

Module 1 Telecon #9

March 13, 2003

Draft minutes

Discussion topics: Permanent IDs, guidance docs

Participants: Chris Clarke, Lou Kerestesy, Dave Butler, Jim Kramer, Ed Mckay, Rick Yorczyk, Robin Feagas, Jack Huntley, Mark Bradford

TASK LIST DISCUSSION:

1. Chris asked if group had received all documents mailed out which included minutes of last telecon, revised permanent ID doc, theme lead task list and graphic representation of harmonization process and levels of drafts. All on line indicated they had received.
2. Mark B. asked if harmonization within transportation was required and his interest in discussion this further since transportation would prefer not to collapse sub themes into one document. Mark asked who will do the harmonization process and role the documents into one all encompassing document. Mark also expressed concern that during the harmonization process there may be negative impacts on other standards and asked how this will be addressed. He also stated that it appears that this will take a fairly long time to harmonize all the documents and asked what impact this will have on the deadlines we are under.
3. Lou stated that we are working with Norm and Julie to ensure that we capture the needed steps and have a clear understanding of the time resource needs.
4. Chris stated that we are aware of the complexity of the effort and that is why we are focusing on capturing the required steps. This will help us to understand the needs but also help the themes and agencies better define and manage the resources required to support the effort. We have all known that there is much to be done but this listing combined with the project plan that Lou maintains will support us in document our progress and further resource needs.
5. Jack asked if Norm was able to provide a timeline on when INCITS can take action on the standards and if it would be approved in a year or so. Chris indicated that Norm has specifically stated that he can not provide a timeline since INCITS has many other projects. He has indicated that he requires a "clean" harmonized product be delivered to him and hence our efforts at documenting the process.
6. Mark B expressed concern that if we do not fulfill the expectations of GOS management and OMB that the agencies will not be viewed favorably by OMB and receive something less than a green rating on this effort.
7. Chris indicated that we are well aware of the concern of all those participating on the effort and especially theme lead agencies that they will be negatively impacted if OMB expectations are not fulfilled. Chris re-iterated that by ensuring we fully document our efforts, maintain a project plan, address critical technical issues as they are encountered and keep GOS management informed of progress, we are doing the best we can. Chris further stated that there is no desire to develop a technically compromised product for the sake of the deadline. In order to address this issue, Chris and Lou hope to get a better handle on some specific users so that we might meet their short-term need at a minimum.
8. Jack asked what the backup plan is if we are unable to meet the September 30, draft harmonized standards to Norm. Chris indicated the backup date was November 1. Lou indicated that he, Norm, Julie and Chris would be meeting on Friday to review schedule and ensure we have not missed any critical time-consuming tasks.
9. Mark asked when will we harmonize drafts, who will do and how will this be done. Lou responded that we have two options, we can address many issues now via telecon as we are doing and/or we can address in face to face meeting which many have suggested. ACTION – get schedule to theme leads.
10. Lou indicated several items that need to be harmonized and included in base standard. They include common definitions, normative text, definitions; cross references must be accurate, resolve conflicts on technical issues etc...
11. Robin asked who will do this activity and adjudicated comments, is there an assigned editor or writer for the effort.
12. Lou responded that he and Chris have been working on the concept of the harmonization team which would include this group and those form the MATS that chose to participate. This may also include a sub-group or "SWAT" team that address critical technical issues. SWAT team would bring recommendations back to larger community for consensus.
13. Robin suggested that an editor is needed to support the effort.

Module 1 Telecon #9

March 13, 2003

Draft minutes

14. Lou asked Jack who adjudicated comments when he did SDFIE. Jack indicated that he did and served to adjudicated and edit final document, though Jack said that this effort is different since it involves many federal agencies.
15. Discussion followed on how public comments would be handled. Lou indicated that can be handled in several ways and themes should share documents with community to ensure accuracy as it's developed. This is not a public review however – rather a community review. Formal public review with announcement in Federal registrar will be done when entire draft is harmonized.
16. Mark, Jack and Robin expressed concern about the outlined process and the ability to meet the September 30 deadline for a harmonized draft standard. Further discussion followed on the challenges of harmonization and how an issue between two standards may result in a delay for the entire standards. Chris and Lou agreed that this is a possibility.
17. Questions arose as to why we are going with a single harmonized standard rather than individual themes and why we are not using FGDC. Chris and Lou responded that the harmonization effort must happen regardless of a single standard or individual standards. In doing a single, in begins that harmonization process early and the resulting standards addresses the themes in one document. The disadvantages include those already identified in discussion.
18. Lou mentioned that doing a duel INCITS FGDC process was discussed early on and due to resource concerns the focus is now on INCITS. There are advantages to using duel process but resources appeared to be a limiting factor and senior leadership preferred focus on INCITS.
19. Rick stated that he was more concerned about the quality of the resulting product than he is of meeting the specific September deadline – though he is aware of the importance of meeting the deadline. Those online agreed that quality and long-term usefulness of the standards to the community should be a critical concern.

PERMANENT ID DISUCSSION - LOU did not capture much of this.

20. Lou outlined changes made to this version of the document.
21. Lou asked if it was permissible to have same section of road with different permanent IDs. Mark indicated yes, since may be different efforts to digitize. Mark indicated that this has been handled in the past by equivalency tables and the last critical difference of each would be the geographic coordinates .
22. Discussion regarding registry and all encompassing or theme based. Conclusion 2.3.1 was good and general enough to allow each community to develop “method” as opposed registry in which to document process.
23. Discussion regarding the meaning of namespace
- 24.
- 25.