

Proposed Metadata Strategy

- “What information is needed about a **[piece of]** data set to assess its appropriateness for a browser’s potential use**[r’s purposes]**?”
- New classification scheme is based on organizing by discipline groups, not data types.

Data Types vs. Disciplines

- Data segregated by “Data Types” - examples

Water Chemical	Sediment	Meteorological
Biological	Soil	Lithology
Taxonomic	Air	Hydrology
Physical	Spatial Info	QC
Microbiological	Temporal Info	Other?

- Data segregated by Disciplines - examples
 - Laboratory Sample Analysis
 - Field Grab Sampling
 - Aerial **[imagery]** -based Remote Sensing
 - Satellite-based Remote Sensing
 - Acoustical (e.g. side scan sonar)
 - Locational – mapping, GIS etc.
 - Etc.

Proposed Metadata Strategy

- Works at two levels
 - Level One - single set of common metadata elements appropriate for all discipline groups (i.e., who/where/what/when data elements)
 - Level Two - separate sets of metadata elements that are discipline-specific **[and that provide the ability to assess data suitability]**

Current Approach - Recap

- Contractor's tasking:
 1. Research universe of existing metadata standards at all levels – state, local ,federal, international.
 2. Survey existing metadata use in Florida.
 3. Analyze results – compare metadata element usage to the metadata standards for each water resource data type.
 4. Write report containing options for comprehensive metadata standards for each water resource data type. **[was this part of SOW??]**

Proposed Approach

- Level one – identify common metadata set
- Level two -
 1. Identify discipline groups.
 2. Each group identifies its minimum metadata set to answer the use assessment questions.
 3. Minimum sets become **candidate** standards for the groups.

Result = sets of candidate metadata standards by discipline, plus a common set

Proposed Approach

- Other tasking:
 1. Research existing metadata standards at all levels (local, state, federal, international)
 2. Examine how our candidate standards match up
 3. Survey the monitoring and research community in Florida for metadata use and for use of standards
 4. Analyze existing use vs. our candidate standards
 5. Adjust candidate standards if needed

Who does what in the proposed tasking?

1. Identify discipline groups – FWRMC is proposed.
2. Research existing metadata standards at all levels (local, state, federal, international)
 - Contractor? Discipline groups?
3. Examine how our candidate standards match up
 - Needs to be automated – contractor?

4. Survey the monitoring and research community in Florida for metadata use and for use of standards
 - Contractor – design of survey tool is critical
5. Analyze existing use vs. our candidate standards
 - Contractor
6. Adjust candidate standards if needed
 - FWRMC

Advantages of Proposed Approach

- Better division of labor – discipline groups propose candidate standards as subject-matter experts before the survey.
- Contractor's role – not discipline-specific, more expertise in IT (survey design & implementation)
- Council's role is to ensure goals are met by identifying all project requirements and processes.

Don't Forget To Mention!

Progress past this point with metadata work depends on Oceans Council funding being released...

Group Discussion

- Include:
 - Role of Expert Panel – steering function for discipline groups?
 - Suggest two levels of discussion
 1. High level – today – general
 2. Detail level – when Oceans \$\$ is released