



Commission 2 – Gravity Field

**Some discussion points in support of the Agenda for the
GGOS Retreat, Oxnard, CA, 19-21 February 2007**

**– in response to questions addressed to Commission 2
by H.P. Plag, 10 December 2006**

by C. Jekeli, president, on behalf of Commission 2

30 January 2007



Commission 2 – Gravity Field

Q: What is the role Commission 2 should and want to play in the GGOS family?

A: Commission 2, part of IAG, has a mission and vision to promote research in the area of Earth's gravity field and continues to support these through study groups, projects, conferences, workshops, and through collaboration with other Commissions of the IAG and various Services.

Products of the Commission clearly serve the purposes of GGOS.

Commission 2 welcomes suggestions from GGOS on areas of gravity research and corresponding goals that would benefit GGOS and the greater scientific community.



Commission 2 – Gravity Field

Q: What does Commission 2 expect from GGOS, and, in particular, what new functions would Commission 2 like GGOS to fill?

A: GGOS serves as a valuable link between societal requirements and geodetic observations and models.

GGOS also serves as a coordinator of products from various services and can recommend consistency in modeling and accuracy for the common good of societal needs and scientific advancement toward improved understanding of the Earth system.



Commission 2 – Gravity Field

Q: Where does Commission 2 see the added value of GGOS as a family?

A: It is suggested that a more appropriate description of GGOS as an embracing unit is “organization” or “facilitator”, which has a less hierarchical connotation than “family”.

GGOS is viewed as a valuable group that advises and recommends with justifications on ways to homogenize and ensure the uniform quality of geodetic products for societal uses and requirements.



Commission 2 – Gravity Field

Q: With respect to the GGOS 2020 Strategy process, does Commission 2 agree with the organizational structure of GGOS as proposed in Chapter 9 (lead author Gerhard Beutler) of the Reference document or does Commission 2 have comments and suggestions for improvements?

A: The proposed organizational structure relative to the Services and IAG commissions could be better defined.

- do the existing services report to GGOS?**
- are the missions and visions of the existing services independent of GGOS?**
- do the IAG and its Commissions serve GGOS under its direction?**
- can the services and IAG pursue an agenda independent of immediate societal requirements and with a longer, more general view of advancing the sciences?**



Commission 2 – Gravity Field

Q: What are your/Commission 2 thoughts and comments concerning the technical components of GGOS as proposed in Chapter 8 (lead author: Markus Rothacher)?

A: The technical components of GGOS specifically address all of geodesy from raw data to finished products (models).

- is such comprehensive engagement consistent with the mission and vision of GGOS?**
- do such all-encompassing pursuits duplicate scientific activities traditionally coordinated by the IAG and the geodetic services?**
- would it be more appropriate to define a functional mission of GGOS that laterally supports collaborations among other services and the IAG? The technical components would then naturally be more conservative and realizable.**



Commission 2 – Gravity Field

Q: Does Commission 2 find itself appropriately involved in the GGOS 2020 process and the input of Commission 2 appropriately reflected in the document?

A: Any lack of involvement in the GGOS2020 process by the Commission is entirely the fault of its president.

We look forward to a pragmatic approach to working with GGOS in its efforts to define and realize its vision to advise on the quality and consistency of geodetic products for societal needs.