Metadata Workgroup Conference Call Meeting, June 5, 2014

Attendees:
Bob DenOuden (GEO) Tanya Haddad (DLCD), Rachel Smith (DOGAMI) Malavika Bishop (DEQ), David Pray (DEQ), Don Pettit (DEQ), Daniel Stoelb (OEM)

A=action items:

Bob opened up a discussion on the initial draft of the revised Oregon metadata standard document. That document was created by editing out much of the existing *Introduction to the Oregon Metadata Standard* document which served originally to open discussion on the standard, and was adopted as the standard by OGIC, but never moved forward to implementation. Rachel noted that the tone of the writing in the document is too conversational and it was agreed that it needs to be written to better match other standards documents. It was also mentioned that the Cartographic Best Practices document might serve as a good example for writing style.

We then discussed adding an opening paragraph to clarify the intent of the document and define what the metadata standard will cover; all data produced and published by state agencies? Framework data only? A starting point for the scope of the metadata standard was suggested as: "All GIS data created and maintained by state agencies or contracted for by state agencies".

Don Pettit noted that some data in the Preparedness FIT data catalog, and elsewhere in the OSDL, will not meet the metadata standard initially. The point was made that even if a particular element is unknown in a dataset, setting the value of that element in the metadata to "unknown" actually *does* provide valuable information to the potential user.

Because the current draft contains so many edits already, it was suggested that a version (call it 1.0) be created and a copy, to be called version 1.01, made with current edits accepted. This was done by Bob DenOuden. Some additional suggestions were made to lift the tone of the document, make consistent reference to metadata as plural, and remove the "metadata about metadata" phrase in favor of "information about metadata".

We then discussed some potential missing elements from the standard. One of these is the inclusion of a disclaimer. DAS has a standard disclaimer that was suggested as a minimum element unless agencies or data purposes require different text. It was noted that the disclaimer is separate and different from access and se constraints, which are already mandatory elements. Disclaimer belongs in the Distribution Information section (Section 6) of the FGDC CSDGM model under Distribution Liability (element 6.3).

We had a discussion regarding the inclusion of the table describing all of the sections of the FGDC CSDGM, as well as the mandatory vs optional descriptions, without the inclusion of all of the detail of the complete CSDGM structure – some found it confusing. BobD suggested adding the complete CSDGM description, in the form of a table provided by DOGAMI, as an appendix to the document.

We then moved onto the topic of what elements might be added when someone noted that the spatial reference system elements are omitted from the present standard (section 4 in CSDGM). It was determined that BobD would send out the complete metadata elements list (this was done) and the workgroup would review this list for additional items to recommend including. BobD set up a doodle

poll to select a date for this review. With vacations and the ESRI UC, the next meeting will likely be in mid to late July.