

Forum for Operational Oceanography Data Sharing Working Group

Summary minutes of the first meeting, 2018-03-18, 1400-1500 AEST

Present: In Hobart – Tim Moltmann, Indi Hodgson-Johnston, Sebastien Mancini, Roger Proctor (all IMOS), Farhan Rizwi (CSIRO); On zoom – Greg Hibbert/Joe Healy (OMC), Jason McConochie (Shell), Edward King (CSIRO), Steve Buchan/Greg Williams (RPS), Chari Pattiaratchi (UWA), Boris Kelly-Gerryn (BoM), Caroline Ochieng-Erftemeijer (WAMSI), Jason Antenucci (DHI Perth), Jenny Smith (WALIS), Jonathan Kool (GA), Daryl Metters (QLD DSITI), Paul Irving (AMSA), Alex Babinin (ANU), Simon Foster (Fugro). (Apologies if I've missed anyone).

Apologies: Frans Schlack (Pilbara Ports), Ryan Lowe (UWA), Martin Exel (Austral Fisheries), Gus Jeans (Oceanalysis), Jan Flynn (Woodside), Barbra Parker (RAN)

The Agenda was as follows:

- 1) Introductions - name, affiliation, interest in the group
- 2) Review the Terms of Reference (attached)
- 3) Gauge enthusiasm for data sharing
- 4) Identify issues affecting data sharing
- 5) Identify some initial data collections participants would like to see shared
- 6) Frequency of meetings

- 1) After a round of introductions, tricky with such a large virtual assembly,
- 2) the draft Terms of Reference were discussed. There was general agreement that these represented a good starting point for the working group and were accepted, with the suggestion that a better definition of 'data' should be included. It was also accepted that Roger Proctor should be the first chair of the working group.
- 3) There was general acceptance that data sharing had benefits, the question was raised "what kind of data?" Was it just metadata, or the data itself, or data products. From an IMOS perspective the expectation is that data will comply to the FAIR principles, i.e. Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable.
- 4) Most of the meeting time was taken up with this item, and a number of issues were aired:
 - a) Getting value for sharing our data
 - i. sharing data is easier if partnering, as it is easier to see the return
 - ii. need to get buy in from partners, to identify benefit, to even make metadata visible
 - iii. with our large data collection it will take a lot of effort (i.e. cost) to share it
 - iv. industry used to share data through a project called SIMORC (System of Industry Metocean data for the Offshore and Research Communities, <http://www.simorc.org/>) but this activity appears to have stalled.
 - v. Sometimes a conflict of interest between organisational requirements to share data whilst at the same time make money from it.
 - vi. Making metadata visible can increase the value of the data and attract partnerships.
 - vii. Making sure that due accreditation is made if data is shared.

- b) How to make data available
 - i. Where to find details on best data management?
 - ii. What is needed to create good metadata?
 - iii. Standards are fine but they are not enforceable.
 - iv. Recognised that a metadata system may avoid duplicating costly measurements; the iGEM project (<http://www.igem.com.au/landing/>) was raised as an example of industry metadata sharing. (This, however, is not an open system)
 - c) Issues with data access
 - i. Sometimes difficult to find the specific data of interest.
 - ii. Often difficult to understand the quality controls applied.
 - iii. Finding out about data QA/QC provenance is important but not always visible.
- 5) The discussion here focussed more on what actions could be taken by the working group to encourage data sharing. It was agreed that:
- a. knowledge of data existence, i.e. the creation of metadata, would be a good starting point.
 - b. having a central location where users/providers could itemise data collections and constraints would be useful, and also to know who was a data provider and who was a data consumer.
 - c. creation of end-to-end data use cases would demonstrate value of data sharing. Calling on the other FOO working groups for examples could provide valuable cases.
 - d. having documentation and tools for data management would aid the process.

ACTIONS:

- 1) AODN would provide working group with details on best data management practice**
 - 2) AODN would provide working group with metadata requirements and encourage use of the AODN metadata submission tool (<https://metadataentry.aodn.org.au/submit/>) by proving an example entry**
 - 3) AODN would set up a google doc (or equivalent) to enable working group members to compile information of potentially shareable datasets, detailing locations, constraints etc.**
 - 4) Farhan Rizwi agreed to provide an end-to-end use case to illustrate the value of data sharing. The Chair agreed to contact the other FOO WGs to elicit use cases.**
- 6) Frequency of meetings – it was agreed to follow the example of other working groups and have a meeting every 3 months prior to each FOO Steering Committee meeting to enable updates of working group activity to steering committee proceedings.

Roger Proctor, 2018-03-27.