

Wall notes, WIGICC Summit Meeting, September 6, 2007  
(as compiled and edited by SJV, 9/20/07)

### Council Composition Questions

Elected by regions or workgroups

Governor – appointed

Senate – appointed

Assembly – appointed

State agency – elected

Regions – elected X7: 7 RPCs plus 1 counties not in RPC

SCO – ex officio

GIO – ex officio

State Budget officer – ex officio

Private if needed, or as another region

“region” covers everyone else in network

focus groups and work groups push ideas upward to council

-----  
Representatives:

- need to fully represent their “group”
- which state agencies: should be 3 different agencies and not DOA
- senate/assembly reps might not be political “champions”
- divide state into 7 (?) regions or 7 interest groups, with rep on council
- lump regional, county, city town, village

- 
- all elected except gov, assembly, senate reps
  - one rep per sector, except 2 for county (include LIO)
  - remove WLIA, WORD, WSLS,
  - possible “at large” positions (2)
  - 17 ± voting, state budget officer (non-voting)

- 
- relationship between membership and structure
  - number (agility) vs. composition (representation): smaller generally preferred; need for adequate representation recognized, but how?
  - technology vs. policy
  - share seats over time?
  - well-rounded decision-making body
- Proposal for smaller body: members chair committees and workgroups

-----  
Potential drops to reduce size:

- governor – represented by GIO (or vice versa)
- legislature – never participated in WLIB
- town, city, village politicians don't care... need people involved with technology and applications.

Include: DOA/GIO, WLIA, LION, GIS technology providers, GIS “value added”, SCO, Fed (non-voting), 5-7 at large members from network

Leads to executive leadership from key players and/or key agencies and organizations

- 
- not all groups need explicit seat on council... views from network, committees, workgroups
  - too big dilutes authority, need “executive” power
  - too big unmanageable – logistics, lack of participation
  - too big leads to power struggles/factions/posturing
  - adequate representation of emerging applications – can a small group understand all domains?

-----  
Add: utilities, LION

Exclude: WRODA

### Council Size Questions

25 okay to start, adjust as necessary  
25 is inefficient for getting stuff done  
<25 is better

- 
- 25 too big, 6-8 sufficient: state gov, sco/gio, WLIA/WSLS/etc., private/non-profit/utility, federal/tribal, cities/towns/villages, county
  - can use workgroups and committees to be effective; small group can represent diverse constituencies
  - might need mid-teens to have sufficient diversity
  - 1/2 elected, 1/2 appointed/ex officio

- 
- work & decisions at committee level
  - executive board to coordinate, and as conduit for information and decisions
  - needs to be smaller to be effective at this
  - size affects the manner of function

- 10 or less

-----

- 17ish

- selection depends on mission

*Group tabulation:*

25 – 0 votes

17 – 5 votes (including 17ish and  $17 \pm 2$ )

< 17 – 8 votes (including <10, 13, 5-12, 12-17)

### How Selected – Elected/Appointed

Voting:

- accountability

- like WLIA

- all registered members of *network* can vote for any of council members positions regardless of sector

Ex Officio: SCO, GIO, SBO (non-voting)

Appointed: Gov, Senate, Assembly

All the rest elected by network (network = individuals)

Nominations Committee

-----

- elected preferred, fewest appointed possible

- leg/gov appointments okay

- no consensus on specific slots v. open election

-----

- some by legislators, to ensure buy-in

- non-techie

-----

*Group tabulation:*

0 for appointed

6 for elected

7 for hybrid (some voted for both elected and hybrid)

Comments:

- mostly elected

- 2/3 elected/1/3 appointed or ex officio

- no legislators

- associations represented only by proxy, e.g. by county

- GIO speaks for state agencies
- appointed people not as engaged

### Administrative Location

- geographic representation
- funding
- \* build on statewide listening sessions
- \* virtual meetings
- central location more acceptable to rest of state: Stevens Point, UW/County Extension

### Questions and Comments

- What is “the network”? Both individual and organizations?
- Are the needs of EM/Homeland Security being met by the proposed model?
- What is the relationship between IGICC and other state organizations? Is it formal?
- Future of organizations like WLIA with respect to WIGICC?
- How can we ensure groups such as LION are included?
- Can WIGICC Executive Council play a role in advising other councils and boards?
- What was elected vs. appointed decision-making process [how was the draft model created]?
- Explicit mechanism for non-included groups to petition for inclusion?
- Proportional representation of explicitly represented groups?
- Participation as a prerequisite for representation.
- WIGICC working group are largely WLIA members – will this to lack of support [from non-WLIA members]?
- What efforts were made to be inclusive in WIGICC process?
- View as an opportunity to be a service to unknowing users of GIS – e.g., EMS and utilities... but how to identify all spatial interests?
- What is the intent of the government committee? In policy and planning?
- Regional government committee versus state of county level focus?
- County board versus county employee representation?
- County representation: at least 1 seat for LIO.
- Political and technical/working for all government seats
- Hold seats for specific organizations or have general categories, e.g., land records professionals?
- More private business representation, e.g., utilities?
- Special interest working groups nominate committee member.
- De-emphasize council, focus on working groups/technical level.
- Who does the electing – network, organizations?