# EPN2020-RI

**EUROPLANET2020 Research Infrastructure**

H2020-INFRAIA-2014-2015

Grant agreement no: 654208

# Deliverable D6.4
# 3rd VESPA Review Board

Due date of deliverable:  30/09/2018
Actual submission date:   30/10/2018

Start date of project: 01 September  2015                    Duration: 48 months

Responsible WP Leader: Stéphane Erard

| Project funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Dissemination level** | | |
| **PU** | Public | x |
| **PP** | Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Service) | |
| **RE** | Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services) | |
| **CO** | Confidential, only for members of the consortium (excluding the Commission Services) | |

| Project Number | 654208 |
|---|---|
| **Project Title** | EPN2020 - RI |
| **Project Duration** | 48 months: 01 September 2015 – 31 August 2019 |

| Deliverable Number | D6.4 |
|---|---|
| **Contractual Delivery date** | 30/09/2018 |
| **Actual delivery date** | 30/10/2018 |
| **Title of Deliverable** | Third VESPA VA Review Board |
| **Contributing Work package (s)** | WP6 |
| **Dissemination level** | Public |
| **Author (s)** | Santa Martinez |

**Board Reporting activity**

| |
|---|
| **Work package title**<br>VESPA-VA |
| **Date of the meeting and reference period (to which the evaluation should be assessed)**<br><br>Reference period: PM25-PM36<br><br>Several telecons held to identify and agree on the focus of the review for the reference period, and to assess the progress on the different activities. |
| **Details of the members of the review board**<br><br>• Santa Martinez (ESA), santa.martinez@sciops.esa.int: chair<br>• Tom Stein (WUSTL / IPDA / PDS), stein@wunder.wustl.edu<br>• Joseph Mafi (UCLA / PDS), jmafi@igpp.ucla.edu<br>• Andrea Nass (DLR /Berlin), Andrea.Nass@dlr.de<br>• Sandrine Guerlet (LMD / Paris), sandrine.guerlet@lmd.jussieu.fr |

**Has the Work package met the objectives in the relevant period as described in the Description of Action? If not please provide suggestions**

The number of online data services available has grown from 34 to 44 during this period, with ~15 more being designed or at test level. This is very close to the final objective of 50 data services.

In addition, the SSHADE service (a spectroscopic database of minerals and ice) is now available, with 13 databases being populated. The review board did not have enough time to evaluate this service properly. A dedicated assessment will be conducted during the next period, and a summary will be provided in the next report.

Tutorials are very useful and clear.

The same recommendations provided in the previous report are still applicable to this period. Some additional suggestions below:

- Conduct a usability study of the VESPA search interface to evaluate how well the users can achieve their goals, how satisfied they are, and how easily they are able to identify the data of interest. Involve both the science community and the data providers in this study. Evaluate the recommendations resulting from this study, and try to implement them. The review board believes that the current search interface addresses the science community too broadly and lacks rigid standards and procedures. User documentation on the query system and on the data services is lacking. This is key when the users are not familiar with the interface and/or the data. There is no way for a user to understand what data are being searched by a given query. There is no information about the provenance of the data, nor information about data quality.
- Implement systematic testing of the VESPA search portal, and improve the review of data services and data sets in VESPA, not only when the data service is added to VESPA for the first time, but on a regular basis. Several issues have been detected, see detailed report in the Appendix.
- A mechanism should be in place to encourage/ensure data sets are up to date. For example, the CRISM data set in VESPA has been static for several years despite the ongoing collection and release of CRISM data from the MRO mission. VESPA contains only roughly 21,000 of more than 1.7 million released CRISM data products.

**Has the Work package met the expected impact in the relevant period as described in the Description of Action? If not please provide suggestions.**

Yes, same as in previous period.

Some metrics being available in the "Second Project Periodic Report" to measure the impact on the users in terms of data access. More specific metrics (e.g. queries per science data set, type of data, most used filters) would be very useful to better assess the interests of the scientific community. This will allow to better focus the VESPA efforts and would contribute to increase the impact in the community.

**Has the Work package disseminated and exploited results in the relevant period as described in the Description of Action? If not please provide suggestions**

Yes, same as in previous period.

However, as indicated in the previous report, the participants' satisfaction with regards to the quality of the dissemination materials could be used as the main indicator of the quality of the dissemination activities. A questionnaire could be made available and informal discussions with participants could be collected to indicate the extent to which the presentations / material were adequate and interesting. A summary could be added to the report of the corresponding reference period report to be assessed by the review board. Such information is not available to the board.