

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

Time: 2007-07-10 from 9:00 to 4:00

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

AGENDA ITEMS

1) Introductions:

Tom Pansky, (BPA), Phil Roger (CRITFC), Bruce Schmidt (StreamNet), Peter Paquet (NPCC), Tom Iverson (CBFWF), Stewart Toshach (NOAA). Nancy Tubbs USGS, Alyson Jason (USGS, WA Liaison), Sheri Schneider USGS Oregon Liaison), Stan Frazier (BLM). On phone: Joy Paulus, (WA IAC), David Tetta (EPA), Jen Bayer, (PNAMP), Jaqui Schei (PNAMP), Jim Geiselman (BPA).

2) Next Steps and Overview of materials for: *A Strategy for Managing Fish, Wildlife, and Habitat Data for the Fish and Wildlife Program.* (Material from Phil Roger)

Peter and Phil outlined plans to make a presentation to the Council “Fish Four” on 2007-07-11 ahead of a presentation to the full Council in August. The Council Chair wants to know what it means in terms of project funding and what differences it will make to current practices. Phil provided an overview of a draft Powerpoint presentation. Comment need to emphasize that while this is a Fish and Wildlife program framework – within the Columbia Basin, it nests in principle within a broader regional framework – with a focus on common data collection and broader network capability. This is consistent with the needs of the Federal Caucus and issues raised at the PNAMP retreat.

3) Executive Summit - Sharing Information for Decision Making 2007-10-02. (NED, PNAMP, PNW-RGIC)

Invitation, Planning and Responsibilities. The invitation is considered complete – after modifying it slightly to emphasize examples of what sort of decisions depend on improved sharing of information management. Columbia Basin Federal caucus wants to be involved in the workshop.

Summit Product: Draft Business Case: *Sharing Information to Improve Decisions - Examples of Cost Avoidance and Benefits.* Steering Committee members agreed to

review and provide comments to Stewart by August 1st. The meeting discussed the importance of the Business case as a foundation document for the summit – to provide a reasoned response to the “what’s in it for me” questions.

Summit Product: *Best Practices for Regional Data Collection, Sharing and Exchange*. This document needs considerably more work to be considered complete. We have examples of best practices documents that are complete but we do not have examples of all needed best practices. Much more input is needed – from more agencies and groups. SC members agreed to read and get comments to Stewart by August 1st.

4) Data Management Initiatives in WA State and Puget Sound – WA State Governor’s Monitoring Forum Workshop. The Washington State Monitoring Forum completed a workshop on data management on 2007-06-20. Stewart provided a briefing to the Workshop – “Transitioning From Dirt Highways to a Data Highway” – with an outline and “Wedding Cake” model about a process to use to make those steps.

5) NOAA RM&E Data Management Guidance, Appendix C at page 53

NOAA has developed RM&E data management guidance. The guidance was provided to SC members for their information and use as appropriate.

6) Quick Updates NED Portal and Inventory. Tom Pansky provided an update on a meeting held concerning the NED Portal and the GOS Community.

Tom’s Conference call notes from 2007/07/05 are as follows

Participants:

David Gadsden, Clive Reece – ESRI (Olympia and Redlands, respectively)
Rob Dollison – USGS, Geospatial One-Stop Project Office
Tom Pansky, Eric Lowrance, Ann Juarez – BPA (Fish and Wildlife, Enterprise GIS, and Web development group, respectively)
Stewart Toshach – NOAA Fisheries, Seattle Science Center

We gathered via telecon to discuss the ongoing development work on the NW Environmental Data Network Portal and integration with other regional and federal efforts including Geospatial One-Stop and the National Biological Information Infrastructure.

Discussed the questions posed from the NED Steering Committee to PNW-RGIC 2006/03 (copy attached).



portals-2.doc

1. The basic issue is **how best to integrate metadata and data content amongst Portals**, and then between Portals and the nodes/clearinghouses of the companion National Biological

Information Infrastructure. There seem to be 2 different strategies at play – either use one national Portal for everything (with both subject matter and geographic communities of interest), or form a confederacy of Portals where the national Portal harvests from a limited number of regional Portals, which in turn harvest from the states in their geography, which in turn harvest from local Portals. The latter approach was chosen by the NED Steering Committee last year, resulting in the NED Portal.

The next version of the Portal Toolkit, due out mid-2008, will support searches by publisher, but not by Community. The Community approach provides a low-cost entry path to Portal publishing for those with very limited resources. GOS has dedicated staff to support all communities, but no full-time support dedicated to any single community.

GOS is currently set up to harvest metadata from EPA. GOS staff briefed the National Science Foundation's Bioscience and Informatics group last week on the need for additional coordination and business agreements in order to get NBII data resources harvested by GOS. Not yet figured out.

GOS is the interface to the NSDI Clearinghouse network. It was formed out of activities in the FGDC and USGS to facilitate government-to-government interaction on data activities with locational attributes. These (GOS, FGDC, NSDI, NBII, USGS) should not be seen as participating in different groups but just different pieces of the NSDI effort.

Conclusion: The federated model or approach is in agreement with GOS NSDI philosophy and seems to make the most sense for NED. Customization options for the current GOS Communities are limited. Better stewardship is achieved in the local or regional model when the Stewards are closer to the source of the data. Content can then be integrated with the national collection. The community on geodata.gov can be as simple as pointing to or featuring the NED portal effort.

2. ESRI's existing contract to build and host GOS is a 5-year agreement. **Long-term plans** are to provide a national catalog or library of metadata and associated data sets, and a portal venue for special communities of interest, including regional and state government. The GOS initiative is now a project completely funded out of USGS and DOI and is being more closely integrated with The National Map as part of USGS's National Geospatial Programs Office. The current contract for the GOS Portal is through 2009 when it will be re-competed. The content of the collection will be available for future contracts.

3. ISO is working on a new/**companion metadata standard (ISO 19139)** which will include a North American profile. This should help fill current metadata standard gaps, including a truly unique id or record number for each metadata record.

4. Portal Toolkit is moving towards using the newer **ESRI ArcGIS Server 9.3** technology. ESRI will continue to support IMS integration (the current set up) as long as necessary. Portal

Toolkit for 9.3 will use a new/updated map viewer (allowing for more/easier customization), a new metadata server engine, and a new catalog service. New tools should assist with management of metadata records, including duplication and clean up issues. ESRI to check on availability of data base migration tool or script so NED Portal can efficiently move from v. 3 to v. 3.1.

B. PNAMP DATA MANAGEMENT AGENDA ITEMS

1) PNAMP Retreat. Jen reported on data management discussion at the PNAMP retreat. The basic issue is that there is insufficient support for PNAMP data management tasks. PNAMP is looking to NED to have regional data management sharing and exchange needs coordinated and to PNW-RGIC for support on regional data framework layers – but it still has some program related data management related tasks of its own. Some suggestions at the retreat included the following: use NED to provide all PNAMP data management tasks – but NED was not set up to provide all data management tasks for PNAMP¹. Another suggestion was that NED should just be a work group for PNAMP – but again this is not why NED was established. The issue of how to get support for PNAMP data management ultimately is a question for the PNAMP sponsors.

C. AFTERNOON WORKSESSION: NED and CBFWA DMFS Work Session. 1:30-3:30

1) A detailed discussion developed ideas and provided Phil Roger with more input for the draft of *A Strategy for Managing Fish, Wildlife, and Habitat Data for the Fish and Wildlife Program*. Input and discussion was also made to a draft Powerpoint presentation about the strategy to present to the Council at it's July meeting.

¹ NED could have lead on development of Protocol Manager, and offered to host this effort, but the sponsor – USBRec had not supported this approach.