1/21/2005
NACP Data Survey Results: Summary

Section 1. Data products in-hand. (63 items)

Includes in-hand products that are needed for current NACP investigations (1a), and products that have resulted from previous investigations (2a).

Data	Spatial	Temporal	Source	Status
National Elevation Dataset (NED), continental U.S.	30m (10m underway)		USGS, EROS	2a
Stream Sinuosity ratio, from NED	vector	~2000	USGS, EROS	2a
Elevation Derivatives, from NED	30m		USGS, EROS	2a
SRTM DEM, continental U.S.	30m	Feb 2000	USGS/NGA	1a/2a
NCEP/NCAR Reanalysis	32 km	1979-2003, 3 hour	NCAR	1a/2a
AIRS temperatue, moisture, and ozone profiles	50 km	2 x day	NOAA-NESDIS	1a/2a
Daymet: Gridded daily surface weather, N. Am. Max and min temperature, precipitation, shortwave radiation, vapor pressure.	1km	1980-pres, daily	NCAR	1a/2a-b
USGS U.S. landcover	30m	1991-2	USGS	1a/2a
Land Cover Trends sample blocks	10km	1970-present, 5yr	EROS	1a/2a
U.S. Land Cover Mapping	30m	1992, 2001	SAIC/EROS	1a/2a
National Land Cover Dataset (landcover, canopy density, imperviousness, Landsat tasseled cap)	30m	circa 2000	MRLC	1a/2a
U.S. Forest Inventory and Analysis data			USDA FS	1a/2a
STATSGO Soil C stocks	>6.25km^2	1970s-1990s	SAIC/EROS	1a/2a
Global Soil Texture	10km	static	IGBP-DIS	1a/2a
Soil C stocks from SSURGO, 2/3/ of conterminous U.S.	1:24k vector	one-time	USDA/NRCS	1a/2a
1992 Major Crops, global	0.5 °, and 5'		U. Wisc.	1a/2a
Historical croplands	0.5 °	1700-1992, annual	U. Wisc	1a/2a
Cont. U.S. Historical crop management practices	county	1800-2000	CSU	1a/2a
Central Iowa crop growth/soil variation	5m	2002-pres	USDA-ARS	1a/2a
Historical fire disturbance, Alaska and Canadad	~1km	1950/60 – 2001	U of Alaska	1a/2a
Historical logging activity, U.S.	0.5x0.5 °	1600-1997, annual	U of Alaska	1a/2a
Historical logging activity, Canada	0.5x0.5 °	1920-1995, annual	U of Alaska	1a/2a

Ameriflux data (CO2, water, and energy fluxes, and supporting observations)	sites	varies		1a/2a
Fluxnet-Canada data	sites	varies		1a/2a
CO2 and H2O stable isotope summary at flux sites	many sites	various	BASIN database	1a/2a
Rangeland CO2 fluxes, Northern Great Plains	1km	1998-2001	SAIC, USGS EROS	2a
Rangeland CO2 fluxes, North Dakota	250m	2004, 16-day, growing season	SAIC, USGS EROS	2a
Rangeland CO2 flux maps	1km	10-day 1998-2001	EROS	1a/2a
SMACEX spatial study, Iowa, energy balance and CO2 fluxes	12 sites	2002	USDA-ARS	1a/2a
Iowa corn/soybean flux site	1 site	1998-pres	USDA-ARS	1a/2a
CO2 and energy balance fluxes, central Iowa	15x20km, 200m res.	June-August 2002, 20 minutes	USDA-ARS	2a
GHG emissions from ag, rangelends, forests, U.S.	county	annual	CSU-NREL	2a
Tunable diode laser CO2 time series, Niwot Ridge	site, 9 levels	July-Sep 2003, 6 minutes	U Utah	2a
Cont. U.S. fossil fuel emissions	30km	2004-2008, hourly	CSU	1a/2a
Coastal surface water pCO2	global	one-time	NOAA-AOML	1a/2a
Coastal surface water pCO2	Carribean	weekly	NOAA-AOML	1a/2a
pCO2 measurements in surface waters, OMPE	eastern coast U.S, cruise data	1993-1996	LDEO	2a
N.A. MODIS vegetation index	250m	2001-pres, monthly	Univ. Ariz	1a/2a
N.A. MODIS FPAR and LAI	500m	2001-pres, monthly	BU	1a/2a
N.A. MODIS landcover	1km	2001	BU	1a/2a
MODIS albedo		16-days	BU	2a
N.A. MODIS Veg. Cont. Fields	500m	2001, yearly	U Md	1a/2a
MODIS MOD17 GPP and NPP	1km, global	2000-pres	U Mt	2a
Aeronet optical thickness, near Terra/Aqua overpass times	tower sites	2000-pres	?	1a/2a
Wind River AVIRIS reflectance	20m/4m	1994-2003(partial)	UCSB	1a/2a
Yellowstone Hymap reflectance	5m	2000,2003	UCSB	1a/2a
Harvard Forest AVIRIS reflectance	20m	1994-2000(partial)	UCSB	1a/2a
La Selva FLI-MAP LIDAR	0.3m	1997	UCSB	1a/2a
La Selva HYDICE reflectance	1.6m	1998	UCSB	1a/2a
Yellowstone ALTM LIDAR	1m	2003	UCSB	1a/2a
Wind River SLICER	10m	1995	UCSB	1a/2a
Sierra Nevada AVIRIS reflectance	4m	2003	UCSB	1a/2a
SERC LIDAR		2002-2003	SERC	1a/2a
Wind River LIDAR	0.93m	1999	UCSB	1a/2a
Harvard Forest LVIS data		2003	GSFC	1a/2a

SERC LVIS data		2003	GSFC	1a/2a
Sierra Nevada LVIS data		1999	UMd	1a/2a
La Selva LVIS data		1998	UMd	1a/2a
N. Am. Forest Lidar (LVIS) sampling	25m	2001-pres	GSFC	1a/2a
NPP, NEP, continental U.S.	8km	1982-1987, monthly	NASA Ames	2a
Carbon sequestration in forests, continental U.S.	8km	present, yearly	NASA Ames	2a
Carbon sequestration in agricultural soils, continental U.S.	1km	1987-1992	NASA Ames	2a
Carbon sequestration in soils	1km	present, yearly	NASA Ames	2a

Section 2. Data products underway. (19 items)

These are products that will result from ongoing NACP investigations, and for which production is currently underway (2b).

Data	Spatial	Temporal	Source	Status
U.S. National Resources Inventory (NRI)	sites	1982-97 (5yr), 2000-pres (ann.)	USDA-NRCS	2a/b
N.A. biomass burning inventories	?	2002-on		2a/b
Cont U.S. Land Cover Trends	30m	1973,80,86, 92, 2000	EROS	2b
NRI-CREAP (croplands)	sites	2003-2005	USDA-NRCS	2b
LANDFIRE: veg composition, canopy cover, height, fire fuels, fuel models, ecosystem conditions, potential veg types, very large field reference dataset.	30m, U.S.	one-time, with future updating	landfire.gov	2b
National burn severity mapping	30m, U.S.	frequent, from 1970s	USGS	2b
Long-term grazing effect on soil C storage			USDA-ARS	2b
Landcover, landcover change over three decades	various	various	USGS/EROS	2b
Incident PAR, N. Am.	1km	instantaneous and daily	U Md	2b
NPP, NEP, selected sites	250m	2001-pres, monthly	NASA Ames	2b
Carbon sequestration in forests	1km, U.S.	present, yearly	NASA Ames	2b
Carbon sequestration in U.S. ecosystems, selected sites	250 m	2001, yearly	NASA Ames	2b
Soil and crop variability in production fields, central Iowa	5m	seasonal	USDA-ARS	2b
GHG emissions, U.S.	10km	1980-2003	CSU-NREL	2b
Soil carbon stocks of N.Am.	1:250,000 and 1:1000000	one-time (1970s-1990s)	SAIC, USGS/EROS	2b
Soil carbon stocks from	1km	one-time	SAIC,	2b

STATSGO		(1970s-1990s)	USGS/EROS	
Greenhouse gas inventory, contiguous U.S.	county	1990-2004, annual	USDA ARS	2b
GRACENET: soil C and trace gus flux data for cropped and grazed systems	plot	variable	USDA ARS	2b
Biomass burning emissions, CO2, CO, CH4	N.Am (res?)	2002-forward, daily	?	2b

Section 3. Data products planned. (13 items)

These are products that might result from current or future NACP investigations, but production is not currently underway (2c).

Data	Spatial	Temporal	Source	Status
Flux site – N. Arizona, P. pine	3 sites	2005 - ?	NAU	2c
Carbon emissions from biomass burning, N.Am.	1km	daily	USFS	2c
CO2 flux maps of eastern US/ Canada	1km	one year, hourly	Indiana University	2c
Value-added MODIS processing for Midwest intensive: subset, reproject, mosaic, filter land products	native MODIS	native MODIS	NASA	2c
CO2 and N2O emissions from production inputs from U.S. croplands	30m and 1km		?	2c
Net changes in land use, soil C, and GHG emissions associated with terrestrial sequestration strategies	nominal 30m	~1992, 1997, 2000	(named PI)	2c
MODIS ocean band surface reflectance over land, Fluxnet Canada sites	1km	?	GSFC	2c
Sampling strategy for NACP Tier 3 sampling	1000 sites	one time	SAIC, USGS/EROS	2c
Soil pedon data linked to soil maps		1960s-pres, with updates	SAIC, USGS/EROS	2c
National Biomass and Carbon Dataset 2000, continental U.S.	~30m		U Mich	2c
Gridded CO2 fluxes, from assimilation in CSU SiB-RAMS. N.Am. and adjacent oceans	10km	2004-2008, hourly	CSU	2c
atmospheric transport, from CSU RAMS data assimilation	10km, 50 levels	2004-2008, hourly	CSU	2c
Carbon, nitrogen, water, and energy flux and state variables (many) for N. Am., from Biome-BGC model using historical surface weather and disturbance history drivers.	1km	1900-present, daily, seasonal, annual	NCAR, U Mt, CSU, CU, NASA Ames	2c
Information on potential users of NACP data, different sectors and different scales			(named PI)	2c

Section 4. Data needed, but not in-hand. (31 items)

These are data products required as input to current or planned NACP investigations but not in-hand. Includes needed data with known sources and status (1b), needed data with uncertain sources or status (1c), needed data that do not currently exist but for which likely future sources are known (1d), and needed data that do not currently exist and with unknown likely future sources (1e).

Data	Spatial	Temporal	Source	Status
Short-wave radiation	1km	real-time	?	1b+
Agricultural productivity by crop		seasonal	USDA-ARS?	1b-c
Land cover and crop types, planting and harvest dates	30m – 1km		?	1b-c
Fire incidence and burned area		monthly?	NASA GMAO, UC Irvine	1b-c
Carbon trace gases measured in-situ	aircraft	1:30 am/pm	?	1c
Remote sensing obs in tower footprints	high-res (?)	yearly – hourly	?	1c
Flux-tower obs, meteorology and fluxes				1c
Space Imaging IKONOS	4m, 1m	one time	IKONOS/NASA SDP	1c
Digital Globe multispectral, complements IKONOS	4m	one time		1c
MODIS surface reflectance	1km, 500m, 250m	seasonal	EROS	1c
Landsat obs		1972-present		1c
Biomass obs (leaf, stem, root)				1c
Transported carbon		hourly to annual		1c-d
Methane flaring				1c-d
Soil characterization data, interpreted for soil carbon	point (20,000 samples)	since 1940	USDA/NRCS	1c-d
Atmospheric deposition of NH4, NO3				1c-d
Distribution of O3, CO2, CH4, and N2O concentrations				1c-d
NOAA/AVHRR NDVI	8km, Goodes	monthly		1c-d
Improved crop maps, distinguishing soy/corn, other crops	Midwest intensive, 30m	annual		1c-d
250m LAI product	Midwest	16-day, 2005	BU, USDA	1d
Soil carbon from samples in University collections	point samples	1940-pres	many sources	1d
Fossil fuel emissions, conterminous U.S.	10km	2004-2008, hourly	CSU	1d
GEOS winds, turbulence, convective transport	0.5x0.625 °, global	2004-2008, 3-hourly	NASA GMAO	1d
GEOS surface weather	0.5x0.625°	2004-2008, 3-	NASA GMAO	1d

		hourly		
EDAS mesoscale weather over N. Am.	29km, 50 vertical levels	2004-2008, 6 hourly	NCEP	1d
Vegetation continuous fields	500m	2004-2008	U Md	1d
Perennial, intermittent, ephemeral streamflow			USGS Topographic Program	1d-e
Freeze/thaw dates, MODIS + soils data + models?	1km	daily	NASA	1d-e
Wetlands maps				1d-e
Magnitude and stability of clathrates	ocean margins	yearly to decadal		1e
Carbon in high latitude storage and its stability				1e

Responses to Data Management Questions

Q1. Formats (35 responses)

Question: What formats are you currently working with, what formats do you prefer, and do you have any suggestions for common data formatting at the NACP level?

Federal Geographic Data Committee metadata standards, specifically for soil geographic data
We use HDF-4 and BUFR formats. Internally we have simple ASCII and BINARY formats.
Geospatial data in formats of Arc GIS and ERDAS Imagine, as well as tabular field plot data
ascii text, comma delimited; we at at the intial stages of our research, and are open to considering common data formats
Currently working with HDF-EOS, ASCII, and Binary datasets. I don't have a preference, but I know many people don't like the HDF-EOS format. HDF is not as complex as HDF-EOS and allows a lot of data to be compiled in one place. It might be a way to store some of the larger datasets that may be compiled.
MODIS LAI/FPAR products are in EOS hdf format I would suggest plain binary data format for satellite data in support of NACP program
Our data is presently in Excel file formats which is what we prefer and are routinely using.
Relational database
ESRI-compatible formats.
plain text, JGOFS, NetCDF
HDF-EOS format for science data and embedded metadata; XML for associated metadata files.

Too complex to answer here. We are finishing prototype work that will help us to complete this information shortly
Any format. For underway carbon measurements we developed a common data and metadata format for future VOS measurements, see http://ioc.unesco.org/ioccp/Tsukuba2004Results.htm
I use binary, ascii and netCDF primarily. netCDF is a very useful data format.
Current formats: MS Excel (.xls); MS Excel (.csv); and Text files (.txt) Preferred formats: MS Excel (.xls); Foxpro (.dbf); Access (.mdb)
FGDC metadata stds
HDF-EOS, binary
Geo tiffs preferred format for exchange. I currently work with Arc Info or ERDAS Imagine.
All image data are stored in ENVI file formats, including ENVI headers with extensive meta data.
I work with a broad range of formats, though many conform to either the COARDS or CF conventions used within the Climate Modeling community.
For spatial data, i am using ArcGIS 8.1. I prefer data be provided in Arc/Info export format when possible, or ASCII with proper header information available so that file access is not a problem.
Binary or Ascii grids, Albers Equal Area Project
Currently working with mainly HDF. GeoTiff seems to be prefered more generally
ASCII comma delimited for measured and modelled data, binary for remotely sensed information and plain ASCII text for metadata/documentation.
straight ASCII files with a uniform meta data format
Fluxnet Canada data comes as text files along with documentation Flat text files are best for tables and documentation MODIS data is in HDF format HDF does have a lot of overhead and can be difficult to use, however it is now the default for MODIS Simple binary files would be easier for novices to handle
net cdf, ascii, arc files are being used
The USGS has helped develop and consistently used metadata standards developed by the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC). Software tools are available to help organize metadata according to these standards.
netCDF, lat-lon grids, custom binary files. I will think about common reporting suggestions.
none
Formats currently working with: ASCII text, netCDF Preferred formats: ASCII text for monthly, 0.5 degree data netCDF for finer spatial and/or temporal scales
raster grid maps of all formats
We work in hdf-eos but everyone hates it and we spend a lot of time dumping data to binary for people.
we utilize numerous formats
We use ASCII,NetCDF,HDF

Q2. Software (29 responses)

Question: What software (if any) do you currently use for database management, and do you have any suggestions for common database management software/practices at the NACP level?

ESRI Arc SDE SQL Server and ArcGIS 8.3 and 9.0 and Workstation ArcGIS 8.3
Access, Oracle, Arc IMS, OGC
we are planning to use MS Access database software; we are open to considering common database recommendations given that we will start data collection in 2005
We don't use any professional data base management sytem in our project. For NACP project such database should have web-based interface. Lay-out of interface could be similar to FLUXNET site: system allows to select site, an then presents overall characxteristics of the site and also shows the links to field and satellite data. Implementation details could be different: it could be Oracle or MS SQL, the major concer is the speed of data retrievals
Excel
SQL server
We are using SDE Oracle and ArcIMS
JGOFS
Sybase and Oracle
Live Access Server (LAS): http://cdiac3.ornl.gov/las/servlets/dataset Mercury: http://mercury.ornl.gov/ocean/ Ocean Data View Program (ODV): http://cdiac.ornl.gov/oceans/atlantic_ODV.html
Relational database software: Microsoft Access 2000; Visual Foxpro 6.0 Geo-database software: Arc/Info 7.11; Mapinfo 7.0
various depending on archive and DAAC plus personal
None
Microsoft Excel/Access
Microsoft excel
We've used MySQL minimally, don't have any suggestions on DBMS software or practices.
ARC IMS
Exccel for our databases
Windows based software and Matlab.
none but am considering MySLQ
We will be using MySQL, but haven't started with it yet
mysql, dods
Oracle
Arc/Info for Geographic Information System data, other ESRI products such as SDE for large spatial datasets, custom in-house software for managing image inventories (see data browse, ordering, and delivery services at http://edc.usgs.gov/). The EROS Data Center uses these tools to receive, process, and archive approximately 2 terabytes (2,000 gigabytes) of data per day, and distributes approximately 1 terabyte of data per day.

EXCEL spreadsheets
home-grown software
Postgres SQL, need a full transactional database
we utilize or support numerous database management systems

Q3. Storage (19 responses)

Question: What are your estimated data storage needs for NACP work, and do you have any suggestions for shared storage of large, commonly accessed NACP-relevant datasets?

Yes. Soil Organic Carbon Calculations. In Arc .e00 format the 1:250,000 data for the U.S. would need about 500 MB with related data and metadata and images
We are developing capabilities to store about 10 tera bytes of data
Our institution has adequate storage for raw and processed data; however, we support having a addition archieve of data with NACP
Storage is always critical. Right now, we have adequate storage space, but that may change in the future.
No, we will store our data at our server
Rather than a need, we have the capacity, infrastructure, bandwidth, and web presence to host, store and deliver data, if those services are needed. If so, we can create a MOU or partnership through which we can provide those services.
This is quite variable, depending on product type, geographic and temporal coverage. We typically keep 12-months of Terra and Aqua global coverage online in our Data Pools that amounts to about 20-25 TB.
No.
?? Uncertain. My experience suggests that centralization rarely works; and that good collaboration in distributed systems can work well. How do you build in incentives for collaboration?
I perfer to store the estimated indident PAR in the NCAP data server. It is 1km and daily.
unsure if USGS EROS severs could be used
If NACP follows the LBA model, I would anticipate providing all data in georectified format, probably shipped on DLT tapes. This could be as much as 100 gigabytes of data. Note, all data sets listed in question 1 will be NACP accessible - retyping information from one for question 2 seemed redundant
Participating in workshop representing OPeNDAP, an open-source data access technology not as a NACP data provider. As such I don't have specific NACP data storage requirements or recommendations.
No.
no need for storage space
The EROS Data Center (EDC) currently serves large amounts of image, topographic, and cartographic data. The EDC would be interested in negotiating a role in NACP data archiving and distribution.

Our products will be voluminous, and I don't think it's appropriate to ask for centralized resources to store them. I think NACP should provide metadata and links from a centralized facility, but *require* PI's to archive and serve value-added data products.
perhaps
we have our own storage

Q4. Networking (24 responses)

Question: What are your current networking needs/capabilities, and do you have any suggestions for networking requirements for the NACP data effort?

USDA Backbone restrictions, T1 lines
NSF is very supportive of developments in Grid computing.
We have internet collections near the study sites, which are located near Northern Arizona University
We have an internal network in the lab as well as a T1 line through the University. I don't know the specifics.
Iam not in positin to evaluate NACP networking needs
Have not considered this at this time.
We have developed web capabilities, and have the infrastructure and bandwidth to deliver data, if needed.
not sure what this means?
We have an OC-12 line going out of the LP DAAC, but it is the end-users network configuration that is the constraining factor. If they are on Internet-2 then they'll realize greater performance than if not.
High speed 100mps
No.
LAN/100Mb
I am somewhat concerned about the nature of the closed groups of scientists on programs such as these. Open it and make it compellingly inviting. Other than that, open source compatability and posting of data, information, understanding is what is really important.
N/A
Good institutional expertise in websites and data delivery at EROS. I have no suggestions at this time.
We have anonymous ftp (~ 30 gigabytes) and a reasonably fast internet capability. We have no difficulty ftp large ASTER or MODIS data sets from EDC currently.
Would suggest that NACP data be directly-accessible, and subsettable over the internet with minimal human-interaction required.
Internet broadband
Part of the ARS network through our own servers and url (www.nstl.gov)Have the capacity of store our our own data
Web based seems fine
The EROS Data Center serves as an internet hub, and has a large data transmission bandwidth.
novell

better than T1, but I don't know the exact specifications
fast servers, data ordering WITHOUT human intervention, ftp based transfers

Q5. Data Sharing (24 responses)

Question:

NSF has specific policies on data sharing.
No.
use of data by others should be preceeded by communication about the use; data sources should be acknowledged
I think a data use policy should be created in which those providing the data are, at a minimum, cited in the references. Acknowledgments of data sources are nice. I don't think co-authorship is necessary or even appropriate for some research efforts.
All NACP data should be publicly shared. No restriction (except to provide appropriate credit to data source in publications). This will geatly facilitate research!
No, once we have published the data in scientific journal format.
Citation of data sources.
None.
No.
Timely, Thorough, Complete, quality controlled, collaborative, meet the needs of the ground projects not simply the large atmospheric modeler needs,
I would like to access to surface incident solar radiation measurements for validation/calibration of our product.
Not at this time.
All spectra, plot data or image data that have undergone extensive processing should have the data source cited, preferably linked to a refereed publication. The LBA policy seems good to me.
No, other than that the data management approach taken by NACP should strive to facilitate data sharing within, and where feasible outside of the NACP.
MODIS 250-meter data products are not available in contiental mosiacs for N. America, nor is it available in a conventional geographic projection for land surface research
open sharing with set embargo (1 or 2-years) for proprietary use
We are performing new types of analysis on existing data sets, thus we must take into consideration the original data producer's wishes when distributing some of our results.
Many data sets are downloadable at no cost over the internet. Most products delivered on media are provided at the cost of reproduction. In some cases, access is restricted for redistribution of proprietary products (e.g., from commercial remote sensing vendors where the EROS Data Center acts as a broker for multiple Federal agencies). Research data sets created at the EROS Data Center would be distributed freely.
We have committed to providing our value-added prducts freely and openly to all comers through the NACP data system, using our own servers. It's incumbent on us to budget appropriately, and to negotiate this service with our sponsoring funding agencies.

not at this time
Before general "public" release of data, I like the idea of data users contacting data originators before publishing data and that credit is given to data originators through co-authorship, citation or acknowledgement. I think that there should be a limited time period of restricted access (about 6 months of collection) to allow data originators to quality control the data (and perhaps publish) before releasing the data to others. Quality controlled data should be made available to the public within 2 years of collection.
Your effort is important, this must be dealt with at the start of the program to ensure maximum compatibility and usefulness across disciplines.
No sharing until after publication.

Q6. Security (16 responses)

Question: Do you have particular security needs/concerns, or do you have suggestions for how to address security issues in the context of the NACP effort?

Concerned about malicious hacking that may interrupt communications or cause data to be lost.
No, our products are public domain.
We do have security concerns.
As for any field study, we have concerns about security of instruments at field sites regarding vandalism
Our data is available to anyone who wants it, so this question doesn't apply to me.
From my perspective this is not an issue.
Not at this time.
Security issues change constantly. I will forward a GIO website that describes them.
We are obliged to work in accordance with NASA and USGS IT Security guidleines and regulations.
No.
n/a
No, other than insuring the authenticity of the data being shared over the network.
I don't have a major concerns about security on our databases. We follow the USDA procedures on computer and database security.
Computer security professionals on staff continually monitor security issues for our data distribution capabilities.
No.
USDA, NRCS, and NRI have stringent confidentiality requirements [do to policy, legislation, and scientic integrity for survey data]

Q7. Policies (14 responses)

Question: Are there existing data policies governing your current data management activities, beyond the guidelines set forth in the Information Quality Act?

Require FGDC metadata for all data released to public
Various NSF Divisions and Programs may have specific data policies that influence the availability of data products from NSF funded research.
none that we know of
MODIS LAI FPAR are publicly available. This is a great NASA policy regarding to MODISA project- and should be applied to all NACP data
Not up to date on this topic, I would have to check with the agency and others involved in such studies.
please see url http://ssldata.sc.egov.usda.gov/datause.asp
We operate under a non-discriminatory data access policy.
Yes.
n/a
not sure
No, we primarily follow the guidelines provided by NASA's ESE which we're funded under. We strive to make data available as soon as it's feasible.
No.
The EROS Data Center operates under USGS data policies.
our policies for NRI generally go beyond those of the USDA & OMB guidelines

Q8. Other Issues (16 responses)

Question: Are there any other data management and/or data center issues that you would like to see addressed within the NACP context?

How will we "harmonize" units between SI and English when working with historic data? Will we follow prescribed scientific standards for data conversion? What projection parameters will we adopt when working across the North American Continent to ensure that equity in expressing carbon units for nations is achieved when area weighting is considered?
NSF has funded projects in data sharing, networking and other aspects and it may be possible to leverage resources by collaborations with existing projects. NSF will also consider related proposals in a number of relevant programs.
1) It would he helpful to have reference raw data sets for co2 eddy covariance in order to test the accuracy of processing software to calculate co2 net ecosystem exchange. 2) The development of a consistent protocol and software for processing raw co2 eddy covariance data would help us, and many NACP collaborators.

consistency in format of site-specific data is my primary concern. This is already being met somewhat through the efforts of the ORNL DAAC for both AmeriFlux and Fluxnet. It would be easier if these formats, in as much as possible, were decided upon prior to initiating data colleciton.
NACP should highly support data sharing on the most liberal basis possible. This facilitate progress of science.
Yes. What types of data delivery services are expected or desired?
To be discussed during the meeting.
None
none
Improved methods may be needed for submitting data holdings. I only listed a small part of the current UCSB holdings, because many of the products are derived products (i.e., canopy height, DEM, crown volume, species maps, etc) determined for multiple dates and flight lines. After including plot data, the full list could include several hundred items and could not be included in this survey.
We're committed to the idea of facilitating direct access to science data from within the researcher's analysis application of choice. To accomplish that goal we've been developing a Data Access Protocol for moving science data over the internet. This protocol maps diverse file formats to an internal data model that encapsulates the data, and moves it over the network and into the researcher's application. Client software then transforms the data encapsulated in the data model representation, into the analysis application for direct use by the researcher.
The one aspect that needs to be addressed in much of the data is the qualty assurance/quality control process and documentation. This needs to be discussed and incorporated into the metadata files.
No.
Data access and location should be well advertsied
The EROS Data Center has experience in setting up distributed data sharing networks, such as those of the Famine Early Warning System and Sustainable Tree Crops (see http://edcintl.cr.usgs.gov/).
In order to make NACP function effectively in decision-support outside of scientific research activities, information must be known about how NACP research is or might be used.