

SWWT Meeting 13

**ESA/ESTEC, Noordwijk,
30th June, 2003**

Present

F. Dalla Vedova, AMSAT Italia
 S. Dewitte, RMI Brussels
 G. Drolshagen, ESA-ESTEC
 P. Gille, CNRS-LPCE
 A. Glover, ESA-ESTEC
 A. Hilgers, ESA-ESTEC
 E. Jeansou, Noveltis
 W. Keil, EADS-Astrium
 H. Lappalainen, FMI
 C. Lathuillère, LPG Grenoble
 F. Lefeuvre, CNRS-LPCE
 S. Lejeune, ROB Brussels
 R. van der Linden, ROB Brussels
 R. Marsden, ESA-ESTEC
 C. de Matos, ESA-HQ
 C. Mayr, Navus GmbH
 M. Messerotti, INAF-Trieste Astron. Obs.
 H. Nebdi, RMI Brussels
 R. Pirjola, FMI
 J. -Y. Prado, CNES
 W. Riedler, IWF Graz
 B. Sanahuja, Univ. Barcelona
 C. Schalinski, EADS-Astrium
 S. Stankov, DLR
 R. Warnant, ROB Brussels

Apologies

Y. Beniguel, IEEA
 A. Blusson, CLS
 M. Candidi, IFSI
 T. Dudok de Wit, CNRS-LPCE, Orléans
 M. Hapgood, RAL
 F. Jansen, Univ. Greifswald
 J.-C. Jodogne, RMI Brussels
 B. Jones, Solar Metrics/MSSL
 K. Kauristie, FMI
 N. von Krusenstierna, Aerotech Telub
 J. Liliensten, LPG-Grenoble
 H. Lundstedt, IRF-Lund
 A. Thomson, BGS
 J. Watermann, DMI

1. SWWT Chairmanship

A. Glover recalled how the election of the new SWWT chairman was organised and the final results. F. Lefeuvre specified the role he intends to play as a SWWT chairman. His objective is to contribute to the preparation of a future European Space Weather programme via :

- reviews of actions related to the road-map and of the road-map itself,
- reinforcement of the link with all European organisms interested or potentially interested in Space Weather (EU, EUMETSAT, SSWG, etc.)
- help in the co-ordination of Space Weather activities
- promotion of Space Weather activities.

He proposed to work with a SWWT Board including R. Pirjola, W. Riedler, A. Glover and A. Hilgers. The interest of a SWWT Board is :

- to improve exchanges between ESTEC, SWWT, COST, ...
- to co-ordinate actions in between two SWWT meetings (e.g. with EU, SSWG),
- to reinforce the SWWT position as regards to EU, ESA and the scientific community.

This proposal was approved.

2. Review of Actions in Progress

a. COST (W. Riedler)

W. Riedler explained that the COST programmes, formerly run by the commission, were currently in a transition period as the secretarial responsibility will be taken over by ESF. As ESF is geared towards science, he expressed his concern that telecoms and space weather application fields may fall outside remit in the future. This could be the case for the COST 724 programme (Developing the scientific basis for monitoring, modelling and predicting Space Weather) who was initiated by T. Clark and whose the present coordinator is J. Liliensten. It falls under "Meteorology" and so will be monitored by the Meteorology Technical Committee. As an evaluator of COST 271, W. Riedler expressed his surprise that B. Zolesi (chairman) did not refer to COST 724 at the last COST 271 (Effects of upper Atmosphere on terrestrial and Earth-space Communications) meeting. Apparently, COST 724 is waiting for a final decision to start its activities. In the absence of the J. Liliensten, it was suggested that an action be taken to investigate the potential effects of the new regulation on COST 724 and to see if it necessary to ask the SWWT members to contact their national representatives.

ACTION 1: F. Lefevre

Liase with J. Liliensten regarding COST 724 progress

The point of presenting the Space Weather activities to ESF was raised. Such a presentation was made two years ago at an ESF- SC meeting in Florence. But a new presentation may be necessary. This will be discussed by the SWWT board.

ACTION 2: F. Lefevre and SWWT board

Identify actions to be taken with ESF.

b. SWEET (R. Pirjola)

A response from EU was received on 13th June. The note obtained for the relevance (4/5 for a threshold at 3/5) is very promising. Other notes need to be improved (Potential Impact at 3/5 for a threshold at 3/5; S&T excellence at 3/5 for a threshold at 4/5; Mobilisation of the resources at 3/5 for a threshold at 3/5). The main problems were about the constitution of the consortium and the proposed management. The total score was at 17/30 for a threshold at 21/30.

The evaluation stated that the proposal should have positioned better its activities with respect to ESA and EU (COST) on-going projects, the decision making process is not convincing, and the number of scheduled meetings is not appropriate. It was

considered that WPs 1000 and 2000 should be funded by ESA programmes. A more detailed evaluation is expected in the near future

The main points in the discussion on the future of SWEET (discussion that took place later on in the agenda) were as follows.

Several participants emphasised on the need to follow an approach based on what is also understandable by a man in the street.

R. Pirjola and H. Lappalainen volunteered to start work on revising the proposal in August.

P. Gille suggested that a small core group could begin to think about how to rework the proposal. It was proposed to constitute such a group from R. Pirjola, H. Lappalainen, F. Lefeuvre, M. Hapgood, N. Jakowski, A. Glover, and A. Hilgers. The number of persons in the group has to be limited, but all information will be circulated within the SWWT.

S. Stankov stated that DLR would prefer to contribute to the revised SWEET proposal. However, if major changes are not made to the management structure they are willing to submit their MOPLE proposal either as a collaborative effort or independently in competition with SWEET.

F. Lefeuvre proposed that a small group try to arrange a meeting between SWEET and MOPLE groups before end of August to see if the SWWT can support both or 1 only.

ACTION 3, R. Pirjola and H. Lappalainen

Get the detailed evaluation on SWEET and make contact with commission officers to get more information on the points to be improved. A meeting in Brussels to discuss SWEET/space weather is encouraged.

ACTION 4, R. Pirjola and H. Lappalainen

Arrange a teleconference between core group in August in order to discuss the structure of a new proposal, then contact the MOPLE group.

ACTION 5, F. Lefeuvre and SWWT board

Arrange a meeting of the SWEET and MOPLE groups and decide what project is supported by SWWT.

c. FP6 AO Status (P. Gille)

Informal information on the status of the FP6 AOs is circulated by the national representatives. P. Gille summed up the information he got from France (see the summary of his presentation). The main points are as follows.

- A new GMES AO, including “risk management” is expected by the end of 2003 with a deadline in the first term of 2004 for the answers. It will benefit of the budget which will not be distributed after the first AO.

- Eurorisk was not selected. According to previous contacts, it does not seem that SWEET could be associated to a new Eurorisk proposal
- Although the emphasis be put on research it happens that the proposals which are selected are directed toward the development of operational products. In that respect, the role of SME's in a proposal is of primary importance.

A. Hilgers proposed to investigate other possible ways to enter the FP6 in parallel. He reminded that some security aspects may be relevant to space weather. He suggested that it could be interesting to find out what the content is of the NoE (GMOSS) selected under "Security" after first call.

One important question is to know what the officers have in mind for the future AO and more generally to see how Space Weather could be included in GMES and GALILEO AOs. New contacts with EU officers are needed.

ACTION 6, F. Lefevre and the SWWT board

Contact EU officers in charge of the GMES and GALILEO AOs in order to review the evaluation of the SWEET proposal and to get information on future GMES and GALILEO AOs.

d. ILWS

J.Y. Prado, who was the convenor of the ILWS meeting in Nice a few months ago, presented his views on the role of ILWS and on the possible connections with the SWWT.

R. Marsden stated that ILWS is a coordination activity rather than a science funding opportunity currently. A European coordination meeting is planned in Autumn. It was agreed that SWWT should be involved.

H. Opgenoorth currently chairs the ILWS steering committee. The working group has task groups which are currently being implemented. The "End user" group is waiting for E. Daly to define a charter.

ACTION 7, F. Lefevre and the SWWT board

Be represented at the next European coordination meeting and define appropriate actions to link SWWT and ILWS WG activities.

3. Roadmap and Topical Teams (see presentation material)

- present status (A. Hilgers)

- pilot projects (A. Glover)

http://www.estec.esa.nl/wmwww/wma/spweather/esa_initiatives/pilotproject/pilotproject.html

4. **Promotion of a European SW Network**

Next ESA Space Weather workshop will take place in 3-5th November . J.Y. Prado suggested that the sessions be organised according to the topical teams.

The role of SWWT members in promoting SW applications has been discussed. A. Hilgers pointed out that the pilot project should allow to identify other relevant business and SMEs etc.

The point to re-contact the users who were interviewed during the ESA contracts about a future European Space Weather programme has been discussed. It seems difficult to take an action on this matter without a proper budget. GALILEO was mentioned as a possible user.

F. Dalla Vedova proposed involving national weather agencies

The question of space weather related health issues was raised by W. Riedler and M. Messerotti. W. Riedler suggested that a synthesis of these effects should be made by someone prior to next SWWT meeting to determine whether a new topical group is needed to focus on this.

ACTION 8 , F. Lefevre and SWWT board
Re-examine possible actions to promote Space Weather activities

ACTION 9, F. Lefevre and SWWT board
Nominate someone to review space weather effects on human health.

5. **A. O. B.**

For M. Hapgood (e-mail message) SWWT meetings are not announced enough in advance and meetings in Monday must be avoided. Actions will be taken to notify SWWT meetings more than 1 month in advance. For several reasons, including the price of the plane tickets, it is not obvious to avoid meetings on Monday.

The next ESA space weather workshop was confirmed for 3-5th November 2003. The next SWWT meeting will be held in conjunction with this. It will probably start on Monday afternoon.

The COST 724 KO meeting should take place later in the year.

J. Y. Prado informed the SWWT of an article published in Space News (16 June) about a reduction of 43% in the budget 2003 of the Boulder Space Environment Center. As it is of primary importance to know if this decrease is related to a decrease in the interest of the US administration for Space Weather, an action is taken to get information about the official interpretation.

ACTION 10, all SWWT members

Transmit to F. Lefeuvre and A. Glover any information on the budget situation in Boulder.