

**GoMODP Annual Meeting Minutes**  
**March 31, 2009**  
**Gulf of Maine Research Institute**  
**Portland, Maine**

Present: See attached attendance list

**Outcomes**

- Three focus areas defined:
    1. Consider name change for partnership.
    2. Expand the regional view with a fuzzy northern boundary.
    3. Develop a vision and proposal statement to shop to various interested organizations.
  - Paul Currier will continue to serve on GoMOOS board, ratified by vote.
  - A Wiki or online collaborative tool should be set up for online discussion.
  - Geographic focus will be labeled Greater Gulf of Maine until defined by partners.
  - Review and incorporate recommendations for work plan into the document. Plan remains open for comments and edits. A one-week reminder will be sent and plan will be finalized as “potential work plan.”
  - Metadata Quality Test will be done. Several have offered to participate in a small work group.
  - Ask same group to review and provide updates to technical document.
  - Consider use of workplan as a proposal to help fund various activities.
  - NOAA participant offered “MERMAID” demo.
  - Submit Exchange Network/Jerry’s schema to NOAA.
  - Regional approach should be further reviewed/considered.
  - All partners reminded to complete annual survey.
- 

**Welcome and Review of the Agenda**

Paul Currier, Partnership Chair, introduced the meeting:

- Described partnership and statement of purpose,
- provided presentation as an overview,
- referenced Randy Gillespie’s concept of interconnected communities of practice,
- introduced the agenda,
- asked partners to complete annual survey,
- reiterated the main purpose today is to generate ideas and discuss in panel discussions.

**COINAtlantic**

Paul Boudreau gave a PPT presentation, referencing challenges to be dealt with in coming months and years. ODP is a key participant. Ended with importance of “people” connection and working together. Commitment to make it work is important.

Discussion:

- Metadata and Wiki tool. How to engage a user group and get feedback from user groups? Ranking metadata, for example. Feedback needs to be shared.
- Whose job is it to moderate and make use of exchanges in a Wiki? Shared responsibility.
- What resources does it take? Proof of concept. Dedicated staff. IT people say this requires implementation. No one could have appreciated where Google was going long ago. Making a little step forward to make information useful. How to get people engaged; it is a fun challenge!

**ESIP**

Christine Tilburg, Gulf of Maine Council, provided a PPT presentation as an overview on the Ecosystem Indicator Partnership (ESIP) Steering Committee. Christine is the program manager. ESIP Indicator Reporting Tool is being released. Indicator data sets that are approved for release will be included. Data sets are updated weekly/automatically. This is a data delivery tool for users. Future directions and challenges reviewed.

Discussion:

- Only bringing in data they are using right now and not raw data. About site data and fact sheet would bring you to source.
- Subcommittees develop fact sheets.
- Volunteer. How would you market to get real money behind it? David Keeley is funding person. NGO community, workshops, Gulf of Maine Times, proposals reference in kind hours from various individuals. Passionate group of people involved. Some have been presenting ESIP as part of national meetings and academics write peer reviewed articles on climate change. Ten proposals written in past few months. EPA, Academic folks are aware that money buckets are getting tighter. NOAA proposal. What about NSF? ESIP doesn't want to be in competition for NSF funds.
- Land and ocean link. Has this linkage been useful? Does it help to engage a broader audience? Bringing more land people/planning has been great to bring in people from different organizations. Coastal development group is very different. Largest group. Huge force economically. Local planners looking at a very small area.
- Comment about this as a portal tailored to a certain user community. What is vision as it matures? A lot of connectivity between what you are supplying and existing data sets. Needs to be distributed data set. What about static data sets? Important and useful. As part of data network, how do you make it known to people what static data set you have without their having to find ESIP website? Recovering legacy or static data sets and making sure that everyone can find them. This is a very good question. Christine said this ties in with comments on marketing. Registered in GeoConnections data portal (GDP) and GCMD. GDP is more flexible.

### **Massachusetts Ocean Partnership (MOP)**

Nick Napoli of MOP provided overview with a PPT presentation. Katie Budreski and David Healy from Stone Environmental, consultants to MOP, are in attendance today.

Discussion:

- WQX being looked at as part of program? Water Quality? Yes. What kind of timeline for next steps for data network. Ocean mgmt planning wraps up in next two months. Next month or two refining design, and in next month or two start posting some workshops and forums to get users involved.
- For managers, what kind of high level products do they want? To provide with visualization tools to overlay data from other agencies. Numerous data sets in different places. The key would be to have different data providers to submit data and allow manager to overlay in standardized output from different circulation models. Do they just need overlays? Both. Will there be economic modeling activities that will address ecosystem services and quantify them? Yes, but not specifically yet. Several projects in that area including, cumulative impacts mapping and trade off amongst services.
- Are you keeping in mind an OBIS database? Providers are probably getting tired of having to submit data in different formats? Yes, they will coordinate.
- Why don't you register all sources in GCMD? Everything in database? Not a data owner or provider. Data sources in Mass GIS and CZM databases that have sufficient metadata registered under GCMD under their portal. It is registered.

### **Pearl and Knowledge Base**

Peter Vaux, University of Maine, provided an overview via a PPT presentation. Peter is a "freshwater person". He knows he is preaching to the choir today. As anecdotal observation, Peter worked with World Bank about 15 years ago, going to Latin American countries. Constant comment interviewing folks was, "all these people are doing all these studies and we don't know what information is where"! What we need is an index of work going on in Penobscot basin and data. Five year NSF funded project is helping to do so. Joint project UMaine and USM. Data discoverability portals.

Discussion:

- Indexing lakes by code, are you counting on folks to put in metadata? Yes. UMaine is uploading data to KB. People can actually find list of lakes and populate with MIDIS codes.

- How do you put new records into the system? Simple admin interface. Anyone with password access can do that.
- Paul Boudreau likes what they are doing. Challenges connecting to the world. Peer to peer search between metadata catalogs. Any thoughts on how to effectively accomplish? A peer to peer search for mirror image? No conclusion. Google search now shows up. Duplication is an issue.
- Feedback to providers to make their contributions better. Feedback and user surveys have been wrestled with. Grad students working with user groups to get input. Thinking about some sort of survey on KB page to get info from users.

### **Updates on Major ODP Projects**

**Sensor Network Development:** Philip Bogden of GoMOOS/SURA. OGC Ocean-Sensor Web PPT presentation. ODP new diagram/page.

Discussion:

- How many sensors/how much sensor data? In that one example, small group, 1,100. People are putting interfaces on top of model output. There is no limit to this.
- Does it work in SOS? Yes, you can geolocate. Framework has been created. Standards are complex. All part of SOS.

**Exchange Network Grant:** Deb Soule of NH DES provided overview via PPT presentation.

Discussion:

- How do you deal with synthesized data? If raw data goes into network, does summary data too? No policies on that yet. Being left up to providers at this point. Up to provider to provide summary data as well as raw data, so yes.

**ODP Interoperability Experiment:** Riley Young Morse of GoMOOS provided overview with live demo.

Discussion:

- One user started to fill out data with an earlier version. Continue with version he was on? Started two webinars ago. Suggest holding off for now.

**Metadata Committee:** Bob Branton of Dalhousie University provided two PPT presentations.

1. Ocean Tracking Network roadmap to a standards-based Eldorado
2. GoMODP Metadata Editorial Committee Update

Dan Ricard spoke about metadata records.

**Modeling Committee:** Steve Cousins of University of Maine provided a PPT overview (in Rich Signell's absence) on Model Data Interoperability.

No discussion.

**Major OBIS Additions:** Nick Wolff of University of Southern Maine and Philip Goldstein of University of Colorado provided overview of OBIS USA via PPT.

### **IOOS/DMAC**

Anne Ball, NOAA Coastal Services Center, phoned in to present her ppt presentation.

Discussion:

- Who are originators? Just about anyone. Someone who might submit a standard, for example Quality Control. Also have people submit a standard they are using, like web services.

## Panel Discussion

Paul Currier states that partnership is at a point where it needs to reinvent itself. Would like thoughts and ideas on how best to network and coordinate toward the common goals that the partnership has.

How do we better network going into the future and the thoughts on how to move forward?

As MOP puts design forward, how can they take advantage of the steps that have already been taken?

ESIP is looking at partnership in a different way. Trying to find the data itself to bring into use with their indicators. They hit walls like inability to find data, i.e. GCMD, and also obtaining the data, not just metadata, but getting the data itself. Interested in standardized data sets. Kind of the other end from MOP.

Need to demonstrate usefulness. Develop those tools that you can show on a computer to display what is being delivered by data partnership. Pieces are there but might need more work on front end. This is the next critical step. What does metadata mean and why is it important. It is difficult to make a product that would satisfy that.

In the State of Maine, experience has been that decisions are being made by land use managers at the town level. There is a state planning office and comprehensive requirement, but no identifiable audience that is coordinated in any way to bring some of these data. A research translation piece is needed. In Maine there isn't a layer of people that would do that. How did MOP data effort get into the hands of municipalities?

No interface yet. Most planning commissions are partners. Haven't really involved them yet. That is in the next month or two where MOP is headed. Identifying critical partners. State is confined by Oceans Act has a near shore boundary. Focused on supporting the state and better management of the resource. Working with some of the coastal communities.

In water quality, there isn't really anyone minding the shop. Most of this goes to freshwater. No ability to manage from land use to near shore water quality piece. This is a huge gap. Thinking about the black hole, maybe we should start thinking about how to fill the black hole.

On Boudreau's approach, he knows who his users are. To specify who the users are and to identify is an important first step. Also, need to engage. How would you improve this? Missing from most data gathering initiatives.

With ESIP indicators, trying to provide a user group with tools and frustration at not being able to get at data. Thoughts on how we can move this process forward toward accessibility? When you enter into site, click doorway and enter the right area. ESIP user organized and driven. There is a lack of monitoring for some key indicators. Partnership could come forward with data.

Huge effort getting metadata up on GCMD, but in poor quality. Need to do the follow up on existing records that are broken. Should be a big effort going forward cleaning up the records. Time might be right to tackle a synthesis product. Lots of individual tools. Some sort of demonstration product. This has been difficult in absence of a partnership. Would demonstrate the utility of the partnership. For example, herring migration, couldn't have gotten in the absence of the partnership.

When you target a certain audience, you lose someone. So looking for more general application. Secondary goal would be to make more targeted later. Need an approach where you target the product they really need. Tools can be complicated but many decision makers might not be able to make good use of it. There is a lot of core information already available.

How to encourage volunteerism? Polite “harassment” of individuals. In terms of ESIP, the group is passionate. Requires a lot of one on one contact.

User needs meeting a year ago. Tried to have a discussion about how best to demonstrate. Heard not to find application, just help us find the data. Now it stopped short because now they need the extra step. Average user shouldn't have to have a lesson in metadata to find it. This is where marketing comes in again.

Boudreau had an outreach program. One-day workshops in Geomatics designed for NGO groups, folks with no experience. They contracted services to design a product for the average person. Teaching them and getting their input. It is a whole different field, how do you develop clientele? Curriculum is off the shelf, all part of COINAtlantic.

Observation that Data Partnership is grass roots and low budget. Behooves the group to think out of the box in terms of who might use. Missed an opportunity to submit to NSF \$20m grant opportunity to create distributed data system. There are requirements that you bring multiple science themes. NSF was going to fund for a successful proposal for five years and another one that would ramp down to a self-sustaining model for supporting itself. That kind of money can change into something that is profound. There are enlightened federal agencies that are ready to make this happen. NSF is one of them. This kind of collaborative project is prime to be leveraged. Biggest challenges are cultural, not technical. They would not fund a single purpose like OBIS or Exchange Network. There are opportunities with stimulus funding. Something like that could be turned around in the near future

Interop might get refunded this year. The stimulus money mostly went to projects that received good ranking last year but didn't get funded. It is a possibility that something like that would come back.

Partnership has received in kind contribution from all organizations that are participating. Important to have someone communicating that. That is going to be a real challenge this year. This year, no one is funded to carry out that. What about getting a program manager funded as opposed to a project?

Largest group, land use managers in the State of Maine, most socially relevant piece because it has an impact on landscape and near shore waters. Web based information service (SWIM) discussed. They did a model, complex and simplified.

If a surface water run off level that connects land and near shore waters, then a planner could go to a website and would be a socially relevant tool. This is the kind of tool that might be funded.

Want to see that tool developed into the end of an ODP pipeline. Development of the pipeline is critical. Have a chicken and egg scenario. Need metadata first. There are some pieces that could be done end to end. NSF seems to be asking for the applications that leverage this kind of activity. You can build it iteratively. Iteration is a frightening word for management decision. How do you acknowledge that iteration is the way to come up with that. Follow on to pipeline thought, this allows you to get to deeper level. In a sense, they are going that route, but Paul expressed more eloquently. Metadata is data. Essential information. Not metadata, just data.

Partnership has shed light on a way to engage partners actively in getting metadata to where it is useful. Time to get it correct is when it is entered. Tilburg likes to term revision – updating/enhancement. Establish some forums where we could be around particular use cases. Try it as an experiment. Posting comments on metadata records is helpful. You can't revise, but if we could allow comments, maybe through Gulf of Maine portal? And have them go back to the originator of the data. Metadata record needs correct person as the contact. Maybe where to start! Has public prodding been more or less productive than getting someone on the phone to fix it. A Wiki of sorts. The more involved the stronger the partnership would be. Issues are not new. It is important that we build on what's there and not start from scratch.

Need some driving research question that requires something like a partnership to address. Example is what Napoli was talking about for Ocean Management plan. One step beyond the toys we put together. We have to be working for somebody who wants this data badly and needs it to accomplish their mission. Is that the role of this group or

another entity in the region? Is it that we want to make products for end users? How do we relate to NERACOOS, NROC, etc. to make sure we are giving the most we can to the region as a whole and everyone is working together nicely. Someone has to do that last piece. The pipeline is there. Private sector, agency. Needs to get done. Via partnership or somebody else.

A management or resource driver is important. It helps define scope and understand what data inputs are needed.

### **Purpose of the Partnership**

Need to search for ideas of where to go from here and what the partnership wants to accomplish and become over the next couple of years. Paul has observed today an enormous need to get data in order so that it can get accessed. There is a huge amount of work to do that.

Get the web presence so that you can get to the data set once you have found out where it is. Ultimate goal is that those data sets are interoperable in the background using the tools that are being developed so that it is transparent to the ultimate user.

Question is how do we move forward in the context of all of the things we are doing? How do we pull it off given that it is going to take resources?

Synopsis of current status is that there has been a modest amount of funding through CoML and IOOS through start of money for the regional association. The partnership is currently funded for Exchange Network Grant and there is an application out for a follow up Exchange Network grant. Funding to support the partnership at the current modest level is going away.

We need to think about a vision of ourselves. One suggestion is to align mission with similar entities in the region like NERACOOS, which is now up and running. Part of their mission is to collect but also to make data available. Partnership is strategic to work with NERACOOS to pull everyone's mission together. Expanding to broader region to do that. How do we fit into the bigger picture.

This segues into subtopics.

#### ***1. Representation on GoMOOS Board***

GoMOOS has reinvented itself including establishing a new board of directors, and Paul Currier was asked to participate (ratified by Executive Committee). GoMOOS board feels that partnership is an important part of GoMOOS and would like to continue to be involved. Paul was asked to sit on the board. If partnership wants this to continue, Paul is willing to continue. Motion to continue by Michele Dionne. Seconded. Unanimous vote.

#### ***2. NERACOOS Update***

Plan by end of July so that NERACOOS is ready to respond to RFP from NOAA for IOOS implementation money. Question for the partnership is, it is clear that there could be a strong role for the partnership in the context of NERACOOS and integrating the types of data that IOOS is not necessarily focused on into the bigger picture of integrated observing. That includes a lot of biological data and data that is not necessarily sensor data along with all of the data that IOOS tends to focus on.

NERACOOS for US portion of gulf? Peter Smith from BIO is on board and has been part of the process. There is nothing in place at the moment, but there is talk of an International program. Long way away from fruition.

Bob Branton is on the DIF, so there is a Canadian presence. The OTN is headquartered at Dalhousie and is global in scale. What they are doing is part of NERACOOS and Gulf of Maine. Canadian assets in the water that are specific to NERACOOS. Ties are not parallel, but there.

Are there other ODP's around, or are we unique? There is at least one other in the Southeast that Tom Shyka and Evan Richert visited and presented. They are up and running. They started at the same time that the RA was started, so they are officially incorporated right into the RA in the Southeast. Their partnership modeled after the GoM partnership. It has a similar function.

Paul Currier asks if the data partnership should think about making a pitch for being a central part of the DIF of NERACOOS? Many responded with a yes. If so, that will give EC okay to go ahead with a proposal. Last year when we decided to be a separate entity, wasn't that part of it? NERACOOS was still an organization to be. Now it has formed. Are we reiterating what was discussed last year? Paul is not entirely sure at this point. The ODP can play a role with the integration of more diverse data types into RA's operations. The NERACOOS focus right now is on sensor data and physical oceanographic data. That is where IOOS DMAC is focused.

Eric Bridger was at a regional workshop put on by IOOS program office. At the end, there was an industry day in MD. Reps from EPA, USGS, other agencies who are talking about IOOS and how they are going to integrate into interagency IOOS. There is a definite role for an ODP to be integrated into this IOOS framework. We have made a lot of progress in that direction already.

Council is talking with IOOS about integrating IOOS data with landside data. One thing that is missing for Water Quality Exchange is the discovery metadata/catalog data. At a national level, there is interest.

Tom Shyka reiterates what potential role for data partnership could be. To reach out to other data partners who are not NOAA IOOS funded. In our region, there are state and non profit agencies that are collecting data that need to be integrated into NERACOOS efforts and will help NERACOOS in its goal of serving end users. The Data Partnership should reach out to bring these data sets into NERACOOS. Would help NERACOOS and IOOS to have this broader community participating. ODP can also continue to recommend and review standards for the IOOS.

Is there any opportunity for funding for ODP? Yes. Could be put in proposal for November that could go into next year's funds. This would really be an outreach effort. Highly focused workgroups. Echo what Shyka says. Important thing to consider is mismatch between two groups. For example, do we go around the Cape?

That exercise would have two additional benefits. To ID duplication of efforts and to ID data gaps and make them obvious and hard to ignore.

### ***3. Expand Partnership to Match Other Initiatives***

Last meeting group thought partnership should stay Gulf of Maine focused. Paul Currier wants to revisit that decision. Paul reviewed standard NERACOOS picture that gets used for their area of authority. Stops well short of what COINAtlantic considers its area of responsibility. IOOS stops at the coast. GoM Council area includes the watershed. Might be worthwhile for the partnership to redefine area and that we reconsider including the coastal watershed and pursue the business of facilitating those conversations between land managers, water managers, and Estuaries.

NERACOOS is focusing on NROC defined areas -- hazards, energy, ecosystem and a 4<sup>th</sup> one. What relationship does ODP have with NROC? There is no formal relationship. NROC does not have Canadian reps. Unclear what the relationship will be and how that will play out. May be a source of future funding. Partnership may make a proposal to make a formal connection with NROC. Eastern Canadian premiers initiative organization. They are recognized as observers.

NERACOOS/NROC/ODP and how to connect in the most logical way. Malcolm Spaulding and Ru Morrison are attending the NROC meeting to talk about close synergies and where that level of interaction comes, whether it is through Data Partnership through NERACOOS or a separate entity. Be careful to avoid having parallel discussions with NROC.

Relative to expanding territory, if we are integrating data, it makes no sense to put a line on the ocean. On the other hand, the kind of organization we are, with representatives from many groups, how that would work if we expanded our territory to double or triple the size of this group? Would that change the nature of the organization if it was a hardship to participate, meetings, etc.

What are we bringing to the table? Expertise that we have and are currently developing. Do we need to expand our geographic area to show that these solutions are useful? We have bitten off a large chunk of data types.

Don't want this to be a US thing with Canadians as observers. Want it to be international. That means we go to the North. Paul Currier doesn't have a downside in his mind.

Would ODP remain true to its unwritten work with coastal and ocean data. If we are going landward, new data becomes available. Do we retain the focus or expand it? If you are talking about data types, it's just another type of observation in a water body, and there are advantages to that. It is a different community, but the same kind of thing. Western North Atlantic Aquatic Data Partnership. Lakes, Hudson Bay. What are we talking about? Disadvantages? Advantages? Is there a land based organization already addressing these types of issues?

Expanding north and south wouldn't fundamentally change things too much. By going into watershed, huge change and how manageable would that become? Going out to Newfoundland and RI not as big of a change. Makes sense to expand in terms of ecosystem management. Concept of GoM and watershed is a great entity to think of. Sense of place is really important. Something broad like GoM but can still relate to. Deb Soule reminded group to reference partnership technical guidance which states that we are interested in data in the Gulf of Maine watershed (we already have a land based component). If we don't want to do that, we will need to change that. On defining a problem or set of problems, GoM, NROC, GoMOOS, ODP, NERACOOS, stakeholder interactions and still have yet to conceptualize a good clear problem to be solved. No one has been able to come up with one. Coast Guard Search and Rescue, to pick one. Winds, waves, currents, and weather. Tougher nut to crack is how to you manage the near coast and coastal watershed in order to protect ecosystem while also accommodating human development and activity.

Refocusing on purpose of partnership. Is main purpose to build pipeline, advocate and provide standards, and is it someone else's purpose to develop the tools and applications to go on top of that? Do we demonstrate use from within the partnership, or do we identify a partner to do that? We have tried a couple of times to find something to focus on. We lose interest from partners when we focus on certain things. Should we find an outside organization that would work with a set of users and requirements, promoting each other. ESIP is low hanging fruit on this.

Don't think partnership needs to expand to show the tools are useful. The stuff we are doing should translate across boundaries. If we do expand, there are some challenges. Potential upside to expanding is potential for funding. Aligning ourselves with NERACOOS would make it easier for NERACOOS to support. We could help to establish a southern New England version or expand to encompass that region. If we work closely with the NERACOOS 4 focus areas groups, we would be demonstrating what we have. The geographic boundary can be flexible once you apply the tool. Right now the vision is limited. Ultimately, the data needs to be useful to the people who use it and for the people who are paying for it. Argument for expanding is the NERACOOS one. If there is an opportunity to expand in the south and open up funding, hard to turn our back on those funding opportunities. NERACOOS has fuzzy boundaries and would need some flexibility.

What is best route to sustain the Partnership? We are all being asked to do more for less and less. Paul tells about National Water Quality Council Meeting he was at. On conference call, Dwayne Porter was talking about their motivation for participating in the water quality partnership. Have an underutilized data set. We want a vehicle to get that out there. Paul's thought is that we might develop a proposal to shop to NWQMC, NROC, NERACOOS, and COINAtlantic with partnership as behind the scenes integrating. Would normally advocate for expanding. Scott thinks in this case it would be moving in the wrong direction. Expertise is in the GoM. If you expand, you will lose identity as GoM. As the experts in GoM, you will still compete for funding. In Norfolk, the composition of MACOORA are distinct identities. Competing interests. We get a tiny fraction of the funds spent on the coast. GoMexico alliance is riding off the Katrina wave. Chesapeake Bay's main strength is proximity to DC. What is

our hook? Amount of dollars spent here not proportionate to amount of coastline. We won't be in a position to propose anything to NERACOOS if we don't expand. How much money does NERACOOS have? Not nearly enough. Overwhelming thrust of NERACOOS will be to keep observing assets in the water. Much might have to go into integrated data management. \$1.325 million for the implementation/operational stuff. \$90k to data integration. Some toward NERACOOS web presence. That is unlikely to go far for increasing the funds for ocean observing. It is going to have to grow.

Group is fundamentally about data discovery and integration. Integration is a tough nut to crack. We have not yet demonstrated that we've cracked that nut. Expanding much more may make data integration thing more difficult to accomplish. Simpler it is, might be better.

Have no boundaries. GoM centered, but no boundaries. Linkages to north and south. Boundary lines leads to problems. Do you keep GoMODP name?

Another question on funding, do we have any mechanism as a group? Should we have a financial, grant writing committee?

We need technical savvy like Eric Bridger and Ian Ogilvie, folks available to move projects forward to go after funding to do technical work. The other part of it is the social side, some folks who can put effort into working with data owners to get their data so it is accessible.

NSF knows that the biggest challenge to advancing is working across communities of interest. To expand vision, Michele Dionne wrote a letter to EPA. Two agencies concerned with climate change. Two ready-made partner groups to bring in to help. Within regions, they have powerful data suppliers. NEP, NERRS. May be a place to start. Michele can forward letter if anyone wants to see.

If all we can come together and talk about how the pieces fit together, then when agencies are looking for people to do it, that is the power of a region. Not just one region or discipline.

Next step is to put together a vision and proposal that can be shopped and we put a dollar value on it. A ballpark estimate.

To underscore what Philip said that is so important. Some of NSF money is going to help upgrade the knowledge base for GCMD. To the extent that we can get more involved, it will make the whole effort more productive.

Take GoM out of the name. If to align with NERACOOS, politically more expedient to do things. Other bit is that what we are talking about is including watershed. Focus is still on their impacts to oceans. So no need to take ocean out of it.

Some may not agree. If our job is interoperability, if we don't try to develop a killer app, then we could take ocean out.

Focus is good. But if trying to persuade other groups to get involved with a partnership, having the word ocean may be a disadvantage. What is the balance?

Going back to NSF. Geo Sciences. Within ATM, OCE, HYD disciplines, sub disciplines, challenge was to get those three disciplines together.

How about the Greater Gulf of Maine Water Partnership. Keep water in. Michele likes coast. Water Data Partnership. Gulf of Maine Coastal Network. Coastal Network. Coastal is neither ocean or watershed nor atmosphere. We go a lot farther off than coastal. Back to Northwest Atlantic Data Partnership. Gulf of Maine geographically implies ocean chunk. Leave subject of name change to future gathering with idea that we are receptive to name change. Open to discussion in a Wiki. On geographic focus, Greater Gulf of Maine is okay for now.

Three focus areas agreed on at end of discussion:

1. Name change is under consideration.
2. Expand the regional view fuzzy north.
3. Immediate task is to develop a vision and proposal statement to shop to various folks that might be interested, such as NROC, NERACOOS, COINAtlantic, and NWQMC.

### **Taking Ocean out of Ocean GoMODP**

Covered already.

### **Sustainable funding for Partnership**

Not specifically covered.

### **Partnership Work Plan Review**

Tom Shyka of GoMOOS reviewed work plan document and requested:

- comments,
- items to add, revise, delete,
- organizations willing to take on tasks or offer support.

Input will be incorporated, work plan will be left open for other feedback and a reminder will be sent asking for continued contributions. In two weeks, the work plan will be finalized for the year, realizing that it is a potential work plan.

Discussion:

A lot of metadata progress this year and poised to move forward on improving citations in particular. Give it a lot of profile that the group could commit to. In less than three years, re-run and see significant progress.

We add something more specific about partners acting on the recommendations, specific deadline of three months, focus on citations. Go to the site now and see how they are doing.

GCMD or Geo Connections fix up. That would be a big step forward.

We decide on a minimum set of key words that all of the records have to include. How could we go about that? Bob Branton we could see what is being used now and try to find top five. Drive it from what we've got now. Continuity matters. Bob could do a frequency calculation and recommend from that.

Get data link, could add to scripting as well to make sure that there is an actual URL that responds. Our approach is very programmatic and clunky, vs. what Riley Young Morse presented, which is a lot more accessible. Working with both Bob's report and Riley's metadata tool, that would have to go to GeoConnections as well. Riley's and Eric's tools. Bring these complimentary efforts together. Dan encountered links to Geoconnections had to be manually mapped GCMD and Geoconnections records. That is another shortcoming. Go back to GCMD and Geoconnections people to make sure that the link is working properly. Put pressure on them to do that.

If there was time (two days?) to commit together, that would make it quicker. Bob, Dan, Eric, Riley have a metadata quality test. Very small workshop with key players. Bob volunteered time.

NOAA has a metadata tool called metadata resource management aid stand-alone application that spits out a GCMD record automatically. MERMAID is the acronym. A brief on it offered up by Scott Mowery. Using the same API. The key is that there is a group willing to be led to get this done and we want to demonstrate this.

Eric developed his tool with Ian and Riley. Big part of it was exchange network work. There is a list of fields that are required with certain levels of compliance. That list needs to be finalized.

Interoperability, tracking ocean tracking standards that Anne ball was talking about. As they get proposed, adopted, keep an eye on standards and consider incorporating.

Anne's point is looking for definition standards. This group is poised to have a lot to offer because it is international. Janet looks at where we are now with interoperability. They are looking for infrastructure on how do you communicate this? Not only do we respond, but come up with ideas to propose. Will make infrastructure stronger. Partners to participate in IOOS standards development process - go to website.

Steve was talking about tracking and creating partnership standards that have been submitted and approved so they can be adapted.

In looking at Anne's slides, did anyone see Exchange Network? Jerry's schema? Deb has asked EPA to advocate their standards for approval. May need to take it upon ourselves to submit. Once approved, the partnership submits as a standard? All talking about IOOS and IWGOO group discussions and adopting various standards. At partnership level, a small focus group to propose as a straw person is the best approach. DMAC steering group is a slow process. To move a whole agency is problematic.

Reason to be optimistic that something could happen. It could be multi agency. It is when groups get together and work in complimentary ways that it is powerful and speaks loudly inside the beltway. Regional approach from Maine's perspective, standing alone we have no political clout. NH and MA do better at that.

Technical guidance document is the best thing and the most helpful to Jim Manning. Now we need to update and include IOOS standard and WQX and maybe expand into a proposal. Good idea. At a federal level you can't do these things. Partnership can do that. In plan for metadata group, the group should review and provide updates to the technical document.

Outreach/education to end-users is a critical need for survival of the partnership. Should be a decision of whether ODP does that. Part of plan should be outreach to end users with regard to a specific application or connection to end-users.

NOAA has formed regional teams. North Atlantic regional team. VA/NC border to North Atlantic US. Part of team responsibility is outreach to stakeholders. Fisheries office in Gloucester would be a good partnership. North Atlantic also working with hydro folks as far west as NY. Regional team contact for New England would be Betsy Nicholson. Planning stakeholders meetings throughout the regions.

Anyone willing to commit to supporting?

Dave Stuebe of ASA is engaged in effort with Rich Signell, USGS. ASA is looking for funding to write code and make it functional.

Reminder will be sent out for additional input. That opportunity is open throughout the year.

Meeting adjourned.