



E-government Programme
E-Services
Linked Services Feasibility Project

Report of Findings

In Confidence
Draft for feedback

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	5
About this project.....	9
Why this project?.....	9
What are the business drivers for this project?	10
Relationship to E-government Strategy	10
Project process	11
Possible solutions and how they were derived	11
Outcomes.....	12
Next phase.....	14
Appendix 1 - Project process	15
Appendix 2 - List of agencies asked to participate.....	19
Appendix 3 - Possible linked services.....	21
Appendix 4 - Possible Solutions.....	23

In Confidence
Draft for feedback

Executive Summary

This is a report to the E-government Unit [EGU] about possible solutions to link services on the government portal **www.govt.nz**.

www.govt.nz is the all-of-government single website [known hereafter as the portal] that gives New Zealanders access to online government information. It's a one-stop shop for locating all government information and online services. The portal is service-based.

Traditional service delivery in government has centred on single agencies providing services and their being proficient at delivering particular services. The portal is based on this model, connecting individual services to the single government agency that owns and delivers them.

But, in reality, government agencies are more likely to be delivering their own services as part of what is actually a wider process, extending beyond their agency boundary. At the same time customers have a need to interact with government irrespective of agency boundaries. Linking services relieves the customer of the need to understand what element of an overall service is delivered by which agency or which part of an agency.

An agency may not necessarily in reality "link up" to its own or another agency's services, though this is starting to change. Access to any such linked services is similarly not currently a feature of the government portal.

Currently, when a user searches the portal they are presented a set of unstructured and separate services from one or all of the various agencies involved. The user then has to access and navigate each service -or part of the process- as a separate entity.

No attempt has so far been made to combine these services on the portal and present them to the user as a set of elements of the same process, with a logical order of steps to follow. This is not desirable from a user's point of view and is something we can improve as an information gateway provider to all online New Zealand government services.

This could mean access to government services via the portal progresses to a level where linked services within and across agencies are easy to find and use. Visitors would not only know what services to use and how, *but* would also be able to navigate to them in the correct, logical order.

To do this, we need to identify the processes or linked services, plus the services that link together to form them.

A primary driver for this project is "better service delivery to the public across government structures" as described in the E-government Strategy.

What we did

The [project team](#) first located and reviewed existing information about linked services during December 2003 and January 2004. We contacted identified agencies just prior to Christmas 2003, presented them with our overall project aim and enlisted their support.

We gained agreement from agencies that the work could be undertaken and obtained names of key agency staff to participate in the planned workshops.

In mid- February 2004, we held two "pilot" workshops involving representatives from agencies from the social services and justice sectors.

In order to elicit further interest, the project team undertook a “road show” from March through to late April. Following on from these visits, we gained additional support for the project and a final workshop was then held with the group in early May.

What we got agreement on:

Participating agencies agree in principle that the idea of linked services is worth pursuing and that linked services would add value to **www.govt.nz**. They agree on:

- The idea of linked services.
- The need to start somewhere.
- The need to start quickly and simply.
- The need to look at individual agency services to see which of them has links to services provided by them or by other agencies as well.
- Providing a range of solutions, depending on the type of audience, type of process etc.
- Agencies are willing to consider involvement in specific projects facilitated by EGU.
- Agency involvement in specific projects will be negotiated on a project-by-project basis.
- Projects could explore a range of solutions around a linked service, or could explore a single solution.
- The possible solutions are:
 - Develop a narrative, with links to specific services and documents. This is technically simple, but manually intensive to keep up to date.
 - Re-use existing metadata, and perhaps add extra metadata to services and documents. This is less manual to achieve, but might require reworking of existing descriptions to suit this purpose.
 - Inter-agency workflows, so that users can seamlessly undertake a number of transactions with different agencies, e.g. register a new company and get an IRD number. This is technically more challenging, but interesting to a number of agencies. Moreover, the launching pad for this sort of cross-agency co-operation is already complete in the form of the e-GIF model developed by EGU with agencies.
 - Develop a decision-tree model, where users are prompted for more detail around their searching. This would offer both narrowing and broadening options.
- Overall, the projects selected must explore the range of solutions, to maximise what we can learn from each type of solution:
 - Which solutions best meet different user requirements?
 - What resources are needed for each type of solution?
 - What issues arise?
- There are problems with variation in metadata granularity and quality in the current descriptions of services and documents. This means that existing metadata about many services and documents is unsuitable for re-use without substantial rework from a pan-agency perspective.

We don't yet have specific services identified

In the workshops, although we established the importance of identifying processes, we were NOT able to:

- Identify any further processes/linked services.
- Get clear input from agencies about which processes/linked services ought to be developed and in which order.
- Get clear input about criteria for identifying how linked services might be selected.

We did, however, gain agreement from agencies that further work would have to be undertaken to establish ways of identifying, describing and presenting services that are part of wider processes across agencies.

The general pattern in the workshops was one of wanting EGU to come up with ideas for possible relationships and linked services as well as the criteria for selecting them.

Identifying useful processes is the key "blind spot" that must be overcome to get further traction. The best way forward at this point will be through dialogue between EGU and specific agencies.

Research material already on hand - as well as that being collected currently - as part of other EGU project initiatives about citizen contact with government on the internet and e-Services, will also be invaluable here. Further research work specifically focusing on user needs for linked services could also be undertaken.

What interested agencies want from EGU

Agencies are looking to EGU to facilitate the linking of services. They want EGU to:

- Provide ideas for areas of service linkages.
- Assist them to identify and put together service delivery connections with other agencies.
- Facilitate project plan development, in consultation with relevant agencies, including:
 - Possible solutions to explore
 - Which agencies to be involved
 - What resources each agency will commit
 - Which agency will be the project manager
 - Which agency will own/manage the process and the linked service(s)
 - What tools/technologies the project will need and how they will be funded
 - Timeframes and deliverables

Next phase

This report has established the need to:

- Start somewhere and start quickly and simply.
- Identify some specific projects, preferably by discussion with individuals identified from the workshops and visits:
 - These projects would be around a single set or multiple sets of linked services or an initial "basket" of linked services.
 - Their aim will be to explore what techniques will efficiently improve public access to linked services on an ongoing basis.

- Each project could include exploration of different user needs, drivers and solutions.
- The projects between them would explore all of the identified different solutions.
- Develop project outlines around specific linked services, in conjunction with agencies that are delivering related services.

In Confidence
Draft for feedback

About this project

- The project is an *initial feasibility study* - an information gathering exercise between EGU and key government agencies to address:
 - What processes or linked services exist on the portal and what are the services that link together to form them; and
 - The NZGLS metadata already existing for those linked services to see if and how we can use it to portray linked services on the government portal;

Why this project?

The government portal at **www.govt.nz** is the all-of-government single website that gives New Zealanders access to online government information. It's a one-stop shop for locating all government information and online services. There are links through to government agency websites, but the user doesn't need to know how government is structured and therefore which sites to use.

The portal is service-based. Services consist of what agencies do in response to what people want from them. The portal also contains descriptions of these services - along with their supporting information resources, such as web pages - to assist users to track down exactly what they want.

Traditional service delivery in government has centred on single agencies providing services and their being proficient at delivering particular services. The portal is based on this model connecting individual services to the single government agency that owns and delivers them.

But, in reality, government agencies are more likely to be delivering their own services as part of what is actually a wider process, extending beyond their agency boundary. At the same time customers have a need to interact with government irrespective of agency boundaries. Linking services relieves the customer of the need to understand what element of an overall service is delivered by which agency.

The idea of linked services was first raised by the NZGLS Working Group in June 2003 when they discussed the apparent lack of any structured connection between services on the then new portal and the need to look at better linking them as a way forward.

For example, from a user perspective "Getting a passport" [Department of Internal Affairs] and "Departing from New Zealand" [NZ Customs] are really part of a wider process about "Going overseas". Equally, "Find information about maternity services" [Department of Health] and "Find out about Parental Leave" [Employment Relations Service] are both part of the "Having a baby" process.

An agency may not necessarily in reality "link up" to its own or another agency's services, though this is starting to change. Access to any existing linked services is also not currently a feature of the government portal.

Currently, when a user searches the portal they are presented a set of unstructured and separate services from one or all of the various agencies involved. The user then has to access and navigate each service - or part of the process - as a separate entity.

No attempt has so far been made to combine these services on the portal and present them to the user as a set of elements of the same process, with a logical order of steps to follow. This

is not desirable from a user's point of view and is something we can improve as an information gateway provider to all online New Zealand government services.

This could mean access to government services via the portal progresses to a level where linked services within and across agencies are easy to find and use. Visitors would not only know what services to use and how, *but* would also be able to navigate to them in the correct, logical order.

To do this, we need to identify the processes or linked services, plus the services that link together to form them.

What are the business drivers for this project?

Agencies are tasked and funded by government to undertake specific functions and provide specific services. The funding and accountability models of government are focused on clear boundaries relating to which agency does what. This does not encourage the development of pan-agency connections or initiatives, although it does not prevent them. Some connections and initiatives do already exist¹.

There has been no clear business driver from within individual agencies to try to establish connections and join up services externally to those of other agencies [or even internally], although this could make the user experience more worthwhile.

The primary business driver for the E-government Unit's project is *better service delivery to the public across government structures* as contained in the E-government strategy (see [Relationship to E-government Strategy](#), next).

This derives from EGU's role to facilitate "joined-up" government online. In this role, EGU is acting on behalf of users who interact with government agencies. EGU is the custodian of online information about services across the whole of government. As such, it is in a position to:

- Discover and validate what users want in the way of joined-up service scenarios;
- Observe any potential connections between services provided by different agencies as well as collate and respond to similar observations by individual agencies; and
- Assist thinking and actions around better services connections.

Relationship to E-government Strategy

Identifying, confirming and prioritising linked services across government is an enhancement of a service delivery architecture for the portal that:

Fits with the E-government strategic goals of:

- **Better services** – more convenient and reliable, with lower compliance costs, higher quality and value;
- **Cost effectiveness and efficiency** – cheaper, better information and services for customers, and better value for taxpayers; and
- **Leadership** – supporting the knowledge society through public sector innovation.

And contributes to the following outcomes:

¹ There are established service connections between the Companies Office of the Ministry of Economic Development and the Inland Revenue Department in respect of company and GST numbers being issued at the same time to those applying for company registrations online. Elsewhere, Housing NZ Corporation and Work & Income New Zealand co-locate their offices in South Auckland. The Justice sector has identified a major information initiative to manage and provide better access to sector information.

- **Convenience and Satisfaction**

Services provided anytime, , anywhere. People will have a choice of channels to government information and services that *are convenient, easy to use and deliver what is wanted.*

- **Integration and Efficiency**

Services that are integrated, customer-centric and efficient. *Information and services will be integrated, packaged, and presented to minimise cost and improve results for people, businesses, and providers.*

In particular, linking services and presenting them on the portal ensures many services are documented and displayed - probably together - in ways that might better meet customers' expectations.

Project process

This is fully documented in [Appendix 1](#).

Possible solutions and how they were derived

First two workshops

Feedback included:

- Providing a narrative about links between services could be useful.
- But trying to link complex, constantly branching processes could prove unwieldy and might not provide much benefit to users who would have to negotiate them.
- Sometimes person-to-person contact is essential where there is extensive case management and professional judgement required at various points - the portal could never replace this.
- The portal could act as a “knowledge base” in the same way agency intranet sites have been developed to help with customer service.
- Justice sector agencies are already aware of cross-agency linkages within that sector and are working through the implementation of the Justice Sector Information Strategy to share and better manage information [principally around criminal justice] across that sector. They are exploring a range of online solutions to provide access to sector information to people within the sector as well as those who interact with it, including the public.
- Outside of the justice sector, agencies have a varying awareness of actual and potential cross-agency linkages, but these are usually agency-to-agency. They are rarely one-to-many agencies or many-to-many.

The key findings that came out of the first set of workshops were:

- The examples of linked services used such as “caring for a child” and “getting accommodation” were seen to be too complex, too detailed and headed off in several directions. [A decision-tree model might however help better line up the many available options here].
- Different linked services could be dealt with by using a range of solutions.
- Simple solutions may meet most of the need, e.g. a narrative around a user need such as “going overseas”.
- Agencies don't want the process of service description made more complex/more resource intensive.

- There is interest from IT people in different agencies to connect up transactions across agencies and the business processes relating to them.
- Agencies find it difficult to identify pan-agency processes/linked services by themselves.

During the first round of workshops three solutions were brainstormed:

- Develop a narrative, with links to specific services and documents. This is technically simple, but manually intensive to keep up to date.
- Re-use existing metadata, and perhaps add extra metadata to services and documents. This is less manual to achieve, but might require reworking of existing descriptions to suit this purpose.
- Inter-agency workflows, so that users can seamlessly undertake a number of transactions with different agencies, e.g. register a new company and get an IRD number. This is technically more challenging, but interesting to a number of agencies.

Final workshop

Because we had visited each of the agencies attending and they were already familiar with the project, we decided to use a different approach. This consisted of:

- Outlining the three above possible solutions.
- Asking for more ideas on solutions.
- Asking for ideas on identifying further pan-agency processes/linked services.

Workshop members raised the idea of decision trees as a fourth solution – staff within EGU had also suggested this. Here users could be asked questions about what they wanted to do or what was needed and prompted for more detail. This could offer both narrowing and broadening options.

Key findings from the third workshop are similar to those of the first two workshops, reiterating that:

- Ranges of solutions are needed and should be tested.
- Agencies find it difficult in isolation to identify pan-agency processes/linked services.

[Appendix 4](#) examines each possible solution in more detail.

Outcomes

What we got agreement on:

Participating agencies agree in principle that the idea of linked services is worth pursuing and that linked services would add value to the portal. They agree on:

- The idea of linked services.
- The need to start somewhere.
- The need to start quickly and simply.
- The need to look at individual agency services to see which have links to services provided by other agencies.
- Providing a range of solutions, depending on the type of audience, type of process etc.
- Agencies are willing to consider involvement in specific projects facilitated by EGU.
- Agency involvement in specific projects will be negotiated on a project-by-project basis.

- Projects could explore the range of solutions around a linked service, or could explore a single solution. The possible solutions are:
 - Develop a narrative.
 - Re-use existing metadata.
 - Inter-agency workflows.
 - Develop a decision-tree model.
- Overall, the projects selected must explore the range of possible solutions, to maximise what we can learn from each:
 - Which solutions best meet different user requirements?
 - What resources are needed for each type of solution?
 - What issues arise?
- There are problems with variation in metadata granularity and quality in the current descriptions of services and documents. This means that existing metadata about services and documents is unsuitable for re-use without substantial rework from a pan-agency perspective.

We don't yet have specific services identified

In the workshops, although we established the importance of identifying processes, we were NOT able to:

- Identify any further processes/linked services.
- Get clear input from agencies about which processes/linked services ought to be developed and in which order.
- Get clear input about criteria for identifying how linked services might be selected.

We did however, gain agreement from agencies that further work would have to be undertaken to establish ways of identifying, describing and presenting services that are part of wider processes across agencies.

The general pattern in the workshops was one of wanting EGU to come up with ideas for possible relationships and linked services as well as the criteria for selecting them.

Identifying useful processes is the key "blind spot" that must be overcome to get further traction. The best way forward at this point will be by dialogue between EGU and specific agencies.

Research material already on hand - as well as that being collected currently - as part of other EGU project initiatives about citizen contact with government on the internet and e-Services, will also be invaluable here. Further research work specifically focusing on user needs for linked services could also be undertaken.

What interested agencies want from EGU

Agencies are looking to EGU to facilitate the linking of services. They want EGU to:

- Provide ideas for areas of service linkages.
- Assist them to identify and put together service delivery connections with other agencies.
- Facilitate project plan development, in consultation with relevant agencies, including:
 - Possible solutions to explore.
 - Which agencies to be involved.

- What resources each agency will commit.
- Which agency will be the project manager.
- Which agency will own/manage the process and the linked service(s).
- What tools/technologies the project will need and how they will be funded.
- Timeframes and deliverables.

Next phase

This report has established the need to:

- Start somewhere and start quickly and simply.
- Identify some specific projects, preferably by discussion with individuals identified from the workshops and visits:
 - These projects would be around a single set or multiple sets of linked services or an initial “basket” of linked services.
 - Their aim will be to explore what techniques will efficiently improve public access to linked services on an ongoing basis.
 - Each project could include exploration of different user needs, drivers and solutions.
 - The projects between them would explore all of the identified different solutions.
- Develop project outlines around specific linked services, in conjunction with agencies that are delivering related services.

Appendix 1 - Project process

The following people/groups were involved in the project:

- Workshop participants from invited agencies to:
 - Help identify and analyse processes involving service linkages.
 - QA the report back.
 - Confirm project outcomes.

A list of participating agencies is provided in [Appendix 2](#).

- A project team consisting of David Barrow, Information Analyst from the Portal Operations team at EGU and Trish O’Kane from SWIM Ltd.

We coordinated the workshop arrangements, communicated with and supplied workshop material to nominated agency staff, coordinated workshop activity, presented at the workshops and the agency visits and wrote this report.

- Portal Information Manager, Sara Barham, as Project Leader.
- EGU Operations Manager as Project Sponsor.
- EGU Policy & Development team as advisors and participants as required.

The project team used the following approach:

- We looked for combinations of services that constitute larger, cross-agency processes and developed a list of important linked services. See [Appendix 3](#).
- We gained agreement in principle from key agencies to participate in establishing linked up cross-agency services on the portal.
- We identified some possible solutions and scrutinised them in a workshop environment with agencies.

These were our critical success factors:

- Achieving awareness of the need for connections and service linkages across agencies.
- Communications and progress updates with all parties affected by this project.
- Coordination and alignment with other EGU activities and information.
- Engagement and ongoing support from participating agencies.
- Availability of adequate and appropriate resources in agencies & EGU and strong commitment to getting the project done.

We recognised these project risks:

1. Enlisted agencies may not engage and commit resources to this project.
2. Agencies may not be fully aware of cross-agency connections.
3. Workshops could be poorly attended.
4. Workshops may not deliver information as expected.
5. Insufficient coordination with other EGU activities and information.
6. Ability to deliver project milestones on time using available resources and budget.
7. Project progress slips because of unanticipated events/time constraints/other priorities the project team and participating agencies.

...together with this constraint

- Limited availability or lack of availability and involvement of agency expertise in some instances.

This is what we did and how we did it:

1. We located and reviewed existing information about linked services during December 2003 and January 2004, including:
 - Some useful contacts in government agencies and a list of possible linked services. This list is attached as [Appendix 3](#).
 - Existing metadata for services of those agencies in Metalogue.
 - Material prepared previously by EGU for the e-Services project.
2. We contacted identified agencies just prior to Christmas 2003, presented them with our overall project aim and enlisted their support using either email or telephone. Agencies involved are listed in [Appendix 2](#).
3. We gained agreement from these agencies that the work could be undertaken and obtained names of key agency staff to participate in the planned workshops.
4. We produced detailed project documentation including a Project Charter & Project Plan during January 2004. We refined these down to a more useful Project Overview and gave it to prospective workshop participants along with pre-workshop material to engage their thinking.
5. Seasonal issues, coupled with a reliance on mainly email- communication, culminated in a less-than-expected agency willingness to attend workshops in the then New Year to share ideas. So:
 - In mid- February 2004, we held what then became two “pilot” workshops involving representatives from agencies from the social services and justice sectors. The results of this initial round of workshops are documented in the section on [Possible solutions](#).
 - A debrief after the pilot round of workshops suggested that though these pilot workshops had provided key learning and valuable insights for the project team, we still needed to go out and get more information from more agencies. In particular, there was a lack of any participation from the larger agencies operating in the business sector.
 - In order to elicit their interest, the project team decided to undertake a round of agency visits to encourage those that had not responded. This “road show” was conducted from March through to late April - determined by agency availability. Agencies visited included Accident Compensation Commission; Ministry of Economic Development; Ministry of Education’s Tertiary Information Systems and Sector Liaison; Inland Revenue Department; Department of Labour; and New Zealand Trade & Enterprise.
6. Following on from these visits, we gained additional support for the project and a final workshop was then held with the group in early May.
7. We prepared workshop material as follows:
 - Identified likely linked services from reviewing existing work. These are in [Appendix 3](#).

- Requested agency representatives to be familiar with and to bring along with them statistical information about their customer behaviour, both on- and offline.

In the workshops we used pre-identified sample processes. Attendees at the first two workshops were presented with two diagrams showing a central user-focused process, each surrounded by sub-topics of this process and relevant lists of services:

a) Caring for a child

Sub-processes:

- Get help with parenting.
- Set up a child care centre.
- Caring for someone else's child.
- Is a child at risk?
- Participate in community groups for children.
- Seek child support.
- Find out about children's rights.
- Find out how to get help for children with special needs.
- Appealing government decisions about children.

b) Getting accommodation

Sub-processes:

- Improving housing accommodation.
- Can't afford rent.
- Special housing needs.
- Tenancy rights/agreements/disputes.
- Assistance to buy a home.

8. Workshop attendees endorsed these sample-linked services. But, understanding the concept of cross-agency links and the possible linked services between them was harder for the agencies to achieve.

Instead, they commented on a range of approaches that led to the various possible solutions that we outline and discuss in the section on [possible solutions](#).

9. We got nominee/s from each agency to comment on the further development of the project and the final report.
10. We provided appropriate updates to stakeholders about project progress from time to time. Verbal updates were given frequently to the wider EGU team and the Portal Operations team.

We identified the following relationships with other EGU projects

- Ongoing portal project enhancements, such as replacing the "Things to Know When" section with a "How Things Work" section of single-agency services as well as cross-agency linked services.
- EGU Policy & Development Work Programme about e-Services and e-Channels and the input agencies are having to these initiatives.

- Ongoing metadata management and development, in particular how existing metadata elements could be used to better depict linkages between different services and agencies on the portal [such as refinements of the Relation element such as Relation.requires, Relation.isPartOf or Relation.hasPart; or the Contributor element] or even adding a new entity called “process” alongside existing agency, service and document entities.

In Confidence
Draft for feedback

Appendix 2 – List of organisations that participated

- Accident Compensation Commission.
- Child, Youth & Family.
- Department of Corrections.
- Department of Labour.
- Housing New Zealand Corporation.
- Inland Revenue Department.
- Ministry of Economic Development.
- Tertiary Information Systems & Sector Liaison, Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Housing.
- Ministry of Justice.
- Ministry of Social Development .
- New Zealand Police.
- New Zealand Trade & Enterprise.
- Auckland Local Government Cluster.
- NZGLS Working Group.
- Thesaurus Advisory Group [TAG].

Appendix 3 - Possible linked services

Some linked services identified include:

- Going overseas.
- Starting a business.
- Maintaining/growing a business.
- Solving specific business issues.
- Ceasing a business.
- Guardianship of a child.
- Moving to New Zealand.
- Death of a family member.
- Starting tertiary education or training.
- Knowing your rights.
- Finding somewhere to live.
- Information about the Treaty of Waitangi.
- Buying a motor vehicle.

Also, some potential linked services were identified in an earlier project undertaken by Litmus Testing for EGU that looked for gaps in existing services and was accompanied by lists of services that might be relevant, such as:

- Buying and owning a house, building a house or house extension.
- Starting tertiary education or training.
- Being involved in an accident.
- Losing your job/being made redundant.
- Health and disability support for the elderly.
- Getting older.
- Having a serious illness/being ill.
- Entering retirement.
- Learning to drive.
- Starting a business.

Appendix 4 - Possible Solutions

	Solution	Suitable for/ What achieved?	How/who to develop?	Ultimate Owner	Implications
1.	Decision Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify user needs/modalities from very broad start points such as “immigration” Offer navigation around common user queries Could link up to the other three solutions 	Sector lead agencies and EGU	Sector lead-agency and/or EGU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implies need for research about user search strategies and common needs The decision tree could offer broadening/narrowing/tangential topics depending on interpretation, e.g. should a search for “student loans” also point to “budgeting advice” and more generally to tertiary education information? Implies need for analysis of relationships between services, including broader and narrower topics, and tangentially- related topics Tracking use of decision trees would itself provide much needed information on what users are really looking for
2.	Narrative with hyperlinks to service & document records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily informative - “How things work” Not transactional 	EGU	Sector lead agency and/or EGU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can the user navigate back to the narrative after clicking on a link? Significant handcrafting would be involved Needs a process to create and maintain the narratives and their links

	Solution	Suitable for/ What achieved?	How/who to develop?	Ultimate Owner	Implications
3.	Re-use metadata	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dynamic, timely information 	EGU	Sector lead agency and/or EGU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible creation of another level above service & document description – “Process” Ability to infer relationships between services and documents using metadata Significant technical aspect to using Autonomy to infer those relationships Re-uses existing metadata Creates new metadata – possibly “Process” and new types of relationships Needs a method to generate and manage process creation in Metalogue Need to examine quality of existing metadata = EGU observations and comments from workshop participants Need to build real life examples How can we lower the extent of “handcrafting” required in the use of metadata and maximise the use of tools such as Autonomy?

In Confidence
Draft for feedback

	Solution	Suitable for/ What achieved?	How/who to develop?	Ultimate Owner	Implications
4.	<p>On-line pan-agency transactions -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Software ▪ Process engineering ▪ Commitment to cooperation ▪ Resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transaction-based processes, not “informing” processes e.g. registering companies, get IRD number, register with ACC ▪ Existing or new customers of these processes/services ▪ High-volume, repeated transactions ▪ Relatively easily structured transactions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EGU Pilot + Vendor/training + pilot group of interested agencies 	Transaction initiator / prime agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When to advise using another channel • Idea of “prime” agency and “contributing” agencies • Need to expose agencies web-based services to each other • Are you able to partially complete a process and come back later? • Agency branding/ID – user needs to know which part of process and maybe who they are dealing with • Overlap with specific portals • Complex business processes • Re-engineer processes • Shift work around agencies – what resourcing implications? • Significant technical implications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ e-GIF ○ Authentication ○ Secure mail • Ongoing relation/interaction between agencies • Implications for web design? • Implications for persons with disabilities? • Legislative/privacy implications?