

Montana Land Information Advisory Council

Issue Action Form
For Council Resolution Date
(Date of next MLIAC meeting)

1. What action is requested of the council?

2. Please attach a brief (One-page or less) narrative describing the issue. This form and the narrative must be provided to MLIAC staff so that it can be provided to Council members no less than one week in advance of the scheduled meeting.

3. The following organizations endorse this action:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> MAGIP | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MARLS | <input type="checkbox"/> University |
| <input type="checkbox"/> County Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Private |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Agency | |

Specify:

4. What are the benefits of supporting this issue?

5. What are the costs or resource requirements to support this issue?

6. Signature of Submitter

7. Signature of Council Member if different than 6

8. Date

This portion to be completed by the MLIAC Chair and forwarded for action.

This Issue has been presented, discussed, and voted upon by The Montana Land Information Advisory Council and has been: accepted for council action. denied for council action

The following action will be taken and reported on at the next council meeting:

This action is assigned to: _____ Date: _____.

Identifying Authoritative Sources of Geographic Features for Montana

Requested action: Motion to advise the department to pilot a process, in cooperation with the Montana Land Information Advisory Council, to identify and publish the authoritative source for a given collection of geographic features as a prototype for inventorying the State of Montana geographic information assets.

Need: The Montana Land Information Advisory Council needs an effective and efficient mechanism for accounting for authoritative sources of geographic data. Of particular interest are statewide geographic data and MSDI data products that are routinely used in the business processes of multiple state agencies. Identifying the geographic data product and associated authority, and posting that information to a central location will ensure both the council and the user community can access an inventory of known and accepted geographic data products. Currently no such effort exists.

Proposed Solution: In response to this need, a motion is respectfully requested to advise the department to establish a process, in cooperation with the Montana Land Information Advisory Council, to identify and publish the authoritative source for a given collection of geographic features. The department would solicit the assistance of the Montana Association of Geographic Professionals in identifying and providing an assessment of potential candidates. MLIAC may solicit submissions or users may nominate submissions for consideration by MLIAC. Requests should be narrow and definitive in scope, and standardized complete metadata is considered the vehicle for submitting requests. The user community should be considered an important asset in determining standard accepted distribution protocols for published authoritative sources of geographic data. Authoritative sources would be published to a metadata service, thus meeting the legal obligation of notification by directing data access through metadata.

Benefit: Benefits supporting this issue are a (1) clearly designated authoritative source for a given collection of geographic features, (2) presented in an organized, systematic manner (3) with a known provider for collection, maintenance and distribution. The resulting collection of geographic features will provide users with a single authoritative source recognized by the GIS community and the Council, and benefit the Council in developing annual Land Information Plans.

Potential Cost: The primary costs are (1) coordination cost to request or accept nominations for consideration, (2) review and metadata publication costs, and (3) maintenance of the metadata distribution environment. Most or all of these costs are already accounted for within existing State of Montana entities.

Suggested Prototype: It is recommended that the department prototype a process with the following guideline offered for the initial prototype of the process:

1. Issue a request on behalf MLIAC for a metadata document on an authoritative source for geographic data of the Montana state boundary and county boundaries (two metadata documents submitted).
2. Utilize staff at the Department of Administration and the Montana State Library to review the metadata documents for accuracy, completeness, and correctness.

3. Utilize staff at the Department of Administration and the Montana State Library to review the geographic data referenced by the metadata and determine it to be acceptable and the best available product of its type.
4. Query the user community regarding appropriate distribution formats that meet the business needs of the user community.
5. Post the resulting metadata document to a metadata service with the appropriate information on distribution formats and mark the document as “in review”.
6. Notify the user community through organizations like the Montana Association of Geographic Information Professionals that documents are open to public review for 30 days. After 30 days mark the document as “accepted” or remove document.
7. Report the findings to MLIAC at the 9/7/2006 meeting.

Example of metadata service with simple web interface displaying current inventory:

