



Technical Leadership Workgroup

Minutes – Tuesday, June 17, 2008

1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

MESB/Mosquito Control Offices

2099 University Ave. W., St. Paul

Present: Mark Kotz, Jim Maxwell, John Carpenter, Dave Bitner, Bob Basques, Nancy Read.

Absent: Chris Cialek, Robert Taylor

1. Welcome, Introductions, Note Taker

Mark Kotz called the meeting to order and members introduced themselves. Jim Maxwell agreed to take notes. Kotz noted that Robert Taylor, new employee at Carver County, will be joining the group in place of Pete Henschel and will attend the next meeting.

2. Approve Agenda

Meeting time was changed to 1:00 to 2:30

3. Past Meeting Summary

The May meeting summary was approved with no changes.

4. Coordinating Committee Note

Mark and Nancy will be giving a report of our workgroup progress to the Coordinating Committee; i.e., a review of our charges.

5. Process for Defining Shared Needs for Web Services and Applications

Does the 1996 data process help us? Mark K. thought it was limited in commonality to this effort. Not all needs are spatial and we need to be open to whatever the users “need to do” with an application.

Here is a list of example applications and services that seemed to be needed based on the 87 “mutually exclusive” information needs.

- Given an address or an X/Y, what jurisdiction am I in (e.g. city, county, watershed, park district, airport commission district, congressional district)
- Same as above, what are the environmental conditions
- Given a PIN or address, what are the attributes of a parcel
- There could be lots more of these...

John C.: Hard to define a “top-ten” application classification as it will always be changing. Let a “list” evolve by asking for input.

Dave B: Try to identify “common needs”. MetroGIS should not be in the position of funding or defining or directing the applications. MetroGIS’s role should be as a facilitator/expeditor while the MetroGIS partners can take on various application roles.

Bob B. / Dave B.: We need some clear definition at some time as to what applications, services, data publishing, data facilitation mechanisms, hosting, etc. are. They can be combined or nested as well.

Metadata discussion: We're used to metadata describing datasets. We now will have to create metadata for data services and documentation for other services and applications. Kotz mentioned that the GeoService Finder project has developed a set of core elements to document web services and applications.

Mark K.: We need to define the priorities for shared applications and then determine the feasibility of completing that application; e.g., is it cost prohibitive. Our workgroup's role is to define the process for this.

Nancy: How do we handle data maintenance – especially by multiple organizations? If we have a group setting we need to give initial guidance by laying out what we're talking about and giving direction.

Dave: Group setting may help people hear others ideas and glom on to ideas that they believe in but still may not have thought of.

The group put together a list of general categories of web services and applications. It was acknowledged that these categories are overlapping and not exclusive. Nancy's whiteboard list:

1. Data publishing
 - a. Wms
 - b. Wfs
 - c. facilitation mechanism
 - d. controls – access, how to open; more impt. to private sector
 - e. delivery methods
 - f. cascading – i.e. show “my” data over orthophoto, provide combo as WMS
2. Data maintenance
 - a. Online editing tools
 - b. Single/multiple organizations
3. Simple querying of different sources
 - a. filtering on the fly
4. Presentation/Integration
 - a. Tools
 - b. derived data sets
 - c. Example: property comparables. GeoMoose, MnDOT app.
5. Enabling tools
 - a. service finder
 - b. hosting, framework for working on issues, discussion

NEED: a.) education in these, b.) participants who understand tech possibilities

Dave: What are the issues involved with the above list?

Mark/Jim: Is our charge to answer the question above?

John. Our group could help enable how people look at pulling the pieces together. Perhaps help come up with a framework.

Would a large group setting even understand what we're talking about? What background knowledge would any group need to have. Example, it would be helpful if they knew the kinds of things that *could* be done.

Mark: How should we facilitate the defining of desired shared applications?

(i.e., what method). The group agreed on the following concepts for a forum to define and prioritize shared needs for web services and applications.

1. Likely a medium-sized group of 20-30 people, very similar to the January forum.
2. We will need people who are technically somewhat savvy and can understand what we are talking about and see possibilities, and can also advocate for the business needs of their organization.
3. Start with an educational portion that describes, explains and even demos representative examples of applications and web services to get people thinking about them
 - a. Include the list of possible applications and services we created at today's meeting from the 1996 information needs results
 - b. Also discuss the categories of apps and services and explain what kinds of things might be in each category and how they overlap
4. Next have some kind of brainstorming session to tease out more applications and services we might need. This will need to be kind of a conversation to generate ideas and allow people to interact and build off of each other's ideas. We might want to do this as a whole group or in small breakout groups or both.
5. Then we will need to attempt to organize the defined apps and services in some way to allow people to get a handle on them and see the big picture and the details. Maybe put them into the categories.
6. Finally we will need to prioritize the needs. We might want to do this in multiple ways. E.g.
 - a. Give everyone unlimited dots and ask them to put one dot by any app/service they think their organization would use
 - b. Give them 5 dots and let them pick highest priorities
 - c. Somehow indicate what apps/services their organization would be willing to put resources into creating (how different is this from b. above?)
 - d. Have them also indicate their organization type on dots so we can know if cities want one thing, counties want another, private sector wants another, etc.
 - e. We do not want people to vote or prioritize based on what they think it will cost, but on what they need. We can define and weigh the costs later.

Mark Kotz (and after the fact) Chris Cialek agreed to be facilitators for the forum.

Next Step: Flesh out how we're going to run this forum.

- Start with defining the deliverables and desired outcomes.
- Begin the process of determining who likely participants will be. Combo of technically savvy people who can also advocate for the business needs of their organization.
- What are the details of the process?

6. **Adjourn** The group adjourned at 2:35