

Subcommittee Report Summary

11 of 13 Subcommittees responded:

- **Current Plan or Charter** - 64% have a current plan or charter for collection.
- **Metadata** – 82% have metadata in the FGDC Clearinghouse.
- **Data Sharing Policy** – 27% have a data sharing policy in place.

Recommended for Discontinuation:

- **Base Cartographic Data Subcommittee**
- **Soils Subcommittee**

No Response From:

- **International Boundaries & Sovereignty Subcommittee**
- **Wetlands Subcommittee**

Areas of Concern:

- Inadequate funding / lack of permanent funding base is a risk to future data collection, integration, maintenance, the NSDI, the Geospatial One Stop, and standards implementation.
- Coordination is essential – What mechanism exists to ensure compatibility among standards promulgated by FGDC groups related to vegetation?
- The scope of the GOS needs to be defined in detail and applied to all theme standards.
- GOS contractors have not delivered products – inconsistent and incomplete guidance, processes of consensus and poor contract performance to support GOS make it difficult to produce harmonized products.
- Base funding for spatial climate development within the Federal Government is a significant issue.

Lessons Learned:

- Guidelines drafted by a multi-agency group facilitate buy-in and ensure the usefulness of the guidelines.
- The ISO version of the FGDC Geospatial Metadata Content Standard must be adopted to achieve full metadata compliance.
- Many government agencies at all levels are creating and maintaining road data and USDOT should bring the geographic community together to reduce duplication of effort and increase data sharing between these agencies.