21 May 2015

Time: 1pm Eastern / 10am Pacific.

Call-In Info: Dial 1-530-881-1400, room 651025#

Moderator: Eliot Jordan

Notetaker: James R. Griffin III

Attendees:

- Eliot Jordan
- James R. Griffin III
- John Huck
- Darren Hardy
- Jack Reed

Agenda:

1. Roll Call
2. Call for Agenda Items
3. Next Call
   a. Date: Thu 18 June 2015
   b. Moderator: Darren
   c. Notetaker: James
4. Announcements: Events
   a. Open Repositories 2015, Indianapolis, Jun 8-12
      i. GeoBlacklight Workshop (Jack)
      ii. Inspired by Code4Lib, hands on introduction (addresses the indexing of data, provides assistance for questions, etc.)
      iii. Also proposed for the GeoWeb conference (time is currently unknown)
   b. Hydra Connect 2015, Minneapolis, Sep 21-24, proposals due ??
   c. DLF 2015, Vancouver BC, Oct 26-28, proposals due June 22
      i. GeoBlacklight Workshop
      ii. Panel for Geospatial Repositories
      iii. Workshop for GIS Metadata (Darren and Kim Durante)
   d. Esri Conference (July)
      i. Jack, Darren, and Eliot are attending
   e. ALA Conference
      i. John is attending
5. Report from Hydra GIS Data Modeling WG (Eliot Jordan)
   a. Draft charter
      i. Revised by Darren Hardy
      1. Deliverables
         a. Fedora 4 Reference Implementation (TBD set for the delivery date)
      2. Scopes and Objectives refined
      ii. Prepared to be released to the Hydra Community in a call for participation
         1. Published to the DuraSpace Wiki by Eliot
         2. Two week delay for the review of the charter
   6. Solicit workshop ideas for Hydra Connect and DLF
      a. GIS metadata authoring
         i. Proposed by Darren Hardy (for the DLF 2015)
      b. GeoBlacklight training
         i. Proposed by Jack Reed
            1. Contact Jack for participation
            2. Experience at Code4Lib 2015: Persons with a wide range of skillsets attended the workshop (including using the terminal for the first time)
      c. Status of the Working Group at Hydra Connect
         i. Ad Hoc discussion, or should a discussion be presented more formally?
         ii. Expect a call for proposals by June
         iii. Call for the Hydra Connect Program Committee (May 5th)
            1. Preferred that someone from this interest group participates
            2. Jack Reed volunteers for this
            3. John Huck expressed an interest, but is uncertain if attending
6. Proposal for a HydraGeoCamp in Jan/Feb 2016 at Stanford (Darren Hardy)
   a. Emerged out of LDCX 2015
   b. Structured as a week-long working camp
   c. Bring data, and develop the modeling
   d. Possibly structure metadata and place into OpenGeoMetadata (and index in GeoBlacklight)
   e. Similar to DCE’s HydraCamp
   f. Jan/Feb 2016 at Stanford
   g. On interest group or those trying to plan Hydra development for GIS datasets
      i. Managers would likely be interested as well (related to planning) as technical developers
      ii. Use Cases and Technical Limitations Identified within the Camp
         1. Camp works together to identify obstacles
2. Very participatory; Not instructional in nature
3. U. Minnesota developing GeoBlacklight which integrates with ArcGIS.com as a SaaS Web Map Service and Web Feature Service
   a. Certainly other institutions will look to integrate with similar SaaS providers

h. Feedback
   i. Time-frame
      1. January preferred in order to avoid issues with Code4Lib (February)
      2. Timing well received
   ii. Actionable Items
      1. Agenda and budget proposal to be drafted for submission to Tom Cramer
      2. Undertaken by Darren before the next call
8. Brainstorm ideas for summer activities
   a. Promotional Activities (Mutually Beneficial to all members of the Community)
   b. Sharing Use Cases
      i. Follows the Scrum methodology
      ii. U. Alberta structures these as user stories
         1. Has in mind direct implementation following the capturing of the stories
            a. Generating actionable items
            b. Generating functional or acceptance testing suites?
      iii. Stanford undertakes similar approach
      iv. Provides a common set of user stories
         1. Help informs the other working groups
         2. Provides a Framework
            a. Use a Wiki to begin aggregating these user stories?
               i. Prefer to start in this approach
               ii. John shall undertake the initial measures for this
   c. Esri Conference in July
      i. Jack is discussing a lightning talk for GeoBlacklight at the educational conference
      ii. A formal talk on preserving GIS data is also being given at the primary conference
         1. Discovery as well as the whole life cycle
         2. ArcCatalog used to catalog geospatial metadata
         3. Hydra will be discussed (generalizable to non-traditional Hydra, addressing enterprise GIS functional requirements)
            a. Is there interest outside of academic libraries in using Hydra and GeoBlacklight?
      1. Other Institutions outside of this interest group are implementing GeoBlacklight
         a. Where is the line between this interest group, GeoBlacklight implementers, Fedora Commons users?
      2. Government as an area of potential application for these technologies
         a. Canada
            i. Federal Gov't interested in promoting the usage of open data
            ii. Gov't standpoint: Open data enables commerce and enterprise business growth
   d. Survey of Types and Structure of Data Sets within Repositories
      i. Methodology
         1. How best to approach garnering the necessary responses?
            a. One-on-one e-mails?
            b. Submit a small survey to the Hydra community mailing lists
            c. An initial survey can inform more detailed surveys
         2. Certainly would be valuable for data modeling and for the larger interest group
         3. Intersects with the objectives of the HydraGeoCamp
            a. Virtually bring one’s data to the event with this goal in mind
         4. Establishing a system of rankings for the types of data sets
            a. Accounting for the size of data sets
            b. How best to prioritize the management of data sets by certain factors
               i. Complexity of the data sets
                  1. Maps can be digitized or scanned from parts of an atlas, while others from independent sheet maps
                  2. How is this addressed in terms of data modeling?