

Chris Suri
Geography 696
04/26/2010

A summary of Mills, J. et al. 2008:

The clearinghouse concept: a model for geospatial data centralization and dissemination in a disaster.

Main ideas:

Outline/format of paper: Title, Abstract, Introduction, History, Inception of the LGCC, Data Issues (theoretical), Data Dissemination (theoretical), Data Dissemination (LGCC), Archiving, Correspondence, Endnotes, and References.

- The history of the clearinghouse and spatial data infrastructure concepts and their use in GIS (471-473)
- FEMA and LSU created the LGCC (467)
- The LGCC model can be applied toward other situations and events (467)
- Productivity of a data clearinghouse far outweighs de-centralized data/maps
- File naming conventions save enormous amounts of time ahead of the event
- Information is not data. Information includes data and is more comprehensive
- Virtual Private Networks are not problem free
- Good will of data donation aids the clearinghouse's effectiveness
- Was/is \$150K worth it – this is the cost of maintaining the LGCC
- The idea is to keep the data after an event

Key Points:

Thesis SOP: “This article outlines the formation of the LGCC, issues of data organization, and methods of data dissemination and archiving with an eye towards implementing the clearinghouse model as a standard resource for addressing geospatial data needs in disaster research and management.” (467 - and a shorter version on page 468)

Introduction: The background, thesis SOP, and future recommendations were all written in a shortened format in the last three sentences of the *Introduction* section, which emphasized what the overall point of the article is within the context of research on this topic. (468)

Importance: “Clearinghouses are in a far better position than government agencies to make effective use of these donated services in the aftermath of a disaster, for a while emergency management professionals require these data for immediate use in achieving situation awareness for decision support, researchers can mine the datasets for applications in the months and years beyond their immediate use...agencies are not structures to disseminate their geospatial data.” (470)

Conclusion: The concluding statements were pretty basic but to the point: “the better the information and the more quickly it flows, the more aware and better prepared are emergency management professionals to deal with disaster successfully” (478).

Our 696 class discussion topics (collective responses):

1. What type of paper was this? (467)

This paper was an empirical review of geographic research which uses a clearinghouse model.

2. Did everyone notice all of the acronyms in the paper? (467)

Yes but they are sometimes necessary and better than writing the whole name down repeatedly.

3. Has anyone here had problems obtaining GIS or other data from a city or agency? (469-470)

{A resounding...} YES!

4. Did you notice that the concept of “clearinghouse” was defined using Webster’s dictionary? Why is that?

They may want to be able to explain their ideas in a way that doesn’t shut people off or confuse them. By using the basic definition it is possible to analyze whether or not GIS has altered the concept.

5. How many of us who use GIS make errors or are inconsistent with our own naming conventions? (472)

Yes most of us are...

6. Were the authors specific enough in this paper to convince those who do not believe in the clearinghouse model now to change their minds? (478)

No. Not really. But that may not have been the only goal of the paper.