

DRAFT Pilot 5: FGDC Address Standards and Implementation**Goal**

To educate local authorities on the benefits, use, and implementation of the Federal Geographic Data Committee's United States Thoroughfare, Landmark, and Postal Address Data Standard (FGDC Address Standard).

Background

Addresses are critical information for governments, emergency response, mapping, navigation and many other purposes. Over many decades, thousands of local jurisdictions have evolved a diverse set of address formats and types that now pose complex geo-processing and modeling issues. Government agencies struggle with these issues as they seek to integrate mission-critical files into master address repositories.

The FGDC has sponsored the creation of a comprehensive address standard to resolve address data modeling and geo-processing issues. The objectives of the FGDC address standard include, but are not limited to:

1. Providing one standard that meets diverse address data management requirements.
2. Defining the elements needed to compose addresses.
3. Defining the attributes needed for address documentation, mapping, and quality testing.
4. Providing a systematic classification of US addresses.
5. Defining tests and procedures for address data quality testing.
6. Supporting the seamless exchange of address information by defining XML models for address elements and integrating the information into a single XML Schema Document.

Objectives

1. Provide local governments with the knowledge needed to understand the FGDC address standard in order to make informed decisions regarding its use and implementation.
2. Develop a suite of FGDC address standard training materials to be used by local addressing authorities.
3. Provide training to local governments on the benefit and use of the FGDC address standard. Training will consist of a series of workshops focused on the four parts of the FGDC address standard:
 - a. address Data Content.
 - b. address Data Classification.
 - c. address Data Quality.
 - d. address Data Exchange.
4. Identify common concerns and issues across a variety of jurisdictions in order to develop coherent responses/solutions in the future.

Suggested Tasks

1. Establish a working group of participants, stakeholders and subject matter experts.
2. Establish partnership agreements with all of the working group participants and the Census Bureau.
3. Evaluate the requirements of all the working group participants and the Census Bureau to ensure that the proposed pilot will meet and satisfy the necessary requirements.
4. Determine:
 - a. roles of project participants.
 - b. what initial sources will be used.
 - c. how will the work be conducted.
 - d. who provides authoritative review.
 - e. who and how will the data be tested.
 - f. how to resolve discrepancies.
 - g. what standards are to be used within the overall fabric of the pilot.
5. Evaluate current data availability and quality with a focus on address data content, classification, quality, and data sharing.
6. Evaluate and understand the current FGDC Address Standard.
7. Identify and evaluate activities (i.e. NextGen E-911, Broadband Initiative) underway within other groups (NSGIC, NAPSG, USPS, etc.) and ensure coordination with those activities where appropriate.
8. Using participants from the working group, conduct a pilot project(s) to develop a suite of FGDC Address Standard training materials to be used by local addressing authorities and provide training to local governments on the benefit and use of the FGDC Address Standard; training to include address data content, classification, quality, and data exchange.
9. Refine proposed pilot based on feedback and experience gained from pilot project(s). If the pilot yields measurable results for the local governments, the Census Bureau will expand the pilot to additional participants.

Additional steps could include but not be limited to:

1. Compare local governments address lists prior to FGDC address standard adoption versus post standard adoption to measure success of pilot.
2. Document the process.
3. Development of a mechanism for promoting the adoption of the FGDC address standard.

Success Criteria

1. Improved address data content, classification, quality, and ease of data exchange as a result of the implementation of the FGDC Address Standard.
2. A measurable increase in the number of local governments implementing the FGDC Address Standard with success.
3. Integration and implementation of the FGDC Address Standard and adoption of the model by other stakeholders outside the working group.

Positive Impacts

Positive impacts include but not limited to:

1. Local governments better understand the FDGC address standard and why it is important to adopt the standard; thus, providing for a greater adoption of FGDC standard.
2. Local governments create master address repositories.
3. Local governments improve address content and quality.
4. Local governments exchange address information.
5. Local governments increase organizational efficiencies.
6. Learn more about the implementation process.

Negative impacts

Possible negative impacts include but are not limited to:

1. Potential financial impacts.
2. Resources.
3. Time.

Constraints

Possible constraints include but are not limited to:

1. Political considerations, local governments do not want to implement.
2. Time problems.
3. Funding.

Participants

TBD

Resources Required

TBD

Administrative Infrastructure

TBD