

Date: Thu, 28 Jun 2007 15:19:24 +0200  
From: <tschoene@gfz-potsdam.de>  
To: "Prof. Markus Rothacher" <rothacher@gfz-potsdam.de>,  
"Ruth E. Neilan" <ruth.neilan@jpl.nasa.gov>,  
Hans-Peter Plag <hpplag@unr.edu>  
Subject: Report GEO Tsunami Working Group

Dear All,

a meeting of the GEO-TWG took place on June 21st in Paris. The meeting was attended by around 20 participants.

The chair opened the meeting giving an overview about the overall activities. He stated that the WG was in some points successfully, in other not. Especially the role of IOC was reviewed, concluding that IOC goes faster than GEO. GEO does not play a major role in the establishment of tsunami warning systems.

A documents was distributed to the WG (I typed it below) and discussion in detail (Lessons Learned and Accomplishments).

The chair asked for the endorsement of the group to propose the termination of the WG to the GEO-EC. Representatives gave their opinion. The general conclusion was that still GEO may supportive to IOC/Tsunami activities (e.g. IOC does not control seismological networks, IOC does not have access to telecommunication infrastructure or satellite imagery), but may not longer be focused to Tsunami but more generally to disaster.

After this discussion I had to leave, to get my flight. Dr. Lauterjung from GFZ/Germany attended till the end.

The conclusion of the group was that a small core team should work on the identification of gaps and areas where the Tsunami-WG would be helpful. This work should be done before the ministerial summit in November. A final meeting will be announced well in advance.

With my best regards  
Tilo

I apologize of not being able to attend the GGOS-SC meeting. I urgently need to visit Indonesia to push the tsunami activities forward. However, If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer.

-----

Documents distributed (as copy)

+++++++ Accomplishments of the WG

- 1) The Working Group, through its deliberations, developed and defined the role, scope and mission of such a group to function within the concepts of GEO
- 2) WG addressed specific questions from the Executive Council e.g.

should the WG expand to address all hazard or multi-hazard. WG collected and evaluated member input and made recommendations to the General Council. Issue was brought forward and addressed by the General Council.

3) WG evaluated the GEO tasks related to Tsunami and submitted its recommendations to the GEO.

4) WG evaluated the leadership and contributions of members and participating organizations to each of the tasks and submitted findings to the GEO.

5) WG evaluated the transition of research accomplishments to operations within the GEO framework i.e. policies, transnational issues and regional strategies.

6) WG conducted sessions to address regional strategies and accomplishments, e.g. Mediterranean region.

7). WG demonstrated ability to work virtually as well as face to face

#### +++++ Lessons Learned

1) Charter and Terms of References need to be carefully crafted to assure actions appropriate and pertinent.

2) Assignments need to be focused and task oriented and mechanisms for accomplishment must be provided

3) WGs need to be structured to allow for extensive interaction with the GEO Standing Committees.

4) WGs need to have a mechanism for capturing and distributing products and soliciting feed back from WG members and others.

5) WGs need both geographical and technical discipline diversity and completeness.

6) Role and responsibilities of WG chairs needs to be defined

7) Staff support must be commensurate with the WG assignment

8) Policy implications need to be recognized and considered in the organizational structure of the WG

9) Considerations must be given to the extent and duration of WG to assure efficiency and relevancy