OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE
POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR
THE MISSISSIPPI COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR
REMOTE SENSING AND GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS

MAY 10, 2004

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) met at 11:00 a.m. on Monday, May 10, 2004, at the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) in Jackson, Mississippi. Chairman Phil Sullivan opened the meeting and discussed the items he plans to present at the next Council meeting. He will seek approval to develop a data distribution policy recommendation and support for a data/contact information survey.

Chairman Sullivan then organized three groups for breakout sessions. There was a brief discussion dealing with local government involvement in this process. Some local personnel stated they are involved in order to help guide the process so they don't get harmed by it. They are participating for defensive reasons.

Following the breakout sessions and review of team responses, the same questions were presented for the whole group to respond to based on the breakout meetings and reading assignments.

WHOLE GROUP RESPONSES

From our **readings**, the question and responses were:
What are some important and common elements in the experience of other efforts to establish similar large or statewide remote sensing/geographic information systems (RS/GIS)?
    1) have a contact person
    2) know what data is available (exist)
    3) know what scales of data exist
    4) develop cost options
    5) distribution system with primary custodians
    6) support and training are available and active
    7) formal agreement for participation; keep it simple
From our **breakout sessions**, the questions and responses were:
a) List some common themes:
    1) standards – data and metadata
    2) liability
    3) privacy
    4) levels of accessibility
    5) how you get data
    6) commercialization
    7) who approves use
    8) available data – restricted and unrestricted
    9) legal agreement
b) List items that must be included in policy:
    1) Cooperation is essential. There needs to be a clear strong statement of intent to

cooperate.
   2) standards
   3) no mandates; give guidelines
c) What must not be included in the policy? The only answer recorded was long legal documents which state you wish to participate.

BREAKOUT GROUP RESPONSES

<u>GROUP 1</u>

1. Common points in policy
   a) conform with federal metadata standards
   b) roles QA/QC of data, creation of metadata, data maintenance
   c) local government tends to sell data or restrict use; Feds tend to distribute for free.
   d) all list different products availability
   e) identifies allowed members or users
   f) liability clauses
   g) lack of clear determining of derived products
2. Restriction of publishing was interesting
3. Secondary users were responsible for reporting data errors.
4. One thing that must be included in policy is the setting up on an ongoing body that is under the Council for continued support.
5. Restrict limitation on public

<u>GROUP 2</u>

Needs:
1. good metadata standards that follow national standards; what national standards to start with?
2. shareable data/reliable   example: geocoded street address
3. privacy issues addressed/protected
4. responsibility/liability; final decisions
5. division of state government – convince legislature to fund/maintain

Want: cooperation of data stewardship

Don't want: decentralized data maintenance

Most interesting: cooperation/collaboration

<u>GROUP 3</u>

Common themes:

1. contact person (person versus agency)

2. what data is available
3. level of accessibility
4. costing options – public/private considerations
5. distributed system with primary custodian
6. support and training
7. formal agreement
8. collaboration – what you get and what you give up

The meeting was adjourned.