

Call Notes - 17 July 2019

Attending: Tim Hill (TH), Andy Murdock (AM), Ian Dawes (ID), Nick Evans (NE), Tim Corby (TC), Chris Pointon (CP)

Routes Follow-Up

TH reviewed the work he had done prioritising the User Stories generated during the workshop held 4 July and invited others to comment upon it. He identified the five areas of priority importance as Physical Characteristics, Safety, Additional Information, Proximity (i.e., navigation to the route start point), and Amenities. He also invited comments upon the rough spreadsheet taking a first pass at the data model, and on the GitHub Issues raised in connection with this.

TH highlighted Accessibility as an area that had not been prioritised, because work specifically dedicated to this was scheduled for the autumn. However, he also indicated that some minimal means of addressing the concern would be needed in the first iteration of the standard. AM indicated that Accessibility was a difficult area that required some organisation of the raw data to be useful: it would not be sufficient simply to slurp all the annotations from e.g. OSM's Accessibility layer and present this as metadata about the Route. AM suggested TH contact OSM for further guidance here.

Discussion then turned to specific issues TH felt were particularly tricky in relation to the specification: Route segmentation, Safety, and Difficulty Level.

Comment upon Route segmentation was relatively short, though it was pointed out that if Routes were to be segmented, they would also have to be sequenced. AM pointed out the risks of data duplication and/or divergence in an 'inheritance' model whereby Segments are essentially mini-Routes, a point on which TH concurred.

In connection with Safety, the GitHub Issue TH had created to address it was felt to reflect the workshop discussion poorly. In particular, it had missed:

- the fact that the area of concern might better be described as concerned with 'risk' rather than 'safety'
- that there had been discussion of treating these concerns as an assemblage of Risks and Risk Modifiers
- the concerns that had been expressed about shared use of Routes: for many users, the fact that users in different modalities (walkers, cyclists, equestrians) might also be present might constitute a Risk
- the importance of differentiating between a lack of risk information and a lack of risk: that is to say, whether risk fields were blank because there were no known risks, or simply because data was unavailable

TH asked whether the concerns expressed under the 'safety' rubric were too diverse, and it would be better to split this into three separate topics, e.g. personal threat, shared use, and path maintenance. However, the consensus appeared to be that there were in fact a rather narrow set of concerns here, and it should be possible to create modest term lists of Risks and Risk Modifiers.

Difficulty Level was acknowledged to be a problematic area - and one the National Trust had wrestled with previously. The core difficulty was identified as the subjectivity and variance of the rating, meaning the notion that information such as gradient and distance should be presented to users, who are then trusted to make their own determinations. However, TH opined that novice users were sometimes ill-placed to make decisions here, a comment that gained some assent. AM mentioned that the National Trust had looked at Australian work in this area, but that the work on Difficulty had been on hold for a while.

The call closed with TH expressing concern that it might be difficult to actually populate the richness of the data model - that many publishers had very limited information available, and that only a small core of attributes would thus be used. While others on the call confirmed that this was in fact the case, there was also consensus that availability of an attribute (regarding e.g. safety), particularly if built into publishing implementations, would encourage data-collection and contribution in future.

Actions

Review User Story prioritisation and flag up any Stories that need higher prioritisation - ALL
Review, comment upon, or add to [Routes GitHub Issues](#) as appropriate - ALL
Reflect upon and create terms for Risk Factors and Risk Mitigators - ALL
Contact Liz at the National Trust re:difficulty level work - TH
Contact Rob at Open Street Map about accessibility - TH
Add workshop safety/risk discussion to relevant GitHub issue - TH