**Open Data User Group - Minutes**

**18th meeting**

**20th November 2013, 14:00-16:30**

**70 Whitehall, London, SW1A 2AS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attendees** | **Officials** |
| Heather Savory (Chair) (HS) | Jemma Venables (JV) |
| Bob Barr (BB) 2:30o | Krisztina Katona (Cabinet Office) (KK) |
| Alex Kafetz (AK) | Ekua Boateng (Cabinet Office) (EB) |
| Gesche Schmid (GSc) |  |
| Giuseppe Sollazzo (GS) | **Observers** |
| Tom Smith(TS) |  |
| Jacqui Taylor (JT) |  |
|  | **Apologies** |
|  | Paul Fenton (PF) |
|  | Dominique Lazanski (DL) |
|  | Harvey Lewis (HL) |
|  | Tom Smith (TS) |
|  | Carlos Somohano (CS) |
|  | Jeni Tennison (JTe) |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Agenda**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Description** |
| **1** | Chair’s welcome and update |
| **2** | Update on NII and progress on CO Data Requests |
| **3** | Criteria for funding proposals |
| **4** | ODUG Local Government Voucher Scheme Proposal |
| **5** | ODUG Census Consultation Response |
| **6** | PASC Further Evidence |
| **7** | Case Studies |
| **8** | Land Registry Open Data Challenge |
| **9** | A.O.B. |

**Chair’s Intro and Welcome**

The Chair welcomed the group to the meeting and introductions were made to the incoming Secretariat for the group JV. JV briefly introduced herself to the group and informed the group that her main work had been on the OGP festival and her current role is focussing on wider stakeholder engagement with the open data community, including support for ODUG and the Public Sector Transparency Board (PSTB). KK was thanked by the Chair for her work with the group.

The minutes from the last meeting had been approved in correspondence.

**Chair’s Update**

The Chair had spoken at a Market Research Society conference on the census and open data and also had participated in the Land Registry Open Data Challenge. In addition she thanked the group for all their work on the OGP Summit and GS for his scoring work on the Land Registry Open Data Challenge. HS updated the group about a recent case relating to the commercial use of HMLR INSPIRE Cadastral Polygon data which is subject to derived data licensing restrictions by the Ordinance Survey. HS also confirmed to the group that the funding proposal for an Open Address Dataset was not on the PSTB agenda for the meeting the following day, although the PSTB would consider the Local Government funding proposal at the meeting.

**Update on NII and progress on CO Data Requests**

KK provided an update on the progress of the NII informing the group that approximately 280 data sets had formed the first iteration of the NII. KK gave a brief overview of the next steps of the NII which were:

* Working with the Local Government Association and Local Public Data Panel to consider how best to include local authority datasets
* Working with Departments and their arm’s length bodies to identify their list of unpublished datasets
* Working with Departments to put the datasets currently published through the Open Data Institute’s open data certification process and making the outcome available through data.gov.uk
* Departments will set out the arrangements they have to ensure the quality and regularity of the release of datasets within the NII
* The aspiration is to make all government data open, in a usable and re-usable format but it must be recognised that this may not always be possible. Where it is not possible organisations involved should explore, with stakeholders and potential users, how it might best make useful data available.

The full list of NII Commitments and Next Steps can be found in the National Information Infrastructure publication of October 2013 in Annex A.

ODUG discussed the aged data requests on data.gov.uk and sought clarity on the progress made by the Transparency Team on these requests. ODUG discussed that stakeholders had complained about the time it was taking to resolve these requests and noted that increasing numbers of stakeholders were contacting the group about how to make complaints. KK informed the group that progressing data requests could be a lengthy process that involves negotiations with departments depending on the complexity of the data being requested.

**Action:** JV to provide an update on data requests more than a year old.

**Action:** DR to write a short guidance note for the data community on how to complain to OPSI as it is hard to find the information on how to do so on their website.

**Criteria for funding proposals**

JV informed the group that she was unclear about the criteria for funding proposals for the PSTB as this is a new part of her role under the new Transparency Team structure. JV thought that this issue could possibly be raised as AOB at the PSTB as well as the Local Government funding proposal. She highlighted that the main item for discussion at the PSTB was the Domestic Team Strategy and forward look. She highlighted that Local Authority data was an important area of focus for the Transparency Team and they are seeking to learn more about the landscape and how to provide support in this area.

**Action:** JV and GSc to meet to discuss further the Local Authority data landscape.

**ODUG Local Government Voucher Scheme Funding Proposal**

GSc provided an update on the proposal highlighting that the DCLG Code of Practice was about to be published (29th November 2013) which would have a significant bearing on themes for the voucher scheme. The Code of Practice has some mandated data elements that will not be determined until publication. The group discussed which themes would be put forward with a caveat regarding the publication of the Code of Practice. The group agreed on the themes of: Public Toilets, Planning and Road Gritting.

**Action:** GSc to update the paper to highlight the three themes agreed by the group.

**ODUG Census Consultation Response**

The group discussed the outline of the response being drafted and set out the timetable for this work.

**Action:** BB/TS to send around draft response on agreed timescales, All to respond to agreed timescales.

**PASC Further Evidence**

BB updated the group highlighting that the evidence session went well from the ODUG perspective with HS giving good evidence to the Committee. BB felt that it was likely the Committee would want to know more about the Royal Mail Post Code Address File in the future. BB undated the group on the invitation to submit further evidence and will send a draft paper to the group for comment.

**Action:** BB to send around a first draft of his paper for comment by 26th November; submission is due on 29th November.

**Case Studies**

HS (for HL) presented the a paper on case studies asking the group for their feedback on the proposed template and the suggested open data case studies cited in the template. ODUG discussed what criteria should be used for case studies to be included and agreed that a thematic approach should be taken. The discussion focussed on how ‘pure’ the definition of open data should be and whether case studies should highlight that open data could be combined with other data to demonstrate the value that can be derived. The format of the data was discussed and whether case studies around the use of open data API’s should be included. ODUG agreed an initial focus on case studies focusing on the use of government open data and the value that has been derived from this, with a separate theme for case studies highlighting open data tools. JV highlighted that the Transparency Team were are also putting case studies together as were other stakeholders such as Open Data Institute (ODI), Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) and Nesta and we should try and avoid duplication. JV was also keen to use the ODUG template in order for standardisation across case studies posted on DGUK. The group agreed that this would be a good idea.

**Action:** For All to produce an open data case study using the template and to send it too HL for review at the next ODUG meeting in December.

**Action:** For JV to speak to Head of data.gov.uk about building a page for case studies including functionality for the community to submit case studies using the agreed template.

**Land Registry Open Data Challenge**

GS provided an update on the Land Registry Open Data Challenge and thanked the group for their feedback on the submissions. There were 100 expressions of interest and only 7 full submissions, which is a significant gap. ODUG discussed that this was a typical response rate to many such competitions and it was felt that the incentives for small and medium businesses were not adequate for the size of the prizes together with the potential disincentives over ownership of Intellectual Property Rights. ODUG was interested whether Land Registry had done any follow up with applicants that had not put forward a submission.

GS highlighted that he had attended the Cabinet Office Idea-thon and informed the group about the Education Challenge Series run by ODI and Nesta where the initial prize money is £5,000 and the final prize of £50,000.

**Action:** GS/AK to draft a note about SME response to open data competitions, looking at sources of prize funds and responses to initiatives, to provide feedback and guidance for organisations setting up these initiatives.

**A.O.B.**

GSc updated the group on the PSMA workshop (11th December 2013) informing the group there was now a space for someone else on the group to attend if possible.

GSc also asked ODUG members if they were aware of issues relating to PSMA licensing and the use of third party use of Ordinance Survey data. The general consensus was that many new ODUG members were not aware of the issue in detail.

JT informed the group that Ed Parkes was now leading the Open Data Challenge Series for Nesta and asked the group if they would like hear presentation from Ed at a future meeting. The group agreed that they would like a presentation on the Open Data Challenge Series at a future meeting.

GSc asked the group if there could be 1 presentation per meeting. The group did not come to a conclusion on this but JV spoke to the group about setting out a forward look for ODUG meetings, the group agreed this was a good idea.

**Action:** JV/HS to agree a forward look for ODUG meetings.

**Action:** JV to invite Ed Parkes to a future meeting to present to ODUG about the Open Data Challenge Series.