

## **Breakout Group Validation Assessment**

Facilitators: Marco Hoogvliet and Chris Bremmer (both TNO)

Participants: Andrew Richman, Valerio Comerci, Nuria Blanes (ETC LUSI), Mathias Schardt (Joanneum Research), Valter Sambucini (ISPRA)

The breakout group discussed the information provided in the deliverable Validation Assessment. The session focused on discussing the results of the assessment of validation, supplying feedback and formulation additional recommendations for the EC on the subject.

### **Summary of the discussion**

The discussion group confirmed the relevance of the GNU findings and that validation is an important aspect for the GMES services. Good validation procedures and results build customer confidence.

Because users are very different, detailed information about all validation phases is welcomed. Not just the end results, condensed to a couple of numbers.

Looking back at the FP6 and FP7 projects, there is a substantial risk that experiences on validation that were gained in these projects, will be lost for the GMES services, because some services lack good communication lines with the projects, or have simply not incorporated a study of the wide range of project experiences in their business cases.

But, it's not too late. There's still time to deliver input (suggestions, recommendations, experiences) to the setup of the GMES services. This input must be delivered through the EC, in a formal way, not directly by groups like the GNU consortium. However, GNU can contribute, for instance through the network GNU has tapped into during the task aimed at international/global opportunities. This network contains some key players in the GMES spectrum.

### **Recommendations to the EC**

The group pinpointed some recommendations that are of use to the EC (additional to the recommendations made in the GNU report on validation):

- Include validation as a requirement for GMES services.
- It is necessary to consider user requirements before the development of a service.
- Validation should consider user requirements, first and foremost to know what to validate
- One important FP6/7 project experience is that (looking back) in the first project phase at least 10% of the budget should have been spent on a clear definition of user requirements. Only after the completion of this phase, the development of the products should start.
- Derive input for the design of the validation process from established user requirements
- It is important to involve a variety of users, from different member states (especially include the newer members of the EU because they often lack their own detailed

national data warehouse and are therefore prominent potential GMES users), in all steps of the development.

- The EC should define and set up framework guidelines for validation of GMES services to avoid confusion amongst users. The definition should be based on experiences and suggestions of FP6 and FP7 projects (and GNU recommendations).
- The EC cannot expect that projects will take responsibility for the communication of experiences to the GMES services. This was/is usually not part of their assignment.
- From user requirements to end product: user requirements should be validated by service providers and products should be validated by end users to ensure a mutual understanding.
- In order to increase user uptake, validation results will have to be accessible, transparent
- Validation reports should be publicly available (or at least, the protocol that was applied). Openness about validation results is a must to build user confidence.
- In validation procedures, use common criteria to be able to compare and assess the approaches taken in the validation of different products
- Not only a final end number, a final outcome of the validation should be provided. Explanations sometimes are requested to understand the meaning from the user point of view.
- Most of the recommendations mentioned above need a clear political decision or command to be accomplished. That is why our recommendations are directed first and foremost to the EC.

One important recommendation, apart from otherwise mostly technical points, is that service provider and user need to be aware that validation is an important feature on the road to service acceptance. This includes good specifications of user requirements and intended use of the product as well as open discussion of product strengths and weaknesses on provider side.