

Federal Geographic Data Committee Coordination Group Meeting

Federal Employees Only

Date: June 2 and 3, 2009

Time: 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. ET Location: U.S. Geological Survey

12201 Sunrise Valley Dr. Room BA102 A & B Reston, VA 20192

Attendees

<u>Attendees</u>		
Read-ahead Documents (provided by Friday May 29)	 ExCom Meeting Minutes for April 15 & 16 Working Group & Subcommittee Summaries, Summary Table NGAC Meeting Summary for May 12 & 13 Geo LoB Work Groups Summaries and work plans Draft Coordination Group Charter 	
Other Relevant documents	 6. OMB Circular A-16 7. Executive Order 12906 8. Common Solutions and Target Architecture (CSTA) 9. Geo LoB Joint Business Case 10. A-16 Supplemental Guidance 	
Meeting Objectives	 Identify the current role of the Coordination Group while reviewing its roles and operations. Reach consensus on the Coordination Group Charter Describe the operational procedures necessary to improve Coordination Group operations. Identify reporting requirements for Working Groups, Subcommittees and Geo LoB Work Groups. Identify the mechanisms needed that will allow the Coordination Group to coordinate geospatial activities across the Federal government with other national stakeholders. 	

Agenda June 2

8:30 am	Welcome & Meeting Objectives	Ivan DeLoatch
8:45	Review Coordination Group Survey Results	Facilitators
9:00	Introductions & Expectations for the Meeting	Facilitated discussion
9:30	Role of Coordination Group	Facilitated discussion

- What is the role of Coordination Group?
- How can the Coordination Group be more focused on the coordination of Federal geospatial activities?

10:00	Break	
10:15	 Coordination Group Charter Review What are the key objectives? Who should be members Departments or Agencies? How should the Coordination Group be led? What is the appropriate structure for Coordination Group? What are the roles, responsibilities, and relationship of the Coordination Group to the ExCom, Steering Committee, FGDC Secretariat? How can the Coordination Group operate most effectively? 	Ivan DeLoatch, John Mahoney and Charter Team Facilitated discussion
12:00	Lunch – USGS Cafeteria	
1:00	Geo LoB Work Group Updates/Alignment –Short concise update 2-3 minutes per group followed by discussion • Are the work groups aligned? • What about their work plans? • What are the priorities for FY 2010? • Deliverables? • Milestones? • Return on Investment estimates?	Lew Sanford, FGDC Geo LoB Work Group Leads Facilitated discussion
2:30	Break	
2:45	Subcommittees & Working Group Updates/Validation – Short concise update 2-3 minutes per group followed by discussion • Are the Working Groups and Subcommittees aligned? • What about their work plans? • What are the priorities for FY 2010? • Which need termination? • Which need reinvigoration?	Subcommittee Leads Working Group Leads
3:30	 ExCom Preparation What are the key issues or topics to be raised with the ExCom? Assignments for tomorrow? 	Facilitators
3:45	Check –Up • What worked well? What did not?	Facilitators
4:00 pm	Adjourn	Ivan DeLoatch



Agenda Day TwoJune 3, 2009 **8:30 a.m. – 3:15 p.m. ET**

8:30 am	Summarize Day One	Facilitators
8:45	Subcommittees & Working Group Updates/ValidationContinued	Subcommittee Leads Working Group Leads
9:15	Reporting Requirements for Subcommittees, Working Groups and Geo Lob Work Groups • What information was not provided that would have been helpful to your agency's operations? • What does a common reporting template look like? • How often to report? • Do we need a FGDC Dash Board?	All
10:00	Break	
10:15	 Coordination Group Operations How can the Coordination Group operate most effectively? Does the Coordination Group need an Annual Work Plan 	Coordination Group
11:00	 ExCom Preparation What are the key issues or topics to be raised with the ExCom? How will these be presented and by who? 	All
11:30	Break For Lunch & time to prepare for ExCom	
1:00	 Joint Coordination Group & Executive Committee Session What are the key finding and outcome from the Coordination Group meeting? How can we best align the Coordination Group, Steering Committee and the ExCom to advance Federal geospatial coordination? 	Karen Siderelis, DOI
3:00	Wrap Up	Karen Siderelis, DOI
3:15 pm	Adjourn	Ivan DeLoatch



Federal Geographic Data Committee Coordination Group Meeting June 2-3, 2009

ACTION ITEMS

Complete		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090602-01
Action:	The Coordination Group profile survey will be further	compiled and sent to the
	Coordination Group members.	
Contact:	FGDC, Milo Robinnson, mrobinson@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/	Milo Robinson sent on June 5.	
Response:		
Complete		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat and CG members	Action #: 20090602-02
Action:	Devote a Coordination Group meeting on the topic of defining the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI). Create a running list as part of the meeting agenda of pending items to address in meetings by the CG.	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/	List added to this 6/2-3/09 meeting record.	
Response:		
Complete		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090602-03
Action:	Add to the list of pending CG topics - There is a need to develop a process for standing up a Transportation Theme Subcommittee.	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/	Added to the list of pending items.	
Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat and CG Members	Action #: 20090602 -04
Action:	Suggestions for the Coordination Group Charter revision: need for a more broad representation from the Bureaus; incorporate lack of attendance and consequences, incorporate the Chair/Co-Chair responsibilities. The revised Charter will be sent to members for review and read- ahead before the July 7 th Coordination Group meetingwill try and get it out two weeks before the meeting	
Contact:	FGDC, John Mahoney, jmahoney@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/		
Response:		
Complete		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat and CG Members	Action #: 20090602-05
Action:	Individual Agency programs should be dealt with at th Working Group level. How is this accomplished? Ad	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/	Added to the list of pending items.	

Response:		3
Complete		
Lead:	CG Members	Action #: 20090602-06
Action:	The GeoLoB Grants and Contracts language will be po	
Action.	shared space.	osted on the my.0303.gov
Contact:	FGDC, Lew Sanford, lsanford@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/	Posted on June 5 th .	
	Posted off Julie 3.	
Response:		
Complete Lead:	CG Members	Action #: 20090602-07
Action:	An electronic vote will be sent out for the Coordination	
Action:	Geo LoB work plans. The ballot is needed back by Jun	
Contact:	FGDC, Lew Sanford, Isanford@fgdc.gov	11, 2007
Resolution/	Pat Phillips e-mailed information to the Coordination (Group mombors on June 4
	2009 with a reminder on June 11.	310up members on June 4,
Response: Complete	2007 WILL & TOTHINGEL OIL JUIC 11.	
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090602-08
Action:	Send out instructions on the use of the my.usgs.gov sha	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	ared space.
Resolution/	Pat Phillips sent on June 4, 2009	
	rat Finnips sent on June 4, 2009	
Response:		
Outstanding Lead:	CG Members	Action #: 20090602-09
Action:	The FGDC Subcommittees, Working Groups and Geo LoB leads are to identify all members participating on their teams and report them to Milo for compilatio	
	and presentation at the July 7 CG meeting.	an to Mino for compilation
Contact:	Milo Robinson, mrobinson@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/	wino Robinson, mrobinson@igac.gov	
Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090602-10
Action:	ExCom agreed to hold an electronic endorsement vote	
Action:	Draft vote content for review by CG Chair, than send t	
~	<u> </u>	
Contact:	FGDC, Julie Binder-Maitra, <u>jmaitra@fgdc.gov</u> , paphil	1 0 0
Resolution/	Per discussion with the ExCom, proceed with the elect	ronic ballot for wetlands.
Response:		
Outstanding		1 10 11 00000000
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090603-11
Action:	Merge the Geospatial Enterprise Architecture and Clea	
	Groups into one Working Group named the "Technical Architecture." 1) This	
	merger to be included in the new Coordination Group Charter.	
	2) Ensure the new structure is reflected in the new stru	cture graphic.
G 4 1	Target date is early July.	
Contact:	FGDC, Doug Nebert, dnebert@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/		
Response:		
G 1		
Complete		

Lead:	Coordination Group	Action #: 20090603-12
Action:	A Geo LoB Lifecycle Management Working Group di	alogue will be provided at
	the August Coordination Group meeting.	
Contact:	EPA, Wendy Blake- Coleman, blakecoleman.wendy@	epa.gov
Resolution/	This item has been added to the August agenda.	
Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	CG Working Group	Action #: 20090603-13
Action:	Create an exploratory group/forum to make recommen Users Group" as a working group of the CG (focusing but do not create or manage geospatial data).	
Contact:	Milo Robinson, mrobinson@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/		
Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	CG Working Group	Action #: 20090603-20
Action:	Rename the FGDC Historical Data Working Group to temporal data management issues and analyze the men appropriate participation (ex: IFTN archiving WG).	mbership to ensure
Contact:	LoC, Colleen Cahill ccah@loc.gov and NARA, Brett brett.abrams@nara.gov	Abrams,
Resolution/		
Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	CG Working Group	Action #: 20090603-14
Action:	Realign the Marine Boundary Working Group under the Subcommittee in the FGDC structure graphic. Once a lead can work with the WG lead to combine the members of the subcommittee in the FGDC structure graphic.	pproved, the Subcommittee
Contact:	Milo Robinson, mrobinson@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	CG Working Group	Action #: 20090603-15
Action:	Revise the Standards Work Group Charter	
Contact:	FGDC, Julie Binder -Maitra, jmaitra@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/		
Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090603-16
Action:	The Geo LoB dashboard approach will be developed a reporting out to the Coordination Group. This same readapted to use as a reporting mechanism for the Subco Groups. The Geo LoB dashboard will be presented at	eporting approach may be ommittees and Working
	<u>.</u>	the sury Coordination
Contact:	Group meeting for review and comment.	the sary Coordination
Contact: Resolution/ Response:	<u>.</u>	the sary Coordination

Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090603-17
Action:	Revise the FGDC Working Group and Subcommittee s	structure graphic.
Contact:	FGDC, Milo Robinson, mrobinson@fgdc.gov	<u> </u>
Resolution/		
Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090603-18
Action:	Send out the new proposed draft agenda (using the CG Coordination Group members for comment. Consider Coordination Group meeting from 9:00 am to 3:00.	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/	NCPC only available from 8:30 – 1 pm on July 7. The	meeting agenda will need
Response:	to be adjusted accordingly. Draft agenda will be sent to	
Outstanding		o e e i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090603-19
Action:	The Executive and Coordination Group members came	
	joint meetings as necessary. It was suggested to focus t National Geospatial Policy. Work with the ExCom lea recommended schedule for the meetings.	
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/		
Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	CG Members	Action #: 20090603-21
Action:	The Executive Committee recommended establishing I ExCom and the CoordGroup. They would attend each issues and priorities to improve communications. Conselect the CG liaison.	other's meetings to relay
Contact:	FGDC, Pat Phillips, paphillips@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/ Response:		
Outstanding		
Lead:	FGDC Secretariat	Action #: 20090603-22
Action:	Prepare a summary of recommended CG operational promeeting agendas will be determined at the end of each	-
Contact:	FGDC, Ken Shaffer kmshaffer@fgdc.gov	
Resolution/	7	
Response:		

Coordination Group Meetings (topics listed by priority)

July 7, 2009, Tuesday, NCPC Washington, D.C., 8:30 to 1:00 EST

- 1. Discussion and vote on acceptance of new Coordination Group Charter Objective: Vote on acceptance of CG charter in order to send to SC for action.
- 2. Review Geo LoB Reporting dashboard (the 9:45 slot)
 Objective: Consensus on GeoLoB dashboard content so that usage can begin.
- 3. Review of revised FGDC Working Groups/Subcommittee structure Objective: Confirm the FGDC structure changes discussed in the 6/2-3 offsite and determine next steps.

Note: A request was made to see a FortiusOne CAP grant presentation at the July Meeting.

August 4, 2009, Tuesday, NCPC Washington, D.C., <TIME ???> EST

1. Geospatial Lifecycle Working Group Theme discussion Objective:

September 1, 2009, Tuesday, NCPC Washington, D.C., <TIME ???> EST

October 6, 2009, Tuesday, NCPC Washington, D.C., <TIME ???> EST

November 3, 2009, Tuesday, NCPC Washington, D.C., <TIME ???> EST

December 1, 2009, Tuesday, NCPC Washington, D.C., <TIME ???> EST

Pending Topics

- Defining the NSDI (20090602-02)
- Standing up a Transportation Subcommittee (20090602-03)
- Define/recommend how Agency programs, like *The National Map* and the National Atlas, are identified, included, tracked, and involved in the CG efforts. (20090602-05)



Federal Geographic Data Committee Coordination Group Meeting June 2-3, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Welcome and meeting objectives: Ivan DeLoatch, FGDC

Ivan DeLoatch welcomed the participants to the Coordination Group offsite meeting. The two day agenda, the ground rules and the meeting expectations were summarized. [Ground Rules]

Review of the Coordination Group Survey Results: Milo Robinson, FGDC Facilitator [Survey Results]

The Coordination Group members filled out a profile survey, Milo summarized the results.

Results for the top three priorities for the Coordination Group:

- What are the key data priorities? Better facilitation on standards. Better interaction with the Geo LoB
- The main role for the Coordination Group is to communicate with Senior Leaders and to go up the chain to the Steering Committee and the Executive Committee. Communication should deal with making recommendations on resources, funding, priorities, etc.
- Deliverables, communication, measurable progress
- Coordination of requirements. Clarify the role of Federal versus National.
- The Coordination Group is a gate keeper of all this information, how do we stimulate new ideas?
- There is a need for more tangible activities better linked to our agencies missions, IE. work plan with quantifiable results
- Information sharing, coordination, promoting standards
- Better understanding of "for the Nation Initiatives"
- CG group to achieve 98 % clarity in roles and responsibilities of the members
- Future Coordination Group meetings will be productive role and governance of the Steering Committee
- Devote a Coordination Group meetings to the topic of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and during this fiscal year develop a draft statement/definition of NSDI.
- What is the role of the CG and how can it be more effective.
- Solve the Coordination Group identity crisis
- Identify roles of the members
- Identify concrete way to coordinate
- Better clarity of the roles of the membership, work should support agency needs
- Agreement on the definition of the NSDI, Geospatial One Stop, *The National Map*

ACTION 20080602-01: The Coordination Group profile survey will be further compiled and sent to the Coordination Group members.

Meeting Expectations

- Have a good idea or better idea of CG roles, responsibilities and what needs to be accomplished to move forward.
- Clarity and consensus on roles and responsibilities of the Coordination Group
- Clarify roles and improve process for more effective collaboration
- A clearer understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the CG and how to improve the process
- C.G. role defined consensus
- Gain better understanding of the role of Coordination Group
- Agreement on CG role and governance and recommendations to the Steering Committee
- Clearly defined roles for the FGDC, Managing Partner Team, ExCom, & all the WG and Subcommittees of the FGDC & Geo Lob & how they relate to one another
- Identify specifically the role of the CG and What I'm supposed to do as a member.
- Clearly defined Charter, roles and next steps for CG
- Solve the "Identity Crisis" the CG is currently experiencing
- What is the consensus role of the FGDC, GOS, *The National Map*?
- What is the consensus role of the CG in FGDC? Increase structural coordination among all FGDC/Geo LoB components
- Clarity on Subcommittee measures of success & option to modify its membership
- Future CG meeting will be productive & there will be coordination to create /maintain data
- Concrete ways in which the committee can more effectively coordinate
- Decision made on the degree to which CG day-to-day leads and manages Fed. components of the NSDI
- Expand cooperation and data sharing with agencies and LoC
- We do not produce data or use data—How can we be relevant to the CG/FGDC? What of value can FGDC do for VA?
- How can CG support User Agency needs and Missions?
- Do the POTS and PAWS and move on to the development of standards and build the NSDI!
- 98 % of (Meeting) objectives met

Role of Coordination Group – a facilitated discussion

- What is the role of Coordination Group?
 - o NSDI
 - o Define coordination activities—Work Plans
 - o Quantify results
 - o Information sharing coordination/ networking
 - o Promoting standards
 - Coordination of Fed. data set needs
 - o Coordinate as a committee
 - o Dialog
 - Coordinate end products(standards)
 - o Feeding to ExCom and Steering Committee
 - o Stimulate and harvest new ideas (best Practices) ensure ideas meet requirements
 - o Communication: laterally member to member, hierarchically member to SAOGI
 - o Decision making on resource funding, data sharing, standards

- o Coordination of fed geospatial requirements and data
- o Aggregate data like transportation data
- o Assign responsibilities w/ deliverables and dates, measurable progress]
- o Follow A-16
- o What are the Key data priorities? NSDI what is it now?
- o Better facilitation, coordination, and dissemination of data
- o Standards reduce redundancy improve sharing improve clarity
- Interaction with Geo LoB
- State coordination components
- o A- 16 supplemental guidance
- o Impact of fed geospatial data on end users
- Standards
- o Specific tangible activities linked to agencies
- o Prioritization of data / activities
- o Business case
- o Purpose and who is being served

• How can the Coordination Group be more focused on the coordination of Federal geospatial activities?

- Provide services to agencies that are users
- Set priorities and have a Work Plan
 - o CSTA
 - o A-16 supplemental guidance (waiting for OMB)
- Identify outcomes
- What are our requirements?
 - o What do we need?
 - o What do we have?
 - o **Not** what do we want?
- Use a business driven process
- Look at Exhibit 300
 - o May work for some
 - o But will not work for all
- Library of Congress can help share data
- Study current A-16
 - o Minimal accountability
- Need positive incentives
 - o SmartBuy (Good Story)

Discussion on the purpose of the Coordination Group, who do we work for, who do we serve?

This group should be explaining and communicating the impact potential of geospatial applications. The group should articulate the business case of the geospatial enterprise. This is a first of a number of sessions that the Coordination Group will have to discuss and execute circular A-16

ACTION 20090602-02: Devote a Coordination Group meeting on the topic of defining the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI).

The Department of Transportation (DOT) is not present here today because they do not have a geospatial mission component. The Coordination Group needs to figure this out for DOT and needs to identify how to go about working on the development of a Transportation Subcommittee. This group needs to be more process oriented, more communication oriented.

How can the Coordination Group be more focused on the coordination of geospatial activities?

- focus on the tools that we have in place already
- take exhibit 300 and coordinate from there
- OMB does not define information development
- Library of Congress is a repository of data and should be used as a conduit

Comment: We are still waiting on a ruling from OMB on what will make the cut in this Administration. We should be focusing on priorities that are important for all of us, collectively. One priority is to raise the DOT accountability and to make a recommendation to the Steering Committee to do this. We need to fix things when they are not working.

ACTION 20090602-03: There is a need to develop a process for standing up a Transportation Theme Subcommittee.

Coordination Group Charter Review: John Mahoney, FGDC [Charter]

- What are the key objectives?
- Who should be members Departments or Agencies?
- How should the Coordination Group be led?
- What is the appropriate structure for Coordination Group?
- What are the roles, responsibilities, and relationship of the Coordination Group to the ExCom, Steering Committee, FGDC Secretariat?
- How can the Coordination Group operate most effectively?

John Mahoney presented an overview of the work of the Coordination Group Charter Review Team and stated the use of Draft OMB Supplemental A-16 and the OMB Memorandum M-06-07 "Designation of a Senior Agency for Geospatial Information" as source documents that helped with the revision. Feedback on the Charter is needed from members.

Charter Purpose Statement Comments

- Add "shall develop strategies to achieve..."
- The main comment in the purpose statement– needs to be tied back to Circular A-16
- The 2006 Coordination Group Charter was reactive, the 2009 should be proactive
- Have to have a good understanding of the NSDI in the purpose statement. Should be defined in the Charter
- Why do we keep establishing the NSDI, this was established 20 years ago, remove because already established
- Suggest add "support the NSDI" and take out "establish the NSDI"
- Add "meets societal needs"
 - Concern about using NSDI in Charter
 - Develop "geospatial information" not data and information
 - Framework
 - Add: the CG shall develop strategies with long term milestones and objectives and forward these to Steering Committee for approval

Charter Objective Comments

- There are too many objectives listed
 - Fewer objectives select primary objectives
- Should not include any roles and responsibilities --included in A-16
- List is too long, shorten it
- List two or three objectives only
 - Use appendix for additional details not needed in objectives
 - High level roles and mission, not operational details
 - Collapse current objectives into themes
 - Annual workplan adopted during 1st quarter of FY annually

Membership Comments

- Develop a course of action when SAOGI's or other Members do not show up or participate
- Develop a process to eliminate agencies for lack of attendance.
- Fix wording, replace "Agency" with "Department". Department is more definitive.
- Let all Bureaus that have a geospatial mission participate and vote as primary Coordination Group representative
- Be inclusive not exclusive
- Should role of Federal consortia be addressed/incorporated in Charter?
 - Explain why there are non voting members
 - Use agencies to describe sub-agencies that participate
 - FERC missing from list
 - Census, FWS, etc. who create data should be voting members on CG→ agencies not Dept. included in membership
 - Two subgroups based on need→ consumers /users and producers
 - Letter from SAOGI to support multiple bureaus/agencies within Departments
 - Members vote, partners do not vote but at the table
 - 2/3 quorum required to take vote—28 agencies in current membership—keep 2/3? Too high? Majority?
 - Silence form non participating members representing concurrence?
 - Include attendance stipulations
 - Ramifications for non attendance—voting rights

Chairmanship Comments

- Co-chair to receive support of SAOGI
- Role of Chair and role of people on the committee
- Option Secretariat as chair—don't split out leadership activities
- Option federal member lead agenda development, mtgs, etc with support from Secretariat
- General support for having co-chair
- Develop role of chair and co-chair and share with group for comment
- How selected—SAOGI? Voting by Coordination Group
- Roles and responsibilities for members—mission achievement

Comment: *The National Map (TNM)* needs a consistent input process into the direction of the program and FGDC should be the home for that.

Comment: The National Atlas could also look to the FGDC for new governance.

Comment: Why do we need multiple data sources, we use Google maps.

Comment: The National Atlas integrates data at a national level for the users that we serve, the National public. The data is made into forms that are useful to the user.

Comment: *TNM* and The National Atlas should be addressed at the Subcommittee and Working Group level.

ACTION: 20090602-04 Suggestions for the Coordination Group Charter revision: need for a more broad representation from the Bureaus; incorporate lack of attendance and consequences, incorporate the Chair/Co- Chair responsibilities. The revised Charter will be sent to members for review and read- ahead before the July 7th Coordination Group meeting

ACTION: 20090602-05 Individual Agency Programs should be dealt with at the Subcommittee and the Working Group level. How is this accomplished? Add to pending CG items list.

Geo LoB Work Group Updates/Alignment –Short concise update 2-3 minutes per group followed by discussion, Lew Sanford, FGDC [Work Plans]

- Are the work groups aligned?
- What about their work plans?
- What are the priorities for FY 2010?
- Deliverables?
- Milestones?
- Return on Investment estimates?

The Geo LoB work plans are located on the my.usgs.gov shared site.

Although we are waiting for a decision from OMB, the Geo LoB activity will most likely be continued with this Administration.

FGDC has taken the leadership in many of the work groups so we would like to have leads and participants from the other agencies. There is a need for new blood and reinvigoration.

Discussion - What outcomes are we pursuing for the Geo LoB today? Each Workgroup lead gave an update:

Common Services Workgroup - Michelle Torreano, EPA Lead

- Would like more feedback on their products
- Would like to work more closely with GSA

Q. Are there any formal accomplishments?

A. Yes. The FGDC will share the metrics with the CG.

Comment: The FGDC has a meeting with Vivek Kundra of OMB this Thursday. He is interested in geodata .gov and Recovery.gov. We will leave behind the National Leadership and National Policy for him. This Administration has no interest in process, so they scrapped the first

version of the Recovery architecture. Geo LoB makes sense –but has challenges, is currently funded through 2010.

Grants and Contracts Workgroup - Lew Sanford, FGDC Lead This WG need reinvigoration.

ACTION: 20090602-06 The Geo LoB Grants and Contracts language will be posted on the my.USGS.gov shared space.

Comment: Leadership from other agencies is needed on all Geo LoB Workgroups. Lew Sanford is willing to run a workshop to harvest additional Geo LoB members.

Technical Architectural Workgroup - Doug Nebert, FGDC Lead

This Workgroup is developing reference materials not guidance materials.

There is a workshop on June 9 entitled "Geospatial Service-Oriented Architecture: Best Practices". The workshop will be held at the American Institute of Architects building, from 9:00 am - 4:15 pm

Performance Management Workgroup - John Mahoney, FGDC Lead

This group is developing best case scenarios. They meet by - weekly and can use additional participation. A website is in development.

Lifecycle Management Workgroup - Wendy Blake-Coleman, EPA Lead

Completed the A-16 Supplemental Guidance Document

Geo- Enabled Business Workgroup -Sharon Shin, FGDC Lead

This Workgroup just completed a geocoding best practices factsheet HUD has a geocoding service using common software.

Joint Business Case - Roxanne Lamb, FGDC Lead

Is working to produce a dashboard approach mechanism for reporting out to the Coordination Group.

- **Q.** Do the work plans give the Coordination Group members any activities that you would like to see addressed?
- Q. What is the Federal funding vs. Program Management Office funding
- **A.** The level of FTE is spelled out in the work plans.
- **Q**. If the Geo LoB is not picked up with this Administration what happens to the groups?
- **A.** This topic is included in the transition strategy for the Geo LoB. The question is what can the Coordination Group collectively invest in? Right now we are in a holding mode, waiting for an answer from OMB. It is our understanding that they know the value of geospatial.
- **Q.** What type of geospatial data are you looking at in the Common Services Workgroup?
- **A.** We went with software first because it had the highest demand.

Comment: The Geo-enabled Business Workgroup is looking for additional participation. We would like to know what other agencies can give us some participation. We will take whatever we can get, one day a week, one day a month.

Comment: What is our scope to get additional FTE's with the federal agencies that have a geospatial mission? Do all agencies have a mechanism in place to hear from their customers?

Comment: DHS is willing to add folks from the field to work with Geo LoB Workgroups only if they will gain some return on the investment.

ACTION 20090602-07: An electronic vote will be sent out for the Coordination Group approval of the Geo LoB work plans. The ballot is needed back by June 11, 2009

ACTION 20090602-08: Send out instructions on the use of the my.usgs.gov shared space.

ACTION 200602-09: The FGDC Subcommittees, Working Groups and Geo LoB leads are to identify all members participating on their teams and report them to Milo for compilation and presentation at the July 7 CG meeting.

Subcommittees & Working Group Updates/Validation –Short concise update 2-3 minutes per group followed by discussion

- Are the Working Groups and Subcommittees aligned?
- What about their work plans?
- What are the priorities for FY 2010?
- Which need termination?
- Which need reinvigoration?

A purpose of looking at the FGDC Subcommittees and Work Groups is to identify those that need realignment, reinvigoration or termination. The Subcommittees and Working Groups were color coded according to their level of involvement.

Green = active involvement Yellow = medium involvement Red = no involvement

Cadastral Subcommittee - Don Buhler, BLM Lead

- Very active participation and membership
- Held a cadastral forum at the American Institute of Architects building in March 2009
- Green

Cultural and Demographic Subcommittee - Randy Fusaro, Census Lead

- The Address Group has over 72 members
- The Cultural Resources Standard Group is very active
- Green

Geodetic Control Subcommittee - Juliana Blackwell, NGS Lead

- Very active
- Green

Geologic Subcommittee - Dave Stoller, USGS Lead

• Working on the geologic map standard

• Yellow for no active work plan in place

Marine and Coastal Subcommittee - Toni LaVoi, FWS Lead

• Green

Spatial Water Data Subcommittee – Bob Pierce, DOI Lead

- This subcommittee needs alignment
- Yellow for lack of dialogue.

Vegetation Subcommittee - Ralph Crawford, FS Lead

- Monthly conference call and two face to face meetings annually
- Green.

Wetlands Subcommittee - Bill Wilen, FWS Lead

- Needs Wetlands Standard endorsement
- Green

Transportation Subcommittee - Mark Bradford, DOT Chair

Red

International Boundary Subcommittee - Ray Milefsky, State, Lead

• Red/Yellow

ACTION 20090602-10 Ask ExCom approval to develop an electronic endorsement vote of the Wetlands Standard.

 2^{ND} DAY

Summarize Day One - Milo Robinson

Subcommittees & Working Group Updates/Validation ---- Continued

Geospatial Enterprise Architecture and Clearinghouse Working Groups – Doug Nebert, FGDC, Chair

- Both of these Working Groups meet twice a year.
- Suggestion: Roll theses into one group called the "Technical Architecture Working Group".
- Green

ACTION 20090603-11: Merge the Geospatial Enterprise Architecture and Clearinghouse Work Groups into one Working Group named the Geospatial Enterprise Architecture. This merger can be included in the new Coordination Group Charter. This will be accomplished by early July.

Comment: Let the OGC work for us so that we can eliminate the Clearinghouse.

Comment: The Clearinghouse does still exist and is active and is ingested by Geospatial One – Stop.

The Geospatial Applications and Interoperability Working Group

• The has not been active since 1995 and should be eliminated

Red

Biological Working Group

- This is inactive Working Group and would make a better fit in the Marine and Coastal Spatial Data Subcommittee
- Red

Comment: The recent governance plan for Imagery for the Nation (IFTN) is to recharter NDOP and link it to the FGDC.

Suggestion: Why not have an imagery Subcommittee in which the NDOP is a part of instead of NDOP being its own Subcommittee. Also, we may want to have an elevation Subcommittee.

Comment: NDOP works well because they are focused on aerial photography and folks all work well together. It would slow down the process if NDOP was its own Subcommittee under the FGDC.

Comment: Circular A-16 mandates that NDOP come under the FGDC umbrella. This is a violation of the mandate.

Comment: Every member of NDOP is also a member of an entity of the FGDC enterprise.

Comment: The Coordination Group has not heard recently about IFTN and would like it to be added on to the agenda for July or August.

Comment: Take an inventory of other spatial data coordination efforts throughout the federal government.

Comment: this type of inventory will be included in the National Spatial Data Policy that the ExCom is working on.

Historical Working Group - Brett Abrams, NARA, Lead

- Building historical elements onto the Geospatial One-Stop.
- Proposal to rename this Working Group and change it to a Data Users Working Group
- Green

Comment: We must look at the issue of data over time. There are a lot of systems out there that are not using addresses, etc. and we are seeing this in the recovery .gov meetings. This is central to recovery .gov

ACTION 20090602-12: Schedule the Geo LoB Lifecycle Management Work Group dialogue at the August Coordination Group meeting.

ACTION 20090602-13: Create a "Data Users Group" WG

ACTION 20090602-20: Rename the FGDC Historical Data Working Group to reflect a broader set of temporal data management issues and analyze the membership to ensure appropriate participation (ex: IFTN archiving WG).

Homeland Security Working Group- John Hassee, DHS, Chair

- Must have funding to complete its mission.
- John Hassee has taken leadership over from Mike Lee
- USGS did supply funding at some time
- Yellow

Comment: This group has done a lot of work over the years. Recently DHS has taken the lead and we thought that this was a positive step forward.

Marine Boundary Working Group

Realign the Marine Boundary Work Group under the Marine Boundary Subcommittee

ACTION 20090603-14: Realign the Marine Boundary Working Group under the Marine Boundary Subcommittee.

Metadata Working Group - Sharon Shin, FGDC, Chair

• Green

Standards Working Group -Julie Binder - Maitra, FGDC, Chair

- Would like approval of the Wetlands Standards
- Needs additional communications/outreach help
- Would like independent review of the draft standards as stated in the Charter
- Green

ACTION 20090603-15: Revise the Standards Work Group Charter

Reporting Requirements for Subcommittees, Working Groups and Geo Lob Work Groups

- What information was not provided that would have been helpful to your agency's operations?
- What does a common reporting template look like?
- How often to report?
- Do we need a FGDC Dash Board?

A hard copy [Reporting Requirements Template] was passed out to be used for the Coordination Group, Subcommittees, Working Groups, and Geo Lob. This template will be used to report out once or twice a year and also should be used for the annual report.

COMMENT: The Geo LoB has proposed to use a dashboard reporting mechanism. This will be shown at the July 7 Coordination Group meeting.

ACTION 20090603-16: The Geo LoB dashboard approach will be developed as a mechanism for reporting out to the Coordination Group and will be presented at the July Coordination Group meeting. This same reporting approach may be adapted to use as a reporting mechanism for the Subcommittees and Working Groups.

Q. Will SAOGI's be able to look at the dashboard reporting and see work done by individual agencies?

A. Yes.

Coordination Group Operations Discussion

- How can the Coordination Group operate most effectively?
- Does the Coordination Group need an Annual Work Plan?

Comments on the meetings:

- Not as much show and tell
- Extend meetings to 8 hours, once a month
- Take single items for each meeting and expound on them
- Read ahead's are helpful and should be available especially for the topic of interest
- Lay out a schedule for several meetings ahead of time
- Subcommittees and Working Groups to bring up issues that need resolution
- Schedule twice a month for 2 or 3 times
- Agenda /topics for the next meeting should be laid out at the previous meeting
- Want longer meetings, recommend first and third of each month
- WebEx work effectively
- Take advantage of face to face meetings
- Build the issue as part of the dashboard 0- 20 minutes
- Commit to make decisions
- Hold meeting only went there are issues
- Don't need an update on the ExCom which meets every 6 weeks

Suggested 6-hour Agenda Template

9:00-9:15	Minutes/Actions Items
9:15-9:30	Business Update (ExCom, SC, Initiatives, etc.)
9:30-9:45	FGDC Secretariat Report (Secretariat activities, read ahead's)
9:45-10:00	FGDC/Geo LoB Workgroups/ Subcommittees Dashboard (read ahead's - work plan reports, dashboard status)
10:00-2:45	Topic(s) of Interest
2:45-3:00	Agenda for next meeting
3:00	Adjourn

July 7th Meeting agenda items

- 1. Discussion and vote on acceptance of new Coordination Group Charter
- 2. Review Geo LoB Reporting dashboard (the 9:45slot)
- 3. Review of revised FGDC Working Groups/Subcommittee structure

August Meeting agenda item

Geospatial Lifecycle Working Group Theme discussion

ACTION 20090603-17: Revise the FGDC Working Group and Subcommittee graphic.

ACTION 20090603-18: Send out the new proposed draft agenda template to Coordination Group members for comment. Consider extending the July 7th Coordination Group meeting from 9:00 am to 3:00.

ExCom Preparation

- What are the key issues or topics to be raised with the ExCom?
- How will these be presented and by who?
- How do we better communicate with the ExCom and set priorities
- What is the ExCom expectation of the CG?
- Approval process for Geo LoB Work Plans
- Ask ExCom to reach out to the SAOGI's and ask for additional FTE's for Geo LoB Workgroups
- Endorsement and communication for standards and data development
- Funding for the Working Groups, work plans will be thin with no funding
- Voting and attendance issues with the FGDC Committees, we don't want to be held up by non attendance
- How does the FGDC align their efforts with the priority initiative of the Administration
- CG membership issues, Department vs. Bureau

Joint Coordination Group & Executive Committee Session

- What are the key finding and outcome from the Coordination Group meeting?
- How can we best align the Coordination Group, Steering Committee and the ExCom to advance Federal geospatial coordination?

Discussion Items

1. ExCom/ Coordination Group relationship and communications

- Coordination Group relationship/ Communication not sure our messages are reaching you
- Is the Coordination Group work aligned with the ExCom work
- How we can better support what the ExCom does
- Not getting feedback from the ExCom
- Decisions are being made without Coordination Group input

Comment: Karen Siderelis - Communication is primary for improvement in all groups that we are involved in. Do you feel like it is getting worse? The ExCom is committed to work collaboratively to make this work.

We could have an ExCom member attend the Coordination Group and visa versa, a Coordination Group member participate in each ExCom meeting – liaisons.

Comment: Dan Cotter – This is a big group and we have not set who is responsible for Communications. We need to talk about mechanism, i.e. wiki, etc.

Comment: Jerry Johnston - We need to work together and I am concerned. This message should have gone to the Steering Committee.

Comment: Steve Lowe - Communication and how we are maintaining our networks is critical.

Comment: The idea of the Wiki: of moving towards a more productive communication is good. A lot of brainstorming happened at this two day offsite and could have been done over a blog instead of physically attending a meeting. A wicki would have been far more useful.

Comment: Mike Howell- 38 user communities are using the Max Portal platform.

Comment: Ken Shaffer- The FGDC needs to develop a strategy for collaboration, we just stood up the my usgs.gov shared space for these meetings. The Georecovery uses the max portal space, others exist – how do we managed social networking tools to reduce overwhelming the constituency and to ensure effectiveness?

Comment: Steve Lowe – we also need to build on personal forums not just the electronic.

Comment: Karen Siderelis – Steve Lowe has started to Champion the Communication Team for the ExCom.

2. Coordination Group Charter revision

Key issues of the Coordination Group Charter are:

- Membership. There are 28 Departments however Bureaus are not represented
- Governance/ Change options
- Should be more of a decision making group

3. Coordination Group membership and representation

Comment: FWS does not have a vote as part of the Department of the Interior and does not think that the DOI voting representative will take the FWS vote into consideration. The DOI has eight bureaus and all should have a vote. The structure that the Coordination Group envisioned was that each Bureau would have a vote.

The Department of Commerce has three bureaus, NOAA, Census and National Geodetic Survey, only one has a vote.

Comment: Karen Siderelis - We should have a model that works for us. The Coordination Group is not as heavily dictated as the Steering Committee is with Circular A-16.

Comment: The Library of Congress has three members on the Coordination Group and each represents different functions of the Library, each member has different strengths.

Comment: Dan Cotter - SAOGI's are usually CIO's and don't have the biggest portion of Geospatial in their respective Departments. Voting rights should not be the primary issue to being a Coordination Group member.

Q. Some Coordination and Steering Committee members don't participant or show up at meetings. How do you propose that this be dealt with?

A. Mike Howell - this non-attendance with geospatial has been common for many years.

Comment: The no - shows affects quorum outcomes and other things.

Comment: Steve Lowe –This topic reminds me of Enterprise Architecture. Each discipline looks at issues differently and this Administration understands geospatial. They are looking at us to solve this.

4. How does the FGDC ensure its efforts are relevant to the Administration's priorities?

Comment: Mike Howell- Show us what you can do better, cheaper and faster. This is what will get you a better score card.

5. How do we stay relevant and move our agenda forward?

Comment: Steve Wallach - Take advantage of this Administration coming in. Vivek said don't come looking for money until you've shown us how you used it in the past. Geospatial is an assumed commodity.

Comment: Mike Howell- we need to tell our story better. Right now there is a huge window of opportunity with this Administration, but its dwindling! Take the analytical perspective. Need to plug in to the budget world, put strategies into place and ride the wave. You all know as a community what the best is model is. I Encourage you to think big ...geospatially enabling traffic controlvelocity without friction. Think fast, think big. Geospatial equivalent to g – mail

Comment: Financial data all has heavy locations. The Recovery.gov has no set standards in place.

Comment: Steve Lowe – Look back to Point of Sale and the cash register, who would have thought we could plot this geospatially.

6. FGDC efforts are hindered by lack of resources. How do we address/minimize this issue?

The FGDC Working Groups and Subcommittees have never had a formal funding mechanism. Depending on the Group, 50k to 300k would be needed. Right now most of the work the Coordination Group is doing would be labeled "other duties as assigned". Are there FTE's in the agencies that we can tap into?

Comment: Karen Siderelis - all in Government do not have adequate resources. You need to grow your program and do more with what you have, you need to be both creative and innovative.

Comment: Jerry Johnston - I am framing the problems that we are trying to solve. When work plans come out, I would like to see what the short falls are, it is going to have to fit into the mission.

The outcomes of this discussion:

- 1.Set regular CG-ExCom meetings
- 2. Proceed with the electronic Steering Committee vote on the wetlands standard
- 3. Active promotion of the standards is necessary

Karen Siderelis' presentation [Presentation]

During the April 14 Coordination Group meeting, four topics were identified to discuss and receive feedback from the ExCom members:

- National Geospatial Policy
- Coordination Group governance structure
- Transportation data
- Communications

The ExCom members agreed at their April 14- 15 offsite meeting to:

National Geospatial Policy

Take the lead on the formulation of the National Geospatial Policy strategy and to seek political support

- Create a one-pager with key messages
- Identify strategies to use social media approaches to inform of the development of the policy
- Develop initial Concept for shared infrastructure

Governance and Communication

- Coordinate joint meetings between the Coordination Group and the ExCom
- Establish an FDGC collaboration site
- Other SAOGI's are welcome to attend ExCom meetings
- ExCom notes will be sent to the Steering Committee and Coordination Group members

Data Issues

- Imagery for the Nation schedule a Champion/Chairs joint meeting to discuss outstanding policy issues
- Alaska Elevation –Executive Committee members will reach out within respective agencies or interest and potential funding
- Transportation- The ExCom concurs with the Coordination Group on the need for a Transportation Working Group and the need to resolve the issue.

ExCom ongoing efforts;

Dan Cotter is lead for the National Policy Team
Jerry Johnston is lead for the Partnerships Team
----- is lead for *The National Map* Team
Steve Lowe is lead for the Communications Team

Emerging Directions: Open, Transparent, and Responsive Government Recovery.gov

Data.gov Geodata.gov

Geospatial Leadership: The Secretary of the Interior has not yet made the determination who will Chair the FGDC. Davis Hayes is Deputy Secretary of Interior and Rhea Suh is Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget. Of the three, one will step up to Chair the FGDC.

National Priorities:

Energy

Economy Climate Change Health Care

It is clear what the Administrative priorities are, and it is clear how geospatial can play in that.

Mike Howell Comments:

My office built recovery gov. The Recovery Chair is Earl Devany, Inspector General for the Department of the Interior. We are tracking the accomplishments of the dollar. The Geospatial One- Stop put up 47 data holdings for citizens to use.

The OMB Vice-Chair position remains undecided so far. Much of the National priorities is going into healthcare – geospatial needs to brainstorm how to enter into this. Also brainstorm education, why aren't kids from Kindergarten up getting a geospatial education?

Open Discussion on:

- How can we improve communication between various components of the FGDC enterprise?
- What needs to be clarified about roles and expectations of various components of the FGDC Enterprise?
- What improvements and advances can we make without political leadership in place?
- What do you risk when the FGDC enterprise is not firing on all cylinders?

Comment: Should we only focus on the Federal issues and let the National eventually catch up?

Comment: Why do we need a National Policy if we can't execute the A-16?

Comment: The Coordination Group needs an all new executive order so that FGDC has teeth and Power!

Comment: Need to get back to standards and need someone to listen

Comment: Mike Howell – The formation of the National Geospatial Advisory Committee was a conversation between Jack Dangermond and Clay Johnson revolving around the authority of a National Policy. Instead of going to a legal modification to an existing law, the original executive order defines what the NSDI is and does not make a distinction of national vs. federal. Geospatial went from being USGS - centric to the 3rd world having no geospatial to a national plan in 3 years. There is very little information out there about infrastructure, the importance is where are the hospitals, etc. Think about working on infrastructure standards.

Comment: Mike Howell -The Lines of Business are from the last Administration. If they have shown value and are self sustaining, they will continue to survive, look at the sustainability of the funding model.

ACTION 20090603- 19: The Executive and Coordination Group members came to consensus to schedule joint meetings as necessary. It was suggested to focus the next meeting on the National Geospatial Policy.

ACTION 20090603- 21: The Executive Committee recommended establishing Liaisons between the ExCom and the CoordGroup. They would attend each other's meetings to relay issues and priorities to improve communications. Confirm this approach and elect the CG

liaison.

Closing Remarks – Ivan Deloatch, FGDC

Ivan thanked everyone for attending the meeting and especially thanked the facilitators Milo Robinson and Stacy. Ivan also thanked the ExCom for their insight and hopefully this will help us to focus on just a few things that will help us to be successful.