

Task 2.3

Validation principles and practices in GMES projects and services

Marco Hoogvliet, Chris Bremmer
TNO (Dutch institute for applied scientific research)

Subjects

- What's the validation task about ?
 - Approach / method
 - Some general conclusions and recommendations
- **'seed questions' → discussion → recommendations**

Why a task dedicated to validation?



“ Clear validation standards & protocols determine in part the **willingness** to use GMES products “

“ Validation is **considered critical**. We cannot **communicate** the **value of data products** to inexperienced recipients unless uncertainty can be quantified and product quality can be evaluated ”

What was done in this task ?



→ In task 2.3 a **comparison** and **assessment** is made of validation methods and procedures (is it easy available? how was it done? is it thorough? is the information usable for product users? does the outcome match user needs? is something missing? etc.)

→ **Best and common practices** are **identified** and **recommendations** are made

NOT: assessment of **technical** aspects of validation

NOT: develop and suggest **standardized** or **general** validation principles

Workplan

1. Making a **longlist of 'relevant'** GMES projects & services
2. **Collecting** reports and experiences (from services & users)
3. Comparison and **assessment**
4. **Identification best/common practices** (assuming the role of a critical user)
5. Defining **conclusions** and **recommendations**

Identified candidates for assessment

	GMES Service Element (ESA)	EU FP- 6 projects	GMES Services
Marine Service	MARCOAST	MERSEA	My-Ocean
	POLAR VIEW		
Land Service	GSE Land	geoland	GEOLAND 2
	GSE Forest		
	GMFS		
Atmosphere Service	PROMOTE	GEMS	MACC
	GLOBCOVER		
Emergency Response Service	Risk-EOS	Preview	ERCS
	RESPOND		
	Terrafirma		

Overview of available documents per project and per category



	Validation protocol	Process and/or Product validation	User requirements
geoland	√		√
GEOLAND2	√		
Globcover		√	
GSE Land	√	√	√
MarCoast	√	√	√
PROMOTE 2	√	√	
Respond	√		
Terrafirma	√	√	

Assessment criteria



We divided our attention between:

- A) **Information supply** through reports & website
- B) Validation **protocol** (the workplan)
- C) **Process** validation (steps in production, from measurement to end-product)
- D) **End-product** validation
- E) **User experiences**

Assessment criteria were formulated with the help of the GNU-members

Large differences in availability of information on validation

- Make product validation a more prominent item on websites
- Do not hide information behind authorization walls
- Provide condensed vital information in easy to use and understand reports or summaries.

Major differences in (the setup of) validation protocols

- To some extent, guidelines for validation protocols are desirable

The majority of the collected documents do not reflect on user requirements (while requirements were known)

- A qualitative and practical improvement could be realised by explicitly stating user requirements

Most validation documents do not describe the implications of validation outcomes for the practical use of the end product

- Link validation results to examples of practical product use. This increases the understanding of the consequences of validation results for actual use of the products

General conclusions & recommendations



Not all projects/services provide insight in which parties were involved in which part of the validation process

- It should be clearly stated who performed which task in the validation chain and who is responsible for the results

General conclusions & recommendations



Most the evaluated projects show shortcomings in one or more aspects of the validation process and/or in the distribution of validation results

- Use our report and findings as a 'checklist' during the development and production of future validation protocols and reports