

WG 1 – Minutes – 22/10/2013

Gaetano Elia (GE), Carlos Pereira (CP), Josif Josifovski (JJ), JM-Pereira (JMP), Peter Helm (PH), Eugeniusz Koda (EK), Sahar Hemmati (SH), Raymon Vandermeij (RV).

- All present summarised their background and described how their works fits with the aims of WG1
- Presentation from Sahar Hemmati (SH) on her work during the Ph.D. and Post-Doc.
- Gaetano Elia (GE) to circulate list for new members to add name and email contact
- GE summarised initial framework for aims of WG1
- GE suggested we revise scope to include natural slopes
- GE emphasised the overlap with WG2+3
- GE gave a refresher of his presentation and the minutes from the first meeting at Newcastle University
- **GE emphasised that the MOU output was the state of the art review so this must be our initial focus**
 - Once this was complete it may be possible to undertake a comparison modelling exercise – this would be in addition to the state of the art review.
- GE suggested that STSM may involve travel to collaborate on paper writing as electronic collaboration over long distances may be problematic...
- Carlos Pereira (CP) - It was noted that it was necessary to define what exactly the output would be (i.e. a paper or a report) as they are very different!
- GE pointed out that Tom Dijkstra is co-editor of QJEGH and that he had stated that it would be possible to have a special issue for the COST action
 - **Necessary to get a decision on publication location and deadline – requires discussion with WG leaders and Tom Dijkstra**
- GE asked for comments on the paper outline
 - Agreement that case studies are potentially an important section of the paper.
 - Josif Josifovski (JJ) - commented that it was necessary to extract the most important data from case studies for intro
 - JM-Pereira (JP) – Commented that benchmark studies are high impact and so that would be useful for a paper
 - Raymond – Commented that everyone describing their methods is closer to the MOU
 - GE commented that we need to take care to ensure novelty as SAFELANDS report and Phil Vardon (DELFT) publications are in closely related topics.
 - GE commented that the other WG are not dealing with modelling of cracking / vegetation / evapotranspiration
 - Raymon – Pointed out that as scope was so wide, may be able to write several papers for WG2
 - GE said that originally the scope was 1 paper per WG
- GE commented that if we wish to undertake benchmarking, report must be produced quickly.
- GE highlighted that the MOU stated there would be a review of the methods related to slope instability with partial sat., climate and vegetation.

- As such the report is a mandatory product of the work, benchmarking is an optional high value output
- Paper deadline 1 year from now(circa November 2014)
- **GE suggested creation of a summary table of people and their associated skills / resources and datasets – initially started in the meeting, may be useful to forward a pro-forma to other WG members**
- GE observed that JJ has a number of interesting case studies dealing with the remediation of natural and engineered slopes
 - JJ added that they do FE modelling with standard (Mohr Coulomb) and more advanced constitutive models in Plaxis
 - GE asked if failure triggered by rainfall
 - JJ clarified that the bridge embankments were analysed to identify trigger mechanism and that rainfall appeared to be the cause
- **JMP to contact an associate at UPC to see if they would be interested in collaboration / joining the COST action and to discuss his work**
- GE highlighted that there was a mix of case studies and more “fundamental” modelling research.
- Raymon - It was highlighted that a common structure was required for each of the case studies to allow it to be placed into a paper.
- Peter Helm commented that it was important to discuss advantages AND disadvantages of the various techniques to allow a proper understanding of potential further development work required and also to properly draw conclusions about the various case study results.
- All – It was observed that clarification of what constitutes a case study required - Full scale slopes only? Or the laboratory scale modelling?
- GE stated that if there is money available we should consider a short term scientific mission (STSM) for this financial year of the COST action ideally either to visit another university to better understand alternative methods of modelling or to collaborate on paper writing. Anyone interested to contact GE directly.
 - Should also start to consider potential STSMs for next year.
- Need to consider when we will have another WG meeting –GE said this is likely to be late Feb –early March
- Need to discuss agenda for next meeting.