FGDC Annual Report to OMB
Format for Agency Reports – FY 2003

The following outline should be used by FGDC Member Agencies (or Bureaus) for their Annual Spatial Data Reports, which will be consolidated by the FGDC and submitted to OMB. Reports **should be brief, using bullets where possible**. Please provide only the information that will be useful for OMB to assess the agencies' achievements and for establishing future direction.

Part A
GENERAL FEDERAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES REPORT (All Agencies)

   Not Appliciable

Part B
LEAD AGENCY/BUREAU AND/OR SUBCOMMITTEE/WORKING GROUP REPORT (Agencies with Lead Responsibilities Assigned under the new Circular A-16 in Appendix E - http://www.fgdc.gov/publications/a16final.html#appendixe) (Please provide a separate report for each activity for which you have the lead)

1. Program/Activity Name:

    FGDC Metadata Working Group

2. What are the specific federal programs this data supports?

    The FGDC Metadata Working Group (WG) does not have direct responsibility for data themes, but rather it provides guidance on the documentation of the data. The WG provides access to the FGDC Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata, training materials, and coordinates training between federal, state, local, and non-governmental entities.

3. Uses of Data: How does your data benefit customers and support agency missions?

    Metadata is the foundation to data access and data integration. Metadata provides information on the what, how, when, where, etc. the data was collected, processed, analyzed, and distributed, and how the data may be used. It allows agencies to catalog their data resources and potentially reduces data costs by cataloging the agency's data resources. Metadata benefits the customer by providing concise and complete documentation on data. It provides the user with valuable and timesaving information on existing data resources and for data integration.

4. Charter/Plan: Do you have a current charter or plan for collection? If so - please describe (include how recently the charter/plan was implemented and whether it is in need of update).

    The charter for the FGDC Metadata Working Group may be viewed at: http://www.fgdc.gov/metadata/mwg/fgdcchrt.html.

5. Metadata Status: Is metadata discoverable and served through the NSDI Clearinghouse? What percentage of this theme's data has metadata and is in a Clearinghouse node?

   The FGDC Metadata Working Group, WG, does not have direct responsibility for data. The WG's responsibility lies in supporting and promoting the implementation of metadata in GIS and data management programs.

6. Standards: What is the status of this theme's data, process, transfer, and classification standards?

   The FGDC Metadata Working Group supports the FGDC standards found at the following website:
   http://www.fgdc.gov/metadata/meta_stand.html
   In addition the WG also supports efforts of the FGDC Standards Working Group.

7. Progress: List FY 2002/2003 activities/progress to date (quantify where possible).

   FGDC/ISO 19115 Crosswalk (element to element mapping), draft
   Metadata Resource web page update
   Metadata News (newsletter) premiere issue August 2003. Publication intermittent.

8. Policy: Do you have a formal agency policy in place for full and open access or data sharing? Are you able to fulfill this policy and provide public access with your current agency financial resources as allocated or are you in pursuit of collaborative federal partnerships to support data access?

   The FGDC Metadata Working Group does not have data access responsibilities but supports data access through the implementation of metadata in data management programs.

9. Are there areas or issues regarding lead responsibilities for spatial data themes that require attention, or lessons-learned that you would like to share with others? Please describe.

   Under A-16, all spatial data and GIS activities are required to report their data activities and under Circular 119 agencies are required to support national standards. There exist data programs that create tabular/statistical databases/tables with geospatial attributes, which have not been held to these requirements. This is not the fault of the data programs but perhaps with the interpretation of Circular A-16 "Policy- Bullet 6a."- "All **spatial data** and geographic information systems activities financed directly or indirectly, in whole or in part by federal funds" <have A-16 applications>.   Clarification from OMB states that the ability to map the data whether by indirect spatial reference (e.g. geographic feature, addressing schemes: or by direct spatial reference (point, raster, vector), constitutes geospatial and thus requires compliance with A-16 and Circular 119.   Indirect spatial reference examples:

Political units: cities, county, state
Census geography: block, block group, or tract
Street addressing- Mileposts

While indirect spatial references alone may not be sufficient for geographic analyses, they serve as a means to link the attribute data to descriptions of the place the data applies.   Tabular/statistical databases have and continue to be valuable resources for government and the public. Metadata for these resources makes will make their discovery easier and broaden their use.