



MEETING	LCDB Governance Meeting
DATE	8 February 2012 1:00 pm
ATTENDEES	MSI - Viv Smith (Chair) MfE – Len Brown, Karl Majorhazi MAF – Craig Trotter NZ Geospatial Office (NZGO) – Kevin Sweeney Regional Council Rep – Rob Phillips Landcare Research - David Pairman, Peter Newsome
APOLOGIES	Allan Ross, James Shepherd, Sarah McDermott
SUBJECT	Land Cover Database Programme

1. Apologies

Allan Ross, James Shepherd, Sarah McDermott

2. Minutes of December meeting and matters arising

- Action items from December meeting reviewed:
 - Craig felt access to ETS data should not present a problem. However, as it is illegal to use this data for other than its purpose, we need to be careful and get formal signoff. MAF in a state of change and formal delegations should become clear in about two weeks. May need a letter from MfE stating LCDB is a direct contributor to future inventory.
 - Governance issues – Viv revised – later in meeting.
 - Registration problem have been successfully resolved.
 - Len has asked for a slot for LCDB presentation in CEEFs meeting – typically 15 minute presentation/interrogation.
 - Erin Jones is MAF contact to coordinate checking (Senior GIS analyst - policy branch in science information and risk directorate).
 - TOR for Stakeholder/technical Group drafted – discuss later in meeting.
 - Data recipients have been contacted by David – cover in more detail in agenda item 3.
 - Yet to check with Jeromy Cuff re presentations to Land Monitoring Group.
 - Kevin reported that LINZ is not really in a position to offer much assistance in checking LCDB mapping.
 - LINZ topographic vegetation mapping is much courser than LCDB. However, once completed it might be of use for LINZ in updating their vegetation mapping. (14/12/11 email from Graeme Blick - keep in touch with him). Peter suggested Graeme for technical advisory group.
 - LINZ appointed Michael Judd to their Fundamental Data Leader position. Once he starts, Kevin would like Michael to take over LINZ position on the Steering Group.

- Nationally significant databases. Viv: no quick answer – now part of CRI core funding. Nothing likely to develop on this for at least 3 months. Viv will continue to raise internally in MSI.
- James current methodology presentation – later in agenda.
- 1990 LCDB concept – awaiting Stakeholder/Technical Group formation.
- Backup/disaster recovery situation – David presented a short report on this (see David's notes or PowerPoint). Backup is off-site and reasonably recoverable. There would be inevitable delays in getting equipment and staff organised to continue the work at a new location – probably weeks rather than months.
- Missed action Pt: Craig reported that Farms Online data would not be available for LCDB checking, and likely to stay that way.

ACTION: Craig to clarify who will sign off on ETS access and seek that approval.

ACTION: Len provide MAF with letter stating LCDB is a direct future contributor to national inventory.

ACTION: Craig liaise with David on appropriate format for ETS data and its inclusion in the checking process.

ACTION: Len liaise with David re CEEFs meeting – next on 24th.

ACTION: David to check with Jeromy Cuff re presentations to Land Monitoring Group

ACTION: Kevin to see if Graeme or another LINZ representative would be appropriate for technical advisory group.

ACTION: David put 1990 LCDB concept to Stakeholder/Technical Group once formed (carried over).

3. Project status

- **Mapping progress:**

Peter reported all but two regions (Gisborne and West Coast) are compiled. Three others are in final checking stage (Wellington Canterbury Waikato). We expect the last regions to be issues to stakeholders within a couple of weeks. We are keenly awaiting responses.

Only Marlborough have returned data – incorporated their own land use layer of highly productive and forestry land. Expecting Taranaki mid-month and Nelson end of month.

Rob asked how well councils are following instructions and if we need more follow-up. Peter acknowledged not always what we ask for but grateful for what we get. Rob suggested we could send thank-you email noting gaps in their response.

- **Regional Council checking progress**

David reported on the status of council checking from phone calls to them (see David's notes or PowerPoint). Some concern on Auckland. Otago may have rectification problems in Catlands.

Viv suggested we engender more competition.

Action: David get out email to collaborators with summary of where regions are, try and engender more competition, mention CEEF's presentation. Run past Rob before sending.

Action: Len to give Auckland council a hurry-up.

Len mentioned presentations to Land manager's forum (James Barringer) or Land monitoring group also Biodiversity forum (March mtg). Viv suggested Rob could be a conduit between these, passing material presented at one to the other.

Action: Rob liaises with David on these meetings.

Some discussion on the Fire Service and what checking we can expect from them. They are probably more a user than in a position to check.

- **Research Progress: James**

Landcare employed a new staff member in this research area – working closely with James (started September 2011). As there isn't much room for research in this year's budget, Landcare has allocated capability funding. Work primarily on automated segmentation techniques – specifically semi-automation of cloud clearing. They are making encouraging progress but not at an operational stage.

4. Governance/Steering Group terms of reference:

Viv outlined changes that she had been made to the Governance Group terms of reference (circulated) - mainly wording changes rather than content. No problem in dropping the governance term and using steering Group to better reflect our function. We worked through document page-by-page.

Additional changes were discussed to;

- make a few minor wording changes
- streamline wording in "Functions"
- add "specifications" into bullet on LCDB product
- modify reporting sentence to simply meeting minutes
- similarly clarify Technical Advisory Group reporting

The Steering Group terms of reference were then agreed on subject to the above changes being made.

Action: David to amend Steering Group TOR and re-circulate.

5. Stakeholder technical advisory group TOR and membership: David

The name "Technical Advisory Group" (TAG) was adopted to better reflect its function. The meeting worked through the draft TOR and suggested numerous changes.

Need to manage membership so as not to have people recommending lots of changes for which others to pay for.

Action: David to amend Technical Advisory Group TOR and re-circulate.

Action: David put an agenda item on the first TAG meeting, asking if they want to suggest any substantive modifications to their TOR.

6. Current methodology briefing: James

In James' absence Peter presented his slides on the current LCDB mapping methodology (LCDB3_methodology_James.ppt)

- Mapping has a raster side and a vector side to it
- Raster side: LUCAS satellite imagery from MFE (2008 SPOT-5 and SPOT-Maps)
- Vector side: Existing LCDB-2 (includes LCDB-1)
- Process : look at incompatibilities between spectral signature of 2008 imagery and LCDB-2 mapping. Anomalies either change or error.
- Potential change/error sites identified – fast screen of these done in raster space.
- On vector side: LCDB-2 smoothed to remove stair casing.
- Potential changes viewed with a stack of image dates and edited by hand in vector space. Focus on 2008 multispectral, use history for context and SPOT-MAPS for clarity.

Action: David - Ask TAG if value doing LCDB at other scales (more generalised spatially/thematically) – likely expensive and probably outside scope of current contract.

7. Other business

- **Next meeting**

First week of May or last week of April.

Action: All send David availability for meeting.

Action: Rob and Kevin to get names for TAG back to David

Meeting closed 3:41 pm