

---

**Geohazard Supersites and Natural Laboratories - GEO Initiative**

**2020-2022 GSNL Implementation plan**

---

*March 2019*

**AUTHORS LIST**

	Name	Function
Author	S. Salvi	GSNL SAC Chair
Contributor	F. Amelung	SAC Member
Contributor	F. Haslinger	SAC Member
Contributor	C. Meertens	SAC Member
Contributor	J. Danzeglocke	CEOS DCT member
Contributor	G. Puglisi	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	S. Borgstrom	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	F. Sigmundsson	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	M. Poland	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	S. Ergintav	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	P. Mothes	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	I. Hamling	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	C. Balagizi	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	C. Wicks	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	S. Lalechos	Supersite Coordinator
Contributor	L. Lara	Supersite Coordinator

**DOCUMENT CHANGE RECORD**

Issue/Revision	Date	Reason for Change	Changed Pages/Sections
1.0		First issue	All pages

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (2 PAGES) .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. PURPOSE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS ACHIEVEMENTS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4. RELATIONSHIP TO THE SENDAI FRAMEWORK FOR DISASTER RISK REDUCTION AND OTHER WORK PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6. GOVERNANCE.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7. RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>8. TECHNICAL SYNOPSIS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9. DATA POLICY .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>10. WBS IN SEPARATE TABLES.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>11. ANNEXES.....</b>	<b>23</b>

1 **1. Executive summary (2 pages)**

2 **Geohazard Supersites and Natural Laboratory initiative - GSNL**

3 **GEO Initiative**

4

5 **Overview**

6 The Geohazard Supersites and Natural Laboratory initiative (GSNL) is a voluntary international  
7 partnership aiming to improve, through an Open Science approach, geophysical scientific research and  
8 geohazard assessment in support of Disaster Risk Reduction.

9 The GSNL goal is pursued promoting broad international scientific collaboration and open access to a  
10 variety of space- and ground-based data, focusing on areas with high geohazard and risk levels, the  
11 Supersites and the Natural Laboratories. For these areas a joint effort is carried out: the space agencies  
12 provide satellite imagery at no cost for scientific use, the monitoring agencies provide access to ground-  
13 based data, the international scientific community employs these data to generate new scientific results  
14 which are eventually delivered to decision makers.

15 The decision-making processes which are functional to achieve effective DRR occur at national and local  
16 scales and involve a variety of public bodies. To be well received and effectively support decisions, the  
17 scientific information generated at the international scale must reach the appropriate stakeholders in the  
18 proper way and form. For this reason, the Supersites are coordinated by local geohazard scientific  
19 institutions which have a mandate, in the respective national risk management frameworks, to provide  
20 authoritative information to public decision makers and the population. This ensures a rapid uptake of  
21 the information by stakeholders, benefiting hazard assessment, disaster monitoring and response  
22 actions.

23 The specific objectives of GSNL are:

- 24 1. to empower the international scientific community with open, full and easy access to space- and  
25 ground-based data, knowledge, capacities and resources, over selected, high risk areas of the  
26 world: the Supersites and Natural Laboratories;
- 27 2. to demonstrate over the selected sites how the Open Science approach and international  
28 collaboration can generate actionable geohazard scientific information;
- 29 3. to communicate the information to public agencies and other stakeholders, supporting informed  
30 decision making in risk reduction and management;
- 31 4. to promote innovation in technologies, processes, and communication models, to enhance data  
32 sharing, global scientific collaboration, knowledge transfer and capacity building in geohazard  
33 science and risk management applications.

34 To reach these goals, in the period 2020-2022 the GSNL initiative will expand the network partnership,  
35 increasing the number of Supersites from 11 to 14, with a focus on less developed countries. We will also  
36 improve data access, management and capacity building support, strengthening the way the Supersite  
37 scientific community cooperates to generate new science, and enabling the coordinators to provide  
38 better services to the Supersite end-users.

39 **Planned activities**

40 Reform of the governance structure. Review biennial Supersite progress reports. Work with the CEOS  
41 WG Disasters to coordinate GSNL with other CEOS initiatives on Disaster. Manage with the CEOS the EO  
42 data access for Supersite scientists. Review and approve Event and Permanent Supersite proposals.  
43 Organize at least two annual meetings of the GSNL community at main geophysical conferences, as AGU  
44 and EGU. Manage the data licensing process, and ensure ordering of satellite image acquisition. Pursue  
45 the establishment of the SE Asia Natural Laboratory (or another Supersite in SE Asia). Coordinate the

46 communication and the provision of data/processing services to the scientific community. Enlarge the  
47 community, improve the knowledge exchange and the sharing of research results in digital format,  
48 ensure the proper attribution of IPRs, promote the Supersite activities and seek national resources for  
49 sustainability of the Supersite infrastructures.

50 Improve communication and collaboration with other international initiatives on DRR and open  
51 data/processing infrastructures. Strengthen relationships with providers of data processing services, as  
52 the ESA Geohazard Platform, UNAVCO Plug & Play GPS project, the EVER-EST VRE, to improve the  
53 processing capacities of the Supersites. Contact development funding agencies to explore the possibility  
54 to support Supersite in less developed countries. Improve collaboration with other scientific, user-  
55 oriented initiatives as the Global Earthquake Model and the Global Volcano Model.

56 Carry out capacity building in collaboration with Supersite partners and existing initiatives in GEO and in  
57 the CEOS. Promote sharing of scientific codes for data processing and provide remote processing  
58 services. Student support programs will be requested to national and international funding agencies,  
59 with the help and coordination of the GSNL governance bodies.

60 Collect EO data needs from the Supersite scientific community and request image quota allocation to the  
61 CEOS space agencies. Pursue JAXA support for the initiative. Promote within the Supersite community  
62 the data access services developed by existing data sharing infrastructures as EPOS, IRIS, UNAVCO  
63 GSAC/SSARA, GEP. Promote the use of GEOSS for data and product dissemination.

64 Carry out continuous monitoring activities, early warning and research at each Supersite, using the in situ  
65 and satellite data. Generate new scientific results and monitoring products, and disseminate them to the  
66 Supersite national end-users. Exchange and disseminate scientific information.

67

68 Contact person:

69 Stefano Salvi


70 [info@geo-gsnl.org](mailto:info@geo-gsnl.org)

71

72 Website: [geo-gsnl.org](http://geo-gsnl.org)

73 **2. Purpose**

74 Earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and landslides become disasters only if they meet with vulnerability of  
75 the human environment. When this happens they have the deadliest consequences: in the last 20 years  
76 they claimed over 770.000 lives (56% of the total disaster deaths), causing economic damages in excess  
77 of 785 B\$/year and affecting over 135 million people and 25 million homes, most of which in lower-income  
78 countries (CRED, 2015).



79  
80 Number of deaths by disaster type in the period 1994-2013, CRED, 2015

81  
82 The basic requirement for an effective prevention of these disasters is the accurate knowledge of the  
83 hazard (i.e. the probability of occurrence of the adverse effect in a certain area over a given time period).  
84 The assessment of seismic and volcanic hazards requires continuous scientific investigations, since their  
85 causative processes are still not completely understood (Rundle et al., 2003). The scale at which these  
86 phenomena and their preparatory processes are best studied is the regional scale (100s of km).

87 As stressed in the the [Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030](#), there are still many areas  
88 of the world where the knowledge of the hazard sources, their magnitude, frequency of occurrence,  
89 cascading effects, and dimension of possible impacts, are poorly known due to three main reasons: lack  
90 of data and monitoring, limited local capacities (scientific and/or technical), limited resources.

91 The aim of the [Geohazard Supersites and Natural Laboratories initiative](#) (GSNL) is to demonstrate how  
92 international scientific collaboration can contribute to solve these knowledge gaps and benefit Disaster  
93 Risk Reduction, focusing on providing better access to data, capacities and resources at the local scale.

94 The specific objectives of GSNL are:

- 95 1. to empower the international scientific community with open, full and easy access to space- and  
96 ground-based data, knowledge, capacities and resources, over selected, high risk areas of the  
97 world: the Supersites and Natural Laboratories;
- 98 2. to demonstrate over the selected sites how the Open Science approach and international  
99 collaboration can generate actionable geohazard scientific information;
- 100 3. to communicate the information to public agencies and other stakeholders, supporting informed  
101 decision making in risk reduction and management;

102 4. to promote innovation in technologies, processes, and communication models, to enhance data  
 103 sharing, global scientific collaboration, knowledge transfer and capacity building in geohazard  
 104 science and risk management applications.  
 105

106 GSNL does not have a formal policy mandate from international organisations, however the scientific and  
 107 monitoring institutes acting as Supersites Coordinators (see later) do have a mandate defined by  
 108 national laws or agreements, to provide operational scientific support to government agencies for DRM.  
 109 In most cases, the main reason for committing to establish and maintain a Supersite on a given area is to  
 110 improve access to data and resources, and eventually provide better services to local DRM stakeholders.  
 111 In all cases, the role of the Supersite coordinating institution is truly operational, involving normally 24/7  
 112 multi-parametric monitoring, early warning, provision of information services during the DRM Response  
 113 phase, and production of hazard maps during the Mitigation phase.

114  
 115 The table below shows the most common information products provided to the end-users.  
 116

<b>Science products to support Hazard Assessment and Risk Mitigation</b>	<b>Science products to support Response</b>
Ground deformation maps for seismic and volcanic areas (mean ground velocity over many years)	Ground deformation maps for earthquakes and volcanic eruptions and associated gravitational mass movements (ground displacement related to a single event, or displacement time series during or after the crisis)
Strain rate maps	Precise earthquake locations
Identification of active faults and characterization of their kinematics	Regional Moment Tensor solutions
Models of active faults and estimates of fault slip rates, maximum expected event, recurrence intervals, and other parameters of fault activity	Maps and parameters of earthquake effects on the built environment: classification of building and infrastructure damage at different resolutions
Earthquake hazard and damage scenarios	Maps and parameters of phenomena induced by earthquakes on the natural environment: fault scarps, soil liquefactions, ground fractures, triggered landslides, drainage network changes, etc.
Models and estimates of parameters for volcano plumbing systems	Coulomb stress transfer analysis maps
Volcanic hazard scenarios, for lava flows, flank collapses, lahars, ash fall, ash clouds, etc.	Identification and characterization of magma chambers and plumbing systems during eruptions
Topographic maps (periodical updates)	Models of maximum deviatoric shear stress caused by ground deformation episodes during volcano unrest.
Land use and exposure maps (periodical updates)	Maps and parameters of volcanic hazards, as fractures, collapses, pyroclastic/lava flows, lahars, lava domes, ash fall, etc.
	Near real time scenarios for mass eruption rate, plume height, ash fall, ash cloud paths, etc.

117  
 118 At each Supersite, the authoritative role of the Coordinator in the national DRM value chain is expressed  
 119 in an end to end relationship with a number of public agencies to which the above information products  
 120 are provided within established agreements. The main end-users for each Supersite are listed in Table 1.

121  
 122  
 123

124 Table 1 – Supersite coordinators and end users.

125

<b>Permanent Supersite</b>	<b>Coordinators</b>	<b>End-user</b>
<i>Hawaiian volcanoes</i>	Michael Poland, Ingrid Johanson, USGS, USA	Hawai'i County Civil Defense, Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park
<i>Icelandic volcanoes</i>	Freysteinn Sigmundsson, Kristin Vogfjord, University of Iceland and IMO, Iceland	Icelandic Police - Dep.t of Civil Protection and Emergency Management, Environmental Agency of Iceland, Directorate of Health
<i>Mt.Etna volcano</i>	Giuseppe Puglisi, INGV, Italy	National Department of Civil Protection, Regional Civil Defense
<i>Campi Flegrei &amp; Vesuvius volcano</i>	Sven Borgstrom, INGV, Italy	National Department of Civil Protection, Regional Civil Defense
<i>Marmara Fault</i>	Semih Ergintav, KOERI, Turkey	Istanbul municipality
<i>Ecuadorian volcanoes</i>	Patricia Mothes, IGEPN, Ecuador	National Secretariat for Risk Management, Regional governments, Municipalities
<i>Taupo volcanic zone, NZ</i>	Nico Fournier, Ian Hamling, GNS Science, New Zealand	Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management, Department of Conservation, Regional councils, MetService
<i>Gulf of Corinth-Ionian Islands</i>	Spyros Lalechos, ITSAK, Greece	EPPO, Greek Civil Defense
<i>San Andreas Fault Natural Laboratory</i>	Charles Wicks, USGS, USA	California Office of Emergency Services, Federal Emergency Management Agency, plus many other local stakeholders
<i>Southern Andes Volcanoes</i>	Luis Lara, SERNAGEOMIN, Chile	ONEMI (Oficina Nacional de Emergencias), under the Ministry of Interior and Public Safety
<i>Virunga volcanoes</i>	Charles Balagizi, Goma Volcano Observatory, D.R. of Congo	DRC Civil Protection, NGOs for Emergency and Disaster Management, also in Rwanda, Virunga National Park offices

126

127 The information support provided by each Supersite to its end-users results in:

- 128     ▪ Outcomes: informed decisions by national/local government agencies on operational mitigation and response measures, as risk-aware territorial planning, engineering/structural measures and codes, evacuation plans, alert level change, evacuation decisions, event scenarios, situational awareness, etc.
- 129
- 130
- 131
- 132     ▪ Impacts: the above decisions might result in: reduction of casualties and economic/environmental damage, increase of resilience at community to national levels, increased public awareness of risk, etc.
- 133
- 134
- 135     ▪ Beneficiaries: the direct beneficiaries are the population at risk (also in neighbouring countries for cross-border impacts), but given the far reaching economic consequences of a disaster, the entire population in the country will benefit of more effective mitigation and response measures.
- 136
- 137

138

139 Moreover, since the Supersites, albeit limited in size, have also the role to experiment and demonstrate the advantages of new technological and collaboration models (as Open Science), their example is able to promote the application of the same successful approach at national and even regional scales, eventually producing a much wider benefit on DRR.

143



144 **3. Background and previous achievements**

145 The most important achievements of the initiative during 2017-2019 have been:

146 **Main achievements**

- 147 • provision of open access to in-situ geophysical data for the Supersites;
- 148 • CEOS support for the provision of thousands of satellite images to the Supersite scientific
- 149 communities;
- 150 • generation of new scientific results over the Supersites, based on the open data;
- 151 • approval of the GSNL Data Policy Principles;
- 152 • establishment of the Geohazard Exploitation Platform as the reference portal for EO data access;
- 153 • establishment of the EVER-EST Virtual Research Environment (from an EC H20202 project) as
- 154 provider of data processing services for Supersites in developing countries;
- 155 • provision of scientific monitoring information to DRM decision makers at several Supersites;
- 156 • capacity building by training, collaboration, and provision of resources.

157 **Challenges for 2020-2022**

- 159 • identify a way to ensure that EO data from public space agencies are made fully open for risk
- 160 management use, at least in developing countries;
- 161 • establish a Supersite or Natural Laboratory in Asia;
- 162 • establish further Supersites in regions with high geohazard and risk levels;
- 163 • improve open sharing of further data types, research products and software;
- 164 • promote international collaboration and capacity building;
- 165 • fully implement an Open Science approach in the GSNL initiative.

166 Progress with respect to Tables 5.1 and 5.2 (p.13-14) of the Implementation plan 2017-2019

Task	Task (% completion)	Task progress summary
1.1	Management (85%)	A draft for the new governance structure has been submitted to the Scientific Advisory Committee and is under discussion. Eight biennial progress reports have been received and evaluated by the SAC and the CEOS, and are available on our website. Three more are under evaluation. Constant collaboration with the CEOS space agencies within the WG Disasters has resulted in their support to three new Supersites and a Natural Laboratory. Full coordination with the CEOS Disaster Pilots and Demonstrators is in place. Six meetings of the GSNL community have been organized at the AGU and EGU conferences.
1.2	Networking activities (70%)	We have established the San Andreas Fault Natural Laboratory and three new Supersites: multihazard Supersite in the Southern Andes of Chile, Virunga volcanoes in D.R. Congo, Gulf of Corinth in Greece, all supporting local end users. We coordinated with EPOS, UNAVCO, ESA, for the provision of data and processing services to the Supersites. We have established contacts with WB and UNISDR to explore the possibility to fund activities of Supersites in developing countries, however no result has been obtained. We have established an agreement with the Charter on sharing scientific products during crises. We have presented the initiative to researchers and stakeholders in 14 different countries, stimulating the participation in the initiative. A few new Supersite proposals are now in preparation. One for Peru was submitted in February 2019.
1.3	Data provision (80%)	We analyzed the various Supersite contexts and issued the GSNL Data Policy Principles, to promote the adoption of the GEO Data Sharing Principles in the long term. We have implemented e-collaboration, processing and information services through the <a href="#">GEP</a> and

		<p>the <a href="#">EVER-EST VRE</a>, promoting an Open Science approach for GSNL.</p> <p>We obtained further support from the CEOS, with access to over 5000 new images. We have established new procedures for satellite data access using specialized data infrastructures as the UNAVCO SSARA, EVER-EST and the GEP. We have documented the new procedures on our website. We have set up an agreement with ESA to provide access to over 10,000 Supersite COSMO-SkyMed satellite images through the GEP portal. Part of the images are already available.</p>
1.4	Dissemination & Outreach (85%)	<p>We have created and populated a new website and prepared new material for dissemination, as a GSNL brochure and a 4-page summary. We placed all the Supersite reports on the website, and we are gradually extracting success stories from each report for more immediate communication of results. We have started to use the Research Object Hub (ROHUB) to implement a repository for the scientific results and other information generated within the Supersites.</p>

168

Task	Task (% completion)	Task progress summary
2.1	Supersite management (70%)	<p>Comprehensive reports are submitted and evaluated by the SAC and the CEOS every two years from the date of establishment of the Supersite. Coordinators have been instructed by the GSNL Chair on the satellite tasking and data request procedures. Coordinators report on the scientific achievements and provide the relevant information to their national end users.</p> <p>A few Supersites are now supported, at least in part, by national or regional projects. The new Open Science approach has started to be implemented at some Supersites; technological resources are available to support this step (e.g. the EVER-EST platform), but the community still needs to be fully engaged. Supersite coordinators report periodically on the Supersite achievements to their end users, and deliver the information support products according to independently established agreements.</p>
2.2	Supersite community building (70%)	<p>Community building around Supersites has been promoted mainly through dissemination at scientific meetings. Capacity building at some Supersites has been provided supported by in kind resources and EC projects (EVER-EST, FUTUREVOLC), and has focused on short stages at the coordinating institutions (4), and ad hoc technical courses on the use of platforms and software for EO data processing (2 on EVER-EST in Colombia and Peru, 4 on the GEP at AGU and EGU meetings).</p>
2.3	Supersite infrastructure maintenance & development (60%)	<p>A few Supersites have developed their own data infrastructures to share in situ data. Others use community infrastructures provided by IRIS, UNAVCO, and EPOS services.</p> <p>Most satellite data are now provided through specific portals, and most data become available in few hours to 8 days from acquisition. The Virunga Supersite has elaborated a specific Data Policy to promote the engagement of the international scientific community in local activities, while maintaining a fair level of collaboration, to develop local resources.</p>
2.4	Supersite dissemination /outreach (60%)	<p>Supersite coordinators have provided to CEOS and GEO material showcasing the results of their Supersites. These have been published in public reports. Update of the website proceeds, although not very frequently.</p>

169

170 All the volcano and seismic monitoring products based on Supersite in situ and EO data are constantly  
 171 delivered to the reference end-users shown in Table 1. Several micro-decisions based on this information  
 172 are constantly taken at various levels but are difficult to describe singularly. Some prominent examples  
 173 are summarised below.

174 The ground motions associated with the 2018 Kilauea (Hawai 'iSupersite) earthquakes and eruption  
 175 were constantly monitored using S-1, CSK, TSX, and Pleiades data. The repeated deformation products  
 176 were used for tracking the migration of subsurface magma and for mapping the collapse of the summit  
 177 (over 700 m at places) and the emplacement of lava flows. These data were used in combination with in

178 situ data to draft multiple public documents about the potential hazards of continued eruptive activity.  
179 They were released to the public and formed the basis for the response by both Hawai 'i Volcano  
180 National Park and the County of Hawai. Results were published on HVO's website, so that the general  
181 public could track the evolution of activity in amplitude imagery and SAR interferograms.

182 In 2018, the Copernicus EMS services were activated by the Virunga Supersite to generate hazard and  
183 exposure maps for Goma City and a HR DEM to simulate the lava flow pathways and identify the affected  
184 areas. These maps were validated by the scientists of the Goma Volcano Observatory and delivered to  
185 the Conseil Provincial de prévention des catastrophes au Nord-Kivu, in D.R.C., which includes the national  
186 Civil Protection, Red Cross, Ministries of Interior, Urbanism, research. They were also delivered to similar  
187 institutions in Rwanda, where the risk from a Nyragongo eruption is also very high.

188 The 2017, Mw 3.9 earthquake in the Campi Flegrei Supersite (Ischia Island). The INGV data inversion  
189 based on S-1 and CSK InSAR results allowed to identify a seismic source due to gravitational deformation  
190 mechanisms, not due to volcanic origin.

191 An actively deforming slide was mapped following the 2016 eruption along the inner slope of the White  
192 Island volcano (Taupo Supersite, NZ). Continuous monitoring using stripmap TerraSAR X data showed  
193 slope motions up to 20 cm/yr, and this information was provided to the local authorities which used it to  
194 ban access to this popular touristic area for a number of months.

195 The Bardabunga volcano in the Iceland Supersite started erupting in August 2014, under a 800 m-thick  
196 ice cap. The worst scenario was magma-water interaction and strong ash emissions, possibly replicating  
197 the Eyjafjallajökull eruption in 2010, with risk of strong impacts on aviation across Europe. This caused  
198 issuing a red alert level, blocking overflight by commercial airlines. Seismic, geodetic, InSAR, and field  
199 geological data were shared and jointly analysed by a large scientific community under an EC Supersite  
200 project. The scientists constantly provided evolutionary models for the eruption to the Iceland Civil  
201 Protection, and the latter used this information to lower the alert level and let airlines resume flights.

202  
203 *Effectiveness of the Initiative's governance structure and resourcing strategy*

204 Presently GSNL is managed by a Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) which is composed by prominent  
205 researchers and practitioners in seismic/volcanic/geodetic science or data infrastructures. However much  
206 of the burden of the governance lies on the SAC Chair (including the website update, reporting to GEO,  
207 etc.), whom is not supported by a secretariat. To improve the governance structure of GSNL was decided  
208 in 2017 to identify an operational team to support the SAC Chair, and the best way to do this would be to  
209 obtain support from the single Supersites. However this has not yet been agreed within the initiative. It is  
210 an objective for 2019.

211 The initiative is reviewed by GEO and by the CEOS Working Group on Disasters (WGD). The CEOS Data  
212 Coordination Team (a subset of the WGD) has the task of examining and approving the GSNL requests  
213 for satellite data support to the Supersites. The CEOS WGD receives updates every 6 months from the  
214 GSNL SAC Chair on general issues, and reviews every two years detailed reports from each Supersite. If  
215 the accomplishments are in line with objectives, the CEOS confirms the attribution of image quotas for  
216 the next two years. Until now all the 15 Supersite biennial reports examined by the WGD since 2014 have  
217 passed the reviews. In some cases, appreciating the successes of the Supersite, the CEOS has granted an  
218 increase of the yearly satellite data quotas.

219  
220 *Lesson learned*

221 The main lessons learned from the 2017-2019 Implementation period have been the need for more  
222 consistent funding sources, for the Supersites and for the initiative management, and the need to ensure  
223 more active contribution for the outreach and dissemination of the Supersite results.

224 The reform of the management should help reach the latter objective, while for the funding issue we  
225 would need to develop a sponsoring scheme. GEO support would be much welcome in this subject.

226 **4. Relationship to the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and other Work Programme**  
 227 **Activities**

228 GSNL is contributing to reach the SDGs expressed in the table below:  
 229

<p>11.5          By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations</p>
<p>11.b          By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels</p>

230  
 231 This is actively done at the Supersites. In particular for the Supersites in Iceland, D.R. Congo and  
 232 Ecuador, the improved volcano monitoring capacities established with the satellite data support to the  
 233 Supersites, has already provided benefits on the hazard assessment and early warning of rural areas  
 234 and major cities as Quito and Goma. The actual use of this improved information for the implementation  
 235 of effective risk mitigation measures is the responsibility of local and national governments.  
 236

237 The most direct contribution of GSNL to the Sendai Framework targets is related to:  
 238

239 *G. Substantially increase the availability of and access to multi-hazard early warning systems and disaster*  
 240 *risk information and assessments to the people by 2030.*  
 241

242 This is accomplished at each Supersite by the increased use of EO data by the Coordinating Institutions  
 243 and through the collaboration with the international scientific community. It is clear that without GSNL,  
 244 the countries which host Supersites would have a much more limited access to EO data that are  
 245 extremely useful (and in some cases fundamental) for an effective monitoring of volcanic activity and  
 246 fault-induced deformation.

247 Moreover GSNL contributes to the enhancement of international collaboration on disaster topics, and  
 248 to the development of better disaster risk management capacities by the national authorities in charge,  
 249 and thus it provides partial contributions to most of the other Sendai targets.  
 250

251 GSNL does not have relationships to other Disaster initiatives in the GEO WP. The closest initiative  
 252 would be GEO-DARMA, which however is focused on other risk types (flooding) and on the provision of  
 253 EO data to international initiatives/programmes, with limited involvement of local scientists and  
 254 monitoring institutions.  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263

## 264 5. Stakeholder Engagement and Capacity Building

265 There are three main categories of stakeholders involved in the GSNL initiative:

- 266 1. **The data providers** (for in situ and EO data). They are mostly contributors to the initiative,  
267 however they also use GSNL to promote their activities, demonstrating the societal benefits of  
268 the data they produce, in DRR (e.g. space agencies). The in situ data providers (which are also  
269 the Supersite coordinating institutions) are listed in Table 1. The EO data providers are the  
270 following CEOS space agencies: ESA, NASA, ASI, DLR, CNES, CSA.
- 271 2. **The global geohazard scientific community.** Scientists use the initiative to obtain easier and open  
272 access to a large quantity of EO data, plus in situ data which may not be easily accessible outside  
273 of the Supersite framework. They are motivated by the scientific research, by the possibility to  
274 improve their capacities through a focused collaboration, and by the possibility to contribute  
275 with their work to generate direct societal benefits in DRR. The number of scientists involved in  
276 research at each Supersite varies, and it is not easy to ascertain, since the EO data are open  
277 access and, while we recommend coordination with the local Supersite teams, there is no  
278 obligation to provide feedback on data use. A list of known scientists is provided in Table A1.
- 279 3. **The final users of the geohazard scientific information (end-users).** This category includes risk  
280 managers and decision makers at international/national/regional scales, the industry sector, the  
281 responders, the general public. As mentioned above, each Supersite coordinating institution has  
282 formal agreements to provide scientific and monitoring information to some reference end-users  
283 (Table 1). However, other end-users interested in specific subjects and information may become  
284 engaged on an occasional basis.

285

### 286 *End-user engagement*

287 In nearly all Supersite countries, the national, state or federal agencies in charge of disaster risk  
288 management are already receiving scientific and monitoring information produced thanks to the  
289 Supersite data and its international scientific community. While there might be differences in the roles,  
290 capacities, and powers of the DRM agencies of the different countries, they have a well structured  
291 relationship with the Supersite coordinating institutions (in some cases defined by law), and the  
292 information support products are defined together, as well as the levels of service provision.

293 In case new information products for the end users are developed (e.g. high resolution ground  
294 deformation maps) some individual capacity building is carried out, to explain what is the meaning of the  
295 information and how to best use it for DRM. Some organizational capacity building is also needed, for  
296 instance when the Supersite coordinating institutions develop dissemination services for providing direct  
297 online access to the scientific and monitoring information (see for instance <http://futurevolc.vedur.is/>), to  
298 explain how to exploit the data for decision making.

299

### 300 *Capacity building*

301 Capacity development is increasingly a strong theme for GSNL. As the number of Supersites continues to  
302 grow (increasing by 60% in the 2017-2019 period), and more developing countries are involved (3 at  
303 present), the need to support the improvement of capacities for EO-data exploitation and for the  
304 effective use of the new information in DRM, increases constantly.

305 In fact, the success of any Supersite implementation depends on the attainment of good levels of local  
306 expertise and resources in two main fields: monitoring, i.e. capacity to generate enough observations to  
307 follow the seismic and volcanic phenomena, their evolution and the associated hazards, and scientific  
308 capacity of the Supersite community to use those data to generate new science and useful information  
309 for decision making and risk reduction.

310 The monitoring capacity can be highly variable, especially in terms of quantity and density of instruments  
311 and collected data, and depends from local constraints (mainly funding) for what concerns the ground  
312 networks development, and from the space agencies' collaboration for what concerns satellite image  
313 use.

314 In the ideal conditions the Supersites should have already well developed in situ monitoring networks  
315 which are upgraded and maintained on national funding. However, in less developed countries the  
316 situation is often far from ideal, and resources for the optimal development of the in situ monitoring  
317 networks should be sought at international level, leveraging on the GEO framework. For the satellite  
318 data the GSNL partnership is instead able to obtain a good areal coverage, mobilizing large quantities of  
319 in-kind resources from the CEOS space agencies.

320 The development of improved scientific capacities is also in the scope of GSNL, and is composed of  
321 several actions, as: knowledge sharing, higher education, mobility, networking, dissemination, provision  
322 of data and processing infrastructures, etc. We believe that these actions can be carried out through  
323 transnational scientific collaboration finalized to ensure that the local scientific community becomes  
324 completely independent in providing effective support to local DRM.

325 In GSNL the partners obtain the necessary resources through shared in-kind support (satellite data, data  
326 processing infrastructures, training, stages, etc.), and also through competitive calls or institutional  
327 funding (e.g. from the Supersite Coordinating institutions). In the 2017-2019 period, capacity building at  
328 five Supersites (Mt Etna, Campi Flegrei-Vesuvius, Iceland, Ecuador, Azgeleh Event Supersite) was  
329 supported using funding from the EC EVER-EST project, which developed a Virtual Research Environment  
330 (VRE) designed to provide a variety of collaboration and remote data processing services. Some of these  
331 services will be active until 2020, and possibly beyond if funding is obtained under other EC projects.

332 The ESA's Geohazards Exploitation Platform has also supported several Supersite scientists and will  
333 continue to do so for the next three years, providing data storage, access, and processing services. The  
334 long term sustainability of the GEP and of its support to GSNL is envisioned through new approaches  
335 based on virtualization and federation of the services, and linking them to research infrastructures as the  
336 European Plate Observing System – EPOS (a GEO supporting organization). The EPOS infrastructure is  
337 developing a large set of interoperable data and product services to the Earth Science community, and  
338 fully supports the European Supersites.

339 The USA consortium UNAVCO is also expected to continue providing important in-kind resources to  
340 GSNL, consisting mainly of Supersite data storage and data/processing services, as the Seamless  
341 Geodetic and SAR archives (GSAC/SSARA) and the Plug & Play GPS project. UNAVCO will also continue to  
342 provide technical and management support.

343 **6. Governance**

344 The GSNL initiative is managed at central level by the Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), which works  
345 in close collaboration with the CEOS Data Coordination Team (DCT).

346 The SAC receives the proposals for new Supersites, and evaluates them with the help of two external  
347 reviewers. It proposes to the CEOS DCT to establish or discontinue a Supersite. It evaluates possible  
348 changes to the GSNL mission, and proposes them to the other partners. It provides scientific advice to  
349 Supersites where needed. It reviews the Supersite biennial reports and recommends their approval or  
350 rejection.

351 The CEOS DCT receives from the SAC the proposals for new Supersites, then each space agency decides  
352 whether to support the Supersite with the requested satellite image quotas. It reviews the Supersite  
353 biennial reports and, based on the accomplishments, it may recommend to renew the image quotas for  
354 two more years, or withdraw them. It proposes to the SAC possible changes to the GSNL mission.

355 The activities of the SAC members are supported by their respective organizations as in-kind  
356 contributions.

357 The composition of the Scientific Advisory Committee is:

Name	Role	Affiliation
Stefano Salvi	Chair	Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV), Italy
Falk Amelung	Member	Division of Marine Geology and Geophysics, Univ. of Miami, USA
Massimo Cocco	Member	INGV and European Plate Observing System (EPOS)
Florian Haslinger	Member	Swiss Seismological Service (SED) at Zurich ETH, Switzerland
Chuck Meertens	Member	UNAVCO, USA
Susanna Zerbini	Member	WEGENER, EU

358

359 The activities of the DCT members are supported by their respective space agencies.

360 The composition of the CEOS Data Coordination Team is:

Name	Role	Affiliation
Pierric Ferrier	Chair	Centre national d'études spatiales - CNES, France
Simona Zoffoli	Member	Agenzia Spaziale Italiana - ASI, Italy
Thomas Cecere	Member	United States Geological Survey – USGS, USA
Yves Crevier	Member	Canadian Space Agency - CSA, Canada
Jens Danzeglocke	Member	Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt - DLR, Germany
Henri Laur	Member	European Space Agency - ESA, Europe
Yabe Shizu	Member	Japan Aerospace eXploration Agency - JAXA, Japan
David Borges	Member	National Aeronautics and Space Administration - NASA, USA
Michael Pavolonis	Member	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - NOAA, USA

361

362 Each Supersite is managed by one or two Coordinators (Table 1). In the Supersite proposal they have to  
363 indicate a Core Team, including some international scientists, that should support the Coordinators. The  
364 participation to the Core Team is open to all, but not all researchers who are part of the Supersite  
365 scientific community will be part of the Core Team.

366 The Coordinators are autonomous in managing the Supersite but they have to respect the Open Science  
367 commitments declared in the initial proposals, the [GSNL Data Policy principles](#), and the general rules of  
368 the initiative. This is demonstrated through detailed reports submitted every two years, which document  
369 the scientific achievements, the societal benefits and the end user interactions. The reports are  
370 evaluated by the SAC and the DCT, and if the stated objectives are not met, the Supersite may be  
371 discontinued.

372 All the Supersite reports are published on the [geo-gsnl.org](http://geo-gsnl.org) website, as well as other information on data  
373 access, how to propose a Supersite, management documents, etc.

374 In addition to the Supersite reports, the SAC Chair presents the general accomplishments of the initiative  
375 to the governing bodies of GSNL during SAC meetings, and during meetings of the CEOS Working Group  
376 on Disasters, twice per year.

377 Communication with the wider GSNL community is carried out through the GSNL website, through  
378 mailing lists, and at face to face meetings organized at least once a year, during large geoscience  
379 conferences (AGU meeting in the USA and EGU meeting in EU). Several presentations per year on the  
380 initiative and its accomplishments are made mostly by the SAC Chair or the Supersite Coordinators, at  
381 scientific or stakeholder meetings, and at the GEO WP Symposium and GEO Plenary side events.

382 A reform of the governance model is planned, and should be implemented by 2020. A new Terms of  
383 Reference is also needed given the important changes implemented since 2015, and is an objective of  
384 2020.

385 Risks and present issues in the initiative are mainly related to the uncertainty and scarcity of the  
386 resources (see next section).

387

388 The list of participants to the Scientific Community of each Supersite is provided in Table A1.



389 **7. Resources**

390 The majority of the resources supporting the GSNL initiative are provided in-kind by the participants. It is  
391 difficult to provide an accurate value assessment of in-kind resources provided by such a complex  
392 partnership, but we attempt to provide a reasonable estimate in Table B.

393 The contribution by the CEOS agencies is mainly expressed as in kind provision of satellite images, and in  
394 Table B we provide figures considering the total market value of the satellite data to be acquired on  
395 demand for the Supersite needs. The operation of the existing in-situ instrument networks occurs for the  
396 most part independently of Supersite existence, and is not considered here.

397 In GSNL there are specific resources used for Supersite management, data infrastructures, service  
398 provision and dissemination. Only European Supersites have benefited in the recent years from direct EC  
399 funding, and have been able to develop instrumental and data dissemination infrastructures. Most of the  
400 other Supersites are supported by in kind resources of the Coordinating institutions. Unfortunately, in  
401 some cases the local economic situation prevents the development of even the minimum ground  
402 networks for effective monitoring and early warning (e.g. for the Virunga volcano Supersite in  
403 D.R.Congo), and external funding is urgently needed. The GSNL management is seeking international  
404 funding sources to develop local capacities, and one of the actions is promoting joint participation of  
405 Supersites in research or development projects. We recommend that GEO Secretariat provides support  
406 to GSNL in the identification of possible funding sources.

407 Table B shows the estimated resources available to GSNL for 2020-2022. There is an inherent uncertainty  
408 in the in-kind resources allocation, given the voluntary nature of the initiative, and because these  
409 resources are often identified on a yearly basis. Moreover we expect to establish new Supersites in the  
410 period and this will change the picture..

411 The annual planned income from in-kind resources is 7600 KEuro. Annual planned income from financial  
412 resources (intended as funding directly assigned to GSNL activities identified in this IP): 770 KEuro. The  
413 latter includes funding estimates from running projects (H2020 EUROVOLC project) and from known EC  
414 project proposals presently under evaluation. During the IP period further smaller scale projects may be  
415 activated, providing financial support to Supersites.

416 **8. Technical Synopsis**

417 The core datasets available for each GSNL Supersite are satellite EO data and in-situ data.

418

419 To date the main satellite EO data used by the community are:

Type of data	Data provider	How to access	Type of access
<b>ENVISAT</b>	ESA	<a href="http://eo-virtual-archive4.esa.int">http://eo-virtual-archive4.esa.int</a>	Registered public
<b>RADARSAT-1</b>	CSA	FTP access from Supersite Coordinators	GSNL scientists upon license acceptance
<b>TerraSAR-X</b>	DLR	<a href="https://supersites.eoc.dlr.de/">https://supersites.eoc.dlr.de/</a> and <a href="#">UNAVCO</a>	Public access upon license acceptance
<b>Cosmo-SkyMed</b>	ASI	Via the <a href="#">ESA-GEP portal</a> or <a href="#">UNAVCO SSARA</a>	GSNL scientists upon license acceptance
<b>RADARSAT-2</b>	CSA	Via <a href="#">UNAVCO</a> , <a href="#">ESA-GEP</a> or FTP access	GSNL scientists upon license acceptance
<b>Sentinel-1</b>	ESA	<a href="https://scihub.esa.int/dhus/">https://scihub.esa.int/dhus/</a>	Registered public
<b>Pleiades/SPOT 5</b>	CNES	Tbd	GSNL scientists upon license acceptance
<b>Landsat</b>	USGS	<a href="http://hddsexplorer.usgs.gov">http://hddsexplorer.usgs.gov</a>	Registered public

420

421 The main in situ data used by the community are (not all data types are available for each Supersite):

Type of data	Data provider	How to access	Type of access
<b>GPS/GNSS</b>	Supersite communities	<a href="#">UNAVCO</a> , <a href="#">Iceland catalogue</a> , <a href="#">Mt.Etna catalogue</a> , FTP in some cases	Registered public or through email request
<b>Seismic</b>	Supersite communities	<a href="#">IRIS</a> , <a href="#">EIDA</a> , FTP access in some cases	Unregistered public or through email request
<b>Gas Emission analysis</b>	Supersite communities	Text Reports, FTP access	GSNL scientists through email request
<b>Gravity</b>	Supersite communities	Text Reports, FTP access	GSNL scientists through email request
<b>Tilt, levelling</b>	Supersite communities	Text Reports, FTP access	GSNL scientists through email request
<b>Camera</b>	Supersite communities	Web links or Text Reports, FTP access	GSNL scientists through email request
<b>Strain</b>	Supersite communities	Text Reports, FTP access	GSNL scientists through email request
<b>Geological data</b>	Supersite communities	Text Reports, FTP access	GSNL scientists through email request
<b>Ground-based radar</b>	Supersite communities	<a href="#">Iceland catalogue</a> , FTP access	GSNL scientists through email request
<b>Infrasonic data</b>	Supersite	<a href="#">Iceland catalogue</a> , FTP access	GSNL scientists through

	<i>communities</i>		<i>email request</i>
<b>VNIR/TIR video camera data</b>	<i>Supersite communities</i>	<a href="#">Iceland catalogue</a> , <i>FTP access</i>	<i>GSNL scientists through email request</i>

422

423 Data are provided by the owners, i.e. the CEOS space agencies, and the Supersite coordinators. Some in  
 424 situ data may be provided by the international scientific community (e.g. those acquired during  
 425 temporary experiments).

426 Data are processed using scientific software or commercial packages. Most scientific software is open  
 427 and can be obtained from Github or through institutional websites; some workflows are available on  
 428 Rohub (e.g. [http://www.rohub.org/rodetails/vsm\\_campi\\_flegrei\\_20112013-release/overview](http://www.rohub.org/rodetails/vsm_campi_flegrei_20112013-release/overview)).

429 Commercial software is mainly used for the satellite data. Three platform are available to the community  
 430 for data processing: [UNAVCO Plug & Play GPS](#), the [Geohazard Exploitation Platform](#) by ESA, and  
 431 the [EVER-EST VRE](#).

432

433 Existing issues concern the provision of direct web access to some datasets, especially some in situ data  
 434 types (see table above). There is no easy solution to this problem. The data owners are in general aware  
 435 of this need but they not always have the capacities to build data infrastructures. For some data the  
 436 metadata are also missing or non-standard. However in Europe the EPOS research infrastructure is  
 437 developing data services for a variety of datasets, and may be open to support data provision also for the  
 438 non-European Supersites, at least on a temporary basis.

439 For some Supersites there is also the issue of accessing data processing capacities. At present this is  
 440 guaranteed with the mentioned platforms, but none of them is permanent, and their sustainability  
 441 depends on project funding. We will investigate, during the IP period, if a business model can be applied  
 442 to these platforms (e.g. pay per use), to ensure a long term sustainability.

443

## 444 9. Data Policy

445 GSNL promotes Open Science and the adoption of the GEOSS Data Sharing Principles for all the  
446 Supersite communities.

447 For the satellite data the fully open access is limited by the space agencies (other than NASA and ESA),  
448 and the users need to sign specific license agreements which accept only scientific use. The  
449 management of satellite data is streamlined and well organised (through the GEP, DLR Supersite portal,  
450 and UNAVCO services, in addition to the public access data infrastructures). Although at the moment  
451 GSNL scientists still need to user different interfaces for data access, all platforms provide also web  
452 services for automated access.

453 For in situ data the situation is more fragmentary. In July 2017, noting that the actual implementation of  
454 in situ data sharing was not fully satisfactory, we published the [GSNL Data Policy Principles](#), which set  
455 the minimum standard to which the Supersites should be compliant. The Supersites established after  
456 that date are requested to publish their own Data Policy compliant with those principles, while those  
457 established earlier should progressively align to it. During the next three years we expect to progress in  
458 this field. In the Annex D to the IP 2017-19 we described the status of adherence of the GSNL data  
459 management practices to the GEO Data Management Principles. That status has not changed much.  
460 Seismic data are fully compliant to the GEO DMP, and geodetic data for the most part. We could not  
461 dedicate resources to investigate in more detail which alignment actions could be requested to the  
462 Supersites for the other data types.

463 The SAC continues to press the Supersites to make all of their data accessible through web services,  
464 however as mentioned earlier, many of them do not have the resources to implement such services,  
465 beyond the fact that in some cases particular data types do not even have standardized metadata (e.g.  
466 geochemical data). Between 2019 and 2020 the EPOS European research infrastructure should start  
467 distributing a number of datasets relevant to the European Supersites (Etna, Campi Flegrei-Vesuvius,  
468 Iceland, Marmara and Enceladus), and these will be fully compliant with the GEO DMP principles. The  
469 same for seismic and geodetic data from the US Supersites (Hawaii and San Andreas Fault). For the  
470 other Supersites we hope to be able to support the implementation of data management practices and  
471 ensure their dissemination and preservation using one of the available infrastructures.

472 Concerning the outputs, during 2017-2019 we have tested the use of Research Objects (RO,  
473 see <http://www.rohub.org>) as a means to exchange scientific information and knowledge. Within an EC  
474 project in which three Supersites have participated (and two more were involved as demonstrators), a  
475 Virtual Research Environment was developed and used to support the collaborative work of the GSNL  
476 community (<https://vre.ever-est.eu/>). A number of ROs have been created, containing scientific results  
477 or volcano bulletins, and in some cases also executable workflows (e.g. models), which have been  
478 shared within the community and executed using the VRE web platform. The ROs can be assigned a DOI  
479 to facilitate the sharing of the scientific results even before publishing. The final report of this VRE  
480 demonstration for the GSNL community is available at: [https://ever-est.eu/wp-content/uploads/EVER-  
481 EST-DEL-WP3-D3.6.pdf](https://ever-est.eu/wp-content/uploads/EVER-EST-DEL-WP3-D3.6.pdf). The EVER-EST project ended in December 2018, but the partnership agreed to  
482 maintain the VRE operational at least until the end of 2019; in the meantime other options for  
483 sustainability are investigated.

484 GPS data accessible through UNAVCO web services were discoverable on the GEOSS platform until  
485 2016, but they are not any more. The Sentinel satellite data are discoverable, but not the other CEOS  
486 data; they could be harvested from the GEP web services. Seismic data could be harvested and made  
487 discoverable, however the usefulness of this is not clear, since the use of seismic waveforms is normally  
488 limited to scientists or experts who know already where to download the data from, and how to use  
489 the specialised web services. The same for other datasets, as GPS or SAR, which require high levels of  
490 expertise to be processed.

491 Placing research results on the GEOSS platform would require to have some standard metadata (which  
492 do not exist for some of the results), and that the results be available through web services, which at  
493 the moment is rather limited. Both UNAVCO and EPOS are progressively loading scientific products in  
494 their platforms, so this picture might change considerably in the next three years.

495 We do not implement direct long term preservation methods for the Supersite data and scientific  
496 products. The preservation should be ensured by the data owners through their infrastructures. In  
497 some cases this is guaranteed.

498 **10. WBS in separate tables**

499 The Tables are in an external excel file. For easiness of compilation the Table A layout has been redesigned  
500 in Table A1. The data have been inserted in there.

501 **11. ANNEXES**

502 **ANNEX I - ACRONYMS**

503

Acronym	Meaning
CEOS	Committee on Earth Observation Satellites
DCT	Data Coordination Team (of the CEOS)
DMP	GEO Data Management Principles
DP	Data Policy
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EPOS	European Plate Observing System
FDSN	Federation of Digital Seismic Network
GEOSS GCI	GEOSS Common Infrastructure
GEP	Geohazards Exploitation Platform
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
GNSS	Global Navigation Satellite System
GPS	Global Positioning System
GSAC	Geodetic Seamless Archive Centers
HDDS	Hazard Data Distribution System (of USGS)
InSAR	SAR interferometry
IPRs	Intellectual Property Rights
IRIS	Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology
IT	Information Technology
OpenDRI	Open Data for Resilience Initiative
RDA	Research Data Alliance
SAC	Scientific Advisory Committee of GSNL
SAR	Synthetic Aperture Radar
SB	Small Baseline
SSARA	Seamless SAR Archive
TBC	To Be Confirmed
TBD	To Be Defined
UNAVCO	University NAVSTAR Consortium
UNISDR	United Nations office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UN-SPIDER	United Nations Platform for Space-based Information for Disaster Management and Emergency Response
VRE	Virtual Research Environment
WG	Working Group
WOVO	World Organization of Volcano Observatories
WP	Work Package

504 **ANNEX II - Most recent publications extracted from the Supersite reports**

- 505
- 506 Moore, S., Wauthier, C., Fukushima, Y., and Poland, M.P., 2018. A retrospective look at the February 1993
- 507 east rift zone intrusion at Kīlauea volcano, Hawaii. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 358,
- 508 p. 241–251.
- 509 Dzurisin, D. and Poland, M., 2018. Magma supply to Kīlauea Volcano, Hawai‘i, from inception to now:
- 510 Historical perspective, current state of knowledge, and future challenges. *Geological Society of America*
- 511 *Special Papers*, 538, p. 275–295.
- 512 Swanson, D.A., Fiske, R.S., Thornber, C.R., and Poland, M.P., 2018. Dikes in the Koa‘e fault system, and
- 513 the Koa‘e–east rift zone structural grain at Kīlauea Volcano, Hawai‘i. *Geological Society of America*
- 514 *Special Papers*, 538, p. 247–274.
- 515 Pepe, S., D’Auria, L., Castaldo, R., Casu, F., De Luca, C., De Novellis, V., Sansosti, E., Solaro, G. and Tizzani,
- 516 P., 2018. The Use of Massive Deformation Datasets for the Analysis of Spatial and Temporal Evolution of
- 517 Mauna Loa Volcano (Hawai‘i). *Remote Sensing*, 10(6), 968.
- 518 Anderson, K.R. and Poland, M.P., 2017. Abundant carbon in the mantle beneath Hawai‘i. *Nature*
- 519 *Geoscience*, 10(9), p. 704.
- 520 Fernández, J., Pepe, A., Poland, M.P. and Sigmundsson, F., 2017. Volcano Geodesy: Recent developments
- 521 and future challenges. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 344, p. 1-12. Peer reviewed
- 522 journal articles
- 523 Parks, M. M et al., (2017) Evolution of deformation and stress changes during the caldera collapse and
- 524 dyking at Bárðarbunga, 2014–2015: Implication for triggering of seismicity at nearby Tungnafellsjökull
- 525 volcano, *Earth Planet Sci. Lett.*, 262, 212-223.
- 526 Pedersen, G.B.M., et al., (2017), Lava field evolution and emplacement dynamics of the 2014–2015 basaltic
- 527 fissure eruption at Holuhraun, Iceland, *J. Volc. Geotherm. Res.*, 40,155–169.
- 528 Gudmundsson, M.T., et al. (2016) Gradual caldera collapse at Bárðarbunga volcano, Iceland, regulated by
- 529 lateral magma outflow, *Science* 353 (6296)
- 530 Ruch, J., Wang, T., Xu, W, Hensch, M., Jónsson, S., Oblique rift opening revealed by reoccurring magma
- 531 injection in central Iceland, *Nature Communications*, 7:12352, doi:
- 532 10.1038/ncomms12352
- 533 Drouin, V., Sigmundsson, F., Verhagen, S., Ófeigsson, B.G., Spaans, K., Hreinsdóttir, S. (2017) Deformation
- 534 at Krafla and Bjarnarflag geothermal areas, Northern Volcanic Zone of Iceland, 1993–2015, *J. Volc.*
- 535 *Geotherm. Res.*, 344, 92–105.
- 536 Wittmann, W., Sigmundsson, F., Dumont, S., Lavallée, Y. (2017) Postemplacement cooling and
- 537 contraction of lava flows: InSAR observations and a thermal model for lava fields at Hekla volcano,
- 538 Iceland, *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth*, 122, doi:10.1002/2016JB013444.
- 539 Spaans, K., Hooper, A. (2016), InSAR processing for volcano monitoring and other near-real time
- 540 applications, *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth*, 121, 2947–2960, doi:10.1002/2015JB012752.
- 541 Spaans, K., Hooper, A. (2018), Insights into the stress field around Bardarbunga Volcano from the
- 542 2014/2015 Holuhraun rifting event, *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* (under review)
- 543 Parks, M., Sigmundsson, F., Sigurðsson, Ó., Hooper, A. (2018) Deformation due to geothermal
- 544 exploitation at Reykjanes, Iceland, 2003 to 2016: InSAR time series analysis, *J. Volc. Geotherm.Res.* (under
- 545 review)
- 546 De Michele M, Ergintav S, Aochi H, Raucoules D (2017) An L-band interferometric synthetic aperture radar
- 547 study on the Ganos section of the north Anatolian fault zone between 2007 and 2011: Evidence for along
- 548 strike segmentation and creep in a shallow fault patch. *PLOS ONE* 12(9)
- 549 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185422>



- 550 Diao, F., et al., (2016). Secondary Fault Activity of the North Anatolian Fault near Avclar, Southwest of  
551 Istanbul: Evidence from SAR Interferometry Observations. *Remote Sensing*, 8(10), 846.
- 552 Aslan G, Cakir Z, Ergintav S, Lasserre C, Renard F. (2018a) Analysis of Secular Ground Motions in Istanbul  
553 from a Long-Term InSAR Time-Series (1992–2017). *Remote Sensing*. 2018, 10(3), 408,  
554 doi:10.3390/rs10030408.
- 555 Aslan G, Lasserre C, Cakir Z, Renard F, Ergintav S. (2018b) Shallow creep along the 1999 Izmit  
556 earthquake's rupture (Turkey) from high temporal resolution interferometric synthetic-aperture radar  
557 data (2011-2017) (Submitted)
- 558 Bonforte A., Fanizza G., Greco F., Matera A., Sulpizio R. (2017). Long-term dynamics across a volcanic rift:  
559 21years of microgravity and GPS observations on the southern flank of Mt. Etna volcano. *Journal of*  
560 *Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, Volume 344, Pages 174-184, ISSN 0377-0273,  
561 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2017.06.005>.
- 562 Bruno V., Mattia M., Montgomery-Brown E., Rossi M., Scandura D. (2017). Inflation leading to a Slow  
563 SlipEvent and volcanic unrest at Mount Etnain 2016: Insights from CGPS data. *Geophysical Research*  
564 *Letters*, 44, 12, 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL075744>
- 565 Mitoulaki S., Tobolidi A.M., Bonforte A., Gulielmino F., Parcharidis I., Briole P. (2017). Surface deformation  
566 based on SAR interferometry combined with human exposure in a GIS contributing to risk assessment.  
567 Submitted to *European Journal of Remote Sensing*.
- 568 Poland M. P., Peltier A., Bonforte A, Puglisi G. (2017), The spectrum of persistent volcanic flank instability:  
569 A review and proposed framework based on Kilauea, Piton de la Fournaise, and Etna. *Journal of*  
570 *Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, Volume 339, Pages 63-80, ISSN 0377-0273,  
571 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2017.05.004>.
- 572 Sellitto, P., G. Salerno, A. La Spina, T. Caltabiano, L. Terray, P.-J. Gauthier, and P. Briole (2017), A novel  
573 methodology to determine volcanic aerosols optical properties in the UV and NIR and Ångström  
574 parameters using Sun photometry, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 122, 9803–9815, 2017;  
575 doi:10.1002/2017JD026723.
- 576 Terray, L., Gauthier P.-J., Salerno G., Caltabiano T., La Spina A., Sellitto P., Briole P. (2018). A New  
577 Degassing Model to Infer Magma Dynamics from Radioactive Disequilibria in Volcanic Plumes, *MDPI*  
578 *Geosciences*, 8, 27; doi:10.3390/geosciences8010027.
- 579 Urlaub M., Petersen F., Gross F., Bonforte V, Guglielmino F., Puglisi G., Krastel S., Lange V, Kopp H. (2018).  
580 Gravitational collapse of Mount Etna's south-eastern flank. Submitted to *Nature Communication*
- 581 E. Trasatti, M. Polcari, M. Bonafede, S. Stramondo (2015). Geodetic constraints to the source mechanism  
582 of the 2011-2013 unrest at Campi Flegrei (Italy) caldera. *Geophysical Research Letters*,  
583 10.1002/2015GL063621
- 584 L. D'auria, S. Pepe, R. Castaldo, F. Giudicepietro, G. Macedonio, P. Ricciolino, P. Tizzani, F. Casu, R. Lanari,  
585 M. Manzo, M. Martini, E. Sansosti, I. Zinno (2015). Magma injection beneath the urban area of Naples: a  
586 new mechanism for the 2012–2013 volcanic unrest at Campi Flegrei caldera. *Scientific Reports*, 5, 13100,  
587 10.1038/srep13100.
- 588 K.F. Tiampo, P.J. Gonzalez, S. Samsonov, J. Fernandez, A. Camacho (2017). Principal component analysis  
589 of MSBAS DInSAR time series from Campi Flegrei, Italy. *J. Volcanol. Geotherm. Res.* Version: 1 344 139-  
590 153, issn: 0377-0273, ids: FK3KR, 10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2017.03.004
- 591 S. Tessitore, D. Di Martire, D. Calcaterra, D. Infante, M. Ramondini, G. Russo (2017). Multitemporal  
592 synthetic aperture radar for bridges monitoring. *Proceedings of SPIE - The International Society for*  
593 *Optical Engineering*, 10431, art. no. 104310C, 10.1117/12.2278459
- 594 V. De Novellis, et al., (2018). The 21 August 2017 Ischia (Italy) Earthquake Source Model Inferred From  
595 Seismological, GPS, and DInSAR Measurements. *Geoph. Res. Letters*, 10.1002/2017GL076336

- 596 R. Nappi, et al., (2018). The August 21, 2017, Md 4.0 Casamicciola earthquake: first evidence of coseismic  
597 normal surface faulting at the Ischia volcanic island. *Seismological Research Letters*, 10.1785/0220180063
- 598 Jolly, A., Lokmer, I., Christenson, B. and Thun, J., 2018. Relating gas ascent to eruption triggering for the  
599 April 27, 2016, White Island (Whakaari), New Zealand eruption sequence. *Earth, Planets and Space*, 70(1),  
600 p.177.
- 601 Miller, C.A.; Currenti, G.; Hamling, I.J.; Williams-Jones, G. 2018 Mass transfer processes in a post eruption  
602 hydrothermal system : parameterisation of microgravity changes at Te Maari craters, New Zealand.  
603 *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 357: 39-55; doi: 10.1016/j.jvolgeores.2018.04.005
- 604 Schaefer, L.N., Kennedy, B.M., Villeneuve, M.C., Cook, S.C., Jolly, A., Keys, H. and Leonard, G., 2018.  
605 Stability assessment of the Crater Lake/Te Wai-ā-moe overflow channel at Mt. Ruapehu (New Zealand),  
606 and implications for volcanic lake break-out triggers. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*.
- 607 Rastin, S.J., Gledhill, K.R. and Unsworth, C.P., 2018. A Detailed Spatiotemporal Wavelet Study to Improve  
608 the P-Phase Picking Performance for the 2007–2010 Shallow Earthquake Swarms near Matata, New  
609 Zealand A Detailed Spatiotemporal Wavelet Study to Improve the P-Phase Picking Performance. *Bulletin*  
610 *of the Seismological Society of America*, 108(1), pp.260-277.
- 611 Holden, L., Cas, R., Fournier, N. and Ailleres, L., 2017. Modelling ground deformation patterns associated  
612 with volcanic processes at the Okataina Volcanic Centre. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal*  
613 *Research*, 344, pp.65-78.
- 614 Edwards, M.J., Kennedy, B.M., Jolly, A.D., Scheu, B. and Jousset, P., 2017. Evolution of a small  
615 hydrothermal eruption episode through a mud pool of varying depth and rheology, White Island, NZ.  
616 *Bulletin of Volcanology*, 79(2), p.16.
- 617 Godfrey, H.J., Fry, B. and Savage, M.K., 2017. Shear-wave velocity structure of the Tongariro Volcanic  
618 Centre, New Zealand: Fast Rayleigh and slow Love waves indicate strong shallow anisotropy. *Journal of*  
619 *Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 336, pp.33-50.
- 620 Walsh, B., Jolly, A.D. and Procter, J., 2017. Calibrating the amplitude source location (ASL) method by  
621 using active seismic sources: An example from Te Maari volcano, Tongariro National Park, New Zealand.  
622 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(8), pp.3591-3599.
- 623 Lamb, S., Moore, J.D., Smith, E. and Stern, T., 2017. Episodic kinematics in continental rifts modulated by  
624 changes in mantle melt fraction. *Nature*, 547(7661), p.84.
- 625 Hamling, I.J. 2017 Crater lake controls on volcano stability : insights from White Island, New Zealand.  
626 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(22): 11,311-11,319
- 627 Ebmeier SK et al., (2016). Shallow earthquake inhibits unrest near Chiles–Cerro Negro volcanoes,  
628 Ecuador–Colombian border. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Volume 450, 15 September 2016, Pages  
629 283–291.
- 630 Morales R A, Amelung F, Mothes P (2016). Volcano deformation survey over the Northern and Central  
631 Andes with ALOS InSAR time series. *Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems*, June. DOI:  
632 10.1002/2016GC006393.
- 633 Anieri M. Morales Rivera, Falk Amelung, Patricia Mothes, Sang-Hoon Hong, Jean-Mathieu Nocquet, and  
634 Paul Jarrin (2017). Ground deformation before the 2015 eruptions of Cotopaxi volcano detected by  
635 InSAR. Submitted to *Geophysical Research Letters*.
- 636 Emmanouil Panagiotakis, Nektarios Chrysoulakis, Vasiliki Charalampopoulou, and Dimitris Poursanidis  
637 Validation of Pleiades Tri-Stereo DSM in Urban Areas *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Inf.* 2018, 7(3), 118
- 638 Aggeliki Kyriou & Konstantinos Nikolakopoulos (2018) Assessing the suitability of Sentinel-1 data for  
639 landslide mapping, *European Journal of Remote Sensing*, 51:1, 402-411
- 640 Tsangaratos, P., Loupasakis, C., Nikolakopoulos, K. et al. Developing a landslide susceptibility map based  
641 on remote sensing, fuzzy logic and expert knowledge of the Island of Lefkada, Greece *Environ Earth Sci*

642 (2018) 77: 363

643 Konstantinos Nikolakopoulos, Katerina Kavoura, Nikolaos Depountis, Aggeliki Kyriou, Nikolaos  
 644 Argyropoulos, Ioannis Koukouvelas & Nikolaos Sabatakakis (2017) Preliminary results from active  
 645 landslide monitoring using multidisciplinary surveys, *European Journal of Remote Sensing*, 50:1, 280-299

646 Alexandros Papadopoulos, Issaak Parcharidis, Panagiotis Elias and Pierre Briole (2018) Spatio-temporal  
 647 evolution of the deformation around the Rio-Patras fault (Greece) observed by synthetic aperture radar  
 648 interferometry from 1993 to 2017. Submitted to *International Journal of remote Sensing* (accepted with  
 649 revisions)

650 A. Tsokos, E. Kotsi, S. Petrakis & Emm Vassilakis (2018). Combining series of multi-source high spatial  
 651 resolution remote sensing datasets for the detection of shoreline displacement rates and the  
 652 effectiveness of coastal zone protection measures. *Journal of Coastal Conservation*  
 653 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-018-0591-3>

654 G. Kaviris, C. Millas, I. Spingos, V. Kapetanidis, I. Fountoulakis, P. Papadimitriou, N. Voulgaris and K.  
 655 Makropoulos, 2018. Observations of shear-wave splitting parameters in the Western Gulf of Corinth  
 656 focusing on the 2014 Mw=5.0 earthquake. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 282, 60-76.

657 G. Kaviris, I. Spingos, C. Millas, V. Kapetanidis, I. Fountoulakis, P. Papadimitriou, N. Voulgaris and G.  
 658 Drakatos, 2018. Effects of the January 2018 seismic sequence on shear-wave splitting in the upper crust  
 659 of Marathon (NE Attica, Greece). *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 285, 45-58

660 G. Kaviris, I. Fountoulakis, I. Spingos, C. Millas, P. Papadimitriou and G. Drakatos, 2018. Mantle dynamics  
 661 beneath Greece from SKS and PKS seismic anisotropy study. *Acta Geophysica*

662 Ganas A., Elias E., Bozionelos G., Papathanassiou G., Avallone A., Papastergios A., Valkaniotis S.,  
 663 Parcharidis, Briole P., (2016), Co-seismic deformation, field observations and seismic fault of the 17  
 664 November 2015 M =6.5, Lefkada Island, Greece earthquake, *Tectonophysics*, ù

665 Arapostathis S., Parcharidis I., Stefanakis E., Drakatos G. and Kalogeras I. (2016) A Method for Developing  
 666 Seismic Intensity Maps from Twitter Data. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Architecture*, 10, 839-852.

667 G. Kaviris, I. Spingos, V. Kapetanidis, P. Papadimitriou, N. Voulgaris and K. Makropoulos, 2017. Upper crust  
 668 seismic anisotropy study and temporal variations of shear-wave splitting parameters in the Western Gulf  
 669 of Corinth (Greece) during 2013. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 269, 148-164

670 Melgar, D., A. Ganas, J. Geng, C. Liang, E.J. Fielding, I. Kassaras, (2017). Source characteristics of the 2015  
 671 Mw6.5 Lefkada, Greece, strike-slip earthquake, *Journal of Geophysical Research*,

672 Kassaras, I., P. Papadimitriou, V. Kapetanidis and N. Voulgaris, 2017. Seismic site characterization at the  
 673 western Cephalonia Island in the aftermath of the 2014 earthquake series, *International Journal of Geo-*  
 674 *Engineering*, 8:7

675 Kassaras, I., et al., 2018 The November 17th 2015 Mw=6.5 earthquake of Lefkada (Ionian Sea):  
 676 Implications from instrumental and macroseismic observations, *Journal of Earthquake Engineering*,

677 Polykretis, C., Faka, A., Chalkias, C. (2018) Exploring the Impact of Analysis Scale on Landslide  
 678 Susceptibility Modeling: Empirical Assessment in Northern Peloponnese, Greece. *Geosciences*, 8(7), 261.

679 Polykretis, C., Chalkias, C. (2018) Comparison and evaluation of landslide susceptibility maps obtained  
 680 from weight of evidence, logistic regression, and artificial neural network models. *Natural Hazards*, 93,  
 681 249–274.

682 Polykretis, C., Chalkias, C., Ferentinou, M. (2017) Adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system (ANFIS)  
 683 modeling for landslide susceptibility assessment in a Mediterranean hilly area. *Bulletin of Engineering*  
 684 *Geology and the Environment*, 1–15.

685  
 686  
 687

688

689 **ANNEX III - CV of GSNL SAC Chair**

690 **Stefano Salvi** is technological director at the Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia  
691 (INGV), Osservatorio Nazionale Terremoti (ONT), Rome, Italy. In 1999 he founded the ING  
692 Remote Sensing Laboratory, and in 2001 the INGV Geodesy and Remote Sensing Laboratory. He  
693 now coordinates a research group including engineers, geophysicists and geologists  
694 experienced in the use of space geodetic data for the study of ground deformation due to  
695 various phenomena, earthquakes, volcanoes, tectonics, gravitational mass movements,  
696 sinkholes, anthropogenic subsidence. He has authored over 60 papers on peer reviewed  
697 journals on these subjects. He has been PI or co-PI for several research projects funded by EC,  
698 ESA, ASI, NASA, Italian Antarctic program, national and bilateral research programs, on the use  
699 of remote sensing data and techniques for geophysical applications and geohazard assessment.  
700 He is a member of the CEOS Working Group on Disasters and co-lead of the CEOS Seismic  
701 Demonstrator. He was elected Chair of the GEO GSNL Scientific Advisory Committee in 2014.

702