

# ESA Space Weather Working Team

Minutes of 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 5<sup>th</sup> November 2002  
Zeiss Grossplanetarium, Berlin

## Attendees:

J-P. Adam, IEEA  
E. Amata, IFSI-CNR  
P. Beck, ARC Siebesdorf Research (ARCS)  
Y. Beniguel, IEEA  
P. Gille, CNRS-LPCE  
A. Glover, ESA-ESTEC  
A. Hilgers, ESA/ESTEC  
R. Horne, BAS  
N. Jakowski, DLR  
F. Jansen, Univ. Greifswald  
B. Jones, Virgin Atlantic Airways/MSSL  
R. Pirjola, FMI  
W. Riedler, AAS  
H. Rothkaehl, Space Res. Centre, Warsaw  
I. Stanislawska, Space Res. Centre, Warsaw

## Excused:

B. Arbesser-Rastburg, ESA/ESTEC  
D. Berghmans, SIDC  
P. Cannon, QinetiQ  
R. Favre, Swiss Re  
R. Gendrin  
M. Hapgood, RAL  
N. Hoffmann, ESA/ESTEC  
F. Lefeuvre, CNRS-LPCE  
R. Marsden, ESA/ESTEC  
J.-L. Rasson, Inst. Meteo, Belgique  
P. Stauning, DMI  
A. Thomson, BGS  
W. Verschueren, OSTC  
J. Watermann, DMI

## 1. Welcome (W. Riedler)

W. Riedler welcomed the attendees and commented on the success of the previous evening's Space Weather Forum organised by Frank Jansen.

Participants not present at previous SWWT meetings were introduced as I. Stanislawska, H. Rothkaehl and J-P. Adam. It was noted that the COST 724 Action was not represented at this meeting. Several members agreed that a COST-724 item should be added to future SWWT meeting agendas.

## **ACTION (AG)**

**Contact J. Liliensten (COST -724 coordinator) regarding regular SWWT attendance.**

R. Pirjola stated that sufficient countries are now involved in COST 724 for the action to begin. This information was received via the Finnish delegate. It was also reported that the COST 724 kick-off meeting is scheduled to take place in April 2003.

F. Jansen stated that Germany is already involved in this COST action. W. Riedler stated that Austria has not yet signed the memorandum of understanding.

It was proposed that J. Liliensten be requested to circulate a short note amongst the SWWT membership describing the current status of the COST action.

**ACTION (AG)**

**Contact J. Liliensten to request a short summary of the COST 724 Action status be circulated among the SWWT members.**

2. Review of Actions (W. Riedler)

R. Horne commented that he is waiting to receive a draft briefing pack prior to writing a document for submission to IPC delegates.

**ACTION (AG)**

**Send updated space weather briefing pack to R. Horne**

It was noted that a website has been created where all space weather related FP6 EoIs and relevant documents can be accessed. This can be reached via a link from the SWWT Documents website (<http://www.estec.esa.nl/wmwww/swwt-private>).

**ACTION (AG)**

**Contact all EoI authors to establish whether they object to publishing the EoI page on the public part of the ESA Space Weather Server.**

Y. Beniguel informed the SWWT that following the recommendation made at the previous SWWT meeting, he is preparing a proposal in response to the ESA GSE ITT on behalf of the SWWT.

It was noted that there are a large number of actions on members in need of tracking.

**ACTION (AG)**

**Ask N. Hoffmann to maintain list of SWWT actions**

3. Space Weather related Expressions of Interest in FP6 (P. Gille et al.)

**Appendix 1: Space Weather and FP6**

P. Gille reported that space weather will be mentioned in an EU paper on space policy to be issued later this month. This falls under the keyword “risk”. It was agreed that the SWWT should make sure that the wording of the final call includes Space Weather.

F. Jansen informed the group that one meeting of the space weather consortium responsible for the SW forum is still to take place. This meeting will be organised in Brussels and therefore EU representatives could be invited. This meeting could be held this December. Otherwise, early February is an option.

P. Gille stated that there will be two or three calls for FP6 participation. The first of these will take place in December. It was agreed that the community will need to be in

a strong position before the first call is released, rather than waiting for later calls. It was suggested that the management be prepared before the call is issued.

**ACTION (FJ and AH)**

**Investigate the possibility of inviting FP6 representatives to the Space Weather forum consortium final presentation in Brussels.**

W. Riedler commented on the mention of “solar weather” at the Brussels meeting rather than “space weather”.

A. Hilgers commented that this was in response to a question from R. Gendrin.

The SWWT agreed that the term “space weather” should be maintained at this stage.

P. Beck stated that if a space weather project is selected following the first call, no other projects with the same theme will be selected owing to financial agreements.

W. Riedler commented that this may cause difficulties since space weather is such a broad subject.

A. Hilgers asked whether this rule applies only to proposals including the same type of instrument. He noted that several exist e.g. NoE, IP and training network.

P. Beck stated that the decision is made with respect to the subject of the proposal rather than the instrument.

R. Horne commented that at the Brussels meeting [8/10/02] the EU were not fully aware of space weather. As such this meeting was very important. They did not consider space weather mature enough for a Network of Excellence. It was also stressed that an integrated project must be related to priority area. The three priorities are Galileo, GMES and SATCOM.

Based on his experience with FP5 in the field of radiation, P. Beck considered that any proposal to FP6 should involve two steps. The first step should demonstrate a high risk. The second step should then evaluate these risks in order to provide industries with “strategies”. This should provide a strong argument for research projects.

A. Hilgers questioned whether space weather could be a priority in this context.

P. Beck reminded the group that space weather already exists in the document identified by P. Gille.

A discussion followed on the status of this document and whether it would be subject to changes with the risk that the term “space weather” be removed.

R. Pirjola stated that this document was prepared for delegates within the EU.

A. Hilgers asked whether the SWWT members present could identify whether a NoE or an IP would be more suitable for space weather.

F. Jansen stated that letters from national delegates expressing support for space weather would be needed.

A. Hilgers added that the EU had stated during the 8<sup>th</sup> October meeting, that support from delegates would be needed.

I. Stanislawska informed the group that the COST 271 community was also involved in an EoI.

N. Jakowski pointed out that the MOPLE proposal also benefits from the support of the COST 271 community.

R. Horne pointed out that one should be guided by the wording of the call when it is released. He referred back to a meeting held with EU representatives in January 2002.

During this meeting, the EU representatives had responded positively to the fact that space weather provided a link between ground and space.

A discussion followed on the best possible strategy. There was a consensus for trying to merge as many EoIs as possible, but no consensus on which instrument of the FP6 would be the most appropriate.

N. Jakowski suggested that the DLR office in Brussels would be able to provide assistance with a proposal.

**ACTION (NJ, FJ)**

**Contact DLR Office in Brussels to determine whether a simultaneous NoE and IP within the same theme would be possible**

**ACTION (AG)**

**Invite all EoI authors to next SWWT meeting and inform of the outcome of discussion at this meeting.**

**ACTION (RP)**

**Contact H. Lundstedt, B. Thide and H. Luehr regarding this meeting's discussion.**

It was pointed out that a "green paper" describing this workplan should be released at the EU FP6 Kick Off meeting to be held in Brussels between 11-13<sup>th</sup> November.

A.Hilgers commented that he did not believe that space weather will be given the same level of priority as other EO research fields. If space weather is to be included explicitly in the workplan then he felt that the SWWT members must still make efforts to convince the EU delegates that this field is relevant for GMES.

**ACTION (PG)**

**Contact EU to find the deadline for updating drafts**

**ACTION (SWWT)**

**Contact delegates to promote space weather**

4. Space Weather and GMES (Y. Beniguel)

**Appendix 2: Space Weather and GMES**

Following a call for volunteers to prepare a proposal in response to the GSE ITT on behalf of the SWWT, Y. Beniguel gave a presentation describing a draft proposal that he has initiated. The proposal aims to integrate the service development activities of the space weather applications pilot project into the GSE framework. The deadline for this proposal was identified as 17<sup>th</sup> November.

A. Hilgers pointed out that the contract would last for 2 years. During these 2 years, the GSE ITT requires that a service segment should be consolidated. The goals of this ITT match closely with the activities of the SWWT and pilot project.

Y. Beniguel stated that about 20 documents are needed in order to make an appropriate synthesis of the activities of the pilot project.

R. Horne asked how many people would be involved in this proposal. He also enquired as to the level of funding available and over what timescale it would be available.

The members were reminded that it had been agreed at the last SWWT meeting that a project of 100-200Keuro would appear reasonable in terms of the work involved in producing these reports and the cost to GSE.

A. Hilgers pointed out that R. Gendrin has already provided valuable input in evaluating possible synergies between space weather and GMES and that a report is in preparation.

The proposal of Y Beniguel was well received, but concerns were raised regarding the short timescale available in which to complete the proposal.

**ACTION (YB)**

**Contact R. Gendrin for further input on writing proposal**

5. SWWT Restructuring (A. Glover)

**Appendix 3: SWWT Restructuring**

Restructuring of the SWWT was discussed. A. Glover gave a short presentation of the proposed structure. An announcement of this structure will be circulated via the SWEN newsletter in the next weeks. The next election of a chairperson will be held at the December space weather workshop. ESA will circulate the names of potential candidates before this date.

**ACTION (AG)**

**Circulate details of SWWT restructuring via SWEN**

**ACTION(AG, AH)**

**Circulate names of SWWT candidates for chairmanship election to existing SWWT membership before workshop.**

R. Pirjola stated that he feels the present open structure of the SWWT works very well. However, he felt that it might be better to have one official representative from each member state.

A Hilgers and A. Glover stated that this type of representation will appear in the space weather steering board under this revised structure.

6. A. O. B.

A Hilgers mentioned that a proposal for miniature space weather beacons made within ESA has received preliminary acceptance for GSP and is likely to be submitted to the IPC.

A. Glover informed the group that contact has been made with Herman Opgenoorth (chair of International Living with a Star steering board) to discuss the connection of the ESA space weather application initiative with ILWS. H. Opgenoorth stated that ILWS would become more international and representatives of the applications pilot project were invited to join a task group geared towards 'end users' of the ILWS data. The next steering board meeting is scheduled to follow the EGS/AGU meeting in the spring.

The next SWWT meeting will take place in December 2002, to coincide with the space weather applications pilot project workshop.

---