

Agenda
 Gulf of Maine Data Partnership
 December 7, 2004

<u>Time Start</u>	<u>Time End</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
8:15 AM	8:45	Continental Breakfast	
8:45	9:00	<i>Introduction</i>	D. Mountain
9:00	10:00	<i>From authoritative data to interoperability: an overview</i>	B. Branton
10:10	10:45	<i>An illustration on discoverability</i>	L. Van Guelpen
10:45	10:50	Break	
10:50	12:00 PM	<i>Access and interoperability presentation and critique – GoMMAP</i>	T. Shyka/ P. Bogden
12:00	12:30	Lunch	
12:30	12:50	<i>Governance issues</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operating practice ▪ Voting on slate of officers 	L. Mercer
12:50		<i>Workplan review</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project by project (point by point) review ▪ Implications for partners 	D. Mountain/ E. Richert
		<i>Workplan review (continued)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Endorsement by consensus 	D. Mountain/ E. Richert
	3:20	Wrap Up	D. Mountain

Meeting Attendees:

<u>Name of Organization</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Present</u>
Bedford Institute of Oceanography	Bob Branton	√
Centre for Marine Biodiversity	Bob Branton (alternate)	
Coastal Ocean Observation and Analysis – UNH	Janet Campbell Annette Schloss	No √
EPA/ORD/NHEERL/Atlantic Ecology Division (pending)	Stephen Hale	√
Gulf of Maine Area Census of Marine Life	Evan Richert Nick Wolff (observer)	√ √
Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment	Seth Barker	√
Gulf of Maine Ocean Observing System	Philip Bogden (Tom Shyka)	√ √
Huntsman Marine Science Centre	Lou Van Guelpen	√
Maine Department of Marine Resources	Linda Mercer	√
Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management	Dan Sampson	√
NOAA – Coastal Services Center	Anne Ball	√
NOAA – Northeast Fisheries Science Center	David Mountain Joan Palmer (alternate)	√ √
St. Andrews Biological Station	No attendee – Bob Branton (representing)	
Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary	Ben Haskell	√
Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine /SeaNET	Rebecca Harris	√
USGS – Woods Hole Science Center	Chris Polloni	√
Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve	Michelle Dionne Megan Tyrrell (alternate)	√ (afternoon)
New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services	Deb Soule	√
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (pending)	Bob Groman	√
National Undersea Research Center for the North Atlantic & Great Lakes at UCONN (observer)	Kevin Joy	√
UNH CICEET (observer)	Kalle Matso	No
Coordinator	Sylvia Most	√

1. Meeting called to order at 8:45 AM with introductory remarks by David Mountain. Agenda (above) indicates actual times.

2. Presenter: Bob Branton

1. OBIS/GMBIS poster presentation – “Emergence of a Regional OBIS Node”
2. (GoMODP.ppt) “Using Standards to Enable Publishing of Biodiversity Data.”

Bob’s attendance at the OBIS/OBI meeting in Hamburg last week generated new ideas in the arena of publishing of biodiversity data. Accessibility moved ahead of discoverability in priority. Challenges to data sharing are data quality, which can depend on the intended use; user satisfaction, what works for a resource manager may not work for a practicing scientist; and knowing what works, need a system to discern usable approaches. A data certification process proposed to aid in quality testing and aid in establishing appropriateness for a given use. OBIS-SEAMAP site has a working “terms of use” clause to establish limitations, suggests that we incorporate something similar to our partnership.

- *Authoritative – use OBIS and ITIS to corroborate details, Gazetteers to establish political and bathymetric features.*
 - *Accessible – post biodiversity data on DiGIR, different mechanisms for stable (complete) vs. volatile (changing) data products*
 - *Various discovery options*
 - *Interoperability as demonstrated by OBIS-SEAMAP (Pat Halpin) – overlaying maps (lowest level), up to combining data*
- In conclusion, the benefits of pursuing these methods include increased confidence in data and results; cross-jurisdictional mapping and analysis not possible with ad-hoc methods and better and more efficient use of end-user resources; and of provider’s time. Discussion on use of a “plone” for communication/data exchange – our wiki site is a primitive analog. Issue of official gazetteer – need a standard.*

3. Presenter: Lou Van Guelpen: “An Illustration on Discoverability.ppt”

As a follow-on to Bob’s presentation, Lou outlined the importance of data being high quality, standardized data format (NARMS information available on the Huntsman Marine Science Centre web site) and discoverable. ARC uses the Davis Strait to Cape Hatteras as their “bounding box” for geo-referencing the 133,000+ records available in the museum collection at the Atlantic Reference centre. Lou ran through the details of the GeoConnections data registration process using the Atlantic Reference Centre as an example. Keyword structure is critical to how widely the data is discoverable. Entity attributes are the complex part of the entry process, but also the most valuable. Learnings: data sets must be accurate, follow open standards, standardized species names and taxonomy and datasets must be discoverable. Metadata process is cumbersome, but survivable!

4. Philip Bogden: Standards Enable Innovation

Different languages/protocols will continue to exist; the key is automated two-way communication. Given the diagram, some arrows are one-way (DFO provides to OBIS (one-way), which then serves the user (two-way)). We are not trying to squeeze everything into one protocol, but we can enable web-services communications. What the partnership can do is learn how to “speak” the various protocols and then figure out how to mix/match to create a value-added capability enabling the use of the data by multiple kinds of users. The Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) is using an incremental process to define XML+web service specifications for a variety of applications and is a critical element to our partnership effort. Marine metadata interoperability site is an effort to reach agreement on metadata standard conventions and provide community guidance (www.marinemetadata.org). GoMMAP example: completely distributed data sources dynamically merged using DM solutions application. Data publishers decide what they do or don’t want to provide – they control access. For example, the web mapping service provides layer-able images – not data. Current demonstrations typically show sharing of representations of data (maps), not the actual data (more complex), yet available web feature services can accomplish data movement between users. Periodic data caching can improve portal performance. Other professional arenas are further along this path than the Ocean community – may provide software/models for leveraging. Need to understand what is useful, vs. what is impressive, as well as balancing products vs. dissemination of data.

5. Linda Mercer: Governance Issues

1. Operating practice – discussion on the following elements of the work plan, no dissention from proposed structure.

Membership structure

Quorum (voting by those present)

Authority of executive committee vs. full board

Structure of exec committee

2. Voting on slate of officers – approved as listed with no dissent.

Chair David Mountain NOAA/NMFS

Vice-Chair Robert Branton DFO

Secretary Dan Sampson Mass CZM

Treasurer Linda Mercer Maine DMR

Technical Committee Debra Soule New Hampshire DES

Outreach Committee Evan Richert University of Southern Maine

Host Philip Bogden GoMOOS

3. Committee staffing

- i. Technical partners need to appoint members

- ii. Outreach – Evan gave overview of efforts

6. Evan/David: Workplan Review
 1. Financial overview
Relationship of partnership to the Northeast Regional Association. Regional Associations currently funded through the Coastal Services Center. Proposal is in as of December 1st for 3 year support for the partnership.
 2. Project: Assurance
Discussion focused on the idea that this is actually quite an individual investment on the part of partners; however the investment is what makes the products valuable. Figure out how the partnership can deal with a species list, geographical place names or equivalent for consistency between organizations.
 3. Project: Discovery
Discussion around whether data entry into a portal should be handled by a partner or a centralized entity. If this is already done, then we need to ensure there is a keyword to identify the ocean data partnership. CoML might be able to find funding to enable this to be done on a coordinated basis.
 4. Project: Accessibility
Demonstration project? Bob to provide trawl survey data as a model. Others can then look at it and establish their ability to follow the same procedure. Larger partners may be able to help smaller partners accomplish this.
 5. Project: Interoperability
Technical committee needs to recommend basic data management standards to avoid incompatibilities. Also may want to provide disclaimers that certain datasets may not work together. Alternately, may need to select a documented data mining approach rather than trying to get disparate data sets to work together.
7. Workplan endorsement
David Mountain and executive committee to incorporate changes from the governing board discussion and send out to governing board for approval.
8. Meeting adjourned at 3:20pm. (Winter weather conditions underway).