Metadata Workgroup Meeting, DEQ Portland, April 29, 2014

Attendees:
Bob DenOuden (GEO) Tanya Haddad (DLCD), Rachel Smith (DOGAMI) Malavika Bishop (DEQ), David Pray (DEQ), Chris Rollette(?) (DEQ), Steve Aalbers (DEQ)
By Phone: Eric Brandt (LCOG), Daniel Stoelb (OEM), Josh Tanner (GEO)

A=action items:

Bob reviewed reason for reconvening the metadata workgroup. In the past the workgroup began efforts to prepare for possible adoption of ISO 191* as metadata standard for Oregon. This effort sprung from some outreach events on ISO 191* which occurred around the state. The current effort is less ambitious with an intent to clarify and reaffirm the current Oregon metadata standard based on FGDC's Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata (CSDGM). The statewide metadata standard adoption by OGIC, which occurred very early on, is considered by some to be incomplete. The documentation for the standard is not clear nor helpful in implementing metadata. By removing the uncertainty and providing good examples and tools, the goal is to increase the quality and quantity of well-constructed and consistent metadata accompanying framework data (and other GIS data). It was proposed that we follow the process for a major amendment to a standard to move this action through to adoption by OGIC.

We discussed, as a component of the metadata standard and supporting information, if it would be possible to develop a single document, Excel or xml, for the keyword thesaurus in order to assist users in compiling keywords as part of their metadata. **A**-Bob DenOuden took this as an action item.

One bit of metadata guidance we discussed is to recommend the inclusion of more place name tags, including "Oregon" in order to make searching for Oregon data outside of local data catalogs easier. This led to a discussion of best practices in creating titles for datasets and documents, including places and date keywords to make things easier to find and interpret.

A-It was decided that each of the metadata workgroup meeting participants will send a list of metadata creation and editing tools that they use to Bob DenOuden.

We then discussed the current state of the Oregon metadata standard, as articulated in the GEO document; *Opportunity to Comment on Oregon Metadata Standard*. It is clear that this document does not serve well as a standard since it is difficult to ascertain exactly what the standard says and what the minimal data elements of the standard are without a very careful reading of the document. It appears to be a draft concept and not a finished standard. Rachel Smith mentioned that DOGAMI has a table that lists the minimum elements and will supply that to the effort for inclusion in an edited draft standard. **A**-Bob DenOuden will find an editable version of the "standard" and, along with Tanya, begin the process of editing it with the week of May 19th set as a target for release of an updated version to the workgroup.

Some basic topics of discussion on the standard: what is the intent of it, what data does it cover – framework only or all data? In general, it seemed to be agreed that the metadata standard applies to framework data but should also be considered as a recommended practice for all geospatial data that is produced and shared by state agencies.

Along with the updated document, there is a need for some good examples of metadata that meet the standard. There is also need for a list of recommended tools for metadata creation and editing as well as templates for metadata that meet the standard.

The workgroup will reconvene and discuss the edited standard after it is released for review later in May.