Federal Geographic Data Committee
Coordination Group Meeting
Tuesday, June 8, 2010
FED ONLY: 9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. EST
All Members: 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Location: National Capitol Planning Commission
401 9th Street NW
Washington D.C. 20576

Room: 5th Floor, Commission Chambers, Suite 500

AGENDA

*****A.M. Session – FEDS ONLY*****

9:00 – 9:10	**Welcome and Introductions**	*Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC*
9:10 – 12:30	**Geospatial Platform Pillar Presentations and Discussion**	*Tony LaVoi, NOAA*
12:30 – 1:30	**Lunch**	

***** P.M. Session –PUBLIC*****

1:30 – 2:00	**NGAC Nomination Process Review for January 2011 Nominees**	*John Mahoney, FGDC*
2:00 – 2:30	**Geospatial Platform – Public Presentation**	*Tony LaVoi, NOAA*
2:30	**Adjourn**	

***Read-ahead Documents**	1.
Other Relevant documents	

* Read-ahead documents are located at the my.usgs.gov site for member access.

CG Meeting Planning

Coordination Group Meetings Topics (in addition to the following standing items) - Welcome and Introductions; - Previous Meeting Action Item Review; - FGDC Business Update; - FGDC Secretariat Report; - Summary of Action Items / Next Meeting Agenda; - Adjourn - All meetings are scheduled from 9am to 3pm EST at NCPC in D.C., unless otherwise noted
July 20, 2010 • Reports from: **LoB Lifecycle Management WG (Wendy Blake-Coleman), Vegetation SC (Ralph Crawford), and Marine and Coastal Spatial Data SC (Tony LaVoi).**
August 10, 2010 • Reports from: **LoB Common Services WG (WG Chair) and LoB Grants and Contracts WG (TBD – was Lew Sanford).**
September 14, 2010 • Reports from: **LoB Geo-Enabled Business WG (Sharon Shin) and Geodetic Control SC (Eric Linzey).**
October 12, 2010 • Reports from: **Homeland Security WG (Jonathan Hasse)**
November 9, 2010
December 14, 2010
Pending Topics (date topic was identified)
• Defining the NSDI (20090602-02). • Define/recommend how programs, like *The National Map* and the National Atlas, are identified, included, tracked, and involved in the CG efforts. (20090602-05). • The National Map as an FGDC Work Group.

Federal Geographic Data Committee
Coordination Group Meeting
ACTION ITEMS
Through May 11, 2010

Pending		
Lead:	Department of Homeland Security	**Action #: 20091013-03**
Action:	The Homeland Security Work Group will meet to revise the WG charter and report back to the CG for consensus and approval.	
Contact:	DHS Jeff Booth and Jon Hassee, Jeffrey.booth@dhs.gov, Jonathan.hassee@dhs.gov	
Resolution/ Response:	Meeting scheduled.	
Pending		
Lead:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC	**Action#: 20100112-04**
Action:	The Secretariat will follow up with OMB to see if the place-based policy proposals can be released for review by the CG, either before or after their evaluation, to determine the types of projects the Federal agencies proposed and see if there is a way to leverage some of these in the future.	
Contact:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC, ideloatch@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response	Coordination Group members are asked to contact their budget offices for guidance.	
Pending		
Lead:	Rick Pearsall, NGA	**Action#: 20100511-01**
Action:	Rick Pearsall will send out information to the Coordination Group, Steering Committee and ExCom on the June 8th GWG Meeting.	
Contact:	Rick Pearsall, NGA, Richard.A.Pearsall@nga.mil	
Resolution/ Response:		
Complete		
Lead:	Ken Shaffer, FGDC	**Action#: 20100511-02**
Action:	Ken Shaffer will forward the email on the National Science and Technology Council's Committee on Technology to the Coordination Group.	
Contact:	Ken Shaffer, FGDC, kmshaffer@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:	Link sent.	
Pending		
Lead:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC	**Action#: 20100511-03**
Action:	The FGDC Secretariat will put together a written proposal regarding the Document Adjudication Team and will send it out for concurrence by the CG..	
Contact:	Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC, ideloatch@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/		

Response:		
Pending		
Lead:	Ken Shaffer, FGDC	**Action#: 20100511-04**
Action:	The FGDC Secretariat will evaluate which documents related to the A-16 Supplemental Guidance review are on the myUSGS site, and supplement additional documents as necessary.	
Contact:	Ken Shaffer, FGDC, kmshaffer@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		

ID (yyyymmdd-#)	**Decision/Description** Decisions provide a position/foundation on which actions are taken.
20100511-01	A Document Adjudication Team will be formed. A written proposal will be put together for the concurrence of the Coordination Group.

Federal Geographic Data Committee
Coordination Group Meeting
MEETING MINUTES
June 8, 2010

√	Coordination Group Attendees	Organization	√	Attendee	Organization
x	Ivan DeLoatch – Chair	FGDC		Christina Lett	DOI
x	Bill Mullen – Co-Chair	DoD		Pheakdey Lim	VA
x	Ken Shaffer	FGDC		Jonathan Mann	GSA
x	Brett Abrams	NARA		Scott McAffee	FEMA
	Rani Balasubramanyam	DOJ		Ray Milefsky	State
	Deidre Bishop	Census		John Merrill	DHS
x	Wendy Blake-Coleman	EPA		David Morehouse	DoE
x	Jeff Booth	DHS	x	Jacquie Nolan	LoC
	Mark Bradford	DOT	x	Anne O'Connor	DoC
x	Colleen Cahill	LoC		Tai Phan	DoE
	Trisha Christian	SBA	x	Robert Pierce	DOI
x	Sandra Downie	GSA		Stu Reiter	NRC
x	Randy Fusaro	DoC		Daniel Sandhaus	DOI
x	Shirley Hall	USDA		Antoinette Sebastian	HUD
	Jon Hasse	DHS	x	Charles Smart	TVA
	William Henriques	DHS	x	Jon Sperling	HUD
	Edward Hulger	DoL		David Timmons	SSA
x	Carol Giffin	USGS		Dat Tran	VA
	David LaBranche	DoD		Adrienne Walker	OMB
x	Tony LaVoi	DoC			
	Other Attendees	**Organization**		**Attendee**	**Organization**
	Charlie Adler	FAA		Stephen Lowe	USDA
	Jeanette Archetto	GT		Vicki Lukas	USGS
	Juliana Blackwell	NGS	x	Arista Maher	FGDC
x	Nancy Blyler	USACE	x	John Mahoney	FGDC
x	Bill Burgess	NSGIC	x	Julie Binder Maitra	FGDC
x	Donald Campbell	FCC		Martha McCart Wells	URISA
	Marisa Capriotti	USDA		Doug Nebert	FGDC
	Mike Cooley	USGS	x	Jean Parcher	USGS
	Tod Dabolt	EPA		Rick Pearsall	NGA
	George Deryckere	GSA		Lorri Peltz-Lewis	FS
x	Rob Dollison	USGS	x	Milo Robinson	FGDC
	Lee Fahrner	NSGIC		Jim Rolfes	DOI
	Sheri Farrell			Steve Schwartz	MMS
x	Hank Garie	GT	x	Vaishal Sheth	FGDC
x	Tricia Gibbons	LEAD Alliance		Renee Shields	NOAA

x	Rich Grady	Applied Geographics	x	Sharon Shin	FGDC
	John Hanes	USGS	x	Karen Siderelis	DOI
	Travis Hardy			Dave Soller	USGS
	Charles Hickman	USGS		Justin Steckervetz	EPA
	Marten Hogeweg			Larry Sugarbaker	USGS
x	Alex Hume	GT	x	Gita Urban-Mathieux	FGDC
	Jerry Johnston	EPA		Bill Wilen	FWS
	Kevin Kirby	EPA	x	Linda Zellmer	WestIllU
x	Roxanne Lamb	FGDC		Lin Zhang	DOI
	Mark Lemon	GT	x	Doug Vandegraft	MMS
	Lynda Liptrap	Census	x	Anne Ball	NOAA
x	Mitchell Fiedler		x	Dan Good	USDA
x	David Hoy	USFWS	x	Kent Williams	USDA
x	Don Buhler	BLM	x	Catherine Nolan	GT
x	Karen Matheson	USGS	x	Curt Sumner	ACSM
x	Adena Schutzberg	Directions Media	x	Cliff Allison	NAVTEQ
x	Charles Mondello	Pictometry	x	Nancy Borellos	Pictometry
x	Bert Jarreau	NACo	x	John Palatiello	MAPPS
x	Ed Crane	IAAO	x	Jim Plasker	ASPRS
x	Garth Lawrence	Intermap Technologies	x	Michelle Gallinger	LOC
x	Jenee Kresge	NARC	x	Najia DePiro	DOI
x	Sherry Loy	Global Marketing Insights, Inc.	x	Alan Mikuni	CaGIS
x	David DiSera	EMA, Inc.	x	Jenee Kresge	NARC
x	Zsolt Nagy	AECOM	x	Bert Jarreau	NACo
x	Alexandra Prokhorova	GT	x	Terry Slocum	UKansas
x	Kevin Corbley	Corbley Communications	x	Kelly Downs	LizardTech
x	Cy Smith	URISA	x	Bob Pierce	USGS
x	Lisa Daniels	IAAO	x	Elizabeth Kanalley	USFS
x	Wendy Nelson	URISA	x	Sarah Hammer	GT
x	Kathleen Callister	NASA	x	Pat Cummens	ESRI
x	Autumn Foard	GSA	x	Ralph Crawford	FS
x	Barney Krucoff	DC			
1) CG Members in blue text 2) Check box for meeting attendance.					

***** A.M. Session – FEDS ONLY *****

***** P.M. Session – PUBLIC *****

NGAC Nomination Process Review for January 2011 Nominees – *John Mahoney, FGDC*
[Presentation: PDF]

John Mahoney (FGDC) gave an overview of the National Geospatial Advisory Committee's (NGAC) nominations review process. Audience members were asked to spread the word about the NGAC to encourage well-qualified candidates to apply for the next round of appointments. The NGAC was created in 2008 as a Federal Advisory Committee, under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). It functions as an advisory body that provides recommendations on federal geospatial policy to the FGDC.

The NGAC meets approximately once per quarter. Between meetings, there is a set of subcommittees that meets on a regular basis to develop recommendations. Some of the prior recommendations and activities by the NGAC include: Imagery for the Nation (IFTN), the changing geospatial landscape, and the economic stimulus recommendations. The Geospatial Platform, place-based policies, emerging technologies, broadband mapping, geospatial workforce, *The National Map*, and Partnerships are the most recent areas of focus for the Committee.

The NGAC Charter lays out the general guidelines for membership based on FACA guidance and Department of Interior guidance. Up to 30 representatives are allowed to be on the Committee, and there needs to be a balance of viewpoints and a geographic balance on the Committee. Appointments are for three years, and members can serve up to two consecutive terms.

This will be the third round of appointments. For both prior processes, we have used fairly similar nominations and appointments procedures. There is an open call for nominations, and then those nominations are reviewed by an interagency review panel, which makes recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior.

There are fourteen positions on the Committee that will be up for appointment this coming January. Michael Byrne accepted a new position, so there will be one more space opening up during this round.

The Secretariat will issue a call for nominations during late June or early July. This will be open for 45 days; there will be a press release and Federal Register notice. We will widely advertise this through various organizational channels. Nominations will be evaluated by an interagency panel later this year. Department of Interior (DOI) Secretary Ken Salazar will make final appointments based on recommendations of the panel by early 2011. The review process through DOI and the Solicitor's Office is fairly rigorous. There is some level of background check involved.

The nominations process will be similar to past cycles. Nominations can be submitted on behalf of others – or, individuals can self-nominate. Nominations should include a nomination letter, a

letter of recommendation, a bio sketch, resume, or vita, and contact information for the nominee. Members should be able to effectively represent a constituency or community of interest, and they should have a record of significant accomplishment and be recognized and respected in their fields. Members should also be able to speak authoritatively on geospatial issues.

The next NGAC meeting will take place on June 22-23, 2010 in Shepherdstown, WV. There are two more meetings scheduled for 2010 in September and December. We will be providing updates on the nominations process to the NGAC community during the rest of the year.

Anyone who has questions on the nominations process is encouraged to contact John Mahoney (jmahoney@fgdc.gov). Attendees of today's meeting were encouraged to ask questions.

The question of what type of applicant the selection committee is looking was asked. Ivan answered that much of what we are looking for is a balance of perspectives, so varied experience is highly valued.

Milo Robinson (FGDC) asked, is there exclusion for lobbyists? John responded that yes, anyone who is currently registered as a federal lobbyist is not eligible for an appointment on a Federal advisory committee, based on guidance that came out several months ago.

Jim Plasker (ASPRS) commented that the first round of appointments went very well and that outstanding appointments were made. We at ASPRS believe that diversity is lacking in this particular mix after the last round. In the process, perhaps there was not a step-back at the end of the process to "analyze the forest instead of just the trees." The provider community—especially the private side – is under-represented. Key technologies are also under-represented; for instance, the geodetic element. The need for base data in the NSDI underscores this need. ASPRS' suggestion is that at some point in the appointment process, someone should look at that new group as a whole and ask the question, "Do we have a diverse forest?" The only criterion in the Charter is geographic balance. None of the diversity of technology, etc. is part of it. Maybe it would be helpful to write this criterion into general guidelines. This process replaces half the Committee every three years. It would seem more logical to revisit this in favor of more continuity (i.e., a third every three years).

Ivan responded that we looked at the nominations for balance, but we appreciate the comments and will take them into consideration. Where we didn't have people who didn't have certain level of expertise, we have been reaching out to those experts via our subcommittees. While this may not be a perfect process, it has given us more of the diversity of expertise when necessary.

John Palatiello (MAPPS) asked whether there are segments of the community that Jim's team feels is not adequately represented. He also asked when the policy on NGAC subcommittees that are populated by individuals who are not part of the NGAC took place; he did not see a call for participation from non-NGAC members. Ivan responded that we gave general guidance to subcommittee chairs to allow any non-NGAC participants to help on the subcommittees, but that they need to be vetted first. However, it would be helpful to write more explicit guidance on this in the future, so it is something we plan on working on soon.

Geospatial Platform – Public Presentation – *Tony LaVoi, NOAA*
[Presentation: PDF]

Ivan noted that those of us in the geospatial community have an opportunity to develop an approach to advance the National Spatial Data Infrastructure through the creation of a Geospatial Platform. We will be moving toward a portfolio management approach, and we are using the Geospatial Platform as a mechanism for this. DOI will be leading this process and developing a concept paper to submit to OMB this year. This allows us to coalesce some of the activities in the geospatial sector (i.e., Geospatial One Stop, Line of Business, etc.) into a unified approach.

The definition of the Geospatial Platform is "a managed portfolio of common geospatial data, services, and applications contributed and administered by authoritative sources and hosted on a shared infrastructure, for use by government agencies and partners to meet their mission needs and the broader needs of the Nation." The intent is to have all government agencies and their partners have access to geospatial capabilities to meet mission needs, ensure transparency, etc.

A conceptual model of the Platform was presented in a diagram. The five pillars upholding the platform are: Common Geospatial Data, Services and Applications; Geospatial Portfolio Management; Shared Infrastructure; Segment Architecture; and Governance Structure (Policy and Operations). There is a sixth important element, which is Communications and Outreach. One of the key questions we have asked ourselves is how we can do this differently from previous approaches. This requires strong leadership.

Tony LaVoi gave an overview of the Modernization Roadmap, which is the immediate task at hand. The Roadmap is due to OMB by July 1, and it is still a work in progress. The purpose of the Roadmap is to: define the Geospatial Platform and establish the vision and purpose; describe the future state technology architecture; identify processes and organization elements; describe the strategic path forward to implement vision; and to identify actionable projects and activities for short- and mid-term implementation, including operations. We need to be looking for "easy wins" on things to begin implementing.

A general outline of the Roadmap document was presented. The order of the document is as follows: Preamble, Executive Summary, Introduction, Business Model, Pillars of the Geospatial Platform, Roadmap for Implementation, and Appendices. This isn't going to be an implementation plan, but there will be items identified as time-boxed, discrete tasks that can be achieved in the near-term.

The business model outline was discussed. The business model includes five sub-topics, including: The Offering, Business Institution, Customers (distinction between Customers and Partners), Financial Approach (Capital Investments and Operating Expenses), and Funding Sources.

A list of Champions and Chairs for the Geospatial Platform was shown. This approach is modeled on the Imagery for the Nation (IFTN) plan, which allowed senior executives from

multiple agencies to have ownership of the development of the plan, which was successful for IFTN.

A timeline for the Platform was presented, with an ultimate target date of June 30 to have version 3 of the Roadmap completed. July and August will be an opportunity for stakeholders and partners to have a say in the Roadmap process.

Outreach is a very important part of the Platform; while it is not a pillar, per se, it is one of the work groups. The initial outreach opportunity is through the June NGAC meeting. We want to be able to take advantage of social media and Web 2.0 approaches.

The URL for the Platform is: www.geoplatform.gov. Currently, it takes users to an emergency management application (ERMA) that is being used for the Gulf oil spill efforts, but this will be changed later on.

NGAC member Barney Krucoff asked what OMB expects after the July 1 deliverable. Karen Siderelis answered that part of what is driving the July 1 deadline is the 2012 budget process. We will be doing a considerable amount of outreach and communication after July 1. This Administration has a bias for action; they are expecting that we are implementing parts of the vision during the remainder of FY 10, and that we will be doing the same thing in FY 11—trying to leverage assets we already have to do more. Ivan agreed, adding that we need to demonstrate how we are using the resources we already have the most effectively, and demonstrate what the gaps are. We need to have a concept to OMB in order to have them support us through the budget process. There is no guarantee of any particular outcome, but we are trying to take advantage of this opportunity to present a business case.

John Palatiello (MAPPS) asked how this Platform differs from Geospatial One Stop. One of the pillars is "private data as services" – how do you envision including this through this model? Given what Jim Plasker said about one area where there is a lack of representation (the data producer community) on NGAC, is there any other means to provide input on this from this perspective? Where is the data? We don't have the NSDI. What is the Platform going to do about this? You used the term "authoritative data," what does this mean, especially in regards to private data?

Ivan responded that Geospatial One Stop and the Geospatial Platform differ in that Geospatial One Stop is an application for cataloging resources available, whereas the Geospatial Platform will be more expansive than that, making it accessible through a shared infrastructure as well. In terms of private data/services, we are still working through that definition, but we want everything on the table. We will ideally move to sorting what is needed in the public space and what isn't. With respect to getting input from NGAC, we anticipate doing a more extensive stakeholder input process in July/August, and we anticipate getting more input from the private data producer community then as well. As far as "authoritative data," we define it as "data of known quality," but this is a working concept. It is very important that the data being used is of high quality; the appropriate metadata needs to be attached to data.

Bill Burgess (NSGIC) asked about the review period. Since July/August is the time frame for stakeholder input, it would be helpful to know what sort of form of input is expected from stakeholders (i.e., forums, surveys, etc.) Also, are we looking at more Platforms (Geospatial One Stop), in terms of modernization road-mapping?

Ivan responded that we are not looking at a series of Platforms, but a comprehensive approach for all of these. In terms of the stakeholder schedule, that is a wonderful idea and we will take it back to the communications subcommittee to have them develop something to help stakeholders help us.

Pat Cummens (ESRI) noted that the NGAC has a panel scheduled at the ESRI conference in July, and that this would be a good opportunity for the Communications and Outreach Work Group to present on the Platform and obtain feedback.

Adena Schutzberg (Directions Media) said she is pleased that there is an emphasis on communications. There is already confusion on Twitter about the Platform (ESRI) and geoplatform.gov. Ivan noted that the Platform leadership is aware of some of the confusion, and hopes to clarify through this meeting and future outreach efforts.

Adjourn