

MAGIC Metadata Triage

Agreement Number: 07HQAG0096

Interim Report

Category 1 - 2007

Report Date: October 16th, 2007

Organization: Mid-America Geographic Information System Consortium (MAGIC),
1932 SW Collins AVE
Topeka, KS 66604-3223,
<http://magicweb.kgs.ku.edu/>

Project Leader: Mark Duewell, Missouri Spatial Data Information Service (MSDIS),
(573) 882-6734, duewellm@missouri.edu

Project Narrative

Phase One (Preparation) of the project is well advanced. This is the most time intensive phase involving the creation of the basic workshop infrastructure, and research into additional materials that will insure the project's success. This entailed the establishment of metadata POCs for each state, review, updates and adaption of the - previously approved by FGDC - Virginia curriculum for the MAGIC region. The adaption consists mainly of removing the references within the curriculum to the state of Virginia (other than from the credits!) and their "Virginia Lite" tool / system and substitution of the additional metadata tool (XMLInput) chosen by MAGIC for inclusion based on the recommendation of USGS' Leslie Bearden. Multi-media software, Multi-media Builder 4.9.7 has been acquired to create the course materials CD's for students and instructors.

One example that MAGIC expects the majority of workshop attendees might come from can be found in Missouri's recent series of regional geospatial workshops. These workshops are attended by from 50 – 60 local government staffers interested in GIS – some of them data creators – and most of them not currently creating metadata. The future MAGIC Metadata Triage workshop for Missouri has generated significant interest at these venues from these attendees.

In the way of collaboration activities – each MAGIC state continues to be extremely supportive of the project. The MAGIC Communications Sub-committee has been tasked with providing email review and feedback as the project progresses and members have been very helpful and responsive in this regard. While each state POC has been advised to begin to look at potential workshop locations and potential workshop invitees, the plan

remains to avoid scheduling workshops until the curriculum has been reviewed by all and is ready for distribution.

Challenges –

Current challenges are several – the least of which consists of the daunting size of the curriculum review and research. It was decided from the beginning that since we were asking so much in the way of volunteer time from each of the state POC's that the initial review, adaption and research would be performed by the project coordinator (me!) – followed by a review, comments and additions by the group. In retrospect this has proven problematic at times due to a schedule that was heavily weighted to project travel for me during this period. But this is a challenge - not yet an obstacle – and I have gradually been working through it – sharing more of the project as we move forward. The other two challenges have been more problematic and probably not unusual in that they involve contracting and personnel. It did take longer to accomplish the sub-contracting the coordination services than I had originally planned for due to the many restrictions involved in university contracting. When it became clear that contracting with the university was becoming an obstacle we moved to overcome it by sub-contracting those services from my organization – MSDIS – directly to the MAGIC organization. Personnel issues have regularly cropped up as staff turnover in their various states has had some little impact – sometimes even a simple move of positions has caused a slow down in progress temporarily.

Feedback on Cooperative Agreements Program

What are the program strengths and weaknesses?

After several CAP efforts I feel very comfortable with the process and the FGDC / USGS staff coordinating the projects. I have no doubt as to the eventual success of this project. A drawback continues to be initial project funding – which even when it remains level means that one's dollars don't go as far due to inflation. Achieving substantial results with less money continues to be problematic.

Where does the program make a difference?

Without FGDC's CAP it is certainly doubtful that funding could be found for a number of projects that we've accomplished in the region. It is particularly effective in allowing us to perform outreach and education to many local governments that would otherwise not be informed or participating in data generation.

Was the assistance you received sufficient or effective?

So far – yes - always.

What would you recommend doing differently?

No recommendations at this time beyond those in the narrative above.

Are there factors that are missing or need to consider that were missed?

Not yet...

Are there program management concerns that need to be addressed? Time frame?

None - so far...

If you were to do this again, what would you do differently?

I would better investigate the contract process here at the university as regarding working with an organization such as MAGIC. What we thought was just another contract vehicle became far more complicated than I had imagined.