

Additional TSSDS Questions/Comments

1. Leave the system specific implementation functions in the Federal implementation of TSSDS. This is extremely useful for the new user.
2. How can we continue to have an impact on the future development and direction of TSSDS.
3. There is an implied graphic standard in the TSSDS. Entities are defined as point, line, and area. Graphic representation is scale dependent - a point becomes an area at larger scales and vice versa. How does the TSSDS graphic standard address scale dependencies of graphic representation?
4. Including/specifying a table structures within a federal implementation of TSSDS will confuse the issue and slow the adoption of some form of common standard.
5. Changes to TSSDS may limit or reduce implementation. Can implementation one set at a time be accomplished? Some control and notification of changes is necessary.
6. The FGDC needs to do more bottom up education to get the input and build support for a national standard.
7. The implied graphic standard appears to be more CAD related than GIS, given the lowest common denominator of point, line, area, and text. If this is truly a GIS standard as well, there needs to be provision for higher level graphic models such as nodes, dynamic segmentation, and perhaps regions.
8. How does an organization that has invested years and \$\$\$ in their databases come around to using a standard for sharing data? Is there or can there be translator software for sharing the data and still maintain the internal standards/definitions of their organization? I see this as a necessary interim step as an organization approaches use a state or national standard.
9. Some types were dod-specific (e.g. dod_something) This is too ethnocentric-keep categories general so that everyone can use them and be specific at a lower level.
10. See #3 above-pt line and poly are scale dependent.
11. How realistic is it that our suggested edits to the entity types will actually occur?
12. In the hierarchy of the TSSDS data dictionary structure is there an implied association of entity types to a specific map layer or coverage. In other words, would all the features in a single type be part of the same layer?

13. Change the name and/or the "front" agency to remove the military perception of the standard.

14. I heartily agree with #13. This could be a real impediment to usage.