



***Proposed Canadian Government Action Plan  
On Geospatial Data Policy***

Presented at the

*Canadian Council on Geomatics (CCOG)*  
Annual Meeting  
Fredericton, New Brunswick  
23 October 2001

## **Introduction**

### **Objective**

The objective of this report is to evaluate the recommendations of the April 2001 KPMG Study on *Canadian Government Geospatial Data Policy*, with a view to exploring areas of agreement – as well divergence – among Canadian Council on Geomatics (CCOG) members, on the following:

- *Considerations*: i.e., key issues and factors that need to be taken into account to assess the relevance and appropriateness of the KPMG recommendations, and their possible implications
- *Proposed CCOG Positions*: suggested policy and strategic stance(s) that might be adopted by CCOG with respect to the KPMG recommendations, and related issues and factors
- *Suggested Next Steps*: proposed path forward on outstanding issues, setting out how those outstanding issues might be framed and addressed over the foreseeable future

The ideas in this document will be reviewed and discussed at the CCOG meeting in October 2001, focused on:

- *Articulating CCOG positions* on each of the key issues identified above; and
- *Sketching strategies* to refine government geospatial data policy over the next several months in support of CCOG stances on key data policy issues.

### **Background**

The KPMG *Canadian Geospatial Data Policy Study* was commissioned in order to provide empirical information on the impact of current government geospatial data policies on government, as well as the users and distributors of the data in the business sector and in the community at large. Based on the findings, the project was to make recommendations on how Canadian government geospatial data dissemination policies and practices could be modified to facilitate business development and the improved competitiveness of the Canadian geomatics industry while still ensuring adequate funding for infrastructure. The study was an in-depth and extensive project lead by the GeoConnections Policy Node, with the field work conducted by the Ottawa office of KPMG Consulting LP and a group of expert associates.

The Policy Node presented a preliminary status report on the KPMG Study at the October 2000 CCOG meeting in Winnipeg, Manitoba. The initial presentation elicited much interest from CCOG members, as there was a ready recognition that the scope of the Study had the potential to provide much relevant information on which to draw in

assessing member agency geospatial data policies (See Appendix A for text of CCOG resolution 00-03).

In conjunction with the official release of the Canadian Government Geospatial Data Policy Study, the Policy Node gave a detailed presentation of the Study results to CCOG at the special Spring 2001 meeting of Council. The presentation contained the first detailed assessment of issues stemming from the Study recommendations, as seen from the perspective of the Policy Node. Given the wide scope of the recommendations, and associated issues, CCOG members were asked to review the KPMG Study recommendations and to provide feedback to the Policy Node in order assist in the formulation of a discussion / proposal paper by way of reaction to the Study. The Policy Node was asked to assess CCOG member agency response to the KPMG Study, and to propose steps to address the most significant concerns raised by the Study. Proposals were required to take into consideration, to the greatest extent possible, the complex operational and policy environments of CCOG member agencies (See Appendix A for text of CCOG resolution 01-02).

The Policy Node developed a communiqué to be used in efforts aimed at increasing the exposure of the KPMG Study within the non-government Canadian geomatics community. Throughout the summer of 2001, the Policy Node received and considered feedback on the Study from a wide range of perspectives. Concurrently, a set of discussion questions was distributed to CCOG member agencies with a request to coordinate a review of the KPMG Study within each jurisdiction. These discussions were used by the Policy Node as a major input in the development of draft proposals addressing the most significant issues raised by the KPMG Study.

## **Evaluation of the KPMG Study Recommendations**

What follows is an overview of the government agency response to each of the KPMG Study recommendations, together with other pertinent considerations identified in discussions and Policy Node forums held over the Summer of 2001. As a point of departure, it is important to note that the KPMG recommendations contained some redundancies and ambiguities. Rather than being discarded, these are used to facilitate a deeper understanding of issues that may be common to more than one recommendation, but expressed in different ways. As a result, allowance has been made for some redundancy of responses presented under each of the KPMG Recommendations.

The final policy recommendations emerging from this review will focus on the unique issues and activities raised in the evaluation. It is also of importance to note that the Policy Node received completed discussion guides from one half of CCOG member agencies. While the response rate is less than ideal, it is sufficient for use in articulating the main issues raised by CCOG member agencies in response to the KPMG Study recommendations.

### **1: Data Accessibility**

#### **KPMG Recommendation**

*Digital geospatial data that are collected or created by any level of government should be made as readily available electronically to the public as possible by improving access mechanisms and processes, unless there are privacy, security or competitive reasons not to do so. Specifically, in implementation, the following points should be taken into consideration:*

- *Expand distribution of thematic data via the Internet, possibly by providing some dedicated marketing and distribution funds to expand web-based focal point(s) for free data distribution (e.g., “GeoGratis” or similar sites).*
- *Restrictions on redistribution should be eliminated – except where commercial data used within government is redistributed.*

#### **Evaluation**

A review of data agency responses to this recommendation reveals that data are increasingly being made available electronically across the board by federal and provincial / territorial agencies. Under access to government information regulations, all information that is not classified as “secret” for reasons of national security, or to protect individual rights, is available. As to data format, the survey of CCOG members indicated that geo-spatial data products are widely available at all levels of government in digital format. Some data-sets are still in analogue format, but these tend to be products with lower demand, or for which there is no strong demand for conversion to digital format for use in value added applications.

CCOG respondents both federally and provincially indicated that certain data sets were available at no cost to clients. Data sets ranged from various co-ordinate reference systems, to thematic data and satellite imagery. Redistribution restrictions were varied among such data sets. In some cases, the data are distributed only for research or demonstration purposes. These data cannot be redistributed. In other cases, there are no restrictions, irrespective of the user.

All provincial and federal level respondents indicated that they produced data sets available for a fee, and that there were normally restrictions on the use and redistribution of those data sets. Importantly, however, most agencies also indicated that restrictions and/or data fees were to some extent negotiable. Examples include fees for large volume purchase, or negotiation of less restrictive redistribution rights involving value-added arrangements.

Most agencies are planning or have embarked upon projects to further increase the electronic accessibility of their products and services. Similar initiatives are also underway in several provinces / territories, with a focus on data holdings in these jurisdictions. Corporate data repositories, featuring discovery, evaluation and access tools are planned or in development in a number of agencies. The GeoConnections Discovery Portal (CEO Net) and the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange (OGDE) are two examples of projects well into development. For some, the driving force behind the development of improved access mechanisms is to reduce the cost of distribution, and eventually the cost of products and services.

## **2: Core Framework Data**

### **KPMG Recommendation**

*Core framework data, particularly the geo-reference and topographical framework maps used as the underlay for thematic data, should be provided free as a public good (or, more properly, licenced at no cost), to encourage use, standardization, and consistency amongst all client groups. In making these data more accessible, efforts should be made to keep distribution costs to a minimum; however, additional funding will be required for some agencies.*

### **Evaluation**

All responding agencies indicated that they produced data considered comparable to framework data layers as expressed within the context of the GeoConnections Programme. The most common data sets identified were alignment layers, cadastral coordinate fabric, toponymic, topographic, and administrative boundaries.

In general, fees are associated with the distribution of such data, with exception made by some agencies for coordinate reference data (fundamental framework data). To a lesser extent, some agencies reported that their framework data were available at no cost to other government agencies within the same jurisdiction, or through data sharing

agreements. NRCan's GeoGratis offers a selection of national resolution data sets and geodetic products at no cost.

Federal and provincial policies vary on what the recovered revenues may be used for, with few if any jurisdictions and/or individual agencies having full freedom to reapply revenues directly and fully to data development and maintenance. In general, government providers of geospatial data do not generate significant revenues from distribution charges and royalties, and these generally only recover marginal distribution costs.

Responding agencies indicated that most are amenable to the reduction of fees associated with framework data sets. Some are actively improving access mechanisms, volume sales, or engaging in partnerships in order to reduce distribution costs. This seems to be an implicit recognition that lower user costs will increase volume sales, and that there is a steady, moderate growth in the use of such data sets. However, no agencies were currently contemplating methods of changing the funding models such that core funds could be applied to compensate for reductions of data distribution costs beyond those achieved through efficiencies of scale or through technological / process advancements.

There was a consistent recognition that costs associated with marketing of existing data sets will not likely decrease over the near future. The need to ensure visibility of the framework data sets will be an important component to augment uptake, and less duplication of effort both by government and the private sector. Second, there was some recognition that auto-marketing as achieved through the use of web portals is still expensive. The greater use of the internet, for example, requires a continual investment in technology and maintenance of the discovery, evaluation, and access platforms, and it is not certain whether this will lead to a reduced need for marketing, sales, and post-sales support functions requiring human resources. It is envisaged however, that internet access will significantly broaden the potential client-base for such data sets.

The GeoConnections Policy Node Forum on Public/Private Sector Roles in Geospatial Framework Data (July 2001) identified broad-based consensus among a cross section of data users and data providers that geospatial framework data are highly valued and much needed for a wide range of public and private applications. Greater investment in and availability of framework data will facilitate greater use of geospatial data for public and private benefit, and further stimulate the development of the geomatics industry capacity through greater opportunities for the development of marketable applications based on these framework data. However, there was a recognition that framework data content will need to be negotiated on an on-going basis in order to accommodate changes in technology and user demand.

The Geomatics Industry Association of Canada has indicated its strong support of any plans to promote the wider availability and lower direct cost of framework data.

### **3: Thematic Data**

#### **KPMG Recommendation**

*Where costs (of custom data production) are material and exceed the “public good” of encouraging their use, costs should be borne by those seeking the data. Notwithstanding, the cost of making data available should be minimized as much as possible. “Nuisance fees” can be utilized for non-Internet distribution (e.g., CD-ROM, paper), to encourage use of digital distribution and to recoup easily quantifiable hard-copy reproduction and media expenses.*

#### **Evaluation**

Responding agencies indicated that most produced a range of thematic data. Some data are available at no cost, while other data themes are for fee. In general, there is a sense that thematic data are seen more as a public good. The limited number of uses of a specific theme dictate that a relatively low cost is assigned to such data.

Most responding agencies are planning or already embarking upon projects aimed at reducing the cost of data distribution. Some are working to streamline data exchange with other government agencies within the same jurisdiction, while others will attempt to have all users benefit from reduced distribution costs. It is also appropriate to indicate that these are on-going activities, as governments continually seek to enhance the efficiency with which products and services are provided. Custom data development undertaken on request of a particular user should be provided on full cost recovery basis.

A variety of impediments are seen to the reduction of thematic data distribution costs. These include initial cost increases to convert analogue products to digital and web-based search and self-serve capacity. Depending on the source of thematic data sets, some agencies also highlighted as impediments the existing complexities of current agreements with data suppliers and external distributors.

### **4: Cadastral Data/Process**

#### **KPMG Recommendation**

*Transaction fees should remain an appropriate mechanism for cadastral data systems at the provincial and municipal levels. This includes “registered user” connections and access charges. However, efforts should be made to implement unrestricted integration with municipal/assessment databases.*

#### **Evaluation**

In general, there were fewer responses to questions pertaining to cadastral data operations, thus the quality of the responses are lower, and more general. The development, maintenance and distribution of cadastral data is largely a provincial and

municipal issue. While the federal government does have some interests and activities pertinent to cadastral data, these are generally quite limited, highly specific to federal lands, and generally not closely linked with provincial data. As a result, there is a need to determine what, if any, practical utility and rationale might be associated with the integration of databases either within or across jurisdictions. Exploration of interests, prospects and merits/concerns associated with integration of cadastral data needs to address and understand privacy and other issues, and also needs to understand the specific nature, scope and significance of any federal interests (e.g., related to Canada lands).

Given the above qualification, it is fair to say that in some jurisdictions, the cadastral and assessment databases are linked, while in others they are not. Some responding agencies indicated that cadastral and registry/title information is linked to the current holder of title, however, historical holder data is not linked. Other agencies indicated that these data sets are not linked, but the issue is under study. Foremost among the impediments in linking cadastral, assessment, and register databases are confidentiality concerns (property owner names, liens against property, etc.), funding required to carry out integration studies at the administrative and technical levels, and compatibility of legacy data sets. Costs associated with re-design could be significant.

## **5: Copyright and Licensing**

### **KPMG Recommendation**

*Digital geospatial data should be licenses at no royalty cost to users with respect to use and redistribution. Use copyright and licensing within Canada to protect quality of geospatial data originating from government agencies, rather than to prevent use. Most digital geospatial data should be licensed at no cost to users. “Branding” of the original source data would facilitate re-use by retaining the “brand name” as long as the original data are not modified.*

### **Evaluation**

Responding agencies all indicated the use of licensing requirements as a condition of the use of agency data sets. There was widespread recognition that licensing helps to ensure revenue protection, quality preservation, promotion, recognition, data tracking, and liability control. Of interest, some agencies had fairly robust and standard policies for the payment of royalties, whereas other agencies considered royalty payments on an individual basis. Most agencies report that there are no firm plans to reduce or eliminate royalties in the near future, though it is clear that royalty clauses are not necessarily required to manage redistribution in a cost-effective and equitable manner.

Responding agencies raised significant concerns when asked about the impact of the reduction or removal of licensing / royalty revenues. Primary concern was on the loss of revenues and the consequent impact upon operations, whether they be limited to dissemination or also include data maintenance.



The Geomatics Industry Association of Canada strongly supports the KPMG proposal on copyright and licensing.

The lack of a harmonized policy landscape makes it difficult to determine the impacts of any policy changes in one jurisdiction on the overall landscape.

## **6: Intra- and Inter-governmental Data Sharing**

### **KPMG Recommendation**

*Develop an inter- and intra-governmental data sharing policy facilitating the free exchange and sharing of geospatial data by data agencies with other government departments and with other levels of government.*

### **Evaluation**

The primary intent of this recommendation is to encourage the development of structures that make data collection, storage and distribution more efficient, with one-stop or integrated collection, handling, and distribution being a primary feature. Both Geoconnections and CCOG are heavily committed to promoting greater data sharing through the development of cost-effective partnership arrangements.

In general, responding agencies indicated that with or without express direction, data production partnerships, or sharing arrangements are already in place, or being planned. At the federal level, data partnership arrangements are not as common. Special arrangements are made (mutual data exchanges) where these can be included in the negotiations, but cases of one way transfers of data at no cost are not generally made.

Responding agencies were unanimous that revenue reductions that might result from data sharing arrangements were an issue, though no information on precise impact was given. Even under sharing arrangements, costs are incurred, and typically involve resources for coordinating data extractions, documentation, collecting fees, and managing agreements.

There would be a greater willingness amongst data providers to share their data within the structure of equitable data production partnerships, where production costs are borne by all partners. These arrangements could include data flowing up and resources flowing down within, or even across jurisdictions.

## **7: Value-Added Products / Services**

### **KPMG Recommendation**

*Reasonable direct costs can and should be recovered from clients (public and private sectors) when a government data agency applies some form of “value-added” services to its data. Government supply of valued-added products/services should be limited to*

*instances where the policy rationale is valid (e.g., the private sector cannot provide the value-added products/services due to public good or privacy concerns.)*

## **Evaluation**

The general expression of sentiment was that limited value-added activities are conducted by data producing agencies. It is certainly marginal to the main thrust of operations. Most respondents indicated that unless privacy considerations are at issue, such activities should be conducted external to government.

Notwithstanding the above, it would be of some benefit to evaluate government programs in terms of their criticality to government mandate versus non-essential value added on an on-going basis, based on government-wide policy guidelines.

## **Framework for Policy Development**

Careful review of the Canadian Government Geospatial Data Policy Study recommendations together with the CCOG member agency responses to them has permitted their further deconstruction into fewer and discrete activity and policy domains.

The activity domains are:

- *geospatial framework data* – data-sets defining the spatial structure serving as context for the collection, analysis, and interpretation of social, economic, and environmental data, and supporting myriad societal functions;
- *geospatial thematic data* – data-sets describing the variation / distribution of a theme across space (e.g. social, economic, environmental indicators, facility locations);
- *value-added products/services* – those products and services with significant potential commercial value that can be derived from the further processing or manipulation of standard framework and thematic data-sets produced as part of the core mandate of Canadian government agencies.

The policy domains are:

- *definition/scope* – key concepts and parameters related to each activity domain, i.e., what datasets and/or products and activities are included;
- *access* – key policies and approaches detailing the extent and nature of access to data in activity domains;
- *restrictions* – deliberate constraints placed upon the use and/or redistribution of datasets and/or products and services provided in each activity domain;
- *pricing* – any mechanisms and practices aimed at recouping costs directly from data / product / service users;
- *financing* – any mechanisms and practices used to underwrite costs of data development, maintenance and/or dissemination, i.e., as a complement or alternative to pricing.

All of the KPMG Study recommendations and CCOG member agency responses to them can be understood and evaluated on the basis of this domain structure, thus facilitating the analysis of issues, and the development of proposals pertaining to each domain.

## Proposed Government Geospatial Data Policies and Next Steps

ITEM	FRAMEWORK DATA (FD)	THEMATIC DATA (TD)	VALUE-ADDED PRODUCTS/SERVICES (VAPS)
<p><b>Definition and Scope</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Define FD as core data sets and related meta data that are: a.) needed to provide the minimum foundation necessary to enable development of consistent national geospatial data; and b.) deemed to be of such significant social benefit that they should be readily accessible to all users, with no significant barriers to their use. <b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Make decisions on initial FD content (based on FD Node proposals).</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Promote the development of TD on the foundation of FD, to optimize data utility and compatibility. Focus on the development of TD that are central to the policy and program mandates of the agency, leaving other TD development to the private sector. <b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Systematically review TD offerings, to ensure a focus on mandate-related activity.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Focus on the provision of VAPS that are central to the policy and program mandates of the agency, leaving other VAPS to the private sector. <b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Systematically review VAPS, to ensure a focus on mandate-related activity.</p>
<p><b>Access</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Make FD readily accessible, and actively promote broad awareness of FD, with well documented descriptions of their availability, content and applications. Promote inclusion of technology formats that optimize the social utility of the data. <b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Articulate acceptable standards of “accessibility” for FD, and assess current degree of FD accessibility against these criteria. Establish and communicate an implementation schedule for full FD access to acceptable levels.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Make TD readily accessible, and actively promote broad awareness of TD, with well documented descriptions of their availability, content and applications. <b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Articulate acceptable standards of “accessibility” for TD, and assess current degree of TD accessibility against these criteria. Systematically develop meta data essential for active promotion and marketing of TD. Establish and communicate an implementation schedule for full TD access to acceptable levels.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Promotion and marketing of VAPS should be highly focused, selective and low-key, targeted directly to those government agencies that need VAPS to advance their own policy and program mandates and/or to fill data application gaps that cannot reasonably be fulfilled by private sector specialists. <b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Establish and maintain discreet service relationships amongst VAPS providers and clients. Periodically review VAPS offerings and activities to ensure they do not encroach on private sector interests and capacities.</p>

<p><b>Restrictions</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Restrictions on use and redistribution of FD should be limited to those deemed essential for protection of data quality and integrity, and should include provisions that allow verification of original data sources.</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Articulate, communicate and implement a consistent use/reuse agreement for FD respecting the above.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Restrictions on use and redistribution of TD should be limited to those deemed essential for protection of data quality and integrity and/or to recoup costs (see below), and should include provisions that allow verification of original data sources.</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Articulate, communicate and implement a consistent use/reuse agreement for TD respecting the above.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Restrictions on use and redistribution of products developed under VAPS arrangements should be limited to those deemed essential for protection of product quality and integrity and/or to recoup costs where the latter is part of a mutually agreeable pricing/financing arrangement (see below).</p> <p>Unless otherwise mutually agreed, the original provider shall not be restricted from making products available to other users, provided the terms and conditions are equitable with those for the original user.</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Develop and implement consistent <i>pro forma</i> agreements for VAPS.</p>
<p><b>Pricing</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> FD should be made available at the lowest direct user charge possible (including, where feasible, free), and in any case at price levels that do not constitute significant barriers to a large majority of data users.</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Articulate and communicate a clear and consistent pricing schedule for FD, closely coordinated with the above implementation schedule for FD access.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Prices should cover reasonable direct costs.</p> <p>All reasonable efforts should be made to reduce costs (hence prices) through technological innovation and efficiency. Reciprocal data development and sharing at no or minimum charge should be encouraged.</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Develop, promote and implement a consistent set of principles and protocols for determination of reasonable direct costs.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Prices should cover reasonable direct costs of the development and delivery of VAPS.</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Develop, promote and implement a consistent set of principles and protocols for determination of reasonable direct costs of the development and delivery of value-added products and services.</p>

<b>Financing</b>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Explore and develop alternative and/or complementary mechanisms to finance data development, maintenance and dissemination activities, to minimize or eliminate direct charging to users. These options may include conventional financial appropriations or data sponsorship arrangements by appropriate policy or program agencies.</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Map out current pricing and financing policies and practices related to FD, to determine: a.) the resources required to cover operations for which pricing is currently a necessary financing source; b.) issues and challenges that might be associated with a shift in financing mechanisms away from pricing; and c.) the supporting rationale (“business case”) that will be needed to support any such shifts in policies and practices.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> Explore and develop alternative and/or complementary mechanisms to finance data development, maintenance and dissemination activities, to minimize or eliminate direct charging to users. These options may include conventional financial appropriations or data sponsorship arrangements by appropriate policy or program agencies.</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> Map out current pricing and financing policies and practices related to TD, to provide a broader context for action on pricing and financing issues.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL:</b> (There is no need for any policy action with regard to financing of VAPS)</p> <p><b>NEXT STEPS:</b> (not applicable)</p>
------------------	---	--	--

## **Proposed Implementation Structure**

The proposed policy positions and action items will require concerted effort over the next year and beyond to:

- Develop a comprehensive understanding of current policies and practices related to the development, maintenance and dissemination of geospatial data in general, and framework data in particular;
- Pursue priority initiatives that will enhance the development and dissemination of framework data and priority thematic data in order to advance the commercial and public policy benefits of geospatial data; and
- Establish on-going collaborative processes to address outstanding issues and to capitalize on emerging opportunities related to the development, maintenance and dissemination of geospatial data.

The individual action items set out as proposed next steps in the above chart can be coordinated under five initiatives, each with an inter-jurisdictional working group established to develop, implement and coordinate measures agreed to by CCOG:

- 1.) Development and implementation of a framework data roll-out strategy with an emphasis placed on a definition of the terms and standards of access of framework data content, and applicable across all producing agencies.
- 2.) Accelerate development of federal data partnerships in framework geospatial data so as to enhance the value of integrated framework data serving as a foundation for programs and services of national scope. Accelerated coordination of federal data production will in turn spur the integration of provincial / territorial framework data activities into this broader model.
- 3.) Research and coordination of pricing policies and alternative financing mechanisms for framework and thematic data, with a view to maximizing the affordability of geospatial data for users.
- 4.) Design and implementation of a promotion and marketing strategy/program to increase awareness of proposed policy changes and next steps in reaction to the KPMG Study.
- 5.) Continued coordination and measurement of efforts aimed at setting dissemination/access standards and goals, evaluation of progress and results, and identification of emerging issues and opportunities. The extant GeoConnections Policy Node, or a new CCOG Policy Group are possible venues for such an on-going initiative.

## **Sources**

*Canadian Government Geospatial Data Policy Study.* Prepared for the GeoConnections Policy Node by KPMG Consulting Inc., Ottawa, April 2001.

*Forum Report on Government / Industry Roles in the Creation, Maintenance, and Distribution of Geospatial Framework Data.* Conducted by Phillip Nicholson Consultants Inc., for the GeoConnections Policy Node, August 2001.

*Workshop Report on Intellectual Property and Government Procurement Contracts.* Conducted by the GeoConnections Policy Node. December 2000.

*Workshop on Canadian Geospatial Data Agency Response to the KPMG Data Policy Study.* Conducted by the GeoConnections Policy Node. October 2001.



Appendix A - CCOG Resolutions Pertaining to the KPMG Canadian Government  
Geospatial Data Policy Study

**00 - 03      Support for the GeoConnections Study on Data Access and Costing**

Whereas Council recommended at its 1999 meeting that GeoConnections undertake a study on the economics of government geospatial data; and

Whereas Council received a presentation from Tim Davis, Co-Chair of the GeoConnections Policy Advisory Node, that outlined the progress made on this initiative, noting that the study is underway and that the report is anticipated by February 2001; and

Whereas the Council recognizes the importance of this issue; therefore,

Be it resolved that Council commend the GeoConnections Policy Node for its work to date, and recommend that the results of the study be provided to Council members for their information and comment prior to the finalization of the report; and

Be it further resolved that this work be discussed at the special CCOG meeting in the spring of 2001 (resolution 00-11).

**01 - 02      Data Access and Costing Study by GeoConnections Policy Node**

Whereas Council received from the GeoConnections Policy Node the final draft report and a presentation on the draft final study on Canadian geospatial data policy by KPMG; and

Whereas the Council recognizes the importance of this issue, the complexity of the subject, and the need to further consider the recommendations; therefore,

Be it resolved that Council recognize that barriers to access and redistribution for framework data need to be reduced to further improve and increase the benefits from geospatial data; and

Be it further resolved that the Policy Node develop a communiqué for Council's consideration, for distribution with the final report; and

Be it further resolved that Council members circulate the final report and discuss the potential implications of the recommendations within their jurisdictions; and that they provide comments to the GeoConnections Policy Node by July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2001; and

Be it further resolved that the Policy Node develop an action plan for phased implementation of the recommendations based on input from Council and report these findings at the October 2001 CCOG meeting.