

Review of FGDC standards program of work
Spatial Data Transfer Standard, Part 6: Point Profile

1. What's the problem (issue) that the standard is trying to address?

The issue may be inferred from the scope and objective, as stated in Spatial Data Transfer Standard, Part 6: Point Profile,
http://www.fgdc.gov/standards/projects/FGDC-standards-projects/SDTS/sdts_point/index_html.

What are the complementary standards (voluntary or accepted) that support this standard?

According to Section, 1.1 Scope and Definition:

Part 6, the Point Profile, contains specifications for an SDTS profile for use with geographic point data only, with the option to carry high precision coordinates such as those required for geodetic network control points. (This profile is a modification of Part 4, the Topological Vector Profile, and follows many of the conventions of that profile.)

- a. If the standard refers to other standards, have the referenced standards changed in a way that requires changes to this standard?

Yes, but the plan to replace ISO 8211 encoding with Geography Markup Language has not been realized.

- b. Since this standard was adopted or last reviewed, have new standards been adopted elsewhere that should be referenced in this standard?

Yes, GML.

2. What standard(s) does this FGDC standard support? *Not applicable*
3. Are the standards in active use?

Geodetic control information is still being transferred in SDTS, at the rate of 700 files per month, modest compared to other formats. Control point information may be formatted using SDTS Part 6. ESRI shapefiles being used for transfer. Joe Evjen is pushing NGS to adopt GML for file transfer.

4. Is the standard a 'Government Unique Standard'? *Yes.*
 - a. If so, has it been examined to see if Voluntary Consensus Standards might now be in place? *Parts 1-4 comprise INCITS 320:1998; Part 6 is not included in INCITS 320:1998*
 - i. If a corresponding Voluntary Consensus Standard exists, should the Consensus standard be considered for adoption to replace the existing standard? *Not applicable.*
 - ii. If a corresponding Voluntary Consensus Standard does not exist, should this standard be moved to a national standard?

Review of FGDC standards program of work
Spatial Data Transfer Standard, Part 6: Point Profile

If there were resources to INCITS 320:1998 for current technology, then INCITS 320:1998 should be extended to include the point profile.

- b. Is it appropriate to remain in FGDC? Why or why not?

Yes. The standard should remain as is.

5. Who are the important stakeholders that need input into the review of this standard?

- a. Which Federal agencies in addition to the agency with maintenance authority should the review committee include? *Don't know*
b. Which non-Federal agencies should the review committee include?

Consult with Robin Fegeas.

6. Are there editorial errors that you are aware of since this FGDC standard was endorsed?

No.

7. Are there technical errors or technical changes that you are aware since this FGDC standard was endorsed?

No.

Review of FGDC standards program of work
Spatial Data Transfer Standard, Part 6: Point Profile

Based on your answers to the above, the sponsor team recommends the following:

1. The standard to be issued with no modifications.

Justification:

The standard is needed to define existing data format. It will be withdrawn at a later date.

2. The standard to be revised.

Justification:

Specifically:

3. The standard to be changed.

Justification:

Specific areas of concern:

4. The standard to be withdrawn.

Justification: