

FGDC Cooperative Agreement Program 2003
Category 2: Metadata Trainer Assistance
Project Agreement Number: Interagency - NBII
Final Report

Organization:

US Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive MS302
Reston, VA 20192
Website: <http://www.nbii.gov>

Collaborating Organizations:

If applicable list organization name and point of contact

NatureServe, Celia Najera-DiNicola

Project Leaders

Vivian Hutchison (designated contact for Thomas Hermann)
703.648.4311
703.648.4224 (fax)
vhutchison@usgs.gov

1. Number of Metadata files created as a result of this project:

Comments (optional): This information is indeterminable due to the wide scope of organizations trained under this grant.

2. Clearinghouse Service

Is the metadata resulting from this project being served at a Clearinghouse site where it can be discovered and accessed? Yes. Organizations are asked to submit metadata.

What is the Clearinghouse address: <http://mercury.ornl.gov/nbii>

Comments (optional):

3. For projects who received training assistance:

Number of individuals that received training:

Is metadata documentation and creation a part of your organizations workflow? Describe

4. For projects providing training assistance:

Number of workshops conducted: In total, five (5) workshops have been conducted as part of a collaborative effort between NBII and NatureServe, US Army Corps of Engineers, and US Geological Survey.

List name of organizations and number of individuals trained respectively:

A total of 76 individuals were trained during these five workshops.

Titan Systems Corp. BLM
Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Project of Appalalhan Community and Environment (PACE)

New Mexico State University Dept of Geography
CIESIN, Columbia University
Santa Clara Water District
NOAA Coastal Services Center
NOAA
Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission
Alabama Natural Heritage Program
Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
Florida Natural Areas Inventory
NatureServe - North Carolina Office
USFWS
NBII Southern Appalachian Information Node (SAIN)
MD Natural Heritage Program, MD Dept. of Natural Resources
NatureServe
IAFWA
NBII/USGS
USGS-NBII
"Northern Arizona University-Merriam-Powell Center for Environmental Research"
USACE
National Park Service
Columbia River InterTribal Fish Commission
Yukon Delta NWR/USFWS
Colville Confederated Tribes
FORREX – Forest Research Extension Partnership
Humboldt State University
Alaska Dept of Fish and Game
CO Natural Heritage Program – CSU
AZ Game and Fish Dept
Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory
CA Dept of Fish and Game
WY Natural Diversity Database
North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission
USFWS
USGS
MI Dept of Natural Resources
CO Division of Wildlife
USFWS
The Nature Conservancy
Big Thompson Watershed Forum
NBII Natural Resource Ecology Lab, CO State
Colorado Department of Natural Resources
Comments (optional):

5. For projects providing state or regional coordination:

Describe accomplishments and challenges in coordination (no more than 120 words):

The National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII) is a broad, collaborative program that seeks to partner with many different types of organizations throughout the United States. These partnerships are created by forming regional and state coordination in the development of collaborative projects. The NBII program is organized by regions, called nodes, which are essentially made up of the partners within them. Each of the organizations listed above was trained in metadata in 2003-04, and is involved in regional collaboration with NBII.

6. Project Narrative (no more than 120 words):

Summarize the project activities. Include its accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses, and next steps.

Summary: Each training workshop required pre-planning for the subject matter presented, materials distributed during the training, logistics preparation, and follow-up. Individuals from NBII, NatureServe, and USGS collaborated on these activities.

Accomplishments: NBII was able to successfully train 76 individuals representing 44 organizations throughout the United States on metadata.

Strengths: These training workshops successfully conveyed the importance of creating metadata as well as serving as a mechanism for relationship building for all participants.

Weaknesses: The newest SMMS software was not as effective as its predecessor.

Next Steps: NBII plans to counsel programs that need metadata creation assistance, provide additional training when resources are available, and followup with organizations present in the workshops about their metadata creation progress.

What areas need work?

One area that needs work is the development of user-friendly metadata creation and management products that include the FGDC Biological Data Profile while also working with existing standard software, such as ESRI products (ArcGIS, etc.). Another area of concern is the licensing costs for acquiring these metadata production tools; even with a discount they are fairly high. If FGDC could subsidize the cost of purchasing these metadata tools, and/or encourage the incorporation of the Biological Data Profile into all metadata software products more individuals would be able to effectively continue developing metadata.

7. Feedback on Don't Duck Metadata Program:

The goal of DDM program is to provide organizations with assistance for metadata creation and clearinghouse service through (a.) training, and (b.) metadata creation experience so that metadata documentation becomes part of an organizations normal workflow.

What are the program strengths and weaknesses?

Program strengths include the camaraderie of individuals in the FGDC/CAP network and utilization of materials and resources provided by FGDC. Weaknesses include the lack of communication between the CAP office and the participants in the program.

Where does the program make a difference?

The program allowed us to effectively train U.S. partner organizations, who deal with biological data collection regularly, on the importance of good metadata skills. This is a bonus for them and for us as we are interested in displaying the records in our Clearinghouse.

Was the assistance you received sufficient or effective?

The assistance we received from the DDM program was sufficient, although that is partially due to the fact that we partnered with other organizations who also received the CAP Grant. Had we not done that, the funding would have allowed far less people to be trained.

What would you recommend doing differently?

I would recommend offering different levels of funding for Category 2: metadata training assistance applicants since larger international organizations may have a wider network of organizations that request training whereas smaller organizations may be able to target their audiences to a specific region or group.

Are there factors that are missing or need to consider that were missed?

Each organization that applies for assistance maintains a self-regulated overhead rate which varies for each applicant. This factor should be considered when FGDC evaluates funding needs and amounts for award disbursement.

Are there program management concerns that need to be addressed? Timeframe?

There were no program management concerns.