ICSM Metadata Working Group

Baseline Metadata Catalogue Survey

## Background

In February 2019, the ICSM Metadata Working Group (MDWG) undertook a survey across membership organisations to document the current state of Location Information Catalogue Systems.

The goal of the survey was to provide the MDWG, a baseline understanding on what are the common metadata systems and applications of choice, and to document their:

* age, update frequency, planned updates, maintenance and management requirements
* internal or external capability and capacity to update or manage
* automated integration capabilities between other systems (looking for inefficiencies)
* compliance to standards associated standards, and
* any unique capabilities specific to meet the organisation’s needs.

The purpose of the survey was to provide a baseline to inform the MDWG in the development of working tasks and activities (aligned to the MDWG roadmap), and to help in communicating who is using what and how.

## Key findings

* 18 MDWG member organisations partook in the survey, from a rage of state, federal governments, and research organisations.
* Metadata catalogue systems used
	+ 27% GeoNetwork
	+ 27% ESRI Geoportal
	+ 11% CKAN
	+ 33% in house - bespoke application
* 38% of organisations built their current system within the last 2-5 years, however over 40% of the systems were built over 5+ years. A number of which are based off schemas ranging in age of up to 20 years
* 50% of systems have been updated in the past 2 years, 33% between 2-5 years and 17% over 5 years. It was noted in one case, no resource is available to update. 72% are currently planning to update their system, and the majority have the capability to undertake this update internally.
* Only 55% of catalogues can integrate with other catalogues via CSW automatically. A significant proportion (45%) require some manual intervention.
* 60% currently comply to the old versions of 19115 / 19139, and the majority (60%) only collect metadata specifically for data, and not web services or applications. 70% have a requirement to also host metadata for imagery within the 19115-2 standard, and 60% indicated they require archiving compliance to 19165.
* Unique features identified specific to individual organisations. Feature level metadata, specific security constraints, compliance to other sectoral standards, relational database for content management and publishes to DCAT.
* Compliance to standards, configuration, culture and budget were all identified as being a challenge in managing metadata systems. It was also noted that time and legacy data were also challenges to manage.
* 60% of respondents indicated they would be interested in moving towards a shared metadata system, however noted a demonstrated business case is required, and it needs to meet the needs of individual organisations.

## Next steps

The MDWG note the survey and associated findings, and consider how this shapes the next phase for the MDWG roadmap, specifically what is required in the best practice guide.

The MDWG note that this survey is focusing on the current state of metadata systems, however there is a major move towards updating these systems nationally opening the opportunity to share knowledge and lessons learnt.