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**Abstract**

*250 words max. Clearly summarize the following major sections. Each gets one or two sentences.*

* Problem Statement
* Data
* Methods
* Results
* Discussion and Conclusion

**Problem Statement**

The main objective of this project is to compare the different web APIs (Minnesota Geospatial Commons, Google Places, and NDAWN) using a pipeline that downloads two data sets, transforms both datasets to the same coordinate reference system (geographic and projected), spatially joins them, prints to the screen head showing the merged attributes, and saves the integrated dataset into a geodatabase (Runck, 2022). The interfaces of Minnesota Geospatial Commons, Google Places, and NDAWN use different spatial web APIs which requires us to build unique pipelines to extract its data.

*Figure 1. Building Pipelines for Google Places, Minnesota Geospatial Commons, and NDAWN*

(Note: This figure illustrates a simplified version of the constructed pipeline)

*Table 1. Required Data for ETL Pipeline Analysis*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Requirement** | **Defined As** | **(Spatial) Data** | **Attribute Data** | **Dataset** | **Preparation** |
| 1 | Dataset from Minnesota Geospatial Commons | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2 | Dataset from Minnesota Geospatial Commons | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | Dataset from NDAWN | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4 | Dataset from NDAWN | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5 | Dataset from Google Places | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6 | Dataset from Google Places | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

**Input Data**

*Describe the data in two paragraphs max. Fill out the table.*

*Table 2. Input Data (Minnesota Geospatial Commons, NDAWN, and Google Places)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Title** | **Purpose in Analysis** | **Link to Source** |
| 1 | Assessed Waters, Minnesota, 2016 | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis from Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/env-assessed-water-2016) |
| 2 | Assessed Waters, Minnesota, 2022 | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis from Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/env-assessed-water-2022) |
| 3 | Monthly Weather Data, Baker, Minnesota, 2022 | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis from NDAWN | [NDAWN Center](https://ndawn.ndsu.nodak.edu/get-table.html?station=9&variable=mdmxt&variable=mdmnt&variable=mdavt&variable=mdbst&variable=mdtst&variable=mdws&variable=mdmxws&variable=mdsr&variable=mdapet&variable=mdtpet&variable=mdr&variable=mddp&variable=mdwc&year=2022&ttype=monthly&quick_pick=1_m&begin_date=2021-10&count=12) |
| 4 | Monthly Weather Data, Baker, Minnesota, 2019 | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis from NDAWN | [NDAWN Center](https://ndawn.ndsu.nodak.edu/get-table.html?station=9&variable=mdmxt&variable=mdmnt&variable=mdavt&variable=mdbst&variable=mdtst&variable=mdws&variable=mdmxws&variable=mdsr&variable=mdapet&variable=mdtpet&variable=mdr&variable=mddp&variable=mdwc&year=2022&ttype=monthly&quick_pick=&begin_date=2019-10&count=12) |
| 5 | Nearby Search, Google Places | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis from Google Places | [Google Places](https://www.google.com/maps/search/resturants+near+by/@44.9067304,-93.4077598,13z/data=!3m1!4b1) |
| 6 | Nearby Search, Google Places | Raw Input for ETL Pipeline Analysis from Google Places | [Google Places](https://www.google.com/maps/search/resturants+near+by/@44.9067304,-93.4077598,13z/data=!3m1!4b1) |

**Methods**

*Include a data flow diagram or screenshot from model builder. Do references in line (Rammankutty, 2033). Document any and all steps that you did to the input data in the data flow diagram. Provide natural language description of the most important steps, giving a narrative arc and provide well formatting screenshots with a boarder and centered throughout.*

*Resources on Data Flow Diagrams:*

* [*https://www.visual-paradigm.com/tutorials/data-flow-diagram-dfd.jsp*](https://www.visual-paradigm.com/tutorials/data-flow-diagram-dfd.jsp)
* [*https://www.lucidchart.com/pages/data-flow-diagram/how-to-make-a-dfd*](https://www.lucidchart.com/pages/data-flow-diagram/how-to-make-a-dfd)

*Figure 1. Data flow diagram.*

*If appropriate, add in pseudo-code describing model algorithms and/or objects. If using mathematical equations, create a clear mapping between the reference equation, pseudo-code, and actual implementation in a programming language.*

**Results**

*Show the results in figures and maps. Describe how they address the problem statement.*

*Follow best practice for map design, coloring, etc.*

**Results Verification**

*How do you know your results are correct? This can be a qualitative or quantitative verification.*

**Discussion and Conclusion**

*What did you learn? How does it relate to the main problem?*
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**Self-score**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Description** | **Points Possible** | **Score** |
| **Structural Elements** | All elements of a lab report are included **(2 points each)**:  Title, Notice: Dr. Bryan Runck, Author, Project Repository, Date, Abstract, Problem Statement, Input Data w/ tables, Methods w/ Data, Flow Diagrams, Results, Results Verification, Discussion and Conclusion, References in common format, Self-score | 28 |  |
| **Clarity of Content** | Each element above is executed at a professional level so that someone can understand the goal, data, methods, results, and their validity and implications in a 5 minute reading at a cursory-level, and in a 30 minute meeting at a deep level **(12 points)**. There is a clear connection from data to results to discussion and conclusion **(12 points)**. | 24 |  |
| **Reproducibility** | Results are completely reproducible by someone with basic GIS training. There is no ambiguity in data flow or rationale for data operations. Every step is documented and justified. | 28 |  |
| **Verification** | Results are correct in that they have been verified in comparison to some standard. The standard is clearly stated **(10 points)**, the method of comparison is clearly stated **(5 points)**, and the result of verification is clearly stated **(5 points)**. | 20 |  |
|  |  | 100 |  |