

GEO-CRADLE Kick-Off Meeting Friday, 19th of February, 2016

WP3 – Gap Analysis, Indicators and Priorities

Grigoris Chatzikostas, InoSens





IONIC Centre, 11 Lysiou Street Athens, Greece









To conduct a thorough gap analysis using user needs from T2.4 and EO capacities inventories from T2.1, T2.2, T2.3.



To formulate a set of maturity indicators pertaining to the level of progress of each country towards implementation of GEO and Copernicus.



To define the priorities related to regional challenges using output of previous two steps and devise an action plan to tackle them.



Task	Task Leader	Task Participants	Time Frame
T3.1 – Gap Analysis D3.1 – Gap Analysis Report	INS	NOA, IBEC, CEDARE, CERT, IPB, CIMA, EARSC, EURISY, EGS	M5-M9
T3.2 – Maturity Indicators D3.2 Maturity Indicators and country (G)EO profile I D3.4 Maturity Indicators and country (G)EO profile II	EARSC	NOA, CEDARE, CERT, TAU, CUT, UZAY, SRTI, INOE, UCSM, INCA, INS	M6-M26
T3.3 – Priorities in Relation to Regional Challenges D3.3 Priorities Action Plan	CERT	NOA, IBEC, CEDARE, INS	M7-10



Task 3.1 – Gap Analysis

Task Leader – InoSens





Task 3.1 – Gap Analysis







Collaborative research between countries seen as good starting point towards an integrated operation Africa-wide network





Need to move towards a continent level community to apply EO potential for marine and coastal areas, long-term natural resource management, & water management.





Need for cohesion and coordination within and between countries/fields, start with a top-down approach to drive enabling policies and common standards





Need to overcome fragmentation by promoting GEOSS advantages and to provide higher-quality products to endusers.





Very specific recommendations to improve integration of European atmospheric probing capacities: transparency and commonly defined measurements.



Task 3.2 – Maturity Indicators

Task Leader – European Association of Remote Sensing Companies





Task 3.2 – Maturity Indicators



Ionic Center



Task 3.2 – Maturity Indicators

			Awareness	Capacity	GEOSS & Copernic Implementation	us		
Maturity Table per country Example	rity ry vy vy vy vy vy vy vy vy vy v							
Albania								
Bulgaria		Maturity	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3		
Cyprus		criteria	"Beginner"	"First traction"	"Active Engagement"	"Full swing"		
		1	- No coordinated EO	- Circumstancial dissemination	 Regular Workshops and other dissemination activities 	-Penetration of EO services and products in public services (e.g.		
Egypt		Awareness		dissemination	- Regular networking	civil protection)		
Greece					initiatives (national, regional	- Permanent Fora for EO-		
					level)	related dissemination		
			- No national infrastructure	-Existence of limited	-Critical mass of researchers	- Operation of a space agency		
			- No investment policy - No involvement in	infrastructure -Initial investments on	in the field of EO	- Centers of excellence - Commitment, national		
		Capacity	capacity building projects	capacity building	 Growing industry base Medium involvement in 	planning /prioritisation and		
				- Light involvement in	capacity building projects	financial support		
				capacity building projects		- Solid industry base		
		GEOSS and	- No participation thus far	- One-off participation in	- Participation in GEO SBAs,	- Lead in GEO SBAS, tasks, etc.		
			in GEO projects - No data linked to GEOSS	GEO relevant projects - Limited provision of data	tasks etc. - Implementation of GEO	 Lead of GEO relevant projects Direct provision of data and 		
	_		portal	to GEOSS portal	relevant projects	products/services to GEOSS		
		Copernicus			- GEO partner organizations	- Designated GEO office		
	Implementation				- National representation and			
						participation in HLWG, Plenary		
						meetings, other committees		

- Define common methodology for country (G)EO Maturity Assessment
 - Introduce indicators that will help monitoring within and beyond the project
 - Provide standardised "scoring" tool to GEO
- Enable monitoring of progress against regional priorities

Mock-up of Maturity table and relevant criteria



Task 3.3 – Priorities in Relation to Challenges

Task Leader – Le Centre d'Etudes et de Recherch des Télécommunications











Task 3.3 – Priorities in Relation to Reg. Challenges









Thank you

Grigoris Chatzikostas gchatzicostas@gmail.com



