Project Plan

Project Name: Minnesota Geospatial Metadata Standard (MGMS)

Last updated: 5/13/2011

Don't Duck Metadata!

Prepared by: Nancy Rader

A   Introduction

This project plan documents how the Metadata Workgroup intends to meet the goals outlined in its Charter:

- Develop a short-term solution that allows users of ArcGIS 10 to create and edit Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines version 1.2 (MGMG1.2) metadata.
- Recommend updates to MGMG1.2.
- Recommend metadata fields that document geospatial services.
- Recommend new state geospatial metadata standard(s) that describe data and services.
- Develop a solution for creating and editing metadata using the new standard(s).
- Coordinate with other efforts that rely on geospatial metadata.

See the Metadata Workgroup Charter for more information on the project.

B   Scope

In-Scope

Evaluate options for creating and maintaining metadata in ArcGIS 10
- Become familiar with how metadata is handled in ArcGIS 10, including new terminology and tools.
- Identify existing tools that could be customized for use in ArcGIS 10; currently, these are the EPA Metadata Editor (EME) and the built-in ArcGIS metadata editor, however, critical source code and/or instructions are not yet fully available for these tools.
- Develop criteria and a test plan for evaluating tools.
- For each tool:
    - o Evaluate how it imports existing MGMG metadata and how it creates new metadata
    - o Evaluate what can be customized
    - o Document the pros and cons of the tool
    - o Recommend next steps to customize tool or adopt existing one
- If recommended, customize tool, test, revise and distribute.

Evaluate options for creating and maintaining MGMG metadata with a standalone tool
- Identify existing standalone tools that could be customized for MGMG to replace DataLogr; currently, the only known possibility is the EPA Metadata Editor (EME).
- Concurrent with the evaluation of EME within ArcGIS 10, evaluate EME as a standalone tool.
- If recommended, customize EME, test, revise and distribute.

Documenting Geospatial Services
- Research existing ways to document services.
- Recommend fields to document services.

Recommend Metadata Standard(s) for Approval as a State Standard
- Identify the pros and cons of MGMG1.2 versus NAP.
- Develop a crosswalk between MGMG1.2 and NAP.
- Develop a recommendation for a dataset and a services content standard, including whether or not they are separate standards.
- Propose the metadata standard(s) to the MnGeo Standards Committee.
- During this process, coordinate with the [Geospatial Commons Workgroup](#) and the [Minnesota OpenData](#) effort as needed.

Out-of-Scope
Developing new or revised training materials and educational resources, although very important for the adoption of standards, is beyond the scope of the workgroup's present efforts. The workgroup will recommend next steps for developing or revising training and educational materials for Minnesota's geospatial metadata standard(s).

Scope Management Plan
Proposed scope changes will be assessed in terms of impact to project schedule, cost and resource usage. Any changes to this scope must be documented in a revised version of the project plan. Approval of Project Manager is required. Any scope changes involving staffing or funding changes also require the approval of the project owners.

C   Budget

There is no budget for this project. All staff time, hardware, software and other resources will be contributed in-kind from participating organizations.

D   Project Team

The following people and organizations are stakeholders in this project and are included in the project planning. Additional project team members will be added as needed.

Executive Sponsor: Commit resources and advocate for project
- David Arbeit, Minnesota CGIO, MnGeo

Project Owners: Ensure adequate resources are available and track project status
- Chris Cialek, MnGeo
- Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council

Project Manager: Lead the planning and execution of the project, chair workgroup
- Nancy Rader, MnGeo

Project Workgroup: Plan and execute the project
- Chris Cialek, MnGeo
- David Fawcett, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- Jim Gonsoski, Minnesota Department of Agriculture
- Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council
- Mark Kotz, Metropolitan Council
- Susanne Maeder, MnGeo
- Jesse Pearson, Minnesota Department of Transportation
- Eileen Quam, Office of Enterprise Technology
- Hal Watson, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Tool Evaluation Team: Evaluate metadata tools for ArcGIS 10 and standalone
- Jim Gonsoski, MN Dept. of Ag (Team Lead)
- Jon Hoekenga, Metropolitan Council
- Susanne Maeder, MnGeo
- Jesse Pearson, Mn/DOT
- Hal Watson, MnDNR

Services Team: Recommend method to document geospatial services
- Hal Watson, MnDNR (Team Lead)
- David Fawcett, PCA
- Mark Kotz, Met. Council
- Jesse Pearson, Mn/DOT

Standards Team: Evaluate MGMG1.2 and NAP and recommend revised MGMG
- Mark Kotz, Met. Council (Team Lead)
- Chris Cialek, MnGeo
- Susanne Maeder, MnGeo
- Nancy Rader, MnGeo

Project Team Management

The project manager coordinates the project tasks assigned to team members. Changes to the project team require approval of the Project Manager and Project Owner for the affected agency if relevant. Changes will be tracked in revisions to the project plan.

E   Project Schedule

Schedule Management

The project schedule will be updated as tasks are completed and posted online. Any changes must be documented in a revised project schedule. Approval of Project Manager is required.

Task	Estimated Completion Date	Done
Approve project charter; post it online	5/4/11	✔
Create teams and draft tasks	5/5/11	✔
Draft project plan and send to workgroup for review	5/6/11	✔
Finalize project plan; post online *(will update the plan as the project progresses)*	5/13/11	
Document why the workgroup chose to customize the EPA Metadata Editor (EME) for MGMG1.2 instead of other considered alternatives	5/27/11	
Tool Evaluation Team		
Assess which EME features need to be customized for MGMG1.2	5/5/11	✔
Get source code for latest version of EME *(the project tasks for this team can be done without the source code; however, fewer features can be customized)*	when source code is released	
Customize Help; Remove EPA references from Help file, add any MGMG1.2 specific ones	5/20/11	
Customize metabase of default values; Remove EPA references; add MGMG1.2 specific ones	5/20/11	
Approve help and metabase changes with working group	5/27/11	
Customize interface; remove unneeded fields; add MGMG1.2 specific ones	Source code dependent	
Repackage customized code as MGMG1.2 Editor	Source code dependent	
Test both ArcGIS10 and stand-alone .NET versions	6/5/11?	
Decide to include or remove stylesheet validation	6/12/11?	
Distribute	6/15/11?	
Services Team		
Research fields used to document services (NAP, GeoServices Finder, other…)	5/25/11	
Develop preliminary list of recommended fields	6/14/11	
Distribute for comment	6/15/11	
Recommend final list of recommended fields	7/1/11	
In coordination with the Standards Team, recommend whether or not services metadata should be a separate standard or included within the dataset metadata standard	7/15/11	
Standards Team		
Compile initial list of user-suggested changes to MGMG1.2	4/25/11	✔
Compile initial list of pros and cons of revising MGMG1.2 vs. migrating to NAP	4/25/11	✔
Obtain current versions of NAP and of crosswalk between FGDC and NAP	5/20/11	
Review NAP	6/1/11	
Draft crosswalk from MGMG1.2 to NAP	6/1/11	
In coordination with the Services Metadata team, develop a recommendation for a dataset content standard (e.g., revise existing MGMG, adopt full NAP, define a subset of NAP) with specific elements to be included	7/1/11	
In coordination with the Services Metadata team, recommend whether or not services metadata should be a separate standard or included within the dataset metadata standard	7/15/11	
Create an XML template for the proposed standard(s)	8/17/11	
Send recommendation to workgroup and other key people for their review	8/17/11	
Revise proposed standard and prepare to submit to Standards Committee	9/12/11	
Present proposal to Standards Committee for public review	9/30/11	
Develop recommendations for additional training and educational materials *(actual development of training and materials is beyond the scope of this project)*	During public review period	
Give presentation about the Metadata Workgroup efforts at the MN GIS/LIS Consortium Conference	10/6/11	

F   Communication Plan

The Metadata Workgroup will meet regularly, as needed. Individual task teams will work closely on a weekly or daily basis while completing specific tasks.

The workgroup maintains a Google Docs website for collaborative work; this site is accessible only to authorized users. Additional or alternate workgroup collaborative work sites will be considered if the need arises.

All workgroup members, team members, project owners and others who have expressed interest are included in the email list for meeting agendas and meeting notes, which are also posted on the workgroup's webpage. The project schedule will be updated periodically and posted on the workgroup webpage.

Key stakeholder organizations, listed in the Workgroup Charter, will be kept abreast of the progress of the workgroup through their representatives on the workgroup.

The workgroup chair/project manager will report progress to the following groups at their request:
- Statewide Geospatial Advisory Council
- State Government Geospatial Advisory Council

The project will be presented at the Minnesota GIS/LIS Conference in October 2011. Workgroup members may also provide presentations about the project at other venues. Consortium e-announcements and newsletter articles will be submitted as needed to keep the Minnesota geospatial community informed.

G   Issues Management

As issues arise within the project, each team will determine if the issue is significant enough to report it to the Project Manager. The Project Manager, in consultation with the Team Lead, will decide if the issue should be reported to the full Workgroup. If so, the collaborative work site will be used as a place to describe and track issues. For project work to continue efficiently, it is desirable that most issues be resolved within each team or with consultation with the Project Manager. Issues may include testing results, unexpected problems, and other items that impact project completion.

H   Project Plan Documents Summary

All significant electronic project documentation will be posted on the collaborative work site and, as appropriate, on its public webpage. Teams will determine when a document is sufficiently complete to post.