

Illinois Statewide GIS Initiative
Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Results
August 28, 2007

SWOC Analysis

Strengths

- Positive understanding of need for strategy
- Wider knowledge due to emerging tech.
- Tech interest has risen
- Clearinghouse aeriels
- Current coordination activity in pockets
- ‘Feeling’ for need of coordination
- Strong GIS Network in IL
- Have lots of data (not starting from scratch)
- Nonprofessional use & desire
- Good data dissemination
- Depth of professionalism/expertise
- Education system-limited resources but improving
- Enterprise activities, clearinghouse, geo coder, and coordination
- Opportunity to include coordination with legislature – lots of opportunity
- Benefit from other states’ experiences
- Increasing creativity to use tech and data
- GIS folks stepping up to the plate when needed
- Education – push from below for more coordination
- ILGISA
- USGS liaisons
- Improvement of relationships between agencies, esp. with private sector
- Communication and interest within agencies as info. source
- Level of commitment is ‘ripe’
- GIS coordination for public health
- Recognition of inter-relatedness of GIS capabilities
- Info. is available, especially at county level
- Timing is ‘ripe’ due to “Google” technology
- Bandwidth is IL backbone
- Recorder fees for GIS preplanned
- Clearinghouse: metadata standards, distribution framework experience in IL
- Timing on upgraded flood plain maps
- Spatial science – Argonne, Fermi, Universities etc. (software develop)
- Many groups coordinating
- Possibilities for sustainable funding through agency collaboration
- Economics – overall state well positioned

Weaknesses

- Lack of knowledge in legislature
- Lack of top-down support
- Maintenance of metadata
- Due to lack of coordination – more labor intensive than need be
- Duplication of effort
- Lack of dedicated funding “Volunteer Fire Dept” metaphor
- Lack of input from utilities
- Lack of sharing
- Equipment resource sharing
- Intergov’t. relations (too many units of govt.)
- Price structure culture
- Competition for resources
- No central authority
- Standards for data creation
- Leadership down path of recognition in state “Executive sponsorship”
- Vertical data infrastructure sharing between levels of government and privates
- Barriers to sharing as related to power and control of data
- Overlapping of resources of GIS tech and data
- Lack of centralized authority at every level
- Fear of data sharing to the point of turning down money
- Lack of thinking “Beyond our Borders”
- Lack of accuracy / scale varies @ different levels
- Aerial minimum standard
- Lack of education on value of GIS
- Lack of human resources – particularly in Southern IL
- Lack of “laws” in IL – Wild West
- Google Earth phenomenon leading to false perception of true GIS – no “real” marketing
- Politics changes the landscape for GIS to be permanently institutionalized
- Has the GIS community reached out to produce solutions?
- Need structure in place to obtain data
- Interoperability of software
- Challenge of legal liabilities for data sharing or dissemination
- What’s in it for me mentality
- Memberships and participation in national level orgs/ events
- Accuracy of data is lacking – need national info built from bottom-up
- Lack of coordination in emerging planning for GIS participation
- Licensed data as a cause for inability to share
- Lack of utilization / coordination – had ILGIC which was legally created
- Lack of GIS use for public education in policy decisions
- Also lack of utilization / coordination with land surveyors, engineers etc. standards could help
- Lack of a GIS champion

- Reluctance of data sharing due to security concerns
- Need to build buy-in across the state
- Technology advancements – not enough time to improve past maps – quality control
- Clearinghouse funding
- ILGIC purpose & make-up

Opportunities

- Proactive to promote GIS
- Money is there to be had
- Many collaborations already – can start there
- Minimize duplication
- Work with educators – interns
- Technology advancements allow for “COOL” applications to build public awareness
- Best practices leverage
- Statewide database availability
- Ability to consolidate resources
- Provide “real time” data
- Expand clearinghouse to include local government
- Build from bottom-up
- Enabling technologies

Challenges

- Funding
- Architecture for standards
- Champion ID
- ID Leadership
- Vertical coordination
- Functioning coordinating body
- Size & Platforms
- Sharing Data
- Salesmanship / Public Awareness outreach
- Technical complexity
- Sustainability of leadership
- Wider participation
- Public-Private partnerships
- Education & training
- Defining data standards to meet everyone’s needs
- Political agendas
- Integration into horizontal structure within organization
- Buy-in into this initiative
- Legislation
- Implementation plan

- Integration & maintenance of various platforms / servers
- ID benefits!!
- Integration of smaller or rural areas
- Remaining current with tech / jargon /
- Common language
- ID needs of all GIS users

Vision

- Centralized website that is FREE, accurate and comprehensive
- ARCIMS capability
- Central authority for coordinating statewide efforts
- Accepted standard framework for all levels
- Ability to channel \$ streams
- Integrated systems with out gaps & exceptions
- ESRI platforms that are more workable
- Comprehensive info for end – users of all layers etc. available at every location – portability
- To have accomplished our task
- Data built from bottom-up with centralized coordination authority
- State of the Art Geodetic Control Network
- NSGIC 9 to be met
- Statewide database searchable by location
- Statewide ESRI licensing
- Fully staffed CA to not only update, but maintain
- “Bee-hive” of communication with everyone working together in daily tasks – integrated work flows
- Architecture of hardware etc allows for recycling
- Awareness how GIS can help with proper decision-making processes
- Comprehensive awareness of how GIS can be utilized through a council
- Built from the bottom up & funded by the top-down
- Sustainability no longer an issue
- BI (business intel) & SOA (Service oriented architecture) & GIS is currently not tapped
- Strong base of GIS community
- Become a National Leader

Draft Vision Statement based on above ideas:

The Illinois Statewide GIS Initiative will ensure that GIS can be utilized effectively at all levels of government, in academia and in the private sector. Cohesive data will be gathered from all levels in a centralized, freely accessible location.

Strategic Issues : Strategic issues are issues that must be addressed in order for the vision to be achieved. The group identified the following:

1. Finance Issue:
 - How are we going to get sustainable funding mechanisms?
2. Political Issues:
 - What laws need to be in place?
 - How do we ID champions?
 - What do we need to do in order to establish a central authority?
 - How will the central authority be organized?
3. Data Issues:
 - How do we define sharable data?
 - How do we establish data standards & accuracy w/o placing undue burden?
 - How do we create a data sharing architecture?
 - How do we ID all needs out there for GIS?
4. PR Issues:
 - How do we get buy-in and the motivation to participate in this initiative?
 - How do we sell this initiative in our current status?
 - How do we communicate this?
 - Why do we need to do this? (Common voice of understanding)
5. Education and Training Issue:
 - How do we integrate education & training?

The following are the results of a small group exercise used to help identify strategic issues:

A-Team

1. We want to empower a central authority but we need consistent support
2. We can't standardize because we lack coordination
3. If it weren't for lack of funding we would have statewide data
4. We have to have strong leadership because we need coordination, funding, training
5. Strategic & Biz planning with a mission statement makes us credible

Executive Group, LLC

1. We want to have the state of the art GIS technology & clearinghouse but we don't have funds
2. We can't coordinate because ILGIC currently lacks guidance
3. If it weren't for lack of leadership we would be much closer to the implementation of statewide GIS
4. We have to work together because individually, we lack the resources and expertise
5. BEER MAKES US HAPPY!
6. The lack of complete coordination makes us operate like a volunteer fire dept.

The Visitors

1. We want to have a seamless state map, but the framework for sharing doesn't exist
2. We can't have 1 set of data standards because we all have different needs
3. If it weren't for a lack of a central coordinating authority, we would have more consistent data that could more easily be shared
4. We have to specify different standards classes because requirements vary by scale, accuracy, use, etc.
5. The creation of this group makes us hopeful and optimistic

Four-Um

1. We want to bring GIS technology to all Govt. entities to feed a central repository of quality data, but significant data issues exist
2. We can't force technology standards because of funding & resource constraints
3. If it weren't for multiple formats & platforms we would reduce duplicate efforts
4. We have to sell ourselves & deliver faster because of Google Earth
5. GIS makes us understand our world better

True “Visitors” II

1. We want to coordinate but we have no functioning coordinating body
2. We can't get beyond current level because we don't have a champion
3. If it weren't for inequity in funding mechanisms we would build a state spatial data infrastructure (SSDI)
4. We have to work together because we have no alternative
5. What doesn't kill us makes us stronger