



PI RPB Data Team

Teleconference

April 10, 2017

Meeting outcomes:

1. The Data Team will work to develop a Big Earth Data Initiative grant proposal.
2. A method for seeking PI RPB approval for Data Team actions was developed and will be incorporated into the Work Plan Terms of Reference.
3. Work Plan will go to review by the PI RPB co-leads, then work will start on the tasks.
4. Next teleconferences will tentatively be in May and June, with an in-person meeting in July

Attendees: Bryan Dieter, Ash Evans, Joan Delos Santos, Gretchen Chiques, Arlene Guest, Guy Cochrane, Jim Potemra, Maria Kettermair, Miranda Foley, Nicole Griffin, Justine Nihipali, Rob O’Conner, Tom Murphree

Data Team Scoping Survey

The Data Team reviewed the scoping survey results. Several members responded; most manage data. The survey helped inform options related to data portal and mapping interface development.

Data portals: There are several data portals, and the public has access to more than half. There are data currently excluded. There are restrictions on who can view data via 1) hosting data in an internal database, 2) restricting access by user level, and 3) hosting the data on a separate server. Considerations for data portals include data updates, GIS data that is not yet discoverable, different data portals for different data types, and user constraints. While there are several data portals, not many have an associated interactive web-based map for viewing and accessing the data.

Mapping interfaces: There are very few mapping interfaces, and the public has access to less than half of them. Not all data on the data portals are included in the mapping interface. Many

portals have a geographic interface and search function, but will not allow the end user to produce a derivative map.

Connecting regionally: Data services are expected to evolve over the next few years. NOAA is potentially moving to open source, but that access depends on a NOAA enterprise license; NOAA is establishing a cloud-based storage system; and another organization is possibly moving to an independent platform. Only a few data portals could be connected to from a regional data portal; the same holds true linking a regional mapping interface to different portals. There is data and information that people want in a future regional mapping interface that is not currently in their data portal.

Some respondents saw utility in a regional data portal, but did not see utility in a regional mapping interface. We were cautioned that an all-encompassing data portal and mapping interface is too complex a goal. We were encouraged to go beyond the EEZ to make the tool more useful.

Teleconference Discussion:

There is probably a cross-section of data repositories and data portals included in the answers because a data portal was not defined in the survey. Another question might be what their portal looks like. Also, the focus might be better served being split into two products: 1) data and holding requirements (data portal), and 2) a mapping interface.

The Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) prototype portal uses ArcGIS for the mapping interface. That is the same host that NOAA GeoPlatform uses.

Regarding the usefulness of a data portal and mapping interface, some respondents do not have the same exposure to ocean planning as RPB members, which can make it difficult to see the value in a regional tool. Fine tuning our message can help with explaining the importance of the tool.

Regarding going beyond the EEZ, while we are a regional planning body that is a US body, the Data Team will come identify datasets that either cross the EEZ or are totally outside EEZ. These datasets should be included if they are available for public consumption instead of constraining ourselves to only US waters.

Data Team members were reminded to provide feedback on the NPS prototype so that we can identify exactly what we are looking for in our tool. We can improve the product so that it is useful within the bounds of funding and it could complement existing data portals.

Existing data portals in the regions and at agencies are usually great for specific information either at the jurisdictional or agency level. They rarely cross pollinate with both data, which is why developing a regional portal and mapping interface is so important.

The Data Team discussed the Big Earth Data Initiative (BEDI) grant that is due by April 25. The Data Team agreed that this could be a great funding opportunity for our effort. There is interest in getting data not currently available made accessible, so our effort probably matches well.

Action:

1. The PI RPB coordinator will work with Nicole and Bryan and others to develop and submit a grant proposal to BEDI.
2. The PI RPB coordinator will forward the RFP to the Data Team.

PI RPB News and Inputs

The 2017 PI RPB data goals are:

1. Mapping interface prototype developed that relies on and includes jurisdictional knowledge
2. Identify data gaps for American Samoa and include draft list in their ocean plan

PI RPB feedback/discussion about data at the February 2017 meeting:

- The PI RPB and Data Team must work together to identify the drivers necessitating a data tool
- Without stakeholder input, the portal could be rendered meaningless
- We must plan for continued updating of the data and metadata to maintain the utility of the mapping interface
- There is potential for PaclOOS's Voyager to be tailored to support portals in the jurisdictions and be relevant to ocean planning
- We should add a data portal to the PI RPB planning list for 2017 because it supports ocean planning in all areas, but would require additional funds
- Data portals exist in the jurisdictions, so we should consider scoping accessibility of the existing datasets on the portals
- There is value in a regional interface that allows for jurisdictional control of the datasets feeding into the interface
- Federal data may be easier to share due to the mandate to make data publicly available.
- Proprietary data issues need to be elucidated then vetted.
- Data sets and their quality will need to be verified at the jurisdictional level, with the author if possible
- Data agreements with the jurisdictions should be part of our planning efforts

PI RPB Recommendations:

- 1) We should rely on jurisdictional knowledge to build the mapping interface
- 2) We should continue the discussion between the Data Team and jurisdictions about available datasets at the next meeting

Ms. Nicole Griffin, the Data Team lead, reported out about progress:

- 1) Ms. Griffin met with PacIOOS. This data effort is in line with their mission, so we do not need to create any additional agreements. She received a tour of PacIOOS, GeoServer, and GeoMaps and discussed data acquisition and management. Our first step is data collection for specific layers to answer specific questions. After organizing our data and figuring out how to visualize it, we can assess decision support tools.
- 2) Ms. Griffin met with Pacific Disaster Center (PDC). They have several layers laid out by jurisdiction that are ones we would be interested in using. Their focus is disaster management. We could be mutually beneficial to each other because the ocean planning work provides context for PDC. For example, damage to shipping could be assessed if a hurricane hits. However, their portal is generally not accessible to the public; you need an EMOPs account. They also do not support commercial endeavors and cannot have a commercial benefit. We would need to draft a mission statement about our efforts regarding coastal and marine spatial planning if we choose to ask them to support us.
- 3) Ms. Griffin discussed with a consultant how data could be displayed. For example, ensuring that the mapping interface displays relevant cultural data like Kaena Point.
- 4) Ms. Griffin approached Naval Postgraduate School to advocate for additional funding through this coming year. She is headed to California next week to make the pitch at the Naval Research Working Group.

It was clarified that the PDC data portal has some static and some real time data. The emphasis is on real time, but some static data is needed to provide forecasting capabilities and to show historical data. It also includes data such as hospital and power plant locations.

Data Team Work Plan

The Data Team reviewed the substantive edits provided on the Work Plan, such as the draft Terms of Reference.

The Data Team agreed on:

1. Going one step at a time. First get work plan approval from the PI RPB, then start assigning names to actions.
2. Method for PI RPB approval of the work plan: Co-lead review and approval, follow up with PI RPB member review if the co-leads want to solicit member feedback, and use the strategy that no response is concurrence. The Data Team will respond to feedback that arises.

End-User Discussion

We clarified that the end users, or stakeholders in this sense, are project proposers, proponents, and opponents, as well as agency reviewers. It includes agencies at the federal and jurisdictional levels, plus users of the water – cultural, aircraft, vessels, etc.

Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement should happen at the sub-regional level as they write their sub-plans. It is at this level that input can be provided regarding the mapping interface's data layers, including cultural aspects.

While we will be able to get feedback from American Samoa and the Marianas during their ocean plan development in 2017, the Data Team should discuss how they might go about engaging Hawaii. For example, the PI RPB coordinator could take the product to the Ocean Resource Management Plan team and DMWR to solicit feedback. We could also talk to the people responsible for the Hawaii Ocean Uses Atlas development for advice about how best to engage Hawaii stakeholders (Mimi D'Iorio at NOAA).

The Data Team discussed that there should be a common statement, like an elevator speech, to take to funders and others who ask what we are doing and why (regional approach to a data portal and mapping interface). It would provide an agreed-upon set of answers to specific questions. This statement can be added to the work plan upfront.

Regarding the Terms of References, the Data Team recommended adding the PI RPB approval process.

A suggestion was to start developing a list of all data layers available on Mid Atlantic and New England mapping interfaces and cross reference with where we have that data, if we have it. We could also start doing a compilation of available portals and mapping interfaces. The agreement was to hold off to provide more time for the Data Team lead to communicate with PDC and PacIOOS, as well as for us to seek PI RPB co-lead approval for the work plan.

Agreement: the Data Team should build the mapping interface and data portal first, then seek input on the product. It's easier to seek product review when there is something to look at because it ceases being an abstract thought. Stakeholder input can be done via formal survey to get uniformed responses.

Actions:

3. Incorporate into the work plan the development of a survey to assess the end product, as well as engaging the public in person as part of stakeholder engagement at the jurisdictional level.
4. Add to the opening of the work plan a statement of what we are doing and why with some answers to specific questions about our work.
5. Add the PI RPB approval model to the work plan TOR.
6. Seek Work Plan approval from the PI RPB.

Next Steps

- We should have at least one more teleconference prior to a 2-day in-person meeting (suggestion: have one in May and one in June, then in-person in July)
- Esri conference in California in July is a potential venue for a bigger meeting if enough Data Team members are attending
- Hawaii Conservation Alliance in Honolulu in July is another option, and several people are available around those dates for an in-person meeting