

Data Endorsement ad-hoc Committee

April 7, 2026

1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Attendees

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Alison Slaats MnGeo (Co-Chair) | ☐ Jason Ewert , MNIT MPCA |
| ☒ Kevin Trappe , Beltrami Co. (Co-Chair) | ☒ Linse Lahti , MNIT DNR |
| ☐ Sally Wakefield , MnGeo | ☒ Pamela Oslin , MESB |
| ☐ Gerry Sjerven , Allete | ☐ Kory Thurnau , MnGeo |
| ☐ Stacey Stark U-Spatial | |
| ☒ Tanya Mayer , Met Council | |

Discussion

I. Approval of Previous Work

- Continued review of the **Data Endorsement Evaluation Form** from the previous meeting.

II. Evaluation Form – Redundant Question on Data Updates

Discussion:

- Identified duplication between:
 - Stewardship question regarding active updates
 - Quality question regarding update frequency
- Consideration of whether update frequency is a measure of:
 - Data quality (timeliness), or
 - Data stewardship (maintenance responsibility)

Decision:

- Remove redundancy by:
 - Moving and rewording the Quality question (3.5) into Stewardship (2.6)

Key Points:

- Revised wording better supports:
 - Frequently updated datasets
 - Static or “snapshot in time” datasets
 - Recognition that static datasets still require stewardship (e.g., metadata updates)
-

III. Constraints Section – Question Clarification

Issue Identified

- Current question: “Can you clearly or easily understand the data and its intended use?”
- Concern: overlaps with quality, unclear intent.

Decision

- Reword to focus on **use constraints**:
 - Example direction:
“Are limitations or inappropriate uses of the data clearly identified?”

Rationale

- Shift from “intended use” → “appropriate use”
 - Better reflects real-world disclaimers (e.g., parcel data not for legal boundary determination)
-

IV. Additional Form Revisions

Updates Included:

- **Metadata Section:**
 - Clarified to reference recognized standards (GAC, NSDI, or equivalent)
- **Quality Section:**
 - Added “statewide” context where applicable
 - Acknowledged variability in dataset scope
- **Evaluation Criteria:**
 - Introduced asterisk (*) system to identify required “yes” responses (pass/fail criteria)

V. Framework and Purpose Discussion

Discussion:

- Need for clearer documentation outlining:
 - Purpose of the data endorsement process
 - Relationship to authoritative data and enterprise data governance efforts

Key Points:

- Alignment with:
 - Minnesota Spatial Data Infrastructure (MnSDI)
 - National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI)
- Recognition of parallel data governance efforts across agencies

Outcome:

- Agreement that additional framework documentation may be needed beyond the committee charter

VI. Proposed Data Endorsement Process

Proposed Workflow:

1. Dataset submitted via proposal form
2. Committee reviews and completes evaluation form
3. Committee makes recommendations
4. Recommendation presented to GAC
5. GAC votes on endorsement

Discussion:

- General support for proposed process
 - Concern raised regarding:
 - Potential reliance on limited information
 - Risk of insufficient subject matter expertise during review
-

VII. Public Review and Stakeholder Input

Discussion:

- Consideration of adding a **public or stakeholder review period**
- Comparison of formal standards adoption process (longer and more structured)

Key Points:

- Importance of:
 - Engaging subject matter experts
 - Allowing broader community input
 - Avoiding “rubber-stamping” by GAC

Consensus:

- Include a form of **public or community review step**, potentially shorter than the standards process
-

VIII. Next Steps

- Further develop and document the **data endorsement process**, including:
 - Public/stakeholder review component
 - Role of subject matter experts
- Explore collaboration with the **Standards Committee** for guidance
- Consider **testing the process** using sample datasets
- Evaluate need for additional **framework documentation**

Action Items (Next Steps)

Action Item	Responsible	Timeline
Revise evaluation form per agreed changes	Kevin / Alison	Next meeting
Draft endorsement process including review step	Committee	Upcoming
Consult Standards Committee for process guidance	Alison	Done
Explore framework documentation needs	Committee	Ongoing