

**MDIP Project Board Meeting  
01/03/2006 CEFAS, Lowestoft.**

Peter Liss (Chair)	IACMST
Dave Cotton	MDIP Programme Manager
Garry Dawson	UKHO
Jon Parr	MBA
Paul Eastwood	CEFAS
Mark Charlesworth	MEDAG
Beth Greenaway	DEFRA
Trevor Guymer	IACMST
Jon Turton	Met Office
Kevin O'Carroll	DTI
Juan Brown	BODC
Lesley Rickards	MEDAG
Robert Gatliff	BGS
George Slesser	FRS

**Apologies**

Kieran Millard	HR Wallingford
Michael Rose	EA
Rachel Anning	EA
Paul Leonard	DEFRA
Bill Turrell	FRS
John Portman	GOOSAG
Claire Brown	ABPmer
Mike Cowling	The Crown Estate
Mike Osborne	SeaZone
Steve Wilkinson	JNCC
Mike Reed	MOD
Rob Spillard	MCA

1. Welcome and Apologies

The chair welcomed the attendees and the delegates approved the minutes of the last MDIP Project Board.

2. MDIP Working Groups.

DC gave a presentation on the progress of the working groups. The presentation outlined the outcome of a meeting between DC and the chairs of the working groups (LR, KM, MO). This meeting has drawn up proposals on the revised Terms of Reference, membership and modus operandi of the Working Groups. The remit of the DAC WG is to remain as was except to include recommending and documenting collection standards. The Standards WG will focus on interoperability standards only. The remit of the Mapping and Applications WG will be broadened to include requirements to support application requiring integration of data from different sources. It was

proposed that a new group on 'Data Policy and Licensing WG' should be initiated.

BG expressed concern on which WG the collection standards would be completed. It was queried whether the documentation of data collection standards lay within the scope of MDIP but BG and KO'C felt that MDIP/MEDAG should be specifying standards for the collection of data otherwise it would difficult to use data coming from DACs for holistic assessments. JB suggested that the DACs who are the experts in their themes should be completing this task. Therefore MDIP will not produce standards for the collection of data but each DAC will review the standards currently available for their specific theme and specify which standards are suitable. The DACs will work closely with the proposed Protocols group of MARG and if standards are not available this will be highlighted. JT suggested that physical oceanography standards could be obtained from GOOSAG.

**AP.** DACs will review existing standards for their area of expertise and include in WG report for next meeting.

DC suggested there was a need to break down the problems and tasks of MDIP and try to manage them individually in order to make progress. DC proposed a staged cyclical progression building on the success of the each task allowing focus to be applied on specific tasks. Focus would initially concentrate on DACs, which would then be built on by Interoperability Standards, and Mapping and Applications. The Project Team Meetings will in future concentrate on each of these themes in turn.

K O'C queried whether there was real need for a new group on Data Policy and Licensing as it is clear from a DTI view what the licensing policy was. DC suggested that the licensing policy of other organisation beyond DTI needed some research and that the group would have a small membership (2-3 people) and be focused.

PL expressed concern on the WG deliverables particularly updates from WGs that were requested from the last meeting had not been actioned. Concern was expressed throughout the whole group that 2 of the 3 chairs of the WGs were not present at this meeting, that little progress had been made (or at least that, in the absence of progress summaries submitted by the working groups, there was no documented evidence of any such progress). It was acknowledged that the chairs may have found difficulty in allocating time and resources to carry out the work. However, it was agreed that all of the WGs must act as groups, with active active participation from the working group members, so that they could progress together to an agreed outcome. Regular meetings and discussions should take place and the chairs must ensure that they are able to commit the necessary resources to carry out the activities.

**AP.** WGs must provide a report of progress and activity to date within 1 month (min 1 page). Also WG should produce a document specifying the revised WG

remits, memberships and work plans for the next year to be circulated as supporting documentation before the next MDIP Project Team.

LR stated that she has a 1 page update on progress made by the DAC WG but had not had time to circulate before the meeting.

**AP** LR to circulate current DAC WG update after meeting.

*Data Archiving Centres Working Group (DAC WG)*. LR gave a presentation on progress made by the DAC WG. This included tasks that DACs had been set and progress made. The document defining MDIP DAC requirements will be finalised in a month. There was some discussion of whether DACs which have a trading fund model may have a conflict of interest with some MDIP principles which has implications to how DACs are approved. The benefits and disadvantages of more than 1 DAC for a data theme was discussed. The proposed work plan for DACs and current membership was approved by the PTM.

*Interoperability Standards Working Group (IS WG)*. DC presented slides on the IS WG recommending that the group should compile an overview of relevant issues in a non-expert language, and a summary of current metadata and interoperability standards for initial MDIP DACs in time for circulation before the next Project Meeting in June. Interoperability Standards will be the main agenda at this meeting. Deliverable and actions for this group include:

- Aim to develop interoperability in a system which can work with different rates of progress for different data sets and DACs.
- Identify requirements to move towards common metadata standards, making best use of relevant initiatives towards interoperability, and consistent with wider initiatives (INSPIRE, DNF, etc).
- With MDIP DACs agree route towards inter DAC discovery data searching with eventual aim of achieving fully functional interoperability

It was suggested that the membership of this group be widened to include stakeholders (e.g. DEFRA, DTI, MOD, MCA) and co-opt with DAC reps as necessary. KM to carry on as chair up to annual review.

**AP**. BG to provide name of somebody from DEFRA who works in SPIRE to join Interoperability Standards WG.

**AP**. KM to convene meeting of Interoperability Standards WG to progress issues.

*Mapping and Applications WG*. It was agreed that this WG should change from just mapping to mapping and applications (MA WG). This group should ensure that the needs of the users are adhered to and can also be used to test how easy and useful it is to get data out of DACs. KOC expressed concern that to adhere to the needs of all users is a large task. General feeling is that at this stage MDIP resources should be concentrated on getting data into DACs and available for the wider community rather than adding value. Some concern was expressed that MDIP cannot define a product for an unspecified external user. Need to show that there is an output though and

this could be done by using examples, perhaps one free ( or “public good”) application and one commercial.

Concern was expressed that the community would not accept a situation whereby all marine data products were only accessible through a single commercially operated portal. Thus the Mapping and Applications Group should consider a range of solutions available.

PE suggested that to progress MDIP a list of primary source datasets could be compiled and the Mapping and Applications Group could take this forward. A range of options should be proposed, which are not tied to any specific delivery mechanism. Agreement that this group should identify the information that is available and the quality and cost from which a user can then decide if it is relevant.

General agreement that the deliverables for the WG should be to

- Recommend options for a base reference data set, which is consistent with equivalents on land.
- Guidance on how data types and features should be portrayed.
- How to deal with duplications in key data sets.
- Keep track of and inform MDIP of progress in marine spatial infrastructure initiatives.

It was highlighted by the group that that options should exist for information delivery, the group must be taken forward in a balanced view, and that a meeting of the WG should be convened as soon as possible.

The membership was discussed and the importance of having more users represented on the board and less representation from commercial companies was agreed.

**AP** MO. Membership of Mapping and Applications WG should be widened to include the 3 nominees suggested on slide + A.N.Other from NGOs eg Marine Conservation Society, Wind farm Rep, or a representative from JNCC Irish Sea Pilot. Convene WG meeting as soon as possible.

*Data Policy and Licensing Working Group (DPL WG).* DC suggested the formation of this new group. JB suggested that this may not be a large issue for some DACs such as BODC. KOC suggested looking at the original paper by Mike Cowling which discusses this topic. BG stated that as data will be available from the organisations and DACs then the organisation needs to adhere to standard licences. General feeling that that a WG was not needed but a couple of people to sit down and converse with other interested parties such as the pan- government agreement and INSPIRE. It was agreed that a report of the licence agreements for data supply from each DACs should be compiled

**AP.** DAC WG to gather the data policy statements and any licencing agreements of each DAC and include in progress updates

**AP** All to consider who is the best person from each organisation to provide active technical input to working groups. (and resource them so that they can make an active contribution).

### 3. Establishment plan for MDIP DACs

This agenda item was covered under agenda item 2.

### 4. MDIP Web Site, Logo

MC presented an update on development of the MDIP website which had been a joint exercise with CEFAS. A template had been constructed and content gathered. Some redesign will be required to take into account new logos. It is anticipated that the MDIP website will go live in April and in the interim a dedicated page will be constructed before Oceanology. It was highlighted that the success of the website will depend on contributions from the MDIP members.

BG asked about e-mail contact on flyers and website.

**AP.** DC/LJR to check the correct MDIP e-mail address is used.

DC presented some logo designs that had been put forward. Some opinions on the suitability of logos followed and agreement that to spell out the name in the logo in full rather than MDIP is preferable. There was general agreement that a logo should be chosen to be included in leaflets for Oceanology.

### 5. Communications

Communications of MDIP will be completed in cooperation with the MEDAG team. Planned activities include presentations at Oceanology, articles in CoastNews and UK Marine Scientist, MED Forum, Website development.

Any publications which imply MDIP approval or compliance of activities, data bases, etc should be first checked with DC. Anything potentially contentious will be referred to the next meeting of the MDIP Core Project Team.

**AP** ALL. Send any publications that refer to MDIP to DC for approval prior to publication.

### 6. Joint MDIP/MEDAG Forum

A joint MED Forum is planned for 19<sup>th</sup> June. This will be attended by invited delegates, although other interested parties would be welcome to attend. It will consist of relevant talks followed by discussions in the afternoon on the 19<sup>th</sup>. This will be followed on the 20<sup>th</sup> by a usual format MEDAG/MDIP meeting.

**AP.** MEDAG/MDIP staff to progress organisation of MED forum

## 7. Data Categories

This follows from the original work carried by BG in the form of a spreadsheet. General agreement that this is a good method of tracking progress of MDIP. Some initial work is required to define the data themes (ie rows) in line with other initiatives.

**AP.** DC to publish latest version of spreadsheet and send round with minutes of the meeting and publish on website. ALL to review and send DC proposed amendments. The intention is to make the summary publicly available.

## 8. Any other business

TG outlined the outcome of the IACMST MEDAG review and the implications that it had for the operation of MDIP. At the IACMST plenary the chairman of IACMST suggested that sponsors board should be removed and that MDIP and MEDAG should reported directly to IACMST plenary. KOC suggested that that would not be satisfactory as the sponsors on MDIP are not the same as on IACMST plenary. BG expressed concern of getting high level buy in and sign off of major issues. There was concern that this proposed arrangement is not satisfactory and would be discussed at next IACMST plenary and that any proposals for changes in structure discussed at IACMST should be circulated within a time frame that allows organisations to discuss the proposals in full. It was generally agreed that a sponsor's board could be convened on an *ad-hoc* basis by e-mail or by a meeting chaired by HD when significant issues are to be signed off.

DC stated that he is keeping an overview of finances and would the group like to be updated on them? GD suggested that a summary could be attached to the minutes of the meeting.

**Date of next meeting – 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> June.**

Chair thanked all for attending.

Venue to be confirmed

### **Related Documents.**

- 1) DAC WG Activities Summary (LJR) – March 2006
- 2) Interoperability Standards Review Working Group Discussion Paper (KM) – March 2006
- 3) Working Groups Review Note (DC) – March 2006
- 4) Financial Summary (DC) – March 2006
- 5) MDIP Marine Data Status Report + notes, V1 – March 2006.

## **Actions**

**A1.** DACs will review existing standards for their area of expertise and include in WG report for next meeting.

**A2.** WGs must provide a report of progress and activity to date within 1 month (min 1 page). Also WG should produce a document specifying the revised WG remit, memberships and work plans for the next year to be circulated as supporting documentation before the next MDIP Project Team.

**A3** LR to circulate current DAC WG update after meeting.

**A4** BG to provide name of somebody from DEFRA who works in SPIRE to join Interoperability Standards WG.

**A5** KM to convene meeting of Interoperability Standards WG to progress issues.

**A6** MO. Membership of Mapping and Applications WG should be widened to include the 3 nominees suggested on slide + A.N.Other from NGOs eg Marine Conservation Society, Wind farm Rep, or a representative from JNCC Irish Sea Pilot. Convene WG meeting as soon as possible.

**A7** DAC WG to gather the data policy statements and any licencing agreements of each DAC and include in progress updates

**A8** All to consider who is the best person from each organisation to provide active technical input to working groups. (and resource them so that they can make an active contribution).

**A9** DC/LJR to check the correct MDIP e-mail address is used.

**A10** ALL. Send any publications that refer to MDIP to DC for approval prior to publication.

**A11** MEDAG/MDIP staff to progress organisation of MED forum

**A12** DC to publish latest version of spreadsheet and send round with minutes of the meeting and publish on website. ALL to review and send DC proposed amendments. The intention is to make a summary publicly available.