

 <p>ABERDEEN CITY COUNCIL</p>	<p>Open Data Working Group</p>	<p>Document Ref</p>
--	---------------------------------------	---------------------

MINUTES FROM MEETING ON 26th June 2017

In attendance: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

Item	Subject and Decision	Action By
1. Apologies		
2. Minutes of 5 June 2017	<p>Actions from the previous meeting: 2.2 Project Status WP2 – procurement is still ongoing. 2.3 Project Status WP3 – [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] met with [REDACTED] and compiled the list of priorities. Also added to the list was the “Data driven procurement - Social Care provision” option. 2.5 Maturity Model – [REDACTED] <i>to check that the spreadsheet of summary results is on the KHub</i> 4 WP4 stakeholder mapping – the initial mapping is now on the KHub 6 Skills mapping to be discussed at the meeting in Perth</p>	[REDACTED]
3. Project plan - original to be updated	<p>NA worked through the progress for each of the Work Packages: WP1 – this appears to be behind, with no documentation for ACC on any of the tasks that should be completed by this stage. WP2 – procurement is not complete but does not appear to be an issue with ACC. [REDACTED] <i>to check with [REDACTED] whether the issue is with [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]</i> WP3 – this appears to be progressing and is the least concern at this point in time WP4 – some delay in getting started but making progress</p>	[REDACTED]
4. WP1 - Data standards update	<p>[REDACTED] commented that [REDACTED] had indicated that this Work Package was complete. [REDACTED] <i>to check the level of progress and documentation at national level (8th City Data Cluster – Steering Group Meeting)</i></p>	[REDACTED]

Item	Subject and Decision	Action By
5. WP2 – procurement	<p>The question of whether budget cuts might affect the procurement was discussed. [redacted] thought this was funded out of revenue and was ring-fenced. [redacted] to check [redacted] whether this is a risk]</p> <p>[redacted] explained that the branding for the Open Data platform was to be Aberdeen City and not ACC. Discussion on an Aberdeen City logo was being discussed with the Aberdeen Commons group. [redacted] had been in contact with [redacted] and consequently contacted the Chamber of Commerce as well as possible leads within ACC. [redacted] mentioned that [redacted] might have some involvement – [redacted] waiting to hear from [redacted].</p>	[redacted]
6. WP3 – potential areas for applying analytics	<p>2. School Role – this could have simple metrics. Potential benefits from more accuracy could provide savings. [redacted] thought this would be a good one (financial). [redacted] to speak to [redacted] re potential]</p> <p>3. Local Area Dashboards – [redacted] thought that [redacted] has had some involvement. Benefits could be in helping with Committee reporting (help with decision making). Metrics could include financial. Value could include better community engagement. Dashboards could include statistics e.g. antisocial behaviour. Suggestion is that we could ask the community for suggestions, which links to “4. Communities planning and engagement”</p> <p>6. FOI – this is thought to have negligible benefit. [redacted] currently splits by category (e.g. public, journalist, academic, political etc). Data is often already available but still get FOI requests that need to be processed. The other aspect is that requests can be unpredictable e.g. following fire in London requests regarding high-rise buildings. The community is getting better at putting out data.</p> <p>Need to understand the case for each of the suggested areas for development.</p> <p>[redacted] mentioned the Place Standard tool as a possible way of using Open Data in creative ways to identify local issues. [redacted] said that Community Planning are already using this tool.</p>	[redacted]
7. WP4 - stakeholder mapping, skills and training	<p>One of the potential outputs of stakeholder mapping is a communications plan. The Working Group thought that initially this should be kept very simple, primarily using email to communicate developments. [redacted] pointed out that this was about building relationships, so need to define priorities.</p> <p>[redacted] suggested that one option is to invite partners and members of the public (Community Councils) to join the Working Group. The agreement was that this could be considered once the project is well established. The group thought that when we have a clear identity that it is easier to sell.</p>	

Item	Subject and Decision	Action By
8. Issue log & Risk Log	<p>No issues have been recorded</p> <p>Risk log was discussed:</p> <p>#1 (procurement) - review after the meeting in Perth and discussion with [REDACTED] (identify where the blockage is)</p> <p>#4 (capacity) – this depends on what skills exist within ACC. [REDACTED] gave an example of metadata creation but pointed out that tools can help with this sort of issue (i.e. workarounds where skills are lacking)</p> <p>#8 (quality) – need to consider the relevant quality issues e.g. updating published Open Data. [REDACTED] suggested that this could be down to having good processes in place for publishing.</p> <p>#10 (budgetary) – this may be an issue in relation to WP4 if spending is put on hold but we can still look for creative ways of delivering events.</p> <p>#13 (engagement) – attendance at Working Group meetings has dropped. [REDACTED] stated that this risk was not about meetings or frequency. There are options for our priorities and once we identify specific tasks then members of the Working Group are more likely to be interested. For example, if WP3 progresses “School role forecasting”, then this could be of specific interest to education.</p>	
9. Next steps	None discussed	
10. AOCB	Agreed that the Chair revolve. [REDACTED] was volunteered to chair the next meeting	

Date of next Working Group Meeting: 10 July 2017 12:00-13:00. Where: RmMC-3-W-01