

Identification of Options for
an Information Management
System (IMS) for the
Mackenzie Valley Cumulative Impact
Monitoring Program (MVCIMP)

Prepared for:
The MVCIMP Working Group
April 14, 2002

Prepared by:
Don Boyes, Ph.D. (Map Insight)
Michael Muller, M.Sc. (IEG)
Bernard Hogan, M.A. (NRE)
The Gwich'in Tribal Council (GTC)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 4

1. INTRODUCTION..... 8

2. BACKGROUND..... 8

3. METHODOLOGY 10

 3.1 Identify the Potential Nodes of an MVCIMP IMS 10

 3.2 Develop an Interview Protocol for Consulting the Potential Nodes..... 11

 3.3 Interview Representatives of the Potential Nodes 12

 3.4 Review Hub Approaches Suggested by the Working Group 12

 3.5 Develop Options for an MVCIMP IMS and Analyze Each Option..... 13

 3.6 Identify a Preferred Option 13

4. THE MVCIMP SURVEY 14

 4.1 Survey Results 14

 4.1.1 Organization Information 14

 4.1.2 CIM Information Use Within the Organization 17

 4.1.3 Information Sharing/Costs 20

 4.1.4 Website Information/Costs 22

 4.2 Survey Analysis 23

 4.2.1 Issues Which Guide the Development of the Options for an MVCIMP IMS ... 23

 4.2.1.1 Possible Locations for the Territorial Hub..... 24

 4.2.1.2 Possible Organizations Which Could Host the Territorial Hub..... 24

 4.2.1.3 High Level of Technical Capacity of the Potential Nodes 25

 4.2.1.4 Standardization of Programs 26

 4.2.1.5 Predominance of Biophysical CIM Information..... 27

 4.2.2 Challenges Which Must be Addressed..... 27

 4.2.2.1 Lack of Metadata 28

 4.2.2.2 Low Capacity of the Potential Nodes to Share Their CIM information 29

 4.2.2.3 CIM Information at the Node Level is Not Internet Ready 29

 4.2.2.4 The Need for Additional Resources at the Node Level..... 30

 4.2.2.5 Systemic/Structural Issues 30

 4.3 Limitations 31

 4.3.1 Scope/Length of Survey 31

 4.3.2 Lack of Industry Participation 31

5. REVIEW OF HUB APPROACHES SUGGESTED BY THE WORKING GROUP..... 32

 5.1 The Arctic Borderlands Ecological Knowledge Co-operative 32

 5.2 The EMAN North – Information Centre 33

6. MVCIMP IMS OPTIONS 35

 6.1 Introduction..... 35

 6.1.1 IMS Structure 35

 6.1.2 Definitions..... 36

 6.1.3 Technical Options..... 37

 6.1.4 Organizational Options 38

 6.2 Option 1: Centralized Hub 38

 6.2.1 Description 38

 6.2.2 Cost of Development and Implementation 38

 6.2.3 Time for Implementation..... 39

 6.2.4 Potential to Build Capacity 39

6.2.5 Information Access 39

6.2.6 Ability to Provide Territorial-level Information 39

6.2.7 Roles, Responsibilities, Support Structure and Service Expectations 39

6.3 Option 2: Regional Hub 39

6.3.1 Description 39

6.3.2 Cost of Development and Implementation 40

6.3.3 Time for Implementation..... 40

6.3.4 Potential to Build Capacity 40

6.3.5 Information Access 40

6.3.6 Ability to Provide Territorial-level Information 41

6.3.7 Roles, Responsibilities, Support Structure and Service Expectations 41

6.4 Option 3: Split Hub 41

6.4.1 Description 41

6.4.2 Cost of Development and Implementation 41

6.4.3 Time for Implementation..... 41

6.4.4 Potential to Build Capacity 42

6.4.5 Information Access 42

6.4.6 Ability to Provide Territorial-level Information 42

6.4.7 Roles, Responsibilities, Support Structure and Service Expectations 42

6.5 Analysis of the Three Options 42

6.5.1 Cost of Development and Implementation 43

6.5.2 Time For Implementation 43

6.5.3 Potential to Build Community Capacity 43

6.5.4 Summary 44

6.6 The Preferred Option..... 44

7. FUTURE WORK/NEXT STEPS 45

8. CONCLUSION AND RECCOMENDATION 45

APPENDIX I: THE NODES SURVEY..... 47

APPENDIX II: THE HUBS SURVEY 53

APPENDIX III: POTENTIAL/PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS 59

APPENDIX IV: ADDITIONAL SURVEY RESULTS TABLES 62

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 4.1.1.1: Organization Type 15

Table 4.1.1.2: Location of Respondents 16

Table 4.1.1.6: Current IT/GIS/Library Staff 17

Table 4.1.1.7: Organizations That Are Computer Networked 17

Table 4.1.2.2: Biophysical, Social and Cultural CIM Information 18

Table 4.1.2.4: Format of CIM Information 18

Table 4.1.2.6: GIS Applications Used 19

Table 4.1.2.7: Database Applications Used 19

Table 4.1.2.8: CIM Data With Associated Metadata 19

Table 4.1.3.1: Internet Access 20

Table 4.1.3.2: Own Website 20

Table 4.1.3.5: Willingness to Share CIM Information 20

Table 4.1.3.7 Majority of CIM Information Internet Ready 21

Table 4.1.3.8 Capacity to Share CIM Information 22

Figure 4.2.1.1: Location of Respondent Organizations 24

Figure 4.2.1.2: Types of Organization 25

Figure 4.2.1.3: Level of Technical Capacity of the Potential Nodes 26

Figure 4.2.1.4: Standardization of Programs 26

Figure 4.2.1.5: Biophysical, Social, and Cultural CIM Information 27

Figure 4.2.2.1: Amount of Metadata 28

Figure 4.2.2.2: Capacity of Potential Nodes to Share CIM Information 29

Figure 4.2.2.3: Internet Readiness of Majority of Potential Nodes CIM Information 30

Figure 4.2.2.5: Willingness to Share CIM Information 31

Table 6.5.4: Summary of Options 44

Table 4.1.1.3: Time Spent on Environmental Monitoring 62

Table 4.1.1.4: Importance of Environmental Monitoring 62

Table 4.1.1.5: Importance of Contributing to CIM IMS 62

Table 4.1.2.1: Types of CIM Information Used/Produced 63

Table 4.1.2.3: Scope of CIM Information 63

Table 4.1.2.5: Applications Used to Store CIM Information 63

Table 4.1.2.9: Library System for Non-Electronic CIM Information 64

Table 4.1.3.3: Type of Internet Access 64

Table 4.1.3.4: Speed of Internet Access 64

Table 4.1.3.6: Reasons for Not Sharing CIM Information 65

Table 4.1.3.9: Resources Needed to Share CIM Information 65

Table 4.1.3.10: Production of CIM Information 65