

Vermont Enterprise GIS Task Force (EGT)

**VERMONT'S ENTERPRISE GIS INITIATIVE
MEETING
MINUTES**

Strategic Planning Workshop 1
10/9/2007 1 – 4 pm
AHS, Skylight Conference Room

EGT Participants Present

- Louis Borie
- David Brotzman
- Andy Condon
- Dana Dean
- John Hanning
- Shawn Nailor
- Lin Neifert
- Melissa Prindiville
- Jason Roberts
- Steve Sharp
- Peter Telep
- Peter Young

EGT Participants Absent

- Laurence Becker
- Robert Bower
- Chris Campbell
- Margaret Ciechanowicz
- Erik Engstrom
- Cathleen Gent
- Margaret Gibson
- Jennifer Kachajian
- Angela Leclerc
- Sandy Lundquist
- John Mangion
- Alex McHenry
- Jeremy McMullen
- Patricia Moulton-Powden
- Harry Roush
- Max Schlueter
- Darwin Thompson
- John Wood

Guests:

- Glen Gross & Lisa Bedinger, Facilitators

Documents Distributed:

1. Meeting Agenda
2. FGDC/NSGIC 9 Coordination Criteria for Statewide Geospatial Coordination

DECISIONS MADE	
Agenda Topic	Discussion
Permission to Tape	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Permission granted knowing that the tapes are for Glen & Lisa's use only and will be destroyed at the end of the strategic planning process.
Introductions &	

DECISIONS MADE	
Agenda Topic	Discussion
Introduction to the Process	
Decision Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EGT members will officially abstain from votes in which they need more information from others in their organization in order to place the vote. This abstention will be recorded. ▪ Any member abstaining will have until the next meeting to get the information needed and to enter an official vote on the issue. (It's possible there will be a place to enter amended votes on the new Discussion Board so that votes can be recorded prior to the next meeting) ▪ Each person present will vote (hand count) when there is a high degree of agreement (greater than 2/3 of those present). ▪ When less than 2/3 of those present agree (based on a hand count), each organization (the agency or division for each person on the EGT Contact List) will vote as one. ▪ Unanimity (everyone agreeing) is the best outcome. ▪ When unanimity cannot be reached, minority opinions will be included in the final strategic plan document. ▪ Whoever is present makes decisions – no quorum issues. ▪ Steve has permission to update the EGT Charter with these changes.
Visioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion only - see attached notes.
Closing & Homework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See below.

Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To be determined since the original meeting date is during the NEARC conference.
---------------------	---

HOMEWORK					
Item	Action Item	Assignee	Target Due Date	Priority	Comments
1	Send Relevant Strategic Plans	All EGT Members	10/16/07		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If your agency has any elements in its strategic plan related to the EGT's work, email it to Steve. ▪ Review the plan above for relevant elements and indicate what these elements are. ▪ Let Steve know whether the assumptions and goals of the plan are still valid.

HOMEWORK

Item	Action Item	Assignee	Target Due Date	Priority	Comments
2		All EGT Members	Between 10/15/07 & 10/26/07	High	This will be on VCGI website starting on 10/15. Steve will send an email reminder when it's ready.
3		All EGT Members	Between 10/29/07 & 11/2/07		Steve will also send an email when this is open.

OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS

Item	Action Item	Assignee	Target Due Date	Priority	Comments
1	Considering each organization's minimal functional requirements as part of decision making.	EGT	At one of the upcoming SP Workshops		
2	How to market to and educate potential users of State GIS services and products.	EGT	At one of the upcoming SP Workshops		
3	Phase I Item – Determine process used to approve Strategic and Business Plan developed by the EGT	EGT	At one of the upcoming SP Workshops	Medium	Talk to SEI and STC representatives

DISCUSSION NOTES
FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP 1
10/9/2007

When you get a copy of the Strategic Plan in your hands in March, what will have happened to make you say, “I’m really glad I participated in this project & I’m proud of our work”?

- A template MOU for sharing data exists.
- I have off-loaded a bunch of work.
- We can hand staff a tool that will make their jobs more efficient & better.
- There is better community understanding about the tools.
- A clearer vision & consensus will exist about how to leverage GIT, how to tie the separate pieces together, and how to provide better services & more effectively tools for employees.
- We have done a good job helping managers see the benefit of more coordinated & formal structure.
- We have translated the benefits for managers.
- The plan is utilized & doesn’t sit on the shelf.
- We have elevated the consciousness about the overall benefits of GIS – we have an educational plan in place.
- The plan describes what business plans are needed.
- We are ready to jump into a business planning process.
 - (Note: The Strategic Plan contains big picture objectives in moderate detail and the business plan – which will be prepared as a follow-up to the Strategic Plan – contains detailed implementation steps, plans and cost and benefit information.)

What does Enterprise GIS mean to you?

- ◆ Leveraging systems & resources
- ◆ Collaborating to gain efficiencies & services
- ◆ Shared data, shared services, shared applications all maintained within commonly accepted protocol
- ◆ Provider of services or a place to partner to create services
- ◆ Managers trained in spatial decision-making
- ◆ Exchange of intellectual knowledge
- ◆ “Enabling” organization
- ◆ Data-sharing template MOU
- ◆ Cross-organizational budgeting
- ◆ Centralized leadership & advocacy

- ◆ Actualized economies of scale
- ◆ Relevant products
- ◆ Improved collaboration & sharing
- ◆ Seamless data exchange
- ◆ Access to more GIT tools
- ◆ Increased funding
- ◆ Better marketing to get funding
- ◆ Clearinghouse for data, metadata, tools & expertise
- ◆ Knowledge of existing data, what it is used for & whether it's redundant
- ◆ Coordinated system that makes GIS applications, data, training & expertise available to all state agencies
- ◆ Federated, distributed, centralized
- ◆ Standards, guidelines, policies
- ◆ Resource & data sharing/exchange
- ◆ Enhanced products & services
- ◆ Greater efficiency

TABLE GROUPS

Assuming you had few constraints, what would a good enterprise GIS system look like to you?

- It would be a branch of state government for which centralized GIS services (e.g. GIO as other states have) that would have authority for policy & budgeting and project control, similar to a successful DII
- Service-oriented (shop for or create a service)
- Flexible & dynamic, allowing autonomy for the agency/entity, for example project management life cycle
- Designated geospatial manager
- Measurable in terms of determining achievement
- Economies of scale
- Improved decision support
- Greater efficiency
 - Data sharing
 - IT resource sharing
 - Personnel resource sharing
- Continuity of operation
- Greater access to products, tools and services
- Enhanced marketing, communication and outreach

What will it take?

- Sufficient resources to provide to state agencies, including hardware, software, people & infrastructure.

- Buy in & support from Administration
- Creativity
- Endless resources
- Flexibility
- Compromise
- Involvement
- Mindshare
- Commitment
- Common vision
- Political and financial support
- Committed partners
- Shared responsibility
- Standards and guidelines

Who will be involved?

- All agencies
- Department heads with significant need or interest
- VCGI
- DII
- Relevant IT departments
- Legislature
- ESRI
- First Existing GIS people in each agency then IT managers then agency operations managers then business managers
- CIO
- Executive branch

How long will take to implement?

- At least a year, perhaps 2-3 years
- It depends... 8 months to develop a strategic plan. 3 years for a fully functioning, mature Enterprise
- Years

Who will need to support it?

- GIS users
- Consumers
- Vendors (ESRI)
- The list of people who will need to be involved above
- Interested parties
- Those who participated
- Agency heads
- Business managers

- Management
- IT

What do you see as likely barriers to implementation?
(Not everyone got to this question.)

- Turf concerns
- Have – have not issues
- Budgeting
- Time
- Management priority changes

Discussion after these Table Groups

- I'm surprised no one thought it could be done faster.
- People realize that to garner support, it will take time.
- Prioritize the low hanging fruit first and do a phased implementation.
- Have to overcome inertia.
- Low hanging fruit is good as long as people want to eat it. We need to not be afraid to go after larger goals that are more what is wanted & needed.
- Small, early successes and bigger, harder changes both matter.
- Momentum is important and things can die.
- Ongoing monitoring of progress and accountability is needed.
- More coordination and central services are both needed. Some of these will be federated, some distributed, and some centralized. It's important to consider which is the best model for each situation. It's also important to make a case for why it's the best approach and why it's an improvement from what currently exists.