

Module 1 Telecon #6
February 6, 2003
Draft Minutes

Discussion topics: Feature level metadata, ISO/FGDC metadata, status of authority and permanent ID papers, development and distribution of schedule information, proposal for voting on cross cutting issues and process, coordinate point values

Participants: John Crow, Lou Kerestesy, Chris Clarke, Robin Fegas, Dave Butler, Jim Kramer, Jason Racette, Mark Bradford, Ed McKay, Rick Yorczyk, Nancy Von Meyer.

1. Lou summarized actions/topics and past emails on metadata. Emails were sent out by Nancy, Mark, Shawn, Bob Ader, Dave Butler each addressing some aspect of metadata.
2. Mark asked that material from Shawn be sent out – Lou did during conference.
3. Lou indicated that an additional positive of the papers was that they could be reviewed in the context of each standard and those themes with common handling of issues could be rolled up into the base standard.
4. Mark outlined the roads MAT concern about metadata was the need to capture different sources for those data contributed by multiple parties to help the tracking process. Mark indicated the more documentation the better when you have multiple features from different sources.
5. Mark discussed issue with Steve G. previously and he expressed concern about higher level issues as well – specifically the need to clearly define if FGDC or ISO metadata standards will be used. Chris indicated that Steve has captured this in his cross cutting issue paper as well.
6. John C. mentioned that the use of FGDC and ISO was a concern to USGS and specifically the possible mixing of elements from each standard which occurs in modules 2 and 3. John stated that it was his understanding that GOS was to use the accepted FGDC metadata standard and down the road migrate to ISO if that was the case.
7. Mark asked why would we not use ISO if the end goal is to have an ANSI standard? John responded that we should use ISO when approved but can migrate with some level of ease with tools to the standards from FGDC when need to. But the apparent mix of the two is not ideal.
8. Robin F. believes that the translation or migration of existing FGDC metadata to ISO would not be a significant issue when it became necessary.
9. ACTION: Chris and Lou will discuss further with Sharon, Shawn and others to understand issues and develop a problem statement.
10. Robin indicated the FGDC, ISO metadata issue would need to be addressed for ortho also since they have specific metadata fields to populate and need to define the use of the specific standard.
11. Lou suggested that each of the existing draft theme standards be reviewed to identify those items that are common. Chris, Lou will work with Shawn and Sharon and discuss.
12. Lou indicated there were two issues being discussed, one was the need or value of feature level metadata and the second was the specific standard to use FGDC or ISO.
13. Mark asked if there are existing standards that are using feature level metadata. John indicated that hydro is. Mark suggested we define feature level metadata for discussion. He asked if it is the specific elements that we want to identify a feature. No disagreement noted
14. Mark commented that cadastral docs appear to have very specific definitions for elements. Dave Butler indicated that USDA is very detailed and specific also in the use of the elements in feature level metadata
15. Nancy agreed it is very detailed and that cadastral and what the USDA folks have done is very similar. Nancy indicated that this is critical to cadastral to track data lineage, source, usability etc..
16. Nancy commented that we should be specific in our use of terminology, data VS metadata. Dataset level metadata talks about projection, datum etc.. not the same as feature level metadata
17. Robin F. commented that we can add elements to feature level metadata data and that its an implementation issue. Nancy agreed and said it is critical and sited congressional enabling legislation as an example of an added element in feature level metadata. Where the elements are added is an implementation issue.
18. Mark indicated that roads MAT is very interested in adding authority to data. Nancy indicated that this is critical and cadastral has done for roads to document the chain of events in the feature level metadata.

19. Lou asked if the elements added would be theme specific – Nancy responded yes
20. Nancy indicated that transfer metadata is also critical to those who are providing data at cost or have licensing issues. Elements include date of transfer, payment, how charged, date cut, etc.. so that issues can be addressed if data problems.
21. Robin asked if this was within the scope of the discussion and Nancy indicated no but it is important to acknowledge.
22. Dave B suggested it would be helpful if common understanding of what we are calling data among the datasets can be defined. Label, description, date, feature ID etc.. Three categories of metadata – feature level, data metadata, transfer metadata.
23. Action from above discussion – Chris and Lou will discuss with Shawn etc.
24. Nancy offered examples of cadastral data metadata documentation using the FGDC standard and ISO. She has used the metadata tools in ArcMap and suggested others take a look.
25. Lou asked if security was an additional cross cutting issue. Agreement that it was and suggestion made that rather than security – term restricted access be used. A agreement that this was better term.

End of metadata discussion beginning of several others

26. Mark asked what the final product of these weekly discussions would be, how they be documented, who will they go to etc. Chris indicated that the papers being developed are intended to catch the problem, solution and the agreement of the theme leads on the issues identified. The group has the ability to identify the issues, come to an agreed method for resolution and begin to share with other themes and modules to implement.
27. Lou mentioned that he, Chris, Norm and Julie have met twice recently to capture milestones and critical issues to support Norm in the ANSI process. Every effort will be made to outline the needs, the process and share this with theme leads – hopefully next week.
28. Lou indicated that there is no one authoritative source but this group comes to agreement on issues based on consensus.
29. Nancy expressed concern that there is not identified institutional method by which this effort or issues will be accepted, communicated and implemented to a wider community. For example what is the motivation for cadastral users to add namespace to their database. Nancy asked for assurance that what we are doing will be supported and implemented across the community.
30. Chris agreed this is an issue but indicated that in the short-term the issues being resolved here will be among the seven themes and only over time will we be able to implement in a wider community.
31. Dave Butler indicated that within USDA that is the case, a group comes together to identify an issue and resolution and over time is adopted by a wider community. The example of FGDC was cited as having started as a small group of people concerned about coordinated geospatial data issues.
32. Lou proposed the voting concept to the group. He indicated theme leads would be asked to vote on behalf of their community on each of the issues. Ballots would appear on the bottom of papers and theme leads would be asked to formalize agreement at that time.
33. Mark asked if these issues are being shared with other module leads and those that may be impacted by the conclusions. Chris indicated that all minutes from meetings, issues papers and the like are shared with module leads, Executive Director, FGDC staff, etc.... so we are making every effort to communicate the issues that may have multiple dependencies. Lou mentioned that module leads also meet twice a month and this issue can be raised at that time as well.
34. Chris mentioned that if those themes that have pilots or application expertise such as transportation and cadastral want to submit issues that they believe are critical from the cross module perspective – feel free to do so.
35. John indicated he liked the concept of voting on issues and documenting.
36. Mark suggested that the issues should be shared with the lead agencies identified in A-16 so they are aware of decisions being made.
37. Nancy suggested the next topic for discussion be coordinated point values – this is an issue for geodetics and cadastral and she asked if it was an issue for other themes. Mark said yes for transportation another issue is time and or temporal issues
38. Lou suggested the coordinated point issue be captured in a problem statement and circulated to all.
39. On the temporal issue Nancy suggested the starting point be a paper by Gail Langren (spelling).
<http://page.inf.fu-berlin.de/~kuehn/time.html>

40. Lou asked the group how they wanted to handle the namespace issue and the fact that the definition is different in the permanent ID paper and authority paper.
41. Recommendation was made to change wording in permanent ID paper to read namespace authority. There was agreement. Mark suggested that if the change was made then we would no longer need the authority paper. All agreed and Lou suggested authority paper would become supporting info.
42. Mark asked if MATs and others could be invited to telecons. Chris indicated yes. There was disagreement on this, and those online preferred to work with the MAT and users to capture opinions of issues and represent those back on the telecons rather than have a number of additional people on the telecons. Conclusion was that telecons will be primarily for those theme leads or designee.
43. Nancy made a motion to vote on the permanent ID paper. Those online preferred to review paper when revised and share with the MATS, we would also do voting by electronic ballot when ready.
44. Mark asked how comments received back from the MATs and others would be addressed by the group and or included in papers.
45. Nancy suggested that the theme leads compile the comments and share with the group and that facilitation was not needed for self facilitating groups – agreed.
46. Lou suggested that guidance be developed to further scope out the process by which comments on papers would be gathered by theme leads and brought back to this group for a vote.
47. Nancy agreed that a clear stepwise process is needed and all would be happy to follow if outlined clearly.