# Introduction

The current process for editing requires too much manual comparison to the written (paper) documents that describe the EAs. I am proposing the following workflow to perform a number of standard steps before users start a new district, and then a change in the business process by which users perform editing, focusing on satellite imagery comparison, not paper comparison

# Process for editing

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Description | Time | Status |
| 1. | Set up EA topology | Pre-Analysis | Model – EA topology |
| 2. | Add editing fields | Pre-Analysis | Model – Editing add fields |
| 3. | Project all data to WGS84 | Pre-Analysis | Model Script – Project shapefiles to WGS84 |
| 4. | Search for imagery | Individually completed | Model Script – Fetch imagery tiles |
| 5. | Perform editing | Performed by editors | Manual |
| 6. | Dissolve type 2 EAs | Post-processing | Manual |
| 7. | Export final to shapefile | Post-processing | Manual |
| 8. | Generate EA list | Post-processing | Model – Generate EA name list |

# #5 Perform Editing

The process of editing currently resembles the digitizing process too closely and takes too long. The goal of this new methodology is to eliminate the paper in the editing process, except in cases where there is confusion around a specific EA:

1. Add the PROJECTED support data to the map (generated in step #3 above)
2. Add the relevant satellite imagery (potentially adjust the imagery to all match)
3. Add the topology to the map
4. Correct topological errors
   1. Make sure to validate the errors after every edit
5. Review the extents of the EAs through comparison to the satellite imagery
   1. If something confusing arises, look for the paper information
   2. Make sure all edits are followed by topology validation
6. Disssolve type 2 EAs into localities
7. Generate the EA list (script)