UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
National Satellite Land Remote Sensing Data Archive
Advisory Committee Meeting

Minutes of the
Fourth Meeting of 2-Year Charter (2001-2003)
U. S. Geological Survey
Reston, VA
October 23-25, 2002

Committee Membership

Academia

Laboratory researcher-data user:	Dr. Samuel Goward, University of Maryland
Classroom educator-data user:	Dr. Gerald Nelson, University of Illinois

Government

Federal data user:	Dr. Brad Doorn, USDA/Foreign Ag Service
Federal data user:	Dr. Darrel Williams, NASA
State/Local data user:	Ms. Amelia Budge, Univ. New Mexico, EDAC
State/Local data user:	Dr. Hugh Bender, Texas Nat'l. Res. Info. Service

Industry

Data management technologist:	Dr. John S. MacDonald, Chairman, MacDonald-Dettwiler*
Licensed data provider:	Mr. Herb Satterlee, CEO Digital Globe, Inc.
Value-added or other data provider:	Mr. Bob Winokur, President EarthSat
End user:	Mr. Rick Crowsey, Crowsey Inc.

Other

Non-affiliated individual at-large:	Prof. Joanne Gabrynowicz, University of MS Nat'l Remote Sensing & Space Law Center
Non-government organization:	Mr. Jim Frelk, ECS
International non-U.S. rep:	Dr. Edryd Shaw, Director General, CCRS*
At-large from any sector:	Ms. Kass Green, President, Space Imaging Services
At-large from any sector:	Mr. Daniel Dubno, CBS News

Ex-Officio

WMO	Dr. Kenneth Davidson
Long-Term Archive	Mr. John Faundeen, USGS

Committee Federal Officer	Mr. Thomas Holm, USGS

*Retired

Record of Committee Meeting Attendance

October 23-25, 2002

Present:

Dr. Hugh Bender
Ms. Amelia Budge
Mr. Rick Crowsey
Dr. Brad Doorn
Mr. Daniel Dubno
Mr. John Faundeen
Mr. James Frelk
Prof. Joanne Gabrynowicz
Dr. Samuel Goward
Ms. Kass Green
Mr. Thomas Holm
Dr. Gerald Nelson
Mr. Herb Satterlee
Dr. Edryd Shaw
Dr. Darrel Williams
Mr. Robert Winokur

Absent:

Dr. Kenneth Davidson
Dr. John S. MacDonald

May 1-3, 2002

Present:

Dr. Hugh Bender
Ms. Amelia Budge
Mr. Rick Crowsey
Dr. Kenneth Davidson
Dr. Brad Doorn
Mr. Daniel Dubno
Mr. John Faundeen
Mr. James Frelk
Prof. Joanne Gabrynowicz
Dr. Samuel Goward
Mr. Thomas Holm
Dr. John S. MacDonald
Dr. Gerald Nelson
Mr. Herb Satterlee
Dr. Edryd Shaw
Dr. Darrel Williams
Mr. Robert Winokur

Absent:

Ms. Kass Green

October 24-26, 2001

Present:

Dr. Hugh Bender
Ms. Amelia Budge
Mr. Rick Crowsey
Dr. Brad Doorn
Mr. Daniel Dubno
Mr. John Faundeen
Mr. James Frelk
Prof. Joanne Gabrynowicz
Dr. Samuel Goward*
Ms. Kass Green
Mr. Thomas Holm
Dr. Gerald Nelson
Mr. Herb Satterlee
Dr. Edryd Shaw
Dr. Darrel Williams
Mr. Robert Winokur

Absent:

Dr. John S. MacDonald

*via telecon

March 28-30, 2001

Present:

Ms. Amelia Budge
Dr. Kenneth Davidson
Dr. Brad Doorn
Mr. John Faundeen
Prof. Joanne Gabrynowicz
Dr. Samuel Goward
Ms. Kass Green
Mr. Doug Hall
Mr. Joseph Harroun
Mr. Thomas Holm
Dr. John S. MacDonald
Dr. Gerald Nelson
Dr. Edryd Shaw
Ms. Karen Siderelis

Absent:

Dr. Hugh Bender
Mr. Herb Satterlee
Mr. Darrel Williams

Day 1 – Wednesday, October 23, 2002

Welcome

Thomas Holm, Special Assistant to the Chief, U.S. Geological Survey, EROS Data Center, welcomed the group to the last meeting of this Charter period. The FACA approval process is for a 2-year Committee. In 1999, we had the Landsat launch, as well as Space Imaging and Digital Globe launches. We are indeed in the thick of things.

The USGS and DOI is very interested in continuing the Committee Charter for another 2 years. Thomas would like to know if you are interested in continuing your participation for another 2 years. Membership will change to a certain degree. Let us know by the end of the week.

AGENDA REVIEW

A very rewarding by-product of this Committee is filling the data gaps. There is a Pecora session that Brad Doorn is chairing; Darrel Williams is moderating and John Faundeen is presenting a paper that was done by Williams, Goward and Faundeen.

There is a new, DOC-sponsored FACA advisory committee, ACRES, on remote sensing. We will hear more about it later.

It would be useful to have an update on where the EROS Data Center (archive) is on budget, organization, where you are this year and where you are planning on going in the future.

As of October 1, Faundeen and Holm are in different organizations at EDC.

PRESENTATION - by Helen Wood on NOAA images shared resource models. Helen is the Director, Office of Satellite Data Processing and Distribution, NOAA. A reference to check out is FEMA's disasterinfo.gov

ACTION ITEM REVIEW

1. Dan Dubno, Jerry Nelson, and Amy Budge will draft a paragraph "this kind of outreach can be engaged in."
   This will be covered in the outreach report.

2. We have the outreach document that was submitted. A paragraph from each member should be emailed to Jerry and Dan. Whatever is recommended should become a budget initiative for FY 2004.
   Done. This will be part of the outreach aspect for the budget.

3. Affiliate subgroup: Bender, Doorn, MacDonald, Faundeen, and Gabrynowicz. Include AmericaView.
   Brad Doorn will report later in the meeting.

4. Bender will join Dubno and Nelson on the outreach subgroup. Write a paragraph on AmericaView and outreach to the Archive.
   This is part of 1 and 2.

5. Paper on data gaps should be submitted to Photogrammetric Engineering that updates Warriner's paper. Goward and Faundeen will work to get this information pulled together for a manuscript.
   This is being worked on. Progress report will be given tomorrow.

6. Faundeen to identify technical options for making the data available on the web page.
   John has gone beyond identifying options; data are available now.

7. Subgroup (data sieve) – Goward and/or Williams, Nelson, Doorn, and Faundeen will work in parallel with the LTAP validation.
   This will be covered in Sam's subgroup report tomorrow.

8. Evaluate what it takes to have a data base with spatial observation characteristics to track data.
   This didn't occur. Faundeen has not heard from MacDonald and will continue to try contacting him to decide if there is a reason to continue.

9. Add John MacDonald as an email member of the data sieve subgroup.
   Done.

10. Subgroup (Data Sieve): Goward, Shaw, Doorn, Budge (MacDonald via email) try to meet as soon as possible. Subgroup will go over the table and fine tune it and come up with a draft.
    Report tomorrow.

11. Retention Life Cycle group can complete their on going task.
    This is not retention life cycle but is specific to manned space flight. First a qualification on the Human Space Flight sub-committee, we have only corresponded once or twice since the last meeting, as all members have been extremely busy. A visit to the Johnson Space Center never materialized. More information will be provided in the Subgroup report.

12. Budge and Faundeen to do another report at the next meeting on DAAC, GSFC, and NSLRSDA.
    No meeting was held. This action will be taken off the agenda.

13. Faundeen to report on the LTA workshop. (Focus of meeting changed.)
    John wasn't invited.

14. AAC should brief USGS Director and the Office of the Secretary of DOI. Should Joanne do briefing between now and the next meeting? Yes
    Tom Weimer, Deputy Assistant Director for Water and Science, and Chip Groat, Director, USGS, will be at the 1pm session today.

Comments on action items – none.

CEOS UPDATE (John Faundeen)

In November 2003 John Faundeen will become the chair of the information systems and services working group.

John is also leading a team under WGISS on archiving. An email has gone out on what each country is interested in regarding archiving.

WGISS test facilities – cooperative project with similar organizations.

Working with Cal/Val working group. Any restricted data would not be in NSLRSDA. SPOT vegetation data will probably be restricted and used by EOS scientists.

Working on outreach/inreach program to meet in countries that have not been to the meetings so they learn about CEOS and CEOS learns about them.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON REMOTE SENSING (ACRES) - Robert Winokur

Joanne Gabrynowicz and I are members of this Committee along with General Clapper, Chip Groat, John Copple, and representatives from MITRE, Resource 21, Aerospace, and RSI.

The Committee goal is to look at impediments to commercial licensing processes and what can be done to help (satellite) those processes.

First meeting was in September when the Committee looked at licensing and establishing a potential list of things to look at. Go to www.licensing.noaa.gov for additional information. Next meeting will be January 14 and is open to the public.

CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS AT THE EROS DATA CENTER – Thomas Holm

There were several reasons that the EDC is reorganizing, i.e., align with USGS, maximize use of an independent survey report, and the beginning of performance based contracting.

The new organization at the EDC is in alignment with the USGS Geography programs, streamlining operations, minimizing redundancy, and clarify roles and responsibilities, as well as looking for future opportunities.

An outside consultant conducted a study of the EDC pointing out strengths and weaknesses. Many of their findings have been incorporated into the new organizational structure.

Starting November 1, EDC's major contractor (400+ employees) will be performance based. This is a new concept for the Data Center and will require getting use to.

Under the new organization EDC's front office will be:

Chief – RJ Thompson
Deputy Chief – James Sturdevant
Special Assistant to the Chief – Thomas Holm

The 3 teams reporting to the EDC Chief:

Geographic Sciences Team – Wayne Rohde. Holm is Acting until Wayne returns from military duty. As of November 4, June Thormodsgard will be Acting.

Mission Support Team – Lyn Oleson

Program Services Team – William Draeger

LANDSAT DATA WAREHOUSING VISION (John Faundeen)

John Faundeen has attended the Society of American Archivist meeting and a Midwest Archive Conference (largest regional archiving group in the nation).

Regarding NSLRSDA data migration, Landsat 1-5 MSS and TM will be started in May 2003 and it will take 2-3 years to complete. Once we get to the next media we could transfer to a silo environment. With access to Landsat 1-7 data we could appeal to change analysis users and find what has changed in the previous years by drilling down through the data. This is a data warehouse concept.

John also recently attended a conference of people who take care of historical documents (civil war) where researchers are allowed to work with the originals. A lot of our analog film data has access challenges. Maybe we could get researchers to come out and work with the original data, i.e., Gemini (1960's, 10% or less cloud cover). This would make the archive more relevant to researchers. They could come and work with us.

PRESENTATION TO ASSISTANT SECRETARY, WATER AND SCIENCE, TOM WEIMER AND USGS DIRECTOR CHIP GROAT BY JOANNE GABRYNOWICZ

Joanne's presentation materials can be found under Tab 7 – Reference Materials.

Comments after Joanne's presentation:

As it gets more complicated with more sensors the decision remains to make this data available for the public. What is there to maintain constant policy, approaches, etc. to make that happen? It seems each year these issues get more complicated.

This is a big question and one that we are looking at through affiliate archives and how they can augment what the archive should be doing in the future to make sure the data is useful. We should be able to get assistance from CEOS. We certainly can go to other countries but we also need to make sure that the data they have is useful.

How can we get the DOI, etc., to listen to what is being said? Tom Weimer will work with Chip Groat and get a presentation together and before the right people.

We could look at the 1KM as a policy model – it took little money.

USGS now validates IGS for data that is readable and usable.

We are not talking hundreds of millions of dollars. It wouldn't take much to help take care of this problem.

It has to be a real effort to get people to understand the difference between the operational aspects of the satellite and the actual data.

ELECTRONIC RECORDS ARCHIVE PROGRAM, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION (Kenneth Thibodeau)

Purpose of preservation is access. This is a "Take Home Message." The Electronic Records Archive (ERA) challenge is to take any type of record, and provide discovery and delivery to anyone interested and with a right of access. The amount of records to be preserved is staggering: Clinton-38 million emails, State Department-25 million diplomatic messages, Department of Defense-50 million images, Census Bureau 800 million image files.

The ERA has 22 Government and 35 contractor FTEs.

One way to get a response is to make people aware they have something to lose. Walk/talk like a duck.

The NSLRSDA faces a rather different problem than NARA. NARA works through the National Archive and they know they will get appropriations. NSLRSDA has to convince the right people of the problems we face in order to get funding which takes years and constant attention.

Day 2, October 24, 2002

ZERO PRICE POLICY RECOMMENDATION (Gabrynowicz and Goward)

We like the idea of data being relatively free (but not free). We do not want the Archive to loose base, support monies.

In principle it is a good idea to be tied to the customer to get feedback. There should be some feedback to the NSLRSDA Archive managers on the job they are doing. There is no incentive to make data available.

The budget issue – we have always made recommendations that did not address the budget. Now we are looking at the trade offs. There is a budgetary impact if prices are dropped to zero. What is the Committee's priority to the options available to do? We need to look at priorities. How do you check public good and measure that feedback. When you talk about a price is that the best way to get the feedback? We need to get the word out.

The real value in having a satellite observation is the data. If the cost is significant it will limit the availability of the data to people who can afford it. It means that you are not using the system, as it was mean to be used. Pricing becomes an impediment. We need to work to the lowest price possible.

There is some data for which there will be a charge but current data is free. Do we want to bring up NASA and DOI working better together?

We haven't moved to zero-based pricing in the last 2 years. We don't know what is right. It has to be done through a business process, i.e., data set that has been priced and offer it up for free and then look at what happens.

No one understands the elasticity of data demand. Landsat doesn't compete with the private sector but helps the market. It would be irresponsible of the Committee to give the data away. We need to be real careful. A lot of data is bought from Canada because it is cheaper. Free is not the way to go.

Concern is that in fulfilling requests and providing a cost for doing so to the customer instead of the archive does not help the Archive. They exclude the cost of the archive. Everything else goes into the formula except the archive.

The value of the imagery is the value of the scene. How can we provide this service, through subscriptions, etc.? Whatever language we use should not be tied to the price of a pixel. It is difficult to do.

Fact is that journalists will require information. Government printing offices charge the public and provide information to journalists at no cost. The whole reason for the price is that you don't want an organization tied down with unnecessary requests. The traditional approach is that journalists will be able to have access to this at no cost or what others use for journalists.

We need to come back to the public good. What EDC charges for COFUR doesn't cover the variable costs. It shouldn't cover fixed costs. We can't think about this as cost recovery.

There is already a model of the separate costs and having a reimbursable account for agencies. This way the Government can respond in that there should be no cost to other agencies. Why is the archive separated from the rest of the cost recovery issues?

We can make a recommendation for the lowest price. Trying to interpret the words is impossible.

RECOMMEND: That the NSLRSDA continually move toward the lowest possible price for data access in a fiscally prudent manner.

RECOMMEND: That DOI fully fund all of the costs associated with NSLRSDA's mission.

RECOMMEND: That the DOI be requested to fully fund all the costs associated with NSLRSDA's mission. Needs context.

Set aside for when we have time or to the next Committee.

SUB-GROUP REPORT – NAMING

The current name doesn't say anything to those buying the products. Need a name that is marketable. The name that we came up with is the USGS National Imagery Archive. This is clean and clear. This is being proposed and is open for discussion.

The data is global not national.

The archive is more than USGS.

Land needs to be part of the name.

The name doesn't have to be descriptive of everything.

What you have is probably okay because there is a scientific committee.

If we use global they will want others to fund.

We need to get rid of remote sensing because people get lost.

Do we send this to the next Committee or go with the name National Imagery Archive

What was known to the public as NSLRSDA be known as the National Imagery Archive (outside of USGS).

Should the name be changed? YES

USGS can decide how they want to use the name change. The National Imagery Archive @ USGS.

RECOMMED: That for public purposes NSLRSDA be known, as the "National Imagery Archive @ USGS" but internally DOI/USGS/EDC be able to use the NSLRSDA name.

CONCENSUS – YES (unanimous)

SUB-GROUP REPORT – DATA GAP (Goward, Doorn, Williams and Faundeen)

Landsat data is a critical data set that needs to be in the Archive. This is a critical area and it will help fill data gaps. This is too important to ignore.

RECOMMEND: That the Landsat (MSS and TM) Science Data Buy acquisitions (level 1B and orthorectified) which are already in the public domain, be incorporated into the NSLRSDA, as soon as possible.

CONCENSUS – YES (unanimous)

This data will be global orthorectified and will be completed next year by NASA. To pick a date of acquisition the target will be 1985. We have not considered seasonal data.

The data gap analysis is just beginning.

John Faundeen is looking at requesting data base dumps from IGS.

The map information with the gaps apparent needs to be presented at the LGSOWG and LTWG meetings.

Put a data gap map on a computer in the corner of the Pecora booth. Make an overlay of the data gaps that show or tie to a disaster or what will be lost, i.e., Mt. St. Helens, flooding, etc. There are so many data gap issues. Capture the history, assessment of access to IGS, can the 5-year update be combined? Every NGO in the US would be our client. *In place.*

Subgroup will have an exit report for the next Committee. **ACTION**: Darrel Williams

Joanne Gabrynowicz would like to be involved when policies are established, etc. A list has already been done by Darrel Williams.

If the 5-year updates are recommended then we have to include information on the budget. We are running out of time to access the data before it is too old. Gaps can be filled in with private data (like SPOT and IRS).

We need to try to get other agencies involved so they can help to fund the areas. We also need to recognize the IGS.

RECOMMEND: Talk to guys from Earthsat (names will be sent by Winokur to Faundeen) that were involved in the data buy to see if there is any potential help in filling the gaps.

Address this through CEOS and LGSOWG/LTWG as it is for the good of mankind. It is time for the IGS to give back to the system that has given them so much. We can also become a backup for their archives. Brad Doorn will help to support getting the information.

We are working with SPOT on the archiving of their data.

SUB-GROUP REPORT - DATA SIEVE (Goward, Doorn, Williams and Faundeen)

1. Recommend that we focus on long term.
2. Recommend preservation.

What is the content of the recommendations? There is a whole series of recommendations that the subgroups picked.

There is a reign of responsibility, where do we put our resources?

At some point on the 10-day composite there is a question of assessment of images. We are not considering radar because there is no U.S. source data.

We are focusing the archive for long-term preservation of data. This is the number one priority.

Should the political sieve be a footnote and be recognized?

We need to identify our goal for the meeting.

Report on “Proposed NSLRSDA Data Sieve: AACII Assessment and Proposal” needs to be read and approved by the Committee members. We need any additional information included.

If we can finish we should do that.

The report can be worked on and sent via email.

Need to add AVHRR and vegetation to the table.

Technical Background – Information can be required prior to accepting data.

USGS EDC should participate in the NPOESS Cal/Val efforts. **ACTION**: John Faundeen to check with Kevin Gallo to ensure that USGS is involved.

Special conclusions will be refined by the subgroup. Is it in NSLRSDA and off to the side or not in NSLRSDA? Should be a recommendation to the next Committee – good guidance for the next Committee.

Need to include discussion on metadata, i.e., radar.

The subgroup has the authority to finish the white paper to be completed by the end of the year. Comments on the current draft white paper are required by November 10, 2002. **ACTION**: Sam will email the draft white paper with Amy Budge's comments integrated, to the subgroup. **ACTION**: John will email recommendation to the subgroup.

SUB-GROUP REPORT – OUTREACH (Nelson)

AmericaView (originally OhioView) gives grants to different states and new users. They have a limited budget. Group has become too political. It is still something to monitor. The potential exists for AmericaView to assist the archive.

Outreach is important and worthy of additional funds. Need to target new users, special activities, and development of products.

Develop a set of instructional materials showing the value of NSLRSDA.

RECOMMEND:

1. Start off outreach by announcing the new name.

CONCENSUS – YES (unanimous)

2. Look at the 1990-2000 GeoCover data set that EarthSat is doing for NIMA. **ACTION**: Jerry and Amy will try to make a second standard.

3. Provide educational briefings to Congress, DOI, and other relevant decision-makers on the value of the NSLRSDA.

CONCENSUS – YES (unanimous)

SUB-GROUP REPORT – AFFILIATE ARCHIVES (Doorn, Bender, Gabrynowicz, MacDonald, and Faundeen)

This is an important area for the next Committee. The technology and programs in government are moving this way. A backup is needed and it is very expensive to create. It would be beneficial to have partners who can be backup archives.

USDA FAS letter was written and has moved through the Government process. USDA has sent a letter back to USGS to precede working on an agreement with EDC.

We can use USDA FAS and USGS EDC as a pilot to develop the guidelines for setting up affiliate agreements. Maybe a recommendation should be getting together with other U.S. Government imagery archives. No recommendations at this time. This should be something to put on the mandate for the next Committee.

Work with CCRS - Ed Shaw and Tom Feehan have been working with USGS to determine data that each could archive for the other party.

USDA archive right now will depend on budgets.

EXPANSION OF TRANSFER TIME FOR LICENSES TRANSFERRING DATA TO NSLRSDA (Gabrynowicz)

The Committee can make a recommendation. The proposed recommendation regarding expansion of transfer of time for licensees transferring data to NSLRSDA, requires an explanation to the commercial provider to get wording into the licenses.

RECOMMEND: USGS EDC request NOAA to include in future licenses a requirement that licensees give USGS EDC a minimum of 1 year's notice prior to a data purge.

CONCENSUS – YES (unanimous)

RECOMMEND: USGS EDC send letters to current licensees requesting that they give USGS EDC a minimum of 1 year's notice prior to a data purge.

CONCENSUS – YES (unanimous)

SUB-GROUP REPORTS – DECLASSIFICATION II UPDATE (Frelk, Dubno, Goward, and Faundeen)

Sam Goward and Jim Frelk attended the ceremony that handed the DeclassII material from NIMA to NARA and USGS. There is no, or incomplete metadata for some of the imagery. This is a major issue that should be raised. There are changes in exposure. Imagery varies in quality. Although the original copy goes to NARA, USGS has the responsibility to provide quick access to the data.

ACTION: Sam to email NIMA speech to members.

The data is in NSLRSDA because DeclassI is there. Date ranges overlap.

The absence of adequate and complete metadata is a problem.

The part of the data set that has historical value is the high-resolution imagery.

The real question is should we recommend that the archive ask for the metadata to be provided?

In order to scan and turn the data into radiometry data then you would need to know film type focal length. Ask for it.

John Faundeen is working this informally by sending a letter to see what is available.

Day 3 – Friday, October 25, 2002

WHAT USGS HAS DONE WITH AAC RECOMMENDATIONS (Faundeen)

John Faundeen went through the Recommendations made by the first and second Archive Advisory Committees.

Points and Comments:

- Records management has a direct tie to the Smithsonian records files.
- Remind them that a recommendation was made for a 6-month notice to purge that had no response. A letter needs to be sent to the licensees (recommendation from this meeting).
- Interagency policy was achieved regarding LPDAAC and NSLRSDA. LPDAAC has not meet for about 2 years.
- A decision was made at the USGS/NASA to discuss this issue at a round table meeting.
- Attendance at LPDAAC has not been recommended.
- The process of getting data into the NSLRSDA is very expensive and funding continues to be a problem.
- Address ongoing issues of data funding transparency when data moves from initial agency to NSLRSDA.
- There is no activity on moving Landsat 7 data into the NSLRSDA. This data has to be in the archive. Do we want to write a letter to the Center Chief and remind him of the agreement to get this data into the NSLRSDA?
- Landsat is the backbone of the Archive and the continuity of the data needs to be maintained.
- **ACTION**: John and Sam will draft a letter to the Center Chief, email to members, and send. The letter should ask for a definitive answer before February.
- Quality Process – There is flexibility in the processing. Don't take it too seriously. We simply need some way to guide each situation.
- Use the USDA and CCRS examples to develop guidelines. Every time you have a new opportunity you will have something to guide you through the process. It should be done with a level of comfort.
- Go back to the next group with a report to the next Committee. Address specifics of recommended qualification process for affiliated archives.
- The real issue is the long-term process.
- Maybe the letter should ask for consistency in the migration of data. Stress consistency. Ask what is the status and effort of coordination of transition plans.
- Bringing in the data doesn't free up budget funding for John.
- Do we have science buy in? Does it need to involve legal? May want to clarify the responses to this recommendation. (On going set of process, the E systems used in defining what the minimum requirements are, maintaining long-term archive).

- Go back to the guidance and work with Thomas Holm's help to clarify the responses.
- There is an oral history project at NASA JSC to collect information. The AAC might recommend a contract to this group to write up the history.
- Darrel and Sam and others have the memories that explain the pictures of filing in data gaps. Having this history available can only help in getting responses for policy decisions.
- We need a policy overlay. Continue and expand data gap input with policy overlay.
- USGS should wait for the group to do this. Joanne will email information to John Faundeen on this contract group.
- Help prioritize acquisition of data – Brad Doorn. Needs to be brought back up to the Committee. CEOS LTWG? LTAP meeting – A lot of information was shared. This is an on going meeting. Darrel will always be there.
- We are interfacing with NASA/Johnson and a letter of intent for commercial (management of program and distribution) – being drafted by NASA. We are not sure what the language is. Email has been forward by John Faundeen to Committee members. USGS should continue their involvement in this activity.

All of the recommendations have been very important to John's work in the NSLRSDA.

Where is the draft data policy? **ACTION**: Check with Thomas Holm. Formally request from the chairman – where is this policy.

Is there a backup for John Faundeen that will be coming to the meetings to help with continuity and the oral history? This should be brought to the USGS and DOI. Start by showing the weaknesses and failures (risk assessment). This is a single point of failure.

RECOMMEND: In recognition of the statutory requirement of maintaining NSLRSDA, long term, the Committee recommends that EDC take steps to ensure sufficient staffing for continuity of NSLRSDA management.

CONCENSUS – YES (unanimous)

DRAFT DATA POLICY (Gabrynowicz)

It is an integrated policy that had agreement by the Committee. It should be updated but only when we follow up on where it is. This is a work product on the NSLRSDA web page. We should complete any revision of the draft before February 15.

Thomas Holm's email:

> Here is the concise and to the point status of the Draft Data Policy.
>
> The policy has been reviewed by USGS and has been kicked back to EDC (Thomas Holm), given the many changes in the USGS role in Landsat and other missions.

About the time we were making progress, Space Imaging announced their move to get out of the Landsat program. Now we need a data policy for Landsat, not just Landsat 7. Questions were: how does this draft policy affect potential changes to the Landsat 7 policy, should there be one policy for Landsat, should we have a separate and potentially different policy for NSLRSDA, and many more questions related to the National Map, LDCM, etc.

Further, the GIO is the new home for these Data Policy issues and we are dealing with some new players. Given the many and recent changes in the remote sensing world since this policy was drafted, does the Committee still believe that the draft policy withstands the test of time? Seems the biggest rub of the USGS is what appears to be a separate policy for the archive and how does that play as the USGS strives to bring consistency to their role as a leading source for civil satellite and other geospatial data. Why have a separate policy for the NSLRSDA vs. Landsat 7 vs. LDCM, vs. the National Map vs. other geospatial data being created? Their points sound very similar to our issue with the difference between the USGS and NASA on pricing and how that will be perceived by the public.

This is just a quick summary, if we need more, please take an action and you and I can work it.

Other Points

Briefing materials should be prepared for when presentations are done. The handouts to Groat and Wiemer should have been the presentation materials and not the 3-ring binders.

We should look at overlay slides that show the history of events (why the prices went down). Policy overlay on to the statistics.

Tom Weimer is arranging a briefing with Secretary Norton that will be done by Joanne. Need to prepare a 15 and 30-minute version. Thomas Holm and Joanne will start working on this immediately.

ACTION: Joanne will email overlay slides to Thomas Holm so we know what to update. Thomas to get data to Joanne so she can update her policy overlay slides.

RECOMMEND: Recognizing that NSLRSDA is, officially, a National institution mandated by Congress, the Committee strongly recommends that NSLRSDA have a separate and comprehensive policy. The Committee recognizes the desirability of having the DOI USGS to establish a single data policy that pertaining to access and distribution of all DOI USGS held and/or managed data. However, the Congressional mandate makes a NSLRSDA-specific policy necessary.

CONCENSUS – YES (unanimous)

GUIDANCE – KEY POINTS FOR BRIEFING TO SECRETARY NORTON

- Not enough money to do the job necessary.
- The briefing has to be in the content of the charter to the Committee. We can ask the archive to do explicit things.
- It isn't appropriate for the Committee to ask for funds.
- We need to find out why they asked for the briefing.
- Bring something that is related to Norton.
- Find out why Weimer asked for the meeting.
- Important impacts – LDCM and environmental monitoring.
- Also recognize the Committee members because they have influence.

Information from Thomas Holm regarding the presentation to Secretary Norton: Email was from Chip Groat to Max Ethridge. Based on the archive meeting yesterday, Chip is pushing to have a briefing on the archive activity to Secretary Norton as soon as it can be scheduled, weeks away, not days. Pull together a briefing as soon as possible to have the essence of Joanne's talk at the meeting. It has to be a much smaller presentation then the meeting and we need to cover the key issues expediently.

ACTION: Ed and Sam – estimate of the data gap fill. What would it take to fill the holes? Recommendation is for every 5 years. Whatever number we use, use a high-end number.

Briefing should be in slides and conversation.

You need no more than 5 vu-graphs with moving loops and a single phrase of critical points. Last slide (no. 5) is to reinforce the points.

ACTION: Rick Crowsey will create a slide overly of Committee members. *Done.*

ACTION: Joanne will email her presentation to the Committee members for comments.

LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE NEXT CHARTER

Winokur – Cut the number of days down. 2 ½ days is too long. Can get done in 3 meetings a year. Advantage to having at least one session outside of Sioux Falls is that Chip and others will attend. Maybe have 1 meeting in Denver.

Nelson – Any new members should have a 1-day briefing, including old members that want to attend.

Williams – Should spend 15-20 minutes of each meeting to refocus on the purpose of the Committee.

Bender – Pick certain areas for presentations from EDC people – focus on things that pertain to the recommendations of the Committee.

Nelson – Less Committee time on buses.

Bender – Issues are getting more focused so that meetings can be shorter.

Gabrynowicz – We started at 2 days and it wasn't enough time; then wanted more; now want less.

Faundeen – More focused and shorter agenda is what I'm hearing.

Gabrynowicz – National Space Policy is being change. There could be significant policy changes that may affect the group.

Bender – Subgroups should be more focused and maybe they should stay for the next day.

Williams – Or the subgroups could be held the afternoon of the second day.

Faundeen – There is an intended social element built into the agenda.

Winokur – Decide on the days needed as the agenda develops.

Goward – A real issue is in trying to convene meetings. Subgroup meetings need to go over goals, etc., of the Committee and subgroup.

Faundeen – Would like to see subgroups meet prior to meetings.

Shaw – Don't have so many subgroups that they can't be handled.

Gabrynowicz – At the beginning of the charter period we put out a calendar for 2 years ahead of time.

Charter for the next Committee needs to be established.

Current seasonal time is fine unless we want to meet in DC in August and Sioux Falls in January.

Shaw – Content – We have produced things that haven't been looked at. Follow-up needs to be handled. The Committee has to monitor and engineer this.

Budge – Two points: First, continue to examine agreements between agencies regarding holdings/archiving of global land satellite data sets (also in context of affiliated archives). Second, CEOS and other global communities need to realize (if they don't already) that there are indeed data gaps in the Landsat global coverage (share the graphics prepared by John) and that these gaps are in danger of not being filled due to old data formats, deteriorating tapes, etc. (holes need to be filled ASAP).

Goward – For the next meeting, interaction with private industry should become a major topic of the Committee. Views on decisions on archiving, consideration to open licensing, ramifications and shifting going on right now that the Committee needs to consider.

Gabrynowicz – Presidential Decision Directive is being revised, as is the Space Policy. The next charter period we may have to go back to more of a policy focus.

Need to look at Homeland Security.

Goward – Address directly the interface between the land science community and NSLRSDA.

Does the Committee need a Land Science member? Make sure the science community understands what this committee does.

Gabrynowicz – There are fundamental differences because NSLRSDA is the only entity that is long term.

Shaw – Continue to have an international representative. CCRS is interested in providing a representative to focus on database and affiliate archives.

Address the licensing/purging of data.

Integrate AAC II work products into 4/7/00 draft data policy paper.

Assess newly/developed national policy (Presidential Decision Directive and National Space Policy) as they relate to NSLRSDA.

Look at the Science Community and get them involved.

ITEMS PULLED FROM THE MINUTES FOR AAC III

Revisit cost recommendation and perhaps initiate a study and/or white paper on appropriate and necessary costs.

AACIII should use the guidelines called out under Lessons Learned.

Faundeen will report if the data sieve report occurs.

Use the USDA FAS and USGS EDC as a pilot to develop the guidelines for setting up affiliate agreements. Maybe a recommendation should be getting together with other U.S. Government imagery archives. No recommendations at this time.

Is there a backup for John Faundeen that will be coming to the meetings to help with continuity and the oral history? This should be brought to the USGS and DOI. Start by showing the weaknesses and failures (risk assessment). This is a single point of failure.

MEMBERS FOR THE NEXT COMMITTEE

Include NGO Committee involvement.

Amy has a NIMA contact and will email info to John.

General Clapper can probably recommend someone to be on the Committee.

ACTION: Winokur – for Bill Stein's contact information – send to John Faundeen.

Bill Heidbreder, St. Louis, NIMA.

Commercial Imagery.

ACTION: Darrel Williams will have a Data Gap Subgroup exit report for the next Committee.

ACTION: John Faundeen to check with Kevin Gallo on the NPOESS Cal/Val and ensure USGS EDC participation.

ACTION: Sam will email the draft "Data Sieve" white paper with Amy Budge's comments integrated, to the subgroup.

ACTION: John will email to the subgroup the recommendation from the last meeting on Data Sieve.

ACTION: Jerry and Amy will try to make a second standard similar to the 1990-2000 GeoCover data set that EarthSat did for NIMA.

ACTION: Sam to email to the Committee members the NIMA speech given at the DeclassII ceremony.

ACTION: Sam will draft a letter regarding the Landsat ETM+ data and its continuity and placement into the Archive. The letter will be addressed to the USGS EDC Center Chief. Prior to sending the letter, it will be emailed to members for their approval. The letter should ask for a definitive answer on Landsat data before February.

ACTION: Check with Thomas Holm on the status of the Draft Data Policy. Formally request from the chairman – where is this policy.

ACTION: Joanne will email overlay slides to Thomas Holm so we know what to update. Thomas to get data to Joanne so she can update her policy overlay slides.

ACTION: Ed and Sam – estimate of the data gap fill. What would it take to fill the holes? Recommendation is for every 5 years. Whatever number we use, use a high-end number.

ACTION: Rick Crowsey will create a slide overly of Committee members. (Done.)

ACTION: Joanne will email her draft presentation for Secretary Norton to the Committee members for comments.

ACTION: Winokur – to provide Bill Stein, NIMA contact information to John Faundeen.

Recommendation: Given the volume of satellite imagery needing evaluation by this committee, it is recommended that the committee specify limited follow up issues to be addressed and then temporarily close this investigation as the JSC seems to have the manned space flight photography well protected and accessible. NOTE: This recommendation was a part of a Sub-Group report and was never voted on.

RECOMMEND: That the NSLRSDA continually move toward the lowest possible price for data access in a fiscally prudent manner.

RECOMMEND: That the DOI be requested to fully fund all the costs associated with NSLRSDA's mission.

RECOMMEND: That for public purposes NSLRSDA be known, as the "National Imagery Archive @ USGS EDC" but internally DOI/USGS/EDC be able to use the NSLRSDA name.

RECOMMEND: That the Landsat (MSS and TM) Science Data Buy acquisitions (level 1B and orthorectified) which are already in the public domain, be incorporated into the NSLRSDA, as soon as possible.

RECOMMEND: Talk to guys from Earthsat (**ACTION**: Names will be sent by Winokur to Faundeen) that were involved in the data buy to see if there is any potential help in filling the gaps.

RECOMMEND:

1. Start off outreach by announcing the new name.
2. Look at the 1990-2000 GeoCover data set that EarthSat is doing for NIMA. **ACTION**: Jerry and Amy will try to make a second standard.
3. Provide educational briefings to Congress, DOI, and other relevant decision-makers on the value of the NSLRSDA.

RECOMMEND: USGS EDC request NOAA to include in future licenses a requirement that licensees give USGS EDC a minimum of 1 year's notice prior to a data purge.

RECOMMEND: USGS EDC send letters to current licensees requesting that they give USGS EDC a minimum of 1 year's notice prior to a data purge.

RECOMMEND: In recognition of the statutory requirement of maintaining NSLRSDA, long term, the Committee recommends that EDC take steps to ensure sufficient staffing for continuity of NSLRSDA management.

RECOMMEND: Recognizing that NSLRSDA is, officially, a National institution mandated by Congress, the Committee strongly recommends that NSLRSDA have a separate and comprehensive policy. The Committee recognizes the desirability of having the DOI USGS to establish a single data policy that pertaining to access and distribution of all DOI USGS held and/or managed data. However, the Congressional mandate makes a NSLRSDA-specific policy necessary.