

Draft Report

50th Executive Committee Meeting

Canberra, Australia, 9 November 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chair: Li Pengde, China.

1 SESSION 1

1.1 Welcome from Co-Chairs and Secretariat Director

Outcomes: The Executive Committee:

- Welcomed new members Chile, France, Ghana and Peru; and
- Thanked the Australian hosts for a very successful GEO Week 2019.

1.2 Adoption of Agenda (Document 50.1 – for decision)

Outcome: The agenda was adopted with the addition of items on changes regarding open-source software to the Rules of Procedure and on the process for the selection of the next Secretariat Director, to be handled during Any Other Business.

1.3 Lead Co-chair Goals and Objectives for 2020 (Document 50.2 – for decision)

Outcome: The Goals, Objectives and Indicators were approved, subject to several modifications requested by Executive Committee members.

Action 50.1: The Secretariat to prepare a revised version of the Goals, Objectives and Indicators. **Due: 51st Executive Committee meeting.**

2 SESSION 2

2.1 Review of GEO Week, GEO-XVI and Canberra Ministerial (for discussion)

Outcome: The Executive Committee recognized that GEO Week 2019 was very successful. Some specific observations included the following:

- The Industry Track was a useful innovation, but more opportunities for interaction between industry and government representatives should be provided;
- GEO should track progress toward the commitments in the Declaration and should also compile and monitor whether issues raised in Ministerial statements are being addressed;

- A lessons-learned process should be conducted with the Ministerial Working Group and a survey sent to all GEO Week participants;
- GEO should look to combine other events with future Plenary meetings where possible, including Regional GEO meetings;
- GEO should look to engage communities within the region where GEO Plenary meetings are held;
- GEO must ensure that the engagement of Pacific Island nations is followed up;
- There was successful engagement with indigenous communities and Executive Committee thanked, in particular, Australia and Conservation International for their efforts in this regard;
- Side event categories worked well, but it would be advisable to reduce the overlaps between too many events; and
- GEO should consider how future GEO Weeks could be more environmentally responsible.

2.2 Review of 2019 Applications for Associates Category (Document 50.3 – for information)

Outcome: The Executive Committee took note of the report.

2.3 Proposed Collaboration Areas with WMO (Document 50.4 – for decision)

Outcome: The Secretariat recommendations were accepted.

3 SESSION 3

3.1 GEO Knowledge Hub – Next Steps

Outcome: The Secretariat is to prepare an implementation plan for the GEO Knowledge Hub, in consultation with the GEOSS Infrastructure Development Task Team. The plan is to be reviewed by the Programme Board at its 16th meeting (February 2020).

Action 50.2: The implementation plan, incorporating comments from the Programme Board, is to be presented to the Executive Committee. **Due: 51st Executive Committee meeting.**

3.2 Any Other Business

3.2.1 Process for the Selection of the Next Secretariat Director

Outcome: The Executive Committee launched the process for selection of the next Secretariat Director.

Action 50.3: Each GEO Caucus to identify one representative from the Caucus who will participate on the selection panel. **Due: 22 November 2019 to the Lead Co-chair.**

Action 50.4: The Lead Co-chair, with the assistance of the Secretariat, to establish contact with the human resources department of the WMO. **Due: week of 11 November.**

3.2.2 *Proposal from Finland*

Outcome: A session is to be added to the GEO Data and Knowledge Week 2020 on the issue of open-source software.

Action 50.5: Finland to circulate their proposal to Executive Committee members. **Due: 30 November 2019.**

3.2.3 *Date of the 51st Executive Committee Meeting*

Outcome: The meeting dates will be 19-20 March 2020.

3.3 **Review of Outcomes and Actions**

3.4 **Closing Remarks**

Draft Report
50th Executive Committee Meeting
Canberra, Australia, 9 November 2019

FULL REPORT

Saturday, 9 November 2019

Meeting convened at 9:00

Chair: Li Pengde, China.

1 SESSION 1

1.1 Welcome from Co-Chairs and Secretariat Director

Li Pengde, representing the China Co-Chair, welcomed new members of the Executive Committee and reminded all members that the focus for the meeting following the Plenary is to discuss plans for the coming year.

Stephen Volz, United States Co-chair, stated that he was looking forward to also hearing a recap of the Plenary and the Ministerial Summit.

Mmboneni Muofhe, South Africa Co-chair, thanked all who worked to create a successful GEO Week. He suggested that Executive Committee would review the outcomes of the week to determine what the Executive Committee needs to do in 2020.

Jan Ramboer, representing the European Commission Co-chair, thanked the Australian team for the successful Plenary and Ministerial. He noted the many exciting side events that took place and received positive feedback from commercial sector firms regarding the Industry Track. Mr Ramboer noted that the hard work of negotiations before the event paid off with a unanimous approval of the Declaration.

Gilberto Camara, Secretariat Director, welcomed the new members to the Executive Committee.

Chile stated that they were delighted to be part of the Executive Committee. They thanked Australia for the organization of the meetings, noting that the preparations had started just after the previous Plenary. It was noted that new challenges had emerged during the week which would require complex solutions, but Chile was ready to work as part of the Executive Committee to address them.

France said that they were very happy to be part of the Executive Committee and offered warm thanks to the Australian hosts.

Peru thanked Australia and the Secretariat for the excellent job in organizing the week. They committed to working with other members of the Executive Committee to achieve good results for GEO.

Ghana expressed their sincere appreciation to the GEO community for choosing them to be part of the Executive Committee. Ghana has been a GEO Member since 2010 and has

played an active role in GEO, though it has been in a period of transition lately and thus somewhat less active. Ghana is committed to the objectives of GEO and to supporting GEO in achieving them. It is also committed to Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education. Ghana noted that it may in future propose a fourth Executive Committee seat for Africa so that all sub-regions of the continent may be represented.

Outcomes: The Executive Committee:

- Welcomed new members Chile, France, Ghana and Peru; and
- Thanked the Australian hosts for a very successful GEO Week 2019.

1.2 Adoption of Agenda (Document 50.1 – for decision)

Outcome: The agenda was adopted with the addition of items the process for the selection of the next Secretariat Director and a proposal from Finland, to be handled during Any Other Business.

1.3 Lead Co-chair Goals and Objectives for 2020 (Document 50.2 – for decision)

The Lead Co-chair presented the document and asked for comments.

Japan said that they were unsure how the indicator for Objective 2.2 would be measured. They proposed that a qualitative indicator may work better in this instance.

The United States said that they appreciated the continuity of many of the indicators from year to year. Regarding Objective 3.2, it was suggested that GEO may not be in a position to encourage the development of national coordinating mechanisms and so the second indicator may not be appropriate.

France suggested that, for the indicator for Objective 1.1, wording regarding the achievement of the goals and targets should be added, in addition to reporting. Objective 1.3 should include reference to the Paris Agreement. For Objective 1.5, it would be helpful to have more explanation of the vision. On Objective 2.1, a more detailed roadmap of the process is needed, as was previously discussed by the Executive Committee.

The United States responded that, regarding Objective 1.3, the Paris Agreement is a part of the UNFCCC processes that are mentioned and thus specifying the Paris Agreement is not necessary.

South Africa asked about the plan for dealing with the indicator for Objective 2.1.

Australia agreed with the United States to retain the current language for Objective 1.3. On Objective 2.1, it was suggested that the indicator could be based on the delivery of an implementation plan at the 51st Executive Committee meeting.

Outcome: The Goals, Objectives and Indicators were approved, subject to several modifications requested by Executive Committee members.

Action 50.1: The Secretariat to prepare a revised version of the Goals, Objectives and Indicators. **Due: 51st Executive Committee meeting.**

2 SESSION 2

2.1 Review of GEO Week, GEO-XVI and Canberra Ministerial (for discussion)

Iain Williams, co-chair of the Ministerial Working Group from the United Kingdom, opened the discussion by recalling how the Ministerial Working Group was focused on ensuring a successful Ministerial and Plenary with broad engagement from across the GEO community. In particular, the Working Group focused on increasing participation from the commercial sector, Pacific Island states, and indigenous peoples. Much effort was also directed to the engagement with ministers. Mr Williams stated that he believed these objectives had been met. He noted the success of the Industry Track and how this helped enable the commercial sector, including the new GEO Associates, to engage with the GEO Plenary. Mr Williams also reflected on the huge amount of work that was devoted to the preparation of the ministerial declaration, noting the importance of bringing in colleagues with expertise in diplomacy to assist in writing the declaration. He thanked the Australian colleagues for their tremendous efforts in making the Ministerial and the Plenary a success. He concluded by proposing that a final meeting of the Working Group be convened to review the event and to capture any lessons learned to support South Africa in their preparations for next year, welcoming support from the Secretariat to assist in this.

The United States agreed that lessons learned be gathered about the process and that the Ministerial Working Group meet once more to discuss how to document reflections of the members. It was also noted that GEO had created high expectations with the Pacific island countries and thus there was a need for a conversation in GEO on how to carry this forward.

Australia offered to lead the conversation around engagement with the Pacific islands. This needs to be done in a sensitive way that is agreed broadly within the GEO community. GEO Week has raised the profile of GEO significantly within the Australian government, which has been very useful and is a positive outcome from hosting a Plenary meeting.

Jonathon Ross, member of the Ministerial Working Group, observed that it was good to have linked the Asia-Oceania GEO event and GEO Week. This wouldn't always be possible, but should be encouraged. He noted that there was quite a bit of content that fed from the Asia-Oceania GEO meeting to the side events and then to Plenary. Mr Ross observed that the organization of the side events was more complex administratively than in previous years, but was successful. In particular, there were larger audiences for the key side events, which created good connections across the community. He noted that there was a total of over 80 key, targeted and lightning events. The Pacific programme was also new and was important for this group. All of the Pacific events were well attended, both from people from the region and from the general GEO community. Mr Ross stated that it was critical that GEO follow up on this interest. It was expected that, in a year, the community will have prepared a business case to which GEO can respond. He encouraged the Programme Board to also look into this. Feedback from the Industry Track was also positive, although for future events GEO should look at how to bring the industry and government sides together more. This includes thinking creatively about how to structure the week, including the Plenary, to allow for more connection between groups. Response to the exhibition was also very strong. Having the

UN-GGIM and UN Environment meetings co-located was good to build linkages with these other organizations and communities, but while it was a good first step, the cross-fertilization was not as strong as had been hoped. Mr Ross was glad to see the meaningful indigenous participation during the week, not only from Australia; he thanked Conservation International for their work on this.

Patricia Geddes informed Executive Committee that the Secretariat would be sending out a survey to participants. She also proposed using a structured lessons learned exercise with the Ministerial Working Group.

China said that it was important to follow up on the points raised during the Plenary and the Ministerial. It was suggested that the Declaration points be translated into the GEO Work Programme. Also, consideration should be given to its implications for the Regional GEOs and the national GEOs. Publicity of the Declaration will be important, so it may be discussed in multiple contexts. The enthusiasm of many smaller countries was noted, including concerns expressed regarding climate change, food security and other issues. The interest of Pacific countries was noticeable and was welcomed. China endorsed setting up a task force to engage with these countries, and China offered to work with others on the engagement of the Pacific islands.

The United States agreed that it was important to map the points raised in the ministerial statements and follow up. It was unfortunate that there was not more interaction between the industry and government representatives. The industry track was quite successful and so it had been worth taking this risk. One point that was heard was that the commercial sector is not all the same; there are many different business models. It is important to look at individual examples, case by case. Regional GEOs will be important in reaching out to the commercial sector. GEO as a whole can then look across the Regional GEOs for best practices and commonalities. This would provide a basis for developing a stronger relationship with the commercial sector.

South Africa stated that, going forward, GEO should look at these events as opportunities to engage more communities in our respective regions. It is important to take advantage of these opportunities and to follow up afterward to ensure new groups are brought into GEO. South Africa agreed that it is important to bring the Declaration to life, to look at how we implement it over the next several years. GEO should look at how to improve engagement with the commercial sector, building on the strong foundation of the past week. The Industry Track should be an approach that the whole GEO community should take up. Overall, the flow of the sessions was good and showed that the meetings are being improved each time. The messages were unambiguous; it was very clear what we are trying to do. Participants are seeing the opportunities for them in their involvement in GEO. This GEO Week set a very high standard.

The European Commission agreed with Australia that the different types of side events worked well. GEO should look, however, at how to structure the overlap of the events. Regarding the Industry Track, it was originally set up to allow industry representatives to get together, but we can build on this for the next time.

The United States observed that statements were often made by the same small group of countries. GEO needs to broaden the range of countries that speak during Plenary meetings and Ministerials. It was useful to have Caucus representatives speak because it

forced countries to collaborate with one another. Regional GEOs should take a more active role in organizing interventions from their members. It was also noted that the GEO Associates who were present in the Plenary were not aware that they could speak in the meeting; this should be encouraged in future meetings.

Iain Williams thanked Executive Committee members for their very helpful comments. He also welcomed support from the Secretariat for the lessons learned process. He agreed that it was important to make the Declaration relevant to GEO's future work. He noted that GEO hadn't thought about making the Plenary the "greenest", most environmentally-friendly. Going forward, what would this look like? Mr Williams gave an example of a participant who offset his personal carbon emissions by planting trees; should this be a broader event?

The Chair stated that GEO Week is the most important week of the year for GEO. It brings a focus to how to make Earth observations information integrated with the economy and easier to use. How do we enable the Declaration to be implemented in every country? It is important that Executive Committee checks on progress each year, not just on paper, but through a real call to the world. Bring the Declaration back each year to look at progress. Perhaps we also need explanations of what each sentence in the Declaration means. He noted that GEO is for all countries and that it is important to ensure that no countries are left behind.

Outcomes: The Executive Committee recognized that GEO Week 2019 was very successful. Some specific observations included the following:

- The Industry Track was a useful innovation, but more opportunities for interaction between industry and government representatives should be provided;
- GEO should track progress toward the commitments in the Declaration and should also compile and monitor whether issues raised in Ministerial statements are being addressed;
- A lessons-learned process should be conducted with the Ministerial Working Group and a survey sent to all GEO Week participants;
- GEO should look to combine other events with future Plenary meetings where possible, including Regional GEO meetings;
- GEO should look to engage communities within the region where GEO Plenary meetings are held;
- GEO must ensure that the engagement of Pacific Island nations is followed up;
- There was successful engagement with indigenous communities and Executive Committee thanked, in particular, Australia and Conservation International for their efforts in this regard;
- Side event categories worked well, but it would be advisable to reduce the overlaps between too many events; and
- GEO should consider how future GEO Weeks could be more environmentally responsible.

2.2 Review of 2019 Applications for Associates Category (Document 50.3 – for information)

Patricia Geddes introduced the item, explaining that the Executive Committee had asked the Secretariat to review all applications and expressions of interest in the Associates category that had been received during the year. She noted that some applications are still in process due to the late receipt of the forms. A few applications had also not been approved by the GEO Principal, following the established criteria.

Outcome: The Executive Committee took note of the report.

2.3 Proposed Collaboration Areas with WMO (Document 50.4 – for decision)

Sara Venturini, Climate Coordinator in the Secretariat, presented the document. She reminded Executive Committee members of the original 11 areas for collaboration that had been agreed by GEO and WMO and that this list had been narrowed to five areas through discussions between the two Secretariats in July 2019. Following the direction of the 48th Executive Committee meeting, the Secretariat held further discussions with WMO and prepared a new set of recommendations, which take account of the WMO reform process and expected changes in GEO. Ms Venturini then explained each of the recommendations.

The Chair stated the importance of having more cooperation between GEO and WMO.

Japan agreed that it was important to have better collaboration and thanked the Secretariat for the report and welcomed Ms Venturini to GEO. Japan asked for more information on the reasons for the identification of the five topics. The role of the new Climate Working Group and the Climate Workshop in this process was also not clear. Japan recommended that the Climate Working Group take a leading role in coordination with WMO.

Switzerland recommended that the original eleven topics not be forgotten. While it was good to focus on the five areas, there is capacity within GEO to collaborate on other areas. In particular, Switzerland agreed with the first recommendation. GEO-GNOME is ready to collaborate with WMO. It is important to engage GEO Work Programme activities as part of the response. Switzerland disagreed with recommendation 2, preferring to keep the process internal. GEO should look for a different way of engaging with UN specialized agencies.

The United States was supportive of the recommendations, especially 1 and 2. It was good to “declutter” the space in which the two organizations overlap. The United States encouraged GEO to be cautious about involvement in areas where WMO has a clear mandate. It was also important to clarify the bilateral consultation mechanism.

CEOS stated that the Climate Working Group would be willing to help on implementing the recommendations. CEOS itself is working on some of these priority areas and can help support them.

South Africa requested clarification of points 4 and 5 in Annex A.

China stated that they agreed with most of the recommendations. Ministerial statements mentioned the importance for GEO of working with international organizations. While it is important to have a good relationship, GEO is not part of WMO. GEO is an

independent international organization. It must establish a relationship with WMO as a partner. This is similar to GEO's relationships with UNOOSA, WHO, and so on. The work plan must be practical to implement. There is nothing wrong with a bilateral mechanism, but Executive Committee needs to understand the purpose.

The European Commission welcomed the document and supported the four recommendations. It was noted that the Commission was in the process of signing an agreement with the WMO that covers several areas and GEO is mentioned several times in that agreement.

Ms Venturini responded to several of the points raised. She noted that the terms of reference of the Climate Working Group could be amended to reflect their role in the collaboration with WMO. Regarding the original 11 areas of collaboration, they are not being forgotten but the reduction was based on messages from WMO that they wished to focus on a smaller set of issues, principally climate and data. Recommendation 2 had been suggested by WMO as a means of gaining greater support for collaboration with GEO from their members. Ms Venturini noted that some of the previous collaboration areas were not included due to changes in GEO Work Programme activities and signals from WMO that they were not supportive of GEO efforts in those areas. Regarding radio frequency issues, GEO's involvement had been very limited in the past and currently there was little expertise on the issue in the Secretariat.

Outcome: The Secretariat recommendations were accepted.

3 SESSION 3

3.1 GEO Knowledge Hub – Next Steps

Douglas Cripe, Senior Scientist in the Secretariat, reviewed the document and the presentation to the Plenary.

France asked that, in preparing the plan, the Secretariat ensure that measures are taken to enable the GEO Knowledge Hub to be implemented through alternative providers.

Outcome: The Secretariat is to prepare an implementation plan for the GEO Knowledge Hub, in consultation with the GEOSS Infrastructure Development Task Team. The plan is to be reviewed by the Programme Board at its 16th meeting (February 2020).

Action 50.2: The implementation plan, incorporating comments from the Programme Board, is to be presented to the Executive Committee. **Due: 51st Executive Committee meeting.**

3.2 Any Other Business

3.2.1 *Process for the Selection of the Next Secretariat Director*

South Africa introduced the item, which had been previously discussed in closed session. It was noted that, due to the various steps and timing required under the WMO human resources rules, it was important to begin the selection process imminently. South Africa then briefly outlined the major steps of the process.

The United States said that the process described was as expected. The previous process was appropriately executed and so no major changes were required. It was noted that the Executive Committee should look at how the announcement of the chosen candidate would be made, given the need for sensitivity to all candidates. It was also important to look at how to ensure involvement in the process from all five Caucuses. The United States volunteered to participate on the selection panel, but would connect first with the Americas Caucus.

South Africa also indicated their willingness to serve on the selection panel.

Outcome: The Executive Committee launched the process for selection of the next Secretariat Director.

Action 50.3: Each GEO Caucus to identify one representative from the Caucus who will participate on the selection panel. **Due: 22 November 2019 to the Lead Co-chair.**

Action 50.4: The Lead Co-chair, with the assistance of the Secretariat, to establish contact with the human resources department of the WMO. **Due: week of 11 November.**

3.2.2 *Proposal from Finland*

The European Commission noted that Finland had raised an issue during the Ministerial but that it wasn't addressed then. The matter concerned whether GEO should state a preference for open-source software in its Rules of Procedure. The Commission asked whether China might consider a session in the GEO Data and Knowledge Week 2020 on this issue.

Outcome: A session is to be added to the GEO Data and Knowledge Week 2020 on the issue of open-source software.

Action 50.5: Finland to circulate their proposal to Executive Committee members. **Due: 30 November 2019.**

3.2.3 *Date of the 51st Executive Committee Meeting*

China noted a conflict with the original date of the 51st Executive Committee meeting and important internal meetings of the Chinese government.

Outcome: The meeting dates will be revised to 19-20 March 2020.

The dates for the Executive Committee meetings in 2020 are therefore:

51st Session – 19-20 March 2020, Geneva, Switzerland

52nd Session – 7-8 July 2020, Geneva, Switzerland

53rd Session – 3 November 2020, Port Elizabeth, South Africa

54th Session – 6 November 2020, Port Elizabeth, South Africa

3.3 **Review of Outcomes and Actions**

The outcomes and actions from the meeting were reviewed and approved.

3.4 Closing Remarks

The United States, South Africa and European Commission Co-chairs thanked Executive Committee colleagues and the Lead Co-chair.

Mr Li thanked colleagues for their patience and support, and Australia and the Secretariat team for the organization of GEO Week. He also thanked the China GEO office for their support to his role as chair. Mr Li noted that GEO is a unique community that is at once technical, economic, political, and of the people. GEO will continue to make contributions to the digital economy and to global sustainability. On behalf of the Lead Co-chair, he promised to make best use of the resources across the various ministries and agencies within China to support GEO's work. He also committed to using contacts with WMO and other international organizations to further GEO's goals and encouraged other Executive Committee members to do the same.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30.

List of Participants 50 th GEO Executive Committee	
China	
Mr Pengde Li Deputy Director-General National Administration of Surveying, Mapping and Geoinformation of China No.28, Lianhuachi West Road Haidian District Beijing 100830 China	Phone: +86-10-63881788 Fax: +86-10-63882222 lipdgeo@sbsm.gov.cn lipd@sbsm.gov.cn lipengde@mail.cgs.gov.cn
Ms Songmei Zhang Deputy Director-General National Remote Sensing Center of China Ministry of Science and Technology 15B, Fuxing Road 100682 Beijing China	Phone: +86-10-68529094 Fax: +86-10-68574482 songmei.zhang@nrsc.gov.cn
Mr Changchui He Executive President Academy of Digital China Ministry of Science and Technology No. A8, Liulinguan Nanli Haidian District Beijing 100036 China	Phone: +86 105 737 0439 Cell: +86 156 114 98291 hechangchui@yahoo.com
Mr Chengzhi Sun Deputy Director-General China Aero Geophysical Survey and Remote Sensing Center for Natural Resources China Geological Survey Ministry of Natural Resources of the P.R. China No. 45 Fuwai Street Xicheng District Beijing 100037 China	scz@lasac.cn
Ms Chen Miao Project Officer National Remote Sensing Center of China	miaochen@nrsc.gov.cn

List of Participants 50 th GEO Executive Committee	
Ministry of Science and Technology of the No. A8, Liulinguan Nanli Haidian District Beijing 100036 China	
Mr Wei Li Project Officer China Aero Geophysical Survey and Remote Sensing Center for Natural Resources China Geological Survey Ministry of Natural Resources of the P.R. China No. 45 Fuwai Street Xicheng District Beijing 100037 China	iceliwei@vip.qq.com
European Commission	
Mr Jan Ramboer Policy Officer Directorate-General for Research and Innovation European Commission CDMA 03/109 1049 Brussels Belgium	Phone: +32 229 679 68 jan.ramboer@ec.europa.eu
Ms Marjan Van Meerloo Policy Officer Earth Observation Directorate-General for Research and Innovation European Commission CDMA 03/185 1049 Brussel Belgium	marjan.van-meerloo@ec.europa.eu
South Africa	
Mr Mmboneni Muofhe Deputy Director General	Phone: +27 12 843 6341 Cell: +27 74 296 6244

List of Participants 50 th GEO Executive Committee	
<p>Science and Technology Department of Science and Technology Private Bag X 894 0001 Pretoria South Africa</p>	<p>Fax: +27 12 844 0396 mmboneni.muofhe@dst.gov.za mmbonenimuofhe@gmail.com buliswa.omodona@dst.gov.za</p>
<p>Mr Imraan Saloojee Manager Stakeholder and Business Development SANSA Earth Observation Enterprise Building, Mark Shuttleworth Street Innovation Hub Pretoria 0087 South Africa</p>	<p>Phone: +27 12 844 04 26 / +27 12 660 3035 Cell: +27 72 267 0583 Fax: +27 12 844 0396 isaloojee@sansa.org.za</p>
<p>Mr Humbulani Mudau Chief Director: Space Science Science and Technology Technology Innovation Department of Science and Technology (DST) Private Bag X 894 DST Building 53 CSIR Campus, Meiring Naude Road Brummeria 0001 Pretoria 0182 South Africa</p>	<p>Phone: +27 12 843 68 57 Cell: +27 82 306 72 08 Fax: +27 82 306 72 08 humbulani.mudau@dst.gov.za</p>
United States	
<p>Dr Stephen Volz Assistant Administrator Department of Commerce The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) 1335 East West Highway, Bldg. SSMC1 20910-3283 Silver Spring United States</p>	<p>Phone: +1-301-713-3578 Fax: +1-301-713-1249 stephen.m.volz@noaa.gov</p>
<p>Dr Virginia Burkett Chief Scientist Climate and Land Use Change U.S. Geological Survey</p>	<p>Phone: +1 318 332 1828 virginia_burkett@usgs.gov</p>

List of Participants 50 th GEO Executive Committee	
540 North Courthouse Street Many LA 71449 United States	
Ms Yana Gevorgyan Senior International Relations Specialist NOAA Satellite and Information Service Department of Commerce The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) 1335 East-West Highway Room 7317 20910 3226 Silver Spring United States	Phone: +1 301 713 70 54 yana.gevorgyan@noaa.gov
Mr Christopher Cannizzaro Office of Space and Advanced Technology U.S. Department of State United States	Phone: +1 202 663 2390 CannizzaroCM@state.gov
Armenia (did not attend)	
Australia	
Dr Stuart Anthony Minchin Chief of Division Environmental Geosciences Geoscience Australia GPO Box 378 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia	Phone: + 61-2-62499898 Mob.: + 61-428602791 Fax: + 61 2 62499964 stuart.minchin@ga.gov.au sminchin@gmail.com
Mr Trevor Dhu Program Director, Digital Earth Australia National Earth and Marine Observations Environmental Geosciences Division Geoscience Australia Cnr Jerrabomberra Ave and Hindmarsh Drive 2609 Symonston Australia	Phone: +61 2 6249 9076 Mob.: +61 401 774 057 trevor.dhu@ga.gov.au

List of Participants 50 th GEO Executive Committee	
<p>Mr Jonathon Ross Director National Planning and International Relations Environmental Geoscience Division Australian Government Geoscience Australia (GA) Cnr Jerrabomberra Avenue and Hindmarsh Drive Symonston ACT GPO Box 378 Symonston ACT 2609 Australia</p>	<p>Phone: +61 2 6249 5847 Fax: +61 2 6249 9999 jonathon.ross@ga.gov.au</p>
Chile	
France	
<p>Mr Vincent Pircher Earth Observation Officer Department for Research of the Directorate of Research and Innovation Research Department Ministry for an Ecological and Solidary Transition Tour Séquoia 92055 La Défense Cedex France</p>	<p>Phone: +33 1 40 81 33 31 Cell: +33 6 80 88 25 53 vincent.pircher@developpement-durable.gouv.fr vincent.pircher@orange.fr</p>
Ghana	
Italy	
<p>Mr Nicola Pirrone Research Director National Research Council of Italy Earth System Science and Environmental Technologies Institute of Atmospheric Pollution Research (CNR-IIA) c/o UNICAL Via Pietro Bucci</p>	<p>Phone: +39 09 84 49 32 39 +39 06 90672563 Cell: +39 335 219989 Fax: +39 09 84 49 32 15 nicola.pirrone@iia.cnr.it pirrone@iia.cnr.it</p>

List of Participants 50 th GEO Executive Committee	
87036 Rende Italy	
Japan	
Mr Takashi Ishikawa Director for Environmental Science and Technology Environment and Energy Division Research and Development Bureau Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) 3-2-2, Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-8959 Japan	Phone: +81 3 6734 4181 Fax: +81 3 6734 4162 t-ishika@mext.go.jp
Ms Izumi Mizuno Environment and Energy Division Research and Development Bureau Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) 3-2-2, Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-8959 Japan	Phone: +81 3 6734 4181 Fax: +81 3 6734 4162 izumism@mext.go.jp
Ms Atsuko Nakasone Administrative Researcher Environment and Energy Division Research and Development Bureau Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) 3-2-2, Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-8959 Japan	Phone: +81 3 6734 4181 Fax: +81 3 6734 4162 atsuko-nakasone@mext.go.jp
Korea, Republic of	
Dr Yongseung Kim Principal Researcher National Satellite Operation and Application Center	Phone: +82 42 860 2476 Fax: +82 42 870 3909 yskim@kari.re.kr

List of Participants 50 th GEO Executive Committee	
Korea Aerospace Research Institute (KARI) 169-84, Gwahak-ro Yuseong-gu 34133 Daejeon Korea, Republic Of	
Peru	
Russian Federation	
Mr Sergey Uspenskiy Deputy Director Center on Space Hydrometeorology Planeta ROSHYDROMET 7, Bolshoi Predtechnsky Str. SRC Planeta Moscow 123242 Russian Federation	Phone: +7 499 795 21 12 Cell: +7 926 246 53 70 Fax: +7 499 252 66 10 uspenskys@planet.iitp.ru
Senegal	
Mr Amadou Dieye Technical Director-Earth Observation Specialist Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE) Rue L. G. Damas x Aimé Cesaire Fann Residence BP 15532 Dakar Senegal	Phone: +221 338 258 066 Cell: +221 774 190 288 Fax: +221 332 858 168 dieye@cse.sn amdieye@yahoo.com
Switzerland	
Dr José Romero Chief Scientist Environment International International Affairs Division Department of Environment, Transports, Communication and Energy Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN)	Phone: +41 58 462 68 62 Cell: +41 79 251 90 69 Fax: +41 58 463 03 49 jose.romero@bafu.admin.ch

List of Participants 50 th GEO Executive Committee	
International Affairs Division 3003 Bern Switzerland	
OBSERVERS	
CEOS	
Dr Alex Held Principal Research Scientist Astronomy and Space Science CSIRO GPO Box 1700 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia	Phone: +61 26 246 5718 Cell: +61 41 942 7313 alex.held@csiro.au
IEEE (did not attend)	
IOC (did not attend)	
Programme Board co-chair (did not attend)	
MinWG co-chair	
Mr Iain Williams Deputy Chief Scientific Adviser Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Area 6C Nobel House 17 Smith Square SW1P London 3JR United Kingdom	Phone: +44 208 225 7749 iain.williams@defra.gsi.gov.uk
GEO Secretariat	
7 bis, avenue de la Paix Case postale 2300 CH-1211 Geneva 2	Phone : +41 22 730 8505 Fax : +41 22 730 8520 secretariat@geosec.org

**List of Participants
50th GEO Executive Committee**

Switzerland	
-------------	--