



*SmartCities*

## Project Initiation Document

Pilot name: Local Government Business Model, including  
Smart Cities Services Catalogue

Municipality: Porism Ltd (esd-toolkit)

Work-package: WP2 – Methodology

Date: 6 December 2009

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Pilot information.....	3
2.1. Pilot name .....	3
2.2. Pilot acronym .....	3
2.3. Pilot website.....	3
2.4. What type of initiative is the pilot?.....	3
2.5. Pilot country .....	4
2.6. Pilot city/region.....	4
2.7. Pilot start date.....	4
2.8. Pilot finish date .....	4
2.9. Pilot operational date .....	4
3. Background to the pilot.....	4
3.1. Pilot topics.....	5
3.2. Pilot sector .....	5
3.3. Target users of pilot .....	6
3.4. Description of target users.....	7
3.5. Type of service .....	7
3.6. Overall implementation approach.....	7
4. Pilot description.....	8
4.1. Objectives.....	8
4.2. Approach .....	8
4.3. Deliverables.....	8
4.4. Exclusions .....	9
4.5. Constraints .....	9
4.6. Assumptions/dependencies.....	9
5. Business case .....	10
5.1. Summary/overview .....	10
5.2. Customer benefits.....	10
5.3. Performance benefits.....	10
5.4. Employee benefits.....	11
5.5. Financial benefits of using a common controlled list .....	12
5.6. Project benefits .....	13
6. Pilot management/organisation.....	14
7. Staff/financial resources.....	14
8. Reporting framework .....	16
9. Pilot plan.....	19
10. Risks .....	20
11. Co-design .....	21
12. Transnational work.....	22

## 1. Introduction

A project initiation document [PID] is a document that brings together in one place the key information needed to start, manage and evaluate a pilot.

**All stakeholders should be informed of the development of a PID, and the final PID should be agreed and signed off by the management in municipal partners.**

The PID should contain information setting out the "who, what, why, when and how" for the local pilot. It should define all major aspects of the pilot, and can be used as a key part in the management of the delivery of the pilot and sets the baselines that will be used in any assessment of the pilot's success.

All Smart Cities partners are expected to produce a PID for each local pilot. These will be used by the project and by local partners to measure progress against the aims and objectives set out in each pilot's PID. Many partners will already be expected to develop PIDs for their pilots: in this case relevant information should be copied into this form.

## 2. Pilot information

This section sets out the basic information about your pilot.

### 2.1. Pilot name

What's your pilot project called?

Local Government Business Model, including Smart Cities Services Catalogue

### 2.2. Pilot acronym

Does the pilot have an acronym? [e.g. SCRAN?] If not, leave blank.

LGBM

### 2.3. Pilot website

Does the pilot have a local website? If not, leave blank.

<http://esd.org.uk/standards/> and <http://standards.esd-toolkit.eu/>

### 2.4. What type of initiative is the pilot?

Select **all** that apply to your pilot.

- |                                     |                      |                          |                            |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Project or service   | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award scheme               |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Network              | <input type="checkbox"/> | Promotion/awareness scheme |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Strategic initiative | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other                      |

### 2.5. Pilot country

- |                          |             |                                     |        |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|--------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Belgium     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Norway |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Germany     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Sweden |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Netherlands | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | UK     |

### 2.6. Pilot city/region

National with some work extending to countries of other partners

### 2.7. Pilot start date

1 January 2009

### 2.8. Pilot finish date

31 December 2010, followed by evaluation

### 2.9. Pilot operational date

When did your pilot go 'live' to the public/businesses?

Planned 31 December 2010

## 3. Background to the pilot

Set out the context for the pilot: why are you interested in doing this work, what issues do you need to address, why do you feel you need to address them etc..

Fill in this box. It will expand as you type.

Standards that apply common naming conventions to the elements of public sector service delivery, underpin service improvement work in the UK where resources and metrics are shared and compared between municipalities and some other public sector bodies.

From 2002 a set of controlled lists has been established, published and maintained at [www.esd.org.uk/standards](http://www.esd.org.uk/standards). The [What are all these lists?](#) pages describe the lists and mappings between them. Central to the lists is the Local Government Services List (LGSL) which is used by the central government citizen portal (Directgov), the central government business portal (Business Link), in local authority web site CMSs and in many CRM systems.

Work under SmartCities extends the work on standards to date to address two objectives:

1. To provide a more formal ontology supporting Customer Insight and Business Improvement in local government and apply the techniques of the semantic web via [Linked Data](#)
2. To extend the model outside the UK, building in the services of Smart Cities municipalities to reflect the likely services delivered locally in their countries.

### 3.1. Pilot topics

Select **all** that apply to your pilot

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Efficiency & Effectiveness, Benchmarking     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interoperability       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inclusive eGovernment                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Aspects                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> eIdentity and eSecurity                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multi-channel Delivery |
| <input type="checkbox"/> eParticipation, eDemocracy and eVoting                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Open Source                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> eProcurement  | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy                            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services for Businesses                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional and Local                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services for Citizens                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> User-centric Services  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Impact Services with Pan-European Scope | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure                               |  |

### 3.2. Pilot sector

Select **all** that apply to your pilot

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication (infrastructure) | <input type="checkbox"/> Internal market                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Crime, Justice and Law                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Local/Regional Community Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Culture and Media                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Procurement                          |

<input type="checkbox"/> Customs	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Security
<input type="checkbox"/> Education, Science and Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Electricity/Gas	<input type="checkbox"/> Tax
<input type="checkbox"/> Employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Travel, Transports and Motoring
<input type="checkbox"/> Environment	<input type="checkbox"/> Water
<input type="checkbox"/> Fire Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Social Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Healthcare	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

### 3.3. Target users of pilot

Select **all** that apply to your pilot

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> eGovernment	<input type="checkbox"/> Disadvantaged/deprived communities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrative	<input type="checkbox"/> Families and children at risk
<input type="checkbox"/> Business (self-employed)	<input type="checkbox"/> Homeless
<input type="checkbox"/> Business (industry)	<input type="checkbox"/> Minorities and migrants
<input type="checkbox"/> Business (SME)	<input type="checkbox"/> Older people (60+)
<input type="checkbox"/> Citizen	<input type="checkbox"/> People living in poverty and/or precarity
<input type="checkbox"/> Civil society	<input type="checkbox"/> People with anti-social and criminal behaviour
<input type="checkbox"/> Intermediaries	<input type="checkbox"/> People with disability
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> People with health and long-term care problems
<input type="checkbox"/> eHealth	<input type="checkbox"/> People with no or poor digital literacy
<input type="checkbox"/> Add Patients	<input type="checkbox"/> SMEs, associations and intermediaries
<input type="checkbox"/> General public	<input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed people
<input type="checkbox"/> Health authorities	<input type="checkbox"/> Young people at risk of marginalisation
<input type="checkbox"/> Health professionals	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> eInclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Women
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Any citizen	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3.4. Description of target users

Please describe your target group and provide some information on size, composition and needs.

The work is aimed at officers from municipalities and other public and third sector officers whose interest is service improvement and efficiency via, customer insight and business improvement.

The Customer Insight components (addressing life events, need and customer circumstance) are aimed at better targeting of services, particularly at the socially and digitally excluded.

The Business Improvement components (generic processes, channels, functional scope of organisations) are aimed at increasing the efficiency with which services are delivered.

### 3.5. Type of service

Select the **one** that best applies to your pilot

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable/not available  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IT infrastructures and products |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness-raising information | <input type="checkbox"/> Participation                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training and education        | <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive services of general interest     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Content provision             | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                                      |

### 3.6. Overall implementation approach

Select the **one** that best applies to your pilot

- |  |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public administration   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Private sector  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-profit sector   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnerships between administration and/or private sector and/or non-profit sector |

## 4. Pilot description

These sections of the PID describe what the pilot will do and how it will do it.

### 4.1. Objectives

What outcomes should be delivered by the pilot? (Business case/benefits should be set out in Section 5)

An ontology to describe the components of local service delivery in the public sector and relationships between them.

The work will extend existing work with UK municipalities in defining services and how they are delivered. It will model:

- life events, need and circumstance to provide a structured way of understanding customers and where services should be targeted
- the elements of service delivery, including delivery channels and generic processes involved in transacting a service.

### 4.2. Approach

How will the pilot do this?

- esd-toolkit will work with user groups around the UK both in person and in a virtual environment to gain a collaborative opinion of what works for the majority.
- Porism will manage consultation on the service list and any enhancements requested by partners after initial publication.
- Local service lists will be received from each partner, translated to English and mapped to a high level service list.
- All outputs will be held in a database and shown online for comment via a viewer with multiple download formats available.

### 4.3. Deliverables

What outputs/processes/procedures/definitions will be delivered by the pilot?

- The output will be a public ontology known as the Local Government Business Model (LGBM) freely available in human and machine readable format with supporting documentation on how the model can be applied.
- Porism will produce a high level list of services (or service areas) covering all types of service that are delivered by one or more municipalities in the SmartCities project. The list will cross-reference local service lists provided by each regional partner. Hence it will allow partners to see where other partners are delivering similar services and to share information that is indexed against each service in each municipality.
- The SmartCities participants will be encouraged to take up the outputs to prove the concept of a transnational list of services.
- The list will be presented as a candidate for an EU standard service list.

#### 4.4. Exclusions

What issues are **outside** the scope of the pilot?

Extensions of LGBM outside the UK are limited to the Services Catalogue, subject to feedback by partners. Long term support for the model outside the UK is excluded beyond the term of Smart Cities, unless there is separate provision made.

#### 4.5. Constraints

What issues constrain the pilot? (These will include financial, technical, and timing issues.)

To gain a true transnational consensus, user group workshops should be carried out in participating countries as demonstrated by the esd-toolkit TLCs (Toolkit Local Community Meetings). Funding does not allow for these transnational workshops to take place. The collaboration will be done virtually.

#### 4.6. Assumptions/dependencies

Set out the assumptions you have made at the beginning of the pilot – particularly if your pilot is dependent upon other projects/pilots. Identify external factors which may affect the pilot.

- The work is dependent on concurrent work in the UK by groups looking at Customer Insight, Business Improvement and Performance Management in conjunction with esd-toolkit.
- The EU Service Catalogue relies on candidate lists being supplied by partner organisations and on their subsequent feedback on the draft Service Catalogue.

## 5. Business case

Set out why your municipality feels the pilot is necessary, what the pilot seeks to achieve, and what benefits it will deliver. Include how these benefits will be measured (e.g. increased customer satisfaction, faster processing etc.).

### 5.1. Summary/overview

LGBM will facilitate common referencing of the elements of service delivery and define relationships between those elements. Benefits are:

- Ability to share resources between some 400 municipalities in the UK and many more overseas if they apply the model
- Ability to benchmark against like organisations to identify areas for potential improvement and possibilities to learn from other municipalities
- Reduced effort in creating and maintaining local indices (eg file plans, web site navigation structures, CRM process references) where resources are shared and validated against a common standard
- Ability to test and document relationships between elements of the model (eg propensity of different types of customer to use different channels) and share the learning of others

The EU Service Catalogue will extend some of these benefits to other Smart Cities partners and form the basis of a possible EU standard service list.

### 5.2. Customer benefits

Use of standards:

- Increases customer satisfaction as they get a quick, accurate response to information and transactional service requests.
- Gives them greater confidence in decisions.
- The customer becomes familiar with how information is presented across multiple organisations and EU country boundaries.
- Services and delivery mechanisms suitable for socially and digitally excluded groups are better identified to reduce exclusion.

### 5.3. Performance benefits

- Cuts down handling time and increases first time resolution of customer requests and needs.
- Supports efficiency programmes by providing benefits in productive time.
- Cuts down complaints.
- Gives a more consistent answer to the public
- Enables additional information to be applied such as customer segmentation or FAQs
- Improves business processes by identifying common elements of service delivery, which add value and how delivery can be rationalised across departments

#### **5.4. *Employee benefits***

- Increases staff satisfaction as they feel more in tune with the organisation.
- Cuts down staff training time as they know where to find information and understand the definitions .
- Allows staff to specialise and councils to group service teams together.
- Staff give a consistent response.
- Gives staff greater confidence in the information they give out and the decisions they are making.

## 5.5. Financial benefits of using a common controlled list

Time-based benefits of using a common vocabulary	Searching	25-30% of users' time is spent looking for information with less than 50% success. (Source: Working Council of CIOs, 2001*)
		Microsoft's internal taxonomy has resulted in a 62% reduction in the number of clicks, an average of 16 seconds saved per task and an 11% increase in search success. This equates an <b>£8000 saving per user per year</b> based on the improved click-rate and a user who previously spent 30% of their time searching (Total employment costs used in this example are £45,000pa*) (A)
		In a County Council with 7000 PCs, 5 minutes saved searching per day per user at an average basic salary of £20000 aggregates to a <b>saving of £35,000 per week</b> (based on 1618 FT hours pa) (B)
	Avoiding duplication by being able to identify existing resources	Figures from International Data Corporation show that the cost of reworking information which already exists but hasn't been found would amount to <b>£6.3m pa</b> in an organisation where 2000 staff whose role includes searching for information and whose average employment cost is £22,500 (15% of time spent duplicating existing material**) (C)
	Increased staff trust in their ability to find material	Reductions in number of documents printed out for storage leading to reduced printer costs, storage costs, time spent trying to find information in paper filing systems. Reduced paper usage also contributes to environmental targets.

\* figures are taken from "The Business benefits of taxonomy" by TSO

(<http://www.tso.co.uk/gempdf/TaxonomyV1.pdf>)

\*\* figures from KMWorld Magazine, March 2004: "The high cost of not finding information"

([http://www.kmworld.com/publications/magazine/index.cfm?action=readarticle&Article\\_ID=1725&Publication\\_ID=108](http://www.kmworld.com/publications/magazine/index.cfm?action=readarticle&Article_ID=1725&Publication_ID=108)) - extrapolated from the original figures which are for 1000 staff whose salary + benefits averages at £44,500 (\$80,000)

### ROI based on figures above:

ROI based on savings by 5 users of the type described in (A): **3 months**

ROI based on savings outlined in scenario (B): **1.5 days**

ROI based on savings accrued from not reworking existing information (C): **virtually instant.**

## **5.6. *Project benefits***

- Reduces risk of not being compliant
- Reduces cost of maintaining own standards
- Gives a stable structure for consistent indexing
- Gives consistency across the public sector and across transnational borders to share and exchange information, benchmark and layer additional information such as customer segmentation
- Enables participation in transnational government projects and EU Initiatives such as Smart Cities and EU Services Directive

## 6. Pilot management/organisation

Set out the organisational structure that will manage your pilot. This should include relevant senior managers, project/pilot managers and staff. Please indicate how the pilot will be managed.

Mike Thacker, Technical Director, Porism Ltd will take the lead and have the overall decision on how this work package proceeds.

Sheila Apicella, esd-toolkit Project Lead, will take on the practical day to day running of the UK pilot and be the main liaison link with other project participants.

Nicki Gill, Porism Project Lead, will take on the liaison role between the users and the internal Porism staff. Nicki will work to understand user defined requirements and translate those needs into a technical specification such that the programmers can use to design any software enhancements. Nicki also has a long track record of working with the current LGSL and understands how the model fits within the bigger picture.

Mike, Sheila and Nicki may attend meetings to present findings or request help from partners and may also run workshops relevant to achieve the specified outcomes.

Rob List, Porism Financial Manager, will log all relevant project spend and account for the time spent reporting it back in a timely fashion in accordance with the EU SmartCities Financial Rules.

System analysts and support staff will be involved as needed to review, analyse and present data, applying relevant disciplines, including semantic web techniques.

## 7. Staff/financial resources

Set out what resources are available to deliver the pilot. This should include what budget and staff the pilot can call upon.

### 7.1. Funding sources

Select **all** that apply to your pilot

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public funding EU | <input type="checkbox"/> Public funding local             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public funding national      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private sector        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public funding regional      | <input type="checkbox"/> Charity, voluntary contributions |

### 7.2. Overall cost/budget (€)

€ 63, 508 plus transnational funds claimed by Norfolk from SCRAN for translation services.

### **7.3. Contribution from local funds (€)**

€ 31,754

### **7.4. Contribution from Smart Cities (regional, in €)**

€ 31,754

### **7.5. Contribution from Smart Cities (transnational, in €)**

Approx € 5,000 in external translation costs to be charged by Norfolk to SCRAN

### **7.6. Staff resources**

Approximate use of staff:

- 120 days project lead, including reporting, consulting municipalities and defining requirements
- 60 days senior consultant
- 30 days analyst(s)
- 25 days project management and technical consultancy
- 30 days technical support and data analysis
- 10 days administration

## 8. Reporting framework

How will the pilot report progress, both to local management and to the Smart Cities project? How will the pilot's timelines and reporting mechanisms link with reporting for the Smart Cities project?

Monthly reports will be provided to SCRAN. The web pages under development at <http://standards.esd.org.uk/> and <http://standards.esd-toolkit.eu/> will remain publically available from October 2009.

The EU Service Catalogue will be agreed at Project Meeting and updates provided at Steering meetings.

### 8.1. *Baselines/zero measuring*

What baselines do you have? Do you have evidence to show the pilot is need for this project?

#### **On an International Level**

Currently no EU Services Catalogue exists, so any movement towards making this a deliverable will be an achievement.

The EU Service Directive requires that all businesses are able to be represented on line internationally with interactive forms and response. The EU Services catalogue will be used as a pilot list amongst partners in the first instance.

#### **On a local level**

- The LGSL already exists; LGSL version 3.08 with 1306 services defined was released on 30 October 2009 any extension can be measured from this point.
- From spidering websites we can see that the LGSL is used 30,026 times by 72 public sector Web sites.
- 146 organisations are registered users of the list

Demand is coming from groups of local authorities involved in Customer Insight and Business Improvement for controlled lists of life events, circumstances, need and generic business processes, which do not currently exist. There is also demand to link services to the legislation under which municipalities are empowered or required to deliver them.

### **8.2. How will you measure progress?**

How will you show how your pilot is progressing?

#### **On an International Level**

Outputs delivered in line with the Pilot Plan

- SmartCities municipalities' lists will be mapped to a single list with a common definition for each service or group of services delivered by all partners
- Mappings to each partner country's service list from the EU Service Catalogue produced
- Online tool provided whereby lists and their mappings to local lists may be viewed, translations input and proposals for changes made
- Formal first release of the EU Service Catalogue published in esd-toolkit for partners to view and comment upon
- Establish a means for ongoing maintenance and enhancement
- Review other lists held in the UK (as part of its local government ontology) and by other Smart Cities partners with a view to providing further EU lists which map to the EU Service Catalogue. The most likely candidate list is a customer types list.

### **8.3. How will you measure the impact of your pilot?**

e.g. increased citizen awareness/use of a service

#### **On an International Level**

- SmartCities participants agreeing that the combine list adds value to their service delivery
- Mappings to each partner country's service list from the EU Service Catalogue agreed as making the lists workable
- Online tool provided available that participating municipalities agree is useful
- Evidence of Service Catalogue publicised to other EU projects and governments and considered for wider adoption
- Ongoing maintenance mechanism demonstrated
- Evidence of the review of other lists held in the UK (as part of its local government ontology) and by other Smart Cities partners taken place with a view to providing further EU lists which map to the EU Service Catalogue.

### **8.4. What local indicators will you use?**

e.g. surveys of local citizens, businesses

- Numbers of LAs are benchmarking services in esd-toolkit
- Numbers of UK local authorities localising their trees of services in esd-toolkit
- Case studies showing benefits of using esd-toolkit standards
- Evidence from UK Central Government Departments supporting the use of the standards in esd-toolkit

### **8.5. What national/transnational indicators will you use?**

e.g. levels of service use

- Adoption of EU Service list by participating partners
- Adoption of EU Service List beyond Smart Cities in Europe

### **8.6. What work-package/subtheme indicators will you use?**

104	Fully update esd toolkit and add data
105	Service Directory development
106	Personalised web pages/searches
107	Customer involvement in access design
108	Community profiles

## 9. Pilot plan

This should set out how the pilot will deliver the items set out in 4.3, including timelines for all deliverables and outputs.

### **LGBM in UK:**

- January – September 2009 – define requirements by meeting work group leads and running workshops with them and local authorities officers involved in Customer Insight and Business Improvement.
- October – December 2009 – Develop/refine controlled lists and put online for consultation.
- January – March 2010 – Conduct consultation and modify LGBM accordingly.
- April 2010 – September 2010 – Release formal LGBM, document its use, plan and make further revisions.

### **EU Service Catalogue**

- September 2009 - Present on Services Catalogue to Smart Cities partners and agree project output
- October – November 2009 – Receive local service lists from each partner
- November / December 2009 – Translate local lists
- December 2009 - September 2010 – Compile and publish online draft EU Service Catalogue
- October 2010 – December 2010 – Partners review draft List
- April 2011 publish formal EU Service List in line with feedback and agree any further work.

## 10. Risks

Set out the main risks the pilot faces and what steps you will take to manage these risks.

Risk	Level	How it will be managed
Partners will not provide lists	Med	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use pressure of EU Legislation to encourage candidate lists.</li> <li>2. Use UK List as basis for the EU list to a greater or lesser degree dependent upon numbers of Partner lists provided.</li> </ol>
Partners do not have time to collaborate and comment leaving the EU list not “owned” by the users	Med	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Encourage participation by making the process as simple as possible</li> <li>2. Present findings at SmartCities meetings to show who has taken the most interest and demonstrating the benefits</li> </ol>
Difficulties in publicising EU Service list where it will truly make a difference	Med	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enlist help of all participating partners to use contacts within member countries</li> <li>2. Research EU projects and publicise EU Service List to the contact</li> </ol>

## 11. Co-design

### 11.1. With other organizations and institutional partners

How are you working with other **local** organisations / institutional partners to co-design your pilot ?

The Local Government Business Model is designed by consultation with municipalities across England and Scotland via meetings and online discussion. Officers from more than 30 municipalities and commented on and contributed to the design. Other organisations consulted include: the Local eGovernment Standards Body, the Records Management Society, Salford University, the Society of IT Managers, the Business Matters project and National Archives.

Work includes consultation with the above organisations and reference to their outputs to ensure consistency and completeness of the model.

Also we have participated in UK Cabinet office Chief Technical Officer Council (CTO Council) workshops on a “business model” for the public sector and on implementing Linked Data

### 11.2. Co-design with citizens and individuals

How are you working with citizens and individuals to co-design your pilot?

There is no direct communication with citizens and LGBM is primarily an aid to officers rather than directly to citizens. However it includes vocabularies (such as the Local Government Navigation List that provides a generic website navigation structure) which are citizen focussed. Citizen feedback on such resources comes from relevant council officers (eg web managers who organise focus groups on their website structure).

### 11.3. The impact of co-design

How has this work changed your pilot – are you doing anything differently?

LGBM represents an early implementation of the recommendations of the CTO Council and the pilot was modified to apply their generic naming conventions (eg “Circumstance” to describe characteristics of people, organisations and places) and their means of implementing Linked Data.

The details of LGBM are subject to continual review and modification via submission of changes for review and inclusion in version-controlled updates.

Co-design has resulted in us building in some pre-existing vocabularies into LGBM to gain acceptance and understanding from existing audiences, although the model would be better if everything had been designed from scratch by the organisations jointly.

## 12. Transnational work

### 12.1. Transnational links

What other municipalities and pilots are you working with as you develop/deliver your local pilot?

All municipalities working as Smart Cities partners have contributed lists that define the services of their municipalities. Those of Norfolk and Edinburgh were already part of the English/Welsh Local Government Service List and the Scottish Service List. Lists from other municipalities are being added to one grand EU Services List with services grouped into an EU Functions list. The process involves a two-way dialogue with each municipality to get a generic description of each service and identify if it is substantially the same as another service provided in another country.

The Edinburgh City project to implement a CMS makes use of the service and navigation lists within LGBM.

### 12.2. Transnational learning

How are you incorporating transnational learning into the design/implementation of your pilot?

The work in developing quite a detailed documented record of the services that fall within the scope of each partner municipality (and to some extent their countries) and where these match the services in other countries.

Hence a framework is established for sharing resources across national boundaries. In particular this means that resources referenced against LGBM in the UK can be shared more easily by municipalities outside the UK. The framework allows for learning in the opposite direction to happen over time via complementary work.

### 12.3. Transnational outputs

How will your pilot contribute to the project's transnational outputs? What transnational outputs will it contribute to, and what do you expect the contribution to look like?

The main output is an [EU standards online resource](#) comprising:

- An [EU local government functions list](#)
- An [EU local government services list](#)
- National subsets of each list for each partner country

The above cross-references to the [UK site](#), which has more comprehensive information linked to each service.