

GoMODP Executive Committee Meeting  
Nov 3, 2006 9:00AM – 2PM EST  
NH DES, Portsmouth

**Those Present:** David M., Linda M., Dan S., Deb S., Philip B., Sylvia M., Bob B. (by phone).

**Agenda:**

- Discussion on selected actions from 9/7/06 meeting and ongoing activities
  - Technical:
    - Monitoring Location Pilot Project - OOS-Tethys
    - Exchange Network Grant (EPA Water Quality Location Monitoring proposal)
    - Shrimp project (milestones?)
    - Technical committee – dataset accessibility inventory/description.
    - Technical capabilities inventory
  - Partnership
    - Plan/thoughts for RA/GoMODP integration (Evan to provide memo).
    - Status of conversion to plone from wiki/web site.
- Agenda for Partnership meeting (draft to be distributed)
- 2007 Workplan Draft
  - Web Service prototype for partnership (Philip)
  - Other projects/direction

**Carryover Activities from Prior Meeting**

1. Monitoring Location Pilot Project – template reviewed, few partners have responded. Trying to get sampling data on a web application for the annual meeting. Looking for data from partners by November 15<sup>th</sup>.
  - a. Goal of this is to get partners used to sharing data and ready to use the Exchange Network. This is to be ready for the December meeting.
  - b. OOSTethys ongoing activity – Philip showed map, GoMOOS can use this method to implement the Monitoring location project. This is complimentary with goal of providing a data service. Cookbook approach that is available on the website <http://www.oostethys.org/>. This can jump start the interoperability process.
2. Shrimp Project – Tom Gale, GoMOOS new CTO will be managing this. No progress to date. Problems that have been encountered have not yet been overcome. This is to be ready for the December meeting. We could upload existing information to show integration, but not dynamic integration.
3. EPA Exchange Network Grant – need to apply by Nov. 20<sup>th</sup>. Tom has 8+ partners interested in working on this. This is moving ahead. Approvals would come in late summer 2007. Money would come through NH DES and with associated administration the real start date is not likely to be until early 2008. We will have two years to complete the project after receipt of the grant.
4. Technical committee – dataset accessibility inventory/description – Sylvia – In Progress – get with the technical committee to complete
5. Technical capabilities inventory – Networking activity – Sylvia to complete for the annual meeting (website listing)

## Agenda for Partnership Meeting

- 8:30 Coffee/ Continental Breakfast
- 9:00 Introductions (Introduce new partners and visitors), welcome, review agenda
- 9:15 Review accomplishments (Review 2006 work plan and match items):  
*Report with metrics and demonstrations*
- Technical resource survey (Sylvia)
  - Metadata editorial committee (Bob/Lou)
  - Shrimp Project (Phil/Tom)
  - Monitoring Location Pilot Project (Tom/Deb)
  - Exchange Network Grant Application (Deb/Tom) *grassroots efforts*
- 10:15 Krish Narasimhan, Lockheed Martin – IOOS development – big picture, integrated system architecture – *conceptual plan*
- 11:00 Break
- 11:15 Chuck Spooner – EPA – Exchange network – *specific implementation example*
- 12:00 Lunch sponsored by Alliance for Coastal Technologies (ACT)
- 12:45 Regional Association (Evan Richert)
- Status of funding for staff and technical assistance
  - Future of RA, GoMOOS, IOOS
  - Discussion on RA/Data Partnership relationship
- 2:00 Break
- 2:15 Work plan for the coming year – discussion, key concerns and endorsement
- 3:30 Wrap-up
- 4:00 Adjourn

### Discussion Notes:

- Have presenters bring materials on USB drives
- Reference [http://www.ocean.us/dmac\\_subsystem](http://www.ocean.us/dmac_subsystem) for background
- Need to have a call to Krish to let him know that Chuck Spooner will have questions related to IOOS/EPA collaboration. Krish needs to talk about getting Canada into the process as well.
- Canada/GeoConnections has been leading the way with pushing standardized data exchange. OGC specifications provide a standard. Are Canadian counterparts continuing to be in the loop?
- Chuck Spooner looking for talking points – need to cover this with him
- Side meeting between Chuck S., Deb, Philip, Tom Gale, Tom Shyka, David M. will occur at 4:00 when the main meeting adjourns – topic: National Monitoring Network proposal submitted this summer.

## 2007 Workplan Draft Discussion

- We have the continuing Authority, Discovery, Accessibility, Interoperability and efforts in those areas. Current pilot projects support these areas.
- Exchange Network grant is realistically for 2008 work plan – Deb to write project description.
- Next step is suitability/fitness of the data for a particular task. Metadata editorial committee can contribute here. Partners need to have published metadata sufficient to provide enough information to establish suitability and usefulness of datasets through search engines and portals. This is beyond keyword searches and establishes which keywords are most relevant, as well as ranking of keywords, parameters that are available. Bob will write this up for use in the work plan.
- Bob/Lou to write up expectations for the Metadata Editorial committee. Currently using GCMD DIF standard as the controlled vocabulary standard.
- Other new projects: Enhance monitoring location pilot to make it dynamic. Low cost and incremental improvement. UNH/WHOI may be ready to go.
- Need to get Canada/BIO engaged in these larger projects.
- Workplan should making catalog more dynamic for some of the partners. Work towards harmonization of OBIS, EPA, OGC. GCMD is about accessibility, not about controlled vocabulary.
- Bob would like to work on an OGC based service for OBIS Canada. GCMD discovery metadata could be integrated with a web feature service.
- We should be looking for ways to pursue opportunities together, coordinated “on the cheap.” Identify common elements that can be harmonized and then go after them.
- David/Sylvia to pull document together.

## Regional Association Discussion (Evan’s Memorandum to be appended to these notes).

- Governance challenges of creating an RA are partly cultural, partly technical. Data Partnership is a test-bed for the technical piece, but it also broadens the whole ocean observing context beyond the mission of any one organization.
- Going forward, do we want the Exec committee to handle interacting with the RA Advisory Committee, or do we want the partnership to set up a separate committee to handle this? Do we want to have open partnership discussions on a quarterly basis to handle this transition?
- RA business plan is due by next fall. Communication is a big challenge, need to encourage input at the RA process moves forward.
- ODP needs to draft a vision statement to understand what the unique contribution is that it maintains so that we know how we relate to the RA. Exec committee to draft a vision statement to present at the annual meeting as part of Evan’s RA discussion.

## Website

Presented new phone site – [www.gomodp.org](http://www.gomodp.org) - Request feedback.

## Discussion Points for Chuck Spooner

- Types of projects that go thru the Exchange Network?
- How is Exchange Network used?
- What is the future of the Exchange Network?
- How does it fit with the National Monitoring Network?
- How does this benefit the partnership?

## Workplan for Technical Committee

- Is our technical committee realistically going to help other partners come up to speed?
- Can we get new members from the results of the technical resource inventory?
- Check progress on current Workplan with technical committee.

## 2006 Annual Report (to be distributed at Annual Meeting)

- Deb to write up National Water Monitoring Conference
- Technical committee Workplan – Deb
  - o GCMD Portal
- Shrimp Project – David
- EPA grant – Tom/Deb
- Creation of metadata editorial committee
- Did Lou do additional work with metadata/partners
- Improved website
- Other activities/accomplishments?

**Discussion on Regional Association** - Need to understand how the partnership relates to Regional Association. What do we want to ensure are covered in whatever new arrangements are made in the future. We discussed the need to have a clear vision of the unique contribution of the GoMODP vs. the RA.

Reference MOU language:

### 1. Purpose (this could be considered a mission statement)

The purpose of the Partnership is to promote and coordinate the sharing, linking, electronic dissemination, and use of data on the Gulf of Maine region.

### 2. Goal

The goal of the Participants is to create and support an information system that:

- is technically and institutionally capable of linking databases that are created and individually maintained by Participants and, where necessary and appropriate, to archive data sets;
- is region-wide in scale;
- is compatible with other regional, national, and international information systems;
- is accessible by individuals throughout the Gulf of Maine region and beyond;

- develops the web-based, visualization, and other information technologies needed for the seamless exchange and facile use of distributed and aggregated data; and
- acknowledges and maintains the integrity of all data sources. \

### **NERA Discussion (Philip's notes)**

Requirements for the draft statement of how the GoMODP relates to the NERA.

- Vision: Broad array of users can get the information that they need, easily and when they need it, from the broad array of data providers in the region.
- Mission: To create a community of data providers and users that work toward an integrated and distributed data system that supports a broad array of applications.
- Goals:
  - Start by integrating the existing data systems
  - Facilitate addition & participation of any new data systems & providers
  - Seamless data exchange among participants
  - Seamless data integration capability users
  - Minimal effort for data providers
- In the grand future (i.e., when there is an IOOS), what are the things that the GoMODP has accomplished on behalf of the NERA?
  - We're the data-integration arm of the RA.
  - What are the goals & objectives of the RA as distinct from what the RA needs to do?
  - The RA may be the planning & administrative group, but it's in relation to the data partnership piece.

Meeting adjourned at 2:15 pm. Next meeting will be the Annual meeting in December.

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Gulf of Maine Ocean Data Partnership Executive Committee  
FROM: Evan Richert  
RE: Thinking about ODP's role in a Northeast Regional Association of Coastal Ocean Observing Systems  
DATE: Nov. 2, 2006

As you know, the Northeast Region – defined at present as the Gulf of Maine Area (both Canadian and U.S. waters, and including Georges Bank) and the waters off Southern New England – is one of 11 regions identified as the coastal component of the Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS).

The region is in the midst of organizing an association of the various coastal observing efforts in the region; this association is referred to as the Northeast Regional Association of Coastal Ocean Observing Systems, or NERACOOS. There are many active components in the region (observing platforms and activities, modeling, etc., by many state and federal agencies, research institutions, and non-profits) that potentially will be “glued together” via the NERACOOS. But the best precursors to the NERACOOS, in terms of their inclusiveness, comprehensive missions, and governance, are GoMOOS and the Ocean Data Partnership.

This memorandum is a request to the Executive Committee to begin formally thinking about how the Partnership might envision itself interacting with, merging with, or partnering with the NERACOOS, and what voice it would like in designing the structure of the NERACOOS.

Many (including some of you) already are involved in this effort as principal investigators and members of the Advisory Committee working with the PIs. We also have engaged the major academic research institutions, with the help of Berrien Moore and Janet Campbell at UNH, to help shape the NERACOOS.

As background, I think you can assume the following (these are my words, all subject to change):

### **What will be the NERACOOS mission?**

To enhance the capacity for prediction of events, from hours to decades, associated with the region's coastal ocean, including health and safety events, biological events, and climate change.

### **What, specifically, will NERACOOS's role be?**

This is still very much up for discussion. But probable givens are:

- To provide regional planning for coastal observing systems, including serving as an interface between users of ocean observing information and the providers of it;
- To set priorities for infrastructure, services, and research to meet user needs;
- To receive funds from the U.S. IOOS program, and budget and distribute those funds to various components of the system in accord with the priorities;
- To help establish standards by which various components of the system will collect and distribute ocean observations; and

- To serve as a data aggregator and integrator of ocean observing data, including physical, environmental, biological, and geological, in support of decision-making products needed by users and regulators of the coastal ocean.

I believe there is a strong disposition that under any organizational scenario, the Regional Association will be, and will support, a distributed system of observing, modeling and analysis, and research. That is, most of the actual work of observing and modeling would be carried out by others under some form of coordination by the NERACOOS. The NERACOOS would exist in part to leverage the substantial existing capabilities of others. In this regard, big questions include whether the NERACOOS will itself actually own and operate assets, how should NERACOOS be organized, both legally and functionally, and the relative representation in the organization of users, researchers and providers, industry, and governmental agencies.

### **What kinds of approaches to organization are being considered?**

This is still an open question, and your thoughts would be valued. Thinking very generally, there may be at least these options:

- Replace the precursors to the NERACOOS – GoMOOS and the Ocean Data Partnership – with a single, inclusive organization that serves the roles described above. “Inclusive” means cutting across disciplines, levels of government, the various stakeholders, and regions, including at least the Gulf of Maine area and the Southern New England Bight. Hopefully, this approach would draw on the lessons of governance learned through the experiences of GoMOOS and the Partnership; but would also broaden the identity to include those who do not presently feel an attachment to either.
- “Reinvent” GoMOOS to be a more inclusive, distributed organization within the Gulf of Maine area, “invent” a parallel, sister organization covering the Southern New England Bight, and then together, perhaps along with the Ocean Data Partnership, they would form a higher level NERACOOS to serve as the funnel for IOOS funds coming into the region, and to perform the various functions described above. But in the process, each would maintain its own identity and governance.
- Create a federation of sorts among the many different players in the region. Bound together by MOU or other legal arrangement, different functions and roles of the NERACOOS would be distributed or assigned to the different participants, and NERACOOS as an organization would be more virtual than actual.

I’m certain there are many other approaches within and between these options. The NERACOOS Advisory Committee is considering what these might be. In any case, it would be of great help if the Ocean Data Partnership could begin thinking about the role it may want to play in, and as part of, the NERACOOS, and how about how the NERACOOS should be shaped to best advance the Partnership’s own mission.