



Cover Image: Data Stewardship Rating Diagram for St. Thomas and St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands MHW Coastal Digital Elevation Model

Shades of green are used to represent level 1 through level 5 ratings; denoting Ad Hoc, Minimal, Intermediate, Advanced, and Optimal stages for each of the nine key components, respectively. The dark green level indicates all the practices are completely satisfied. The lighter green levels indicate only some of the practices are satisfied. The lightest green level indicates none of the practices are satisfied.

The stewardship maturity of NCEI data product, St. Thomas and St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands MHW Coastal Digital Elevation Model, is assessed based on a reference stewardship maturity framework. The current maturity ratings of St. Thomas and St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands MHW Coastal Digital Elevation Model are at Level 1 or higher for all nine key components with zero Level 1, two Level 2, four Level 3, two Level 4, and one Level 5 key components.



## ASSESSMENT REVISION HISTORY

<b>Revision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date</b>
V01r00	Initial Release	12/08/2021







## Preface

In response to the President's Open Government Initiative and related policies, NOAA has committed to providing improved public access to all of its environmental information, to enable research and commercial innovation through ease of data discovery and use [Casey, 2016].

OneStop supports NOAA's efforts by leveraging existing access technologies and infusing specific innovations to provide improved discover, access, and visualization services for NOAA's data. Also, OneStop is viewed by a NESDIS as a pathfinder effort with an initial focus on selected high-priority datasets from NESDIS and other program data meeting OneStop standards, but eventually scalable across NOAA's data. Lastly, OneStop is implementing the USGEO Common Framework for Earth Observation Data and leveraging/supporting the NOAA Big Data Project (BDP) and Big Earth Data Initiative (BEDI) [Casey, 2016].

As with any process of improvement planning, agencies need to find out where they are in terms of their compliance to the federal regulations and what they need to do if any areas of non-compliance are identified. To this end, a unified framework would be beneficial for assessing the current stage of stewardship practices applied to individual datasets and for providing a road map that will guide future investments towards enhanced stewardship of environmental datasets. The value and quality of a dataset depends in part on the stewardship practices applied after its development and production. Therefore, a unified framework providing a holistic view of the quality of stewardship practices applied to individual datasets is beneficial to data stewards and users [Casey, 2016].

The Data Stewardship Maturity Matrix (DSMM), jointly developed by domain (data management, technology, and science) subject matter experts from NOAA's National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) and Cooperative Institute for Climate and Satellites – North Carolina (CICS-NC), provides such a consistent framework [Peng *et al.*, 2016]. The DSMM, leveraging institutional knowledge and community practices and standards, defines a graduated maturity scale for each of nine key components of scientific data stewardship to enable a consistent assessment of the measurable stewardship practices applied to a given data set or product.

The NOAA data stewardship maturity technical series captures stewardship maturity assessment results for individual datasets, provides consistent representation and citable documents of those assessments, ensures transparency, and allows better data quality information integration and content-based search and discovery of NOAA data.



# **NOAA Technical Report NESDIS DSMR-000 2 Version 1.0**

## **Data Stewardship Maturity Report for St. Thomas and St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands MHW Coastal Digital Elevation Model**

### **1. Introduction**

#### **1.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to describe the results of stewardship maturity assessment for NOAA Climate Data Record for Mean Layer Temperature (Upper Troposphere & Lower Stratosphere from UCAR, Version 2, utilizing the Scientific Data Stewardship Maturity Matrix or DSMM [Peng, et al, 2016]. DSMM defines levels of stewardship maturity stages for Preservability, Accessibility, Usability, Production Sustainability, Data Quality Assurance, Data Quality Control/Monitoring, Data Quality Assessment, Transparency/Traceability, and Data Integrity key components. Each of these components is ranked from ‘Ad hoc’ to ‘Optimal’ (see Appendix I). This report is based on evaluation performed by NOAA OneStop metadata specialists working with Subject Matter Experts and utilizing the DSMM template [Peng, 2016].

#### **1.2 Scope**

Assessing stewardship maturity - the current state of how datasets are documented, preserved, stewarded, and made accessible publicly, is a critical step towards meeting U.S. federal regulations, organizational requirements, and user needs [Peng et al., 2016]. The goal of this document is to provide consistent and transparent stewardship maturity information to data users and decision-makers.

#### **1.3 Dataset Abstract**

{{insert dataset abstract here}}

## **1.4 Document Maintenance**

This document is generated and maintained by NOAA's National Centers for Environmental Information. More on policy is available at <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/>.

## **2. Results**

The data stewardship maturity assessment information is summarized in Table 1. Each component is displayed along with its corresponding score in a color-coded table.

**Table 2. Dataset and Data Stewardship Maturity Assessment Metadata**

<b>Dataset Title</b>	St. Thomas and St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands MHW Coastal Digital Elevation Model
<b>Dataset Information URL</b>	<a href="https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html">https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html</a>
<b>Data Provider POC (Name; E-mail; Affiliation)</b>	NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI), dem.info@noaa.gov
<b>Dataset POC (Name; E-mail; Affiliation)</b>	Barry Eakins, Barry.Eakins@noaa.gov, NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information; Dan Kowal, Dan.Kowal@noaa.gov, NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI)
<b>SMM Version (Document ID and Version Number)</b>	NCDC-CICS-SMM_0001_Rev.1 12/09/2014
<b>SMM POC (Name; E-mail; Affiliation)</b>	Ge Peng, ge.peng@uah.edu, University of Alabama-Huntsville
<b>SMM Template Version (Document ID and Version Numbers)</b>	NCDC-CICS-SMM_0001_Rev.1 v4.0 06/23/2015
<b>SMM Template POC</b>	Ge Peng, ge.peng@uah.edu, University of Alabama-Huntsville
<b>SMM Assessment Version (v&lt;nn&gt;r&lt;mm&gt;, e.g., v01r00)</b>	v02r02
<b>SMM Assessment Date (MM/DD/YYYY)</b>	02/28/2017
<b>SMM Assessment POC (Name; E-mail; Affiliation)</b>	Paul Lemieux III, paul.lemieux@noaa.gov, Earth Resources Technology, Inc.
<b>Stewardship Maturity Ratings (each key component) (kc1/kc2/kc3/kc4/kc5/kc6/kc7/kc8/kc9)</b>	5 / 4.5 / 3 / 4 / 3 / 3.5 / 2.5 / 2.5 / 3.5
<b>SMM Original Assessment Date (MM/DD/YYYY)</b>	06/20/2016
<b>SMM Original Assessment POC (Name; E-mail; Affiliation)</b>	Paul Lemieux III, paul.lemieux@noaa.gov, Earth Resources Technology, Inc.
<b>SMM Last Modified Date (MM/DD/YYYY)</b>	10/12/2021
<b>SMM Last Modification POC (Name; E-mail; Affiliation)</b>	Paul Lemieux III, paul.lemieux@noaa.gov, Riverside Technology, Inc.
<b>SMM Modified Date (MM/DD/YYYY)</b>	04/23/2019
<b>SMM Modification POC (Name; E-mail; Affiliation)</b>	Paul Lemieux III, paul.lemieux@noaa.gov, Riverside Technology, Inc.

Table 3. Stewardship Maturity Levels and Detailed Justifications for Each of Nine DSMM Key Components for the Dataset.

DSMM Key Component	Stewardship Maturity Rating, Justification, and Comments
<p><b>Preservability</b></p>	<p>Level 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conforms to NCEI archive guidelines which are OAIS RM and NARA compliant.</li> <li>▪ Conforms to ISO 19115-2 metadata standards.</li> <li>▪ Plans in place to upgrade to newer ISO 19115-1 metadata standard.</li> <li>▪ Products managed per the submission agreement (SA).</li> <li>▪ Archive procedures and processes are managed and Trustworthy Digital Repositories (TDR) audit in place.</li> <li>▪ Annual reviews per the SA.</li> </ul> <p>Comments: The assessment does not apply to the source data used to create this DEM</p>
<p><b>Accessibility</b></p>	<p>Level 4.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DEMs available through multiple data services (search forms, mapping, geoportal): <a href="https://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/coastal/coastal.html">https://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/coastal/coastal.html</a></li> <li>▪ Each DEM is a collection and individual DEMs are discoverable by different attributes.</li> <li>▪ Dissemination reports available internally but not online.</li> <li>▪ New technology for OneStop search and discovery planned (i.e. ElasticSearch, Hyrax Servers, etc.) This dataset is part of the DEM data group that will be OneStop ready</li> </ul> <p>Comments: No comments</p>
<p><b>Usability</b></p>	<p>Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Community standard format (ASCII) and metadata (ISO 19115).</li> <li>▪ Source code from MBSsystem, primary software used for generating DEMs is available as community software but other source code of COTs software used in the process is not available due to licensing agreements.</li> <li>▪ DEM development report [Love, Sutherland, Beasley, et al., 2014] describing workflows are available online: <a href="https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html">https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html</a></li> </ul> <p>Comments: No subsetting or aggregating options available No known external rankings</p>
<p><b>Production Sustainability</b></p>	<p>Level 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coastal Science Team is a NOAA internal group dedicated to supporting DEMs.</li> <li>▪ Contracts negotiated annually for DEMs with funding programs.</li> <li>▪ Product improvement process based on user feedback in place.</li> </ul> <p>Comments: No comments</p>

Table 3. Stewardship Maturity Levels and Detailed Justifications for Each of Nine DSMM Key Components for the Dataset.

DSMM Key Component	Stewardship Maturity Rating, Justification, and Comments
<p><b>Data Quality Assurance</b></p>	<p>Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Metadata and technical reports describe quality assessments performed on the products.</li> <li>▪ Evaluation of source data and “defect detection” are critical parts of DEM development.</li> <li>▪ For additional data quality assessment information see the DEM Development Report [Love, Sutherland, Beasley, et al., 2014] available online here: <a href="https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html">https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html</a></li> </ul> <p>Comments: No known external reviews</p>
<p><b>Data Quality Control/ Monitoring</b></p>	<p>Level 3.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DQA procedures [Love, Sutherland, Beasley, et al., 2014] are defined and available online here: <a href="https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html">https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html</a></li> <li>▪ Evaluation of source data and “defect detection” are paramount in the development of the DEMs.</li> </ul> <p>Comments: User feedback process in place</p>
<p><b>Data Quality Assessment</b></p>	<p>Level 2.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Research assessment in the DEM development report [Love, Sutherland, Beasley, et al., 2014] available online here: <a href="https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html">https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html</a></li> <li>▪ Some operational products are assessed by the modelling community.</li> </ul> <p>Comments: No known external rankings</p>
<p><b>Transparency / Traceability</b></p>	<p>Level 2.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Software information available internally but not online due to licensing agreements.</li> <li>▪ Technical report [Love, Sutherland, Beasley, et al., 2014] available online that document workflows: <a href="https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html">https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html</a></li> <li>▪ Product information available in literature [Eakins and Grothe, 2014] available online here: <a href="https://doi.org/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-13-00192.1">https://doi.org/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-13-00192.1</a></li> <li>▪ OID assigned: gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030</li> </ul> <p>Comments: No DOI assigned DEMs are not under any CM</p>
<p><b>Data Integrity</b></p>	<p>Level 3.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The archive compressed source data and DEM final products. The compressed file contains an internal checksum which could be used for obtaining MD5 checksums for AIPs.</li> <li>▪ Final DEMs and support data goes through NCEI’s Enterprise Ingest systems, checksums are computed per SIP, verified and stored in a tracking database with other information from the AIP.</li> </ul> <p>Comments: No comments</p>

#### **4. Acknowledgment**

This work is supported by the NOAA OneStop Project.

We thank the dataset POCs for their valuable input, as well as the collaborative efforts of the OneStop teams, especially the Metadata team. We would also like to show appreciation to Ge Peng for her contributions.

The draft of this data stewardship maturity report is systematically generated by a tool created by Kieran Hodnett and populated with the stewardship maturity assessment done by the author(s) of this report. The tool was developed based on a Word template created collaboratively by Robert Partee II, Raisa Ionin, Paul Lemieux III, Ge Peng, Don Collins, and Sonny Zinn with helpful input from the NOAA Central Library and the NCEI Communication Team.

#### 4. References

Casey, K. (2016), The NOAA OneStop data discover and access framework project, Version: June 3, 2016. <https://cdn.ioos.noaa.gov/media/2017/12/OneStop-IOOS-DMAC-03-June-2016.pdf>

Peng, G. (2015) The scientific data stewardship maturity assessment model template, Version: NCDC-CICS-SMM-0001-Rev.1 v4.0 6/23/2015. doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.1211954.

Peng, G., J.L. Privette, E.J. Kearns, N.A. Ritchey, and S. Ansari (2015), A unified framework for measuring stewardship practices applied to digital environmental datasets, *Data Science Journal*, 13, 231-253, doi: 10.2481/dsj.14-049.

Peng, G., J. Lawrimore, V. Toner, C. Lief, R. Baldwin, N. Ritchey, D. Brinegar, and S. A. Delgreco (2016) assessing stewardship maturity of the global historical climatology network-monthly (GHCN-M) dataset: use case study and lessons learned, *D-Lib Magazine*, 22, doi:10.1045/november2016-peng.

Love, M., Sutherland, M., Beasley, L., Carignan, K., Eakins, B., (2014), Digital elevation models of U.S. Virgin Islands: procedures, data sources and analysis, NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information, Boulder, CO., retrieved online: <https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/metadata/geoportal/rest/metadata/item/gov.noaa.ngdc.mgg.dem:5030/html> (Accessed 28 February 2017).

Eakins, B., and Grothe, P., (2014), Challenges in building coastal digital elevation models, *Journal of Coastal Research*, 30(5), 942—953, doi:10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-13-00192.1.

## Appendix I: The Scientific Data Stewardship Maturity Matrix (DSMM)

Table A1: This matrix (Version: NCDC-CICS-SMM-0001-Rev.1. 12/09/2014) describes the criterion used to evaluate data stewardship maturity for each of the nine DSMM key components [Peng *et al.*, 2015].

<b>DSMM Component</b>	<b>Level 1 <i>Ad hoc</i> Little or no management</b>	<b>Level 2 <i>Minimal</i> Limited management</b>	<b>Level 3 <i>Intermediate</i> Defined management, partially implemented</b>	<b>Level 4 <i>Advanced</i> Well-defined management, fully implemented</b>	<b>Level 5 <i>Optimal</i> Full management, audited, measured, controlled</b>
<b><i>Preservability</i></b> <i>(The state of being preservable)</i>	Any storage location  Data only	Non-designated repository  Redundancy  Limited archiving metadata	Designated archive  Redundancy  Community-standard archiving metadata  Conforming to limited archiving standards	Level 3 +  Conforming to community archiving standards	Level 4 +  Archiving process performance controlled, measured, and audited  Future archiving standard changes planned
<b><i>Accessibility</i></b> <i>(The state of being searchable and accessible publicly)</i>	Not publically available person-to-person	Publically available direct file download (e.g., via anonymous FTP server)  Collection or dataset level searchable online	Level 2 +  Non-standard data service  Limited data server performance  Granule/file level searchable  Limited search metrics	Level 3 +  Community-standard data service  Enhanced data server performance  Conforming to community search metrics  Dissemination report metrics defined and implemented internally	Level 4 +  Dissemination reports available online  Future technology and standard changes planned



<p><b>Usability</b></p> <p><i>(The state of being easy to use)</i></p>	<p>Extensive product-specific knowledge required</p> <p>No documentation online</p>	<p>Non-standard data format</p> <p>Limited documentation (e.g., user's guide online)</p>	<p>Community standard-based interoperable format &amp; metadata</p> <p>Documentation (e.g. source code, product algorithm document, processing or/and data flow diagram) online</p>	<p>Level 3 +</p> <p>Basic capability (e.g., subsetting, aggregating) &amp; data characterization overall/global,</p> <p>e.g., climatology, error estimates) available online</p>	<p>Level 4 +</p> <p>Enhanced online capability (e.g., visualization, multiple data formats)</p> <p>Community metrics of data characterization (regional/cell) online</p> <p>External ranking</p>
<p><b>Production Sustainability</b></p> <p><i>(The state of data production being sustainable and extendable)</i></p>	<p>Ad Hoc or Not applicable</p> <p>To obligation or deliverable requirement</p>	<p>Short-term</p> <p>Individual PI's commitment (grant obligations)</p>	<p>Medium-term</p> <p>Institutional commitment (contractual deliverables with specs and schedule defined)</p>	<p>Long-term Institutional commitment</p> <p>Product improvement process in place</p>	<p>Level 4 +</p> <p>National or international commitment</p> <p>Changes for echnology planned</p>
<p><b>Data Quality Assurance</b></p> <p><i>(The state of data quality being assured)</i></p>	<p>Data quality assurance (DQA) procedure unknown or none</p>	<p>Ad Hoc and random</p> <p>QA procedure not defined and documented</p>	<p>DQA procedure defined and documented and partially implemented</p>	<p>DQA procedure well documented, fully implemented and available online with master reference data</p> <p>Limited data quality assurance metadata</p>	<p>Level 4 +</p> <p>DQA procedure monitored and reported</p> <p>Conforming to community quality metadata &amp; standards</p> <p>External review</p>

<p><b>Data Quality Control/Monitoring</b></p> <p><i>The state of data quality being controlled and monitored</i></p>	<p>None or Sampling unknown or spotty</p> <p>Analysis unknown or random in time</p>	<p>Sampling and analysis are regular in time and space</p> <p>Limited product-specific metrics defined &amp; implemented</p>	<p>Level 2 +</p> <p>Sampling and analysis are frequent and systematic but not automatic</p> <p>Community metrics defined and partially implemented</p> <p>Procedure documented and available online</p>	<p>Level 3 +</p> <p>Anomaly detection procedure well-documented and fully implemented using community metrics, automatic, tracked and reported</p> <p>Limited quality monitoring metadata</p>	<p>Level 4 +</p> <p>Cross-validation of temporal &amp; spatial characteristics</p> <p>Physical consistency check</p> <p>Conforming to community quality metadata &amp; standards</p>
<p><b>Data Quality Assessment</b></p> <p><i>(The state of data quality being assessed)</i></p>	<p>Algorithm/method/model</p> <p>Theoretical basis assessed (methods and results online)</p>	<p>Level 1 +</p> <p>Research product assessed (methods and results online)</p>	<p>Level 2 +</p> <p>Operational product assessed (methods and results online)</p>	<p>Level 3 +</p> <p>Quality metadata assessed</p> <p>Limited quality assessment metadata</p>	<p>Level 4 +</p> <p>Assessment performed on a recurring basis</p> <p>Conforming to community quality metadata &amp; standards</p> <p>External ranking</p>
<p><b>Transparency/Traceability</b></p> <p><i>(The state of being transparent, trackable, and traceable)</i></p>	<p>Limited product information available</p> <p>Person-to-person</p>	<p>Product information available in literature</p>	<p>Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) &amp; source code online</p> <p>Dataset configuration managed (CM)</p> <p>Unique Object Identifier (OID) assigned (dataset, documentation, source code)</p> <p>Data citation tracked (e.g., utilizing Digital Object Identifier</p>	<p>Level 3 +</p> <p>Operational Algorithm Description (OAD) online, OID assigned, and under CM</p>	<p>Level 4 +</p> <p>System information online</p> <p>Complete data provenance online</p>

<p><b>Data Integrity</b></p> <p><i>(The state of data integrity being verifiable)</i></p>	Unknown or no data ingest integrity check	Data ingest integrity verifiable (e.g., checksum technology)	(DOI) system) Level 2 + Data archive integrity verifiable	Level 3 + Data access integrity verifiable Conforming to community data integrity technology standard	Level 4 + Data authenticity verifiable (e.g., data signature technology) Performance of data integrity check monitored and reported