

Module 1 Telecon #5
January 30, 2003
Draft Minutes

Discussion topics: unique Ids, authority, feature level metadata

Participants: Bob Pierce, Chris Clarke, Jim Kramer, April Avnayium, Mark Bradford, Julie Binder Maitra, Nancy Von Meyer, Ed McKay, Robin Fegus, Lou Kerestesy, Steve Grise, John Crowe

1. Lou summarized status of paper on unique identifiers.
2. Nancy asked for confirmation that the wording “permanent ID or unique ID” was a functional identifier and not intended to appear in each feature class or UML model. Steve G confirmed that was the case.
3. Discussion arose on data exchange as a representation or real world model. Robin F. expressed concern that the one-pager does not adequately address the fact that we are conveying digital representations of the data. Discussion centered on bullet 1.3. Conclusion was that Lou would add the following wording to problem statement “digital representation”
4. Discussion continued on modifications to 1.3 and that may not be applicable for all, such as hydrography. Bob Pierce indicated that it would be OK for hydrography. Hydro also brings multiple identifiers together to support integration 1.3 is ok.
5. Nancy indicated with edits, paper is good for cadastral

END of unique ID discussion ----- beginning of authority

6. Lou outlined draft authority doc mailed to all. Summarized last discussion and concerns of John C. on using authority incorrectly to indicate quality.
7. Nancy indicated that the land agencies have responsibility for the “official” record defensible but that does not mean the data is accurate. Official is not always correct. Nancy indicated that authority implies quality, which further implies official – these are reserved words. Nancy suggested the use of assignor.
8. Ed suggested we need to define assignor.
9. The existing definition for namespace was suggested and all agreed – “an agency, organization, individual or entity responsible for maintenance and continuity of an identity.
10. Steve G agreed that authority and unique id discussion are closely aligned. Suggested that the existing ISO metadata docs be reviewed and specific wording be extracted and included in this effort to ensure consistency etc.. Assignment of task not made
11. Lou asked if there was any disagreement with the statement that authority is the person responsible for namespace? Robin said he agreed as long as namespace was defined
12. To address number 3 in draft authority paper, examples are needed. Agreement that theme leads should work to develop examples specific to their data. Nancy identified NGS blue book and cadastral model as two good examples for authority and namespace issue.
13. Steve G suggested change to authority PowerPoint – change quality to source
14. Lou asked if authoritative should be addressed – Nancy indicated that it can not be until it is fully defined.

End of authority ----beginning of feature level metadata

15. Nancy commented that attributes need to be added on name space and metadata be accurate on how used. Steve suggested we look a the ISO metadata docs to see what has been developed
16. This topic will be main discussion for next week
17. Robin asked what is the difference between feature level metadata and metadata on data or coverage. Steve suggested Sharon be on line next week to discuss
18. Nancy offered a paper that cadastral has developed – may be dated but still helpful. Addresses web/clearinghouse, data transfer, feature level metadata, operation/maintenance. Nancy will send.

Discussion on scheduling

19. Nancy expressed concern regarding the process that each of the draft standards will follow to fulfill the ANSI standards and what the requirements are from the theme leads to ensure milestones are met. Chris and Lou apologized to the group for any confusion or frustration that folks have been experiencing on this issue. Chris indicated that though we are working towards an ANSI standard, draft standards can and will be shared among communities. This will be reflected in the schedule.
20. Chris indicated that she, Lou, Norm and Julie will meet Wednesday (Feb 5th) to update the existing schedule to reflect changes that have occurred over the last months. Once the plan is updated, step by step information will be provided to theme leads to help explain the process, outline the expectations and hopefully eliminate confusion. Chris and Lou indicated that though it is unfortunate that we do not have specific details today, every effort will be made to rectify in the short term and assured the group that no time has been wasted on behalf of the MATS, theme leads or cross-theme telecons.
21. Mark and others expressed concern for the participants of the MATs and all agreed that we need to ensure that their contributions are fully acknowledged, documented and respected. The best way to do this is to ensure the critical milestones and expectations are documented and shared as soon as possible with all. Lou and Chris agreed and will work with Norm and Julie and others to address concerns, document, validate info and share with group. Chris offered to formally thank the members of MATs, reviewers etc. if that would help to further acknowledge our appreciation of their efforts.
22. Those online agreed we are addressing multiple and competing forces and respected the need to remain somewhat flexible but did need more specific info to share with and help support MAT contributors and other involved in effort.