

Day One Meeting Minutes
LOSLR CAP Framework Data Project Interim Review Meeting
Canada Centre for Inland Waters
Burlington, Ontario
January 29, 2003

Participants:

Roger Gauthier – GLC
Stuart Eddy – GLC (connected via call-in)
Kevin Yam – GLC
Ian Gillespie – EC
Rob Read – EC
Aaron Thompson – EC
Mike Robertson – OMNR
Arlene Kreuzsch – IJC Communication Officer (US)
Arianne Matte – IJC Communication Officer (Canadian)
Pete Zuzek – Baird
Steve Langendyk – Baird
Chris Stewart – CJSC
Jeff Ehman – Pangaea
Shon Doseck – Pangaea

Primary Issues

- Increase exposure and attention given to geospatial data issues in the Great Lakes, and especially the coastal zone, through the success of this project and its public outreach components.
- This project and the work of the IJC Study should embrace and extend the “own what you must, access what you need” data management and access paradigm.
- Data sources of all the framework thematic layers should be reviewed as part of the integration procedure.
- Framework data should be selected instead of clipped by either a buffered area around the shoreline or the areal extent of the CAP Framework Data Project.
- The focus area of the CAP Framework Data Project is defined by the coastal region of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. Some framework data layers which provide general spatial reference will be included to the extent of the watershed boundary in the WMS
- Metadata completeness is based on compliance with the format and inclusion of required elements in the FGDC Standard (*syntactic compliance*) and the ability of the metadata content to effectively communicate the meaning of all metadata elements used (*semantic compliance*).
- Currently, metadata for LIO data does not comply with FGDC Standards.
- A distinction between the efforts of the CAP Framework Project and the IJC Study is necessary when discussing issues of public outreach and communications.
- Public outreach material for the CAP project and its products should include brochures, pamphlets, and posters able to be distributed across the Great Lakes basin.

Related Issues

- There exists a need for clear procedures for both internal and external communications in the IJC Study – a Communications Strategy or Guidelines for each would be helpful.
- The expense and additional time burdens related to translation requirements of the IJC Study will affect the productivity of Study activities. A Study Board decision on translation for internal communications would be very helpful.

Decisions and Action Items

- The decision was made to collect transportation, tributaries, political units, and watershed boundaries to the extent of the focus area of the Framework Data Project (10 km buffer of the shoreline) for detailed data and to the extent of the watershed boundaries for coarser resolution, reference data.
- The decision was made that February 15th would be the deadline for the incorporation of new data and/or data sources into the framework data integration process.
- Baird will conduct the necessary GIS forensic work to ensure a complete understanding of data lineage and attribute information for source data, and provide detailed guidance regarding specific procedures for binational data integration, and document this in the Data Integration Guidelines document.
- Pangaea will review the Guidelines document and execute the procedures developed by Baird to integrate the framework data, with possible revisions to specific procedures, and document final methods in a Data Integration Procedures Report.
- Mike Robertson will update the Ontario data with the most current data held in LIO, and revisit the issue of bringing the LIO metadata into compliance with the FGDC 1998 Standard.
- The decision was made to ensure temporal and spatial scale consistency for the shoreline data.
- CJSC will provide copies of their updated shoreline data with information detailing the data source/lineage and process steps used in data creation.
- Pangaea will digitize shoreline data from the most recent orthoimagery where data of better or equivalent quality is not available.
- Roger Gauthier will engage Roger Barlow regarding the identification of appropriate data owners and stewards for data corresponding with the National Map layers in New York, particularly the elevation data.
- The decision was made that the GLC will be the long-term host of the CAP website.
- CJSC and the GLC will coordinate transfer of website information.
- CJSC will take first cut at developing public outreach material which will include a flier, newsletter article, and poster.
- Arlene Kreusch will include information about the CAP project in the next Ripple Effects newsletter, if she receives this information by the end of February.
- CJSC will send information for Ripple Effects to Arlene Kreusch by the end of February deadline.
- Mike Robertson will provide access to a subset of the 1:10,000 scale transportation data (i.e., main roads and highways) for the extent of the study area watershed. This will vertically integrate with the full set of 1:10,000 data to be included in the project focus area (10km buffer of the shoreline)

Agenda Item I - Meeting Introduction

Jeff Ehman provided an introduction to the agenda, hitting on all the key points, emphasizing the importance of documentation and integration of the work being done with the efforts of the International Joint Commission (IJC) Study and particularly the Shared Vision Model (SVM).

Roger Gauthier commented that the web presence of the CAP Framework Project and the Information Management Technical Working Group (IMTWG) is evolving into a document management system and will be an important component of our discussions. Roger also presented the importance of the group to begin thinking ahead to the final Cooperative Agreements Program (CAP) Framework Project meeting scheduled for this spring.

Ian Gillespie pointed out that it is important for discussions involving the web presence and public outreach efforts to include Public Interest Advisory Group (PIAG) participation. The increased significance of communications within the Study requires more integration between the IMTWG and PIAG. Roger expanded on Ian's comments of extending our discussions to include the Plan Formulation and Evaluation Group (PFEG) / SVM (Wendy Leger) in regards to the integration of our efforts with those components of the Study.

Commenting more generally about the CAP Framework Project, Jeff pointed out that the time has come to implement the plans made regarding the Framework Data Project and that it is a real turning point in the project with the Canadian private sector partners under contract and ready to begin more active involvement.

Roger finishes the introduction of the meeting by emphasizing the importance of meeting minutes and their distribution to everyone involved in the IMTWG and CAP Framework Project, particularly those who were unable to make the trip to Burlington.

Framework Data Integration Discussion

Led by Baird, this agenda item became an open discussion of framework data and metadata issues.

Pete Zuzek introduced the agenda item by commenting on the beneficial perspective the GeoTools Conference provided in terms of placing our efforts within the spectrum of what has been going on in other area with similar interests. This project is innovative in the coordination effort required, but the technical aspects of what we are doing aren't so new.

Roger supported these comments and added that the Great Lakes gets much less attention in this arena than what it warrants and that this project can do a lot in promoting the concerns of the Great Lakes region.

Steve Langendyk brought up the point that data could always be searched for and possibly found that is better in one or more ways than our current holdings; however the project must now function under a compressed timeline and we need to be able to confidently move forward with

what we have relatively soon. *(It was later decided that February 15th would be the deadline for the incorporation of new data and/or data sources into the framework data integration process.)*

Roger agreed with the need to move forward but emphasized the importance of identifying the specifics of data and data sources that fit well into the framework strategy, so that those elements can be integrated into our efforts once they come online.

Steve brought up another guiding decision: that the group must come to consensus on a single political boundaries layer and the definition of the areal extent of the Framework Data effort. The group discussed the fact the common base layer holdings have been processed using clip or select functions that are not consistent in their definition and across the various thematic layers. These processes should be more consistently applied across regions and thematic layers as it makes the most sense. The approach for processing most of the common base layers for the Ontario region seems to be more effective and provides a more comprehensive reference.

Roger explained that the Study Board requires watersheds in the base layers in the Study and inquires about its listing as a framework. Political units should also be considered in regard to their reference to the watersheds and other common base and framework layers. Jeff clarified the point that Roger's and Steve's comments point a larger question of what the areal extent of the Framework Project should be. Roger suggested that the inclusion of additional features to the existing common base layers will likely not require an exceptional amount of additional labor and should be considered across the framework data themes.

Ian suggested that we determine which order of watershed is the most feasible for us to include in the framework project as one of the first steps in defining our areal extent. Frank Kenny at the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) has information about the best available (4th order) watershed data for the province. The National Map through GeoGratis are planning to serve 1:1,000,000 scale watershed (1st order) data for all of Canada as part of a larger initiative for providing public access to national scale framework data. Ian introduced the group to a motivating clause that has come out of Natural Resources Canada's (NRCAN) recent efforts, "Own what you must, access what you need." This simple statement summarizes the geospatial information management model increasingly being employed by the public sector.

[The group viewed specific examples of political units and watershed data on the overhead projector.] Roger commented that one of the primary concerns needing to be addressed is the compatibility of US and Canadian data. This will apply to the meaning of different data within a particular theme (e.g., lots, concessions, and townships in Canadian terms are the equivalent to what data layers in US terms) and to the integration of the data features and attribute information. In defining the areal extent for the common base layers, the IMTWG (formerly the Common Data Needs TWG) defined an extent of the common base layers as the 77-meter contour or 5 kilometers inland, whichever is a greater distance from the shoreline. Shon Doseck suggested that the group consider a more general definition of the areal extent for framework data project that would be applicable across the Great Lakes region. Pete extended this notion in commenting that the halo or extent of the data sets may differ by layer, however a general or guiding principle should be defined.

Ian commented that the time will soon come when web mapping and feature services will provide access to the data you need directly from the owners and stewards (or custodians) of those data. Shon supported Ian's comments and explained that the original intent of the framework project's workplan was to identify the data owners that would be associated with each of the framework data themes. Roger commented that the notion of data ownership could have implications for concerns recently expressed by the Study Board regarding the intellectual property that is coming out to the Study. At the end of the Study, the Study Board expects to be given a single archive of all geospatial data coming out of the Study. It is still uncertain what format or medium this information will be delivered in; however this begins to fall outside of the scope of our current discussions.

Returning back to the considerations of areal extent and data source for the framework data themes, Ian suggested that political units be selected by their connection to the watersheds that affect the system. For political and cadastral data layers, which are subdivisions of more generalized layers, the extent of features to be included should be defined by the extent of the most generalized data layer's features. Ian also pointed out that the 4th order watersheds exist for Ontario, however the equivalent level of detail for the Quebec has not been made available and it is uncertain whether we would have access to such information. Ian has been in contact with the province of Quebec regarding their involvement in the framework project; however, access to Quebec provincial data is uncertain as the province is highly integrated in the cost recovery model and has been slow to respond to past efforts made to include in the framework data project. A recent letter received from the province implies that the chance is still there to actively engage and incorporate Quebec into the project and further effort will continue to be made.

Turning attention to metadata issues, Shon presents the metadata status by region (Ontario, Quebec, and New York), using the Data and Metadata Inventory Review document as a guide, and starting with Ontario. Speaking generally about the review of framework metadata, Shon explains the difference between syntactic and semantic completeness. Syntactic completeness is determined by processing the metadata records using the Metadata Parser (mp) which is a utility available through Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC). This utility checks a metadata record for its compliance with the content standard's element definitions. Semantic completeness requires that the metadata records convey the necessary meaningful information defined by the content standard. For example, a metadata element requiring a "free text" entry would pass syntactic compliance with a value of "blah blah blah"; however this lack of meaningful information would constitute semantic incompleteness.

Metadata provided by ONMR for data coming out of the Land Information Ontario (LIO) system falls short of both syntactic and semantic compliance with the FGDC 1998 content standard. This is a known issue and has been discussed a number of times over the past few months. Shon indicated that he had been in contact with Jennifer Aikman at OMNR regarding the shortcoming of the LIO metadata in regards to its compliance to the FGDC 1998 standard. Shon had provided LIO a detailed assessment of how well their metadata format fits within the FGDC 1998 content standard; however LIO has yet to make any concerted efforts to bring their existing metadata into compliance with the FGDC 1998 standard. Mike Robertson has agreed to revisit this issue

with Melanie Blamire and Jennifer Aikman at OMNR and will report back to Ian regarding their ability to provide FGDC compliant metadata for data coming out of the LIO system.

The Quebec data currently held as the common base layers for the Study has no associated metadata.

Most of the New York data currently collected by the IMTWG as part of the common base layers has associated metadata that comes close to syntactic compliance with the FGDC 1998 standard and requires still more work to comply semantically with the standard. The single data layer which has no associated metadata is the Shoreline. All other data requires minor changes to syntactically comply with the content standard and a more significant effort to provide values for metadata elements crucial to conveying a complete understanding of the data source, processing and appropriate use.

Both Ian and Roger expressed concern regarding the incompleteness of metadata for the Study's common base layers and emphasized the importance that these metadata records become compliant both syntactically and semantically with the FGDC 1998 content standard as the IM TWG is presently driving the initiative demanding that level of compliance from the other TWGs.

Prior to breaking for lunch, the discussions regarding integration of political units and shoreline data were revisited. Native lands should be considered in the development of the data integration procedure for the political units framework theme. As part of the extended discussion regarding the shoreline data, the definition of features to be included in the shoreline was discussed. Should the shoreline include all features hydrologically linked to the system? Should the shores of rivers with open water be represented as shoreline when they are connected directly to the system?

[Break for Lunch]

The discussion was refocused on the methods, procedures, and considerations for integration of the shoreline framework data theme. Steve brought up the point that given the importance of this theme in the LOSLR Framework Data Project, the group should consider allocation of more time and effort to this theme than the others included in the project. The group was agreeable to this suggestion.

After further review of the shoreline features, the group concluded that the source data scale of 1:24,000 was suspect and some forensic work would likely be required in determining the true scale of the data. Since alternative sources for shoreline and hydrographic data are likely available at a better scale than what currently exists as a common base layer, the group discussed the approach of integrating data features from alternative data sources using edgematching techniques and maintaining attribute information regarding source lineage of the features of the newly integrated dataset. While the combination of data with dissimilar sources into a single integrated dataset can lead to misrepresentation of data features, the extreme discrepancies of data scale along the system's shoreline and the lack of consistent data that covers the entire area

of interest supported the ultimate decision to move forward with the approach of edgematching the best available data to create a comprehensive shoreline dataset.

Roger suggested that as we discuss the prospect of long-term sustainability of the LOSLR Framework, identification of data owners and stewards will become increasingly important. Involving the appropriate agencies and organizations in the custodianship of the data layers is important, particularly regarding the local perspective they can provide regarding the collection and maintenance of the local features. For US data, it will be important that we engage Roger Barlow in identifying the appropriate data owners and stewards.

Discuss and Review Website

[As scheduled in the meeting agenda, Arleen and Arianne from the Study PIAG phoned into meeting for the discussion regarding the project website and web mapping service. In order to accommodate their schedule, a continuation of the discussion of framework data integration was placed on hold while Chris Stewart presented the proposed project website, IMTWG website, and web mapping test application being run from the GLC.]

Chris began the presentation with a quick overview of the LOSLR Framework Project website, walking everyone through the content of the site. Arleen commented that the information for this site needed to be translated to French before it could be published. Chris responded that the website would support some of the efforts of the Study but was in all other purposes separate from the IJC Study. Roger stated that this issue needs to be addressed by the Study Board. Arleen indicated that it would be possible to provide a link to the CAP project website from the IJC Study site, but that there would need to be a disclaimer prompted from that link which stated that “You now are leaving the official IJC Study site”.

As Chris presented the mock Information Management TWG, the issue of translation resurfaced in regards to the translation of all documents that would be made available to the public. After all documents are translated, they would need to be reviewed by Arianne. As this effort becomes more significant the amount of time required by Arianne to review these documents should be considered in the timeline for final publication. Ian and Roger both commented that the cost and procedures associated with translation could have crippling effects on the ability of the Study to disseminate information and do the work required of the TWGs. It was then discussed whether the establishment of password protected site be established for internal Study use through which draft and documents and internal study communication could occur without having to consider the translation factor. Arlene (or Arianne?) commented that this solution might have negative impacts on the Study’s level of transparency and would still not completely protect an untranslated document from being passed to the public.

Placing the translation issue aside, the group discussed (a) the links between the CAP site, IJC Study site, and other TWG sites that need to be considered as part of the Study’s communications strategy, (b), that discovery and access to documents as presented in the CAP project and mock IM TWG sites in the “Geospatial Data Clearinghouse” are provided through a Windows 2000 web server running FrontPage extensions, and (c) that a document management

system would provide a much more robust mechanism supporting discovery of documents and other information related to the Study.

The on-line demonstration of the web mapping service revealed that there was potentially a slow connection to the service that could have significant effects on the overall usability of the application. The PIAG participants raised questions about the target audience of the application and how someone might use it. Chris opened an extent containing detailed orthoimagery, showing how a riparian might access the site and view information relating to the Study in a way that brings the work being done by the Study closer to his or her personal interests.

Rob asked how the TWGs could use this technology (e.g., websites and web mapping) in communicating their work within their own TWG and to other TWGs. This reinitiated the discussion of internal versus external website and the need to translate all content, including documents, which are accessible from an external site. It became apparent that these issues will need to be addressed by the Study Board fairly soon, while the Study is at a stage where such communication would be beneficial.

Focusing again on the CAP project website, Roger suggested that the group consider making the CAP project bilingual, even though it was not a requirement stipulated by FGDC or GeoConnections. The group agreed that the copyright information currently on the site referring to the IJC should be removed and that the site be moved to the GLC domain.

A discussion regarding the public outreach efforts related to both the CAP project and the IJC Study focused on what items and methods would be most effective in communicating the work being done in the Lake Ontario and St Lawrence area. Roger suggested that a brochure of 1 or 2 pages summarizing the CAP project and related efforts would be an item that could be very useful in the public outreach component of the framework project. It may also be helpful to have a more detailed newsletter style publication of 4 to 8 pages in length that would be directed to a more focused audience. Shon suggested that a poster would also be a product that could be useful in demonstrating the CAP project at conferences and public meetings. Roger asked the PIAG participants about the possibility of placing a brief summary of the project in Ripple Effects. While the schedule for upcoming Ripple Effects is quickly becoming full, Arleen expressed willingness to accommodate us if we have specific information we would like to include. Roger also mentioned the Great Lakes Commission (GLC) has an extremely valuable distribution network already in place for this sort of information and the group might consider utilizing the mailing lists maintained by the GLC.

Framework Data Integration Discussion (con't.)

Before the group wrapped up for the day, the group returned to the discussion of framework data integration, focusing on a few more data sets. Before that discussion of framework data integration began, Aaron Thompson inquired about how temporal data with no strong (or highly resolved) spatial relations can be integrated into the general efforts of data discovery, access, and visualization. After discussing the various ways that temporal data can be presented in a GIS, Roger responded more generally indicating that throughout today's discussion it has become

apparent that a meeting with TWG chairs to discuss the finer points of information management as part of the Study would likely be helpful. Roger and Ian discussed the idea of scheduling such a session at the upcoming Study Board meeting in March.

Returning to the data integration discussion, a discussion of how best to serve the elevation data included considerations for providing access to xyz point data in ASCII format vs. serving the grids derived from the raw point data. Throughout the discussion considerations were given to whether the data should be seamless or tiled, who would have the capacity to ship CDs for data that are too large to transfer over a network, and also how to handle the issue of a lack of comprehensive elevation data across the entire system. The decision was made to provide access to the best available data as defined by the extent and view scale of the mapping service. For download, the data should be provided in its raw form and the consumer can apply the necessary processing to generate an elevation grid or other data format.

Roger stated that the shoreline data set could be viewed as the “crown jewel” of the geospatial data emanating from the Study. Pangaea agreed to produce this dataset, using three datasets as inputs: 1) the “0 contour” shoreline generated from the high-res elevation data, 2) the digitized shoreline from the Coastal group, as provided by Chris Stewart, and 3) from additional digitizing from the best-available orthoimagery. The DLGs would not be used to maintain temporal consistency. Ian reminded everyone that double-precision coverages were specified in the Short-term GIS Guidelines and should be used for this and every other framework layer.

For the transportation theme, the group agreed that a lower-line density of road data should be provided for the entire watershed area for the web-mapping application, and that the higher resolution geodata would be “turned-on” at the appropriate viewing scale for areas around the shoreline. Discussion ensued regarding the 5km vs. 10 km buffer and feature selection. It was agreed that the 10km buffer would provide users a greater amount of reference information.

In concluding the day, the group agreed that, in general, the data sources of all the framework thematic layers should be reviewed as part of the integration procedure.

Day Two Meeting Minutes
LOSLR CAP Framework Data Project Interim Review Meeting
Canada Centre for Inland Waters
Burlington, Ontario
January 30, 2003

Participants:

Roger Gauthier – GLC
Stuart Eddy – GLC (connected via call-in)
Kevin Yam – GLC
Ian Gillespie – EC
Rob Read – EC
Aaron Thompson – EC
Wendy Leger – EC
Mike Robertson – OMNR
Pete Zuzek – Baird
Steve Langendyk – Baird
Chris Stewart – CJSC
Jeff Ehman – Pangaea
Shon Doseck – Pangaea

Primary Issues

- Integration of the framework and non-framework data with the SVM will rely heavily on the metadata, with content referencing each appropriate TWG/Performance Indicators (PI) set.
- The TWG Inputs and Outputs data catalog should be updated for each TWG.
- Weekly conference calls should be scheduled for the system development group to discuss development issues and implementation given the aggressive timeline for system development and implementation.

Decisions and Action Items

- CJSC and the GLC will generate complete lists of the Metadata Liaisons for TWGs under their respective responsibilities as Metadata Coordinators.
- Roger Gauthier and Ian Gillespie will coordinate a meeting with the TWG liaisons/leads at the March Study Board meeting.
- CJSC and the GLC will coordinate with the TWG Metadata Liaisons the updating of the TWG “Ins and Outs” document (which is a list, by TWG, of all geospatial data used or produced in their PI modeling efforts).
- If the IJC joins OGDE, then OGDE information needs to be advertised and made available to the TWGs.
- Further discussion is needed between Mike Robertson, Ian Gillespie and Roger Gauthier regarding IJC participation in the OGDE.
- Wendy Leger will coordinate further IM – SVM integration activities including linking specific TWGS and PIs to framework and non-framework metadata.

- Ian Gillespie and André Plante will continue discussion with Daniel Pepin and other Quebec representatives regarding inclusion of provincial level data.
- André Plante will be coordinating weekly conference calls for the system development group.
- A decision was made to go ahead with the March project review meeting, and add a mid- to late-May meeting with increased participation from the Great Lakes Framework community.
- Roger Gauthier will check on dates for the later meeting against already scheduled events in the Great Lakes region to avoid potential conflicts.
- Mike Robertson will provide further information about OMNR's document management tool.

Study Issues and PFEG / SVM Integration

In addition to those who were in attendance during the first day of discussions, Wendy Leger participated in the second day of discussions representing the Study PFEG. After bringing her up to speed with the issues discussed during day one (particularly the discussions regarding translation and Study website communication), she explained the efforts currently underway which relate to the SVM. At the Study Board meeting scheduled for March 10th and 11th, the PFEG will first present the test process to the Board without comment from the board regarding the outcome of the model or the process. During the second day, the Study Board will be provided the opportunity to respond to the process of evaluation. The Study Board will also be able to rank the test criteria used by the SVM. The development and refinement of the SVM will occur over the Feb 11 – 13 PFEG workshop.

The group reviewed the links between the SVM and the Information Management Strategy through the Performance Indicators (PI) and their respective inputs and outputs as defined by the individual TWGs. Through well-documented procedures and standard compliant metadata, the input and outputs of the TWGs can be referenced to specific performance indicators and then to the evaluation process of the SVM. At the most basic level, the input and outputs of the Study TWGs will require detailed metadata including supplemental information or extended elements relating to the Study's performance indicators. Ian commented that the inclusion of a reference to a performance indicator should be incorporated into the Metadata Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and Principle Guidelines document. Debate over the best way to implement the procedure of establishing a direct link between the performance indicator reference and the shared vision model involved a couple of feasible options. Those included: 1) the use of a keyword thesaurus which represents a finite list of performance indicators already defined as such in the SVM, and 2) the establishment of a linking table which takes the free text entry of the metadata author and matches it with an existing performance indicator in the SVM. Both of these options should be discussed by the metadata review team and incorporated into an updated version of the Study Metadata SOP and Guiding Principles document.

Roger emphasized the need to engage the TWGs – to let them know what data is available, not only the “common base layers” from the IMTWG, but that from other TWG's as well. The group agreed, and concluded that an update to the brief data catalog (aka PI model “Inputs and

Outputs”, Appendix II in the *IM Strategy* document) is warranted. Mike Robertson stated that an update of the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange (OGDE) data would also be advisable.

System Development

The discussion of system development and the effort that will be required for system implementation began with Ian reading the information sent by André Plante. Andre outlined a revised schedule for implementation, which has the final system running by the end of April. Due to hardware acquisition difficulties, the funds for all required hardware components are being split between fiscal years. Therefore the server will be installed and running in March with the final system components arriving in April and final implementation occurring throughout that month. The system might be ready for beta testing by March 27/28 for the Great Lakes Framework Meeting – CAP Closure meeting in Burlington, but demonstrations and public access would not be available until the beginning of May at the earliest.

For Ontario data access and web mapping integration, IJC, EC, and GLC participation in the OGDE involves several unresolved issues to be addressed. Mike, Ian, and Roger will continue to address those issues, and hopefully have resolution prior to the need for the Ontario system to be online and accessible for development of the integrated system.

At the GLC, issues regarding the available resources for hosting the services need to be evaluated and settled. With assistance from André, the GLC should be able to implement the physical design provided by André with less effort than would be required in a system’s development from scratch. Ehman suggested that periodic development meetings via conference call should be scheduled for this effort considering the aggressive timeline for development and implementation. The group agreed that weekly meetings would likely be necessary and should be scheduled.

Great Lakes Framework Meeting

In addition to the final meeting of the CAP participants scheduled for the end of March, a public meeting will also be held in May to advertise the LOSLR Framework plan to the organizations and agencies in the Great Lakes basin that would have an interest in sustaining and expanding the efforts undergone by the CAP demonstration project. The dates of May 21st and 22nd were discussed and it was suggested that the meeting be one day for public participants to maximize the attendance and participation by organizations and agencies from around the region. The option of half a day to prepare for the public may be beneficial for the CAP participants to take care of any outstanding coordination. This meeting will be located in Ann Arbor and the dates will be reevaluated so they do not coincide with other similar event in the region. Further discussion will need to take place as the efforts and results of the Framework Project continue to unfold.