



## PI RPB Data Team Teleconference Summary

---

Thursday, December 15, 2016

1:00 – 4:00 PM HST

### 1. Welcome and roll call

Arlene Guest, Bryan Dieter, Edwin Reyes, Guy Cochrane, Jim Potemra, Joan Delos Santos, Justine Nihipali, Maria Kottermair, Nicole Griffin, Becky Walker, Rob O’Conner, Tom Murphree, Tony Ingersoll, Jess Rojas, and Roque Rosario

### 2. Old Business

Membership: *Gordon Tribble of USGS has passed the reigns onto Guy Cochrane. Tom Miewald (FWS) has asked Matt Brown to find a local replacement.*

### 3. New Business

#### a. Develop the Data Team Goal

**Original:** *The goals of the data team are to gather and assess relevant data, identify an adequate data host site and mapping interface, and identify/develop decision support tools that further coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP) in the Pacific Islands Region.*

**Edited and accepted:** *The goals of the data team are to gather and assess relevant data, identify an adequate data host site and mapping interface, and work toward identifying/developing decision support tools that further coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP) in the Pacific Islands Region.*

“Work toward” was added to reflect that the Data Team may not develop a decision support tool (DST) due to limited resources. Identifying a data host site and service will enable development of tools if resources become available.

#### Discussion:

Other points of discussion were that real time data will pose a challenge. This concern came up during the previous meeting as well. The Data Team will need to figure out the necessity of real time data versus summary data and make recommendations to the PI RPB.

A tier structure might be useful when setting up our data service and viewer in which tier 1 is location (instrument in the water, track line for a camera), tier 2 is raw data collected at a location, and tiers 3 and 4 are summary level products for a site, island, or region.

#### **b. Tasks and Data Team roles for the Goal(s)**

Ms. Pautzke described how the tasks were determined in the Work Plan. The question put to the Data Team was whether the tasks in the plan fed well into the agreed-upon goal of the Data Team.

#### Decisions / Actions:

- 1) Inventory data sets for the jurisdictions.
- 2) Inventory data portals and assess their relevance to CMSP.
- 3) Have end users (stakeholders) identify what data they would like to display instead of the Data Team members. Suggestions should be offered to kick-start conversations with end users.
  - a. The PIRPB would be tasked with the stakeholder engagement, not the Data Team.
- 4) The Data Team should be more open and less focused, instead of having the specificity of the NPS.
- 5) Ms. Pautzke will email a revised Work Plan by the end of February 2017.

#### Edited Tasks:

*Task 1: Identify and include additional datasets, and identify and assess data portals in the prototype data portal (PDP)*

- Under this task, the Data Team would create a data catalog from an inventory of data sets from the jurisdictions, inventory data portals, then identify data gaps (task 4).

*Task 2: Create additional interactive maps based on RPB needs and direction*

*Task 3: Address issues that are brought to the data team. Be responsive.*

- EX: NPS's question about data standards
- This task includes improving the usability of NPS's prototype data portal; recommending the appropriate data format; determining if there are better ways to organize, access, analyze, and/or display the data; looking at other data portals, such as MARCO and NROC's data portals, as examples; and identifying priority functionalities of interfaces.
- **Prototype Data Portal Recommendations:**
  - 1) Separate buttons for data sets that allow users to preview data, preview metadata, and download.
  - 2) Data should be divided by region and categorized.
  - 3) Add a search function to PDP

*Task 4: Identify and fill in additional dataset gaps*

- The Data Team will, after completing task 1, recommend a platform then identify additional data sets to include. This will also help identify data gaps.

#### Discussion:

The Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) project should feed well into the portal(s) that are agreed upon by the Data Team members. It is intended to be a prototype for the RPB to consider for use, using part of, or rejecting. Ms. Guest described the NPS data portal. The data portal includes a first level for data

where an end user wants a shape file, data layer, etc. that can be downloaded and integrated with their own mapping program. A second level for data is for end users who only have a web interface.

The Data Team discussed the necessity of having interactive maps if the goal is a mapping interface.

The MARCO data portal (<http://portal.midatlanticocean.org>) and mapping interface (<http://portal.midatlanticocean.org/visualize/#x=-73.24&y=38.93&z=7&logo=true&controls=true&basemap=Ocean&tab=data&legends=false&layers=true>) was shared with team members. It was agreed that while we can download our data as data sets in the Pacific Islands, we do not have an interface like the Marine Planner of MARCO. PacIOOS Voyager is close, but is based on open-source software, while MARCO appears to be built using ESRI. PacIOOS is funded through NOAA and is required to avoid proprietary formats whenever possible.

Recommendations were received by email from NOAA Coastal Services Center about data portals:

- Instead of the Data Team developing its own portal, each jurisdiction should house a marine planning data category/portal under their current geospatial infrastructure
- The Data Team should support data identification needs and the design of a web viewer to suit each jurisdiction's needs

One primary reason to have each jurisdiction house their own spatial data is because it will be included as part of their regular infrastructure maintenance.

### **c. Data Team Work Plan**

The above tasks will be incorporated into an edited Work Plan that will be distributed for review by Ms. Pautzke.

A one page summary of the Data Team that includes a list of members on the back will be emailed to Data Team members for review. This document can then be used to share with people inquiring about the Data Team.

### Decisions / Actions:

- 1) Draft a Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Data Team that describes who people are, who is supposed to do what, the existence of the team in perpetuity, how members can be added, etc.
- 2) The TOR should then be referenced in the Work Plan.

### **d. Data Team Scoping Survey**

A scoping survey can help answer some questions before beginning work on tasks in the Work Plan. The Data Team was asked what questions should be asked of the Data Team members to save time moving forward. The following draft questions were agreed upon:

- 1) *Do you already have a data portal in your jurisdiction? If yes, can we connect a mapping interface to it? And, are there any considerations we should know, like licensing, data updates, hosting, proprietary issues, etc? Do you see relevance in a REGIONAL data portal?*
- 2) *How easy is it to add data to your existing portal?*
- 3) *What can you do on your end to push a data portal to the mapping interface? Do you have capacity or does the RPB need to help?*

- 4) *Is a regional data portal and/or mapping interface something you'd use? How different is this concept from what you'll be using in 3 years? For example, might your efforts move to an online ARC GIS viewer?*
- 5) *If there is information or data we want on the interface that is not already on your portal, do we push that data through the portal to the mapping interface or directly host it on the mapping interface?*
- 6) *Given your input thus far, does the work plan seem reasonable? Are there tasks that should be added or removed?*

#### Feedback

- Respondents should identify their role to mitigate mis-information (e.g. would you use a data portal? Not necessarily if you're a data provider.)
- Survey Monkey is fine
- #5 should be wordsmithed – it is confusing because it is unclear the frequency with which data would be on an interface but not on a data portal

#### **4. Naval Postgraduate School Data Portal**

In the Work Plan, Appendix B discusses a data standard that was borrowed from PacIOOS. Generally, the Data Team members agreed with the standard.

#### Discussion

- Metadata: Metadata is needed and data providers must provide their own metadata. However, the team agreed that if data is provided without metadata, it would not be excluded because it's more important to have the data.
- QA/QC: Added to PacIOOS because the national IOOS office requires it. Recommendation was to remove the language about QA/QC because the requirement can be onerous and the data may be valuable regardless of QA/QC.

#### **5. Other Topics**

A NOAA team is seeking input about what data needs the regions have, as well as what projects will be acquiring data so that those who need data can be connected to those getting data, and those getting data may be connected to other projects who might be acquiring similar data. These two pieces of information will then be fed into the SeaSketch project at [fedmap.seasketch.org](http://fedmap.seasketch.org). Ashley Chappell of NOAA is the lead.

AS EPA and AS DOC are co-leads on a DOI-funded project that runs through September 2017. Current data are not easily accessible or easy to use, so the goal is an open data platform for different environmental GIS data, permits, etc. The portal includes coastal use data layers. The data will be useful for ocean planning as well. Mostly local government agencies have agreed to participate and contribute data, including Public Works, AS Power Authority, DMWR, Department of Agriculture, and Historic Preservation Society.

In Guam, the Application Review Committee is creating a database to show past and future projects. It will link to the permit reviewers. Hawaii is doing something similar, but it is mostly land based.

## **6. Wrap up**

Ms. Pautzke will send out the edited work plan and one pager that includes a list of DT participants. She will also draft a Roles Document.

The Data Team agreed on its goal and that Data Standards will be the same as PacIOOS's standards without the QA/QC language.

The next Data Team meeting is proposed for the week of March 20<sup>th</sup>.