

Hi Kelli,

We have completed our pre-review of the GLOS certification documents and provide comments below. Please remember that the pre-review was not an official review and that the lack of specific comments on any part of the descriptions and documentation you provided should not be considered approval of meeting that certification requirement.

Please contact me or Kathy Bailey if you have questions about our comments. I have attached the updated version of the Certification Guidance as well.

General comments from me:

- In several instances, the GLOS Blueprint and GLOS Enterprise Architecture Design are referenced as supporting documentation, but there are no specifics on where the supporting information is found. The application should provide specific details on where in these documents the information that supports meeting the certification requirement is located. This is done for some requirements, but not all.
- Similarly, for §997.23 (b)(3), in the documentation box, the GLOS website is listed. The link should be to a specific webpage listing the partners, or removed, as the information is contained in the description box of the application.
- All individuals that are proposed as filling one of the RICE employee roles, should have a description of their role within GLOS and their responsibilities. This description does not exist for John Carey and Tom Johengen.
- DMAC comments from Kathy Bailey:

- 1 Data ingestion/processing/distribution: I had a hard time following the data management process for each of their data streams overall. They seem to organize by access nodes (services) rather than data type. I couldn't tell how they ingest certain buoy data, for example. In their response, "1b) Data *such as* usace water levels..." this is vague because only provides one data stream as an example. Would recommend more specifics on what data streams follow which pathways (or at least provide some explanation of their organizational approach). Data streams can be consolidated into larger categories if they follow the same procedures.
- 2 Would appreciate clarification on Figure 1 - wasn't clear what the dashed outline/boxes meant. It was also hard to read overall - very small font.
- 3 QC: They are working towards implementing QARTOD to cover all non-federal data sets, and a date is provided. Recommend being more detailed about which data streams fall under this intent to QC. Again, want to be able to follow the data management process for each data stream.
- 4 In the table in http://glos.us/sites/default/files/documents/GLOS_QAQC_1.pdf -- CO-OPS is incorrectly listed as a non-federal partner. They are part of NOS.
- 5 Archival: They need to point us to their existing SIF with NCEI - this would best answer the archive question. I also didn't understand the response in the application to the archive question (997.23 f 6): "... and will explore with NODC the feasibility of archiving data through their process." Recommend clarifying. If any data sets are not currently archived, need to detail a plan following NCEI Guidance:

"The agreement will describe the method of data transfer (e.g. FTP push/pull) and the responsibilities of the RICE and its partners. Overall, there are 6 questions that must be answered for each data set (#1, 2, and partially #4 are likely already discussed or referenced in earlier sections), and the RICE must indicate whether or not the information currently exists or needs to be added to their data management plan:

1. List of parameters/observations being collected.
2. Processing steps/quality control including final format.
3. Timing of data submissions and approximate sizes.
4. Development of Data Documentation (metadata).

5. Data disposition (path to archive center, e.g. FTP push/pull).
6. Data affiliations, including both institutions and individual persons whose names will be associated with the data set in some way. (where did it come from? where does it go?).

The timing and granularity of the archive packages for data can be determined through negotiation with NCEI representatives. However, the RICE should indicate the desired granularity of the archive information package (AIP) per data set (e.g. near-shore sensors). Examples:

- One AIP per platform, updated monthly.
- One AIP per month, with all platforms.
- One AIP per data set (i.e. Near-shore sensors), updated monthly.
- Any other variation that stakeholders might find beneficial."

Regards,
Dave

--

Dave Easter
Regional Coordinator
U.S. IOOS®
Silver Spring, MD
P: [\(301\) 427-2451](tel:3014272451)
["Like" us on Facebook!](#)