2019 Framework Development Program Proposal Reviews Report Addendum

January 21, 2020

Summary Table: Amended and Resubmitted Proposals

ID	Contact	Title	Framework Coordinator Recommendation
03	Williams	Building Footprints Dataset of Oregon	This data element is an example of a highly complex data element that requires strong coordination and stewardship in order to meet the goals of Oregon's GIS Framework. Many stakeholders feel that it is important to their work and would like to work together to get the most out of the US Building Footprints published openly in June 2018. Currently various agencies are already working with and modifying these data in an uncoordinated way. OGIC has an opportunity to take the lead on these data and stay out in front of state spatial data infrastructures. Recommendation: Fund conditionally using the proposed proposal amendment process and direct additional funding to ensure coordination and stewardship needs are met.
05	Allan	Oregon Statewide Tsunami Geodatabase Compilation	Enter into the proposed proposal amendment process
07	Percy	Oregon Geology Data Schema migration	Do not fund; enter into the proposed proposal amendment process

Building Footprints Dataset of Oregon

03 Williams

Final funding recommendation: **fund conditionally**

New Conditions

1. Identify risks and mitigations to potential changes to the definition of “building” as a result of stakeholder input.
2. Provide status briefs to the Framework Coordinator to document the stewardship process followed and raise issues or risks.

Original Conditions

Identify and document mitigations for addressing risks related to data ownership and licensing. These project risks include but are not limited to: attribution, modification, and distribution under the open data license.

Attributes, especially polygon IDs, and polygon review methods should be included in the work scope.

Budget seems expensive; please provide additional budget justification.

Definition of "building" is vague and without a higher level of clarity may result in variation from GIS analyst to analyst.

Coordination risks are perceived to be great and were not clearly defined in the proposal. Please provide a description of the coordination needs, engagement process, with a timeline, deliverables from the coordination process (such as the data standard and stewarship plan or pre-plan documentation) and involved stakeholders where possible.

Stewardship risks are also perceived to be great and were not clearly defined in the proposal. Please provide a brief summary of the coordination and anticipated requirements for a stewardship plan for the buildings data element, the plan's class, and involved stakeholders where possible. In addition, please identify coordination activities that can and cannot be performed by the project personnel or organization with respect to all coordination needs.

Change tracking for the resulting product is not clear, leading to concerns about stewardship of the data, specifically modifications/updates. Please provide additional detail about how to manage the changes required over time to keep this data element up-to-date.

Oregon Statewide Tsunami Geodatabase Compilation

05 Allan

Final funding recommendation: fund conditionally

New Conditions

1. Data Deliverable Modification: Develop an interoperable webmap service in lieu of an online geodatabase that includes an incomplete set of data to meet the requirement for providing access to project data.
2. QAQC Process Definition and Monitoring: Further develop the QAQC process and provide draft documentation and recommended reviewers to the Framework Coordinator in advance of the QAQC process steps. The Framework Coordinator will coordinate review of the process and provide approval to proceed. Provide QAQC status briefs on a schedule that makes sense for the project and is approved by the Framework Coordinator.
3. Data Deliverables List: Provide a complete list of data deliverables in a logical structure, such as that used in Table 3 of the amendment, and file format.
4. Benefit to the user community. Please provide a brief explanation of how these data will be used and/or benefit resource managers, planners and the public-at-large.
5. Stakeholder engagement. Consider including Marian Lahav (DLCD) in your stakeholder engagement efforts.

Original Conditions

Considerable concerns were raised about the GIS methods and deliverables as presented in the proposal. Concerns included appropriateness of the GIS data models and processing steps. Please work with the Hazards and Preparedness FITs to tailor products for the Preparedness community and other users external to DOGAMI. The Coastal and Marine FIT may also be consulted for advice on effectively transforming and representing coastal phenomena in GIS, for example, transforming data modeled originally on irregular grids into appropriate GIS data models.

The distribution plan for the data is unclear. Why are there so many outlets? Who are the audiences and what are the best mechanisms for getting the data to them? What drives where data will be stored or should reside and be distributed from? Why would the core legacy data come to GEO, but not the new data? Would it be desireable to have all of the data hosted by GEO? Why or why not? What data will go to NANOOS and how will this be determined? Please clearly link to the deliverables to the audiences and the distribution point(s) for them.

Please provide assurances that the data will meet the user requirements access and usability. This condition may be addressed through coordination activities.

Stewardship: are there other stakeholders and users of the data? How will they be engaged in development of the standard and data update in the future? What are their roles in data maintenance?

Oregon Geology Data Schema migration

07 Percy

Final funding recommendation: fund conditionally

New Conditions

1. Interagency Coordination. Schedule regular check-ins with DOGAMI to coordinate project work and updates. Provide the schedule to the Framework coordinator for approval.
2. Consensus. Gain and document support for converting the geology data compilation to GeoSciML from the Geosciences FIT and submit documentation to the Framework Coordinator at least 30 days in advance of creating a GeoSciML version of the data compilation.
3. Request additional funding from GEO to support QAQC and publication of the data deliverables by DOGAMI at least 90 days in advance of the QAQC and publication actions.
4. Provide protocol/procedure document for conversion from GeMS to GeoSciML. GEO can provide additional funding for this later in the project.

Original Conditions

Demonstrate clear and detailed understanding of the status of the 2017-2019 geology schema project.

Provide well-defined objectives and measurable, tangible project deliverables and outcomes relative to the current state of the 2017-2019 geology schema project.

Please provide a brief summary of the coordination requirements and risks related to the prpoject, including explanation of the data transfer between organizations.

Please provide clear description of the anticipated requirements for a stewardship plan for the data element, the stewardship plan's class, and involved stakeholders where possible.

Provide a task and deliverable-focused timeline.

Please provide a budget in one of the recommended budget formats (see the original RFP). (Note: The data standard should be developed using in-kind or matched funds.)