GMRT-AusSeabed Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting no. 2: 18th August 2021, 11:00-12:30

Notes prepared by Kimberlee Baldry and Kim Picard

Attendees: Kim Picard (Geoscience Australia), Robert Kay (Geoscience Australia), Paul Branson (University of Western Australia /CSIRO), Eric Schulz (Bureau of Meteorology); Kimberlee Baldry (Geoscience Australia), Joshua Sixsmith (Geoscience Australia).

Apologies: Kerry Levett (Australian Research Data Commons),

Actions list

Table 1. Action list with new actions raised during this Steering Committee meeting (SC2)

	Action	Responsible Party	Due date	Comments/Status
SC1.1	Aero to invite SC at QPI showcase, include siobhann.mccafferty@ardc.edu.au	KB	August 2021	SC members were not added to last QPI showcase.
SC2.1	KB to discuss with KP if and where SC meeting minutes should be published	KB	15 Sept	
SC2.2	KP to update the progress report spreadsheet to align with the revised project plan	KP	15 Sept	
SC2.3	The technical team should define the prototype/MVP (MS7)	JS, KP	10 Oct	This is part of MS7
SC2.4	The technical team should provide justification the SC on metadata decisions.	JS	1 Oct	
SC2.5	Technical team to re-structure and extend reports in light of SC comments and review. Consult with PB about his concerns. (Reports section)	JS	15 Sept	
SC2.6	KP to inform the SC out-of-session of the decision outcomes and final MS2/3 reports	KP	1 Oct	

Introduction

- Meeting opened 1105
- The SC endorsed the agenda with no additional business raised

Minutes and Actions

- Minutes from SC Meeting #1 were endorsed out of session. Publication of the minutes has yet to be discussed.

- It was noted that SC members were not successfully added to the last AusSeabed Quarterly Showcase. Action SC1.1 remains open.

- All other actions were closed.

Action SC2.1: KB to discuss with KP if and where SC meeting minutes should be published.

Progress Report

KP provided an update on the progress of the project, supported by the progress report supplied in the meeting papers. The progress outlined the near-completion of MS1-3 and an update against MS 4-9, noting that the project was on track.

Core design decisions have been made since the development of the project plan and have resulted in a reordering and slight modification of activities that make up Milestones 3,4,6,7 and 8. Milestone 9 will remain on schedule as per the original plan. A revised work plan was provided to the SC and has been translated into the original detailed project plan.

- The SC noted that a further revision of the progress reports was needed to align with the revised project plan. This includes making sure that timeline and budget tracking lines up.

KP clarified progress in light of this

- M1 and M2 – The report needs to be published and is in final stages of review

- M3 – Reports needs to be published and is in final stages of review

- M5 – Data subset scope prioritised with a primary focus area determined based on the variety of datasets available in that area. If time allows, datasets from the secondary larger priority area will be supplied Data processing (cleaning) is underway by partner institutions. Datasets specificationsare being delivered in light of workshops (MS3) and user survey (MS2). Dataset conversions may need to be made after received from data providers. As a result there may be a short delay in delivering MS5.

- KP noted that there will likely be a delay on the publication of MS5 datasets to the AusSeabed Data Portal. This does not impact the overall deliverable associated with the platform development.

- M9-11 not started.

- JS provided an update on Component 3:

    o Slight delay in progressing milestones due to the realisation that metadata curation is considered essential to enable the user-control necessary.

    o Jupyter Hub will cater for specialist user needs. It will provide a basic interface that will leverage of the existing interface on Jupyter Hub rather than build a full immersive GUI, which is unnecessary for the user base. This MS has been re-scheduled to later because it isn't needed first.

    o The Platform will be built on AWS not NCI/Nectar. This is to eliminate the risk of access problems with research infrastructure and High Performance Computing. This is also in line with the general direction of Geoscience Australia, AusSeabed and LDEO. NCI can't ensure up-time/accessibility constantly. The team is conscious that AWS could be costly and that will need to be considered in the future. This project will set up the prototype from which operational cost can be assess. Potential ways to alleviate cost if necessary could be a pay for service fee, approach AWS to partner through one of the scheme, or seek additional government funding.

- The SC asked if the reduction in the priority area for data subset posed a risk in restricting the end-user.

    o the prototype should be able to handle data outside the bounding box and/or additional datasets within the area of interest are likely to be supplied throughout the year from the other AusSeabed activities.

    o The architecture model (MS7) needs to include in and outside of scope.

- The SC asked that a minimum viable product be defined so that they can better assess abd help direct the project

    o JS commented that caution is needed regarding the expectation of the project. This is a prototype, and moving forward with an operational system is a different outcome.

    o It was noted that going forward all communications should be made very clear on what the prototype is going to look like.

    o It is unclear what kind of user-subjectivity on decision making will be enabled, and what is needed as a minimum.

    o ES notes that the tool needs to accommodate available data that exists

    o JS raised caution that with increased flexibility comes increased complexity

- The SC challenged the need for expensive metadata in C3 and the establishment of new metadata standards.

    o KP noted that the AusSeabed Data Hub metadata is insufficient for GMRT project. JS and KP elaborated.

        ▪ Inconsistencies have been identified. There are also many different standards used within the database and data cannot be queried efficiently.

- AusSeabed is undergoing a metadata overhaul. This includes adding a quality or uncertainty index for datasets. There is missing metadata in historical data within the Data Hub. AusSeabed has simple metadata, but for this project we want to add more metadata on quality to allow users to make decisions.

- PB concerned on spending too much effort on another metadata standard rather than spending effort where needed on data ingestion. This needs to be further considered and justified where necessary with completion of M7

- The SC asked for clarification on the ocean model mentioned in M10.

  - KP noted the model has yet to be identified. The model will be selected from the results of the user survey as a demonstration model.

Action SC2.2: KP to update the progress report spreadsheet to align with the revised project plan.

Action SC2.3: The technical team should define the prototype/MVP (MS7).

Action SC2.4: The technical team should provide justification the SC on metadata decisions.

Workshop and User Survey Reports

Three draft reports were presented to the SC as part of MS1-3. These reports included 1) a summary of the user survey results 2) a summary of workshop 1 addressing attribute values and definitions, and 3) a summary of workshop 2 focused on data structure and formats.

- ES noted that there should be reporting on who participated in the workshops

- The SC noted that the reports needed to be further developed to deliver MS2: End-user platform requirements report and MS3: Platform data requirements and design report. This includes being more specific on the outcomes of the workshops and surveys, and what the implications of the recommendations are to the project.

- The SC would like to see a mechanism to track decisions from workshops and potentially have them included within these final reports. For example, decisions should also be accompanied by where they came from (e.g. made by the technical teams as a result of the end user survey and workshop), the pros and cons of the decision, and the downstream decisions still required based on the outcome of the report (including who is responsible for the decisions and when they should be made).

- The SC highlighted that the synergies between the reports on decisions should be described. KP suggested that maybe one further decision-cantered report is only required (combining deliverables from MS2 and MS3) e.g. what recommendations did the user survey and workshops provide in relation to the data and metadata formats. Were they conflicting?

- PB express concerns about being mentioned in the acknowledgement, which suggested he endorsed the report when he hasn't.

- Should remove those who participate and provided feedback to the workshop summaries from the reviewers list as they were participants

Action SC2.5: Technical team to re-structure and extend reports in light of SC comments and review. Please confer further with Paul Branson about his concerns.

Action SC2.6: KP to confer out-of-session with SC on decision outcomes and final MS2/3 reports

KPI and Risk Reporting

KP noted that we are tracking on KPI1 and KPI2, although running a little late on publishing due to publication procedures. No new risk is reported.

- The SC asked if the increasing impact of COVID was a risk. KP and JS noted that most people involved are accustomed to working from home, but the team will keep checking in for impacts.

- The SC noted that a user paywall to facilitate AWS costs may compromise FAIR data principles which the project must adhere to.

- KP has been tracking risk with overseas partners, but engagement has been active and the connection with GMRT is good.

Next meeting

The next meeting will be in November 2021.

Meeting closed at 1230