TGF Public Review Issues – proposed dispositions and discussions

Consideration of Issues
The Editors held a wide-ranging editorial meeting on 2 November 2011 and agreed a large number of proposed dispositions of comments so-far received. These discussion were followed with a series of bilateral discussions, notably with officials from the Government of New Zealand, that led to substantial re-writes of four patterns.

Issues List
In the accompanying and detailed Issues List spreadsheet, the status column indicates:

- “Completed” – the editors consider that the proposed disposition is appropriate and achieved consensus
- “Assigned” – the issue is logged, an editor is working on the solution and proposed disposition
- “Deferred” – the issue will be addressed and followed-up but the progress towards approval should not be held up by this issue
- “Obsolete” – the issue has been overtaken by more recent edits or proposals. Some or all of the issue raised may have been included in a later proposed edit.

The status will be changed to “Closed” following a decision by the TC.

In the “proposed disposition” column, there are a large number of references to “See NZ Edit” – these refer to substantive edits made as mentioned above, and which are outlined in more detail below.

Note: in line with issues resolved, the order of the patterns has changed. All references below are to the newly re-numbered patterns

Recommendations and proposed disposition of issues
We have grouped our recommendations in to the following four sections.

1. To close “on trust”
Issues which are typos, minor editorial, or where proposer and editors agree and no/little modification needs to be done – Please trust us on these! 😊

Primer
54 to 55, 58-59 all discussed and agreed at 13 Oct TC meeting already

Core Patterns
60-63 all discussed and agreed at 13 Oct TC meeting already

2. Non contentious
Agreed unless there is significant objection:
53 (Primer) Make wording of Guiding Principles less “chatty” and keep in an active voice
57 We propose to delete the conformance section from the Primer entirely, along with the ‘Disclaimer’ at lines 1-9. Given the maturity of the Pattern Language document, these elements can be safely deleted
Concerned with how the TC addresses the TC Charter objective of preparing a ‘reference model’. The conclusion is that the Pattern Language constitutes a tractable "reference model" and thus fulfils the Charter. The "Core Terminology" in the Primer is being updated and completed and all terms aligned between both documents

(outstanding) Visual and harmonised formatting of all patterns – b=to be completed before TC meeting

Whether the word “typically” at line 330 begs the question about exceptions. Defer

Move patterns “Skills” and “Supplier Partnerships” to be grouped with, and immediately after, Critical Success Factors

Move “Benefits Realisation” pattern to end, consistent with being component 4 of the TGF (Primer) Switch “CSFs” and “Delivery Processes” components, to align with the patterns and with the visual logic presented in the main TGF Figure.

Propose to use “attitudes and behavior of public service customers.”

OK to use unqualified phrases such as “there is evidence that...” given expertise of the TC members

Remove reference to risk management in CSFs

Welcome references by European Commission to existing cross-boundary eID services – Defer any inclusion or reference at this stage

Better introduction text to explain concept of a pattern language, the objective of a TGF pattern language and the current core set of initial patterns. Defer at this stage the addition of an (UML) object model to explain structure of single pattern or concept map to show relationship between patterns so far – useful in a presentation slide deck

End of "Guiding Principles" pattern modified to reflect new ordering of patterns

Soften the line taken on lower cost digital channels in the Channel Transformation pattern

3. **Discussed and Resolved**

Discussions covered both a series of **themes** and series of **patterns** covered in what we called in shorthand, the “NZ Edit”

a) **Themes**

**Issue:** Align uses of “Citizen”, “Customer”, “Consumer”, “User”, “Service Consumer|Customer”

**Resolution:**
- Keep using “Citizen and businesses” where possible; Use “Citizen” only when businesses are explicitly not concerned
- Use “Customer” when it is clear that we are talking about that role, as customer, in relation to government – when we define “customer” and use it the first time in any document, we should be clear that we mean “customer using a public service”. Although the nearest corresponding term in SOA is certainly “consumer”, we need to take into account Chris’ point that consumer can seem too passive; nor does not get across John’s point about “consumers of government services don’t have alternative service suppliers, so they can’t shop around like ‘real’ consumers...”. I think nonetheless a short note in the terminology would help to show how the term “customer” aligns with the SOA preferred term.
- Use “People” when it really is concerned with a particular person’s rights/responsibilities, etc (such as individuals in relation to personal data)
- Use “Population” where necessary
- Avoid using “User”
Issues resolved: 67, 72, 73, 77, 80, 83, 85, 120, 121, 123-128, 130, 131, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 144, 145, 148, 149, 152-155, 157, 159, 161-162, 164-167, 169, 177, 192

Issue: Are we talking about “citizen service transformation”, “public service transformation”, or simply “transformation”
Resolution: preferred terms are “Transformational Government” or, in context, “service transformation”. Issue resolved: 140

b) “NZ Edit”
Four patterns have been substantially updated as a result of editorial discussions
[6] Transformational Business Model – covers and/or renders obsolete issues #87, 88, 90-92, 94, 169,
[7] Franchise Marketplace – covers issues #93-95, 100, 111, 133, 156, 168, 176, 184
[12] Channel Management Framework – covers issues #150, 151, 192

4. Not actionable
General comments with no specific change request

102, 110 Other (non-UK) references would be valuable but nothing to add at this stage
181 Positive comments from NZ Government are noted
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