FGDC Future Directions Forum
Meeting Summary – April 5, 2004
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Room 700A MIB

Host: Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC Staff Director

Facilitation Team: Tricia Gibbons and Carol Jeffords, LEAD Alliance

FD Planning Team Representatives: Bruce McKenzie, April Avnayim, Jon Sperling

Participants:

Participant	Organization	Contact Information
Lupien, Tony	GDT	tony_lupien@gdt1.com 410-433-7914
Cutler, Paul	Mapping Science Committee (MSC)	PCutler@nas.edu 202-334-2744
Cowen, David	Mapping Science Committee (MSC) University of South Carolina	cowend@sc.edu 803-777-5234
Albrecht, Jochen	UCGIS	jochen@umd.edu 301-405-8541
Palatiello, John	MAPPS	john@mapps.org 703-787-6996
Somers, Rebecca	ACSM	rsomers@somersstclaire.com 703-204-0033
Samborski, Bob	GITA	bsamborski@gita.org 303-337-0513
Bacharach, Sam	OGC	sbacharach@opengis.org 703-352-3938
Wells, Ed	URISA	ed.wells@att.net 202-727-0552
Plasker, Jim	ASPRS	jplasker@asprs.org 301-493-0290 x102
Lees, Joe	STIA	Jelees2@aol.com 703-304-6704
Corle, Fred	STIA	Fcorle@spatialtech.org 202-216-9116

Objectives of the Meeting

- Share consistent messages so far
- Solicit input and perspectives on the NSDI vision
- Identify national goals for the NSDI
- Work together as a geospatial community

Agenda

10:00 Welcome, Purpose and Introductions – Ivan DeLoatch

10:10 Brief Summary of the Future Directions Project – Tricia Gibbons
- o Purpose
- o Interviews, workshops, forums
- o Foundation documents
- o Messages so far

10:20 Meeting Set-up
- Objectives for Today
- Rules of the Game - tentcard

10:25 Group Discussion
- Vision
- National goals
- Roles & contributions
- Partnerships

11:50 Wrap-up
- Evaluation
- Next Steps

Ivan DeLoatch opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. by welcoming participants and facilitating introductions. Tricia Gibbons, meeting facilitator, led the discussion. Comments were accepted without evaluation or attribution and represent multiple perspectives.

What's your vision of the NSDI in 2014? What does it look like?
- Should be looking at the ultimate vision, rather than an interim vision?
- NSDI is a 3-legged stool (FGDC, TNM, GOS)—need a clear vision of each of the 3. <u>Editor's Note</u> – Executive Order 12906 defined NSDI as: "the technology, policies, standards, and human resources necessary to acquire, process, store, distribute, and improve utilization of geospatial data. " Therefore, by definition, the NSDI is much broader than the FGDC (a Federal interagency coordinating committee); GOS (a short-term Presidential E-gov initiative) and TNM (The National Map--the topographic map for the 21st century).
- NSDI doesn't brand well; thought about blowing it away and just calling it The National Map
- Step back and out because so many of us have been in this so long
  - o Needs to be simple & understandable for "the guy on the street"
  - o Easily findable, accessible, usable
  - o Break out of our mold
  - o Vision statement defines us – needs to be strong
- What's the final public message?
- The vision needs to be a little more specific, more than contributing…
- Who's going to build it, use it?

- Analogy with National Defense Transportation Policy/Interstate Highway System
  - o Infrastructure
  - o Stop building and start using; it does exist
  - o Focus on those who are driving on the highway
  - o Give them things they can use
  - o Timely access to data
  - o Refocus on services, users, applications
- "Draw some real lines on the map"; current vision statement – nothing is tangible; too many "relative" words; nebulous
- Who is our community?

- Get "3-legged stool" message out there. It is not being articulated outside the geospatial circle.
- The word "utility" not in the document, yet it comprises 85% of infrastructure
- Will FGDC coordinate for Federal community alone or state & local communities also?

- What do the "partners" need from one another?
  - o National building database
  - o National cadastral database
  - o Openness & accessibility - not secrecy
- Vision statement—we're "there" to some degree; NSDI mission will have been accomplished by 2014 so NSDI will no longer exist
  - o Geospatial data will be part of what we use day-to-day
- Analogy: Spatial data in 2014 will be what the Internet is today. We won't even give it a second thought. It will be everywhere & nowhere; part of everything we do; ubiquitous
  - o If we do it right, it should go away as an issue; won't even call it geospatial; no one will even know where it comes from; it's just there

What are the interim steps? (means to the end)
- Movement from portals to search engines; intelligence built into search engines will make portals obsolete
  - o Don't have to separately look for the spatial data
- Qualities needed
  - o Clear governance – roles & responsibilities
  - o Stable and long-term funding base
  - o Comprehensive multi-jurisdictional planning
  - o Education/training—human capital to sustain
  - o Strong consistent clear message with compelling global metaphor
  - o Commitment to interoperability
  - o Metrics to measure and describe the process & results
  - o Additional adjectives: transparent, virtual, active, rigorous, user friendly, responsive, comprehensive, well-funded, inclusive, accountable, efficient
- Need standards that are complete, articulated, accepted
  - o Standards are needed for data content, technology, metadata, and policy

What are some specific milestone targets (national goals) to be reached by 2007? What's the roadmap for getting to where we want to be?

- We need to know how we can interchange information. What do we say no to? (e.g., acceptance of data not meeting standards)
- Metadata standards are in use but not loved
  - Address the standard?
  - Cadastral Working Group?
- If we have a partnership (local, state and federal) - all three have to be part of the process.
- FGDC is more manageable. It can lead the way if coordinated.
- How do we link multiple representations of the same reality? How do we link all these?
- Challenge: Does the FGDC have all the players at the table?
- Same is true about the private sector, both on producer and user sides
- How attractive is the NSDI to the private world?
  - How can we involve the private sector in discussions so we can get this correct?
- Neither the federal nor the private sector is monolithic.

- Need to develop organizational relationships and rules to make decisions; e.g., critical infrastructure protection
- NSDI is taking a long time—data, how & when to share
- Simultaneously, local and state initiatives with all stakeholders at the table
- Create a table where everyone has a seat and a voice to see results
  - FGDC—not all stakeholders are at the table
  - Partnerships with other organizations and coalitions will lead to a series of projects from local level up.
  - Want assurances of some controls—policy, standards, support
- FGDC can't put together the broad-based political support on its own
  - Needs industry leadership
  - Industry may be able to drive this—funding, governance within Feds
  - Try to put together a coalition of interests to demonstrate broad-based support.
  - Better incentives for a variety of stakeholders are the compelling reasons to be involved.
  - Make sure everyone has a voice (an incentive)

- STIA Conference on Homeland Security—Purpose
  - Bring together community of interests
  - Raise awareness and heighten interest
  - Funding, promoting, building coalitions, etc.
  - Getting consensus within the industry
- Private sector having a hard time taking the government seriously
- Federal support to create the organization; how many have used FGDC?
  - Larger dollars are spent by some agencies not even involved in FGDC
- People come together by law, money or attention
  - Better chance of compliance if a federal law rather than voluntary
- FGDC process—Secretariat staff are the only ones required to coordinate. Coordination is voluntary everywhere else. Need either a carrot or a stick. Take to state, local and private sector.
  - FGDC needs tools to support the process.
  - Political component cannot be driven by FGDC.
  - Does FGDC really have the mandate to lead? Can they follow? Do they get in the way?
  - There is a structural charter issue.
  - Observation: GAO is also looking at this issue from the outside. Is there a redundancy?
  - Historical lineage - lack of authority, lack of budget, lack of a truly empowered entity

What is the role of your organization in achieving those goals?

GITA

- Provide a forum for discussion and exchange of information
  - More opportunities for federal agencies message needs
  - Feedback system for message
  - Outreach
  - Partner and assist FGDC—messages
  - Getting concerns to the proper place in the federal government
    - Refine messages from the bottom

URISA

- Will FGDC work only within the federal government or reach out to the private sector?
  - o If the focus is narrow, not much will change for URISA. URISA will continue to inform its members of FGDC activities, and they will continue to be important to URISA.
  - o If broader, URISA is able to offer access to a network of the most innovative and interested professionals; will pilot, move things forward, and provide feedback.
  - o In either case, FGDC activities will continue to be important to URISA.

ASPRS

- Unique role—technical
- Historic partner in standards setting; data collection
- Communications with constituents

MSC

- Honest brokers
- Non-partisan observers
- Raise questions
- "What's a user to do?" effort
- Bring together experts
- Write reports to educate & inform
- Studies/resource to the community—licensing study, recommendations, decision making process, bring together some people who aren't normally brought together

OGC

- Dialog, planning, education and outreach
- Technical specifications for software
- Interoperability
- Differentiate among standards

UCGIS

- Too diverse to have a single voice
- Developing a college-level geo science curriculum (educate)
- Cutting edge research to support large scale data mining
- Serve as highly redundant network to local, state, national geospatial data

ACSM
- Provide input from four distinct entities
  o Surveyors
  o AAGS—geodata network
  o CAGIS—cartography
  o GLIS (large scale land info systems)
- A lot on the production-side developers

STIA
- Information on the industry; industry needs
- Communications & outreach
- Standards support, subject matter experts
- Workshops & discussion groups

GDT
- For examples of successful data-sharing communities, the Federal Government might look at states where GDT has helped to implement "One Map" programs, where all state agencies share a common spatial data infrastructure, which provides a shared base for decision-making in planning and emergency operations"

Issues and Concerns
A conversation is needed regarding roles of government and private sector in the geospatial community.
- Not a funding issue, but needs to be considered—cost savings and investments
- Not a technical issue
- Structural and political barriers
- Partnerships and relationships need to be discussed.
- Internet did not explode until the private sector got involved; value went up (differences of opinion were expressed).

Is FGDC limited in the professional groups/associations to work with? We all have unique perspectives.

How do we convince legislators (and state and local governments) that the construct is efficient & working?

- Get confidence level up
- Federal government is contributing (back to funding issue)

National focus is too big. We need a regional approach.

It is important to make it work.

- Need clout
- Treasure chest
- Champions
- Killer applications (e.g., MapQuest)
- Awareness

Ideas to Consider/Actions to Take

- Joint conference—GIS/LIS
  - Collaboration; discussing collective issues
  - E.g., URISA's meeting
- Conscientiously try to do things together
  - Need action associated with the talking.
  - Produce something that has value.
  - Try to achieve the objective.
- Can we collectively figure out how to solve the problems or challenges we're facing?
  - Look at legislative piece—how can each of us contribute to the process?
  - How to make the best of working within the current governance structure?
  - Discussion of regional model; pilot—test model to work together in a specific area
  - How to expand what we've learned into other areas? Can we expect that in other areas? How not to lose the expertise?

Closing Remarks

Let's take the opportunity to shape the direction.

Ivan DeLoatch thanked the participants for their commitment and participation.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Tricia Gibbons and Carol Jeffords, LEAD Alliance.