

Gulf of Maine Ocean Data Partnership Executive Committee

July 21, 2005

NHDES Conference Room

Attendees: David Mountain, Deb Soule, Philip Bogden, Evan Richert, Linda Mercer, Bob Branton, Richard Eisner (guest, DFO), Charlie Spies (guest, GoMOOS COO), Tom Shyka, Sylvia Most, Dan Sampson

Planned Agenda:

1. Regional Association update – Evan
 - What this means for the Partnership
2. MetaData/registration project - all
 - Lessons from Lou's report
 - Issues from Bob B. (e-mails of 7/16)
 - Technical Committee input
 - MetaData training in the fall?
 - What are the next steps?
3. Technical Committee update – Deb
4. Partner Survey - Sylvia
 - Status
 - Issues?
5. How are we doing on our annual work plan?
 - Where do we need to put more energy?
6. Planning of the Annual Meeting
 - Dates?
7. Newsletter draft
8. Other business/issues:
 - a. Bob requested discussion of OBIS related issues
 - b. Philip SCOOP/SURA update

Meeting called to order by David Mountain at 9:25 AM. We amended the agenda (other business) and went through introductions.

Meeting Notes:

Membership: Gulf of Maine Research Institute is now a member (#20). Tom Perkins is the current contact.

Regional Association update: final deadline was June 30th, but still awaiting news on award. \$1.1M, 3-yr grant to USM for the coalescing of the ocean observing activities in the Gulf of Maine into a Regional Association. We will become one of 10 such associations in the US. Alaska, Great Lakes and ours have relationships with Canada. Evan is lead. PI's include Janet Campbell, UNH; Philip, GoMOOS; Josie Quintrell, GoMOOS. Hosting of the Ocean Data Partnership for 3years is part of the program to create stability for the partnership. One ½ time person housed at GoMOOS who will serve as staff to exec committee and partnership. Second

year will include another ½ time person to perform technical assistance. Part of the project will include establishing what products need to be provided to users.

Metadata Pilot Project – Lou Van Guelpen completed his report and submitted it late June. He worked with 5 partners to get through the metadata registration process. Discussion on Page 4’s recommendations/conclusions – GeoConnections will work as a viable registration portal and some hand-holding will be required to get partners to register. Evan would like to see Lou continue to do this or some other person who would like to take on the project if we can find funding. It is apparent that it is necessary to have a resource available to keep the effort moving. Bob termed it a “data scout.” On p.2 of Lou’s report there is mention of some of the confusion of using the GeoConnections site. Bob investigated and worked with their helpdesk staff to identify weaknesses. GeoConnections has committed to implementing changes. Since the site was originally based on physical sciences, the biological realm has been a bit difficult to integrate. Our feedback has been important for positive improvements on the site.

- Our desire was to have everyone registered by the end of the year. We need to find funding to continue an effort similar to Lou’s project with the initial 5 partners. The Metadata training is one step – can we incorporate getting the registration process complete?
- Need to look at GeoConnections and GCMD, as they both have different things to offer. Over time these (and others) are becoming increasingly integrated. Portals are becoming less the goal as inter-operable data registration and discovery is now a reality enabling people to only register one time. API’s (Application Programming Interfaces) are the new development. FGDC is contracting for an API for the Geospatial One-Stop. It is a new concept and difficult to implement, so it will be changing rapidly. GCMD and GeoConnections are looking at it.
- Should our metadata training workshop include a session with GCMD or some other provider to see what is available?

In response to this project, Bob created a GoMODP entry on the organization list at GeoConnections. He also went through and added “Gulf of Maine Ocean Data Partnership” and “GoMODP” as keywords and verified that they showed up.

MEDI catalog contains a metadata authoring tool developed by IODE in partnership with GCMD (<http://ioc.unesco.org/MEDI>). This came up in the context of only entering data one time and ensuring that the entry tool is robust and high quality.

Keywords are an important component of consistent data entry and discoverability. OBIS is focused on marine species. GeoConnections has been focused on land-based. Need to advocate for merging of keyword lists to enable effective data discovery.

Metadata workshop: Funded by FGDC for the Ocean Data Partnership. Committee members include Chris Polloni, Anne Ball, Seth Barker, Lou Van Guelpen, Tom and Sylvia. The committee also would like to include Bob. NOAA CSC will provide the metadata trainer and materials. Two committee calls have been conducted so far to discuss goals and logistics. General goals include having one member from each partner to attend the training in order to get everyone up to the same level of understanding. Have the partners bring a dataset to work with,

as the design is for a “hands-on” workshop. We are also considering an evening session for discussion on portals. Logistically, we are planning to have people bring their own computers to the GoMOOS facility. Budget includes 25 people, 2 days, including food, some travel and accommodations.

Discussion on goals/content of Metadata Training workshop. Should we have a “use case” (peer reviewed example; also an example of how data will be used). The purpose of this effort is to provide context for the metadata entry. If we provide examples of “good” metadata entries will help people know what to bring to the session. Richard pointed out that there are multiple aspects of metadata including discovery, data management policies, selection of data points ... In the end we concluded that this “context-setting” step was important to ensuring that partners understand the importance of attending the seminar. Bob and Richard will join the subcommittee in the interest of helping to develop these “use cases” or good examples of well-done metadata entries. In summary, we want to ensure that people can link their efforts to the vision of the organization. Functionally, we don’t need the use cases for the initial invitation, but should have them for the follow-up. In between the two day-long training sessions, we can have an evening presentation/discussion with GCMD to provide feedback on the use of the portal.

It would be good to have Lou or some other “data scout” under contract to help develop and attend this workshop. Evan committed to discuss this with Lou and develop an initial scope of service. We need to define milestones for the contract in terms of databases registered.

We will schedule a separate meeting to bring the exec and technical committees together in early November to tackle the discussion of bringing the discoverability and accessibility pieces together. At the conclusion of that meeting we would write up our decisions and specify the goals for the next year’s work plan.

Technical committee update: Meeting on June 1. Technical guidance will not be ready by the end of the summer, but a subcommittee has been assigned to complete this. We anticipate that the draft will be available by the end of August/early September. Guidance on data authority should be included in the invitation letter to the workshop.

Partner Survey: Has been piloted with the technical committee. Bugs are being fixed today and we expect it to be rolled out to the rest of the partnership over the next week. We discussed the usefulness of the survey and the long term implications.

Work Plan Status: We are well along on the goals of authority and discoverability. Need to work on the Accessibility milestones. Nov. exec/tech committee workshop will be to put together a work plan for moving beyond pilot projects toward actual accessibility between partners. This will be presented at the annual meeting. On the interoperability piece, Dave has funding for a programmer and may be able to extend the Shrimp project. Bob has a project running that will take data from ESRI shapefiles and display with WMS or WFS outputs from OBIS. Anticipate this being fully operational by November (in advance of annual meeting). In terms of keeping the energy up, we are looking for about \$10K to renew Lou’s contract for technical assistance. Philip anticipates GoMOOS resources available to help with NMFS project to extend the Shrimp project.

Annual meeting plan: 12/6; 12/8; 12/13 possible dates. Sylvia to send email out to partners and alternates. Suggest sending query out with the newsletter. As was done last year, plan a one day meeting with speakers. Exec committee members will need to think over the possible speakers and make suggestions over the next 6 weeks. Dave Mountain, Bob Branton and Linda Mercer will make the final decisions on speakers and finalize agenda.

Proposed Agenda:

- retrospective on discoverability, review of 2005 workplan
 - i. successes/failures
 - ii. status
 - iii. useful examples (use case)
 - iv. example of how the information was used
 - v. encouragement to complete this part
- discussion on discoverability
 - i. discuss recommendations
 - ii. buy-in
- discussion/acceptance of proposed new work-plan
- speaker possibilities
 - i. person from GCMD to discuss direction and possibly provide feedback on our status/direction
 - ii. select projects that demonstrate the practical power of allowing access to well-registered data
 - iii. Melanie Meaux to talk about metadata
 - iv. Pat Halpin re: forward looking
 - 1. when you can get access to multiple databases, here's what you can do
 - 2. he is integrating 120 different sources of data using GIS.
 - 3. focus is on inspiration for the coming year
 - v. Open IOOS is another example. It is a proof of concept rather than a decision support tool. It would be good to discuss and develop some criteria about what would be worthwhile tools for decision making.
 - vi. Ocean use atlas – Heather Bries
- Discussion on partner's datasets for the purpose of generating ideas for products and applications.
- Discussion on new partners that we would like to coerce or otherwise invite to join the partnership (Canadian Geological Survey, Fish and Wildlife Service)

Location: Possible options include the NHDES Pease facility; USM Library or Abromson facility; St. Andrews has space and accommodations; New England Aquarium; WHOI Carriage house. Sylvia to investigate costs/options and work with David to finalize. The key issue is cost, budget. Evan, Philip and Charlie will work on funding after the budget is defined by Sylvia and David.

Newsletter draft: Need to add GMRI as a member. Add some additional info on the survey and the annual meeting. Sylvia to distribute with other information. Also, need to develop stationery.

Vacancy in the OBIS Secretariat: There will be a job posting shortly. The project will be ongoing until 2010.

OBIS Editorial Board: Names suggested include Lew Incze, Evan Richert, Bob Branton. Bob to talk with Lew and Evan about the commitment involved. This is a step toward moving into scientific publishing arena.

Marine Metadata Initiative: Philip provided information on a recent SURA project that involves interfacing systems and incorporating legacy systems onto the OpenIOOS site. They are planning to document this system for others to use.

SCOOP/SURA: Philip provided a paper that outlines the integration of various subsystems that must communicate in order for effective modeling and analysis.

Need a draft meeting announcement for the GoMODP general meeting so that speakers can have an idea of what the purpose is. David will draft this for Sylvia to edit.

Meeting adjourned at 3PM.