

Module 1 Telecon #8

March 6, 2003

Draft minutes

Discussion topics: Permanent IDs, status guidance docs

Participants: Chris Clarke, John Crowe, Lou Kerestesy, Dave Butler, Jim Kramer, Ed McKay, Rick Yorczyk, Steve Grise, Robin Feagas,

1. Lou reviewed updates of latest issue paper on permanent IDs dated MARCH 6, 2003. Comments captured in tabular format 1-8, addressed sequentially.
2. Comment 1, Dave Butler indicated that he added the word authoritative since it is critical from his perspective for a user to know who the authority is for a particular dataset. Dave G. suggested not using the word authoritative since we have not been able to come to resolution on meaning and implies other things to some folks. Ed commented that Nancy raised concerns about legal implications of word authority. Jim K. preferred authority remain in wording. Steve G indicated that more detailed info about authority will be in metadata and that will be exchanged with data so it would be covered that way. Dave B stated that he wants to know who the authority is for data so he can reference etc.. Lou suggested different wording that would satisfy all, will provide un updated paper. Lou took **ACTION** to discuss with John C. (not on line at the time) and Nancy to ensure their issues are addressed by proposed wording changes. Key on this issue is ensure uniqueness
3. Comments 2 in table. Steve G is ok with removing digital rep as suggested by Doug. Dave B suggested leaving in. Robin not on line at time to discuss, Lou took **ACTION** to discuss with Robin
4. Comment 3 in table. Dave B expressed concern about comments from Robin which he interpreted to indicate that not all IDs would be unique. Steve G. suggested that what Robin was implying is that we have stated that permanent ID will exist but community may chose not to populate. We need to specifically state that should be populated.
5. Comment 4 in table. Lou asked if this is linked to comment 3. Evolved into discussion on the need to define what is meant by the word model. Dave G suggested that model exchange was the minimum required data for exchange which is also the data exchange model. Steve G. cautioned that this should not be confused with populating the native dataset for business applications. This will be taken very literally by community unless we state otherwise – it is for data exchange. Community can choose to include or not.
6. Dave B indicated that there will be some confusion if multiple sources populate permanent ID with “roads” for example but source is different. Suggested additional detail – such as Virginia roads, Portland roads etc... Steve G. said yes but need to leave to community unless we develop central source. Dave asked if when exchanging data, providers would include a field “permanent ID” Steve G indicated yes. He also said that in some cases users may have in their native database Virginia roadID but for the sake of exchange would add permanent ID. Steve G suggested rewording 1.1 and 1.2 to be more clear n this or add a 1.3. Suggestion OK with those online Lou will make changes.
7. Comment 5 in table. Dave B indicated his comments were related to data exchange and uniqueness issues. Steve G. indicated that each community would define how they populate unique ID. Those online with changes as indicated by Dave – OK
8. Comment 6 in table. Dave B. reviewed how we have developed the wording of names space authority over several discussions and suggested wording to clarify present statement in 2.1. Those online OK with suggested changes.
9. Comment 7 in table. New item 2.2 intended to clarify assigning of names space authority. Some discussion on use of word authority since it is loaded. Those on line agreed with intent of 2.2 but preferred use of “authority” be changed to steward or owner. Dave B was ok with that. Others online OK. Lou will reword. Steve suggested namespace implies you are owner of data and maybe authority is not needed, lou will suggest wording in revised version. Those online agreed intended changes in addition of 2.2, needs some wordsmithing. Dave B. summarized that the main intent of 2.2 is to ensure that namespace can be populated at different levels for the sake of clarity.
10. Comment 8 in table. Dave B indicated this is more implementation but it is critical that authority is unique. John C. agreed. Ed M. asked if developing and assigning a central authority would give the impression the feds were controlling process. Dave B suggested using the word registry rather than authority. John preferred use of authority. Steve G indicated this is critical but main focus is not to define in standards but to provide guidance to allow community to assign. Steve suggested that we could implement a central service such as GOSnamespace.net where providers are assigned

Module 1 Telecon #8

March 6, 2003

Draft minutes

namespace. This was tabled for discussion since its more implementation but it is an option. Chris indicated that this was also discussed in the Jan 23 minutes of telecon 4. Ed M. mentioned that geodetics addresses this issue in similar way by the use of the "blue book". Lou will reword 2.2 - concept is fine.

11. Revisit of comment 2 in table since Robin joined telecon. Robin clarified his statement that the only time dataset can have different ID for same feature is when we have different digital representations. For example real word and exchange. Jim K. agreed this a subtle but key issue and suggested leaving digital representation in. Those online OK
12. Ed M. made two additions to edits. 1) the use of "multiple representations" be clarified 2) change the use of "real world" to something like discrete.
13. Chris indicated that task list, module 1 milestones, harmonization team charter, and listing of relevant standards would be sent to all by COB Monday. These documents will feed the larger effort to provide overall guidance but will fulfill the shorter term need to define steps feeding INCITS/ANSI process. Every effort has been to ensure documents are consistent with our understanding within FGDC and INCITS. Module leads have had an opportunity to review and comment. We will mark documents Draft until Lou, Chris, Norm and Julie have one final group review but we believe the documents accurately capture the major issues. These documents will also feed overarching documentation under development by Norm.