

MetroGIS Business Planning Oversight Team
Meeting Notes – May 22, 2007
1 to 3 p.m.
Metro County Government Center

Team Members Present: Nancy Read, Jane Harper, Mark Vander Schaaf, and Rick Gelbmann.

Staff Support Team Members Present: Randall Johnson and Jonathan Blake

1. Identify Competencies and Resources (Current and Needed)

Prior to the meeting, staff provided the members with a preliminary listing of competency statements to stimulate discussion that were categorized under three headings: Create Public Value, Sustain Political Legitimacy and Support, and Sustain Cross Jurisdictional Operational Capacity. (*Chris – add the May 11 “concept map illustration as an attachment for the record”).*

Staff prefaced this discussion by commenting that:

- The members should concentrate on defining MetroGIS’s competencies and not give any consideration at this time to how the competencies relate to the strategies. The latter will be topic of future discussion when Professor Bryson is present.
- The members should not be bogged down in the labels used to categorize the draft listing of competencies. The competencies themselves are the topic of discussion.
- If a problem arises with discussion of competencies in a conceptual and theoretical context, the discussion group should consider thinking about them in terms of specific strategies.

General Discussion Notes

- Competencies are the “engines” that make performing certain activities possible
- Competencies that cannot be tied to a necessary activity are meaningless
- Self-reinforcing loop: Better product → More support → Increased availability of resources → Better product
- Note on “Core Capacities” map: 100 level items are aspirations, 200 and 300 level items are competencies.

Competencies – Have now

Staff commented that competencies include abilities MetroGIS currently has but also those which are needed or need to be improved. The group then offered the following responses to the statement “MetroGIS possesses the ability to _____”:

- Bring together organizations to collaborate and build capacity (sharing resources to achieve common goal that individual stakeholder organizations cannot achieve on their own)
- Gain broad “buy-in,” leading to better public value. Achieve trust in the collaborative products leads to more use and less duplication of effort (i.e. better understanding of the product builds trust).
- Create meeting experiences valuable to the participants were the cost of attending is less than what the participants get out of the experience. Participants able to focus on

knowledge sharing (who's doing what) and decision-making and not logistics, which are supported by staff.

- Attract/engage broad-based participation respected participants (with diverse and appropriate content knowledge). (#205 and 303)
- Ability to operate outside of any organization.
- Provide structures/means for data sharing
- Understand and anticipate customer need/demand, but being inclusive during needs identification proceedings.
- Utilize workgroups and engage competent leadership to effectively address diverse views and needs with sensitivity and timely responsiveness.
- Show results for broad constituencies, relevant to the participant and their respective organizations.
- Show how technical results translate into organizational benefits - why good for business (e.g. testimonials, County stakeholder demonstrations to the Policy Board, June 1, 2006 Forum, etc.).
- Engage more people in production of content, yielding broader base of users.
- Create and sustain a public/private marketplace for geographic data and information (*Consider recognizing as an outcome.*)
- Collaborative define the infrastructure and inter-organizational components needed to support a metro market place.
- Leverage talent in Twin Cities area to make DataFinder attractive/useful
- Maintain political support and legitimacy
- Be flexible and nimble, respond quickly as technology changes. (Note, the group recognized that maintaining flexibility has implications for MetroGIS's organizational structure)

Competencies- Needed

“MetroGIS need to improve its ability to _____”:

- Attract and engage the non traditional user.

Topic for Future Discussion

- Importance of active involvement in MetroGIS by policymakers (and define “policymaker”)

2. Review Draft Challenges and Strategies Section of Business Plan

In response to a question, the group spent some time reviewing the “concept map” date April 13, 2007 for the origin of the six priority activity areas listed in the annotation under Item 1 of the meeting agenda. After some discussion, the team concluded that “advocacy and awareness” should have a marketing emphasis and that knowledge sharing should be dealt with as a separate activity area.

The discussion of need for an emphasis on marketing evolved into a broader conversation about the meaning of “stakeholder”. The group concurred that beneficiary is different than participant and that there are different types of participants. All concurred that users-only, or consumers, of MetroGIS's services are beneficiaries but are not participants and that marketing should be directed to these interests to encourage their participation. This conclusion led to a discussion of

what it means to be a “participant”. The consensus was that “participant” has at three component meanings: 1) organizational custodial role, 2) individuals assisting with decision support in the workgroup/committee structure, and 3) producers that do not participate in the decision making or formal custodial roles. It was also agreed that there is continuum of participation from infrequent to regular. Staff agreed to develop a proposal to capture these ideas in the Business plan (See table in Section 2.5).

The group also agreed that the activity titles, as listed in the “concept map” need to be stated in the strategies presented in the Business Plan.

The group then discussed

The group decided another meeting should be scheduled to discuss specific strategies. It was also agreed that to ensure we make the best use of the limited time remaining with Professor Bryson that the meeting scheduled for June 6 should be postponed until the Team has better defined both desired strategies and competencies before sharing them with him for advice.

3. Business Plan Schedule

Discussion deferred to the next meeting

4. Coordinating Committee Update

It was generally agreed that the information to be shared with the Committee at the June 27th meeting should include:

- Outline for the Plan document (ask if anything is missing?)
- Update on all aspects of the Plan development process
- Framework for where we a going (timeline and related actions)
- Sections for Challenges and Strategies and if possible Operational Implications
- Intention to seek Board approval at the time of the Business Plan is adopted in October 2007 of 2008 workplan and preliminary 2009workplan and budget request

It was also agreed that the Committee should break into small groups to be led by Team members to facilitate comment. More discussion about how to achieve the desired feedback is to be a discussion item at the next Team meeting, including potential for a special Committee meeting.

5. Next Meeting

The group asked staff to speak with the members who were not in attendance about their preference to meet on June 5 (AM or PM) or June 7 (PM) for the next meeting. Staff agreed to refine the draft Plan to incorporate direction received at this meeting. Staff was also asked to provide a draft outline for the entire Plan.

Prepared by

Randall Johnson
MetroGIS Staff Coordinator
and
Jonathan Blake

MetroGIS Staff Support Team