

USDA 2008 Imagery Planning Meeting

Shirley Hall
Farm Service Agency



Farm Service Agency

System of Records Changes

GIS Centralization Effort

Program Compliance Changes

Changing Imagery Needs and
NAIP

System of Records

Public Federal Notices of System of Records Changes

- CIMS (12/11/07)
- Multiple (12/12/07)
 - Includes sharing CLU and other data with other Federal, State, local partners for conservation programs
 - Hold users of the data to FSA ethical standards and not to disclose the information without customer permission

Move to GIS Centralization: The Problem

- Service Center Servers are old and outdated
 - Current Server Hardware does not adequately support High Performance for GIS Apps Like Land Use
 - Replacement is Cost Prohibitive
 - Need a Solution Soon
 - Refresh for Workstations are also very Costly
- Current Distributed Environment Doesn't Support FSA needs
 - Real time access to CLU data
 - Web Distribution and other Data Sharing
 - Efficient Management of Out of County Land
 - Distribution Costs of Imagery
 - Data Backup and other Data Vulnerability Issues
 - Dependency on Service Center Staff for Routine Data Management tasks (DB compression, history table updater)

Option 1 Enhanced Distributed Environment

- New Servers at Every Service Center
- Near Real Time Replication of Databases to a Centralized Server
- Public Access and View Only Web Access to Geospatial Data
- Integrated Desktop Business Applications
 - Land Use, CRP, Price Support, etc.
 - Linkage to SCIMS, Farm Records and other Data Services

Distributed, Pros and Cons

● Pros

- Utilizes current applications/databases
 - “Painless” transition
 - Relatively stable update path
- Communication with Sys36

● Cons

- Expensive Infrastructure
 - 2350+ Servers
 - 12,000 Workstations to Manage and Refresh
 - Data Management Expenses
 - Software Distribution
- Limited Support for Web
- Security Issues
 - Physical security of servers and workstations
 - Data Security, more points of access for PII

Option 2 – Centralized, Terminal Services Environment

- Centralized Servers Replace Service Center Servers
- Utilizes Current Desktop Applications running remotely
 - New apps would be added as necessary
 - Increased integration of Business Apps over time
- Public access and View Only Web access to Geospatial Data

Term Svcs Only, Pros and Cons

- **Pros**
 - **Centralized Environment/Databases Support most FSA current and future needs**
 - **Efficient**
 - **Proven High Performance GIS Environment**
 - **Faster Transition**
 - **limited software development to utilize the environment**
 - **Allows full integration with Business Apps (SCIMS, Farm Records)**
 - **Improved Security of Data and Infrastructure**
 - **Improved Software Distribution**
 - **Easier Database and Hardware Management**
 - **Cheaper Workstation Refresh**
 - **Centralized Management. Reduced dependence on Service Center staff.**
- **Cons**
 - **Requires additional software licensing**
 - **Not the Web**
 - **May not meet all FSA requirements (unknown)**
 - **Communication with Sys/36**

Option 3 Centralized, All Web

- Web Servers replace all Service Center Servers
- Migration of all Apps to Web Interface
- Integrated Business Apps
- Public Access and read-write Web Access to Geospatial Data

Web Only, Pros and Cons

- Pros

- Centralized Environment/Databases supports most FSA current and future needs
- Efficient for many types of GIS applications
- Allows full integration with Business Apps (SCIMS, Farm Records)
- Improved Security of Data and Infrastructure
- Improved Software Distribution
- Cheaper Workstation Refresh
- Centralized Management. Reduced dependence on Service Center staff.

- Cons

- Slower Transition
 - significant new software development and Database Design
 - May not be ready when current Environment reaches critical failure
- Performance for heavy editing applications using ArcGIS Server is unproven
 - Land Use would be very risky
- Development of Full Function GIS apps would be very difficult and slow
 - CLU Maintenance
- Communication with Sys/36

Option 4, Centralized Hybrid Web and Terminal Services

- Centralized Servers replace Service Center Servers
- Some Applications “Desktop”/Term Svcs
 - Apps needing More GIS Functionality
 - Heavy Polygon editing, Cartographic Needs
 - CLU Maintenance
 - Land Use
 - Short-term Transition
- Many Apps go to the Web
 - Light Editing, Canned Maps, Canned Reports
 - Bin Tool, TERRA, CLU Viewers

Hybrid Centralized, Pros and Cons

- Pros

- Centralized Environment/Databases support all FSA current and future requirements
- Efficient
- Faster Transition (limited software development to utilize the environment)
 - Tools that will remain in Terminal Services long-term
 - Tools moved to Term Svcs for an interim period
- Allows full integration with Business Apps (SCIMS, Farm Records)
- Allows mid and long term transition to full Web applications
- Improved Security of Data and Infrastructure
- Improved Software Distribution
- Cheaper Workstation Refresh
- Centralized Management. Reduced dependence on Service Center staff

- Cons

- Requires additional software licensing for Term Svcs
- Communication with Sys/36

What Next?

- Currently completing new Business Case and Cost Benefit Analysis
- Currently testing Terminal Services on a Small Test network using current Applications
- Hope to Pilot Test Citrix Terminal Services for Geospatial Applications later this Fiscal Year
- CLU – Farm Records Data Reconciliation

Contacts

- Jim Heald 202-720-0787
 - Jim.heald@wdc.usda.gov
- Ted Payne 202-720-2187
 - Ted.payne@wdc.usda.gov

FSA Compliance Changes

- GAO Audit
- Revised Statistical Sampling Method Established
- Producer Selection – All Programs/All Farms Reviewed
- FY 2007 – 2000+ Farms
- Program dependent site visits required throughout the year
- Producer Selection for 2008 in January

Changes Under Review for NAIP

- More focus on over-all programmatic support and less on compliance (acreage spot check) activity
- Move to 1 meter only
- Revise the cycle timeframe
- FSA area of concern is only CLU areas
- Still Leaf-On/Growing Season, but look at extending collection window
- Determine if flexibility can be provided in delivery timeframes
- Other long term opportunities

What Remains Constant

- Partnership Participation
- Performance Measures with USGS for 17 Western States
- Continue to work to stabilize funding
- Need to collect/publicize benefits of NAIP and impacts if the program goes away
- Continuous Program Improvements
- NAIP continues to fit into the IFTN Proposal

Target States for 2008

- States “next in line” based on acquisition cycle schedule: *MN, OK, *IN, VA, MA, *NH, *VT, RI, NY**
- Out of Cycle States with potential partnership contributions identified: TN, TX, KS, WI, ID
- Out of Cycle States that have more recently indicated potential partnership: NC, ND

*Potential State partners identified

**FSA planned replacement

On-going Activities

- Reconcile/review requirement submissions
- Looking at other issues and opportunities (e.g., discontinue public CCM Downloads, how to handle out of cycle collections)
- Confirm changes
- Complete transition plan
- Determine funding and subsequent impacts
- Formal announcement of changes
- Continue with planned RFP and selection activities.