# Improving Access to NASA's Earth Science Data through Collaborative Metadata Curation

AGU Fall Meeting New Orleans, LA December 11, 2017

Adam W. Sisco<sup>1</sup>, Kaylin Bugbee<sup>1</sup>, Dana Shum<sup>2</sup>, Katie Baynes<sup>3</sup>, Valerie Dixon<sup>3</sup>, and Rahul Ramachandran<sup>4</sup>

Rav

(1) University of Alabama in Huntsville, (2) Raytheon Company Riverdale,(3) NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, ESDIS, (4) NASA Marshall Space Flight Center





# **EOSDIS** and CMR

- Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS) manages NASA's Earth science data
- Ever growing collection of data is archived and distributed by 12 Distributed Active Archive Centers (DAACs)
- Nearly 7,000 collections and 370 million granules are described by metadata housed in the Common Metadata Repository (CMR)
- Data is described using a number of different metadata standards, and core elements of each standard are mapped to and from a common model the Unified Metadata Model (UMM)



### **Earthdata Search**

- The Earthdata Search Client uses metadata in the CMR to present users with the information they are looking for and hand users off to more specific applications
  - Are users finding the information they are looking for? If not, why?
  - Are users being handing off to more specific applications? If not, why?
- Poor quality metadata is often the answer
- The CMR functions best when the metadata it houses is complete, consistent, and accurate
- Let's examine real examples of "less than ideal" metadata and the consider the consequences





- Can I access the data via direct download?
- Served correct data?
- Served all data requested?



- Does the metadata enable users to be handed off to online documentation?
- User's guides, README files, ATBDs, FAQ pages, product quality assessments, etc.

# What is metadata curation?

Traditional curation



Information Age web content curation



**Digital curation** "Digital curation involves maintaining, preserving and adding value to digital research data throughout its lifecycle."

"...curation enhances the long-term value of existing data by making it available for further high quality research."

# Analysis and Review of CMR (ARC) Team

- All have been or currently are users of NASA Earth Science data for research applications
- Backgrounds in Earth science, atmospheric science, space science, and remote sensing
- Previous experience from the Climate Data Initiative (CDI)
  - Review of 850 metadata records for quality and accessibility



# ARC's approach to digital curation

#### Compliance

- Required elements
- Controlled vocabulary
- Broken URLs
- UMM usage
- DOIs

#### **Compliance + Content**

- Accuracy
- Consistency across collections
- Addition of new information
- Comprehensibility
- Keyword relevancy

## **ARC Curation Process**



## **ARC Curation Process**



Stakeholders collaborate to address both DAAC-specific and EOSDIS-wide issues

# **ARC Curation Process**

- Priority classification scheme
  - Assist DAAC in formulating a strategic plan to address findings
  - Track resolution of issues
- ARC submits finding to DAACs
  - Overview report (Identifies DAAC-wide issues)
  - o Detailed reports (Identify record-specific issues)
- DAAC submits a report to ESDIS on a strategy and timeline devised to work off findings
- DAAC works off findings with the ARC and CMR teams available for support
- DAAC alters internal processes as needed to ensure adherence to EOSDIS policies and best practices moving forward

High	<ul> <li>Inaccurate, incomplete, or missing content</li> <li>Broken URLs and invalid collection-granule relationships</li> </ul>
Medium	<ul><li> Revisions of existing content</li><li> Addition of new information</li></ul>
Low	Minor consistency issues

# Phase I

- Mid 2016 to late 2017
- Records from all 12
   DAACs reviewed
- 1,959 collections reviewed
- GHRC, ASF, and CDDIS
   fully reviewed
- Supported CDDIS and SEDAC in the generation of brand new collection and granule metadata

#### **ARC Collection Reviews Ending December 2017**

![](_page_11_Figure_7.jpeg)

# **Key Outcomes from Phase 1**

• Evaluation of updated metadata for ORNL and SEDAC

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### SEDAC

![](_page_12_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_5.jpeg)

Brand new granule metadata achieved a passing rate of 94% (Average initial granule passing rate is 65%)

## Phase II

- ARC reviews will transition to an online dashboard environment
  - Improve ARC/DAAC communication
  - Enable automated metric tracking
- Implement a more strategic approach to ARC delivery of findings
- Track DAAC improvements from Phase I
- Improve UMM documentation and provide new reference resources for metadata authors
- Document and disseminate best practices that have emerged from the curation effort

![](_page_13_Figure_8.jpeg)

#### Questions

## Adam Sisco

#### adam.sisco@nsstc.uah.edu

![](_page_14_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### **Scratch Slides**

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

ARC Team

![](_page_16_Picture_3.jpeg)

**CMR** Team