

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

Time: 2007-05-02 from 9:00 to 4:00

Location: Conference Room: Northwest Power and Conservation Council
851 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100
Portland, Oregon 97204
503-222-5161 or 800-452-5161

NED AGENDA ITEMS

1) Introductions.

Tom Pansky, (BPA), Phil Roger (CRITFC), Bruce Schmidt (StreamNet), Peter Paquet (NPCC), Tom O'Neil (NWHI), Curtis Cude (ODEQ), Scott McEwen (LCREP), Tom Iverson (CBFWF), Matt Goslin (SOS), Matt Deniston (BPA), Ben Zelinsky (BPA), Stewart Toshach (NOAA). On phone: Jen Bayer, (PNAMP), David Tetta (EPA), Cedric Cooney (StreamNet), Joy Paulus (IAC), Steve Rentmeester (ISEMP), John Piccininni, Jim Geiselman (BPA), Tom Rien (ODF&W).

2) Data Management Initiatives for PISCES, Ben Zelinsky & Matt Deniston, BPA.

Ben and Matt went over the data management strategy that is being considered within BPA. There are three main components: how to manage legacy internal data from BPA projects, how to report on work that has been completed through a web portal, and, how to provide data to analysts. Important to deal with data availability – where is the data and how can it be accessed. One option is to use the NED Portal as a tool for discovering data- BPA contractors would need to post metadata records to the Portal. Cedric thought that this could be an issue for ODF&W, with pushback, since current data providers might not be ready or able to provide this data – especially if FGDC compliant metadata was required. Joy provided references to a couple of metadata formats used by the State of Washington to gather data at a level that was less intensive than the full FGDC metadata set: Natural Resource Info Portal and WA State Metadata 'Lite'. Connection to the NED best Practices docs was recognized for potential to help define these needs.

Questions were also asked about how the Protocol manager fitted into this picture. Currently, Protocol manager is expected to manage the details of what is involved in each protocol stored within protocol manager. One purpose of Protocol Manager is to maintain a current version or each protocol and to allow the protocol to be extracted and referenced into the metadata record for the data set of interest.

Ben said that some implementation issues were expected and that it would be critical to have guidance and training available. Others thought it was a good idea to have a link between projects that are being undertaken and the data that is available from the projects. There are three main steps in this task. Create metadata, post the metadata to the Portal and manage the metadata with the support of a regional Portal Channel Steward. Descriptions of this Data Steward task and a data sharing agreement have been developed by the NED Data Discovery and Sharing work group.

There is agreement on the importance and use of metadata with more discussion needed on how much metadata is required and how metadata reporting would be phased in.

3) Update: Data Summit Planning and Responsibilities – Now Proposed for 2007-10-02 (note this date has been changing as we have juggled logistics). Stewart briefly reported on a conference call by the Data Summit planning group on April 26th. Jen Bayer expressed some concern that success for the summit will depend on attendance and we cannot guarantee that we can get the needed attendance. We agreed to seek confirmation from PNW-RGIC on joint sponsorship.

4) Metadata Training Workshop May 22-23. A planning call was held on 2007-4-30. The metadata Training work group met in a conference call on April 30th to confirm logistics and remaining details. There is currently space for 3 or 4 more participants – with closing on participants on May 9th. Bruce and John Piccininni suggested that while they are participating they don't necessarily need to be plugged into a computer so could participate but not need to create their own metadata record. This could give space for a couple more participants.

5) Northwest Environmental Data Network Inventory update. David Tetta, John Piccininni and Curtis Cude have divided the inventory task into thirds and are following up on updates. A lot of updates are needed and those contacted have been supportive of the effort. There is strong interest from the work group to automate this process and to use the metadata tracking capability of the NED Portal to help support this task. David reported that he had 10 responses from 28 contacted so far and plans to follow up with phone calls as time permits. David said that the group was also dealing with some new databases.

6) NED Data Portal (At 11:00):

- Potential Channel Manager Participants: NED Water Quality Group, Upper Columbia Basin Trust, Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership (LCREP), Pacific Northwest Regional Geographic Information Council. Scott McEwen from the LCREP went over the potential for the Partnership to use the Portal and what else is involved in this decision. LCREP is a newer group with a known universe of data that is “almost comprehensible” and includes funding of restoration projects and effectiveness monitoring data. The practical problems include knowing where the data is, how to get it and how to roll it up into reports and products at different scales. LCREP has been tracking the NED initiative, and is now interested in what commitment can NED make to help LCREP to meet their needs. In particular, if LCREP commits to use NED resources,

for example, the Portal, is there a regional commitment to maintain and support the Portal over a defined time period. What is the planned longevity of the NED effort? LCREP is also looking at what other resources might be available, for example OSU's Institute for Natural Resources with the Oregon Explorer. The time-line for LCREP to make a decision is urgent, ideally it would have already been made. Stewart said he would send the current Portal Steward job description and data sharing agreement to Scott for his information and feedback. A request for funding the Portal Administrator and Data Steward tasks is currently included in the NED 2007 work plan.

- Technical Issues – automatic harvesting. Tom Pansky reported that he and Eric Lowrance have worked with ESRI to make the automatic harvesting feature of the Portal functional. Tom will work with Van Hare at StreamNet to test the functionality. The automatic harvesting tool can be provided as an option. This suggests that NED needs to develop a business rule/s about when the automatic harvesting could be best used and what impact it would have on Portal data.

- Technical Issues – Instructions for manual uploading of Metadata

We discussed whether or not the instructions could be improved for manual "To upload your metadata file manually – Tom provided mentioned that he had used the following language with success: "Once you log in to the NED Portal (via your own choice of username and password), you will see a number of new choices in the left-hand frame. Look for "Upload Metadata". You should then see a dialog box where you can either type in the path where the file lives, or use the "browse" button to search for the metadata file on your system. Then hit "upload"."

- Populating the Portal – needed action, outreach contacts. Tom gave a quick update – but this item will be discussed further at the June 6th Meeting.

7) Process for Developing Comprehensive Data Management Strategy for the Council – Update from Tom O'Neil and Phil Roger. Tom and Phil provided a first draft of a conceptual framework document. There was considerable discussion. Comments on the document need to be sent directly to Phil and Tom by May 16th. Tom Iverson suggested that the CBFWA Data management Framework group be convened as a NED work group to avoid duplication and recognize that we only need one regional framework. Stewart identified existing framework products originating with the NED SAIC report, the 2005 Regional Workshop Papers and agreed to make sure these were available to the current deliberations. Dave Tetta expressed concern that the Framework effort be broad enough to nest the Columbia needs within it since NED also represented broader interests. Tom Pansky commented that since the draft materials identified that a Portal was a needed part of a regional framework – the use of the NED Portal should be clearly specified in the framework for this purpose –that is why the Portal was developed.

8) NED Document Development:

- Activities Needed to Bring the Subbasin Planning Archive From Framework to Reality – Status (From Framework to Reality). Phil Roger. Not discussed.
- Reviewing Data Sharing Guide (Data Sharing Guide_StreamNet_ST edits). This document is the next version of the draft guide with comments from Bruce Schmidt on changes Stewart made. Stewart said that no further comments had been received. Bruce, Phil and Stewart agreed to convene a conference call to discuss.

B. PNAMP DATA MANAGEMENT AGENDA ITEMS

1) New Task -request from PNAMP for NED to review the PNAMP Macro- Invertebrate Protocol (2006_1002MacroinvertChecklist), (2006_1002MacroinvertChecklist). PNAMP is sponsoring the completion of protocols for macro-invertebrate data collection. The protocols include a small section on data management and PNAMP has asked for NED to provide comments on the Data Management section. Stewart agreed to provide comments and circulate to the NED Steering Committee

2) New Task -the PNAMP Fish Population WG is beginning a protocol review/discussion with respect to fish monitoring protocols. First, they will examine tagging, telemetry, & marking methods. Later this summer, they will do a gap analysis (after the SFPH is published) to consider what other methods should be reviewed/discussed, etc. PNAMP has already identified QA/QC and data management as important elements of these methods and found a biologist to help with this, but need data management experts to help. Phil Roger, Steve Rentmeester and Bruce Schmidt said they expected to be attending these meetings and would be able to provide data management input to the group.

3) New Task -PNAMP is attempting to produce data definitions for methods/metrics of interest. This task needs to be systematically completed across PNAMP and PNAMP needs support from NED in constructing a process so that PNAMP can be efficient with the task. Stewart agreed to provide a process that PNAMP could follow to complete this task. It would be based on the exiting NED document Best Practices for Data Dictionary Definitions and Use.
<http://www.nwcouncil.org/ned/DataDictionary.pdf>

4) Information Update: Protocol Manager Testing: from PNAMP Meeting on 2007-04-24. PNAMP convened a Protocol Manager Testing meeting on 2007-04-24 with the Developer Spatial Dynamics. Spatial Dynamics has released a new version of the application and some testers have experienced some challenges installing the application on their PC's and are working with Spatial Dynamics to get the installs made.

The Database Administration has fixed a bug in the routine for updating/import routine for importing data form existing older PM (Version 0.75) databases into the new schema. Some other minor modifications have been made to the 'Admin' module: We added a working/progress bar for database creations. We changed the menus so that functions that are not supported in the beta version are grayed out.

5) Information Update: PNAMP Inventory task. The PNAMP Inventory Task is now considered to be complete with the exception of adding data collected by State of the Salmon Consortium. Decisions to continue development have not been made.

C. AFTERNOON WORKSESSION: NED, PNAMP, PNW-RGIC – SUMMIT, BUSINESS CASE and FISH and HABITAT STRATEGY

Attended by: Tom Pansky, Bruce Schmidt, Phil Roger and Stewart Toshach. On phone: Joy Paulus, and Jen Bayer.

1) Data Management Summit, planning and responsibilities. (Summit Invitation_2007-5-01)

The invitation was reviewed. Stewart agreed to take all comments and prepare a final version of the text to be laid out by Susan Zemek at IAC. Some concern that the language does not sufficiently emphasize fish and wildlife agencies, and is not a big enough “hook” participants, so the group completed some redrafting. Ambridge Conference Center confirmed as best compromise for transport, size of room and cost. 8:30 to 12:30 time slot confirmed. Jen will revise the participant list, share with Cy and Stewart and then each group will circulate it again.

2) Development of Compelling Business Case.

Stewart provided a draft based on an outline prepared by Joy with new material to support the business case. The business case outline is based on the collective work completed by Scott Riordan with NED, PNAMP and PNW-RGIC. Content is being pulled together with a particular goal of documenting examples where benefits or avoidable costs of taking a coordinated regional approach to sharing and exchanging data have been documented. An example from combined regional monitoring efforts is sought and Jen Bayer will try to locate. Joy and Stewart will work on the next iteration. Any comments on current draft are due by May 16th.

3) PNW Strategy for Fish & Habitat Data.

An effort is currently underway by the NED Co-Coordinators to gather more detailed information about what the FCRPS, the Action Agencies want to be included in the needed strategy. Information is also being sought about who is the actual client for the strategy, what entity would be responsible for deploying it, and over what time period and what resources are likely to be available for deployment. This information would help to define the needed scale and scope of the strategy. There was considerable discussion about how the PNW Strategy for Fish and Habitat Data related to the Framework effort that CBFWA is getting started on or the Strategies that NED has developed over the last few years. At a minimum there is an appearance of some duplication of effort. Since the groups who have jointly requested development of the strategy were not present at the meeting it was agreed that many of these questions could not be resolved during the meeting.