



Draft

*Setting the Stage for the
Next-Generation of Collaboration*

**Summary of the Process to Update
MetroGIS's Policy Foundation
(February to April 2007)**

Last Modified: April 17, 2007

Compiled by
MetroGIS Staff Support Team

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The advice provided by the MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop Planning Team members was invaluable to maturing the Workshop objectives, defining a program format to successfully achieve those objectives, and refining the information received at the forum into a compelling and relevant policy foundation to guide MetroGIS's efforts over the next 3-5 years. The members of the Workshop Planning Team were as follows:

- John Bryson, Professor of Planning and Public Affairs and Associate Dean for Research and Centers, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota - Lead workshop facilitator
- David Arbeit, Mn Office of Geographic and Demographic Analysis - MetroGIS Coordinating Committee member and former Chair of the Committee
- Rick Gelbmann, Metropolitan Council – MetroGIS Coordinating Committee member and Chair, Mn Governor's Council on Geographic Information
- Jane Harper, Washington County - MetroGIS Coordinating Committee member and former Chair of the Committee
- Nancy Read, Metropolitan Mosquito Control District – MetroGIS Coordinating Committee member and immediate past Chair of the Committee
- Trudy Richter, Richardson Richter Associates, MetroGIS Staff Support Team
- Mark Vander Schaaf, Metropolitan Council - MetroGIS Coordinating Committee

A thank you is also in order to the 32 workshop participants (See Appendix F), those individuals who participated in the program (Professor Bryson, William Brown, William Craig, Commissioner Reinhardt, Mark Kotz, Jonathan Blake and Trudy Richter), and those who provided critical assistance and support behind the scenes before and on the day of the forum (Christopher Kline, Craig Skone, Alison Slaats, Jeanne Landkamer, Kafé 421 catering, and U of M facilities support staff).

Finally, critical contributions of two organizations are recognized: The University's Center for Urban and Regional Affairs for its assistance in securing the Humphrey Center as the venue and the Metropolitan Council for its funding sponsorship in conjunction with its capacity as primary sponsor of the MetroGIS and custodian for MetroGIS's "Fostering Collaboration" function.

This forum and the numerous follow-up discussions to refine the vast amount of material generated at the forum into coherent and useable statements of desired policy could not have been successful without the combined efforts of these individuals and organizations.

Respectfully,

Randall Johnson, Workshop Project Manager
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
Executive Summary	1
Welcome / Introductions	x
Setting the Stage:	
<i>Historical Overview – A Decade of Fostering Collaboration</i>	x
Provide Strategic Direction:	xx
<i>Part 1 – Opportunities, Challenges, Activities</i>	xx
<i>What should MetroGIS be doing the next 3-5 years?</i>	
<i>Part 2 – Outcomes, Results</i>	xx
<i>What would result if MetroGIS did these things?</i>	
<i>Part 3 – Guiding Principles</i>	xx
<i>What principles and operating standards should guide MetroGIS’s future efforts?</i>	
<i>Part 4 – Priorities and Capabilities</i>	xx
<i>What are the desired priority outcomes, major strategies, and capabilities for the next 3-5 years?</i>	
<i>Part 5 – Implications for Mission Statement</i>	xx
<i>Is the current MetroGIS Mission Statement consistent with outcomes desired for the next 3-5 years?</i>	
Reflections	xx
Forum Closing	xx
Refinements to Products Following Workshop (<u>Part 6</u>)	xx
Listing of Figures	xx
A. Welcome – Chairperson Reinhardt	xx
B. Introductions – Professor John Bryson.....	xx
C. Historical Overview – William Craig.....	xx
D. Wall Space Created by “Lines” Workgroup (<i>Picture</i>)	xx
E. Wall Space Created by “Points” Workgroup (<i>Picture</i>)	xx
F. Wall Space Created by “Polygons” Workgroup (<i>Picture</i>)	xx
G. Wall Space Created for the Combined Outcome and Activity Labels (<i>Picture</i>). ..	xx

Appendices	XX
A. Final Program	XX
B. Program Transition Slides	XX
C. Forum Evaluation Results	XX
D. Background Information Packet	XX
E. “Starter Kit” Statements	XX
F. Forum Participants, Small Group Assignments and Support Team	XX
G. Letter of Invitation	XX
H. Concept Map – Enhanced Version	XX
Endnotes	XX

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On February 8, 2007, thirty-two individuals, each of whom possesses insight important to MetroGIS's continued success¹ participated in the day-long MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop.

The purpose of the Workshop was to provide policy level direction to guide MetroGIS's efforts over the next 3 to 5 years, that is, focus was on "whats" and "whys". The participants were informed that defining the "hows" would be the focus of the subsequent MetroGIS's Business Plan Update project. Specifically, the purposes of the Workshop were to:

- Collectively define major desired outcomes and activities that MetroGIS should pursue over the next 3 to 5 years.
- Provide clear and agreed upon direction to regarding key issues and opportunities important to MetroGIS's continued success.

The participants included five (5) members of MetroGIS's Policy Board, twenty-one (21) members of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, and six (6) individuals possessing special expertise important to setting direction for MetroGIS. The mix of perspectives also included that of policy maker, manager, and technologist, representing a wide variety of professions affiliated with all forms of government that serve the seven-county Metropolitan Area, Greater Minnesota and beyond, as well as academic, utility, non-profit, and for-profit interests.

Numerous desired outcomes, and strategies to achieve those outcomes, were identified. Straw polling was used to identify outcomes and activities of most importance to the participants. General agreement was also reached on desired modifications to guiding principals and mission statement.

According to the participants' evaluations, the Workshop successively achieved this purpose. On a scale of 1 to 5, with a 5 meaning "outstanding", the effectiveness evaluation ratings from the participants for each of the core workshop components ranged from 4.25 to 4.72, with an overall average of 4.44², with a 5 meaning "outstanding".

General Policy Direction: The participants concluded that the mission statement that served MetroGIS during its first decade should be modified to reflect both the growth that has occurred in the technical capabilities and maturity of the community as to its understanding of the benefits possible through collaboration to address shared information needs. Several policy issues were also identified during Parts 3 -5 of the Workshop which the group concurred need to be resolved before sustainable next-generation strategies can be developed and implemented³. The group also collectively concluded that:

- 1) MetroGIS is serving a valuable public purpose,
- 2) The collaborative solutions and best practices that have been achieved through MetroGIS's efforts should be sustained,
- 3) The scope of MetroGIS's activities should focus on "shared" as opposed to "common" information needs thereby enabling work on shared needs recognized to be critical to the region but which do not directly impact all core stakeholders. .
- 4) Efforts should be made to broaden participation – users, contributors, and jurisdictions adjoining the Twin City Metropolitan Area.
- 5) The range of existing activities should be expanded to include:
 - Addressing shared application needs related to solutions to shared information needs,
 - Fostering development of technology advancements and infrastructure improvements needed to achieve MetroGIS's desired outcomes,

- Expanding outreach efforts to include benefits of using GIS technology in addition to the current focus on fostering collaboration to address shared needs.

Through the use of a group facilitation and analysis technique called “causal or concept mapping”, the desired outcomes, strategies/activities, and relationship defined among and between them that had been generated by the participants⁴. Following the Workshop, the information captured at the Workshop was refined to improve readability⁵. From this enhanced version of the “map”, the following desired outcomes and activities are easily recognized and logic of the relationships among and between them is more readily depicted.

Desired Outcomes: Three types of desired outcomes were identified to guide MetroGIS’s efforts for the next 3 to 5 years.

Community-focused Outcomes: The first type is comprised of major outcomes that MetroGIS can influence but other organizations are actually responsible for their achievement. The following such “community-based” outcomes that the participants desire as a result of MetroGIS’s efforts are as follows:

- Solve Real World Problems
- Better decisions being made
- Stronger local economy
- More informed citizens
- Achieve community goals
- Improve quality of life

Community-based outcomes relate to the substance of a vision or destination statement for an organization. Through the process to refine the products of the Workshop, the following draft vision (destination) statement from MetroGIS was crafted:

Draft Vision Statement: *“Organizations serving the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Area are successfully collaborating to use geographic information technology to solve real world problems.”*

MetroGIS-focused Outcomes: The second type of major outcome involves results for which MetroGIS can directly influence and which MetroGIS should be accountable. These outcomes are good in tot own right. The Workshop participant identified the following such outcomes for MetroGIS over the next 3 to 5 years:

- Expanded Resource Availability Through Partnering
- Cost Avoidance
- More Efficient/Effective Core Stakeholders
- Enhanced (Broadened) Understanding of Our Region
- Broadened Participation (Users, Contributors, and Jurisdictions Adjoining the Metro Area)

These major outcomes relate embody the substance of a mission statement or statement of operational purpose which is intended to work in concert with guiding principles:

Draft Mission Statement: *“The mission of MetroGIS is to address shared geographic information technology needs, through a collaboration of organizations that serve the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Area, especially regional and local governments.*

Performance Measurement-focused Outcomes: The third type of outcome involves those outcomes that are subordinate to major outcomes, they typically are a means to achieving a major outcome

and therefore often are important performance indicators. They are not listed separately in this report but are depicted on the “casual map” in presented in Appendix H⁶.

Desired Activities/Strategies (To Achieved Desired Outcomes)

The participants identified the following eight major activity areas to focus on over the next 3 to 5 years. These activity areas are strategically related to the MetroGIS’s ability to achieve desired major outcomes. They are not intended to be listed in any order of relative importance, as setting of priorities will occur during development of the Next Generation Business Plan:

- Facilitate better data sharing (*more data available, more users, improved processes*)
- Sustain stakeholder satisfaction with MetroGIS’s accomplishments to date.
 - Regional data solutions to shared information needs
 - One-stop, Internet-based tool for data discovery and access (MetroGIS DataFinder)
 - Adopted standards and best practices
 - Data sharing policies and agreements
 - Forum for knowledge sharing and spirit of working together
- Expand regional solutions (*to shared information needs*) to include applications and foster infrastructure enhancements needed to fully leverage the capabilities of those regional solutions.
- Expand of MetroGIS stakeholders :
 - Interoperability with jurisdictions adjoining the seven-county Metropolitan Area.
 - Municipal government participating as producers of data for regional solutions (*addresses*)
 - Partnerships with non-government entities to secure resources needed to address shared needs.
 - Expand users of MetroGIS’s services.
- Build advocacy and awareness (*of the benefits of collaborative solutions to shared needs*)
 - Improve understanding among government leadership that use of GIS technology is a cost of effectively doing business in today’s high-tech world and that cross-organization collaboration is necessary to fully realize these capabilities.
 - Coordinate with the State of Minnesota’s Spatial Technology Infrastructure planning to seek alignment between state policies and MetroGIS’s solutions to shared information needs and distribution architecture.
- Optimize MetroGIS organization
 - Sustain a broadly supported stakeholder-governed organizational structure that operationalizes the guiding principles and is consistent with the capabilities required to achieve the vision.
 - Have funding policies that result in the most efficient and effective use of taxpayers’ money
 - Sustain and enhance core and distinctive competencies

Next Steps

The policies statements, desired results activities put forth in this document are intended to remain designated as “works in progress” until adopted as part of a complete Next Generation Business Plan to guide MetroGIS over the next 3 to 5 years. The “works in progress” designation is because it is possible that desired modifications may be identified to these statements and preferences as specific recommendations are developed as part of the subsequent Business Planning process.

These “works in progress” are scheduled to be shared with the Policy Board on April 25, 2007. Once Policy Board endorsement is received for the “works in progress” policy foundation described in this document and which comprise the core components of the Next Generation Business Plan, the work to develop detailed strategies will begin to define the “hows” for each of the priority activities and priorities for work programming.

(Note to the reader: The presentation slides used to transition from one segment of the workshop program to the next are presented in Appendix B.)

WELCOME

At 8:20 a.m. Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County Commissioner and MetroGIS Policy Board Chairperson, welcomed the participants.

Figure A: Chairperson Reinhardt Presenting Welcoming Comments.

(Picture)

Chairperson Reinhardt began her remarks by commenting that both GIS technology and MetroGIS have come a long way during the past decade, as evidenced by GIS technology playing an ever increasing important role in the everyday operations of more and more government entities. She thanked the sponsoring organizations for making this event possible and the participants for agreeing⁷ to dedicate an entire day to help set a course for MetroGIS for the next 3-5 years.⁸

Chairperson Reinhardt closed her remarks by noting that with this amount of serious commitment, she is confident that important work will be accomplished today to set a course that is both compelling and ambitious for MetroGIS to pursue for next several years.

INTRODUCTIONS

Professor John Bryson, Lead Workshop Facilitator, welcomed everyone to the Hubert H. Humphrey Center.

Figure B: Professor John Bryson Introducing the Day's Activities

(Picture)

Bryson commented that eleven years earlier that he had had the pleasure to facilitate the strategic planning retreat that led to the establishment of MetroGIS and was pleased to have also been invited to facilitate this workshop. He then invited each participant to introduce themselves and offer one outcome that if it were achieved would make this workshop a success. The comments are listed below in the order offered. (See Appendix F each participant's organizational affiliation and their involvement with MetroGIS):

Last Name	Comment
Drealan, Dave	Clear vision for the future (desired outcomes and clear idea how to achieve)
Givens, Joella	Commitment to continue to move forward (collaborative solutions)

Craig, William	Achieve innovative ideas shared at the June 1 Imagining Possibilities Forum
Gelbmann, Rick	Receive a mandate to move into application sharing to optimize data sharing and standards development
Carpenter, John	Already a success to have facilitated the submittal of recommendations from the non-government sectors (October 2006 submittal). Specifically, looking forward to ways to effectively open collaboration with others and opportunities for bold new applications
Schneider, Terry <i>Policy Board member</i>	Define what is possible now and we can better utilize our resources to achieve those possibilities
Cummins, Pat	Learning from and sharing the experience of the MetroGIS community with similar programs in other areas
Phillips, Ned	Outstanding opportunity for the community. Need to make sure that opening new horizons does not result in sacrificing ability to sustain accomplishments.
Jones, Deb	Continue to extend the spirit of collaboration
Read, Nancy	Define how to effectively interrelate with the State and pursue solutions to common application needs.
Harper, Jane	Look into the future and figure out how to act on opportunities with limited resources. Also need to collaboratively figure out how to make the time to actively participate and leverage additional resources
Lake, Roger <i>Policy Board member</i>	Part of something bigger. Need to figure out how to work with next ring of counties and possibly beyond
Claypool, David	Need to identify next generation of meaningful consequences to recharge. Look to the future, break out of thinking based upon boundaries. Work towards greatest benefit to the public.
Brown, William	Overcome stumbling blocks of the past that hamper data sharing (e.g., data licensing and cost recovery policies).
Wakefield, Sally	Broader variety of stakeholders. Updated understanding of needs which have changed over the past ten years and better understanding of the value that the non-profit community can bring to achieving desired outcomes
Jilk, Ken	Improved sharing of data. Still too many differing policies and procedures, particularly legal standards that greatly impede access and timely use.
Egan, Tom <i>Policy Board member</i>	Identification of applications useful to Dakota County's needs, even if only conceptual, that have the promise of improving efficiencies.
Wencl, Ron	Federal agency partnerships with regional interests that bubble up through the state to the national level.
Craun, Kari	MetroGIS's emphasize on collaborative solutions to common needs is viewed as a model for where the entire geospatial community is trying to go. Hopefully, this work will influence national level partnerships.
Vander Schaaf, Mark	Leverage the potential of the "Internet" as we implement capabilities and procedures
Reinhardt, Victoria <i>Policy Board Chair</i>	Outcomes that will help educate elected officials to better understand the value of GIS technology and benefits that can be obtained through collaboration to improve the cost effectiveness of programs for which they are accountable.
Pistilli, Tony <i>Policy Board Member</i>	More private/public collaboration and expansion to other levels of government (achieve state policies that effectively integrate proven metro area data sharing/collaboration policies).
Arbeit, David	Roadmap and commitment for more integrated use of GIS to support individual business needs and support of shared services to accomplish state mandated processes. This workshop is expected to provide important guidance for the State pending geospatial planning effort. Integration with the work accomplishments of MetroGIS is a goal.

Chinander, Gordon	Expand the successes MetroGIS has had to achieve sharing of commonly needed data and cooperation to support regional solutions to include the counties which adjoin the Metro Area.
Radke, Allan	More sharing data and collaboration with utilities.
Bitner, David	Up until now MAC has been a recipient of MetroGIS's efforts. Hope to define an effective means for a small regional interest to contribute.
Carlstrom, Dick	In 10 years to be able to look back at the outcome of this workshop and marvel at our wisdom
Henry, Brad	Relevance that will re-energize, partnerships with private sector, and a stronger outreach program to get the message out to the next generation of participants and leaders.
Knippel, Randy	Think more about effective ways to improve efficiencies for citizens. Less organization centric than in the past when evaluating the benefits of participation. Need to focus on ways to expand collaboration and build a strong awareness for the value of GIS. Another objective should be to provide leadership to the State on effective ways to attain collaboration across multiple levels of government and among organizational sectors.
Slusarczyk, John	Resolve stumbling blocks to application sharing and broad implementation of shared services.
Verbick, Ben	Validation that involvement of cities is important to the achieving effective regional solutions. Define practical means for cities to participate.
Simmer, Scott	Concurred with Vander Schaaf that the leveraging the power of the Internet is critical to MetroGIS's relevance and success in the coming years.

Bryson thanked everyone for their comments and introduced, William Craig, the next speaker.

SETTING THE STAGE:

Historical Overview – A Decade of Fostering Collaboration

William Craig, Associate Director for the Center of Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA), University of Minnesota

Figure C: William Craig Setting the Stage for the Day's Activities

(Picture)

Craig asked for a show of hands from those individuals who had participated in the first Strategic Planning Retreat held at the Wilder Forest facility in 1995. Besides him, five of other 31 participants indicated that they had participated in 1995 retreat. He acknowledged their considerable commitment and then presented several slides (Appendix B) on which were listed significant accomplishments of MetroGIS since its inception in 1996, major awards received, major publications through which MetroGIS's efforts have been recognized, and a chart illustrating growth in data sharing activity attributable to MetroGIS's efforts.

Key comments offered by Craig during his presentation were as follows:

- Many important accomplishments have been made but the question is which direction(s) to head at this point.
- Among the most important milestones achieved is the Metropolitan Council's validation in 2006 of the value of MetroGIS's activities not only to the Council but to the region as a whole.
- The political legitimacy obtained through the creation of the Policy Board, together with the active role that policy makers have played in the evolution of policies that guide MetroGIS, has been a key to success.
- Significant grant awards were received early in MetroGIS's work though grants have not played a role in MetroGIS's work since 2001. He noted that this lack of recent awards may in some part be due the shift at the national level to relying upon state GIS councils to further geospatial activity at and within states and away from regional initiatives.
- MetroGIS has received national and international attention from several prominent interests and is seen as a model for encouraging collaboration at the substate levels.

Craig then turned the program back to Bryson who congratulated MetroGIS on its impressive accomplishments.

PROVIDE STRATEGIC DIRECTION:

(Note to reader: Three wall spaces in the meeting room had been set up identically before the workshop to support Parts 1 and 2. Each of these wall spaces contained a papered area of approximately 16 feet in length by 7 feet in height. "Starter kit" statements⁹ were attached to the wall with masking tape next to each papered area.

Bryson provided an overview of the activities planned for the day. His final introductory comment informed the participants that through the progression of exercises planned for the day they would in effect be progressing step-by-step through the logic of strategic planning.

Part 1 – Opportunities, Challenges, Activities

What should MetroGIS be doing the next 3-5 years?

At 9:10 a.m. Bryson asked the participants to break into their three pre-assigned workgroups – Lines, Points, and Polygons. (See Appendix F for the participants and facilitator assigned to each workgroup.) The eleven to twelve participants in each workgroup arranged their chairs in a semi-circle in front of each of the three papered wall spaces. Each of the three small group facilitators then led their respective groups concurrently through the process outlined below:

- *During the initial 5 minutes of the exercise, each participant was asked to write down on paper sheets provided up to five (5) activities that were not included in the activity-related starter kit statements. The listing of the activity-related starter kits statements were also handed out and in view on the wall for reference.*
- *Start the next part of the exercise with activity-related "starter kit" statements. Purpose – confirm acceptability of the underlying concept and document any concerns by amending the statement. Place on the papered wall space in discrete themes to the extent possible.*
- *As each activity is added to the wall, to the extent possible, place the more abstract activities closer to the top and the more concrete activities closer to the bottom within each general theme.*
- *Once the "starter kit" statements are dealt with, ask each member to offer their highest priority activity that is not already listed on the wall. No discussion at this time, other than*

to assign the appropriate theme and general level of abstractness. Continue the “round robin” process until all suggested activities are placed on the wall space.

- *Agree on a label for each discrete activity theme and apply a blue dot to each label.*
- *As time permits, draw dashed lines between related activities to illustrate dependencies.*

The following pictures were taken near the end of this exercise to illustrate the number of suggested activities offered by each of the three workgroups.

Figure D: Wall Space Created by the “Lines” Workgroup

(Picture)

Figure E: Wall Space Created by the “Points” Workgroup

(Picture)

Figure F: Wall Space Created by the “Polygons” Workgroup

(Picture)

The “labels” created by each of the three workgroups to categorize similar desired activities for MetroGIS to pursue during the next 3-5 years are listed below.¹⁰ These listings are not intended to imply any order of relative priority. Assignment of priorities will be a function of the Business Planning subsequent Business Plan Update Project. (Refer to Appendix H for “concept map” graphics that illustrate the numerous individual activities associated with each the following activity categories labels as defined by each workgroup.)

Lines Workgroup (Facilitator –Jonathan Blake)

- Develop and maintain regional data solutions to identified common information needs
- Expand endorsed regional solutions to include applications
- Build advocacy and awareness
- Plan for continuity
- Expand scope of MetroGIS
- Find funding
- Address legal options
- Build infrastructure

Points Workgroup (Facilitator – Mark Kotz)

- Address funding & cost issues
- Document stakeholder benefits
- Optimize MetroGIS as an organization
- Develop and foster adherence to standards
- Develop and promote tech advancements
- Expand scope of MetroGIS

Polygons Workgroup (Facilitator - Trudy Richter)

- Build Infrastructure
- Facilitate better data sharing
- Market GIS
- Expansion of MetroGIS stakeholders
- Enhance involvement of local government
- Provide forum for knowledge sharing
- Support and develop applications and services
- Develop funding policies to get most efficient and effective use of taxpayer’s money

At 10:20 a.m. Bryson asked the participants to stand and congregate near the wall space constructed by the Lines Workshop. The workshop’s facilitator was then asked to read the label for each activity category that their workgroup had created. This process was repeated for the Points and Polygons workgroups.

REFRESHMENT BREAK

At 10:30 a.m. Bryson recessed the group for a break.

PROVIDE STRATEGIC DIRECTION:

Part 2 – Outcomes, Results

What would result if MetroGIS did these things?

At 10:45 a.m. Bryson asked the participants to reassemble into the same workgroups they participated in during Part 1. Each of the three small group facilitators then led their respective groups concurrently through the process outlined below:

- *During the initial 5 minutes of the exercise, each participant was asked to write down on paper sheets provided up to three (3) outcomes that were not included in the activity-related starter kit statements. The listing of the activity-related starter kits statements were also handed out and in view on the wall for reference.*
- *Start the next part of the exercise with activity-related “starter kit” statements. Purpose – confirm acceptability of the underlying concept and document any concerns by amending the statement. Place the “outcome” statements on the papered wall space above the activity themes and near the most relative activity cluster with the understanding that there may be both one-to-one and many-to-one relationships with activity themes. As with the alignment of activity statements, the most abstract to be placed toward the top and most concrete placed nearest the line separating outcomes from activities.*
- *Once the “starter kit” statements are dealt with, ask each member to offer their highest priority outcome that is not already listed on the wall. No discussion at this time, other than to attempt to align with the most relevant assign the appropriate theme and general level of abstractness. Continue the “round robin” until all suggested outcomes are placed on the wall*
- *If time permits, draw dashed lines between activity themes and related outcomes.*
- *Agree on a label for each discrete outcome theme and apply a red dot to each label.*
- *As time permits, draw dashed lines between related outcomes to illustrate dependencies.*

The three workgroups created the following “labels” for the categories of similar desired outcomes that they identified for consideration by MetroGIS during the next 3-5 years.¹¹ These listings are not intended to imply any order of relative priority. Assignment of priorities will be a function of the Business Planning subsequent Business Plan Update Project. (Refer to Appendix H for a “concept map” graphic of the individual outcomes associated with each outcome category as defined by each of workgroup.)

Lines Workgroup (Facilitator –Jonathan Blake)

- Improved/Better confidence in data
- Improved stakeholder effectiveness in achieving their core functions
- GIS recognized as essential activity/service
- Expanded GIS user base and visibility of MetroGIS
- Sustained past accomplishments
- Sustained and optimized investment
- Overcome obstacles to expansion and policy of MetroGIS capacities
- Improved reliability and availability of geospatial services

Points Workgroup (Facilitator – Mark Kotz)

- More effective, efficient government
- Better decisions being made
- Improved stakeholder effectiveness in achieving their core functions
- Broader base of political support
- Better information
- Enhanced understanding of our region

Polygons Workgroup (Facilitator - Trudy Richter)

- Have data that is needed
- GIS recognized as essential service
- Broadened participation
- Good collaboration occurs and endures
- Develop common applications
- Achieve common funding strategy

At 11:30 a.m. Bryson asked the participants to stand and congregate near the wall space constructed by the Lines Workshop. The workshop's facilitator was then asked to read the label for each outcome category that their workgroup had created. This process was repeated for the Points and Polygons workgroups.

LUNCH RECESS

At 11:45 Bryson recessed the group for the lunch break.

During the lunch break, Bryson, the support staff, and the three workgroup facilitators set up a fourth papered wall space approximately 16 feet in length and 7 feet in height in the front of the room. Copies of each activity and outcome category label created by each of the three workgroups was replicated and arranged on the fourth papered space. Labels for activity categories were placed below and near labels for related outcome categories. Lines delineating casual relationships were drawn between related outcome and activity category labels, providing a composite graphic representation of the logic developed during Parts 1 and 2.

For easy reference, two poster-sized listings (3-feet wide and 5-feet tall) of MetroGIS's guiding principles and operational standards were also taped to the wall on each side of the papered wall space described above.

Figure G: Wall Space Created for the Combined Outcome and Activity Labels

PROVIDE STRATEGIC DIRECTION:

Part 3 – Guiding Principles

What general philosophy should guide future MetroGIS efforts?

At 12:45 a.m. Bryson reconvened the group. He explained that the purpose of the Part 3 exercise was to validate or provide direction for desired changes to the principles and operational standards that have guided MetroGIS’s actions and decision making thus far.

Prior to initiating discussion about the individual items, the group concurred that:

- The current guiding principles and operational standards were developed in an environment in which local and regional government interests were the core stakeholders and that changes will be needed to accommodate the preference identified via the Part 1 and two exercises to seek out partnerships with a broader community of interests.
- The preference expressed in the preceding exercises to “expand the stakeholder community” will result in the need reevaluate the meaning of “common need”.
- Consensus-based decision making means all parties are either in favor of or can tolerate a particular outcome/decision, that no party is opposed (includes ambivalence but not objection), and voting is used as a means to evaluate whether consensus exists.
- The number of guiding principles and operating standards should be reduced and listed separately.

Bryson then facilitated an exercise designed to validate or provide direction for desired changes to the thirteen guiding principles and operational standards listed in the “starter kit” materials¹² and on a large poster attached to the front wall. The results of the discussion for each item follow:

Principle/Operating Standard (Short Name)	Discussion / Direction / Decision
Have active involvement of policy makers to set policy direction	Concurred acceptable as stated.
Build once, share many times	Concern was raised that the term “sharing” does not communicate the core concept of increasing inter-organizational cooperation. Agree that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consideration should be given to changing “share” to “use”.• This topic takes on broader implications if the stakeholder community is broadened.
Have consensus-based decision making	Agree that <i>consensus</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should remain an important component of the way MetroGIS decides issues important to long-term success.• Is attained when all parties are either in favor of or can tolerate particular outcomes or decisions.
Have broad support of vision and objectives	Concurred and reinforced that support is necessary by many champions to sustain efforts.
Have all relevant and affected perspectives	Concurred that involvement by diverse perspectives will result in the ability to serve many purposes/users which will strengthen base of support.

Have many champions with diverse perspectives	<p>Agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To change “with” to “from” (e.g., Have many champions from diverse perspectives). (This change addresses a concern had been raised that continued inclusion of the term “with” would have resulted in problems agreeing on collective courses of action via a consensus based decision model if the stakeholder community is broadened.) • That “champion” is synonymous with “advocacy” and includes individuals and organizations. It does not imply a vote/decision focus.
Focus on common needs	<p>Agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limiting focus to “common needs” should be revisited and that means to provide flexibility should be investigated to permit solutions that are critical to society but not necessarily common or critical to all individual stakeholders. • Use of the term “commonly-recognized need” appears to provide the flexibility desired.
Focus on Stakeholder Benefits	<p>Agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All stakeholder interests have a common motivation to maximize efficiencies and effectiveness. • Sharing/collaboration is fundamental to maximizing effectiveness and efficiencies. • The benefit focus should migrate from the individual organization to the common good (benefits to taxpayer /(society) as a whole). That is, organizations need to be introspective when it comes to electing to provide support. • Some stakeholders get little direct benefit from participation but do so because they believe participation is the “right” thing to do and accept the notion of independency is the current reality. • An expectation should be that all interests will do what they can – that the concept of a balance sheet gets in the way.
Acknowledge fair-share contribution in several forms	<p>Agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to recognize that stakeholder contributions come in a variety of forms (i.e. funding, data, expertise, etc) and that all contributions are helpful. • The ramifications of “expecting” stakeholders to bring something to the table should be investigated. What are the implications if the stakeholder community broadens?
Align regional solutions with willing custodian organizations	<p>Agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works well if an organization(s) has a perceived need to support a regional solution (component). If not, the voluntary model may need to be modified to include encouragement (incentives) to support a regional solution. • To consider dropping the term “regional” solution. (<i>Does anyone recall the reason/concern?</i>). Instead refer to as simply “collaborative”.

Voluntary compliance with standards	<p>Agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary compliance was necessary to launch MetroGIS but standards and dominance by others are not longer viewed as threat. Offered as an escape clause. • MetroGIS is not a “legal entity” so voluntary was the only option. Worked well to build to credibility and demonstrate with “willing participants” the value of standards and collaborative solutions. • Widespread adherence to standards will be necessary to achieve expectations for application/service sharing and technology interdependencies. Voluntary compliance is counter intuitive in the current environment which is demanding interoperability. • Need to investigate is possible to pursue “mandatory” implementations with regressing in support. • Need to investigate the implications of mandatory requirements in terms of a broader stakeholder community.
Pursue collaborative solutions when more efficient option	<p>Agree that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each organization participating in the support of a MetroGIS endorsed collaborative solution(s) should not be concerned about MetroGIS addressing needs beyond their individual needs as long as they obtain what they need from MetroGIS’s efforts and are satisfied that their investment is cost effective relative to their internal needs. (E.g. Councilmember Pistilli used the example that it will not be an issue for the Metropolitan Council if MetroGIS pursues policies that involve geography/jurisdictions beyond the seven-county, Metropolitan Area, as long as the Council continues to receive what it needs from MetroGIS’s efforts.) • Change the phrase to “pursue collaborative efficient solutions”. <i>(Is this stated correctly?)</i>
Encourage data enhancements form many sources	Concurred acceptable as stated.

The group concurred that the MetroGIS organization is in a different place than it was eleven years ago and that substantive modifications to the operating standards are in order. It was agreed that a workgroup should be formed to draft recommended modifications to the guiding principles and operating standards to address the preferences identified during the preceding exercises. It was also agreed that it would be acceptable for this workgroup¹³ to work in parallel with the other workgroups expected to be charged with refining strategies to address priority outcomes. In other words, it was agreed that that there is no need for a sequential process.

PROVIDE STRATEGIC DIRECTION:

Part 4 – Priorities and Capabilities

What are the desired priority outcomes, major strategies, and capabilities for the next 3-5 years?

At 1:35 p.m. Bryson asked each participant to place up to three (3) red dots on one or more outcomes they deemed to be the most important for MetroGIS to pursue and up to five (5) blue dots on one or more activities they believed to be the most important to pursue. Each participant was also given two (2) orange dots that they could use to identify any activity or outcome that they can not live with.

At 2:00 p.m. Bryson summarized the results of the voting and provided a brief overview of the relationships and logic that comprise the “concept map” of outcomes and activities that had received the highest number of votes.

The preferred outcomes¹⁴ that received the most number of votes were as follows:

- Solve Real World Problems (*added by consensus at the conclusion of this activity*)
- GIS recognized as essential activity/service (14 votes)
- Expanded resource availability through partnering (12 votes)
- More effective, efficient government (11 votes)
- Improved Reliability and Availability of Geospatial Services Through Partnering (9 votes)
- Better decisions being made (9 votes)
- Broaden Participation (9 votes)
- Achieve common funding strategy (9 votes)
- Develop common applications (9 votes)

The preferred activities that received the most number of votes were as follows:

- Support & develop application services (21 votes)
- Promote and develop technology advancements (17 votes)
- Marketing GIS (14 votes)
- Expansion of MetroGIS stakeholders (14 votes)
- Build infrastructure (11 votes)
- Funding policies to get most efficient and effective use of taxpayers’ money (10 votes)
- Provide A Forum For Knowledge Sharing (10 votes)
- Develop and Maintain Regional Data Solutions To Common Information Needs (8 votes)

(Note to the Reader: *This exercise represented the initial step in defining priorities. The results obtained at the workshop were refined by the staff support team following the Workshop with the assistance of Professor Bryson. This subsequent staff effort involved adding “best estimates” of causal relationships between the activity and related outcome statements identified that were by the three individual workgroups and those not identified by the large group for the combined concept map created at the front of the room. Specialized software was then utilized to capture the raw outcome, activity, and causal relationship data and produce the “concept map” products presented in Appendix H.*

The refined concept maps are intended to serve as a starting point for the various Implementation Workgroups that will be tasked with recommending courses to action to achieve priority outcomes and strategies. This workgroup effort will be a component of the subsequent MetroGIS Business plan Update project. At that time, the refinements offered by the staff support team are expected to be either corroborated or further refined in the course of the effort of each Implementation Workgroup. The refined “concept map” products will be created for the workgroups which illustrate the “structure” of activities and relationships among the activities associated with the outcome they are assigned to address (e.g., an outcome with its component activities and interrelationships). Documenting the “structure” in this manner insures that none of the ideas identified at the Workshop is lost as the recommendations are developed to achieve particular outcomes.)

The final activity associated with the first segment of this exercise involved Bryson facilitating discussion to address each of the following three topics that had received orange dots (can not live

with votes) during the voting exercise. In each case, modifications to the concept map statements were made that resolved the concern:

Concern	Modification to Resolve
Use of the word “eliminate” preceding Legal obstacles to expansion and policy of MetroGIS capacities (1 dot) (Outcome # 776)	It was agreed to change “eliminate” to “overcome”. It was generally agreed that in some cases policy changes will be noted to resolve legal obstacles. <i>(Staff comment – this change incorporated into the concept maps included in this document)</i>
Document stakeholder benefits – (two dots) (Activity # 749)	The concern was that the manner in which this activity was positioned in the workspace implied that “documenting stakeholder benefits” was the only means to expand political support (Outcome #751). It was agreed that MetroGIS should not rely solely on a reactionary strategy (document after the fact) but that other proactive strategy(ies) are also needed to gain and sustain necessary support. The linkage from this activity was modified to reroute it to connect to “build advocacy and awareness (activity #759). <u>(Should the relationship line that connects this activity to Outcome #751 be removed?)</u> . It was agreed that documentation of stakeholder successes /benefits should continue as an important activity. A “build business case” statement (activity # 761) was added to the concept map to encompass the broader strategy concept.

The group concluded that the highest level goals identified in the concept mapping workspace did not connect to real world needs. By consensus, it was agreed that “solve real world problems” should be added as the highest order statement identified to that point. Bryson concluded this component of the workshop by stating that performance indicators are also often embedded in the outcomes located toward the top of the concept map.

REFRESHMENT BREAK

At 2:10 p.m. Bryson recessed the group for a break.

Part 4 – Priorities and Capabilities - Continued

At 2:20 p.m. Bryson reconvened the group and introduced the final component of Part 4. For the outcomes that had received the highest number of votes, Bryson facilitated a brainstorming exercise designed to identify assets and resources that currently exist and those that are needed to achieve the desired outcomes. The results of this exercise are listed in the tables that follow. Discussion of each topic area lasted approximately ten minutes.

Outcome: Marketing and Advocacy

HAVE	NEED
Incredible GIS staff	Making the link for policy makers –information used (report etc.) and its source
Credibility	Show maps
Track record	Demo what data does
Incredible maps and data	Use “cool” language
High concentration	Stronger state level advocacy
Awards program	Access to marketing talent
Increasing public awareness	How to “brand”
Make picture maps	Take complimentary advantage of not competitive

Outcome: Expansion of MetroGIS Stakeholder

HAVE	NEED
Public stakeholders	Private and nonprofit (define their expectations, find a way to bring them in)
Other counties interested	Incorporating counties where (contiguous?) <i>Need to define</i>
Model works	Stakeholder versus participant
Council seeking opportunities to go beyond 7 counties VOLUNTARY	Encourage
State agencies desire similar	Cities to be engaged utilities and others
	Accept different levels of detail/scale
	Scaleable model

Outcome: Support and Develop Applications

HAVE	NEED
Governance structure and process in place to facilitate common outcomes	Build strategic alignment with other data and technology related initiatives e.g. MCCC and INET project
	Initiative with IS/IT (local) around fiber optic i.e.
	Building awareness of existing infrastructure
	Cities need high speed
	Examine high availability, band with and redundancy reexamine partnerships for mission critical

Outcome: Develop Regional Data Solutions

HAVE	NEED
We have some current data	Vehicle to keep data current by others
Method for identifying and developing data	More standards
Standards	Other government agencies to maintain in geospatial form
Metadata format	What’s missing inventory
Flexible and visionary relevant marketable data base	
Flexible solutions to access to data	
Figure out how to work with utilities	

Group Conclusion: A new concept emerged from this discussion, consistent with the preference for an outward looking view of the benefit of MetroGIS’s efforts: Organizations agree to maintain data that is not critically needed for an inside operation to support a component of a regionally significant application through which the data provider obtains information valuable to their operations.

Outcome: Funding

HAVE	NEED
Existing investments	Inventory how much what by whom
Redundancy?	Grant acquisition strategy
Have received grants (1999, 2001)	How to fund other than regional or topic specifics
Community forum	Politically influence state for funds and it is states interest to fund local
Metropolitan. Council	Not using power
Strategies that need local partners	
Collective buying power	

Group Conclusion: The group concurred there is a need for MetroGIS to advocate for state funding to improve capacity needed elsewhere for MetroGIS to achieve its goals. MetroGIS should seek alliances with interests involved in the development of infrastructure such as broadband and fiber to leverage the organizational capacity possessed by MetroGIS to achieve outcomes important to stakeholders within both (more) alliance communities.

Outcome: Infrastructure

Have	Need
Governance structure + process in place to facilitate common outcomes.	1) Build strategic alignment w/ other data + technology related initiatives e.g. MCCC and the INET project
	2) Initiative with IS/IT (local) around fiber optic i.e.
	3) Building awareness of existing infrastructure
	4) Cities need high speed
	5) Examine high availability, bandwidth + redundancy + examine partnerships for mission critical

Group Conclusion: Consider seeking out a strategic alliance to coordinate with cities and school districts that are building capacity with through development of fiber networks. Apply the concept of build once, use many times in a different way – across sectors to leverage strategic alliances. Interconnections between

the Information Technology (IT) and GIS communities are lacking as is high speed capacity both of which are important to achieving the “Build Applications” strategy.

Outcome: Forum for Knowledge Sharing

HAVE	NEED
A lot of information quarterly	Frequency
GIS consortium	Use to go statewide
User groups	Communication to share other opportunities
Won workshops	Work with groups with similar interest
June and Today	Online forums
Governors council strategic planning	Id others and reach out to others “parties” a
Met council staff support	Active workgroups
	Purpose needed for work groups
	More people to avoid burn out
	Smaller scale test beds
	Create momentum with some making news

Group Conclusion: Staff can only do so much. Members of the Coordinating Committee (and Policy Board?) need carry the message to their respective communities. Forums for sharing ideas are great but something needs to be produced. Consider involving a collar county in a project to demonstrate viability and build momentum. Also need to leverage the Metropolitan Council’s resolution to use MetroGIS’s model beyond the Metropolitan Area to communicate the value of collaboration to achieve common geospatial needs. Important to produce a product but acknowledged that staff resources in addition to the those contributed by the Metropolitan Council will be needed to be successfully achieve the desired outcomes. The idea of seeking grants was suggested as one means to expand capacity that should be pursued.

PROVIDE STRATEGIC DIRECTION:

Part 5 – Implications for Mission Statement

Is the current MetroGIS Mission Statement consistent with outcomes desired for the next 3-5 years?

At 3:55 p.m. Bryson summarized the work that the group had accomplished and commented that a good deal of progress had been made to decide what to do, what is needed to accomplish those desired actions and outcomes, and what will be the likely result if those activities and outcomes are in fact accomplished. He then introduced the final exercise for the day, which was designed to identify modifications desired to the current mission statement necessary to align it with desired next-generation outcomes.

Bryson then invited the group to comment on the current mission statement:

“Provide an ongoing, stakeholder governed, metro-wide mechanism through which participants easily and equitably share geographically referenced data that are accurate, current, secure, of common benefit and readily usable.”

(Note to the reader, for easy reference, a poster-sized listing (3-feet wide and 3-feet tall) of MetroGIS’s mission was hung on wall in the papered working space next to the composite activity and outcome statements created in Part 3.)

The discussion began with a request of Bryson to comment on the optimal length for a mission statement and whether the current statement is too long. He responded that a more important consideration is to have a statement that is inspiring.

After several minutes of conversation, it was agreed that stakeholder understandings and their needs have actually moved beyond some of the philosophies represented in the current mission and, as such, a new statement is needed to guide MetroGIS's effort from this point forward. It was agreed that the small group created to recommend changes to the guiding principles and operating standards should be also charged with recommending a new mission statement. Bryson mentioned that components of a mission statement are often represented by outcomes located near the top of the workspace (concept map); in this case, the work spaces created during Parts 2 and 3.

There was general discussion about the preferences for the concepts that the modified mission statement¹⁵ should include:

- Outward looking stakeholders – value/benefit to the region as a whole to solve real world problems as opposed previous inward looking focus on benefits.
- Declare MetroGIS's efforts to be critical to effectively supporting wise decisions in modern democracy.
- Declare to be in the public interest to foster use of geospatial technology to its full capacity
- The concepts embedded in the current center clause “equitably share” statement should be retained.
- Resolve the potential inconsistency between use of the term “Metro” in MetroGIS's title and the preference to expand the constituencies that comprise MetroGIS. It was acknowledged that the label “Metro” carries with it an element of identity. Is this still appropriate/desirable?
- Evaluate whether major changes or simply refinements to the underpinning philosophy and mission are needed to address comments and concerns. If substantive changes are involved, would “rebranding” to a name other than “MetroGIS” appropriate/desirable?
- Is there value in referring to MetroGIS as a virtual enterprise, charged with bundling operational capacity across stakeholder operations to effectively address common needs?
- A mission statement should have deeper meaning than a slogan.

REFLECTIONS

At 4:20 p.m. Bryson affirmed that the group had accomplished a good deal today and during the past eleven years.

(Note to Reader: Due a lack of time, a decision was made to skip the exercise than had been planned to ask each participant to describe the day's experience with one word.)

FORUM CLOSING

At 4:25 p.m. Bryson introduced William Brown, Chairperson of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee, to comment on his expectations for next steps.

Brown prefaced his comments by quoting a statement made by Harlan Cleveland at the 2001 National GeoData Alliance Conference held in Denver. The quote was “information has an inherent tendency to leak and the more we have, the more it leaks. He then reaffirmed his comments during the morning introductions that he intends to bring to the Committee's deliberations thoughts about how to streamline access to data, in particular, parcel data. He also

shared that he believes the time is here for Hennepin County to move past its history of restrictive “custody of data” policies and that he will do his best to overcome these and other obstacles to broad access to data.

Chairperson Reinhardt was invited to offer closing comments. She used an analogy of being told over and over about the need to drink water while attending the same 2001 conference referenced by Brown but because the why was not explained, she had not drunk enough water and ended up getting altitude sickness. Her message was that one can not just tell another about the needs to be done but one must explain why to fully communicate with the other person. Chairperson Reinhardt concluded her comments by emphasizing that a well written mission and guiding principles are needed to accomplish the telling of the why.

At 4:30 p.m. Bryson adjourned the workshop by encouraging each participant to complete and submit an evaluation form and thanked everyone for their hard work.

REFINEMENT OF PRODUCTS FOLLOWING WORKSHOP

Part 6 – Explanation of Comment and Refinement Processes

Following the Workshop, the Workshop Support Team and Business Planning Oversight Team:

- 1) Captured the ideas generated by the participants in the form of a “causal or concept map” using specialized software entitled Banxia Decision Explorer¹⁶ and
- 2) Summarized the processes used at the Workshop and the major results of those processes in the form of an earlier version of this document.
- 3) Crafted vision and mission statements and finalized language for guiding principles from the refined “causal maps” and direction received at Workshop.

A Workshop Summary was distributed to the participants for comment on March 15th to insure their recollections of the day were correctly captured. The only change requested was from Chairperson Reinhardt who asked that the Executive Summary more clearly state the outcomes of the workshop relative to where the group started the day. That request resulted in a decision to expand the Workshop Summary document to include this section, a description of the post-workshop refinement process, in addition to documenting the results of the Workshop itself.

The refinement process was conducted to improve the readability and general usefulness of the “causal map” created at the February 8th Strategic Directions Workshop and by so doing clarify major desired outcomes and related strategies to accomplish them.

The support team met six times from February 27 to April 5, the last four meetings with Professor Bryson, who facilitated the Workshop, to distill and interpret the ideas and direction received at the Workshop. The Business Oversight Team also met twice, the last time on April 9 to refine direction received at the Workshop into vision and mission statements and to finalize language for guiding principles to present to the Policy Board for comment on April 25, 2007¹⁷.

After each meeting of workshop support team, a modified “causal map” was produced, which in turn, led to the identification of further desired refinements to improve the usefulness of the product. Refinements made included:

- (1) Rearranging the activities and outcomes presented in the “casual map” to improve clarity and understanding of relationship. Among the major realizations that occurred early on was the presence of both community-focused outcomes and capacity building outcomes. .

- (2) Adding “best estimates” of causal relationships between activity and related outcome statements that had been identified by the three individual workgroups at the workshop and for those not identified on the combined concept map created by the full group at the February 8th Workshop,
- (3) Consolidating like statements.
- (4) Applying a color and highlighting scheme to clarify the hierarchy between highest level and supporting outcomes and activities.

The primary reasons for taking the time and effort to distill the “causal map” into an enhanced product¹⁸, including incorporation of the results of the straw polling of ideas of the most importance to the participants, were to:

- (1) Insure none of ideas offered at the Workshop is lost,
- (2) Create a means to readily visualize the agreed upon desired outcomes and activities and logic of the relationships among and between them.
- (3) Provide accurate and definitive guidance for subsequent task-specific workgroups charged defining options to achieve each of the major activity areas as part of the Next-Generation Business Planning initiative, specifically to provide:
 - (a) Ability to quickly identify the outcomes that their efforts are intended to achieve.
 - (b) A preliminary overview of steps that likely will be important to defining a recommended solution.
 - (c) Easily identify related subtasks that were identified by the participants of the Strategic Directions Workshop.

Appendix A

MetroGIS

Cooperation, Coordination, Sharing Geographic Data



Strategic Directions Workshop *Setting the Stage for the Next-Generation of Collaboration*

Thursday, February 8, 2007

Room 180, Hubert H. Humphrey Center, University of Minnesota

7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Purpose: *Establish a clear and agreed upon direction regarding key issues and opportunities to be explored during the Next-Generation MetroGIS Business Planning process.*

Facilitator: *John Bryson, Professor of Planning and Public Affairs and Associate Dean for Research and Centers, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota*

Program

- 7:45 a.m. Continental Breakfast Provided and Pick up Name Tags**
- 8:15 Welcome**
Victoria Reinhardt, MetroGIS Policy Board Chairperson and Ramsey County Commissioner
- 8:20 Introductions**
- 8:50 Setting the Stage: Historical Overview – A Decade of Fostering Collaboration**
William Craig, Associate Director Center of Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota, charter member and former Chair of the MetroGIS Coordinating Committee
- 9:00 Provide Strategic Direction: Part 1 – Opportunities, Challenges, Activities**
Facilitation question – What should MetroGIS be doing the next 3-5 years?
- 10:30 Refreshment Break**
- 10:50 Provide Strategic Direction: Part 2 – Outcomes, Results**
Facilitation question – What would result if MetroGIS did these things?
- 11:45 Lunch (provided on site)**
- 12:30 Provide Strategic Direction: Part 3 – Guiding Principles**
Agree on general philosophy to guide future MetroGIS efforts
- 12:45 Provide Strategic Direction: Part 4 – Priorities and Capabilities**
Agree on desired priority outcomes, major strategies, and needed capabilities.
- 2:30 Refreshment Break**
- 2:45 Provide Desired Strategic Direction: Part 5 – Implications for Mission Statement**
- 3:30 Reflections**
Professor John Bryson, Lead Workshop Facilitator
- 4:15 Closing and Overview of Next Steps**
William Brown, Hennepin County Surveyor, and Chairperson, MetroGIS Coordinating Committee

Appendix B

Program Transition Slides

http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/program_transition_slides.pdf

Appendix C

Workshop Evaluation Results

Of the 32 participants, 25 submitted an evaluation of their workshop experience. The results of their evaluation of the various aspects of the workshop are as follows:

Outstanding .. 5
Good 4
Average 3
Poor 2
Terrible 1

Did this Workshop Provide an Effective Means to:

1. Incorporate diverse viewpoints?	4.48
2. Capture new ideas/opportunities?	4.48
3. Identify ways to improve current practice?	4.04
4. Reach consensus on policy direction?	4.00
5. Set realistic and actionable priorities?	3.92
<i>Cumulative Average</i>	4.18

Usefulness of Materials Provided Before Workshop:

1. Background Information Packet	4.20
2. Information Brochure – <i>Sharing Information Across Boundaries</i>	3.96
3. “Starter Kit” Statements	4.08
4. Roster of Participants	4.32

Effectiveness of Program:

Part 1: Opportunities, Challenges, Activities (<i>Small Group</i>)	4.72
Part 2: Outcomes, Results (<i>Small Group</i>)	4.60
Part 3: Guiding Principles (<i>Large Group</i>)	4.32
Part 4: Priorities and Capabilities (<i>Large Group</i>)	4.32
Part 5: Implications for Mission Statement (<i>Large Group</i>)	4.25
<i>Cumulative Average</i>	4.44

Adequacy of Facilities:

1. Location – University of Minnesota, West Bank	4.12
2. Meeting Room	4.16
3. Food	4.20
<i>Cumulative Average</i>	4.16

Please Identify the most inspiring idea you brought away from the Workshop

- Sell the outcomes not the process.
- Restructure/Reorganize/Revise Metro GIS components/organizational structure. – *Ron Wencl*
- More frequent information sharing.
- Willingness of participants to challenge their own attorneys. – *Will Craig*
- Possible change to mission statement reflects the importance of the workshop outcome.
- Willingness to expand reach of Metro GIS – *Terry Schneider*
- Advocacy and expansion – *David Claypool*
- Maturing organization – Can move to higher level mission
- Collaboration, Community – *Ned Phillips*
- Metro GIS no longer needs to justify its purpose but that it has support for a transformation to something more ambitious in function and ambitious in geographic scope.
- We are still on the same page! We have come to a consensus that we need to move forward, and we have the start of a roadmap for the next generation.
- More and open participation

- The group is looking forward; feeling successful
- Re-focus mission statement on results + value of Metro GIS – *Mark Vander Schaaf*
- Expansion of mission upward – Connection to increased presence of GIS in daily lives – *Kari Craun*
- Dump mission statement –think bigger
- Idea of GIS becoming a central function (of government?) rather than peripheral
- New directions, new guiding principles, new mission statement, new opportunities

Please identify one thing that if achieved would make this Workshop a major success.

- Public/private partnerships
- Increased access to data – *Ron Wencl*
- Getting behind the marketing ideas and making them a reality
- Take a serious review of key messages from June 1 forum – *Will Craig*
- Clear direction for application and services
- Connect with private sector – *Terry Schneider*
- The reaffirmation of our design and usefulness to our community – *David Claypool*
- Additional stakeholders -
- Expanded participation
- If ideas presented are turned in obtainable outcomes – Find way to engage private sector expertise
- Clearly express the intent and scope of Metro GIS expressed in a mission statement and strategic priorities that can be fulfilled by a committed group of stakeholders.
- Re-write mission statement, guiding principles and operating standard; comprehensive notes and follow-through
- Broader base of open partnering
- Get some improvement in the legal area
- Work-plan to make Metro GIS relevant on the age of the internet – *Mark Vander Schaaf*
- Develop a list of required/needed applications to meet participant business needs. – *Kari Craun*
- Evolution of the identity of this group to encompass the outcomes outlined today
- Get a demonstration project or model with a private partner using GIS data

Additional Comments:

- The interdependence of many areas was apparent – may be hard to do one, then another – they tend to support each other

-I worry that good details are lost from early rounds of activities, e.g., – *Will Craig*

1) June 1 forum/internet

2) Take Metro GIS model to other regions around country

I also endorse idea of involving new people. Therefore I opt out of business plan update

-I'm a little concerned that we seem so ready to toss out Metro as our scope and GIS as our focus.

Outcomes “effective government, better decision making, etc... are obviously the point, but we are bringing GIS to the party and shouldn't be discouraged from letting people know about it.

-Excellent forum!! Well worth the time spent today

-In my view, there was too much information provided in the background packet – I think it would have been fine to provide just the final edited statements that we used during the workshop with some basic introductory comments. – *Mark Vander Schaaf*

-I was surprised at how far it went beyond “status quo” Excellent preparation by the people who put on this event!

Appendix D

Background Information Packet

http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/background_info_pkt.pdf

Appendix E

“Starter Kit” Statements

http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/starter_kit_statements.pdf

Appendix F
Workshop Participants and Support Team

(To be included in the final document)



January 11, 2007

Name
Organization
Address
City, ST 00000

MetroGIS Strategic Directions Workshop (February 8, 2007)

Dear Name:

As Chairperson of the MetroGIS Policy Board, it is my pleasure to personally invite you to join me for the MetroGIS Strategic Directions **Workshop** scheduled for **Thursday, February 8, 2007**. An all-day event is planned, including continental breakfast and lunch provided by MetroGIS. A preliminary Workshop program is attached. In January, each confirmed participant will receive a packet of background information and a few questions to think about prior to the Workshop.

The purpose of the February 8th Workshop is to establish clear and agreed upon direction regarding key issues and opportunities to be explored during MetroGIS's upcoming MetroGIS Business Planning process, through which strategic initiatives for the next 3-5 years will be set. The Workshop will be facilitated by Professor John Bryson, Associate Dean for Research and Centers, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota. Professor Bryson facilitated a similar workshop eleven years ago that resulted in launching MetroGIS and providing strategic guidance that has served MetroGIS well since that time.

As a member of MetroGIS's Policy Board or Coordinating Committee, your perspective and leadership are highly valued. Your participation in this Workshop is important. Please understand that a **full day commitment** is involved, with each Workshop segment building on the previous. To optimize effectiveness, Workshop participation is limited to 36 individuals, who possess a diversity of professional and organizational expertise reflective of MetroGIS's stakeholder community. Current Policy Board and Coordinating Committee members are the target participants. However, to achieve the desired diversity of perspectives in the slots available, we ask that you RSVP only if you can participate for the entire day.

To help staff insure that optimal attendance will meet achieved, please **RSVP by January 8th** by contacting Randall Johnson, MetroGIS Staff Coordinator, (randy.johnson@metc.state.mn.us or at 651-602-1638). After January 8th, any remaining open seats will be offered to others who possess perspective and expertise valuable to MetroGIS's efforts.

Again, I trust you will accept this invitation and plan on participating in this important Workshop, as your input is important to setting widely supported objectives for MetroGIS's future efforts. The goal is to present a draft Next-Generation MetroGIS Business Plan to the Policy Board at its July 2007 meeting.

Sincerely,

Victoria Reinhardt, Chair
MetroGIS Policy Board *and*
Ramsey County Commissioner



Strategic Directions Workshop *Setting the Stage for the Next-Generation of Collaboration*

Thursday, February 8, 2007

Room 180, H. Humphrey Center, University of Minnesota (*proposed*)
7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Purpose: Establish a clear and agreed upon direction regarding key issues and opportunities to be explored during the Next-Generation MetroGIS Business Planning process.

Facilitator: John Bryson, Professor of Planning and Public Affairs and Associate Dean for Research and Centers, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota

Preliminary Program

7:45 a.m. Continental Breakfast and Pick up Program Materials

8:15 Welcome

Victoria Reinhardt, MetroGIS Policy Board Chairperson and Ramsey County Commissioner

8:20 Introductions

8:50 Setting the Stage:

- *What does it mean to be a member of MetroGIS*
- *Overview of what's working and what's not*
- *Questions about background materials provided to participants prior to Workshop*

10:00 Refreshment Break

10:15 Provide Desired Strategic Direction: Part 1 – Opportunities, Challenges, Activities

Facilitation question – What should MetroGIS be doing the next 3-5 years?

12:00 p.m. Lunch (on site)

12:45 Provide Desired Strategic Direction: Part 2 – Outcomes, Results

Facilitation Question – What would result if MetroGIS did these things?

2:30 Refreshment Break

2:45 Provide Desired Strategic Direction: Part 3 – Priorities

3:15 Provide Desired Strategic Direction: Part 4 – Confirm Direction

4:25 Closing

Appendix H

Concept Maps

The complexity of the “concept maps” makes them difficult to read if printed on paper less than 22 x 34 inches in size. Therefore, rather than include printouts of them in this document we have elected to provide URLs to view each of the concept maps online, which are downloadable and printable if the reader has the capacity to print in this larger format.

1. Concept Map Created by the Lines Workgroup
http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/conceptmaps/lines.pdf
2. Concept Map Created by the Points Workgroup
http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/conceptmaps/points.pdf
3. Concept Map Created by the Polygons Workgroup
http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/conceptmaps/polys.pdf
4. Composite Concept Map (Large Group Exercise)
http://www.metrogis.org/about/business_planning/sdw/conceptmaps/group.pdf

Note regarding concept maps: The green connections were added by staff after the Workshop, whereas the black connections were added by the participants during the Workshop.

ENDNOTES:

- ¹ See Page 8 of the Background Information Packet provided in Appendix D. A “Give-Take” diagram is presented on this page that illustrates interests important to the long-term success of MetroGIS. This document was sent to participants prior to the workshop.
- ² See Appendix B for a full accounting of the evaluation results.
- ³ The participants agreed that a workgroup should be formed to refine the direction generally agreed upon at the Workshop to propose specific modifications to MetroGIS’s mission statement and guiding principles. Two workgroups engaged immediately following the Workshop. The results of their efforts were presented to the MetroGIS Policy Board on April 25, 2007. The agenda report can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07_0425/index.shtml.
- ⁴ See Appendix XX. This “map” is the as depicted on the walls at the Workshop prior to any refinement to improve readability. The “casual mapping” technique was selected to provide a means to readily visualize the agreed upon desired outcomes and activities and relationships among them.
- ⁵ See Appendix XXX. The information depicted on this “enhanced map” is the same as shown on the “original map” created at the workshop. However, enhancements were made to improve readability without changing substance.
- ⁶ These indicators will be the substance of the Performance Measurement Plan Update process that is schedule to launch once the Business Plan Update project is essentially complete. Identification of these performance indicators is a direct result of utilizing the “casual map” facilitation and analysis technique.
- ⁷ See Appendix G for Chairperson Reinhardt’s letter of invitation to participate.
- ⁸ See Appendix A for the workshop program.
- ⁹ See Appendix E, Attachment 1, for a listing of these statements.
- ¹⁰ A component of the subsequent Business Plan Update Project will involve a comparison of MetroGIS’s current core activities (regional data solutions, mechanism to discover and access data via the Internet, and forum for knowledge sharing) to those identified at this Workshop for the next 3-5 years.
- ¹¹ A component of the subsequent Business Plan Update Project will involve a comparison of MetroGIS’s current priority outcomes, including guiding principles, operating standards and components of the mission statement that have guided MetroGIS’s efforts thus far, to those identified at this Workshop for the next 3-5 years.
- ¹² The list of 13 guiding principles and operating standards was created following a small group exercise facilitated at the December 2006 Coordinating Committee meeting. A draft listing had been shared for comment at the meeting and suggestions obtained via four simultaneous small group sessions were consolidated to create the list included in the “starter kit”. This list was also shared with the Policy Board for comment at its January 2007 meeting but not changes were offered. Given level of preliminary consideration, it was a surprising that such an engaging discussion of these principles and guidelines ensured at the Workshop as well.
- ¹³ The Business Planning Oversight Team meet on March 20th to prepare for the March 28th Policy Board meeting. The Team reached agreement on draft policy statements to address four cross-cutting issues identified at the Workshop (definition of common need, geographic scope, whether to pursue applications as a component of solutions to common information needs, and definition of stakeholder/participant/partner). The logic of the Team’s recommendations was embedded in the draft policy foundation presented to the Policy Board on April 25, 2007. The agenda report can be viewed at http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07_0425/index.shtml. Item 3a in the Reference Section outlines suggested policies to address the four cross-cutting issues.
- ¹⁴ A component of the subsequent Business Plan Update Project will involve a comparison of MetroGIS’s current priorities to those identified at this Workshop for the next 3-5 years.
- ¹⁵ A component to the subsequent Business Plan Update Project will involve crafting a new mission statement that incorporates the comments offered at this Workshop to guide MetroGIS’s efforts for the next 3-5 years. A vision (destination) statement, in addition to a mission (organizational means) statement, will be investigated as a means to fully address the comments and suggestions offered.
- ¹⁶ See Appendix XX. This version of the “causal map” displays the ideas, as depicted on the walls at the Workshop, prior to any refinement to improve readability. The “causal mapping” technique was selected to provide a means to readily visualize the agreed upon desired outcomes and activities and relationships among them. The “causal mapping” technique is promoted by Professor John Bryson as a tool to assist with the process of strategic planning. His use of this technique was a major consideration in the decision to retain Professor Bryson to assist MetroGIS launch its Strategic Planning initiative. In general, use of this technique helps the participants visualize relationships between and among principal deliverables of the strategic planning process – desired outcomes and activities/strategies through which to achieve outcomes.
- ¹⁷ See http://www.metrogis.org/teams/pb/meetings/07_0425/index.shtml for the agenda report to the Policy Board.
- ¹⁸ See Appendix XXX. The information depicted on this “enhanced map” is the same as shown on the “original map” created at the workshop. The enhancements were made to improve readability without changing substance.