

Notes

Framework Governance Review

Thursday, January 27th
10am to Noon
Land Board Room
Department of State Lands
775 Summer St. NE
Salem, OR

This document represents our interpretation of the discussion that occurred at this meeting. Progress has been made in some areas but not in others. Referenced documents are available on the Framework page (<http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/fit/FIT.shtml>) in the “Framework Governance Review Documents” section. Suggestions, corrections and any other feedback welcomed.

Thanks!

Milt

milton.e.hill@state.or.us

Terms:

We discussed the need for a glossary. There are several specific to GIS (http://wiki.gis.com/wiki/index.php/GIS_Glossary and <http://resources.arcgis.com/glossary> among others) and we don't need to duplicate the available listings but we do have some specific uses for words or phrases that would benefit from a publically available glossary. Two Oregon specific glossaries have been located and we've combined them and made a few changes but more work needs to be done. Please review and submit suggestions. “**Oregon_GIS_Glossary_v0.1.doc**” is the draft of this new glossary.

The two existing sources referenced are:

- Appendix G. from the 1996 Oregon GIS Plan (<http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/ogic/ogicplan.shtml#gloss>).
- Appendix A from the 2007 Framework Guidance document (<http://gis.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/GEO/docs/stewardship/navigatORFrameworkStewardshipv03.pdf>)

Framework Implementation Team (FIT) discussion:

Topics we heard in the discussion:

- FIT used to have regular meetings and people want this to happen again.
- Can we develop “health indicators” for the FIT Groups?
- Fit used to produce status reports. Perhaps we should reinstitute them?
- FITs are self organizing and voluntary so we have to be cautious of the bureaucratic burden asked of them and the leads. Too heavy of a burden may result in less participation.
- Some FITs work well with an informal structure and others don't.
- A Lead review offers the opportunity for the group to assess progress and direction. It also offers the opportunity for others to become involved.
- There appears to be little oversight and reporting from FITs. Perhaps there should be a periodic report to OGIC?
- What is the definition of Framework data?
- Do we have an up-to-date list of Framework data?

Follow ups and Proposed actions:

- Assure regular FIT meetings, perhaps every 6 months and alternating with Forums. This implies either a Forum or FIT meeting every three months.
- Attendance at these regular meetings: FIT Leads and active workgroup leads
- “Regularly scheduled meetings” have been included in the FIT Charter (section 6) (**“FIT_Charter_v0.1.doc”**)
- A definition for Framework data has been added to the glossary (**“Oregon_GIS_Glossary_v0.1.doc”**).
- Update the Framework Theme and Element list. The existing documents are from '07 and need work. This effort needs to be coordinated with a similar effort underway in the Preparedness FIT to create a catalog of data needed for preparedness and emergency response. We need your help with this. Contact Milt if you can volunteer some of your time. An example of the existing list is **“FW_Elements_Priority_Oct07.pdf”**. Please don't edit this or spend a lot of time on any feedback until we develop a way to assimilate it.

FIT Charter:

We discussed several issues related to the Charter including Lead confirmation or endorsement, periodic review of the Leads and a stronger tie to Stewardship. With regards to the endorsement and review of FIT Leads we propose the following language in section 4.c.2 and 4.c.3.

2. *The FIT group Lead shall be proposed by consensus of the group and/or the FIT chair and subsequently endorsed by OGIC for a three year term.*
3. *Prior to the end of this term a FIT Group shall address the Lead position and propose either renewal or change to OGIC.*

See this proposal in the context of the entire document by opening **“FIT_Charter_v0.1.doc”**.

Additional suggestions that have yet to be included in the Charter:

- Ensure data is available with full FGDC metadata through the Spatial Data Explorer as both a downloadable file and map services.

Stewardship Governance and document development process:

We have model Stewardship Plan and Charter documents but no standard process for document development and review. OGIC asks that we investigate applying the Standards development process to Stewardship development.

Topics we heard in the discussion:

- The Standards development process is too involved for Stewardship. Make it simpler.
- Only applies to Stewardship Plans, not Charters.
- The model Stewardship documents are difficult to use. Can't we make them easier to adapt to specific cases?
- Make stewardship documents like metadata – “machine readable” or parsable.
- How do we know which information appears in a Stewardship document as opposed to metadata and other documentation?
- Formal stewardship, in this context, is only for Framework data.
- BLM trains data stewards in the responsibilities associated with being a Steward. Perhaps we should do something similar?

Follow ups and Proposed actions:

- Develop a Stewardship Plan development process modeled after the Standards development process but less complex.
- Rework model Stewardship documents, involve interested parties in process. Make sure the final document is parsable.
- Revise the existing spatial data documentation matrix (**“Spatial_Data_Document_Matrix_v0.1.doc”**). It's purpose is to document a common understanding regarding how spatial data documentation should be handled, i.e., what

goes where. Assure that the final document matches specifications in the Metadata Standard and model Stewardship documents.

- BLM has provided some of their training materials. We'll review these and distribute something prior to the meeting for discussion.

Standards documentation refresh:

The Framework Standards development process is robust and works well but the documentation is outdated. Items to be addressed include:

- Intent is to mandate standards for State agencies and strongly encourage for others.
- State CIO (OGIC Chair) has legislative authority to set standards.
- Should CIOC be part of the endorsement process?
- Should some other State entity be included?
- What is the appropriate role for local/tribal/regional government?

Topics we heard in the discussion:

- Need to emphasize that the intent is for an exchange standard and does not apply to internal business use.
- There is concern that the scope could be misinterpreted as applying to ANY copies or uses of spatial data.
- State CIO has the authority to mandate IT Standards for State Agencies. This includes the existing GIS Standards. How should we proceed?
- Once the State mandates a standard other organizations (AOC, etc.) could take the standard to their membership for consideration.
- Standards = efficiency for participants.
- Standards represent an individual burden for a common gain.
- Standards represent a public asset.
- OWEB has statutorily mandated role in spatial data management, please send reference.
- OWEB needs to review proposed changes to their role in Standards review process.
- Existing Standards review process doesn't identify specific reviewers. There is a concern that simply specifying groups (GPL, PAC, etc) to review documents may result in insufficient review.
- We should consider adding true peer review to the process. USGS may have an example process. It was suggested that we set a minimum, documented review process that includes, for example, three reviews.
- We should consider extending review opportunities to subject matter experts outside the state.

Follow ups and Proposed actions:

- Develop guidance on the scope and applicability of State CIO mandated standards prior to implementing them. We think this has already been done but haven't located it yet. If we can't find it we'll work on recreating it.
- GEO is working with OWEB to obtain their input of proposed changes to their involvement in standards review as specified in the existing standards process diagram. We'll do this soon and share the proposed diagram with everyone prior to the next meeting.
- Further revise the standards process diagram to include peer review.
- Update and combine the existing "Oregon Standards Development Effort" and Procedures for Amending GIS Standards in Oregon" documents.
- The revised statute that specifies OWEB's role in coordinating natural resource geographic information is ORS 541.365 (<http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/541.html>) (scroll down to .365)

" 541.365 Conduct of watershed enhancement program; integration of geographic information. (1) The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board shall conduct a watershed enhancement program to benefit all users of the waters of this state. The board shall conduct the program in a manner that:

(a) Provides the greatest possible opportunity for volunteer participation to achieve the goals of the program; and

(b) Coordinates the information, data and data retrieval needs of the natural resource agencies of the state with the State Service Center for Geographic Information Systems.

(2) In order to effectuate the program described in this section, the board shall establish protocols, policies and procedures necessary to integrate and organize geographic information and make it available to persons and entities involved in implementation of the Oregon Plan.

(3) In working with the State Service Center for Geographic Information Systems, the board shall ensure that:

(a) Information received by the center is formatted in a manner that results in an integrated geographic information system that meets the needs of all local, state, regional, tribal and federal entities involved in implementation of the Oregon Plan; and

(b) The data are available to local, state and federal agencies and to any person implementing activities under the Oregon Plan.

(4) The program developed under this section shall include development and implementation, in coordination with the natural resource agencies of the state, of a statewide monitoring program for activities conducted under the Oregon Plan. [1987 c.734 §5; 2001 c.841 §3a; 2001 c.842 §1]"

Framework Funding:

- Currently funded by the assessment to State Agencies
- This funding is leveraged to a great extent
- navigator Business Case indicates that a large funding gap exists (~\$100m)
- Is there a way to increase sustainable funding for Framework data development?
- Should local/tribal/regional Governments play a role?

Topics we heard in discussion:

- The ORMAP Program is a funding model that spreads pain and benefit. It's a fee on a business process that funds a service that benefits the business process.
- ORSTATS and vUSA projects results in cost savings and this should be documented
- The real power in cost savings needs to be communicated to business process owners and they aren't present at this meeting
- Perhaps we can target an existing infrastructure or business process fee or group of fees?
- Do we know of successful examples in other states? Unfortunately, no..
- Data duplication, thus wasted funds, is still a big problem. Improvement in communication would provide tremendous benefits. Those benefits would manifest themselves as a reduction in the actual funds required for NavigatOR.
- Sustainability of funding would be increased with stronger Local Govt/Tribal roles.

Follow ups and Proposed actions:

- Identify existing fee programs where GIS can offer a service.
- Propose how we might help.
- Involve OGIC