

EO-MINERS 6-monthly Management Committee meeting

Minutes of meeting

Drafted by F. Mojon Lumier, reviewed by S. Chevrel

Date:	July 1 st and 2 nd , 2010
Venue	DLR - – Oberpfaffenhoffen D-82234 Wessling (Germany)
Distribution:	All partners
Organisation	S. Chevrel (BRGM) - C .Fisher (DLR)
Version:	0.1
Attendees	Coordinator , WP Leaders, project assistant
Description:	Periodic Management meeting to assess progress, discuss problems, plan future activity at M6

Thursday July 1st,2010–

Participants	Initial	WP lead	Organisation
Stéphane Chevrel	SC	0	BRGM
Philipp Schepelmann	PS	1	WI
Eyal Ben Dor	EBD	2	TAU
Christian Fisher	CF	3	DLR
Andreas Müller	AM	3	DLR
Stuart Marsh	SM	4	BGS
Horst Hejny	HH	5	MIRO
Frédérique Mojon Lumier	FML	0	BRGM

The agenda of the meeting is in Appendix 1

WELCOME address

CF welcomed the participants to the DLR brand new building and meeting room.

He asked if everyone agreed with the Agenda and HH mentioned the Mineral conference in Madrid was missing.

SC said the agenda was meant to be an informal document providing the outline for discussion. It could be modified as the meeting was going, if needed.

Overview of the project

SC as coordinator of the project listed the major problems encountered during the M1- M6 period and started the review.

- 3rd Demo site issue
- Lack of available time for the coordinator
- Lack of internal communication
- Gantt chart missing
- Consortium Agreement and Advance payment

1. 3rd Demo site issue

SC presented the 3rd Demo Site ongoing issue, explaining that despite the official letter of withdrawal of AACL (Anglo American Chile Limitada) received on Feb 12th, the EC still considered AACL as a partner in the project. The reasons for keeping them “alive” were both administrative and strategic: the idea was to buy time and allow the new partner to come in smoothly. The deadline was June 30th.

However, finding a new site had been a difficult task requiring strong involvement of the EO-MINERS members.

In March, Namibians (approached by Henk Coetzee from CGS) declined for lack of staff and confidentiality reasons.

SM objected that EC would like mining companies to disclose data they were reluctant to let out. Besides, Florence Bérout should be made aware that administrative issues had to be kept low to avoid difficulties with some partners' management (eg AOL).

SC then mentioned that the good contacts with BOR (Serbia) could have led to an effective agreement, but the EC had refused because of involvement of similar partner/site in another EC project (ImpactMine) and the risk of overlapping with EO-MINERS subjects.

Further on, the discussions with CODELCO had failed. From one side E. Falk (UVSQ) was in touch with University of Chile while Wuppertal Institute had contacts with CODELCO. Again the problem of confidentiality was found to be crucial (CODELCO had a CSR project going on which they wanted to keep it confidential).

SC concluded that the last chance now was the Kyrgyz site contacted through DLR and TAU who initiated discussions.

Early in June, he had received a letter of commitment from CAIAG (Central Asian Institute for Applied Geosciences), saying that they were ready to start the administrative steps. Despite the rioting episode mid June, Gilles Ollier and Florence Bérout had not actually rejected the Kyrgyz site however they had not yet given their final decision either.

SC added they now were waiting to receive the provisional budget from the Kyrgyz managers. CF reported CAIAG was strongly committed and already working on a budget. Yet the second partner Kyrgyzaltin (mining company) was to join the loop and a more detailed budget produced for both organisations.

SC recalled what would then be the following steps:

- New Annex1 (DoW) to the Grant Agreement including RTD aspects and new budget
- Registration of CAIAG and Kyrgyzaltin (PIC)
- New forms A
- New Grant Agreement between EC and Coordination
- Modified Consortium Agreement

Various members of the MC commented on the need to soon travel to Kyrgyzstan to secure the agreement and help the new partners deal with the administrative and budget process, and other aspects such as confidentiality, insurances...

SC agreed that the visit had to be done in July since the EC had not ruled out the Kyrgyz but would require a well-documented case.

CF explained the historical situation, adding that since 1999, Kyrgyzaltin had become a sort of State agency grouping all the gold mines (in use or abandoned) and working with the ministry of Environment. He suggested that the involvement of CAIAG and Kyrgyzaltin should be dealt with first, and then other aspects of mining activities (other ores, uranium ...) could be looked at later on. This is the same for the international mining company Kumtor gold mine, which was presented as a good test site with one mine processing slurries and dams full of residues from mine.

The MC members agreed that they had to schedule another visit in autumn to work on the actual technical programme to be implemented before the long winter season. This would show EO-MINERS commitment and allow putting target dates forward.

Action 1.1: A visit to Kyrgyzstan to be organised in July to secure administrative issues and budget

Action 1.2: A second trip to be scheduled in autumn, to prepare a work-plan and organise next year field visits. . A visit of CAIAG representatives, e.g. at GFZ-Potsdam could be an alternative.

Lack of coordination

SC acknowledged the lack of time for coordinating the project, due to commitment to numerous other projects including visits abroad, recalling he had many times alerted his hierarchy without success.

The MC members were concerned not because of the coordinator's performance but because of the possible risks for the project. It was discussed under agreement from SC to send a letter to BRGM headquarters to describe the situation and support the project coordinator in this way.

Then the MC agreed that SC, while keeping management activities and responsibilities, could save time delegating some tasks such as attendance to conferences and other minor work. Assignment could be made through more communication and discussion.

Action 2.1: Sending a letter to BRGM to support the project coordinator

Action 2.2: Re distribution of some activities within WPs to unburden the coordinator.

2. Consortium Agreement and Advance payment

The status of the Consortium Agreement was quickly reviewed. The signatures of all partners but AOL ATD had been collected. Fatima Ferraz had been sent a reminder. Then, in due time, the 3rd demo site would also have to go through this administrative requirement.

The MC members started an animated discussion about the advance payment. So far the EC contribution had been kept on a special FP7 account by BRGM and the coordinating organisation had been reluctant to release the first half of the pre-financing payment on the grounds that administrative documents had not been signed by all the partners (AACL still being considered a partner officially, as said earlier) and that the project future was still uncertain. The MC members objected that this might not be legal and was putting further financial risks on the project as they were relying on their own organisation finances. Some of the partners are small companies and running a negative cash-flow is putting a big stress on them.

SC explained it would be a very difficult process to retrieve the money once paid if the project was to be stopped. . The idea in this case would be to ask the partners to present all their expenses and reimburse them on their actual incurred costs. In any case no first payment could be triggered without an official document assessing the continuation of the project.

MC members protested this could jeopardize the project already facing major issues and agreed to alert BRGM on this issue

Action 3: send a letter of complaint to BRGM asking to address financial issues

3. Lack of internal communication between WPs

DLR evoked the difficulty in organising the field trips (to South Africa and Sokolov test sites) and in agreeing on a programme for various activities. CF believed this actually highlighted a low communication between the partners in the work packages involved.

SC added this also underlined the need for the Gantt Chart he had been requesting ever since the beginning of the project.

PS objected WP1 found these field trips premature with regard to the work they had to achieve. As a first step, WP1 had to take stock of the policies of the various stakeholders (in the political, corporate, NGO's fields...) in footprints due to mining activities on international, EU and national level. The actual definition of footprints is scheduled in a second step eventually leading to a draft report on information requirements and SWOT on operational footprinting methodologies and indicators in month 18. On the way to this deliverables a number of conceptual, methodological and scaling questions need to be answered especially in dialogue with WP2 and WP3 and ultimately in the triologue. .

CF said the WP 1 schedule for producing information and results may lead to the need for rescheduling other WP's deliverables. This was actually the consequence of the agreed timetable in the DoW and maybe overcome by additional communication and interactivity EBD explained that similar problems exist for the first deliverables of WP2.

All agreed that there was room for improvement in organisation, scheduling, financing and linking WP's tasks. The absence of a running website and involvement also worsened the situation. This had to be discussed thoroughly.

Finally it was agreed that the 6-month deliverables of WP2 and WP3 will be postponed to October. To ensure better communications, different meetings should be organized. Thus the following draft time schedule was defined:

- a. 1st meeting: 22/23 July in Wuppertal
- b. 2nd meeting: within the Sokolov field campaign (if necessary)
- c. 3rd meeting: 16/17 September at DLR. This meeting will serve as a preparational meeting for the upcoming field trip to RSA (scheduled from 26th Sept. to 8th October)

Action 4: Discuss the lack of communication and interaction between WP's to sort out problems and find solutions in Wuppertal meeting

4. Guest experts for the Advisory Board

SC recalled that only 3 advisors had so far been recruited for EO-MINERS. The other contacted experts had never answered. They needed to identify and persuade new suitable "candidates" for EO-MINERS.

MC members discussed the various fields of activities that would bring expertise to the project and listed technical (Remote Sensing, mineral or raw material), political (Geo secretariat, Raw Material Initiative), international organisations (OAGS, UNESCO...) ...) areas and mining management figures (???).. Finally it was decided that the following persons would be approached by the MC members.

Action 5.1: Contacting identified suitable guest experts asap

NAME	ORGANISATION	MC members in charge
Fernando RAMOS	GEO Secretariat	SC //SM next week in London meeting

Robert MISSOTEN	UNESCO	SM
Mike RAST	ESA (European Space Agency)	AM
Luis MARTINS	EuroGEOsurvey	SC through Slavko Solar
Luis MARTINS	Raw Material Initiative Platform	SC through Slavko Solar

5. Scheduling of various field trips and activities

Sokolov flight campaign

DLR is organizing the proposed airborne flight campaign with the HyMap sensor system of the project in Sokolov end of July or first week of August, depending on weather conditions. CF said various test sites had been selected. EBD explained the difficulties met by TAU with HyMap data (dark holes, inadequate calibration) from the previous campaign in 2009. TAU and DLR had discussed solutions for correction; now only exact data had to be settled on.

SA autumn campaign

SC announced Henk Coetzee had asked the South African field trip dates be postponed. HE would check the dates with him quickly.

3rd demo site visits (Kyrgyzstan)

CF mentioned they also had to fit in a visit to the Kyrgyz site before their winter started, even if no actual field work could be performed they would be able to get organised, prepare the campaign with the new partners, set the goals.

SC confirmed he would be available from October 7 to 12th.

HH objected they still had to schedule the first trip to Kyrgyzstan in July to sort out and prepare the administrative matters. It was agreed that SC and CF would go, 2 days only and Christian would handle the trip organisation getting in contact with Helmut Echtler (GFZ).

Due to weather conditions a field trip to Kirgizstan should be planed to May-June 2011.

Gantt Chart

SC insisted upon the need for establishing a detailed Gantt Chart to manage the project accurately. So far only TAU had provided a very detailed one, but other WPs had to also prepare their planning. It would highlight the links between the WP's and their activities and help improve the communication.

SC added he wanted to have the final document ready by the end of July. He would compile it out of each WP contribution which he needed by mid July. It was agreed that tasks for the 3rd demo site could be foreseen and dates inserted later after their official integration.

WP1 /WP2 and WP3 communication and interaction

WP 1 main objective was to analyse environmental demands at social/political levels to then pass on the information the other WPs in charge of choosing the appropriate EO techniques. It is clear that no final solution can be developed within the first 6 month of the project, but the WPs have to communicate to ensure, that the different items will wok in similar direction.

Progress of WP 1 in that field had proven to be difficult and time consuming. A delaying factor were the originally unplanned missions to London for the field trip planning and the

field trips to South Africa and the Czech Republic. Additional time of WP1 had been invested in finding a 3rd test site in Chile. Nevertheless, PS was optimistic that draft versions of D1.1 and D1.2 due end of July (M6) could be delivered in time. D1.1 drafts had already been circulated for commenting. D1.2 is currently being finalized. A draft of an unplanned additional third deliverable on Civil Societies had also been circulated. Nevertheless, the analysis of both deliverables on the national/regional/local levels cannot be concluded before a third partner is integrated. Finalization of D1.1 and D1.2 is therefore open. A discussion started on the need to reschedule WP1 linked activities and deliverables -the 3rd demo site case being set aside for the time being. TAU and DLR suggested they should clearly identify the links between the definition of impact and footprint on society and their contribution to actually open methodological issues and improve communication, all to be included in the new Gantt Chart:

- 1 meeting in July(week 29) at Wuppertal Institute, then WI would produce their deliverables
- 1 meeting early in August, coupled with the Sokolov campaign, if seen as necessary
- 1 meeting in 16/17th September to optimise EBD visit at DLR

Participants: PS (WI), CF (DLR), EBD (TAU), HH (MIRO), Barbara Palumbo or Richard Ogilvy (BGS)

Action 6.1: Set the exact dates of next field visits (Sokolov, Witbank, Kyrgyzstan) and inter WP meetings over the summer

Action 6.2: SC to make up and finalise the project GANTT Chart, from the elements provided by the WP leaders

Action 6.3: SC to make up a table with the various meetings' final dates

6. WP Activity review

WP1 – presented by Philipp Schepelmann

PS quickly recalled WP1 objectives. He explained that the analysis of corporate policies, according to UVSQ focused on CSR only. WI wondered whether EO-MINERS could broaden the scope to operational questions of mining companies like exploration or rehabilitation.

HH said the points of view of other actors in the society (Activists, NGO's, civil society...) on mining aspects could help to reconcile data. Besides, companies had to show they were environmental friendly and were also faced with compliance with EC rules on environment.

PS concluded their problem was at this stage of analysis the lack of connexion between this deliverable and the requirements when it came to actual site measurements. SC objected the lack of interest of mining companies in mining impact and footprints was known from the start and wondered how WP1 would solve this problem.

PS answered that when looking at public policies for the second deliverable, it became obvious that companies had to cope with a wide range of legislations. Although it is difficult to make a selection footprinting could ideally help companies to deal with legislative requirements.

EBD suggested rehabilitation (as planned in the Sokolov area) would be a good example, giving way to a directive and involving local stakeholders (mining companies, local citizens) even if mining companies were still reluctant to enter such schemes for fear of the discovery of the negative impact of mines by the society.

Asked about the legal framework to such policies at different levels (local, national, EU), PS answered that there were different scales ranging from general declarations to directives requiring implementation and influenced by financial flows, mandatory environmental policies. He added that at this stage it was difficult to define what "footprint" actually encompassed. Some moving factors such as the Raw Material Initiative, sustainable use of resources, resource efficiency, innovation in the European 2020 plan, would affect the final description.

Other members acknowledged this could be seen as an opportunity for EO-MINERS. They had to assess the existing policies, their validity and effect on corporate policies, while replacing them in this evolving context. The Raw Material Initiative is promising and new developments in these areas could give grounds to discussions and propositions.

PS commented that to be relevant, the indicator would have to take into account the level of policy making (local, EU).

When CF said that airborne prospecting might not be a suitable solution for small companies they agreed EO-MINERS would have to put forward different methods to monitor environmental and societal impact, define the tools and select the type of mines (similar or different ores comparison) to produce aggregate indicators.

EBD suggested all this could be discussed in depth during the July meeting, to assess with what means the WP2 and WP3 could contribute.

HH believed local small mines should be looked at first before opening to aggregate policies. The EC expected recommendations on suitable methods and tools rather than actual indicators, so that could be a basis for the trialogue discussions, then they could try and identify common issues and issue recommendations. CF objected local solutions might not be adapted to EC policies level. HH approved and added the link could come through sustainability or raw material negotiations.

PS thought it could have a great impact if EO-MINERS could come up with an environmental footprint indicator elaborated from site specific problems and addressing aggregate EU problems.

EBD suggested rehabilitation methods could be evidenced and presented as another solution. All agreed this possibility could be looked into by WP1.

The MC concluded this discussion had been positive and helped broaden the scope and themes and set the goals for the 1st meeting in July.

WP2 – presented by Eyal Ben Dor

EBD recalled the various tasks and objectives of the WP2 and said the mission planning would allow them to decide on the means, since expertise was available.

Part of the work done so far was related to calibration tasks of the HyMap data from 2009, flown in Sokolov, they had found solutions to the calibration and validation issues.

Discussions with DLR took place and actions to prevent such problems for the 2010 campaign in Sokolov have been taken by DLR and TAU..

He added cooperation with WP3 was good but the lack of involvement of WP1 in their activities had slowed the progress.

The first attempt with questionnaires had not worked well so they had decided to do it on a personal basis as people seemed to be more collaborative.

The aims were to set mapping targets with different factors (topography, air pollution...). Some would be discussed in the July meeting. They required further information and data to establish the sensor description summary. EBD then presented the list of sensors and radars they had prepared. SM suggested BGS or BRGM could provide expertise and information in the geomagnetic area if needed

Regarding the difficulties and problems faced, EBD mentioned: the lack of partners' contribution to the tasks, in particular the WP1 contribution, the sensor expertise, the site acquisition goals that were not clear, the elaboration of an integrative system needed in WP4.

The WP2 suggestions were that a running website would help improve email exchanges and communication. Then EBD suggested a better planning of the meetings, the scheduling of expected input and output and collaboration between WPs, he also advocated for naming deputies to WP and tasks leaders so as to avoid uneven activity.

He concluded he was looking forward to the July meeting to sort out these problems but feared their deliverable would have to be postponed.

WP3 – presented by Christian Fisher

CF reviewed the WP3 objectives and activities.

1st Site: Sokolov

He said they worked in close cooperation with the Sokolov site managers to prepare the next flight campaign planned in August/September. Detailed information about the test site already made available by Veronika Kopackova. The next step is to discuss the data (physically) available, needed as reference information for image analyses. Then the database could be improved further as it went. They had looked at environmental impact (AMD, remediation problems, with a specific interest put in modelling); needs (detailed list of geological datasets, preparation of the HyMap flight campaign). In addition it has to be decided, which other satellite data sets have to be organized, e.g. TerraSAR-X-data or HR optical data sets. CF noted that the SAR data are for free, but a scientific proposal has to be developed. DLR is in charge for the scientific evaluation of the TerraSAR-X-data, so this should be comparable easy to organize. In addition a decision should be made, what kind of commercial available data should be ordered – as such data sets should be shared within the project partner, it does not make any sense to buy different data sets individually.

EBD added that a EUFAR flight campaign is under review to fly the area under investigation with an airborne TIR sensor system. The proposal was conjointly developed by CzechGS DLR and TAU.

2nd^t Site: South Africa

According to the latest news, the detailed list of reference of data available looked promising. An airborne EM survey is planned by CGS. For the environmental impacts they would consider the ground water contamination, the problems expressed by the affected vegetation, in addition first aspects under discussions are related to underground coal fires.

3rd Site: Kyrgyztan

The issue had already been discussed.

DLR already has worked on other mine sites, which might be used as case studies for methodological developments within the project.

- Crossen: Remediation of uranium mine waste site, flown with HyMap in 2009 in two different altitudes, e.g. methodological questions for upscaling aspects could be addressed – reference spectra were available, as well as soil and vegetation samples for reference analysis.
- Chuquimata (a Chilean test site): monitoring open pit mining using Terra SAR-X, with focus on the mining activities that causes environmental impact (in particular waste disposal). Results evidenced the influence of different factors such as soil moisture.

After showing these slides, CF explained that such processes could be moved to other sites as well and may support the developments of standards and protocols. In addition DLR is leading a WG supported by the Assoc. of German Engineers (VDI) within the network of excellence of the BMBF for Optical Technologies, named “Earth Observation by Imaging Spectroscopy using Airborne Sensor Systems”. VDI-guidelines are a pre-stage of a DIN / ISO EN, but accepted by the legislative. There is a strong relation to different standardization activities in Photogrammetry and RS in Germany => DIN ISO 18717, 18740, etc., including standards of the ISO TC 211 regulations. Up to now, there is no similar activity in Europe on airborne hyperspectral sensor systems. DLR is interested in tight cooperation with WP-2 on related activities here.

Among the questions to discuss, CF again underlined the communication between the WP 1 and WP2/3. He also wondered about the question of data acquisition: the opportunity to make a flight campaign in SA against the possibility to acquire commercial satellite data and the issue of “free” access to data (as advocated by GEOSS) made available on the GEO portal and to other data.

Regarding data management, it is seen as a very important point that a geospatial data infrastructure (GSI) for the project relevant data has to be defined. This is not only for Wp2/WP3 important, but also for the modelling aspects within WP4. Known standardization activities, e.g. the INSPIRE directive, should be taken into account. SC mentioned, that he could ask experts from BRGM to contribute on this aspect.

For management activities, CF thought they had to develop contacts related to GEO and get further information. Then SM mentioned the AEGOS workshop on Geology and GEO to be held the following week in London and invited the board. CF declined as notice was too short but asserted DLR would be interested in participating and contributing to this type of activities with strategic aspects and making proposals for building an observing system in GEO.

To conclude, CF mentioned a coming WS workshop organised by DMT on the impact of mining which could be an opportunity for EO-MINERS to be advertised, although at national (Germany) level rather than EU level. Another international event could be the Colloquium of African Geology in January 2011.

CF also offered HH and the WP5 their help to set up a mailing list (EO-MINERS@xxxx).

WP4 – presented by Stuart Marsh

SM explained this WP was only to start after M+6, so there was not much to report. Among their tasks they would be translating EO datasets into integrated products which was a requirement from WP1. They then would have to consider how to integrate these into management support, working towards the Trialogue, while contributing to GEOSS. SM assured they would start fairly soon and expected the coming meetings would help them trimming the information.

Regarding task 4.4 on EO-MINERS and GEO, he thought that, to keep up with new developments in the GEO final work-plan, they could end up reviewing the timing for the M18 workshop. They would have to gather enough material and be able to hold it earlier.

The deliverables were only due in 2nd half of the project, so the early tasks for his WP were to link with other WPs and engage a timely dialogue to get data. Then depending on GEO issues to be firmly decided upon in November, he thought the workshop could usefully be advanced to M13 or 14 (ie Spring 2011). He added Fernando Ramos (GEO Secretariat) would be attending the coming week AEGOS meeting in London and could give them updates on the latest aspects. Besides, during that AEGOS workshop, he expected more concern and focus put on minerals, further enhanced by the presence of SC and Mark Jessel (IRD).

SM then mentioned that Colm Jordan would need more precise information on SA specific sites situation, adding BGS were also planning to strengthen the team working on these tasks.

SM assured they would work on the Gantt chart and deliver a more detailed planning.

He also concluded saying they had already presented EO-MINERS in GEO meetings (GEO European projects workshop in April and GEO work-plan Symposium in Pretoria in May). He explained “minerals” were missing from the tasks in the GEO SBA’s. This was a drawback for EO-MINERS as a project. However, they had advocated for the recognition of the role of geology in GEO. After discussions, the need for a sensible “home” for minerals had been acknowledged so this might hopefully end up with the renaming of the “Energy” SBA into Energy and resources.

Given the time (18.00 pm), it was decided to stop the meeting at this stage of the WP activity presentation. The WP5 presentation by HH could be postponed to the next morning and coupled with his overview of the project presentation to the outside world.

Friday July 2nd, 2010– session resumed at 9.00 am

Same participants except Andreas Muller absent.

WP5 – presented by Horst Hejny

HH started reviewing the objectives of the WP5 (communication, capacity building activities, contacts with local communities and authorities, NGO's to build up the trialogue).

He added they were contributing directly or indirectly to all the WPs in the project, hence the difficulty for them to draw a reliable and precise Gantt chart.

From M1 to M6, WP5 had developed the logo, the website general layout and various communication tools such as the mailing lists and the leaflets for the project. However, due to the financial issues, these activities (in particular the launching of the website), had been put on hold. Other problems met had been the low contribution of partners, the lack of respect of the deadlines and the missing 3rd demo site.

The need for a general leaflet or brochure in various languages, presenting the project (but still omitting the 3rd demo site for the time being) was expressed by the other WP leaders. HH objected this already existed and had even been circulated. As some said they had not received it, he added the basic version could be resent and also a pdf version of the leaflet could be made available on the website once the financial issues would have been solved.

DLR and WI said they would then also post it on their organisation websites.

The WP5 next steps were then reviewed and HH assured they would first catch up with the delays. In Task 5.1 they would start activity on dissemination and capacity building and envisaged animated slide shows for multimedia material. For task 5.2 they would continue activities related to communication, producing targeted material and increasing occasions to promote the project. With task 5.3 they would start structuring and planning the local trialogue based on WP1 information and input.

As PS objected it was difficult to identify who they were targeting and to draw a calendar for events, other members reassessed the usefulness of a running website to address specific groups and the need for an updated calendar for each theme (Remote Sensing, airborne survey...). HH then showed the "test" website browsing the various pages.

A discussion started on the project slogan "Creating unity for the future" which was meant to be a slogan for the trialogue promoted by the project. SM did not like "creating unity" and proposed the whole sentence should be reworded. A few propositions were put forward such as "means for mines" or "transparency" then the discussion was stopped but it was decided continue thinking about it until the website would be "on". HH went on presenting the Forum space before concluding the Trialogue would actually start with information retrieved from the field trips and statistics around September. The exploitation plan for Task 5.4 would have to be addressed later.

7. Presentation of the project to the general public

HH explained they planned to advertise the project using an external mailing list for dissemination to contacts, information on events in which EO-MINERS would be presented (e.g. RMSG), establishing communication channels to stakeholders (that still had to be more precisely identified).

After some discussion, it was agreed that EO-MINERS could also usefully be presented at the ImpactMin workshop by both CF (keynote speaker on RS Monitoring tasks) and HH as EO-MINERS representative.

At the end of the WP5 presentation, the board members insisted on the need for the project to dispose of suitable, clear and user-friendly templates (deliverables, reports, powerpoint

presentations...) as well as other tools such as the logo and the website. HH said he would see for the layout to be ready by the following week.

Action 8.1: HH to finalise various project templates and prepare the website launching

8. 6th monthly technical report.

The Management committee was then recalled that the EC Project Officer had requested a regular project follow-up through a 6th monthly report (a FP7 new requirement). FML presented the document and explained that although she had circulated the template to the WP leaders only, this document had to be completed by all the partners for the WPs in which they had been involved during the given period. Each WP leaders concerned would then have to collect their partners' contributions and produce the synthesis of the work achieved, problems met... The WP leaders and coordination would then start compiling the document and in the end carry out the review of the final document to be sent to the EC.

FML said she also needed all the partners to feed in the "effort table" with the breakdown of Person Month budgeted for each WP at the various periods of the project (on 6 monthly basis). This table was one of the reporting tools presented during the kick-off meeting and would help to assess regularly the partners input in term of activity, delays or shift of effort from one activity to the other,... The board objected they were not willing to perform this task as it would be time-consuming and they did not reckon the usefulness of this tool at this stage.

Finally, a schedule for the 6th monthly report was agreed upon after some discussions. FML would send the 6 monthly report template and the procedure explanations to all the partners at the beginning of week 27 (July 5th to 7th).

By July 31st: partners to send their contributions to the WP leaders

By Sept 15th: WP leaders and the Coordination to compile and synthesise the reports

By Sept 20th: WP leaders and the Coordination to carry out the reviewing

On Sept 30th: Final version of the 6th monthly report to be sent to the EC Project Officer

Action 9.1: FML to send template, schedule and explanations of the 6th monthly report to the partners .

After the break the meeting was resumed with the assignment for the board to decide and tentatively schedule all the upcoming commitments and mission planning.

9. Schedule.

What and where	Who	When
3rd Demo Site Bishkek <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help for integration, admin and budget matters (2 days) 2 nd mission for work and activity planning	CF and SC	12/17 or 26/28 July 2010 October 2010 (TBC)
Communication WP1 and other WP <i>“Foot printing connecting Earth Observation”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st meeting at Wuppertal Institute • 1 meeting linked to Sokolov flight campaign • 3rd meeting linked to Hyperl Net WS 	PS (WI), CF (DLR), EBD (TAU), HH (MIRO), Barbara Palumbo or Richard Ogilvy (BGS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (week 29)22/23rd July TBC by CF • 1st/13th August • 16/17th Sept
Field trip to RSA		27/09 to 8/10/2010
Project Annual Meetings and conference Capetown <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder conference – to be held in conjunction with Indaba (Capetown 7/10 Feb 2011) Witbank <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st year Management Committee Meeting • General Assembly meeting • Advisory Board 	SC and some WP leaders /project members MC Board, Advisors, partners	11 Feb 2011 15 th to 18 th Feb 2011 1 day each
Gantt Chart <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WPs contributions Compilation final doc	All WPs members SC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid July • End of July
6 Month Activity report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution sent to WP leaders 	Partners	By July 31 st

• Compilation & synthesis	Coord and WPLEaders	By Sept 15 th
• Reviewing by Coord and WPLEaders	Coord and WPLEaders	By Sept 20 th
Final version to PO	Coord and WPLEaders	Sept 30 th

10. Plan for the next 6 months

WP1 committed to finalize deliverable and input to the Gantt chart as required by the coordinator. They would also develop communication and exchanges with WP2 and 3 and review the programme in order to improve conceptual coherence on footprinting with WP2&3. Rescheduling would be done after the meeting and according to the decisions taken with WP2 &3. They then planned to start working with WP5 on the stakeholders issues.

SC asked if they would still produce the Del 1.8 at M6 and PS answered this one would have to be delayed depending on TAU's desk top research on the state of the art. SC also wondered how they would turn the information (e.g. from UVSQ) into indicators and PS said the CSR issues mentioned the day before and the need to the above mentioned conceptual coherence with WP2&3 would have to be talked over with E. Falk.

CF then, also talking on behalf of EBD absent at that moment, said they mainly had to solve the communication issues between WPs then postpone their deliverable from September to October. The next step would be to organise the flight campaigns in Sokolov and then in SA, involving references, measurements, data infrastructure preparation. They would also have to focus on the footprint definition and get more details on the existing models and datasets modelling from BGS.

Besides, WP3 would contribute to the 3rd test site activities, in management activities and would renew their interests in the NGO's side.. He concluded saying the Del 3.1 would have to be rescheduled for 2 or 3 months.

Regarding the Year 1 Management Meeting, it was again discussed and envisaged to have a presentation made during the INDABA Conference followed by a Stakeholders Day organised at the end of this event (Friday Feb 11th). Then once in Witbank the following week, they would also be able to meet the local stakeholders. They would have to investigate how to sufficiently advertise this event and have it set up by October at the latest.

For WP4, SM said they now had 3 main activities to start. It would mainly consist in initiating the dialogue with other WPs to work on the requirements for the EO products to generate: set up of indicators (task 4.1), requirements for modelling such as data, standards, constraints (tasks 4.2).

They would also discuss with the GEO secretariat on the timescale of the new GEO workplan and if EO-MINERS could be attached to GEO, they would have to retime and anticipate the workshop

Most of the work is to be done after M12. They would start background thinking on Del4.3, but their deliverables were only scheduled in the 2nd half of the project.

Talking for WP5, HH said their first objective was to catch up with delays. The forecast for the website was after 20/22nd of July. Then the various WP tasks would be tackled:

5.1: meeting with S. Solar on dissemination and capacity building activities, including the production of associated material (slide show)

5.2: would be continued on the same line and the project events calendar for promoting actions should be drafted.

5.3: they would start to structure the work on the dialogue (at test site, in meetings on indicators)

5.4: work on the redaction of a draft exploitation plan would not start before the end of the first year.

SC asked about the stakeholders' workshops as one only was planned in South Africa. HH said more could be planned, one in 2012 and another at a date to be discussed within the schedule. The workshop to be held parallel to Indaba conference had to be prepared and key-persons contacted. Luc Chevallier's name (CGS) was suggested. Then PS mentioned two events that could be adapted to stakeholders' meeting: the "Green Week" in Brussels June 2011 and the "World Resources Forum" (Sept 19-21 2011) in Davos. This last event being also political was seen as a good opportunity for EO-MINERS. The Raw Material Initiative developments were also to be investigated but many points remained unclear such as the position of the EC, the distinction between resources (agriculture, land use...) and raw material (industry, ...).

11. Conferences – papers

SC announced he would participate in the "COSPAR" Scientific Assembly in Bremen, mid July as he had been invited (by Europe) to make a presentation there at the "Earth Observation for changing earth" session. SM mentioned he had participated 10 years before to one session and had found it was too big, he added he would be interested in having Stéphane's feedback.

SC had initially planned to go to the "Mine Closure Conference" in Chile in Nov 2010, but after his abstract was accepted, his presentation had been rejected so he eventually cancelled.

SM said they had no plan so far but could collaborate with other people on papers.

He would continue participating in the GEO network, with two upcoming events: "Science and technology workshop" in September and the "Beijing ministerial summit" in November.

EBD said TAU had a paper on soils they could present on account of EO-MINERS while other papers about EO-MINERS could be published sometimes.

CF said the conference on "Coal fires" was just over and they still had to write some papers about it – it would be interesting, if coal fires do exist in the area under investigation in RSA .

Then AM would attend the ESA Oil & Gas workshop in September and would probably meet people there (such as M.Rast)

12. Conclusions

Before the meeting was wrapped up, the summary of the main actions decided upon was reminded:., advisory board members to contact, Gantt chart to finalize, 3rd demo site missions to carry out, project documents (template, website..) to produce, 6th monthly report to be sent.

Then SC thanked the participants and concluded it had been a good meeting with fruitful discussions (always better than e-mails). He also promised to do his best to spend more time on the project.

The meeting was closed at 15.00 pm

EO-Miners Management Committee Meeting @ DLR

MEETING AGENDA

1st July (day 1)	10:00-10:15	Welcome at DLR, short update of the agenda, if needed	C. Fischer
	10:15-11:30	overall items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general status of the project and short comments on 3rd demo site • point on the Consortium Agreement, transfer of advance payment • quality assurance plan 	S. Chevrel, F. Mojon-Lumier
	11:30-11:45	Coffee Break	
	11:45-12:15	difficulties encountered improvement of communications	S. Chevrel, WP leader
	12:15-13:15	Lunch at DLR cantina	
	13:15-14:00	details on the 3rd test site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • needed activities, • time constraints, etc. 	S. Chevrel
	14:00-15:30	project rescheduling, Gantt chart design	S. Chevrel, WP leaders
	15:30-15:45	Coffee Break	
	15:45-17:30	WP progress	WP leader
	18:30 -	Dinner	

2nd July (day 2)	09:00-10:00	project presentation to the outside world	H. Hejny, WP leader
	10:00-10:30	6-month activity report	S. Chevrel
	10:30-10:45	Coffee Break	
	10:45-12:00	further work for the next 6 months clear time schedule for the different WP	S. Chevrel WP leader
	12:00-13:00	Lunch at DLR cantina	
	13:00-13:30	general assembly meeting month 12	S. Chevrel
	13:30-14:30	miscellaneous (meetings, conferences, etc.)	
	14:30-15:00	minutes of the meeting, end	scribbler (tbd)