

## AGI Gigateway Advisory Group

16<sup>th</sup> November 2005, 10:30am

AGI Offices, Block C, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Morelands, 5-23 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HL

### MINUTES

#### Attendees

Peat Allan (PA)	Ordnance Survey
Tony Black (TB)	Intelligent Addressing
Jamie Justham (JJ)	Dotted Eyes
Robert Mann (RM)	AGI - <i>Chair</i>
Geoff May (GM)	Ordnance Survey
Maureen Nessling (MN)	AGI - <i>Secretary</i>
Alan Smith (AS)	Office for National Statistics
Robert Turner (RT)	AGI
Rob Walker (RW)	GI Standards Committee
Lee West (LW)	AGI

#### Apologies

Robert Barr (RB)	Manchester University
Jerry Giles	British Geological Survey
Bruce Gittings	University of Edinburgh
Carol Hryniewicz	ODPM

- 
1. **RM Welcomed all to the meeting**
  2. **Review of Minutes and Actions from Previous Meetings**

Actions from the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> May were reviewed and the following points were noted:-

#### *Work with ESRI*

**Action:** RM to follow up with ESRI and other vendors the possibility of linking up their own metadata systems with Gigateway. *There have been no formal discussions as yet, RM hopes to convene a meeting later this month.* **Carried Forward** RM

#### *Report from User Survey*

**Action:** LW to compile a report from both User Surveys. A final report will be in the October Newsletter. **Completed** LW

#### *Obtaining the UK's key national datasets*

**Action:** Team to get information on key national datasets into gigateway as quickly as possible. *See section 3c for an update on the progress.* **Carried Forward** TEAM

Actions from the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> September were reviewed and the following points were noted: -

*Workshops for metadata portals and key dataset providers*

**Action:** LW to organise a workshop for Key National dataset creators and another one for metadata portals. **Carried Forward** LW

*NIMSA Consultation Update*

**Action:** RM to make formal representations on behalf of gigateway. He will circulate plans to wind up the service and draft a letter from the Advisory Group. *No timetable has yet been provided, but the indications are that an extension will now be agreed – see item 4 below.* **Completed** RM

*Update on future of gigateway*

**Action:** RM to circulate a note after his meeting with Les Rackham to update the group. *RM, LW and LR met on 8<sup>th</sup> September and RM emailed the group on 22<sup>nd</sup> September with the details of the meeting.* **Completed** RM, LW, LR

**Action:** RM to contact Les Rackham to see if a group meeting can be arranged. *TB, RB, RM and LR met to discuss gigateway on 12<sup>th</sup> October.* **Completed** RM, LR, TB, RB

*Update of gigateway work*

**Action:** RT to circulate the MetaGenie v2.0 specifications to the group. **Carried Forward** RT

**Action:** LW to send out the most recent version of the Metadata guidelines to the group. *Metadata quality guidelines published on October newsletter.* **Completed** LW

### 3. Update on current gigateway work

#### 3a) MetaGenie v2.0

RT stated that the hold up on the delivery of MetaGenie v2.0 was due to the recent changes between the early draft and final draft of ISO 19139 and incorporating them in the UK GEMINI schema. RW said all applications for minor changes and comments should be submitted by the 21<sup>st</sup> November. RW said ISO 19139 should be finalised next year and he didn't expect there to be any major changes to disrupt the MetaGenie v2.0 development work. RT

RT stated that "Phase 1: has been accepted. "Phase 2" Converting the existing metadata records to UK GEMINI" has been started. "Phase 3: Extra functionality" has not started. RM stated that we need to pin the delivery date down. RM

**Action:** RT to let the group know the revised delivery dates of MetaGenie v2.0. RT

#### 3b) Feedback on CEN 287 Metadata work

RW informed everybody that the working group had convened and had produced a draft document which would need revision. RW

**Action:** RW to send out the the latest ISO version when available. RW

### 3c) Update on adding further organisations/datasets.

RM had a meeting with Andrew Trigg of the Land Registry who said that they are looking to recruit people to compile their metadata in the future, but at present they do not have the resources to produce any metadata.	RM
RT stated that the IGGI node would have existing data removed and replaced with 17 new datasets later this month. TB asked why ODPM are not fulfilling their commitment to gigateway by maintaining and encouraging wider use of the IGGI node.	RT, TB
<b>Action:</b> RM to draft a letter to Lars Calvert, seeking assurance that IGGI will maintain an active node, during the remainder of contract and extension.	RM
AS is keen to set up a node for ONS and will investigate what his options are for hosting his node. EDINA was suggested as being very reasonably priced. ONS have 20-30 datasets that they would consider publishing at the present time.	AS
<b>Action:</b> AS to investigate the options for setting up a node for ONS and submitting his metadata.	AS
PA reminded the group that since January 2005 there has been a mandate for Government departments to supply metadata under e-GIF, his questions were: "What should be happening?", "Where is it happening?", "Why is it not happening?" and "How will government departments make it happen?". TB stated that staff do not really understand and that perhaps a workshop for Local Government Departments may increase input. JJ thought that the the Local Government SIG may be able help in facilitating these workshops. RM thought that it was senior government staff that needed persuading and he would discuss this with Robert Barr with a view to raising it at the GI Panel on 13 <sup>th</sup> December. RM will also communicate with the e-Gov Unit in the Cabinet Office as to the supply of metadata under e-GIF. RW stated that we should identify which groups we need to contact and convince them to use metadata. LW suggested that we should send out a document to all the key dataset providers stating that there is expertise available to them so that any assistance from consultants or extra funding could be distributed fairly.	PA TB RM RB RM RW LW
<b>Action:</b> PA to obtain metadata from the Defra Family (i.e. English Nature, Environment Agency, etc.) at a meeting the following week. He will also speak to Andrew Trigg about the Land Registry's metadata.	PA
<b>Action:</b> RM to communicate with the e-Gov Unit regarding sustaining metadata via e-GIF and work with the Local Government SIG as appropriate.	RM
<b>Action:</b> RM to discuss with Robert Barr a possible formal note to the GI Panel expressing the Advisory Group concerns.	RM, RB
<b>Action:</b> RT to find out when QinetiQ's node will be live again and if they need any assistance.	RT

### 3d) Feedback from AGI 2005 exhibition.

LW and RT both thought that the stand at the exhibition was successful. LW, RT  
SeaZone are interested in creating a node and Mark Jonas said he would start working on it in the New Year. There were lots of enquiries as to when the UK GEMINI schema would be available and we have a list of contacts to email.

#### 4. Update on future funding and operation of gigateway

ODPM have published their intention to put gigateway out to tender in the New Year by posting details of the procurement schedule for a National Metadata Service on [www.procurementportal.odpm.gov.uk](http://www.procurementportal.odpm.gov.uk). It is very likely that elements of the service will be divided into lots including website maintenance, educational support and website hosting.

GM expects to receive written confirmation from ODPM soon requesting that OS extend their involvement with gigateway for a further 6 months from March 2006 (under the existing governance arrangements) at which point OS will also invite AGI to extend. GM

TB disagreed that gigateway should enter into a 'Care and Maintenance' phase and all members of the Advisory Group thought that they should have some input into a possible Operating Plan for March 2006 to September 2006. TB

RM asked whether there would be a fixed price for the extension. GM said he would pose the question at the next NIMSA Review Group meeting which was scheduled for Friday 18<sup>th</sup> November. GM also replied saying that once we have been offered the extension, then the AGI, with input from the Advisory Group, should respond with any concerns relating to the proposed 'care and maintenance' phase. RM, GM

**Action:** RM and LW should set some targets that could be achieved during the 6 month extension period and liaise with the Advisory Group in relation to a proposal for extending the current Operating Plan. RM, LW

#### 5. AOB

##### *Terms of Reference*

With the uncertainty of how gigateway would be maintained and managed in the future JJ raised the question as to the role of the Gigateway Advisory Group. LW agreed to circulate the current Terms of Reference to clarify the situation. LW

**Action:** LW to circulate the Terms of Reference relating to the Gigateway Advisory Group. LW

##### *Quality Checking for Metadata*

RW asked how the metadata quality checking was going and LW responded saying that in general they were seeing reoccurring inaccuracies in the metadata records specific to each company. RW said that quality assessment is just as important as quality control and testing any new metadata records that are submitted to gigateway. RW, LW  
RW

**Action:** LW to send the Advisory Group with some examples of the metadata quality problems that the Gigateway Team are coming up against. LW

*INSPIRE report on SDIs and e-Government Unit's IT Strategy*

TB asked if anybody had seen two recently published documents: one from INSPIRE relating to SDIs and the other relating to the Government's IT Strategy. TB questioned the accuracy of the former document and said that the latter tended to be technology and not people or mechanism focussed enough. TB

**Action:** TB to email the group with the relevant URLs. TB

*Future meetings*

Two dates were confirmed: Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> January & Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> March