AddressAB Working Committee Notes from Meeting Nov. 17, 2010

Meeting Time: Nov. 17, 2010, 10:00am – 2:00pm

Attendees: Pat Drinnan, Jim Chorel, Ellen Styner, Wendy Amy, Nancy Merritt

Via Conference call: Johanna Kortenschyl-Allan, Laraine Lawson, Tony Woods, Steve Lepp, Juliana Wafula

AddressAB objective review:

- The initial phase of this initiative is to create a central repository for provincial address point data that is consistent, accurate and authoritative for Alberta

- The dataset will only contain information provided by the municipalities, no new address data will be created through this initiative

- Municipalities are the address authority

- Letters have been sent to all Mayors, Reeves and CAOs to request initial participation in this AddressAB initiative**.**

- **ACTION: SDW to send a copy of this letter to committee members so they can be aware of the request from their end.**

Schema

- Geo-codes could be stored in both Lat / Long and 10tm northing/easting

- The spatial address point location should be considered. Some municipalities store two points for an address, one that is the access point off the main road and another point locating the structure. This is particularly helpful when the house location is several miles (not visible) off the main road.

- Some municipalities use the taxroll number as the unique identifier where multiple address points exist.

- Discussion took place regarding naming physical features (ie. bridge). If the municipality has an address point for a physical feature then it can be incorporated into the repository. A 'type' code could be populated when information is available, to distinguish types of address points (buildings, bridges)

- Common Place name field is required (ie. McKenzie Community Center)

- Provide a field in the schema for a unique identifier for each address so it will be easier for the municipality to sync their data and forward updates. This unique id could be

populated by the municipality (when available) and in conjunction with the jurisdiction; it could be unique throughout the dataset. (30 characters)

- Include a field for a MUNI ID

- Review 911 schema to ensure the dataset will be compatible

- Dates for record creation, updates, deletes should be incorporated in the schema

- Schema to include municipal authority

- Consider storing an attribute describing the source that the point location was created from (i.e. GPS, parcel centroid, etc.) to be populated where available.

- A discrepancy field should be stored in the database. This field would provide feedback to the municipal authority where load anomalies exist and could also be used to store user feedback, identifying potential discrepancies.

- Historical addresses should be managed in the schema and not deleted (go forward approach).

- Acceptable abbreviations should be derived from Canada Post but also be flexible to take what currently exists in each municipality

- Street name fields must be very flexible in length

- Schema design should consider/determine required and optional fields

- **ACTION: Nancy to send to Pat a digital copy of Alberta Health 911 schema**

- **ACTION: SDW to develop a preliminary schema for committee review**

Updates

- The intent is that municipalities deliver a consistent format of their own choosing

- Most municipalities forward their updates to Telus 911 and other utilities companies monthly or bi-monthly in spread sheet format. Possibly once the address dataset is completed, arrangements can be made so that the 911/utilities companies can obtain updates from the SDW address repository.

- **ACTION: Tony Woods to provide Pat a sample of the current csv export for Telus.**

- The repository structure should be flexible enough to provide users with complete and/or transactional updates

Delivery options

- One Call would require entire province wide updates

- Data extractions could be done using a municipal key

- Many users would require full replacement updates

- Some users would like to receive just changes

- Telus 911 and JUMP requirements to be considered in development of product(s)

Format

- Committee suggested that the first format option for distribution be ASCII and Shape files would be the second option

- CAD format not considered a required format in this initial committee discussion

Agreements

- Consideration should be given regarding the length of all agreements (shorter length with rolling expiry date)

- Include an update delivery schedule from the municipalities in the agreement

- It is the intent of AltaLIS to <u>not</u> put restrictions on Municipalities for the distribution of their address dataset

- Educational use has a unique agreement

- Potentially three tiers of licensing to be considered –

    1) Municipal Authority

    2) Public Safety

    3) Commercial Users

- Initially, only licensing for tiers 1 & 2 will be considered

- Data use considerations are extremely important to jurisdictions that have to answer to their council and ultimately their residents

Next Meeting: Early in New Year