

## DMWG 6/5 notes

### Attendees

David Harris (co-Chair)  
Steve Steinberg (co-Chair)  
Greg Smith DWR  
Gil Vazquez SWRCB  
Jeff Kapellas SWRCB  
Steve Goldman DFW  
Liz Whiteman, Ocean Science Trust  
Roger Kunkel, CERES  
Tony Hale, Ocean Science Trust/SFEI  
Dave Osti, 34 north  
George, Delta Conservancy(?)  
Monica Downs, CERES  
Mark Emmerson, CDPH

### Announcements:

Liz Whiteman: Now recruiting for a new info systems officer as Tony Hale is now with SFEI. Announcement can be found on the OST web page. May not be able to participate as much due to the transition, but will still be active in Ocean workgroups.

Greg Smith: DWR about to release draft of California Water Plan. Need comments by close of business Tuesday. 2-day webinar on Thursday-Friday 6/13-14. Will be able to comment after the release, but not add new material. Chapter 6 is the data component. CWMC has been available

## 2. Workgroup priorities

Try to add more direction to the workgroup. Specifically need to set guidelines for data interoperability on the web and the approximate costs of the implementation.

Tony H.: Need to have functional outcome, so try to figure out where the data gaps are which are the ones that need to be addressed first. Would build upon what we're starting to do (data standards, etc.). Good way would be to put together a small project, take info that's not in the portal, marry it with info in the portal and share it. That could show some of the gaps. May end up with two-tiered system so that existing portal data may be non-standard, but everything moving forward would adhere to the new standards. When time to upgrade existing systems, then can move to conform to new standards.

George: Value of using older/historic data of great use, so shouldn't overlook the value of those existing systems.

Steve S.: Our expertise is what dataset is it that you need, what agency has it, and what is the best method for making the data systems to talk to each other.

Jeff K. What's the low hanging fruit?

Steve S. Need to pick a specific workgroup (maybe one that is just starting up their portal), and then work closely with them.

David H.:

Dave O.: Estuaries is more developed. Provides mapping, discovery, download, etc. Provides some analysis Also CDEC. Will provide a workbook to provide training on how to organize the data for entering into the system. Could provide good case upon which to build. Also good case for integrating with other workgroup portal (e.g., Ocean's workgroup).

Greg S.: 34N has built its own database upon which it built its portal. Is this a good case for the other portals?

Dave O.: Created a software package (OpenNRM) to manage the data for the portal, and that can be adapted for the other portals.

Roger K.: So far have a pretty basic, generic description of services in our standards. Could make it more comprehensive to cover more complex type of services, like content management.

Mark E.: Drinking Water portal has used .NETNuke as means to construct the Drinking Water portal which will enable multiple people to maintain and develop the various portal pages without having to write code.

Mark E.: Important question: how am I going to render the data in a manner that they can then use in their own system. Standard method for exposing datasets.

Steve G.: Fed government is developing data APIs for most data. Current executive order for doing this. FTC.gov has model standards for data API.

Roger K.: Need to do deeper analysis on how to apply Water ML and Environmental ML for metadata standards and how they can be generalized to FGDC.

Steve S.: We need to maybe narrow the scope of what we try to accomplish in the next 6 months, and what can be done as longer term.

Greg S.: Proposal: set standard feature class(es) to use in your portal to discover data. Also, are there any portals which are up and running and could we cross-walk the data from existing portals to show how the cross walking could work.

Roger K.: If we had a defined library of feature classes that everyone can map to, that everyone can work off of. These would be the authoritative source for the portals. Should be sure to incorporate the works that CTA/Geoportal is doing.

Jeff K. Need a means for classifying monitoring stations in consistent manner in order to be able to query consistently across datasets.

Dave O.: CEDC has station standard, but don't do maintenance; up to monitor to maintain the location, etc.

Tony H;: Need to be clear which standards we're talking about at any particular time: metadata standards, data standards or application standards.

Questions/Issues to address:

- What are the data gaps? (the driver for the interoperability needed)
- Data standards
- What questions that can't be answered by current portals (data or interoperability issues)
- Existing portals (may not be fully standardized, don't necessarily re-organize to standards).
- Methods for accessing existing data (legacy data)? Which are the priorities
- Demonstrate value (quick success) for accomplishing this task?
  - o Collaborate with a new/different workgroup (use case, to develop a plan of attack).
  - o Estuary (Delta) – not launched, but far along – have documented the process – built on in-house content management (NRM) reusable product/platform.
  - o Ocean – not started yet
- Retroactive analysis of portals that have been developed?
  
- Do we want workgroups to ingest/prep data – federated systems?
  
- **What common issues/functionality?** (Portals should provide a common user experience, functionality)
  - o Drinking water portal (.NET Nuke) – allows us to allow upkeep/development, but w/o coding out details. (ease of use).
  - o Maintaining the system
  - o How will I render the raw data to others?? (standard method for dynamically exposing (sorting, filtering, selecting) our data as a backbone to the portals) – e.g. XML, JSON structure.
  - o API - Federal Govt. moving forward on this (Obama's plan) [Goldman] What can we leverage from Federal initiatives? (avoid reinventing the wheel)
  - o Domain specific (WaterML, FGDC, etc. tools to help) use the existing stacks? Show VALUE for the effort of the cross-walk. Are other domain specific groups out there?
  
- Recommendation re: **what feature classes** to use in your portal (e.g. different groups should not differ by portal) [Greg]
- **What opportunity do we already have** to bring together the portals (e.g. data from one better serve the others) low hanging fruit since already established.
- Who is not at the table? (other agencies)
- Utilize a standard schema (XML, Fusion Tables)

IS THERE A SCHEMA (XML OR OTHER) FOR CEDEN

Common means/standard for identification of monitoring stations (CDEC, Lat Long).

Prioritize out discussion?

Develop specific objectives (going forward)

Which type of standards:

- Data (feature standards)
- Metadata standards
- Applications standards

Action Items:

Will tighten definition of deliverable and set work plan to it.

4. Subcommittee reports

Tools/Portal Documentation

Action Items: (Cristina G. and Jeff K.)

Send templates to the Dave O and Mark E for the Estuaries and Drinking Water

Standards group [Roger Kunkle]

- Develop and provide a “Data Stewardship” guide as parallel to portal development guide for the workgroups.
- Compliant catalog services (geoportal, CERES and others)

Model of document/contents drafted.

Preliminary version of California FGDC from Scott is drafted.

4. Cross-group interaction

Marine Portal group starting up.

Estuaries portal ready for September rollout. Will be future discussion for where to house the dataset and how to access it. 34N will draft documentation on the dataset.

Safe To Drink workgroup is due to meet. Have integrated safe drinking water portal with drink intake portal. Once for presentation the other for intake.

Next meeting;

Aug. 7 @ 1:00 pm.

Action Items

Deadline for Comments on Standards document outline: June 19

Need to identify data types/service types/resource types to be sure to add into the document

Expand membership: (who is missing?)

Who are our customer(s)

- Portals
- Council
- Legislature

Cost question: We need to get workgroups to lay out questions and sub-questions, with their relative priorities

Identify someone to work with each group to answer questions: (Steinberg/Hale/Grosso)

Develop a list/flow of what questions, data, and mechanisms workgroups need/priorities to meet them.

Revised draft for group review: July 24  
Add wiki information to the notes.

New Contact info:

Roger Kunkel: [Roger.Kunkel@water.ca.gov](mailto:Roger.Kunkel@water.ca.gov)  
Tony H.: [tonyh@sfei.org](mailto:tonyh@sfei.org)

DMWG documents are available at - <http://wqdata.water.ca.gov>

Contact Greg Smith <[gregs@water.ca.gov](mailto:gregs@water.ca.gov)> if you need access to the site