

Meeting Notes
MetroGIS Data Producer Work Group
Monday, January 27, 2003
Roseville City Hall

Members Present: Dave Drealan - Chair (Carver County), Jane Harper (Washington County), Randy Knippel (Dakota County), David Claypool (Ramsey County), Bill Brown (Hennepin County), Jim Hentges (Scott County), and Gary Swenson (Anoka County)

Staff Present: Randall Johnson (MetroGIS) and Mark Kotz (MetroGIS)

1. Meeting Summaries from December 2002 meetings

The group accepted summaries for its December 6th and 16th meetings, without comment. No one offered any additions or modifications to the document which describes the agreed upon options, as updated following the December 16 meeting. (Each of these documents is posted at <http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/index.shtml#private2>).

2. Option A1 Implementation

Johnson reported that the tasks previously approved by the workgroup regarding modification of the metadata on DataFinder for the Regional Parcel Dataset and adding a list of county contacts on the MetroGIS website were made the week of January 13, fully implementing Option 1A.

3. Option A2 Procedures

In accordance with direction received at the Workgroup's December 16 meeting, Johnson shared a draft for discussion of the Option A2 order form, instructions, shrink-wrap style license, and general information proposed to be posted on the MetroGIS website to implement this Option. The discussion and agreed upon direction is summarized below:

License:

Definitions: Agreement was reached that government and academic institutions with serving MN or elsewhere can have access without fee.

Section 2.01(c): The concept of stipulating that the Licensee could not share the data with a subcontractor unless authorized as a 3rd party was discussed. It was agreed that the language should remain as presented in the draft and to rely on the phrase "except as expressly provided for in this agreement" to cover any such requests that may arise.

Section 6.04: All agreed that it should include a listing of the county contacts and not a link to a web page.

Section 6.05. The majority of the discussion focused on this section. All agreed that if their respective legal staffs will support the concept, that the user would, in effect, agree to all of the license restrictions and responsibilities when they submit an order request. There would be no signature required and the user would not have to submit a copy of the license with their order.

General: It was agreed for the time being that a separate license should be implemented for For-Profit & Non-Profit interests to keep the document focused. All agreed that the consideration of combing the public sector license that is currently in place with this proposed license should be postponed until the negotiations for 3rd generation data sharing agreement is initiated later this year. Staff was also asked to use the license approved by all of the counties in 2001 as the base from which to illustrate all of the agreed upon changes and to email it to the counties as soon possible.

Draft Order Form and Instructions:

The draft forms and instructions and the web page that would present the instructions were each reviewed. Modifications were suggested, including but not limited to:

- Change “mailing address” to “billing address” and provide a statement that this information is optional if the applicant wished to travel to the county(ies) and pay in person. This modification was suggested to avoid a possible conflict with a provision in the Data Practices Act that does not permit the distributing organization to ask the applicant their name or how they wish to use the data.
- Add a bold disclaimer that submittal of the order form means that the applicant agrees with and obligates themselves to comply with the licensing restrictions and responsibilities.
- Change the reference to the fee to state that a processing fee, in addition to the price per parcel, would be required for access.

The group discussed the possibility of a web-enabled order form. Several issues were raised:

- not sure whether the applicant could attach the description of the geographic area of interest,
- not sure if the information received via a web enabled application could be easily forwarded to the affected county(ies) via email or fax,
- not sure how to guarantee that the user reached the web enabled page through the link that stipulates they agree to the licensing provisions when they submit the application.

It was agreed to use simplest order option to launch the process. Once launched, staff was asked to investigate web-enabling but pursue only if it can be implemented by existing staff resources without any out-of-pocket expenses.

Staff was asked to modify the forms and instructions agreed upon and forward to the members by email for review. All agreed that they would strive to reach internal approval of the licensing concept in the next month so that Option A2 could go live by early spring to begin testing whether there is sufficient market interest to warrant expansion of [DataFinder Café](#) to include an eCommerce capability. Staff was also asked to post information about the Workgroup’s activities on web. (Editor’s note: see <http://www.metrogis.org/data/datasets/parcels/index.shtml#private2>.)

4. Next Meeting

The group concluded that there was no immediate need to schedule another meeting and that they would prefer to communicate by email to resolve any outstanding issues or concerns with implementation of Option A2. The members stated they want this matter well in hand before turning its attention to any of the other responsibilities that the group has been assigned.

Submitted by,

Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator