Subcommittee Meeting Notes **3/3/02**

Attending: Dean, Ronda, Dan, George, Cy, John W, Roger, Scott, Eric, Doug, Bob H., Margo

1. Web Page: Last minutes not there as staff were on vacation.

2. GIS Description: Did not get addressed.

3. All Job Descriptions: Did not get addressed.

4. Disclaimer: Discussed disclaimer as developed by OGISA in 95. The group felt the disclaimer was a good starting point. Group felt we need additions as follows: a) Clearly state the product/data is not surveying. This makes it more compliant with NCEES model law addendum. b) Should include references to metadata, including accuracy, source, etc. (we need to include info that metadata must address but not a specific standard). c) Should include a contact person

5. Certification: As an introduction: Dean reviewed his presentation to OGISA/URISA where they were nervous but gave the OK to proceed with exploring this. Cy also discussed a presentation that he gave to SW Oregon folks and they took it all OK. Doug reported on how ASPRS does certification (please see http://www.asprs.org/membership.html). They have certification and a process to decertify someone. This has only been used twice in the history of ASPRS and both times the person in question did not lose their certification. ASPRS has a peer review process that involves ethics, etc. Eric reported on URISA's national efforts to do certification. This will be presented during lunch at GIS in Action next month.

   We had a long discussion on certification. The general conclusions were:

   a. The process for certification should take advantage of national efforts, including work already underway by URISA and work already done by ASPRS.
   b. Focus of certification must be to protect the public from harm. This could be when you give data away, produce a map, or provide access.
   c. Must include acceptance of liability for data. If you accept data from somebody else and use it for external purposes then you need to be willing to accept liability. However, if you accept it from another source for a product you should reference that other source. This could be just pointing at their metadata web page.
   d. Certification of GIS professionals must be carefully done, involve education, fit our profession, and have minimal legislation.
   e. Certification must have teeth. If you do bad, there must be consequences. We should be able to take advantage of administrative rules.
   f. Must not step into to realm of surveying and photogrammetry as we proceed.

6. Review of GIS/LIS Addendum to NCEES Model Law: We reviewed model law and went through two examples as follows:

    a. Hydrologist determines riparian areas (boundary) under contract for city. Under model law this is not surveying.
    b. Consultant or staff use GPS to identify manholes. City then publishes/exchanges coordinate locations. Under model law using GPS for inventory is OK. In fact, providing this info to others is OK as long as that it clearly states that this is not surveying. So this works OK too.

7. Recommendation: We are staying with recommendations as developed.

    a. GIS data when presented in such a way that the public may be harmed needs to have a standard disclaimer and metadata.
    b. The addendum to the model law clearly defines the line between surveying and GIS.
    c. GIS/Cartographers/Photogrammetrists need to explore how to become certified/licensed.

8. For next time:

    a. We will be presenting status at GIS in Action and focus on certification. George and Dan agreed to help.
    b. We will need to meet with the big group in April. Dean will try to setup meeting to review recommendations.