

**RA DMAC Survey For Spring IOOS Meeting**  
**January 2016**

**What do you see as the strengths of your regional data management program?**

- Our data providers are very cooperative. Our staff is skilled.
- Application of data assets to highly usable products; and close collaborations with local data providers
- Data servers providing easy formats for users; data visualization; ability to build tools and pages tailored to user needs
- Flexibility, ability to respond quickly. Progress made on standardization and quality control.
- An experienced and competent team that are working to expand and build a regional Data Management System.
- Our data is structured in consistent formats.
- Flexible, well funded and staffed, well supported by AOOS board.
- We are filling a genuine regional gap of data aggregation/coordination, appropriate niche, user-needed services, not much competition (locally)

**Are there any weaknesses or particular challenges with your data management program?**

- Time and resources are in short supply relative to the opportunities to improve the system.
- Our primary challenge is handling increasing, accumulating responsibilities with flat funding
- Limited capacity in terms of people/time to address all that stakeholders would like to see.
- Data standardization and quality control is always a challenge.
- Biggest challenge is capacity. Balancing data management needs with the need for the observations.
- We need to be able to acquire legacy data cheaply.
- Pressure is to ingest new and historical data, which means we don't have enough resources for developing new products and tools.
- Overlapping federal/NOAA efforts, but lack of federal/NOAA vision/guidance for our niche and future directions/prioritization

**What emerging issues do you see related to data management?**

- Change management (always an issue) and new frontiers (delivery of quality product to mobile platforms).
- Certification; NCEI archiving, Glider DAC, QARTOD, NDBC, etc
- CMSP decision-support tools;
- I think the RAs do need time to mature with netCDF, THREDDS,

integration, quality control. Whatever can be done collectively to promote these items, the better.

- The balance between trying to get efficiencies by have a single of multiple shared DMAC providers (as suggested in the RFP) and the need for a truly regional DMAC team. Efficiencies are great for integrating already established data sources but regional DMAC teams are the most efficient way to increase data management capacity with individual data providers.
- Biology data is more difficult and time consuming to curate.
- Always an issue with competing programs, and with keeping current.
- Under-utilizing potential to support/promote/advance larger IOOS/RA missions

**What concerns or questions do you have about the IOOS data management program?**

- What is the IOOS DM program? Leadership/guidance/solutions/services? What is its mission statement?
- More attention and effort should be paid to: - Leverage our common DMAC investments, both from the RAs and IOOS PO (IOOS Catalog, Registry, etc). - Coordinate other NOAA requests for RA's more closely through IOOS with a keen understanding of IOOS DMAC resources, to leverage directly our collective investments in IOOS DMAC services and minimize one-off work that does not improve our DMAC enterprise capabilities.
- What is the vision for the IOOS DMAC program? What are the plans for the next 6 months for DMAC staff?
- Deployment of protocols / standards / tools that the regions are required to implement that have not been properly tested and do not work. This significantly impacts the DMAC capacity in the regions as they then have to fix the problem.
- We need to make the granularity of the IOOS catalog more consistent. For example, should it have the same number of items in an RA catalog?
- Still unclear what the vision is for the national program, and how thematic/technical DACS fit with regional DACS.
- nothing near-term

**What specific topics would you like addressed at the March Meeting?**

Status of archiving at NCEI	50.00%
-	4
Plans for QARTOD Manuals	25.00%
-	2
Next steps for national product (Axiom demonstration project)	62.50%
-	5
Data Catalog update - what is the catalog, what it isn't	50.00%
-	4

-		<b>87.50%</b>
<b>IOOS PO goals and tasks for the coming year</b>		7
-		<b>87.50%</b>
<b>Long term plans for DMAC -</b>		7
-		<b>50.00%</b>
<b>Program metrics</b>		4
-		<b>75.00%</b>
<b>Data Acquisition Centers - HFR, Glider, ATN, OA</b>		6
-		<b>12.50%</b>
<b>Responses</b>		1
<b>Other (please specify)</b>		

Other: What should we take and use from OOI CI?

## How would you define a successful data management session in March?

- If we depreciated SOS efforts and pushed harder on ERDDAP/TDS.
- Success is if we keep these topics above the weeds, but inform RA Directors of important activities and vision to enable discussion so we achieve shared understanding and group consensus between IOOS PO and RAs
- Specific objectives articulated for above topics. Expectations and timelines for IOOS and RAs also discussed.
- Making sure that all the RA DM priorities are addressed. RAs are at different levels of DM. It is important to have a common goal.
- One in which we walk out with some common objectives / tasks for all the regions.
- A clear vision of IOOS Data Management is articulated.
- We ALL leave with shared goal(s)/objective(s) and clearly understand any next steps (by RAs and IOOS office) needed towards achieving those goals

## Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

- I think DMAC is sufficiently mature that we could work toward an "Ocean Weather Channel" concept.
- Suggestion: Organize IOOS DMAC (P.O. and RA's) meetings and/or conference calls to foster OOI CI - IOOS DMAC interactions and integration, now that OOI data release is imminent.

- I think it would be good for each RA to spend 3 min or so talking about the DM priorities within their region. I'm not sure we are as coordinated as one thinks.
- ERRDAP seems like a good tool to integrate data from multiple sources into a common framework. Is a common deployment across the RAs sensible? Can this enhance common product development?
- Involve the DAC's. It would be useful for me to talk with others about the secondary data sets made from real time observations. Is anyone processing data to produce cleaner, quality controlled, intermediate data products?
- Would like IOOS office to more strongly advocate within NOAA for use of regional DACS as NOAA DACS to respond to NOAA needs.
- Does the IOOS office want to get anything out of this discussion? I don't have the impression that the RA directors can effectively come together on a common agenda. Difficult or not, the IOOS office will probably have to lead any meaningful conversation about the future of DMAC. If that isn't desired at the moment then we might as well not push the issue.

Respondents: NANOOS, GLOS, AOOO, PacIOOS, SCCOOS, GCOOS, NERACOOS, CeNCOOS