

Notes: Northwest Environmental Data-network Steering Committee and PNAMP Data Management Work Group Meeting

Time: 3/1/2006 from 9:00 to 4:30

Location: Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fisheries Commission, 729 NE Oregon St, Ste 200, Portland Oregon.

Present:

Present: Bruce Schmidt (StreamNet), Tom Pansky (BPA), Peter Paquet (NPCC), Tom O'Neil (NWHI) Stewart Toshach (NED), Roberto Morganti (USFS), John Piccinini (BPA), Jill Leary (Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership), Paul Ocker (USACE), Stewart Toshach (NED)

On phone: David Tetta (EPA), Russell Scranton (NOAAF-NWRO), Joy Paulus (IAC), Nancy Tubbs (USGS), Burney Hill (EPA), Randy McIntosh (NWIFC), Cedric Cooney (StreamNet-ODFW)

Apologies: Bobbi Riggers (OWEB)

A. NED AGENDA ITEMS

1) Review of Steering Committee 06 Tasks.

At the February 1st meeting the Steering Committee reviewed progress and work plans for the individual NED work groups. The remaining review task, for the March meeting was to review core tasks of the Steering Committee as a whole. A summary follows with respect to each Core task from the NED 06 work plan.

Task 2.2.2 Develop Organizational and Administrative Arrangements for Regional Data Network.

Work is ongoing to identify and facilitate development and adoption of organizational and administrative arrangements to improve regional data sharing and networking. The first task is to develop arrangements for needed functions – an outline has already been developed. The second task is to identify resources needed to complete these functions. Ground work for this task was been completed during the 2005 workshop and the SAIC needs assessment. The NED Executive asked the NED Steering Committee to further develop this product. There is Executive interest in developing NED as a formal project under the Fish and Wildlife Program, and to bring it into sync with the 2007-2009 funding process. John Piccininni noted that there would need to be a request for a 2007 Placeholder.

Task 2.2.3 Provide briefings on regional data management, as needed, to interested groups. This year briefings have been provided to the Federal Columbia Regional Power System Caucus, and to a Research Monitoring and Evaluation planning meeting convened for the BPA Fish and Wildlife Program. A briefing is planned for CBFWA on 4/29.

Task 2.3 Promote the use of and educate data collection and management entities on the importance of using consistent regional data management protocols in agencies and entities with responsibility for collecting and managing NED related data.

Efforts to encourage the use of NED-developed or adopted data standards and protocols in agencies internal and external business practices – such as in contracting and program implementation are ongoing. Considerable effort has been put into the PNAMP effort to promote the importance of developing data management standards and practices in addition to development of data collection standards. The Executive of the BPA Fish and Wildlife program are considering action, within the Fish and Wildlife program to require data to be collected and managed in standard ways that are regionally consistent. Efforts to make the PISCES and the PCSRF data definitions consistent are a current challenge. A cross-walk comparing the data definitions has been completed. Phil Roger thought we needed to be more proactive influencing database development planning up front to avoid the need for fixing the problems after different approaches have been deployed.

The 2005 and the upcoming 2006 Regional Data workshops are seen as the main effort to complete training and education to promote understanding and advantages of data standards deployment. Other efforts are mostly peer to peer.

Task 2.4 Develop and maintain tools that can support scientific and resource decision makers

Consistent data management protocols are tools that are needed to support data sharing and exchange, regardless of the technology that delivers data and information products. NED has developed a set of Best Practices for Reporting Location and Time Related Data. It is working with other groups to support common approaches to defining data and for the use of regional data dictionary products, for example the Protocol Manager being developed by the US Bureau of Reclamation. There was detailed discussion about the planned method for deploying standards. The intention, where there is authority, to work to attach the standards as requirements to contract and other work being completed within agency programs, for example in the BPA Fish and Wildlife Program.

NED has developed a web page <http://www.nwcouncil.org/ned/Default.asp> within the NPCC web site. Further development of the site is planned to introduce features and products as they are developed.

A pilot portal for NED is under development. The development work and the site for the Portal is being completed within the BPA. The specifications, functions and management of the portal are being managed by a NED Workgroup. The portal will be designed to reflect regional needs and features. The NED group is also collaborating with other groups (PNAMP, PNW-RGIC and others) on portal development and exploring opportunities for collaborative portal development.

Task 2.5 Identify sources and mechanisms for funding.

Development of an equitable mechanism for funding the regional effort is a priority. It will be needed to sustain the regional effort over the long terms. This task was delayed pending participation by additional entities in NED. The May 2005 workshop provides a starting point for this task, however it is now necessary to identify specifics. The most promising approach involves minimal equitable assessment of data collection efforts.

2.6 Identify regional requirements for spatial and metadata compliance.

NED has collaborated with Federal, State, Tribal and other entities to develop a set of Best Practices for Reporting Spatial and Temporal Data. Collaboration with PNW-RGIC which has a particular interest in developing spatial framework data, is ongoing and will continue as PNW-RGIC develops work plans and products.

2.7 Maintain a regional data network resource plan.

The NED Executive has asked NED to develop a detailed plan to identify and stage the steps and costs necessary to achieve improvements in regional data quality, quantity and access. The NED Project Team December 2003 Report, the SAIC report, and the White Paper documents from the May 25 and 26, 2005 Data Sharing and Exchange Workshop will be the starting points. Work on regional planning had been delayed pending additional participation in NED. While further approaches to relevant agencies that are currently not signatories to the NED MOU will be made at an Executive Level, it is now necessary to move on with existing participation

2.8 Draft a Regional Data Sharing Agreement.

PNAMP and other user groups are interested in the development and adoption of a partnership agreement that defines responsibilities for managing and sharing regional data. NED plans to help develop a draft partnership agreement and hopes to have it available for discussion at the May 2006 workshop. Examples of different existing agreements have been collected for use in this task and have been circulated to all NED Steering Committee members.

2.9 Make NED plans and other products available for Regional decision making.

NED plans have been made available to inform the Council or other decision makers, via e-mail, through the NED Steering Committee and via the web site.

2) Report on Meeting with NED Executive Co-Chairs to discuss their response to the White Papers.

Peter reported on a recent meeting with the NED Co Chairs: Dr Tom Karier from the NPCC and Dr. John Stein from NOAA. The Co Chairs said that they now wanted to move forward to develop detailed proposals, together with costs to complete Regional Data management needs based on the SAIC report, and subsequent fine tuning reflected in the White from the May 25th and 26th, 2005 Intergovernmental Workshop, Portland, Oregon.

There was discussion about the method that would be used by Program managers in the region to deploy standards. Peter said the most promising method would be to attach specific data management requirements to deliverables, for example to Contractors involved in data collection and reporting. Paul Ocker thought that the USACE had similar problems with consistent data reporting on some USACE projects. Cedric Cooney thought that there needed to be data sharing agreements to define the arrangements. Bruce Schmidt thought some projects in some Fish and Wildlife Agencies would not comply with these sorts of requirements, in part because NED represented a federal (top down) approach. Joy Paulus offered an alternative view, that States do adopt Federal Standards, in part because it is in their interests to do so, because the States also have to share data and also because funding that can come with the requirements can be valuable. There was agreement that education would be a necessary part of any program to require common data reporting requirements

4) Planning for the 2006 Pacific Northwest Environmental Data Management Workshop Tuesday May 23 and Wednesday May 24 at the Jean Vollum Natural Capital Center (Ecotrust) Portland Oregon.

Stewart went over arrangements. An invitation for the workshop had been prepared with input from a work group comprising Tom O'Neil, Cy Smith, Jennifer Bayer, Greg Robillard, Cathy Kellon and David Tetta. John Piccininni, Joy Paulus and Jill Leary will join the group. Peter Paquet and Kendra Phillips have organized location and other logistics. The invitation (attached) had been sent to participants from the 2005 Workshop, the NED Mail list, the PNAMP mail list, the PNW-RGIC mail list and will also be posted to the Columbia Basin Bulletin. A detailed agenda for the workshop would be developed with support from Nancy Tosta from Ross and Associates. Nancy will also be the workshop convenor. Stewart distributed a list of potential participants, made up from suggestions from NED members. Tom O'Neil also suggested that it might be helpful to use a motivational speaker.

The next step is to develop the detailed workshop agenda

5) Development of a Draft Data Partnership Agreement Material (for May Workshop). Stewart will work through the potential partnership materials, distributed at the last meeting, and develop a first draft for discussion at the April NED meeting. David Tetta, Bruce Schmidt and Phil Roger offered to help with this task.

B) PNAMP DATA MANAGEMENT AGENDA ITEMS

1) PNAMP Data Management Plan for 06. Review of progress (carried over from last meeting).

Stewart went over the PNAMP work plan – item by item. Outcome A has been achieved. For Outcome B the PNAMP Data management group had recommended that PNAMP fund a data management coordinator. Funding from the Steering Committee was not available so the alternative offered is for PNAMP to host cross-cutting meetings to directly develop data consistency across the work groups. Outcome C, to complete a formal identification of PNAMP data needs was also not funded. As a partial alternative PNAMP is completing an inventory of monitoring projects in the region. Bruce Schmidt and Mike Banach are leading a contract effort, by StreamNet, to complete this task. Follow up actions may be taken by PNAMP to identify what data from these projects must be shared and to develop a plan to share the data. Action Item D, adopting data collection and sharing standards depends first on PNAMP identifying data collection protocols and standards, or alternatively identifying protocols/standards developed by others. The PNAMP SC is developing a method to decide what protocols and standards it will adopt. Outcome E, Sharing PNAMP requirements and results with regional data networking entities will require the PNAMP SC to identify their requirements and since this task was not funded and requirements have not been identified this task cannot proceed. Outcome F involves testing collection protocols sampling methods and data sharing mechanisms. The task of testing sampling methods should be completed by scientists rather than a data management group. The PNAMP/NED data group will develop a check list of important data management steps that should be satisfied as a part of designing any PNAMP testing of protocols. Outcome G cannot be completed until needs are identified.

There was some discussion about limitations of the PNAMP Data Management work group: 1) because the PNAMP SC had not supported action to complete a needs assessment there was little that could be done to proceed to develop data management capacity for PNAMP. 2) There has been little in-kind or volunteer support for the PNAMP data management group. Substantive participation, in terms of producing products has come from only a few individuals, all of whom have other work obligations.

Bruce Schmidt suggested that the current tasks did not warrant a separate work group for data management within PNAMP and that PNAMP should simply ask NED for data management advice when it identified what it needed. Stewart would ask Jennifer Bayer to put this topic on the PNAMP retreat agenda for discussion by the PNAMP SC.

2) PNAMP Inventory Task: Bruce reported that the PNAMP SC was currently finalizing the data that they want to acquire. Jen Bayer said that a draft questionnaire was out for comment but few had been received to date. Joy thought it was long and should be shortened. Stewart thought that if it was planned to use an e-mail survey it should be augmented with in-person

follow up to respondents. Bruce said that in-person follow up was planned and Russell thought it would help.

C) AFTERNOON MEETING 1:00 through 4:00

Work Group meeting: Technology for Data Discovery and Sharing Group. Tom Pansky.

The NED Work Group on Technology for Data Discovery and Sharing discussion focused on the NED Pilot Portal development. Attendees were Tom Pansky, Steve Sherer, and Eric Lowrance (BPA), Nancy Tubbs (USGS Oregon Office), Bruce Schmidt and Van Hare (PSMFC), Phil Roger (CRITFC), and Stewart Toshach (NOAAF).

Tom reviewed the outcomes from the January 9 technical development meeting with ESRI. The Portal now has a dedicated test and development servers. Source code has been secured to speed customization. A services contract has been developed and sent to ESRI to have them convene an Advanced Design Workshop to assist with customization. NED Steering Committee members will be invited to participate. Draft business rules and partnership agreements will be developed.

Stewart and Tom briefed the group on meetings with PNW-RGIC during the week of February 20. There was discussion about forming a new NW Community at Geospatial-One-Stop to house NED, PNW-RGIC, and the USGS CRUISE efforts - rather than developing a regional NED Portal. The NED SC reviewed a draft list of questions to send back to PNW-RGIC in order to better assess their proposal. The questions were sent to Vicki Lukas and Cy Smith on March 2 along with a note of thanks for bringing more information and views into the mix of possibilities. In the meantime, the group requested that BPA continue with development of the NED Pilot Portal.

Work Group Meeting. The Data Management for Sub-Basin Planning met – notes will be made available later.

Next meeting:

4/5/2006 from 9:00 to 4:30 at Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fisheries Commission, 729 NE Oregon St, Ste 200, Portland Oregon.