
	eo reserach	3		impact Copernicus	3		policy	3
	industry base	2		international	3		penetration	3
				funding	3			

Detail evaluation

			cooperation		
nfrastructure	space authority	3	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	2
	space borne	2		specific actions on SDG's	0
	access 3rd party missions	3		designated GEO office	2
	ground based	2		provision data to GEOSS	2
	in-situ	3	impact Copernicus	projects	3
	modelling & computing	з	international	ESA	4
	eo data exploitation	3		meteorological	5
research	n. public organizations	з		UN / Int. agreements	2
	n. researchers	з		INSPIRE	5
	courses offered	3		standardization	3
	publications	3	funding	R&D participation	3
dustry base	n. companies	3	uptaka	indicator	lauro.
	employment	3	uptake	Indicator	leve
	receilers partnerships	2	networking	networking	3
	-	~		data portals	2
	clusters	2	policy	policy	4
				budget & investment	2
			penetration	use	4



APACITY			COOPERATION			LIPTAKE		
	_		COOPENATION	_		OF DAILE	_	
core c	ard							
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	•		policy	0
	industry base	0		international	-		penetration	-
				funding	2			
mastructure	space autro	onty		collaboration GEU	5 part	icipation GEU		
	space born	9	0		spea	cific actions on	SDG's	2
	access ard ground base	ad	0		Drov	ignated GEO of	EOSS	0
	in-situ		2	impact Copernics	is proj	ects		
	modelling &	computing		international	ESA			2
	an dala ave	loitation	-		meb	eorological		•
	eo data exp				UN	/ Int. acreement	8	0
o research	n, public or	ganizations	-			INSPIRE		
o research	n. public org	ganizations ers	-		INSI	PIRE		•
o research	n, public org n, researche courses offe	ganizations ers ared	-		INSI	PIRE		•
o research	n, public org n, researche courses offi publications	ganizations ers ared	• •	funding	INSI stan R&D	PIRE idardization 0 participation		•
o research dustry base	n. public org n. researche courses offe publications n. companie	ganizations ers ared s		funding	INSI stan R&D	PIRE idardization) participation		• • •
o research dustry base	n, public es n, researche courses offe publicatione n, companie employmen	ganizations ers ared as t	A A A A A A A A	funding uptake networking	INSI stan R&D	PIRE idardization) participation indicator vorking		• • • • • •
o research dustry base	n, public or n, researche courses offi publicatione n, companie employmen resellers, pr	ganizations ers ered s s t t utnerships	• • • • •	funding uptake networking	INSI stan R&D netv data	PIRE identization 0 participation indicator vorking a portals		
o research	n, public or n, research courses off publications n, companie employmen resellers, pr clusters	ganizations ers ared s s t t	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	funding uptake networking policy	INSI stan R&D netv data politi	PIRE iderdization participation indicator vorking a portals cy		e c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c
o research	n, publicatione n, researche courses offi publicatione n, compani employmen resellers, pa clusters	panizations ers ared i s t untreships		funding uptake networking policy	INSI stan R&D netv data politi bud	PIRE iderdization 0 participation indicator vorking a portals cy get & investmen	4.	

						_		
CAPACITY	•		COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	•	
Score c	ard							
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	lev
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	^	uptake	networking	-
	eo reserach	-		impect Copernicus			policy	h
	industry base	•		international	-		penetration	1
				funding	2			
infrastructure	space autho	ority		collaboration GE	0 part	Indicator		h
infrastructure	space autho	ority		collaboration GE	0 part	indicator		P.
infrastructure	space authors	ority e	0	collaboration GE	O part	Indicator Icipation GEO cific actions on	SDG's	1
infrastructure	space authors apace borning access 3rd	ority e party missions		collaboration GE	O part spec des	Indicator Icipation GEO offic actions on gnated GEO off	SDG's loe	h ?
infrastructure	space autho space born access 3rd ground base	ority e party missions ed		collaboration GE	O part spec des prov	Indicator Icipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO off rision data to GI	SDG's loe EOSS	N ? .
infrastructure	space author space bornin access 3rd j ground base in-situ modelino 8	wity e party missions ed	0 0 0	collaboration GE	O part spec desi prov us proj	Indicator Icipation GEO offic actions on gnated GEO official rision data to Gil ects	SDG's lice (OSS	h ?
infrastructure	space author space born access 3rd) ground base in-situ modelling &	e party missions ed computing		collaboration GE	O part sper desi prov us proj ESA	Indiation Inipation GEO offic actions on gnated GEO official Associated at to Gi exits acceleration	SDG's lice (099	h ?
infrastructure	space author space born access 3rd) ground base in-aitu modelling & eo data exp n, public or	e party missions ed computing lotation		collaboration GE	D part spec desi prov us proj ESA mat	Indiator Icipation GEO offic actions on gnated GEO officient fision data to Gl ects scrological / lot. acreement	SDG's Ice EOSS	h ?
eo research	space autho space born access 3rd) ground base in-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public or n. researche	e party missions ed computing loitation ganizations ers		collaboration GE	O part spec desi proy us proj ESA met UN	Indicator Icipation GEO offic actions on : gnated GEO official ision data to Gi ects controgical / Int. agreement PIRE	SDG's fice EOSS	h ?
eo research	space autho space born access 3rd j ground bas- in-situ modelling & eo data exp n. public org n. researche courses offe	ority e party missions ed computing lioitation ganizations ers ers		collaboration GE	O part sper desi prov US proj ESA rost UN INSI stan	Inditiation Initiation GEO offic actions on : gnated GEO off Assion data to Gi ects ecological / Int. agreement PIRE dardization	SDG's lice EOSS	 N O N O
eo research	space suffic space born access 3rd; ground base in-situ modelling & eo data exp n, public or n, researché courses offic publications	ority e party missions ed computing isotation ganizations ars seed s		cooperation collaboration GE impact Copernic international	O part spec desi prov ESA Des ESA UN UN INSI stan RAD	Indibator Indibator GEO offic actions on : gnated GEO official restance of the second restance of the second resta	SDG's loce (099)	 N 7 0 1 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1<
eo research industry base	space suffic space born access 3rd; ground base in-situ modelling & eo data exp n, public or n, researche courses offic publications n, companie	arity e e computing ilotation garizations rrs wed s s	N O	cooperation collaboration GE impact Copernic international funding	O part spec desi prov us proj ESA mat UN INSi stan R&D	Indication Incipation GEQ offic actions on : gnated GEQ official dision data to GI dision data to GI ests ecrological ecrological / Int. agreement PRE dardization 0 participation	SDG's loce EOSS	 N O N O O<
eo research industry base	space auffre space born access 3rd j ground base in-site modelling & eo data exp n. public of n. researche courses offe publications n. companie employmen	wity e e computing iotation ganizations ers seed s s s s t	N O	colaboration GE impact Copernic international funding uptake contending	O part sper desi prov us proj ESA met UN INSI stan RAD	Indicator locipation GEO contactors an grated GEO off ksion data to Gi ksion data to Gi ecrobogical / Int. agreement PRE diardization indicator ecrotopical	SDG's loce loos5 s	
eo research industry base	space authors space born access 3rd j ground bass in-sbu modeling & eo data exp n, public or n, public or courses off courses off n, compare n, nogaret amploymen ensploymen	wity wity e party missions ed . computing ioistation genizations ars ered s s 4 wtnerships	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	eolaboration GE eolaboration GE impact Copernic international funding update	O part sper desi prov us proj ESA met UN iNSi stan R&D	Indicator locipation GEO cipations dhi grated GEO off ksion data to Gi exclosed and data to Gi exclose	SDG's loce loos5	
eo research industry base	space suffic space suffic access 3rd j ground base in-situ modeling & o data sey n, public org n, researche courses offi publication n, compare n, compare n, context seguinaria n, context seguinaria negative negative seguinaria negative seguinaria negative seguinaria negative negative seguinaria negative seguinaria negative n	wity e e computing isotration genications ars esed s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s		codewnition collaboration GE impact Copertic international funding updala natuohing policy	O part spec desi prov us proj ESA mat UN INSI stan R&D R&D netv detti	Indestor Indestor Indestor Indestore Indestore Indestor Inde	SOG'S	 N 7 0 7 0 1 0 1 1<
eo research industry base	space suffic space born access 3rd of ground base in-situ modeling & e of data exp n. public ey courses off publication n. research publication n. pompany employment messiles, po clusters	arity ary arity ar	N 0	colourniton collaboration GE Impact Copernic International funding update natuocking policy	O partin speceration provus projus provus projus provus projus pr	Indextor Indextor GEO officiation GEO officiations on ' officiations on ' officiations on ' officiation of the officiation officiation of the officiation officiation of the officiation of the officiation officiation officiation of the officiation of the officiation officiation officiation of the officiation of the officiation	soors loos	
eo research industry base	space suffic space born access 3rd of ground bas- in-situ modeling & so data exp n, public or n, public or publication n, company employmen resellers, po clusters	arity		colourniton collaboration GE impact Copernic international funding updata policy policy period	o parti speceration provide provide pr	Indicator Indicator Incidentian Incidenti	SDG's	N 7 0 1 0 1

Maturity card Cyprus (ranged)

ED C						Eļ	JND	t
lssess	ment (ra	nged)						
CAPACITY	•		COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	•	
Score c	ard							
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	lovel	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GEO	0	uptake	networking	h
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	•		policy	•
	industry base			international			penetration	
				funding	-			
Detail C	valuatio	ndicator	level	cooperation		indicator		level
infrastructure	space autho	ority	-	collaboration GE	EO pa	rticipation GEO		
	space born	9	2		sp	ecific actions on	SDG's	0
	access 3rd	party missio	ns 🕨		de	signated GEO of	ice	
	ground bas	ed	-		pr	ovision data to GI	EOSS	0
	in-situ		-	impact Copernic	cus pr	ojects		
	modelling &	computing	-	international	ES	iA		
	eo data exp	loitation	-		m	eteorological		2
eo research	n. public on	ganizations	-		U	V / Int. agreement	5	
	n. researche	ars	-		IN	SPIRE		0
	courses off	ered	-		sta	Indardization		0
	publications		-	funding	Rð	D participation		-
industry base	n. companie	15	•	uptake		indicator		level
	employmen	t		networking		tworking		

Maturity card Cyprus (rounded)





Assessment (rounded)

	and the second second	-

Score	card							
maturity indicators	indicators	lovel	maturity indicators	indicators	lovel	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	-		Impact Copernicus	•		policy	
	industry base	h		international	•		penetration	
				funding	•			

Detail evaluation

•

			cooperation		
infrastructure	space authority		collaboration GEO	participation GEO	•
	space borne	2		specific actions on SDG's	0
	access 3rd party missions.	•		designated GEO office	
	ground based	-		provision data to GEOSS	0
	in-situ	-	impact Copernicus	projects	
	modelling & computing	-	international	ESA	
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	3
eo research	n. public organizations	-		UN / Int. agreements	
	n. researchers	-		INSPIRE	0
	courses offered	-		standardization	0
	publications	-	funding	R&D participation	-
industry base	n. companies	•		1000	1
	employment	h	uptake	indicator	leve
	resallers, partnembios		networking	networking	-
	al al an			data portals	A
	uluotero.	-	policy	policy	h
				budget & investment	•
			penetration	use	-
				capacity building	-

Maturity card Egypt (ranged)

O initial 🖿

basic 🗢 intermediate 🤊 ad

Maturity card Egypt (rounded)



SSess	ment (ra	naed)						
CAPACITY	h	ngous	COOPERATION	0		UPTAKE	h	
Score (card						la dissistant	Inund
maturity	indicators				level	maturity		
maturity indicators capacity	Indicators infrastructure	level	maturity indicators cooperation	collaboration GEO	O	indicators uptake	networking	In the second se
maturity indicators capacity	Indicators infrastructure eo reserach	level	maturity indicators cooperation	collaboration GEO impact Copernicus	level O O	uptake	networking	•
maturity indicators capacity	Indicators infrastructure eo reserach industry base	level	maturity indicators cooperation	indicators collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	level O O	uptake	networking policy penetration	0 0

infrastructure	space authority	0	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	0
	space borne	0		specific actions on SDG's	-
	access 3rd party missions	•		designated GEO office	0
	ground based	•		provision data to GEOSS	0
	in-situ	-	impact Copernicus	projects	0
	modelling & computing	-	international	ESA	0
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	2
eo research	n. public organizations	-		UN / Int. agreements	-
	n. researchers			INSPIRE	2
	courses offered	-		standardization	h
	publications	•	funding	R&D participation	•
industry base	n. companies	•		tottoto.	
	employment		uptake	indicator	level
	resellers partnerships		networking	networking	•
		-		data portals	
	clusters		policy	policy	•
				budget & investment	0
			penetration	use	•
				canacity building	

CAPACITY	•	4	COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	•	
Score c	ard							
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	leval	maturity indicators	indicators	leve
capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	h	uptake	networking	-
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	0		policy	
	industry base			international	-		penetration	
				funding				
capacity infrastructure	indi space authority	cator	level O	cooperation collaboration GE	O part	indicator		0
capacity Infrastructure	indi space authority	cator	level O	cooperation collaboration GE	O part	indicator		0
capacity Infrastructure	space authority space borne	cator	level O O	cooperation collaboration GE	O part spe	indicator icipation GEO offic actions on	SDG's	0
capacity Infrastructure	space authority space borne access 3rd par ground based	cator / ty missions		cooperation collaboration GE	0 part spe des	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on ignated GEO off vision data to GI	SDG's loce EOSS	0 • 0
capecity Infrastructure	space authority space borne access 3rd par ground based in-situ	cator / ty missions		cooperation collaboration GE	O part spe des pro- tus proj	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on ignated GEO off vision data to GI ects	SDG's loe EOSS	0 • 0 0
capacity	indi space authority space borne access 3rd par ground based in-situ modelling & co	ty missions		collaboration GE	iO part spe des pro us pro ES/	indication icipation GEO cific actions on ignated GEO off vision data to GI ects	SDG's loe EOSS	
capacity infrastructure	indi space authority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & co eo data exploit	cator / ty missions mputing ation		cooperation collaboration GE impact Copernic international	O part spe des pro- nus pro- ES/ met	indication logination GEO offic actions on i lignated GEO off vision data to Gi ects k ecrological	SDG's lice EOSS	
copacity infrastructure	indi space authority space borne access 3rd par ground based in-situ modelling & co eo data exploit n. public organ	ty missions mputing ation izations		cooperation collaboration GE impact Copernic international	C part spe des pro- tus pro- ES/ met UN	indicator icipation GEO offic actions on i ignated GEO offi- vision data to GI ects k ecrological / int. agreement	SDG's loce EOSS	
eo research	inst space suthority space borne access 3rd par ground based in-situ modeling & co eo data exploit n, public organ n, researchers	r ty missions mputing ation izations		cooperation collaboration GE impact Copernic international	IO part spe des pro- us pro- ES/ met UN INS	indicator logitation GEO cific actions on i lignated GEO off vision data to GI ects k ecrological / Int. agreement PIRE	SDG's loe EOSS	
eapacity infrastructure eo research	insti space suthority space borne access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & co eo data explait n, public organ n, researchers courses offered	r ty missions mputing ation izations		cooperation collaboration GE impact Copernic international	IO part spe des pro- tus pro- tus pro- tus us us us us star	icipation GEO cific actions on i ignated GEO off vision data to GI ects vision data to GI e	SDG's kee	
eopecity infrastructure eo ressarch	space authority space borne access 3rd par ground based in-stu modelling & co eo data exploit n, public organ a, researchers courses offerec publications	r ty missions mputing ation izations		cooperation collaboration GE impact Copernic international funding	C part spe des pro- us pro- us pro- us met UN INS star star	indication licipation GEO cific actions on i grated GEO offi- kision data to Gi ects k monological / list, agreement PIRE datrdzation 0 participation	SDG'a	
capacity infrastructure eo research industry base	space sufficients space sufficients spaces 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & co eo data exploit n. public organ n. researchers courses offered publications n. companies encomment	r ty missions mputing ation izations		cooperation collaboration GE impact Copernic international funding uptake	iO part spe des pro- us pro- ES/ met UN INS star R&I	Indicator isopation GEO cific actions on in ignated GEO off vision data to Gi ecta ecta k k ecrological / lint. agreement PIRE viderdization) participation indicator	SDG's lice EDSS 8	
eapacity infrastructure eo research industry base	space sufficients space sufficients space sufficients access 3rd part ground based in-situ modelling & co eo data exploit n, researchers courses offered publications n, companies engloyment exployment exployment	r ty missions mputing ation izations		codevation collaboration GE impact Copervice international funding uptake networking	iO part spe des pro- nus pro- ES/ met UN INS star R&I R&I	Indication sicipation GEO cific actions on in ignated GEO off vision data to Gi ecta ecta ecta ecta ecta ecta ecta ecta	SDG's Construction of the second seco	
eopachy infrastructure eo research industry base	space suthority space suthority space borne access 3rd par ground based in-stu modeling & co ac data exploit n, public organ n, researchers courses offered publications a. companies employment resellers, parto clusters	ry missions ty missions ation ation stations d s erships		cooperation collaboration OF impact Copernic international funding uptake networking	IO part spe des pro- nus proj ESJ met UN INS star R&D R&D netv data	indicator sicipation GEO cific actions on i grated GEO off actions on i grated GEO off actions on the sicilar of the enrological / let, agreement PRE enrological / let, agreement PRE indicator working a portals	SDO'S	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
eopachy infrastructure eo research industry base	space authors; space borne access 3-d para ground based in-stu modelling & co exists explain n, public regan n, researchers courses offence courses offence n, ompanies employment resetters, path clusters	r ty missions mputing ation izations 5 erships	Invel O O Image: Image of the second se	cooperation collaboration GE impact Coperryic international funding uptake networking policy	Provide the second seco	indicator isopation GEO offic actions on i grated GEO offic actions on i grated GEO offic ison data to GI ecos ecos participation indicator indicator indicator ecos participation indicator indi indicator indicator indicator indicator indicato	BOG'S loce EOSS 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	
eopeoly Infrastructure eo research Industry base	I pape authority ispace barne access 3-d par ground based in-stru modeling & co data exploit n publications n creaschers publications n companies everyloymet essiliers, patru clusters	ry missions mputing ation izations 5 erships	Invel O Image: Image of the second secon	Cooperation contaboration Off impact Copernic international funding uptake networking policy	A part of the speed of the spee	indicator isopation GEO (isopation GEO (isopation GEO (isopation GEO (isopation) (isopatio	SDG's Construction of the second seco	

Maturity card FYROM (ranged)





○ initial ▶ basic ● intermediate ● advanced ● optimized

Assessment (ranged)

LEGEND eo maturity card

CAPACITY	2		COOPERATION	2		UPTAKE	2	
score o	card							
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	leve
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	۰	uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	۰		policy	7
	industry base	-		international	2		penetration	•
				funding	2			

Detail evaluation

			cooperation		
infrastructure	space authority	2	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	•
	space borne	•		specific actions on SDG's	٠
	access 3rd party missions	2		designated GEO office	•
	ground based	•		provision data to GEOSS	•
	in-situ	2	impact Copernicus	projects	•
	modelling & computing	2	international	ESA	•
	eo data exploitation	•		meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	•		UN / Int. agreements	٠
	n. researchers	•		INSPIRE	•
	courses offered	•		standardization	-
	publications	•	funding	R&D participation	2
industry base	n. companies	•		1.10.10	
	employment	•	uptake	indicator	level
	mailer antembies		networking	networking	•
	reseners, parmersnips	-		data portals	٠
	clusters		policy	policy	•
				budget & investment	7
			nenetration	150	
			ponotionon		-

Maturity card Greece (ranged)

Maturity card FYROM (rounded)





FYROM

Assessment (rounded)

CAPACITY	2		COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	•	
score (card							
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	Indicators	level	maturity indicators	Indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	٠
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	•		policy	۰
	industry base	2		international	•		penetration	
				funding	2			

Detail evaluation

			cooperation		
nfrastructure	space authority	3	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	•
	space borne	h		specific actions on SDG's	
	access 3rd party missions	2		designated GEO office	
	ground based	•		provision data to GEOSS	
	in-situ	2	impact Copernicus	projects	
	modelling & computing	2	International	ESA.	
	eo data exploitation	۰		meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	•		UN / Int. agreements	
	n. researchers	•		INSPIRE	
	courses offered	•		standardization	-
	publications	•	funding	R&D participation	2
ndustry base	n. companies	•	10000	in the second second	
	employment	•	opcase	Indicator	
	resellers, partnerships	-	networking	networking	
	clusters			data portais	
			policy	policy	2
				budget & investment	۲
			penetration	use	۰
				capacity building	

Maturity card Greece (rounded)



ssess	montua								
CAPACITY	2		COOPERATION	-		UPTAKE	•		
maturity	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	level	
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	-	
	eo reserach	2		impact Copernicus	•		policy	-	
	industry base	2		international	-		penetration	٠	
etail e	evaluatio	n		funding	•				
letail e	valuatio	ndicator	level	funding	•	indicate	1	lovel	
etail e apacity frastructure	space autho	n indicator ority	level	funding cooperation collaboration GE0	• D parti	indicato	r	level 7	
etail e apecity frestructure	space authors	indicator ority e	level •	funding cooperation collaboration GE0	• parti spec	indicato icipation GEO cific actions on	sDG's	level 7 7	
etail e apacity frastructure	space author access 3rd	indicator ority e party missi	level 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	funding cooperation collaboration GEG	parti spec desk	indicate icipation GEO tific actions on gnated GEO of	SDQ's	level 7 7	
etail e	space autho space space sorro access 3rd ground bas	ndicator ority e party missi ed	level 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	funding cooperation collaboration GE0	 parti spec desi prov 	indicato icipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G	SDG's fice EOSS	level 7 7	
Gtail G apacity frastructure	space author space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ	ndicator ority e party missi ed	level 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	funding cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu	D parti spec desk prov us prok	indicate icipation GEO iffic actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts	SDG's fice EOSS	lovel	
ictail c	space author space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling &	ndicator ority e party missi ed	Isvel Ons Ons Ons Ons Ons	funding cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernics international	parti spec desk prov s prok ESA	indicate lepation GEO sific actions on gnated GEO of lision data to G acts	SDG's fice EOSS	lovel	
posity érastructure	space authors access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling & eo data exp	Indicator ority e party missi ed computing cloitation	lovel 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	funding cooperation collaboration GEG impact Copernics international	D parti spec desi prov is proje ESA	indicate icipation GEO affic actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts acrohogical	SDG's Tice EOSS	level	
Petail C spacity frastructure	space authors access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling & e o data exp n. public on	ndicator ority e party missi ed computing Notation ganizations	lovel Cons	funding cooperation collaboration GEG impact Copernicu international	 parti spec desk prov as projet as pr	indicato icipation GEO sife actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts sorological i lint, agreemen ano	SDG's SDG's EOSS		
pecity drastructure	space autor space autor space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling & eo data exp n, public on n, research	ndicator ority e party missi ed computing Notation ganizations ars	lovel i ovel ons i o i i i i i i i i i i i i i	funding cooperation collaboration GEG impact Copernics international	parti spec desi prov s prov s prov us nots UN INSF	indicato icipation GEO sific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts acrohogical / int. agreemen 2IRE	sDG's SDG's Fice State S	levrel 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	
pecity drastructure	space author space author space born access 3rd ground bas ground bas ground bas nodeling & e o data exp e o	n indicator orky e party missi ed a computing stotation ganizations ars ered	lovel Cons	funding cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernics international	parti spec desk prov s prov s final stan stan	Indicato Indication GEO cific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G acts enrological / Int. agreemen PIRE dardization	sDG's SDG's Fice State S	levret 7 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	
o research	space out space out access 3rd ground bas in stu modeling & oc data exp n, public n, n, public courses off publication	n indicator ority e party missi ed computing anizations ars ered s e e		funding cooperation collaboration GEG impact Copernics international	 parti spec desi prov zs proje eSA mete UN / INSF stan R&D 	Indicato Indication GEO cific actions on gnated GEO of ision data to G ects ecrological / Int. agreemen PIRE dardization e participation	SDG's	levret 7 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	
o research	space authr space authr space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modeling & e data exp e data exp e, publication n. research courses offi publication n. comparis	Indicator ority e party missi ed computing koitation ganizations ars ered s es t		Lunding cooperation colaboration GEG impact Copernics international funding uptable	D parti spec desi prov ss projo SSA Matter SSA NNSF Stan R&D	indicato icipation GEO ific actions on grated GEO of islon data to G acts acrological / int. agreemen PIRE dardization participation indicato	r SDG's SDG's EOSS I	ievel	
dustry base	space barn space barn access 3rd ground bas in situ modeling & e o data exp n, public on n, nsearch course of publication n, compani employmen	Indicator ority e party missi ed computing skoitation ganizations ars ered s s ered s s t t transe bios	Inst 0	Lunding cooperation collaboration GEG impact Copernics international funding uptake networking	D parti speci desk prov ss prok SSA meto UN / NSF stan R&D R&D	indicato idipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO of data to G acts acrological i lnt. agreemen PIRE dardization i participation indicato vorking	r SDG's Fine EOSS Fine Fine Fine Fine Fine Fine Fine Fine	ievel	
p etail e apacity arastructure	evaluatio	Indicator ority e party missi ed computing koltation ganizations ars ered s s es t t artnerships		Lunding Cooperation Collaboration GEG Impact Copernics Informational Lunding Lunding Lunding Lunding	 parti spec desi prov desi prov ESA metu NSF stan RSD stan netw data 	Indicate ocipation GEO alfa actions on grated GEO of ision data to G acts perological / int. agreemen PIRE derivation Indicate porking portals	SDG's Fice EOSS Fice Fice Fice Fice Fice Fice Fice Fice	level 3 4 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	

O initial **b**asic • intermediate • advanced • optimized

_								
CAPACITY	•	cod	OPERATION	•		UPTAKE	2	
maturity	indicators lev	el 🚺	maturity	indicators in	wei 🚺	maturity	indicators	le
capacity	infrastructure C		operation	collaboration	-	uptake	networking	1
	eo reserach			impact			policy	1
	industry base			international			penetration	
				funding				
	space borna		•		specifi	c actions on	SDG's	7
infrastructure	space authority			collaboration GEO	partici	pation GEO	800%	-
	access 3rd party r	missions	•		distion	ALC: NO DEC - D	50e	-
					arag	lated GEO on		
	ground based		•		provisi	on data to Gl	EOSS	0
	ground based in-situ		•	Impact Copernicus	provisi projec	on data to Gi ts	EOSS	0
	ground based In-situ modelling & comp	outing	• •	Impact Copernicus International	provisi project ESA	on data to Gl	EOSS	0
	ground based in-situ modelling & comp eo data exploitatio	outing	• • • • •	Impact Copernicus International	provisi projec ESA meteo	on data to Gl ts rological	EOSS	0
eo research	ground based In-situ modelling & comp eo data exploitatio n. public organiza	outing on	• • • •	impact Copernicus international	provisi project ESA meteo UN / h	on data to Gi ts rological rt. agreement	EOSS	0
eo research	ground based In-situ modelling & comp eo data exploitatio n. public organiza n. researchers	outing on tions	0 7 0 0 7	impact Copernicus international	provisi projec ESA meteo UN / In INSPIR	on data to Gl ts rological st. agreement RE	EOSS ta	0
eo research	ground based In-situ modelling & comp eo data exploitatiú n. public organiza n. reseàrchers courses offered	wing on tions	0 7 0 7 0 0	Impact Copernicus International	provisi projec ESA meteo UN / h INSPIF standa	on data to Gi ts rological st. agreement RE edization	ta	0
eo research	ground based in-situ modelling & comp eo data exploitati n. public organiza courses affered publications	outing on dions	• • • • • • •	Impact Copernicus International	provisi provisi ESA meteo UN / h INSPIF standa R&D p	rological nt. agreement RE enticipation	ta	0
so research	ground based in-stu modeling & comp eo data exploitatio n. public organiza n. researchers courses offered publications n. companies	suting on tions	• • • • • • • • • •	Impact Copernicus International funding	provisi project ESA meteo UN / h INSPIF standz R&D p	on data to Gi ts rological tt. agreement RE entization anticipation	ta .	0 h 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 0
eo research industry base	ground based in-situ modeling & comp eo data exploitativ n. public organiza n. researchers courses offered publications n. companies employment	outing on tions	0 7 0 7 0 0 7 7 0 0 7 7 0	Impact Copernicus International funding uptake- notworking	provisi provisi ESA meteo UN / In INSPIF standa R&D p	on data to Gi ts rological nt. agreement Relation anticipation anticipation chdicetor king	EDSS	0 h 0 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
so research, industry base	ground based instru modeling & comp data exploitation n. public organization n. public atoms publications n. comparises employment readies, partners	wing on tions	0 7 0 7 0 0 7 0 7 7 0 7	Impact Copernicus International funding uptake- notworking	provisi projec ESA meteo UN / It INSPIF standz R&D p	no data to Gi to rological nt. agreement RE erdization anticipation findicator findicator findicator		0 h • • h • • • • • • • • • • • • •
ea research	ground based institu modeling & comp en data exploitati n. public organiza courses offered publications n. comparises employment resolvers, partners clusters	wiling : bions	0 7 0 7 0 0 7 7 0 7 7	Impact Copernicus International funding uptake noteocking policy	project ESA meteo UN / h INSPIS standz R&D p netwo data p policy	on data to Gi ts rological rt. agreement RE ardization articipation king ortals	ta la	0 h h 0 h h 0 h 0 h 0 h h h h h 0 h h h h h h h h h h h h h
eo research	ground based institu modeling & comp en data exploitation n. public organiza curues offered publications n. comparises employment reseliers, parloars clusters	wing	0 7 0 7 0 0 7 7 0 7 7	Impact Copernicus International funding uptake notworking policy	netwo data p polocy budge	rological ts rological tt. agreement RE edization anticipation fing ortals	ta ti	0 h • h 7 0 h 7 0 h 7 0

Maturity card Israel (ranged)



maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	2	uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	•		policy	2
	industry base	-		international	2		penetration	
				funding	٠			

Detail evaluation

LEGEND en maturity card

			cooperation		
infrastructure	space authority	•	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	•
	space borne	-		specific actions on SDG's	•
	access 3rd party missions	-		designated GEO office	2
	ground based	-		provision data to GEOSS	7
	in-situ	2	impact Copernicus	projects	-
	modelling & computing	-	international	ESA	•
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	•
eo research	n. public organizations	2		UN / Int. agreements	•
	n. researchers	2		INSPIRE	•
	courses offered	-		standardization	-
	publications	-	funding	R&D participation	•
ndustry base	n. companies	-			
	employment	2	uptake	indicator	leve
	recellers northershine		networking	networking	2
	reserves, partnerships			data portais	-
	clusters		policy	policy	•
				budget & investment	2
			penetration	use	2
				capacity building	

Maturity card Israel (rounded)





Assessment (rounded)

CAPACITY	-		COOPERATION	2		UPTAKE	2				
Score card											
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level			
capacity	infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	-			
	eo reserach	2		impact Copernicus	-		policy	•			
	industry base	-		international	•		penetration	2			
				funding							

Detail evaluation

			cooperation		
infrastructure	space authority	۰	collaboration GEO	participation GEO	•
	space borne	-		specific actions on SDG's	
	access 3rd party missions	-		designated GEO office	2
	ground based	-		provision data to GEOSS	2
	in-stu	2	impact Copernicus	projects	-
	modelling & computing	-	international	ESA	
	eo data exploitation	-		meteorological	
eo research	n. public organizations	2		UN / Int. agreements	
	n. researchers	2		INSPIRE	
	courses offered	-		standardization	-
	publications	-	funding	R&D participation	
industry base	n. companies	-			
	employment	3	obrava	indicator	Nev e
	resollers partnerships		networking	networking	2
	the second se	-		data portals	
	ciusters	-	policy	policy	
				budget & investment	3
			penetration	u59	2
				capacity building	

Maturity card Romania (ranged)

Maturity card Romania (rounded)



CAPACITY	h		COOPERATION	•		UPTAKE	•	
core	card							
maturity ridicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	leve
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	•		policy	-
	industry base	-		international	-		penetration	-
				funding	-			
acity	ii Ii	ndicator	level	cooperation		indicator		level
scity istructure	in space author	ndicator	level	cooperation collaboration GEO	parti	indicator		level
acity Istructure	space autho	ndicator prity a	level O O	cooperation collaboration GEO	parti spec	indicator cipation GEO :ific actions on	SDG's	level O O
acity istructure	space autho space borne access 3rd p	ndicator ority a party mission	level O S O	cooperation collaboration GEO	parti spec desi	indicator cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO off	SDG's	level O O
astructure	space autho space borne access 3rd p ground base	ndicator ority e party mission ed	level O s O	cooperation collaboration GEO	parti spec desi	indicator cipation GEO tific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI	SDG's ice EOSS	level O O
acity astructure	space author space borns access 3rd p ground base in-situ	ndicator prity e party mission ed	level O s O	cooperation collaboration GEO	parti spec desi prov	indicator clipation GEO iffic actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI acts	SDG's ice EOSS	level O O O
pacity	space author space borns access 3rd p ground base in-situ modelling &	ndicator prity e party mission ed computing	level O s O S S O S S O S S O S S O S S O S S S S S S S S S S S S S	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	parti spec desi prov proje ESA	indicator cipation GEO lific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI ects	SDG's ice EOSS	level 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0
ipacity frastructure	space autho space borns access 3rd p ground base in-situ modelling & eo data expl	ndicator prity e party mission ed computing foitation	level C S C C S C C C C C C C C C C C C C	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	parti spec desi prov proje ESA mete	indicator cipation GEO iffic actions on i gnated GEO offi ision data to Gi acts sorological	SDG's	level 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
pacity frastructure	space autho space borne access 3rd p ground base in-situ modelling & eo data expl n. public org	ndicator prity a party mission ed computing loitation ganizations	level C C C C C C C C C C C C C	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international	parti spec desi prov prov ESA mete	indicator olpation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI acts corological Int. agreement	SDG's SDG	level 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
apacity frastructure	space autho space borne access 3rd p ground base in-situ modeiling & eo data expl n. public org n. researche	ndicator rity a party mission ed computing lotation ganizations rrs	level C C C C C C C C C C C C C	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicut international	parti spec desi prov ESA mete UN /	indicator cipation GEO tific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI ints sorological 'Int. agreement PIRE	SDG's ice EOSS	level 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
pacity frastructure	space autho space borne access 3rd p ground base in-situ modelling & eo data expl n. public org n. researche courses offe	ndicator prity party mission ed .computing totation ganizations ars ared	level C C C C C C C C C C C C C	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicut international	parti spec desi prov prov ESA mete UN / INSF	indicator cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI ision data to GI isi	SDG's construction of the second seco	level 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
pacity frastructure	space autho space borns access 3rd p ground base in-situ modelling & eo data expl n. public ogn n. researche courses off publications	ndicator prity a party mission ed computing loitation ganizations ars pred s		cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international funding	parti spec desi prov ESA mete UN / INSF stan R&D	indicator cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI ision data to GI icits cological 'Int. agreement IIRE dardization participation	SDQ's	level 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
research Justry base	space autho space borne access 3rd p ground base in-situ modelling & eo data expl n. public org n. researche courses offe publications n. companie	ndicator arity a party mission ed computing lotation ganizations aris ared s s	level	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international funding	parti spec desi prov prov prov scale prov prov prov prov prov prov prov prov	indicator cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI ision data to GI isi	SDQ's	
research Justry base	in space autho space borne access 3rd p ground base in-situ modelling & eo data expl n. public org n. researche courses offe publications n. companie employment	ndicator arity b party mission ed computing totation ganizations aris ared b t t t	level 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicue international funding uptake	parti spec desi prov proj proj spoj spoj spoj prov prov prov prov prov prov spoj spoj spoj spoj spoj spoj spoj spoj	indicator cipation GEO ific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI ision data to GI isi	BDG's	level
research lustry base	h h space autho space borns access 3rd j ground bass in etitu no delling 2 n, public org publications n, companie employment reselier, on	ndicator rify a party mission party mission ed computing panizations ars ars ars t t urnerships	Issel 0 0 0 1 <td>cooperation cofaboration GEO impact Copernicul International funding uptoke networking</td> <td>partii spec desi prov proj proj Stan un A Stan R&D</td> <td>indicator colpation GEO (ific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI ision data to GI i</td> <td>SDG's COSS 5</td> <td>level O A A A A A A A A A A A A A</td>	cooperation cofaboration GEO impact Copernicul International funding uptoke networking	partii spec desi prov proj proj Stan un A Stan R&D	indicator colpation GEO (ific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI ision data to GI i	SDG's COSS 5	level O A A A A A A A A A A A A A
peority frastructure o research dustry base	It is space authority of the space authority of the space borne access and y ground base of the space and the space of the	ndicator rifly a party mission ed computing totation panizations ars ars b a t t t t urtnerships		cooperation colaboration GEO limpact Copernicut international funding tuptake networking	partii spec desi prov prov prov scale spec prov prov prov spec spec spec spec spec spec spec spec	indicator cipation GEO ific actions on anated GEO off lision data to GI incts corological intra agreement 'Int. agreement 'Int. agreement undicator indicator corking portals	SDG's	level C C C C C C C C C C C C C
o research idustry base	the space auto- space auto- space borns ground base ground base modeling & no public out n, public out n, nucleosition n, public out n, no public out publications n, no publications n, no publications n, no public out n, no public out n, no public out n, no public out n, no public n, no pub	ndicator rity party mission ed computing lotation ganizations ris ris t t t urtnerships		cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicul international funding uptake networking policy	partil spect desi prov proj proj spoj ESA Metter Stan R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D R&D	indicator colpation GEO iffic actions on anated GEO official source of the original source of the original source of the original source of the original indicator orking portals sy	SDG's Construction of the second seco	level C C C C C C C C C C C C C
pacity frastructure o research dustry base	i transmissioner autoritation autoritation autoritation access 3rd granum bases 3rd granum	ndicator rity party mission ed .computing location ganizations rrs tred s t t treships	level O O O O O O O O O O O O O	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicus international funding uptate networking policy	partil spect prov prov spect SAA SPAC SPAC SPAC SPAC SPAC SPAC SPAC	indicator cipation GEO infite actions on anated GEO off ision data to GI ision data to GI i	SDG's SDG's SDGS SDGS SDGS SDGS SDGS SDGS SDGS SDG	
irastructure iresearch dustry base	the space auto space auto access of a ground base in situ modeling & n, puble org n, nesearche course offe publication n, norsearche enclasses n, norsearche enclasses n, companie enclosyment reseliers, pa clusters	ndicator prity party mission ed computing totation ganizations ers ses totation set totation ganizations tred t turnerships		cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicut international funding tytake policy pelicy	partii spec desi prov prov sprov sprov prov sprov prov prov prov prov prov prov prov	indicator cipation GEO dific actions on gnated GEO officient sion data to GI istor data to GI istor data to GI istor data to GI istor actual non data to GI indicator	SDG's	

CAPACITY	•		COOPERATION	-		UPTAKE	-	
Score o	ard							
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	leve
capacity	infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GE0	^	uptake	networking	2
	eo reserach	^		impact Copernicus	•		policy	-
	industry base	-		international	2		penetration	-
				funding	-			
	snace home		0		604	cific actions on	SDG's	0
nfrastructure	space autho	ority	0	collaboration GEC	parti	icipation GEO		0
	space borne	2	0		spec	cific actions on	SDG's	0
	space borne access 3rd (e party missions	0		spec	cific actions on ignated GEO of	SDG's lice	0
	space borns access 3rd p ground base	a party missions ed	0		spec desi	cific actions on ignated GED of rision data to G	SDG's fice EOSS	0
	space borne access 3rd p ground base in-stu	e party missions ed	0	Impact Copernicu	spec des prov s pro)	cific actions on Ignated GED of vision data to G ects	SDG's fice EOSS	0
	space borne access 3rd g ground base in-stu modeling &	e party missions ed computing	0 0 1	impact Copernicu international	spec desi prov s prov ESA	cific actions on ignated GED of vision data to G ects	SDG's fice EOSS	0
	space borne access 3rd j ground base in-situ modeling & eo data expl	e party missions ed computing loitation		Impact Copernicul	spec desi prov s proj ESA	cific actions on ignated GED of vision data to G ects ects ecrological	SDG's fice EOSS	0 • • 0
eo research	space borne access 3rd p ground base in-situ modelling & eo data expl n. public org	e party missions ed computing loitation ganizations	0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Impact Copernicu International	spec desi prov s pro) ESA meb UN	cific actions on ignated GED of vision data to G ects ecrological / Int. agreement	SDG's lice EOSS	0 • • • • • • • • •
eo research	space bome access 3rd j ground base in-stu modeling & eo data expl n. publo en n. researche	e party missions ed computing loitation ganizations ms	0 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	impact Copernicu International	spec desi prov s proj ESA meb UN INSI	cific actions on ignated GED of rision data to G ects worological / Int. agreement PIRE	SDG's fice EOSS	0 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
eo research	space born access 3rd j ground base in-stu modeling & eo data exp n, public er; n, researche courses offe	e party missions ed computing loitation ganizations ers ers	0 0 7 0 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Impact Copernicu International	spec desi prov s pro) ESA meb UN INSI stan	offic actions on ignated GED of resion data to G ects is ecrological / Int. agreement PIRE idardization	SDG's lice EOSS ts	0 • • • • • • • • •
io research	space born access 3rd j ground base in-stu modeling & eo data exp n, public er; n, researche courses offe publications	e party missions ed computing lioitation ganizations rrs med		Impact Copernicu International	spec desi prov s prov ESA meb UN INSI stan R&C	cific actions on ignated GED of rision data to G ects actors acto	SDG's floer	0 • • • • • • • • • • •
eo research nduatry base	space borne access 3rd j ground base in-s&u modeling & eo data expl n, public org n, researche courses offe publications n, companie	e party missions ed computing loitation ganizations rrs wed i s		Impact Copernicu International	spec desi prov s pro) ESA meb UN UN INSI stan R&D	olific actions on ignated GED of rision data to G ects ecrological / int, agreement PIRE eder dization 2 participation extremes	SDG's files	
eo research ndustry base	space borne access 3rd j ground base in-situ modeling & eo data expl a public org n. researche courses offe publications n. companie employment	e party missions ed computing loitation ganizations ers wad i s s		Impact Copernicu International funding uptiliko networking	spec desi prov s pro) ESA meti UN Stan R&D	olfic actions on ignated GED of vision data to G ects ecrological / Int. agreement PIRE ederdization 2 participation ederdization vorking	SDG'a	
eo research ndustry bese	space borne access 3rd j ground base in-stu modeling & e o data exp n, researche courses offe publications n, comparie employment resellers, pa	party missions d computing ioitation ganizations rrs red i s c t c		Impact Copernicu International funding uptako networking	spectral spe	olfic actions on ignated GED of ision data to G eccts eccological / Int. agreement PRE education 2 participation indicato vorking a portats	SDG'a	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
eo research industry bese	space borne access 3rd j ground base in-stu modeling & e o data expl n, public org n, researcha courses offe publications n, comparise employment medilers, pa clusters	party missions d computing iontation ganizations rrs res res t computing i		umpact Copernicu international funding uptako metworking policy	spec desi prov s pro) ESA meb UN Stan R&C	olific actions on grated GED of rision data to G acts acts acts acts active participation and cate vorking a portails ov y	SDG's flore ECOSS	
eo research industry beae	space borne access 3rd y ground base In-situ modeling & n-situ n-situ n, numer publications n, comparie publications n, comparie employmer, pa clusters	e party missions od computing fortation garizations ers ers ers ers t t t terships		Impact Copernicu International funding Lyctain networking policy	spec desi prov s prov ESA mete UN INSI stan R&C	olific actions on grated GED of rision data to G acts to G ects to G ectorological / Int, agreement PRE exterdization of participation edicate vorking a portais or or or or or or or or or or	SDG's floor	
eo research industry base	space borne access 3rd y ground base in-situ modeling & e odata vey n, public org n, public org publications n, comparis employment reselfers, pa clusters	e party missions od computing fortation garizations ers ers ers ers t t t terships		Impact Copernicu International funding optimic antworking policy penetration	spec desi prov s prov ESA mete UN INSI stan R&C	olfo actions on ignated GED of rision data to G ects ecosological vint, agreement PIRE eder dization op participation eder dization gap chaine exp get & investment	SDG's files EOSS S S S S S S S S S	0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

Maturity card Serbia (ranged)

O initial 🖿 basic 🖛 interr

ediate 🤊 adv

Tunisia 000 **Assessment (ranged)** Score card • . industry base **Detail evaluation** ess 3rd par h n-situ

data portal

diate 🤊 advanced 🔍

Maturity card Serbia (rounded)



	-		COOPERATION	-		UPTAKE	
Score	card						
maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	lovel	maturity indicators	Indicate
capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	-	uptake	network
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	-		palicy
	industry base	-		international	-		penetrat
				funding			
Detail	and a local difference of the						
capacity	evaluatio	ndicator) leveli	cooperation	1	indicator	à
capacity infrastructure	SPAILIALIO space auto	ndicetor arity	level	cooperation collaboration GEO	part	Indicator	
capacity infrastructure	space aufr	ndicator ority a	level	cooperation collaboration GEC	part spe	Indicator Icipation GEO Liffo actions on I	5DG's
ospacity infrastructure	space suffy space born access 3rd	ndicator orky R party missio	tevel	cooperation collaboration GEC	part spat	indicator icipation GEO tifle actions on I gnated GEO off	SDG's
capacity infrastructure	space aufh space born access 3rd ground bas	nicicator orky R party missio ed	level N ns N	cooperation collaboration GEO	Part spe des prov	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on I gnated GEO off ision data to GE	SDG's ice SOSS
ospacity infrastructure	space auth space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ	ndicator orky R party missio ed	level A N N N	cooperation collaboration GEO impact Copernicu) part spe des prov s proj	Intidator Icipation GEO cific actions on I gnated GEO off Islon data to Gil ects.	SDG's ice EOSS
capacity infrastructure	space auth space auth space born access 3rd ground bas in-situ modelling 8	ndicator ority e party missio ed computing	livel N N N N	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international	e part spec desi prov s proj ESA	Indicator icipation GEO cific actions on I gnated GEO off islion data to Gi ects	SDG's ice

	in-situ	
	modelling & computing	
	eo data exploitation	-
eo research	n. public organizations	2
	n. researchers	-
	courses offereid	-
	publications	-
industry base	n. companies	-
	employment	h
	resellers, partnerships	-
	clusters	

Assessment (rounded)

Maturity card Tunisia (ranged)

O initial 🖿 ba

ic 🛋

.

Maturity card Tunisia (rounded)

•



0000

Turkey

APACITY		ngem	COOPERATION	-		UPTAKE	2	
core (card							
maturity ndicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	leve
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	1	uptake	networking	2
	eo reserach	2		impact Copernicus	2		policy	2
	industry base	-		international	2		penetration	7
				funding	-			
pacity irastructure	i space autho	ndicator	level	cooperation collaboration GEC	part	indicator		level
		- diantes	Invest			Indianter		Incode
ipacity frastructure	i space autho	ndicator	level	cooperation collaboration GEC	part	indicator		level
ipacity frastructure	space authors	ndicator irity	level	cooperation collaboration GEC	parti	indicator cipation GEO cific actions on	SDG's	level
ipacity frastructure	space authors space borne access 3rd	ndicator irity) party missic	level	cooperation collaboration GEC	parti spec desi	indicator cipation GEO sific actions on gnated GEO off	SDG's	level
ipacity frastructure	space authors space borne access 3rd j ground base	ndicator irity arity missic arity missic	level ons	cooperation collaboration GEC	parti spec desi prov	indicator cipation GEO sific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI	SDG'S Ice EOSS	lovel 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
ipacity frastructure	space author space borne access 3rd g ground base in-situ	ndicator irity) party missic ed	level 7 ons 7 7	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu	parti spec desi prov 8 proj	indicator icipation GEO sific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI acts	SDG's Ice EOSS	
ipacity frastructure	i space autho space borni access 3rd j ground base in-situ modeling &	ndicator irity party missic ed computing	Jovel - - - - - - - - - - - - -	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicul international	parti spec desi prov s proj ESA	indicator icipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to Gi acts	SDG's ice EOSS	
ipacity frastructure	space author space author space borni access 3rd j ground base in-situ modelling & o data exp	ndicator rity barty missic ed computing loitation	level Called	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international	parti spec desi prov 8 proj ESA meb	indicator icipation GEO sific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI acts corological	SDG's Constant	
rastructure o research	space autho space bank access 3rd j ground base in-situ modeling & e o data exp n. public org n. public org	ndicator rity) aarty missic ed computing loitation panizations	iovel instants	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international	parti speci desi prov s proj ESA metri UN a	indicator cipation GEO affic actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI acts corological / Int. agreement accs	SDG's	lovel 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
pecity frastructure o research	space author space author access 3rd j ground base in-situ modeling & eo data exp n. public or n. researchs courses off	ndicator rity coarty missic ed computing loitation ganizations r8 ward	level information	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international	parti spec desi prov s proj ESA meti UN i INSI	indicator icipation GEO offic actions on gnated GEO offi ision data to GI acts corological / Int. agreement PIRE discritation	SDG's	lovel 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
pacity frastructure	space author space borns access 3rd j ground base in-situ modelling & e o data exp n. public org n. researche courses offic publications	ndicator rity boarty missic ed computing loitation rs rs red	level - <td>cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international</td> <td>parti speci desi prov s proj ESA meti UN INSI stan B&C</td> <td>indicator cipation GEO offic actions on gnated GEO official acts decorrections acrological functional scrological dardization transitionation</td> <td>SDG's Ice ICeSS ICSS I S</td> <td>lovel 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international	parti speci desi prov s proj ESA meti UN INSI stan B&C	indicator cipation GEO offic actions on gnated GEO official acts decorrections acrological functional scrological dardization transitionation	SDG's Ice ICeSS ICSS I S	lovel 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
pacity frastructure o research dustry base	space author space author space borns access 3rd ground base in-situ modeling & e o data exp n. public or n. researche courses offe publications n. companie	ndicator rity b anty mission of anty mission computing loitation real real is	Izvel A 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicu international funding	parti spec desi prov s proj ESA metri UN Stan R&C	Indicator cipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO off (sion data to GI acrological (Int. agreement miRE dardization (participation	SDG's ice EOSS	lovel 7 1 1 1 1 1 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
pacity frastructure o research dustry base	space authors space borns access 3rd j ground base in-situ modeling 8, e o data exp n. public org n. researche courses offe publications n. companie employment	ndicator rity barty missic ed computing loitation rs rs red i s t	Isvel	cooperation collaboration GEC Impact Copernicu International funding uptake	f parti spectra desired desire	Indicator cipation GEO cific actions on gnated GEO off ision data to GI actos corological i (Int. agreement arrel darditation garticipation indicator	SDG's Ice EOSS 5	
pacity frastructure > research dustry base	space author space author access 3rd g ground base in-situ modeling & n. public org n. n. researche curues off publications n. comparise endogram, participations n. comparise metalines, pa	ndicator rity b coarty mission ad computing loitation rs rs red is t rtnerships	level 	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicul international funding uptalia networking	spectrosp	indicator cipation GEO affe actions on anated GEO off ision data to GI ests acrological acrological arrite acrological arrite ar	SDG's Ice COSS S	
ppacity frastructure > research dustry base	space authors space authors access 3rd j ground base in-altu modeling & e o data exp n. public ory n. public ory n. public ators publicators n. n. companie employment resellers, pa	ndicator rity b coarty mission ad computing loitation rs rs red is t rtnerships	Ive	cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicul international funding uptake networking	parti spex desi prov s proj ESA metr UN Stan Stan R&D	indicator colpation GEO affe actions on geneted GEO off ission data to GI acts acrological corological indicator indicator undicator perking portals	50G's 100 5 5	
ppacity frastructure o research dustry base	space suffici space suffici space born access 3rd j ground bass ground bass ground bass ground bass ground bass ground bass ground bass ground bass access 3rd n, researcha courses off publications n, comparis n, comparis amployment resellers, pa clusters	ndicator inity: b boarty missic ad computing loitation rs computing loitation rs sing transitions rs t t thereships	Hype 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 10	cooperation extrabonation GEC Impact Copernicu International funding extraording policy	parti p	Indicator cipation GEO affe actions on gnated GEO off ision data to Gi sects coological accological arrange dardization indicator varking uportals py	SDG's Construction of the second seco	
psocity frastructure o research dustry base	apace authors space born access 3rd j ground base ground base of the statu modeling & n publications n, comparison n, comparison	ndicator rity: b boarty missic ad computing loitation rs sing transations rs t transations rs t transations t transations t transations t t transations t t t t t t t t t t t t t		cooperation collaboration GEC impact Copernicul international funding uptake networking policy	partitive	Indicator cipation GEO site actions on annet de GEO of ision data to Gi actis acrosological fint, agreement arrenticipation t participation indicator conting portals ay actis portals and part all investment and actis actional actional indicator	sDG's cost of the second secon	

Maturity card Turkey (ranged)

CAPACITY	2		COOPERATION	2		UPTAKE	2	
Score c	ard							
maturity indicators	Indicators	Jevel	indicators	indicators	level	maturity	indicators	ke
capacity	infrestructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	-	uptake	networking	1
	eo reserach	2		impact Copernicus	2		policy	
	industry base	2		international	2		penetration	1
				funding	-			
	space borns	•	2		tiped	cific actions on	SDG's	-
capecity	1	ndicator	level	cooperation	0	indicator		level
infrastructure	space autho	ority	-	collaboration GEO	parti	icipation GEO	2000 Y 1	7
	space borns		-		spec	cific actions on	spors	-
	access and	party missions			Des	ghased GEU on	0000	-
	ground base	ed		Internet Constants	prov	aston pata to Ga	5055	-
	modeline 8	come fina	-	international	E DEA	eco.		-
	eo data esp	lotation			met	emboiral		
an managerith	n miblic or	aprations	2		LIN	lini ameriment		2
	n. researche	ers.	2		INSI	PIRE	7	2
	courses offe	ared	•		stan	dardization		-
	publications		2	funding	RAD	participation		7
	n. companie	15	2	100000				Contraction of
industry base			2	optako		indicator		evel
industry base	employmen		-	networking	nete	vorking		2
industry base	employment resultors, pr	rtnerships			Cata	i portani		-
industry base	employmen resulters, pr clusters	irtnerships	-	maline		1		
industry base	employment resulters, pa clusters	ithenships	-	policy	hat	nat & incontinue		
industry base	employmen resellers, pr clusters	itherships	-	policy	bud	get & investmer	nt.	2

Maturity card Turkey (rounded)

CRADIT.	Assessment (ranged)	CRADILE CRADILE		Assessment (rounded)
Albania		Albania	2	2 3
Bulgaria		Bulgaria	3	3 3
Cyprus		Cyprus	2	3 3
Egypt		Egypt	3	2 3
FYROM		FYROM	2	2 2
Greece		Greece	4	5 5
Israel	CAPACITY ? COOPERATION • UPTAKE ?	israel	5	3 4
Romania		Romania	3	4 4
Serbia	CAPACITY D COOPERATION OUPTAKE	Serbia	3	3 3
Tunisia		Tunisia	3	3 3
Turkey		Turkey	4	4 4
LEGEND eo maturity c	and O initial B basic a intermediate 9 advanced 0 actimized	LEGEND eo maturity card	0 ini	tial 2 basic 3 intermediate 4 advanced 5 optimized

Global Assessment (ranged)

Global Assessment (rounded)



We have also prepared intermediate processes to get statistically the right value planned to be used. The assessment has considered the following values, being

- the values extracted being the Σ of all indicators & media is named (C) : [Σ 1,2,3,..., 32 / 32]
- the Σ of indicators per three main pillars (3) & media of each main section will be corresponding with (B) : [capacities (Σ 1,2,3,..., 15/ 15) + collaboration(Σ 1,2,3,..., 11/ 11) + uptake (Σ 1,2,3,..., 6/ 6)]
- Σ of indicators per three main pillars & media each of subsections will be the (A) : [CAPACITIES [infrastructure (Σ 1,2,3,..., 7/ 7)+ research (Σ 1,2,3,4/ 4) + industry (Σ 1,2,3,4/ 4)] + COLLABORATION [GEO (Σ 1,2,3,4/ 4)+Copernicus (Σ 1)+ Int. efforts (Σ 1,2,...,5/ 5)+ funding (Σ 1)] + UPTAKE [networking (Σ 1,2/2) + national policy (Σ 1,2/2) + penetration (Σ 1,2/2)]]

Level A: media group indicators: Capacities (national infrastructure, critical mass of EO researchers, industry base) // Collaboration (Collaboration through GEO, Impact of Copernicus, Participation to other international efforts, availability of funding) // Uptake (networking activities, National Policies implementation, Penetration) Level Aa: media three main pillars [capacities, collaboration, uptake] Level Aaa (ranged) Level Aaaa (rounded)

The examples below visualise from the ranged or rounded perspectives:







Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	capacity infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	0		policy	
	industry base			international	-		penetration	7
				funding	-			

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus	0		policy	
	industry base	0		international			penetration	-
				funding				

Maturity card Albania (comparison > contrasted assessment)





Bulgaria



Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	apacity infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	-
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	•		policy	
	industry base			international	2		penetration	
				funding	-			

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	0	uptake	networking	
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	1		policy	•
	industry base			international	-		penetration	-
				funding				

Maturity card Bulgaria (comparison > contrasted assessment)





Cyprus



Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	-	uptake	networking	-
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus			policy	
	industry base			international	-		penetration	•
				funding	2			

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	structure	cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus			policy	0
	industry base	0		international	-		penetration	-
				funding	2			

Maturity card Cyprus (comparison > contrasted assessment)





Egypt

C ranged C rounded	Contrasted Assessment						
B ranged	B rounded						
	CAPACITY COOPERATION UPTAKE						
Aaaa ranged	Aaaa rounded						
	CAPACITY COOPERATION UPTAKE						
Aaa ranged	Aaa rounded						
	CAPACITY COOPERATION UPTAKE						
Aa ranged	Aa rounded						
	CAPACITY - COOPERATION UPTAKE						

Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	-
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus			policy	
	industry base			international			penetration	
				funding	-			

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GEO	0	uptake	networking	
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus			policy	
	industry base			international			penetration	-
				funding				

Maturity card Egypt (comparison > contrasted assessment)





FYROM



Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	capacity infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	-
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	0		policy	
	industry base			international	-		penetration	
				funding				

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	0	uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus	0		policy	0
	industry base			international			penetration	
				funding				

Maturity card FYROM (comparison > contrasted assessment)




Greece



Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	٠
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	•		policy	•
	industry base	2		international	•		penetration	•
				funding	2			

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	7	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	۲
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus	•		policy	7
	industry base	-		international	2		penetration	٠
				funding	2			

Maturity card Greece (comparison > contrasted assessment)





Israel



Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	7
	eo reserach	•		impact Copernicus			policy	7
	industry base	2		international	-		penetration	٠
				funding	•			

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	2	cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	2		impact Copernicus			policy	-
	industry base	2		international	-		penetration	٠
				funding	•			

Maturity card Israel (comparison > contrasted assessment)





Romania



Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	۰	uptake	networking	-
	eo reserach	2		impact Copernicus	•		policy	•
	industry base	-		international	•		penetration	7
				funding	•			

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	leve
capacity	infrastructure	-	cooperation	collaboration GEO	2	uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus			policy	7
	industry base	-		international	2		penetration	-
				funding				

Maturity card Romania (comparison > contrasted assessment)





Serbia



Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	•	cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	7
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	•		policy	-
	industry base	-		international	2		penetration	
				funding				

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	•
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus			policy	•
	industry base	-		international			penetration	-
				funding				

Maturity card Serbia (comparison > contrasted assessment)





Tunisia



Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO	•	uptake	networking	
	eo reserach	-		impact Copernicus	•		policy	-
	industry base			international			penetration	7
				funding				

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure		cooperation	collaboration GEO		uptake	networking	
	eo reserach			impact Copernicus			policy	•
	industry base			international	-		penetration	-
				funding				

Maturity card Tunisia (comparison > contrasted assessment)





Turkey

C ranged	C round	ed 🛛	Contrasted Assessment
3		4	4 3 4
B ranged			Brounded
4	3	4	4 4 4
Aaaa ranged			Aaaa rounded
4	3	4	4 4 4
Aaa ranged			Aaa rounded
3	3	4	4 4 4
Aa ranged			Aa rounded
3	3	4	4 4 4

Score card rounded

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	4	cooperation	collaboration GEO	3	uptake	networking	4
	eo reserach	4		impact Copernicus	4		policy	4
	industry base	4		international	4		penetration	4
				funding	3			

Score card ranged

maturity indicators	indicators	level	maturity indicators	indicators	level		maturity indicators	indicators	level
capacity	infrastructure	4	cooperation	collaboration GEO	3		uptake	networking	4
	eo reserach	4		impact Copernicus	4			policy	4
	industry base	3		international	4			penetration	4
				funding	3				
LEGEND e	eo maturity caro	ł	0 init	ial 2 basic 3	intern	nedi	ate 4 ad	lvanced 5 opt	imizeo

Maturity card Turkey (comparison > contrasted assessment)



Representation (Σ of all indicators per three main pillars / media each of subsections)									
	capacities	RANGED	ROUNDED	cooperation	RANGED	ROUNDED	uptake	RANGED	ROUNDED
Albania	1,08			1,15			1,83		
Bulgaria	1,82		•	1,89			1,83		
Cyprus	1,13			1,93		•	1,50		
Egypt	1,75		•	1,13			1,50		
FYROM	1,21			0,83	0	0	1,00		
Greece	3,25	•	•	3,65	1	•	3,83	7	•
Israel	3,54	r	•	2,35	•		3,00	7	•
Romania	2,39	•	•	3,28	1	•	2,83	•	•
Serbia	1,99		•	2,03		•	2,17	-	
Tunisia	1,73		-	1,88		-	2,00	-	
Turkey	2,96	•	•	2,75	•	•	3,00	7	•

Maturity cards (Σ of indicators / subsections/ representing each of the pillars > representation)



Maturity representation in Radar chart (3 pillars > subsections> capacities)



Maturity representation in Radar chart (3 pillars > subsections> cooperation)





Maturity representation in Radar chart (3 pillars > subsections> uptake)

During the course of the visualisation exercise, different graphics have been considered to approach the most accurate level of maturity representation. The graphic on contrasted assessment illustrates the media of all representations.





Annex 6: Definitions

EARSC classification based on EO activities

(i) Satellite operator - defined as the owner of a satellite system

- (ii) Data reception and distribution owner or operator of a ground station (EO).
- (iii) Data reseller satellite or other data from non-EU sources
- (iv) Value- adding services company using EO data to produce products
- (v) Downstream / GIS services but with a satellite data element.
- (vi) Consultancy studies / analyses not VA services.

(vii) Hardware / software provision.

GEO-CRADLE classification based on EO activities by users

- (i) Space strategy: Space agencies
- (ii) Upstream: hardware/software manufactures, launchers, satellite operators
- (iii) Downstream: Raw data providers, EO value-adders, GIS providers, consultancies
- (iv) End users: In house GIS providers, managers & decision makers, citizens

Classification of companies by size

- -Micro: 1-9 employees < €2 million -Small: 10-49 employees (includes micro) < €10 million -Medium-sized: 50-249 employees < €50 million
- -Large: over 250 employees €50 million+

Examples of missions whose data are resold:

ALOS (MS+PALSAR), ALOS-2, Aqua, Bilsat, Cartosat-1(P-5), Cartosat-2, COSMO- SkyMed, DEIMOS-1, Envisat, EO-1 (ALI, Hyperion), Eros-A1, Eros-B1, ERS- 1/2,,Formosat-2, GeoEye-1, Ikonos, IRS-1 C/D, IRS-P6, (Resourcesat-1), IRS- ResourceSat 2, J-ERS, Kanopus-V/BeIKA-2, KOMPSat-1, KOMPSat-2, KOMPSat-3, KOMPSat-3A,KOMPSat-5,KVR-1000,Landsat 1-7, ,Landsat 8, OrbView-3, Pléiades 1A-1B ,QuickBird-2, Radarsat-1, RADARSAT-2, RapidEye, RASAT, Resurs-DK1, Resurs-P , Spot 1-4, Spot 5, SPOT 6 & 7, Terra (ASTER- MODIS), TerraSAR-X, TH-01, THEOS, UK- DMC SLIM-6, WorldView-1, WorldView-2, WorldView-3.

Example of Courses being offered by Universities:



- Geoinformatics •
- **Environment and Development**
- Geology and Geo-environment
- Applied Geography and Spatial Planning
- Techniques and Methods in Urban Analysis, Design and Management
- Applied and Environmental Geology
- Meteorology Climatology and Atmospheric Environment
- Agriculture
- **Environmental Physics**
- Environmental Engineering and Science
- Atmospheric Sciences and the Environment

- **Energy and Environment** •
- Meteorology Applied and **Environmental Physics**
- Space Science Technologies and Applications
- Geography Applied and Geo-Informatics
- **Environmental Sciences**
- Ecological Engineering and Climate Change
- Geotechnology and the Environment
- Water Resources and Climate Change
- Environmental Management, Sustainable Energy and Climate change

Example of thematic type of courses offered (bibliography from Greece contact partner):

- Methods for precise geodetic measurements and data processing
- Geospatial data vizualization
- Geoportals and geospatial services
- Location based services
- **Digital photogammetry**
- Geodesy in city planning •
- Real estate cadastre
- Applied geophysics in geomatics •
- Application of GNSS systems
- Advanced remote sensing technologies
- Valuation of real estate
- Spatial and temporal databases
- Geosensor networks •
- Optimization in geodetic surveying •
- Service oriented architecture in GIS
- GIS Geographic Information System •
- Remote Sensing in Geography
- **GIS in Spatial Planning** •
- Advanced GIS •
- **GIS and Tourism** •
- **GIS and Population** •
- Remote Sensing Methods of **Environmental Research**
- **Geospatial Data Bases**
- **Digital Mapping of the Environment**
- **Environmental Information Systems**
- Meteorological Measurements
- **Remote Sensing**
- **GIS Application in Geology**
- Fundamentals of Gravimetry
- Gravimetry
- **GIS Technologies**
- Physical Principles of Remote Sensing

- Analysis of the accuracy of terrestrial laser scanning
- Integrated geodetic measurement systems in engineering fields
- Methods of precise satellite positioning
- Energy Mechanics and Natural **Resources Management**
- Energy Monitoring and Accreditation of Buildings
- Environmental Measurement Technologies
- Environmental and Industrial Development
- Foundations of Ecology
- **Renewable Energy Sources**
- Foundations of Energy
- **Renewable Energy Technologies**
- Environmental Impact Assessment
- **Building Energy Management**
- Critical Analysis and Research Preparation
- **Energy Dissertation**
- **Economics for Renewable Energy**
- Heat Transfer and Heat Exchangers
- **Process Intensification**
- Ventilation and Air Conditioning
- Technology Futures and Business Strategy
- Demand Management and Energy Storage
- **Building Inspectors**
- Inspectors Boilers and Heating Installations
- **Inspectors HVAC installations**
- Rational Use of Energy and the renewable forms



- Multimedia Education Material
- Solar DHW and Space Heating
- Design of Solar DHW/Space Heating Systems
- Basic Principles of Energy Savings
- Specialization of Energy and Environment
- Solar Energy Systems
- Energy and Environment
- Electrochromic devices
- Photo-electrochromic devices
- Dye-Sensitised solar cells
- Photovoltaic technology applications
- Solar Thermal applications
- Thermal Solar Collectors and Systems
- Thermal Storage Systems- Analysis and Design
- Solar cooling
- Thermal Distillation Desalination
- Mechanical/Solar-assisted Drying Processes and Systems
- Metrology of Energy Quantities
- Computational Fluid Dynamics and Heat Transfer
- Solar and Thermal radiation Thermodynamics of the atmosphere
- Geophysical Fluid Dynamics
- Methods and instruments in environmental measurements - Data analysis
- Numerical Methods for Geophysical Fluid
- Physics of the build environment
- Building energy design

- Principles and applications of remote sensing
- Atmospheric and Environmental Physics
- Atmospheric Technology
- Energy Resources in the Environment
- Radiative transfer models
- Renewable Energy resources
- Statistical analysis of time series
- Radiation in the atmosphere
- Environmental data analysis
- Satellite remote sensing
- Agrometeorology and Hydrometeorology
- Atmospheric pollution and climate change
- Satellite Meteorology and Climatology
- Meteorology and Climatology
- Principles of atmospheric chemistry
- Environmental chemistry
- Space environment
- Satellite communications
- Applied computer science
- Signal/image processing and pattern recognition
- Big data management
- Space applications
- Earth system science
- Satellite systems and networks
- Dependable and energy efficient computing
- Satellite positioning and navigation
- Space business aspects



Annex 7: Bibliography

The following references were supervised as preparatory activities during the course of this deliverable

Several EU projects in the regions have been searched as starting phase those are:

- ACTRIS (Aerosols, Clouds, and Trace gases Research Infrastructure Network)
- AfriGEOSS (AfriGEOSS initiative, developed within the GEO framework)
- BalkanGEONet (Balkan Geo Network, towards inclusion Balkan countries into GEO)
- BRAGMA (Bridging Actions for GMES and Africa)
- ConnectinGEO (Coordinating an Observation Network of Networks Encompassing satellite and INsitu to fill the Gaps in European Observations)
- IASON (International Action for the Sustainability of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea Environment)
- OBSERVE (Strengthening and development of Earth observation activities for the environment in the Balkan area)

Related to sector studies:

- Copernicus User uptake, Space -Tec partners, February 2016
- EARSC Views on the Procurement of the Copernicus Services, September 2014
- EARSC Developing the EO Services Industry, September 2013

Related to policy:

- EARSC Views on European Space Strategy, June 2016
- EARSC Survey into Public Bodies using EO data and services, April 2016

Related to maturity readiness:

- Evaluating Renewable Energy policy, UKERC (J. Watson, 2014, policy paper, presented by the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA)
- Maturity Model for Assessing the Digital Readiness of Manufacturing Companies (A. Carolis, © IFIP International Federation for Information Processing 2017)
- Networked Readiness Index. Geospatial readiness (Geospatial World, 2017)
- Real growth rate in 2016 (link), Wikipedia List of global indicators
- Taxonomy of Economic Activities Based on R&D Intensity, Galindo-Rueda © OECD/OCDE 2016

Related to benchmarking:

- International benchmarking from OECD countries (S. Helgason, OECD, February 2017)
- Regional benchmarking in the smart specialization process: Identification of reference regions based on structural similarity (M. Navarro et al. JRC 2014)
- The Global Energy Architecture Performance Index 2017: Methodological Addendum (World Economic Forum 2017)
- The Global Information Technology Report 2015 (World Economic Forum, 2015)





Annex 8: Benchmarking

In order to support countries defining their (G)EO maturity, the maturity assessment is proposed in this report, but countries might need to select a pure maturity assessment or a comparative assessment which would be able to semi-compare practices across countries in order to benchmark maturity within different indicators. These two methods are different steps of the maturity understanding, firstly, to identify what desired level countries have to reach and, secondly, to select some indicators, which have to be improved.

The benchmarking practice fraught with difficulty for many reasons, notably on how to contemplate differences in governmental expectations, difficulty in identifying total resources, right number of entities developing of the EO activities, particularly w.r.t. private companies, or varying levels of government transparency including public organisations and funding. The assignment of values to the various indicators for a given country should follow– as much as possible – an objective approach and allow scrutiny/comparison against countries with well-mapped capacities.

Assuming that benchmarking will help to identify and implement best practices in the country; those have to be evaluated and adjusted to the needs of the benchmarking of the country. Overall, it is interesting to highlight the following issues for using benchmarking in future projects:

- *i.* Assess the performance of the relevant national EO sector objectively to allow comparison and evaluation in a more equitable way: Countries should be assessed on their current status in relation to the maturity indicators criteria and benchmarking guidelines. The resulting ratings should focus on the actual/current level of performance assessed against the maturity indicators, rather than any degree of improvement. It should be noted that the process to provide assessments and evaluations and maturity indicators derives from informed judgments from stakeholders. Indicators are used to assist country teams in determining country scores so national contact points will have the value of the dimensions, the rating and its justification of each of the dimensions
- *ii.* Highlight the evolution of other countries: the application of the methodology should consider the size of the economy in the countries and its degree of sophistication in implementing the maturity indicators. Accordingly, the criteria could be developed to ensure that, to the extent possible, their contents are not influenced by the level of development in the country; but in parallel, the methodology could be applied in other regional areas.
- iii. Expose areas where improvement is needed and reveal underlying problems of the country: All benchmarking activities involve performance measurements of some kind and these can become catalysts for progress beyond the scope of the specific sector being investigated. Such an activity might bring additional benefits such as an understanding of the nation's performance when compared to third countries, standardisation of methods and uptake of best practices, providing links to the budget process and other relevant decision-making activities.
- iv. Best practices: Benchmarking against high performing countries allows comparison of the information gathering exercise itself. Through such a process, particularly useful methodologies for identification of EO-sector related performance information within the framework of good governance, economic and social development. The resulting improved prioritization of resources and facilitation and coordination for the benchmarking process facilitates optimisation of this process in the target country.
- v. To predict whether improvement will be successful in future revisions of country strategic plans. The goal will be to highlight a set of instruments to improve the country position and future revisions by answering the overall question of what it would take for a country to catch up with the country of reference?' There could be a wide range of sub-questions to arrive at this goal e.g.: What are the main elements/priorities for evolving in geo-information? What are the necessary steps to implement future revisions? How will the country develop market-based 'next level' of services working with strategic sectors? Could the Government be considered as a customer?



As the benchmarking can be costly and time/resources consuming (establishing benchmarks that are applicable across countries with different GDPs, income levels, different populations and, of course, different EO needs); within this report, it is important to note that this methodology will just organise the process of benchmarking in order to achieve good results in later studies. We are just exploring the benchmarking as a method to compare the performance of the geo-information processes and products with the best performances of other countries in future activities. A full benchmarking approach requires an array of considerations and resources which will not be considered as part of the methodology.



Annex 9: Geospatial readiness index

There is a little documentation on how to develop a maturity readiness that is theoretically robust, tested and widely accepted, but some exercises on this direction have been taken in the last years. The activity done by Geospatial Media and Communications is one of those.

The Countries Geospatial Readiness Index (CGRI) is a comparative assessment of 50 countries spread across geographies, at different development stages, evaluated and assessed for their geospatial maturity. The index is an important tool for decision makers to comprehend the areas for developing geospatial capabilities for value-creation, economic-growth, and overall national development.

The index assesses a country's geospatial capabilities on the following pillars (figure 15): (i) Data infrastructure, (ii) Policy framework, (iii) Institutional capacity, (iv) User adoption level, (v) Industry fabric, while GEOCRADLE methodology base the assessment in three main blocks (a) Capacities (b) Cooperation and (c) Uptake and each block is subdivided in groups of indicators.

Geospatial	GEO-CRADLE	Capacities	Cooperation	Uptake
CGRI	methodology			
Data infrastructure		*		
Policy framework			*	*
Institutio	nal capacity	*		
User add	option level			*
Indust	ry fabric	*		

Table 27: Comparison Geospatial CGRI / GEO-CRADLE maturity indicators methodology

The CGRI was introduced by Geospatial Media and Communications in 2017, parallel to the activities GEO-CRADLE was conducting. The major goal was providing a framework to the decision makers in respective countries to better understand the imperative of developing and inclusive geospatial ecosystem strategy. This index can be used by stakeholders of a country to know and identify the key areas for developing effective and efficient geospatial capabilities which could then contribute to robust national growth and development.

It is also to note than while the CGRI is including key segments of the geospatial industry – GNSS and Positioning, GIS/Spatial Analytics, Earth Observation, and 3D Scanning, the GEO-CRADLE maturity indicators are focus on GEOSS and Copernicus activities with a strong component on Earth Observation.

Future activities could improve the methodology and relate the exploitation of the GEO-CRADLE methodology with the Geospatial readiness index.



END OF DOCUMENT