



e-Government Unit

GOVERNMENT SCHEMA GROUP

Minutes:

Meeting Details:

Time: 10.30-14.00

Date: 1st November 2005

Venue: Maple Rooms 3, Stockley House

Attendance

Name	Department
John Wailing	eGU Cabinet Office - Chair
Geraldine Lilley	eGU, Cabinet Office - Notes
Linda Humphries	eGU, Cabinet Office
Judy Jerome	eGU, Cabinet Office
Paul Spencer	Boynings Consulting
Anna Harvey	Local e-Government Standards Body
Bruce Yeoman	Local e-Government Standards Body
John Ochiltree	Houses of Parliament
Elizabeth McLaren	ONS
Nig Greenaway	Fujitsu Services
Colin Mackenzie	Electronic Media Consultants Ltd
Naran Hirani	PITO
Chris George	PITO
Lynda Minns	CJIT – Technical Directorate
Victor McFetridge	DWP
Kerr Donaldson	Scottish Executive
Gregory Everett	Lewisham Council
Jay Cousins	SGML Centre
Andy Greener	IR
Karen Tricker	HMCE
Linda Robey	DEFRA
Graham Knight	IBM
Bryan Fitzpatrick	ONS
Len Anderson	Newcastle City Council
Ian Hardy	Criminal Justice IT

Apologies

Name	Department
Alan Smith	ONS
Andrew Coote	ESRI (UK)
Ann Wrightson	CSW
Glenn Wood	Wolverhampton
Gordon Wilson	NHS National Services Scotland
Joe O'Meara	House of Commons
Martin Pickering	DWP
Patrick McLaughlin	DEFRA
Michael Andrews	e-GU
Nick Chapallaz	ESRI (UK)
Nigel Pommils	e-GU
Paul G Spence	Scottish Executive
Paul Harvey	TSO

Item	Topic	Action
1	Introduction/eGIF	

	<p>John Wailing welcomed the group mentioning that the Transformational Government Strategy was due for publication imminently. Key themes are sharing and alignment leading to reuse. Commenting that architectures need to become aligned – rather than each organisation writing its own. An implementation plan is in development for publication early next year. eGIF is central to achieving objectives in Strategy but as a framework it needs to be made useful and practical particularly for procurement specialists</p> <p>Confirmed that eGU working groups would be reconvened where useful, and in some cases once CTOs had proposed appropriate representation.</p> <p>AH – LeGSB runs an approval process and are producing 'blueprints' by way of advice – currently scoping one on eGIF which should be useful to others.</p> <p>JO – nothing in eGIF about governance – issue of difference in compliance and standards between different organisations. JW commented in response that the CTO Council will guide on this.</p> <p>AH asked if suppliers would be invited to join the CTO Council – JW responded saying that there may be two cuts of the group with suppliers participating in one.</p> <p>GK – Suppliers need clear objectives, adherence to standards reduces risk and compliance ought to be built into acceptance criteria</p> <p>BY – need for core of firm standards that can be used as building blocks – JW commented that keen to build in pieces using proven components so avoiding need for testing. LA – interagency working and lack of skills to assess suppliers and compliance highlights need for guidance and the need for reusable components. BY commented that LeGSB tries to pull together standards across Local Authorities but the landscape is complex.</p> <p>AG – Commented that the Gateway should be eGIF compliant – JW is talking to Jim Purves on this issue</p> <p>JW – eGU modus operandus will be to orchestrate others to deliver both for themselves and for wider use i.e. more generically. (eGU to shrink and Technical Policy Team will buy in expert help as required). CTOs and IWG members to 'volunteer' to use their own resource and work in a more collegiate fashion. Issues to be discussed by CTOs at ½ December CTO Council meeting. JW commented that one big challenge is to know what others are doing – this intelligence could be provided by the CTOs. CM suggested an online register. NH referred to the OSS community that have solved similar problems – but through personal drive and commitment.</p> <p>Schema QA Process: CM – architectural schema of wide interest should be flagged to all. GK – need to identify those with appropriate expertise to work on specific schema. CG commented that someone needs to own the process as should all decline to comment a schema would pass process unchecked. PS – which highlights need for independent QA by a certified expert in data integration – and need to pay for independent review rather than rely on members goodwill.</p>	<p>AH to share 'blueprints' with eGU</p> <p>JW to consider how to collect intelligence on work underway across the piece</p> <p>JW to consider how best to progress</p>
2	<p>Minutes and actions from last GSG meeting</p> <p>Michael Andrews email of 24th June updated actions from the last meeting. <u>Detail as follows:</u> ACTION 1: Annual Review of Schema Guidelines - Carried over. ACTION 2: Issues around XML, legislation and paper documents to be discussed with William Perrin - Completed. This will be taken forward by the eGU Transformation Team. ACTION 3: Civil Registration DS proposals to be circulated – sent round. ACTION 4: NHS to be contacted regarding membership - Completed. ACTION 5: Schema metadata work to be included in TORs - Revised TORs sent round. ACTION 6: XML Schema Process FAQs to be posted on GovTalk - Completed. ACTION 7: XML Schema QA Process document to be circulated for approval – sent round for comment. ACTION 8: Schema metadata slide circulated - Previously circulated with minutes. ACTION 9: Group to be kept informed of movement of local government schemas to LeGSB - no schemas moved from GovTalk to date. ACTION 10: Meeting with ONS regarding country codes and religion/ethnicity - A meeting took place. ACTION 11: Discussion document regarding Person Relationship Types data standard - Held over.</p>	
3	<p>Standards</p> <p>GDSC – Paul Spencer <u>BS7666</u> Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses are a problem with every project 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability to join incompatible elements with XML • BS7666 does not describe postal addresses - but people try to use where structured addresses are required (based on addressable objects which is one of its limitations) <p>PS proposes the use of an alternative – PAF?</p> <p>BY commented that the use of PAF address schema could cause confusion. Also enquired what we were trying to achieve – exchange addresses or unambiguously identify the correct property when we communicate between organisations or between organisations and the public. Also suggested looking at BS7666/Postal addresses/simple text addresses – would provide a flexible mechanism.</p> <p>AG – OASIS address standard – rather than invent a PAF address structure we should look to implement CIQ</p> <p>PS – proposed formation of a group of 4 to develop recommendation(s) based on an understanding of what govt wants to use structured addresses for. (Comment that ODPM rep was missing and as primary users of addressing info we need to consult them), Group likely to be PS/BY/ODPM rep/DWP rep.</p> <p><u>Character sets</u> Issue: The sets of characters people want to use are not covered – accented names etc. This might raise FOI issues - requests to remove a record where the name hasn't been captured correctly.</p> <p>CG – accented characters need to be exchanged by some systems and this needs supporting (but not necessarily by all those that do not require such a capability).</p> <p>JW – proposes putting question to ID Cards for their views also will find out what the Registry Office, UKPA and others are doing and why.</p> <p><u>Personal Relationships</u></p> <p>ONS – use relationship codes for their social surveys – could offer as a new standard</p> <p>VMF – if no business case to come up with a cross government standard then proposes we leave alone.</p> <p><u>Ethnicity</u></p> <p>EM - asked ONS to provide a standard as ethnicity is only used for surveys and no other govt purpose (Looking at 2011 Census now and will forward details to JW) (police use of ethnicity?)</p> <p>PS – Dfes have two standards – proposes that we look at what exists and identify commonalities.</p> <p>JW – asked who actually needed the work – concluded no pressing need for action.</p> <p>LM (added by e-mail) – CJIT has four standards defined for ethnicity (details have been provided to Elizabeth McLaren). This work is required for any government body that has a responsibility for the care of a person. This is particularly relevant to the Criminal Justice System, where there is a pressing operational need by those organisations that are responsible for the day to day care of offenders, e.g., Police, National Offender Management Service (Prison and Probation Service). There have been cases reported in the press of racist murders within prisons and it is believed that better intelligence re ethnicity / racially aggravated offending would go some way to lessening the number of occurrences whilst increasing public confidence in the Criminal Justice System. The same need may also be relevant to Local Authorities and Health Care Organisations.</p> <p><u>Addresses</u> Paul Boynton says there are always problems with address formats in projects. Post Code validation has problems.</p> <p>Several use cases need to be considered, eg electoral register needs postal address and a method of validating a person. Several Core businesses needs more than a postal address.</p> <p>HMRC suggested adopting the International Standard CIQ ownership of addresses, not the Post Office.</p> <p>The consensus was that mapping between different address types would be</p>	<p>JW to manage formation of group</p> <p>JW to speak to Henry Bloomfield HO</p>
---	--

	<p>necessary - and ODPM must be involved - whether or not the NSAI is resurrected. The problem needs in strong e-gu sponsorship to look at strategic ways of setting the standard.</p> <p>DWP only plans to use postal address.</p> <p>A suggestions to use the UPRN was discussed - as in Sweden - but there are cultural issues mitigating against it.standard, which also contains names.</p> <p>It was proposed to set up a small group to consider the requirements - which must include ODPM. It was reported that some suppliers are changing their systems to BS7666, eg OLM CareFirst. Len Anderson summarised the responses to the proposed new schema provided by John Waring (Newcastle City Council).</p> <p>It was pointed out the Local Authorities have ownership of addresses, not the Post Office.</p> <p>The consensus was that mapping between different address types would be necessary - and ODPM must be involved - whether or not the NSAI is resurrected. The problem needs in strong e-gu sponsorship to look at strategic ways of setting the standard.</p> <p>DWP only plans to use postal address.</p> <p>A suggestions to use the UPRN was discussed - as in Sweden - but there are cultural issues mitigating against it."</p>	
4	<p>ONS and Civil Partnerships</p> <p>Comment that the Civil Partnership Bill comes into effect next year and is very important for HR systems (pension rights etc). ONS publishes schema and data models.</p> <p>CW – the issue requires DTI input who have had legal advice on the issue. Legacy systems do not need to be changed – i.e. no need for new marital status tag. Upshot being that sensible approach would be to agree to differ and include both ONS and DWP schema.</p>	
5	<p>Schema</p> <p>RegRep</p> <p>JW – explained that Kristina Pearcey had been experimenting with ebXML repository to evaluate and assess its capabilities (Sun Beta v3). AH mentioned that Government Connect want to use this and asked about the possibility of adding things in. JW responded saying he wanted to make the repository point outward (give it an IP address).</p> <p>Updating guidelines</p> <p>JW – looking for 3-4 volunteers to help develop the new eGMS4. Desire to make the document useful. Paul Spencer, Andy Greener and Ann Wrightson proposed. Noted that eGU schemas do not meet the guidelines also the need for guidance on the periodicity of updates.</p> <p>Need for guidance or an example on importing names/spaces.</p> <p>eGMS XML Schema application profile and binding for XML schemas</p> <p>LH gave a brief update - the technical and schema groups are both about to be reconvened.</p>	<p>JW to consider AHs request</p> <p>JW to consider how best to manage process around eGMS4</p>
6	<p>AOB</p> <p>None</p>	
7	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>tba</p>	

