



## MDIP WG Chairs Meeting – Draft Minutes

Friday 9<sup>th</sup> Feb , 09:30-12:30 Seaton Room, IMAREST, London EC2R,

### Attending

Peter Liss (IACMST), Beth Greenaway (DEFRA), David Cotton (MDIP), Jon Parr (MBA), Keiran Millard (HRW), Mike Osborne (Seazone), Paul Eastwood (CEFAS)  
Apologies: Lesley Rickards (MEDAG), Steve Wilkinson (JNCC)

### MINUTES

#### 1. Last meetings minutes and actions

The minutes for the last meeting were accepted. All actions completed, or picked up through later agenda items, except the following (renumbered):

*Action A1 SW:* Email SNH to discuss representation in MDIP.

*Action A2 DC:* To plan an article in next (March) issue of Marine Data News on launch of Marine Bill white Paper

*Action A3 DC:* To plan for an event in October/November to publicise MDIP Recommendations for Implementation of a UK Framework for Marine Data and Information”.

*Action A4 K O’C, SW, DC:* To review the DAC responses to the DAC requirements paper (by end March ‘07).

*Action A5 LR, JP:* To liaise with DC, BG regarding access to lists of monitoring data to be generated by UKMMAS tier 3 evidence groups.

*Action A6 ALL* To send DC commonly asked questions, for DC to start a list of “FAQs” on the MDIP web-site explaining the function of DACs within the MDIP framework.

*Action A78 KM, DC:* Once a satisfactory, accepted and stable (Marine) Discovery metadata format is achieved, to consider how to promote the wide application of this standard.

*Action A8 MO, PE:* Propose a set of actions to address the problems in accessing and using marine data. This could identify actions that each individual MDIP partner could commit to addressing within their own organisations.

#### 2. General Update

##### *MDIP Discovery Portal*

DC referred to his presentation of the 8<sup>th</sup> Feb (circulated with those minutes). Note also subsequent email discussions between DC, EDINA, KM and DACs, and Interoperability WG summary, circulated with these minutes.

*Action A9 DC/KM* To establish with DACs, NDG and EDINA current status with regard to availability of metadata records, harvesting process and portal development, and hence a timetable to producing a release version of the portal and signing off the EDINA contract.

*Action A10 DC, KM, JP/LR* To hold portal sign-off meeting with EDINA (late feb / early march)

*Action A11 DC:* Circulate URL of portal once it is operational.



## THE UK MARINE DATA AND INFORMATION PARTNERSHIP

DC has engaged some BODC (student) effort and Geodata to develop a web-enabled version of this document, which includes a traceable editing process.

### *MDIP Budget*

DC presented an outline budget. At present there is a projected £16,600 surplus within the current financial year. Note however that this does not take into account travel costs that will be incurred by DC from now to end March or the Geodata/BODC effort to produce the web document above.

### **3. Working Group Reviews**

#### *DACS Working Group*

JP referred to the presentation he made on the previous day, and to the 1 page summary of progress (*attached to these minutes*). He noted that he had been asked to look at the issues surrounding the management of video data by MEDAG.

The DAC accreditation process was discussed, and points from the previous day's meeting were reiterated, i.e. it is essential that the DAC accreditation process is transparent, objective and robust. It should be clearly identified what exactly the DACs are offering in return for their accreditation.

#### *Interoperability Working Group*

No progress summary was available, due to SW's illness and KM's unavailability.

The main effort has been concentrated on achieving a functional Pilot Metadata Discovery Portal.

There is a need to achieve a standardised "MDIP flavour" of UK Gemini, which should be compatible with a new version expected this year.

*Action A12KM:* To talk to AGI and establish process and plans towards implementation of new version of UK Gemini.

Also there was a wide ranging discussion about Metadata granularity:

The "granularity" of metadata records is inhomogeneous across the MDIP DACs, and even between different data sets within individual DACS. To be useful, the metadata records presented to a Discovery Portal need to allow discovery at the level which will satisfy user requests. There is a need to establish what is the current situation in the MDIP DACs, what is accepted best practice, what is the user need, and to agree with the DACs a route to a more coherent level of metadata granularity which will match users needs (e.g. as required to support a useful metadata discovery search capability. Recommendations on how to develop this capability should be included in the MDIP "Phase 1" report. It was generally agreed that users require to discover data at the 'capture' level. This is the level at which the environmental understanding had been abstracted. That is a data set the pointed to 'n' data sets of current meter measurements around the UK (data set collection) is not ok; where as a data set of 'mean current velocities around the UK' (single derived dataset) would be ok.

*Action A13 MO/PE:* To establish (with reference to the use cases) a user specification for the required level of metadata granularity.



## THE UK MARINE DATA AND INFORMATION PARTNERSHIP

*Action A14 KM:* To write a note on metadata granularity, referring to accepted best practice and any existing, developing standards.

*Action A15 JP/LR:* To ask DACs for a description of the current level(s) of granularity in their data holdings, together with information on any plans to improve these.

Plus a need to address issues highlighted at the MDIP Open meeting on the previous day:

*Action A16 Interoperability WG:* In consultation with relevant experts establish metadata schema and to publish on the MDIP website.

MO noted the potential value in making available a tool to support the generation of metadata records.

### *Mapping and Applications Working Group*

MO and PE provided a summary WG progress report. With regard to the use cases the following points were noted:

- The cost and efforts incurred in sourcing and accessing data, and potentially saved were MDIP resources available, should be requested / estimated.
- Is it worth continuing to engage with Use Cases after the MDIP recommendations have been agreed?
- Use Case assessment should identify Policy Driver

### *Communications*

First issue of Marine Data News has been published (see <http://newsweaver.co.uk/coastmapnews> )

*Action A17 DC:* DM to be invited to attend future MDIP co-chairs meetings.

*Action A18 KM:* Marine Data News article on “MDIP portal as Turing test”.

A joint MEDAG MDIP leaflet has been designed. DC was tasked to increase MDIP profile on front page of MEDAG / MDIP leaflet, which he has done.

### MDIP website

A number of points:

- Need a better signposting of “MDIP standards” on the front page.
- Put MAWG documents on the website (Base reference data set and additional reference data tables).
- Need a statement on MDIP metadata recommendations on MDIP website.
- There is a strong case for a redesign of MDIP web pages, so that they look less like a project web page and provide easier access to a number of key resources.

*Action A19 DC:* To put recent documents on Website (WG reports, minutes, leaflet pdf)

*Action A20 KM Early requirement:* To write a short statement to go on MDIP website about MDIP metadata activities – What are aims and plans? When will a standard be available? What are current recommendations?

*Action A21 DC/KM:* To consider redesign of MDIP website, so it is more user friendly.



### 4. Generating the MDIP “Phase 1” final Report

DC’s outline was discussed. It was generally agreed that this first draft format was too “scientific”, and that the report should be presented more in the form of a business case. It should include a 1 page executive summary at the beginning, and be 20 pages maximum.

A suggested revised format (thanks to MO!):

1. Executive Summary – Recommendations
2. Introduction – What this document achieves – The vision
3. The Problem - Where are we now? – Relate to initial MDIP report (2005)
4. Key Policy Drivers
5. The Solution – UK Framework for Marine Data and Information
  - a. DACs
  - b. Metadata (levels and provision by DACS)
  - c. Priority Data Layers
  - d. Bringing in New Data
6. Relation to Marine Bill /MMO
7. Funding, management, monitoring, delivering
8. Technical Appendices

Also it was noted that:

- Report needs to contain diagrams , including data flow diagrams
- Report should clearly spell out required commitments from MDIP partners – this should be a more tightly specified and higher level commitment than for Phase 1.

*Action A22 ALL* To comment on MDIP “Phase 1” report outline format, (by end Feb)

It was proposed that we should work towards generating the Executive Summary first (structured to match the full report), with a first draft ready in mid-May – according to the timetabled MDIP events listed later.

### 5. Data Policy

DC’s strawman set of “Data Clauses” to be included in govt contracts had been passed to DTI as they wished to include something along these lines in contracts they were issuing (23<sup>rd</sup> Feb) for data gathering exercise in the N Sea.

*Action A23 ALL* To review DC’s data policy strawman (updated since 09/02 to include DTI’s interpretation and intended implementation – circulated with these minutes)

### 6. GI Layers

PE gave a short overview of the work he had been carrying out for DEFRA in identifying and assessing GI layers that were needed to support (govt.) marine spatial planning. There was some (unresolved?) discussion as to whether the data overview document could be revised / expanded to include information on these layers, and on the proposed Base Reference Data Set(s) and Additional Reference Data Set(s).

It was also noted that the EA/DEFRA Flood Defence reports has identified GI layers that are necessary for flood defence legislation.



## THE UK MARINE DATA AND INFORMATION PARTNERSHIP

*Action A24 PE/MO* To review PE's GI layers report, and map to (proposed) Base Reference Data sets, and Additional Reference Data sets.

### 7. MED Forum

This had been discussed on the previous day. If theme were suitable could be coordinated with AGI Marine event on 24<sup>th</sup> April (too soon to arrange anything?), otherwise provisional target date is June 2007 – possible maritime heritage theme.

*Action A25 DC:* to liaise with MEDAG to identify theme and make arrangements for MED Forum.

### 8. AOB

Date of Next meeting set at 2<sup>nd</sup> May, London – to fit within the overall planning timetable outlined below:

#### *Provisional Timetable of MDIP related events for 2007:*

28 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2007	Consultation period for EC Maritime Strategy closes.
March 2007	Pilot MDIP Metadata Discovery Portal Released.
15 <sup>th</sup> March 2007	Marine Bill White Paper Issued (12 week consultation period)
24 <sup>th</sup> April 2007	AGI Marine meeting
April 2007	INSPIRE implementation plans – consultation on drafting.
2 <sup>nd</sup> May 2007	MDIP WG Co-chairs meeting – agree headline issues for MDIP “Phase 1” report, respond to Marine Bill white paper. Draft Executive Summary for MDIP “Phase 1” Report. Should include other key MDIP partners (e.g. Scottish Exec, CCW or WAG?)
22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2007	MEDAG meeting
24 <sup>th</sup> May 2007	MDIP to report to IACMST?
1 <sup>st</sup> June 2007	Marine Bill White Paper consultation period ends
June / July 2007	Possible MED Forum MDIP WG Co-chairs meeting 1 <sup>st</sup> Draft of MDIP “Phase 1” report. MDIP Partners Open Meeting.
September / October 2007	MDIP WG Co-chairs meeting Present MDIP “Phase 1” report to MDIP Sponsors’ Board and to IACMST



### 9. Actions

*Action A1 SW:* Email SNH to discuss representation in MDIP.

*Action A2 DC:* To plan an article in next (March) issue of Marine Data News on launch of Marine Bill white Paper

*Action A3 DC:* To plan for an event in October/November to publicise MDIP Recommendations for Implementation of a UK Framework for Marine Data and Information”.

*Action A4 K O’C, SW, DC:* To review the DAC responses to the DAC requirements paper (by end March ‘07).

*Action A56 LR, JP:* To liaise with DC, BG regarding access to lists of monitoring data to be generated by UKMMAS tier 3 evidence groups.

*Action A6 ALL* To send DC commonly asked questions, for DC to start a list of “FAQs” on the MDIP web-site explaining the function of DACs within the MDIP framework.

*Action A7 KM, DC:* Once a satisfactory, accepted and stable (Marine) Discovery metadata format is achieved, to consider how to promote the wide application of this standard.

*Action A8 MO, PE:* Propose a set of actions to address the problems in accessing and using marine data. This could identify actions that each individual MDIP partner could commit to addressing within their own organisations.

*Action A9 DC/KM* To establish with DACs, NDG and EDINA current status with regard to availability of metadata records, harvesting process and portal development, and hence a timetable to producing a release version of the portal and signing off the EDINA contract.

*Action A10 DC, KM, JP/LR* To hold portal sign-off meeting with EDINA (late feb / early march)

*Action A11 DC:* Circulate URL of portal once it is operational.

*Action A12 KM:* To talk to AGI and establish process and plans towards implementation of new version of UK Gemini

*Action A13 MO/PE:* To establish (with reference to the use cases) a user specification for the required level of metadata granularity.

*Action A14 KM:* To write a note on metadata granularity, referring to accepted best practice and any existing, developing standards.

*Action A15 JP/LR* To ask DACs for a description of the current level(s) of granularity in their data holdings, together with information on any plans to improve these.

*Action A16 Interoperability WG:* In consultation with relevant experts establish metadata schema and to publish on the MDIP website.

*Action A17 DC:* DM to be invited to attend future MDIP co-chairs meetings.

*Action A18 KM:* Marine Data News article on MDIP portal as Turing test.

*Action A19 DC* To put recent documents on Website (WG reports, minutes, leaflet pdf)

*Action A202 KM Early requirement:* To write a short statement to go on MDIP website about MDIP metadata activities – What are aims and plans? When will a standard be available? What are current recommendations?

*Action A21 DC/KM* To consider redesign of MDIP website, so it is more user friendly.

*Action A22 ALL* To comment on MDIP “Phase 1” report outline format, (by end Feb)

*Action A23 ALL* To review DC’s data policy strawman (updated since 09/02 to include DTI’s interpretation and intended implementation – circulated with these minutes)

*Action A24 PE/MO* To review PE’s GI layers report, and map to (proposed) Base Reference Data sets, and Additional Reference Data sets.



## THE UK MARINE DATA AND INFORMATION PARTNERSHIP

*Action A25 DC:* to liaise with MEDAG to identify theme and make arrangements for MED Forum.

Also note actions from MDIP Open Meeting:

***Action 1: DAC WG - To ensure that the process of accepting DACs as “MDIP DACs” is a transparent, independent and robust process.***

***Action 2: Interoperability WG to agree metadata schema and to publish on the MDIP website (Chrs mtg A17)***

***Action 3: Interoperability WG chairs to ensure all relevant experts are involved in establishing an MDIP metadata schema. (Chrs mtg A17)***

***Action 4: MDIP to circulate URL of Pilot MDIP Metadata Discovery Portal to all MDIP partners. (Chrs mtg A12)***

***Action 5: MDIP partners to review metadata schema and portal functionality and report.***

***Action 6: All – to comment on definition of, and desired contents of, a Base Reference Data Set, by 20<sup>th</sup> February (To be confirmed).***

***Action 7: MDIP to ask Howard Dalton<sup>1</sup> to send a letter to alert sponsors that further significant funding is required if MDIP is to continue and realise its goals***

***Action 8: All to provide any comments on MDIP response to EC Maritime Policy Consultation to DC by 23<sup>rd</sup> Feb.***

***Action 9: MC/DC to circulate details of drafting rules for INSPIRE and provide feedback***

***Action 10: All to consider potential topics for a MED forum, and to send a paragraph to DC outlining any suggestions***

***Action 11: All to pass comments on Marine Data News to DC and/or Dave Morris. All invited to submit articles for future issues***

---

<sup>1</sup> To be actioned after 2<sup>nd</sup> May WG Chairs meeting. BG suggested Rodney Anderson (DEFRA Director of Marine and Fisheries) may be more appropriate than HD. Does it depend who will be IACMST chair at the time?