

**Discussion topics:** Update of guidance documents; theme lead responsibility documents; telecon participants discussion and decision making process; revised permanent ID and authority issue; FGDC and ISO metadata issue; next call; next topic.

**Participants:** John Crow, Robin Fegeas, Dave Butler, Jim Kramer, Bob Ader, Mark Bradford, Ed McKay, Rick Yorczyk, Nancy Von Meyer, Jack Huntley, Doug Nebert, Chris Clarke, Lou Kerestesy.

## Call Summary

### *Group Authority Issues*

- Chris C. explained that the purpose of inviting MAT and Board of Directors members to join the group was to include others with required subject matter expertise and formalize the theme leads representation of the MATs.
- **Action: Lou K. will draft boilerplate text for an email message from the theme leads to the MATs.** The text will note that theme leads have been representing the MATs on calls to date and can continue to do so; explain the task and time commitment expected; invite participation on a topics-basis if that is more feasible; and identify topics on the cross-cutting issues list<sup>1</sup>.
- Nancy VM. asked how decisions made by this group would be made known to department/agency staff doing program work. Decisions reached by the group will be reviewed by each MAT to check the effect on its model and normative text. Once approved by all MATs, decisions will be incorporated into models and normative text and become part of the standard.
- A question was asked about whether federal department/agency implementation of the Geospatial One-Stop standard would be voluntary or mandatory. John C. referred to EO 12906 and OMB Circular A-119 as evidence that implementation was expected to be mandatory. John commented that agencies ignore the requirement, which is an enforcement issue.
- Nancy VM. asked when what we're doing could be relied on by departments/agencies doing work, now, who could use it.
- Chris C. answered that decisions are not final now and that the implementation process is a long-term migration. Lou K. noted milestones in that migration – the compilation of a harmonized draft, the draft revised following ANSI public comments, the published standard, and then revisions over time incorporating user experience.
- Nancy VM. asked about professional association participation on the cross-cutting issue team. Mark B. commented that it was beyond the scope of this group to ensure that degree of participation. Chris noted that some organizations are Board of Directors members and included that way. Lou noted that all received the Geospatial One-Stop open call for participation, and also noted that we could work with Leslie Wollack, outreach coordinator, to ensure information gets to identified groups.

### *Permanent Identifier Document*

- Lou K. explained that he had amended the permanent identifier document with redline and strikeout, per the February 6, 2003 teleconference. He had also made other wording changes not discussed at the February 6, 2003 teleconference as he thought appropriate for clarification. All

---

<sup>1</sup> Those identified to date include permanent identifiers; authority; feature-level metadata; coordinated points; definition of Framework data; and an implementation informative annex.

edits were accompanied by MS Word Comments so the team could see the origin and rationale of the edit.

- **Action: Lou K. asked the team to review the document and send edits to him by Wednesday, March 5, 2003. Lou will revise the document for the March 6 call.** Once final, the document will be sent out to team members for concurrence, after which it will be presented to the MAT for their review and comment, and for their check against the model and normative text.

#### *FGDC/ISO Metadata*

- Chris C. noted that Steve Grise and others have seen both FGDC and ISO metadata content across the working drafts. Chris C. spoke with Sharon Shinn about which should be used, and Sharon advised FGDC to be consistent with Module 3.
- Doug N. and John C. commented that ISO implementation was so far away that only FGDC could be used.
- Chris C. noted that the issue will appear in theme lead guidance material. Chris was asked if Norm Andersen agreed with Sharon's advice. Chris explained that she had discussed the issue with Norm and that he had not disagreed and that all guidance will be shared with module leads, Norm, Julie and others as appropriate to ensure consistency.

#### *Next Call and Topic*

- Participants agreed a call should be held March 6, 2003.
- Agenda items will include the permanent identifier paper; theme lead guidance and responsibilities list; the email boilerplate; and a schedule of topics.
- **Action: Lou and Chris will propose a schedule of topics.**
- Doug N. commented that an important topic for future discussion is an informative annex describing an Extensible Markup Language (XML)-based encoding. Because one goal of Geospatial One-Stop is to have organizations provide data via the Portal using OGC Web Services, the standard should include an implementation schema to tell users what exchanged data packages might look like, something the UML model won't do. John C. commented that such implementation content should not be part of the standard. The group agreed the issue is not framed well for discussion at the present time.
- **Action: Lou K. will work with Doug, Steve Grise, and Chris C. to frame the issue for consideration by the group.**