

Technology I

Breakout Session

Recorder: Greg Matthews

Andrew Turner

CTO FortusOne

Paul Wiese

USGS Enterprise Architecture

Katie Filbert

Longtime Volunteer/software development/GIS/OSM

Doug Nebert

FGDC Secretariat – Advance Tech of the NSDI.

Lynn Usery

Research Geographer USGS

Karie Craun

NGTOC Director

Jeff Wendel

Web App Developer for USGS

Owen Evans

ESRI Tools to enable capture of Geo info

Helena Zinkham

Library of Congress. Consumer of Geog data.

Eric Wolf

USGS. Looking at how decision are made that are not made based on the quality of the map.

Greg Matthews – USGS. Notes

Cover:

Current Efforts

What works and what doesn't work.

USGS –

Not much work with volunteer data. Working with user input tools for data including hydro. Structures – Funded effort in Indiana with FEMA. Target national data sets. Geographic Names accepts input from people and have developed procedures for this. Web based input for names.

Examples that feed into The National Map:

Hydrology - Data comes in through the states to the USGS. Transaction scheme built around this as XML exchange.

Names - Public/states/federal/tribes/public may submit names. This may be through a web interface, entire data sets from other agencies. States may get data pushed back to them. Names is part of a common vector data management system.

Structures - USGS has focused volunteer program around this because of local knowledge. Data predominantly comes from states. Reconcile data from states to data that are already in the Names Database. There was an initial push for this type of data because of national security. It would be good to have local insight or local knowledge that may be applied to this layer.

Break issues into geometries and attributes. Volunteer opportunities to fill data holes. How long is the feed back cycle for the volunteer data to get posted? This is not known. The USGS has problems with both geometry and attributes.

Additional comments. It would be good to have a preferred submission to flag trusted volunteers that submit more quality data.

Additional comments. We could say that data was “contributed” rather than just from volunteers. This would include data coming in from States, other Fed agencies, or single volunteers.

Data submitted from partners could be sent back to be fixed if the data was not accurate. This would be easier with states rather than individuals.

The volunteer updates per year are in the millions but it’s not currently being used by the USGS. Part of the problem may be staffing levels to process the data.

Crowd Sourcing Tools for Trans – pie in the sky possibilities.

An idea for submission could be that Feds, States and individuals could certify data for each other. QC and tagged by other agencies to be used for a common certification for all agencies to use. You could rate editors to give them feedback.

Moderators to figure out how good the data is in a region. These could be certifiers.

OSM licensing structure. What would this mean to try to use OSM data in TNM because of the licensing structure? It’s not clear if the license is compatible.

Could there be a The National Map version of OSM? - A parallel version. DC could create a DC service in OSM. If USGS did this parallel version it could flow back into OSM at some point.

It would be an advantage to see both certified data and uncertified data at the same time.

TNM ← OSM.gov --> OSM

OSM.gov only for registered users or partners

Using an agreed set of certification levels

Cert level 1 – geometry

Cert level 2 – geocoding

Cert level 3 – Rout ability

Create a common set of attributes that agencies will want to share.