

Module 1 Telecon #4

January 23, 2003

Draft minutes

Discussion topics: unique IDS and authority

Participants: Shawn Silkinson, Chris Clarke, April Avnayium, Fred Broome, John Crowe, Mark Bradford, Lou Kerestesy, Dave Butler, Jim Kramer, Ed Mckay, Rick Yorczyk, Paul Wiese, Steve Grise

1. Mark Bradford asked if he could get copies of draft standards to share with his MAT. Lou and Chris responded yes as long as distribution was kept to the MAT and recipients were aware versions are not the products intended for wide public review but initial products. Lou will get products to Mark
2. Lou outlined second draft of discussion paper on unique identifiers. First paper resulted from telecon two weeks ago and this version has incorporated most of email correspondence and additional feedback received on first draft that went out to theme leads.
3. Lou asked group if based on email exchange if the proposed unique ID was needed and resolution proposed in paper seemed reasonable. Several agreed.
4. John Crowe stated that elevation does not use permanent identifiers as indicated in number 1 of solutions in the draft paper. Steve G indicated that in drafting document, it was assumed we were talking about vector data. John stated that the use of permanent identifiers can not be mandatory for elevation or ortho since they are not used. Steve G. agreed we need to clarify we are addressing vector data.
5. Fred B. asked if elevation uses an ID for geodetic control - John indicated that elevation carries no attributes. Fred concluded based on this that the use of permanent identifiers would then need to be considered "conditional"
6. Shawn summarized discussion by stating that since ortho and elevation have no features, there would as a result be no need for feature identifiers. Several agreed, no verbal disagreement. Also restated as the following - features in general have identifiers but since ortho and elevation have no features, they have no IDS.
7. Discussion followed regarding random, string and grid points in the elevation data and the use of the term "coverage" for ortho and elevation.
8. Steve G indicated that though there may not be a need for unique ID in elevation and ortho, namespace can still be used
9. Lou summarized to this point that changes need to be made to number 1 to address concerns expressed by John, all appeared OK with 2 and 3. Steve and Mark summarized background of #4 which addresses authority and namespace. Lou summarized that all seemed OK with 4 but changes need to be made to reflect lack of applicability to ortho and elevation
10. Discussion on item #5 revolved around the need for central service but Steve G indicated that Doug N had raised the issue about time, and impact on developing the standards now. Alternative is to have each theme develop and publish method by which they populate the namespace. Fred B suggested using the existing GSA title and numeric index for federal agencies as a model to populate namespace. Steve G agreed this could be used as a model to develop state and local identifiers.
11. Dave B suggested that two critical issues are being discussed. One - authority or the author of the data and Two - Keys or unique identifiers which we are calling namespace. As an example Dave used a theme which might be composed of 5 separate sources of data and as a result be composed of 5 separate namespaces. Continued discussion on this and concluded this would be appropriate discussion under the topic of authority for another telecon.
12. Continued discussion using above example, Steve G indicated that a product of 5 different road layers should have different identifiers and namespace. The only way we can ensure maintaining uniqueness of anyone layer is by use of the unique ID AND the namespace together.
13. Mark B raised the issue of multiple geographies. For example, multiple road data sources at different scales. This lead to dis cussion on NHD and hdyro by Paul W. regarding the use of "identification ID" with different representations and geometry. For example ID association with feature but different geometry can support the differentiation between a pond and a stream. Steve G. - same identity and namespace and unique representation identifies a unique feature such as a pond.
14. Steve G posed the question - do we want to have multiple features with the same identifier?
15. Dave Butler indicated that temporal changes to features can be handled in authority.

Module 1 Telecon #4

January 23, 2003

Draft minutes

16. Steve G summarized that we can handle multiple geometry in one of two ways. Add a bullet to address a special case - the repeated use of permanent identifiers for multiple geometry. OR ----- have hydro concatenate the unique identifier and ID representation.
17. Fred B. suggested that before we start making decisions and implementing change in standards that we ensure the following - we know how we are going to create the identifiers, how multiple geometry will be handled, recommendations have to be operational, and we should test to ensure applicability... Fred indicated that we should make sure wording is clearly stated so all understand. Lou asked Fred if he was OK with where we are and this group making decisions on such issues. Fred indicated that he was, just wanted to convey that testing the standards is a critical step.
18. Steve G. agreed and suggested that #3 of the paper be clarified and examples provided to help those implement consistently.
19. Mark B. stated that we need guidance but do not want to be limiting to those who need to develop methods that meet the needs of their standards. Need to clarify methods to be used and logic but do not want to be prescriptive and limit what people can do. Need examples
20. Discussion on item number 6 of draft paper focused on the value of the item to the overall solution. Group concluded little value is offered by item 6. Fred B suggested that either 6 be dropped or that the wording be changed to indicate that features are to be identified with an alphanumeric. Dave B suggested that 6 was important with numeric if you want to maintain leading 0 for some reason. Steve G stated that he assumed this would be a string. Fred B. concluded then that this eliminates data type. Steve agreed.
21. Steve G. suggested that either the wording of 6 be changed to read that the permanent identifier be a string or remove and place the wording in #2 but wording is critical to capture
22. Discussion on the meaning of number 7 revolved around the implied "publication" of the scheme and where and how that would be done. Steve G indicated that we could point to an existing published URL or include in content standard. Fred B asked who has the authority to identify method for population scheme if it is outside of the standard. He further suggested that if government units does not have a method, one must be developed for the standard. Discussion then migrated to the existing authorities for indices and the need for an on-line index system for the community.
23. Fred summarized discussion as follows: themes would provide method to populate name space, provide broad guidance on how to do, and an annex or source for the info to populate. No disagreement heard.
24. Fred suggested wording for #7 - each theme shall provide guidance on populating data elements and this implies the method is public and agreed to by the community.
25. Dave Butler suggested that a statement be added to say that the permanent identifiers are permanent and should not be revised - that is – not changed or reused.

END OF UNIQUE ID DISCUSSION - Beginning of discussion on authority

26. Group agreed to discuss authority rather than feature level metadata since authority had come up several times in previous discussion on unique IDs
27. Mark B provided some background on issues that arose in roads MAT. Authority issues came up concerning who created data, who created a feature, who was authority for the feature, who maintains and what frequency. etc..
28. Authority of particular interest by local partners since they want to know who has authority of what features etc. Who "owns the feature" and can authenticate.
29. Steve G indicated this is an issue of a dataset which can be documented with traditional metadata versus features which need feature level metadata
30. Lou asked if this is related to data quality - Steve responded yes, from the local perspective this is linked with the questions of "who is the authoritative source" and "what is best data for me to use for xyz"
31. Steve G said we need feature level authority so that when data is brought together from multiple sources we can determine who the generator of features are - example hydrants.
32. Mark B and Steve G indicated that namespace does not cover feature authority.
33. John C. cautioned on using authority to indicate or imply quality. Suggested sticking with metadata and don't infer something from a field that is not intended for that purpose.

Module 1 Telecon #4

January 23, 2003

Draft minutes

34. Steve G. stated that the data quality and data authority issue needs to be addressed to educate people on what happens when data is patch worked together resulting in multiple metadata sources etc... Steve indicated that we need to define very specifically so that we know what to put in metadata for source quality not authority. John C. agreed.
35. Steve G defined authority as metadata at the dataset level defining who owns namespace. We are assuming a known authority defines the namespace
36. Dave B suggested that a local govt. generating data may have to request namespace. This lead to discussion regarding added value or modified datasets and how authority is populated. Question was asked “ will data generators/modifiers have to coordinate with authority to ensure unique IDS???”
37. Paul W. explained how NHD addressed feature level metadata and authority. Decided that FGDC minimal metadata requirements work OK but a bit general. NHD has specific requirements for lineage which they addressed in metadata.
38. Steve G provided an example based on above of a user publishing a dataset used for modeling in which they have changed some feature locations but the unique IDs remain the same. Steve indicated that the feature changes could be captured in the metadata.
39. Shawn indicated that the ISO 1905 metadata docs provides for this ability to capture instances of feature changes.
40. Lou asked Shawn to provide documents to him to distribute for next call - Shawn agreed
41. Shawn also reference ISO 19109 where classes of changes are captured.
42. Lou summarized that several kinds of authority are being discussed - origin and those that have added value or changes. Mark B. commented that it’s critical to ensure that authority and namespace are different. Mark asked if we could define authority
43. Steve G. suggested that authority points to metadata and relationship to namespace and what that means, assessment or validation (metadata), feature basics or quality of feature.
44. Steve added that a critical component is the lack of info in the metadata about if the data is the correct source for specific applications.