

REFERENCE SECTION

PREVIOUS COORDINATING COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

At the Committee's December 17, 2003 meeting:

1. The Committee decided that it should plan on meeting in a workshop format in fall 2004 and that the topics should not be limited to the "regional dataset" philosophy that precipitated the proposal. Staff was asked to develop an agenda and add this topic as a discussion item at each regular meeting until the workshop. Discussion topics agreed upon for the workshop were as follows:
 - a) Possible philosophical changes to address priority information needs that have not been able to be addressed with the "regional dataset" philosophy that has underpinned MetroGIS since its inception. *(component of the 1st proposed issue statement)*
 - b) Concept of multiple organizations sharing update/maintenance responsibilities for a particular dataset (e.g., separate custodians for the spatial data versus attributes). *(a component of the 1st proposed issue statement)*
 - c) Expanding the Performance Measures to include a measure that quantifies the benefits realized relative to the cost to attain these benefits. *(component of the last proposed issue statement)*
2. Staff shared with the Coordinating Committee the scope of work for the current Professional Services Contract with the firm of Richardson Richter and Associates. It calls for a 2005 project to update the MetroGIS Business Plan and pursue related projects, such as a Participant Satisfaction evaluation.

BACKGROUND AND QUESTIONS FOR ISSUE STATEMENTS (FALL 2004 WORKSHOP)

1. **Issue Statement:** Work on solutions to several priority common information needs is stalled or moving ahead very slowly. *(THE CURRENT INFORMATION NEED SOLUTION PROCESS NEEDS TO BE CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRIOR TO THIS DISCUSSION.)*

Background: Several regional solutions to common information needs, for which clear regional champion organizations exist, including a distribution mechanism, have been implemented (census geography, parcels, street centerlines, jurisdictional boundaries, planned land use, and DataFinder). Unfortunately, work is progressing at a much slower pace on solutions to several other common information needs. In these cases, no single organization appears to have a compelling business need to guide the regional solution process in a manner that addresses the preferences of the broader community (e.g., existing land use, hydrology, and potentially Phase II of the pending socioeconomic effort).

Where regional solutions have been implemented, they all have in common an organization that volunteered to facilitate broadly-supported agreement on data specifications and custodial responsibilities; resulting in a uniform solution for the entire seven county Metropolitan Area. With the exception of the Land Cover solution, which DNR championed, the regional custodian for the other implemented regional solutions is the Metropolitan Council. One of the reasons that progress has slowed on regional solutions to the remainder of the endorsed common information needs is that the Council does not have a compelling business need to be a part of solution. Therefore, if a regional solution is to be achieved for the common need efforts that are stalled or moving slowly, changes in perception of desired outcome and possibly in practice may be needed.

Discussion Question A: Should MetroGIS's efforts deviate from current expectations for future regional solutions? *For example: MetroGIS's efforts may be limited to defining a best practice (e.g. coding scheme) and possibly hosting an Internet-based application for a particular solution, which would be widely promoted but there would not be a regional custodian to monitor activity or assist with issues as they arise.*

Discussion Question B: What changes could be made to the current information needs solution process to improve flexibility and timely responsiveness to new issues and opportunities, without compromising the currently sought after breadth of participation to define expectations and broadly-supported solutions?

Discussion Question C: Would consideration of the concept of multiple organizations sharing update/maintenance responsibilities for a particular dataset (e.g., separate custodians for the spatial data versus attributes) move stalled discussions forward? Is this concept practical?

2. **Issue Statement: No activity has been initiated for two endorsed priority information needs – Land Regulations and Rights to Property.**

Background: MetroGIS’s current philosophy assumes that an organization with a compelling internal business need must provide leadership to guide the process of defining a desired regional solution, be it Data, Applications, and/or Best Practice. Despite outreach efforts to foster interest in investigating solutions to the Land Regulations and Rights to Property information needs, no person/organization has come forward.

Discussion Question: If a lead person/organization does not volunteer after a specified period of time, should MetroGIS continue to cite the status of specified common information need as To Be Determined (TBD)? What efforts are appropriate to seek out a lead organization? Should formerly identified common information needs, for which no work on a solution has been initiated, be included in any next-generation priority setting process?

3. **Issue Statement: Other common information needs may be appropriate for regional solutions in addition to those identified in 1997.**

Background: In 1997, MetroGIS endorsed its original 13 priority common information needs. The time horizon for answering the question “I need to know about (*information need*)” was 5 years or 1997-2002. A second-generation common information needs identification project has been anticipated in the Committee’s workplan since 2002. No action has been initiated to identify any additional common information need candidates because the work on the first round of the priority needs is still in progress. Although, following the September 11, 2001 national tragedy, the Policy Board added Emergency Preparedness to the list of original 13 priority common information needs.

The pending Minnesota Spatial Data Infrastructure (MSDI) Plan identifies framework data themes (e.g., elevation and imagery) that are not currently recognized as possible collaborative opportunities for the MetroGIS community.

At the Committee’s December 17th 2003 meeting, Member Knippel commented that maybe MetroGIS should cease taking on new regional solution initiatives because existing resources may not be able to support the desired solutions. A similar statement was made by a Policy Board member when the Phase I Socioeconomic Implementation strategy was proposed for approval, which resulted a discussion about how MetroGIS staff are not the primary support for defining solutions and that initiatives are not undertaken unless the required support resources are available. Attachment A was produced to demonstrate that many individuals (77) are currently participating in MetroGIS’s regional solution efforts and that only a few are involved in more than one workgroup at a time.

Discussion Question: Should MetroGIS continue to plan on conducting a second-generation common information need discovery process to define additional candidates for regional/collaborative geospatial solutions?

4. **Issue Statement: Some information needs, although not common to all five organizational types represented on the MetroGIS Board, are important enough to consider for regional solutions, assuming that an organization with a related business need is willing to shepherd the process of defining a desired regional solution.**

Background: In Nancy Tosta’s keynote address at MetroGIS’s November 2002 Participant Appreciation Event, she encouraged MetroGIS not to limit its concept of “common information need” to only those needs important to all five types of government organizations represented on the Policy Board (cities, schools, watersheds, counties, regional), but rather to also consider also pursuing regionally-endorsed solutions to needs critical to a subset of the core stakeholders. She recognized the current strategy was important when MetroGIS was established to insure all stakeholders benefited and were engaged but now that MetroGIS is more well established she encouraged MetroGIS to consider collaborative initiatives important to a subset of the core stakeholder community.

Discussion Question A: Should MetroGIS seek out opportunities to collaborate among subsets of its core stakeholders once solutions to information needs common to all of its core stakeholder organization types are in place?

Discussion Question B: What considerations should drive a decision to recognize, as a MetroGIS priority, a need that is shared by some, but not all, core stakeholder organization types?

Discussion Question C: Should there be a minimum number of qualifying organizational types citing a common information need before MetroGIS's resources are made available?

Discussion Question D: Should needs that are common to all core organization types be viewed as a higher priority than needs common to a subset of organizations represented on the Board, all other things being equal?

5. **Issue Statement:** Applications, in combination with implementation of a regional dataset(s), often are needed to totally satisfy an information need. Applications to query, analyze, map, and convert regional datasets to other forms (mailing labels) are often an integral part of the complete solution.

Background: The current Business Plan recognizes the importance of applications to addressing priority information needs. No formal policy currently exists to decide priorities related to pursuing applications to complete a information need solution or to pursue a solution for a the data component. The first time the need for such a policy arose was in 2002 when the decision was made to pursue a regional mailing label application to address the "I need to know where someone lives and how to contact them" information need. The current work plan calls for identification of other candidates for regional solutions to priority information needs. In the past, priority has been given to projects that have sponsorship and resources.

Discussion Question A: Should a formal policy be set to establish priorities among the data and application components for common information needs, which have not be satisfied?

Discussion Question B: Should the same three outcomes be sought for applications as for data relative to solutions for common information needs (specifications, roles and responsibilities, and willing custodian)?

6. **Issue Statement:** Testimonials, other anecdotal evidence, and performance measures clearly demonstrate that MetroGIS's accomplishments are benefiting the community but the cost to the key participants is not well understood.

Background: MetroGIS's underpinning philosophy assumes that collaborative solutions, by their nature, must address a compelling self-interest/need of the participating entities in a more cost effective manner than can be achieved individually. MetroGIS also currently leaves this judgement up to the individual participating entities due to the wide variation in business functions and practices. Evidence that this self-interest is being met includes consistent good attendance at all meetings and forums since inception as well as testimonials.

Last Spring, at the direction of the Coordinating Committee, staff conducted a series of interviews in an attempt to implement Performance Measures 6 and 7 (page 12 of the document at http://www.metrogis.org/benefits/perf_measure/perf_meas_plan.pdf), which called for quantifying benefits to key producers of participating in MetroGIS's efforts. At its September 2003 meeting, the Committee concurred with staff's conclusion that quantifying costs to the data producers could not be meaningfully accomplished. As such, a Performance Measure Plan amendment was recommended to continue the prior practice of seeking out qualitative evidence of benefit through testimonials. Member Knippel raised the matter again at the Committee's December 2003 meeting and it was agreed to add this topic to the agenda for the fall 2004 Workshop. Member Craig offered a suggestion to quantify volunteered time on the part of the producer community as a component of quantifying costs versus benefits.

Discussion Question A: Should MetroGIS attempt to quantitatively document direct (and indirect?) costs by all participants related to its achievements/benefits?

Discussion Question B: If so, what should the component measures and responsibilities be to accomplish this quantitative documentation. What should and should not be included? What level of effort is deemed satisfactory to achieve the desired documentation?

ATTACHMENT A

Last updated
March 8, 2004Current Participants on
MetroGIS Committees and Workgroups

	Address Workgroup	Coordinating Committee (4 mtgs/year)	County Data Producers Workgroup	Emergency Preparedness Workgroups	Existing Land Use Technical Workgroup	Highways & Roads Technical Workgroup	Parcel Data Enhancement Workgroup	Socioeconomic Information Need Workgroup	Technical Advisory Team (2 mtgs/year)	TOTAL
1	Aaron Buffington			1					1	
2	Adam Snegosky			1					1	
3	Al Laumeyer	1							1	
4	Allan Radke	1							1	
5	Amy Fisher						1		1	
6	Amy Geisler	1							1	
7	Barbara Ronningen						1		1	
8	Bart Richardson							1	1	
9	Bill Brown	1	1						2	
10	Bob Basques							1	1	
11	Bob Cockriel	1							1	
12	Bob Diedrich							1	1	
13	Bob Moulder					1		1	2	
14	Brad Henry	1							1	
15	Carla Coates			1					1	
16	Curt Peterson					1		1	2	
17	Dan Falbo							1	1	
18	Dan Pfeffer							1	1	
19	Dave Drealan	1	1						2	
20	David Arbeit	1			1				2	
21	David Bitner	1							1	
22	David Claypool	1	1					1	3	
23	David Vessel					1			1	
24	David Windle	1			1				2	
25	Deb Jones	1							1	
26	Dick Carlstrom				1		1		2	
27	Eltayeb Elhassan							1	1	
28	Eric Eckman							1	1	
29	Francis Harvey							1	1	
30	Gary Swenson	1	1			1		1	4	
31	Gordon Chinander							1	1	
32	Heather Britt						1		1	
33	Heidi Welsch						1		1	
34	Jane Harper	1	1						2	
35	Jim Hafner				1				1	
36	Jim Hentges	1	1						2	
37	Jim Maxwell					1		1	2	
38	Joella Givens	1							1	
39	John Carpenter	1					1		2	
40	John Connelly							1	1	
41	John DeJung	1							1	
42	John Hoshal			1		1			2	

ATTACHMENT A

Last updated
March 8, 2004Current Participants on
MetroGIS Committees and Workgroups

	Address Workgroup	Coordinating Committee (4 mtgs/year)	County Data Producers Workgroup	Emergency Preparedness Workgroups	Existing Land Use Technical Workgroup	Highways & Roads Technical Workgroup	Parcel Data Enhancement Workgroup	Socioeconomic Information Need Workgroup	Technical Advisory Team (2 mtgs/year)	TOTAL
43	John Mertens				1				1	
44	Karen Johnson	1							1	
45	Kathie Doty		1						1	
46	Kathy Johnson						1		1	
47	Kent Tupper					1		1	2	
48	Larry Charboneau	1							1	
49	Lee Whitcraft	1							1	
50	Lyn Rohe	1							1	
51	Mark Sloan			1					1	
52	Mark Vanderschaaf	1					1		2	
53	Mary Karcz						1		1	
54	Michael Munson							1	1	
55	Mike Ryan			1					1	
56	Nancy Pollock	1							1	
57	Nancy Read	1	1			1			3	
58	Ned Phillips	1							1	
59	Nicole Peterson	1							1	
60	Pat Cummens			1					1	
61	Paul Buschmann						1		1	
62	Pete Eggimann	1				1			2	
63	Randy Knippel	1	1	1					3	
64	Rebecca Blue			1					1	
65	Rick Gelbmann	1		1				1	3	
66	Rick Person							1	1	
67	Robert Maki	1							1	
68	Ron Wencil	1		1				1	3	
69	Sandra Paddock	1					1		2	
70	Sarah Midler			1					1	
71	Scott Renne	1							1	
72	Scott Simmer							1	1	
73	Sherry Coatney							1	1	
74	Sonia Dickerson			1					1	
75	Steve Lehr	1							1	
76	Susanne Maeder							1	1	
77	Tim Zimmerman						1	1	2	
78	Will Craig	1					1		2	