

NGAC Resolutions

National Geospatial Advisory Committee



Josh Delmonico

FGDC OS, Executive Director

October 16, 2024

Agenda

- Genesis of review
- 2008 – 2024 NGAC Resolutions/Recommendations
- Example language
- GDA Reporting Recommendations
- GDA Implementation Evaluation Recommendations
- Open discussion and brainstorm

Genesis of NGAC Resolution Review

- During April 2024 NGAC meeting, NGAC requested a review and analysis of NGAC's recommendations and resolutions.
- FGDC OS analyzed recommendations and resolutions that NGAC approved during public meetings.
 - This does not include recommendations made in NGAC subcommittee outputs or papers.

NGAC Resolutions and Recommendations

- Between 2008 – 2024, NGAC has approved:
 - 37 Resolutions/Recommendations
 - These have been during Public meetings only – this count does not include all recommendations approved in NGAC Subcommittees
- FGDC reported back on 21 of these resolutions/recommendations during NGAC meetings.
 - Some might have had actions taken but were not captured in the minutes
- 8 of these did not have an action written into the language
 - NGAC Bylaw adoption
 - Endorsement of NSDI Strategic Plans
 - Recognition of NGAC Chair Anne Castle

Examples of NGAC Recommendations

October 2008 RECOMMENDATION : NGAC recommends that FGDC, through the Cadastral Subcommittee, convene a stakeholder group to address parcel data issues related to the mortgage crisis.

Aug. 2009 NGAC Meeting - FGDC Cadastral Subcommittee Land Parcel Data Update

John Mahoney provided a brief update on the recent activities of the FGDC Cadastral Subcommittee. The Cadastral Subcommittee hosted a Land Parcel Data Stakeholders meeting on May 7th, which included over 50 participants. The purpose of the meeting was to explore the potential uses of land parcel data for more effective management of mortgage and financial oversight programs and activities, seek input and feedback from key stakeholders, and demonstrate tools and capabilities.

The key recommendations resulting from the meeting were as follows:

1. Add the local Parcel ID to Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data - The Federal Reserve is moving toward adding the parcel number to the HMDA
2. Develop a Parcel Early Warning System - Early Warning Level - Triage Monitoring Level - Response Level
3. Complete the standardization and availability of parcel data nationwide

Example of 3 National Address Database Resolutions

SEPTEMBER 2013 RESOLUTION : The NGAC adopted the following resolution:

“The NGAC reiterates its strong support for the development of a National Address Database in partnership with State, local, regional and Tribal governments; commends the Department of Commerce for its efforts to further this initiative; and encourages the FGDC Steering Committee to coordinate the development of a sustainable funding strategy.”

SEPTEMBER 2014 RESOLUTION : “The NGAC reiterates its strong support for the development of a National Address Database (NAD) and encourages the Census Bureau, the Department of Transportation, and other FGDC agencies to coordinate and collaborate with partners in the development of a business requirements plan for a NAD during FY 2015.”

Actions/Updates:

September 2014 – NGAC received an update regarding the Address Subcommittee, the use cases for the National Address Database and a draft paper. U.S. Census updated NGAC on the NAD development and coordination with Department of Transportation, as well as other partners.

March 2015 – Update on the National Address Database Summit which identified possible alternatives for developing a NAD with the pros and cons of each alternative based on real case examples that are currently in place. Participants include representatives from federal agencies, state governments, local governments, private sector and nonprofit organizations

September 2015 – Update on Dept. of Transportation’s pilot projects and address challenge. U.S. Census updated NGAC on its Community Tiger pilot project.

Example of 3 National Address Database Resolutions

APRIL 2018 RESOLUTION : The NGAC adopted the following resolution:

“The National Geospatial Advisory Committee (NGAC) is encouraged by the progress the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) community is making in developing the National Address Database (NAD). The NGAC commends the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Department of Transportation for their leadership of this important initiative. The NGAC has expressed its support for the development of the NAD for many years, through an initial paper, “The Need for a National Address Database” (2012), through a previous NGAC resolution (2013), and through April 2018 NGAC Meeting Minutes – FINAL 10 development of a set of use cases (2014). The NGAC believes that the NAD is consistent with the Data, Accountability, and Transparency component of the President’s Management Agenda; that it reflects a productive partnership of Tribal, Federal, State, and local governments; and that it will be a model use of the FGDC’s Geospatial Platform. The NGAC strongly encourages FGDC agencies to devote appropriate support and resources to create a National Address Database Program that will ensure the long-term institutionalization of the NAD as a National Geospatial Data Asset.”

Actions/Update 2019 – NGAC received multiple updates from Dept. of Transportation and U.S. Census, however resourcing, funding, and contracting issues affected the progress of the NAD releases.

Recommended Path Forward

- Moving forward, utilize the model used for NGAC GDA Subcommittee recommendations.
- FGDC reviews the recommendations, documents comments and actions taken, and reports back to the subcommittee.

FGDC Responses to NGAC Comments on FY2022 GDA Summary Report FINAL						
NGAC Comment	Report Section	Report area	Positives, Improvements, or Recommendations	Type of Change/Suggestion	NGAC Comment (Original)	FGDC Comment (Consolidated/Summarized)
2.1	1	Executive Summary	Areas Needing Improvement	Agency Responses	Overall results = Lead Covered Agencies 14% Meets Expectations.	Noted, LCAs are reporting against a different set of criteria than the CAs which accounts for the different level of "meets expectations" between LCA and CA reports.
2.2.4.1	2.4	Changes to GDA Annual Reporting	Areas Needing Improvement	Dashboards	The reporting dashboards are very helpful. Recommendations for improvements include: 1) Have a pop-up load when a visitor comes to the page that explains how to interact with the dashboard. 2) Consider renaming the tabs to the subjects they refer to, rather than the US Code sections they pertain to ("2805(b)(3)(C)" is not very intuitive). "Standards", "Completeness", "Goals", etc. could be alternatives titles for the tabs rather than the section numbers.	For FY2022 dashboards: 1) Added a sidebar with instructions but no pop-up due to security issues with pop-ups. Pop-ups are also not supported by Hub environment. 2) Renamed tabs for better public understanding.
2.2.4.2	2.4	Changes to GDA Annual Reporting	Areas Needing Improvement	Dashboards	On the reporting dashboards, the purpose of the "Appendix A: Survey Picklists" tab is not clear at first read through. It appears to list all possible values that can be selected in the General Information tab "Meeting General Responsibilities" section. Consider adding text at the top of the Appendix A entry to explain it shows the possible options that can be chosen for meeting general responsibilities.	For FY2022 dashboards: Agreed, added explanatory text regarding the survey picklist options.
2.2.4.3	2.4	Changes to GDA Annual Reporting	Areas Needing Improvement	Dashboards	On the reporting dashboards, the presentation could be improved. Currently, there are tabs for "LCA Reporting: Introduction", "LCA Reporting: Executive Summary", and "Appendix A: Survey Picklists" that never change, and then a series of tabs whose content does change depending on the selected theme.	For FY 2022 dashboards: Agreed, moved tabs with background information to the end.
2.2.4.4	2.4	Changes to GDA Annual Reporting	Areas Needing Improvement	Dashboards	On the reporting dashboards, the "Key" entry shown in some of the tabs should be consolidated to the Appendix A tab to make the screens they are currently on cleaner.	For FY 2022 dashboards: Consolidated appropriate tabs and moved text to "Overview" for LCA dashboard only.
2.2.4.5	2.4	Changes to GDA Annual Reporting	Areas Needing Improvement	Dashboards	The dashboards have an overall feel which is very "federal government" and clinical or emotionless. Consider having someone trained in data visualization offer feedback on how to present the information in a more engaging manner.	For FY 2022 dashboards: Noted, however we have to work within the scope of the program that we are using.
2.2.4.6	2.4	Changes to GDA Annual Reporting	Areas Needing Improvement	Dashboards	The reporting dashboards don't appear to be Section 508 ADA compliant (WCAG 2.1 Level AA).	For FY 2022 dashboards: FGDC OS worked with subject matter experts at the U.S. Census to review the necessary changes needed to bring all dashboards up to compliance. All dashboards are now compliant with Section 508 ADA.
2.2.4.7	2.4	Changes to GDA Annual Reporting	Areas Needing Improvement	Dashboards	On the reporting dashboards, the status reports are written in an impersonal manner and would benefit from making the text more plain language and approachable.	For FY 2022 dashboards: Noted. The agency responses in the dashboard status reports are verbatim from each agency's annual reports. However, the FGDC's annual summary report is written to be more engaging and accessible.

NGAC GDA Subcommittee Recommendations

- NGAC's GDA Subcommittee reviews the FGDC's Annual GDA Summary Report
 - This report summarizes the information and achievements of the 16 Covered Agency Reports and the 18 Lead Covered Agency Reports.
- FGDC has produced 4 Summary Reports since the passage of the GDA that have been reviewed by the NGAC: FY2020, FY2022, FY2023

NGAC Recommendations on Annual GDA Summary Report

Per GDA section 2802(c)(11)(A):

- NGAC reviews each Annual Summary Report and GDA dashboards (dashboards were discontinued in FY2023)
- NGAC provides the following types of comments:
 - Positive Elements/Improvements from Last Year
 - Areas Needing Improvements
 - Recommendations for Future Reports
 - Other Comments
- FGDC responds to areas needing improvements, recommendations for future reports, and other comments each year. FGDC tries to implement as many comments as possible during the current or following reporting cycle.
 - Changes have been made to the covered agency and lead covered agency self-assessment questionnaires, the annual summary reporting structure, NGAC reporting analysis documents, and reporting dashboards.

NGAC FY2020 – FY2022* Reporting Recommendations

Type of NGAC Comment	Total # of NGAC comments	Total # of FGDC implemented recommendation	Implementation Rate
Areas Needing Improvement	29	19	65%
Recommendations for Future Reports	38	22	58%

Examples:

*The FY2023 comments will be analyzed during the FY2024 reporting cycle.

- NGAC has requested more details on how the agencies are rating themselves
 - FGDC added agency additional questions requesting highlights on agency achievements .
 - FGDC has also added mandatory requirements for agencies to provide details on how and why their self-assessment rating changed.
 - FGDC has developed new analysis documents for NGAC to review agency summaries based on question and requirement.

NGAC GDA Subcommittee Recommendations Implemented

- NGAC suggested changes to the summary report structure.
 - FGDC has included an Executive Summary, summary statistics of covered agency and lead covered agency self-ratings.
- NGAC recommended updates and compliance recommendations for the reporting dashboards.
 - FGDC updated the dashboard items within the same year that they were suggested, ensuring 508 compliance and readability for dashboards before they were discontinued.
- NGAC suggested exploring different technologies for the self-assessment survey.
 - FGDC has developed a new self-assessment survey template for covered agencies for the FY2024 reporting cycle.

NGAC GDA Subcommittee Recommendations Not Applicable

Examples of Recommendations that were not implemented/applicable:

- Specific suggested language inclusions that were not applicable from one fiscal year to the next.
- Formatting suggestions that are not in line with USGS Publishing Standards
- Changes to GDA mandated requirements within the Summary Report

NGAC GDA Implementation Evaluation Recommendations

- The same approach was taken with the NGAC GDA Implementation Subcommittee and their paper, “Evaluation of Geospatial Data Act Implementation”.
- The GDA Implementation Subcommittee developed 8 major recommendations.
- FGDC reviewed and replied to these recommendations.

NGAC Recommendation 4 and FGDC Response

NGAC Recommendation 4: FGDC member agencies should comply with all applicable international, national, sector, and voluntary standards and best practices for making geospatial data, information, and assets Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable (FAIR), to ensure maximum use and value from agency geospatial programs, and work with the rest of the community to develop and advance relevant standards, specifications, community standards, profiles, good practices, and de facto standards.

FGDC's Response: FGDC concurs with the intent and direction of recommendation 4. The FGDC Executive Committee has identified standards as one of the top FGDC priorities for 2023-2024 and has established a task team to develop a path forward on reestablishing the FGDC standards process. FGDC is considering goals and objectives in the new NSDI Strategic Plan that will address the importance of open standards and FAIR data practices.

NGAC Recommendation 6 and FGDC Response

NGAC Recommendation 6: The FGDC should work with Congress to modify the GDA reporting requirements to include criteria for collaboration, governance, benefits, and outcomes, shifting the focus from reporting about general process-oriented compliance to an outcome-oriented reporting process that identifies and encourages collaboration among geospatial data providers, data managers, disseminators, and users of geospatial data. This kind of reporting would require explaining how an agency has coordinated with non-Federal entities, with the NGDA elevation theme annual reports used as an example.

FGDC's Response: While FGDC has limited ability to work directly with Congress, FGDC generally concurs with the need to improve the GDA reporting process to focus more on the major outcomes of Federal geospatial programs. FGDC believes it would be useful to work with Federal agencies and non-Federal partners to identify a common set of high-value measures and the collaborative development and benefits that encourage collaboration of data providers, data managers, disseminators, and users of geospatial data.

NGAC Response and Open Discussion

Questions?