1. Potential installation of SpatiaLite DLL(s), Python and Python libraries may require admin or USDA/CEC assstance. – If installation of DLL(s) are required than we will need to consider altering our MVP. Give that spatial will be dealt with in a later phase, we can deal with this down the road but leave the door open to modify the requirements.

2. Policy and mechanisms for managing hybrid content (e.g. data from multiple sources and/or SSA plus WSS ad-hoc AOIs) is not yet explored or defined. The MVP may already address this point. The MVP states "Database can store multiple soil survey areas". The source of the SSA shouldn't matter but the database should be able to store multiple records in the legend table and other tables that store SSA information. This should be true regardless of how the SSURGO data is generated and regardless of how many SSAs are included within a single set of SSURGO text files.

3. Use of metadata text files distributed with WSS SSURGO downloads is not considered. – Let me ask this, do we even need to consider these other than ensuring the metadata text files included in the SSURGO download are up to date? Here is another thought, do we even need to retain these files? Other than Steve using them for gSSURGO schema, what purpose do they serve and are they used by customers? If there are select group of people that do need these files (e.g. Steve for gSSURGO), could we simply redirect them to the SQLite database as the source of the metadata and remove these metadata SSURGO text files from the system. That results in one less piece in the puzzle.

4. Definition and delivery of an "empty template" is not finalized. The stories define a path to a manually-created empty template. We do need to refine this. My thinking was that we deliver the same sort of product we deliver for the mdb. That is a database that has the metadata tables and payload tables, along with relationships, indexes, and constraints. The idea was the user downloads the SQLite template and runs some script(s) in some environment to load the SSURGO data into the payload tables. I think this needs further discussion because as I understand the process you proposed, this would not be the case. Instead, the database would be initially constructed or rebuilt by the python script that executes the SQL statements. That may be okay but the "empty template" was us saying we just wanted to do the a similar thing that we did the mdb.

5. Management of version mismatch (version.txt vs SQLite instance) is undefined. I would like Steve to comment on this one.

6. Ability to work with "non-ESRI open source programs such as R" is ill-defined. "R" is a language. What other languages beside Python and R are required? Is R in the MVP? We should have said ability to work in other non-ESRI programs. I think ideally the new database could be used in R Studio but I know very little about R and I would defer to Dylan to better define R/R studio requirements. I think this language needs to be modified in the MVP.

7. Interoperability of a populated database is undefined. For example if data are loaded when using Arc GIS Pro, should the same database file be useable in QGIS? I'm not sure how to answer this because I hadn't envisioned using ArcGIS Pro to load data. The idea was to load the data outside of ESRI.

8. Must the SQLite+SpatiaLite or GeoPackage be editable in ArcGIS Pro or QGIS? I think it should be it's not a requirement. Editing is rare occurrence and is greatly discouraged and should only be left to someone who is comfortable with the database.

9. Should spatial data (shapefiles) be loadable into the SQLite+SpatiaLite or GeoPackagewithout needing to resort to a GIS? I think yes but I would defer to Steve, Adolfo, and Chad.