

A-16 Leads Report Summary

17 of 34 A-16 Leads Responded:

- **Current Plan/Charter – 76%** have a current charter or plan for data collection
- **Metadata – 65%** have metadata listed through the NSDI Clearinghouse. The rest plan to list their metadata in the Clearinghouse soon.
- **Data Sharing Policy – 76%** have a data sharing policy.

Areas of Concern:

- Coordination for common definition and lead responsibility is needed for certain inland waterway features.
- Because Orthoimagery is a fundamental base layer for a multitude of applications across layers of government, collaborative strategies must be put in place to fund hosting and maintenance of these large multi-terabyte datasets.
- Lack of a multi-agency enterprise business model for data collection, data integration, data archive and data access hamper the USGS's ability fulfill its a-16 elevation responsibilities.

Lessons Learned:

- A subcommittee is preferable to one agency leading the development of guidelines.
- Consensus is needed among the broad land surveying community when defining the scope of the geodetic control theme.
- Leveraging dollars spent to effectively host data for the benefit of many agencies and programs will save dollars across government and avoid redundancy.
- The USGS needs to plan and implement the model for orthoimagery archives and public access that satisfies the requirements of *The National Map* and Geospatial One Stop.
- Only when funding strategies that leverage dollars spent to effectively develop, preserve, and host geospatial data for the benefit of many agencies and programs will the government be able to save dollars and avoid redundancy.
- Approximately 20 separate cultural resource data sets exist within the National Park Service, which must be tied together and presented as a coherent cultural resource dataset for the public.