

## Prep-FIT Meeting Held at DEQ's Salem Office 9/15/2015

**In attendance:** Don Pettit (DEQ), Bob DenOuden (DAS-Geo via phone), David Pray (DEQ via phone), Dan Brown (City of Salem), Daniel Stoelb (OEM), Dave Gullledge (OSFM), Phil Smith and Joe Seversen (ODOT), Steve Lucker (DLCD) and Myrica McCune OSU-INR).

### Purpose of meeting:

- Review of the proposed Use, Access, and Security classifications to be utilized to classify the datasets used in the Prep-FIT's Emergency Preparedness Data Project.
- Review of the individual datasets to identify any with a need for special Access, Use or Security constraints and to capture the proper classification.

An initial discussion of the proposed Access, Use and Security classification scheme was held in advance of attempting to assign classifications. The proposed classification scheme outlined at the meeting was based on the Emergency Preparedness Data Security Classifications draft that I had distributed ahead of the meeting and the following table that was created using the default categories and classifications built into the EPA Metadata Editor:

### EPA Metadata Editor Dataset Constraints

Access	Use	Security Class
Secured	Secured	Secured
Restricted	Restricted	Restricted
Limited	FOUO	Confidential
Unrestricted	Unrestricted	Unrestricted
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified

Some participants were concerned that there were too many categories of dataset constraints, and a replication of very similar sounding classes for each. For example, Access and Use are pretty similar in that one could constrain Use by limiting Access to only those with clearance to use the data. Likewise, the classifications Restricted and Limited are not defined and could be construed as the same.

I indicated that Bill Clingman of LCOG had provided similar comments ahead of the meeting knowing he was not going to be able to attend. Bill also expressed concern with using the term "unclassified" as a means to describe datasets without forcing the data providers to choose an actual classification. Bill had also expressed in the e-mail that the terms restricted and confidential could be combined to simplify the classification without loss of any needed specificity. This sentiment was echoed as a part of the Prep-FIT discussion, and it was generally agreed that simplification was preferable. I suggested that the most important end point was known and consistent use of whatever classification scheme was settled upon.

I indicated that there was utility in retaining both the Unrestricted and Unclassified categories. Although the Unclassified is the default value, it accurately describes many federally-obtained datasets that have not been assessed for needed constraints. There is a difference between the two terms, and that

difference should be carried forward unless we (the Prep-FIT) choose to assess the need and impose that constraint. I am reluctant to conduct that assessment for all the datasets, due to time constraints. My preference in terms of completing the goals of the project are served best by settling on a classification scheme as soon as possible, so long as we can be consistent in terms of use with any applicable standards and internally consistent in application to the data assemblage.

I attempted to explain my understanding of other differences in these classes and how they could be used on different types of data to provide a more clear sense of why the constraints were placed and how it might help us control different aspects of distribution and end use. Having failed to make that case well, I suggested we might better be able to understand the differences and the need for more detailed scheme through review of examples in the dataset.

I was unclear about the exact genesis and development of the proposed constraint categories having created the draft over 6 months ago, though the categories are reflected in the EPA Metadata Editor, which is the tool being used to streamline metadata creation. I agreed to review the Oregon Metadata Standard and the FGDC Metadata Standards with respect to dataset constraints and report back to the Prep-FIT with recommendations for moving forward. The result of that review is below and helps to understand the reason for inclusion in the EPA Metadata Editor.

### **Background on Dataset Constraints:**

#### The Oregon Metadata Standard utilizes but one Dataset Constraint

1.12.2 A Security Classification free text, e.g. "Secured", "Restricted", "Confidential", "Unrestricted", "Unclassified"

The FGDC Standard contemplates the same categories we have built into the EPA Metadata Editor...though it only prescribes a suggested set of classifications for the Security Classification...and those seem a bit geared toward terms no longer in general use such as Top Secret.

#### The text from the FGDC Standard (1998 last update)

1.7 Access Constraints -- restrictions and legal prerequisites for accessing the data set. These include any access constraints applied to assure the protection of privacy or intellectual property, and any special restrictions or limitations on obtaining the data set.

Type: text

Domain: "None" free text

Short Name: accconst

1.8 Use Constraints -- restrictions and legal prerequisites for using the data set after access is granted. These include any use constraints applied to assure the protection of privacy or intellectual property, and any special restrictions or limitations on using the data set.

Type: text

Domain: "None" free text

Short Name: useconst

1.12 Security Information -- handling restrictions imposed on the data set because of national security, privacy, or other concerns.

Type: compound

Short Name: secinfo

1.12.1 Security Classification System -- name of the classification system.

Type: text

Domain: free text

Short Name: secsys

1.12.2 Security Classification -- name of the handling restrictions on the data set.

Type: text

Domain: "Top secret" "Secret" "Confidential" "Restricted" "Unclassified" "Sensitive"

free text

Short Name: secclass

My preference in terms of completing the goals of the project are served best by settling on a classification scheme as soon as possible, so long as we can be consistent in terms of use with any applicable standards and internally consistent in application to the data assemblage. To this end, I would suggest we utilize the categories and classes described in the EPA Metadata Editor, which appear to be based on the FGDC Standard, and which the Oregon Metadata Standard follows, but with the following Access and Security Classification changes:

<u>Access</u>	<u>Use</u>	<u>Security Class</u>
Secured	Secured	Secured
Restricted	Restricted	<del>Restricted</del> -Sensitive
<del>Limited</del> (eliminate?)	FOUO	Confidential
Unrestricted	Unrestricted	Unrestricted
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified

We do not deal in "Top Secret" data, and the Secured classification is a suitable replacement for the types of data which we most need to restrict access to. Although not perfect, it will fulfill the needs of the project, and will allow us to move forward without delay. If during this application we find that it does not serve the needs of the Prep-FIT community, we can revise at a later date. Reminder that although these typically are classified similarly across the three categories, they need not always be. For instance, something may require unrestricted access but be FOUO or be unrestricted in access because it is widely published and available elsewhere, but be considered Sensitive due to the content it provides (like the Snowy Plover Habitat example).

I will expand the table showing the classes/categories to explain in more detail (similar to the previous draft table) and provide to the Prep-FIT. This will serve to document our current use of the different classifications. If anyone has serious concern with that approach, please let me know ASAP and we can work to resolve those concerns.

#### **Emergency Preparedness Dataset Review:**

A review of the ~250 individual datasets was completed using our project tracking spreadsheet to record the identification of any with a need for special Access, Use or Security constraints and to capture the proper classification. In general, most datasets are Unrestricted or Unclassified with respect to all three categories (Access, Use, Security) of constraint. Several datasets, particularly those with security sensitivity associated with the location of hazardous substances, were assigned the classification Access – Restricted; Use – FOUO; Security – Restricted.

The meeting was adjourned after the conclusion of the dataset constraints review, which took up the bulk of the meeting time. I will post a copy of the Data/Metadata QA Review Tracking spreadsheet when review is complete. Anyone needing an in-progress version, just let me know.

**Next Steps:**

Follow up with Bob DenOuden and Myrica McCune to review Framework status for each dataset, decide which will be provided as services and which will be able to be downloaded (and where) and resolve any duplication issues within the OSDL. We will also try to determine the best sequence for relaying data, metadata, posting to servers, and other steps necessary to post on OSDL.