Construction Knowledge Tools Working Group

Meeting: Workshop 4

Time: 10am Thursday 18 March 2021

Location: Online.

Attendees

- Amy Whittle   Barbal
- Carl Collins   CIBSE
- Dan Rossiter   BSI
- Eileen Bell   CIBSE
- Gregor Harvie   DBW (Chair)
- Heidi Schwartz   DBW
- Jonathan Silver   HIS Markit
- Maria Thanigasalam   BSRIA
- Mike Moseley   i3P/KTN
- Nicholas Nisbet   AEC3 UK Ltd
- Rebecca Draper   Stride Treglown
- Robert Illes   BRE
- Ruth Wilkinson   NBS
- Steven Cross   RIBA

Introduction

Gregor Harvie introduced the session.

Draft brief

A number of comments were made about the draft brief for the proof of concept (poc) knowledge tool:

- The brief needs to be clear about how the poc tool is better than Google.
- The poc tool will need to have natural language processing capability.
- It will need to index article contents as well as the news fields.
- Questions were raised about who would power the search and indexing capabilities.
- It was agreed that traditional news providers may not be useful sources of content as they would dominate results with duplicate results.
- The required quality and conformance of publishers will have to be set out in clear terms and conditions.

Likely uptake

Polls carried out during the session revealed that:

- 10 attendees out of 11 respondents suggested that their organisation would be prepared to adopt the necessary fields on their news content to make them searchable by the poc tool.

- It was thought that this would result in 20 to 25 items of news a week from the working group members. **It was suggested that a list should be prepared of other news publishers that users would expect to appear in the results.**
- The majority (8 out of 11) of respondents were unsure whether they would be able to add a poc tool to their websites. It was felt therefore that a demonstration domain may be necessary to display and test the poc tool rather than relying on adoption by other organisations.

User experience

Discussions about the user experience revealed:

- Concerns about driving traffic away from adopters websites to other sites.
- Concerns about whether web owners would permit the tool to be adopted on their site.

It was decided that in the first instance therefore it may be better to develop a standalone site that simply to tests the functionality of the tool and proves the concept. This could then be used as the basis for a funding application to develop the more comprehensive tool described in the brief.

Funding

Concerns were expressed about the likelihood of obtaining the funding required for the full poc tool described in the brief in a reasonable time frame.

Again participants agreed it may be better to develop a very simple standalone tool at minimum cost to test functionality and prove the basic concept.

Mike Mosely agreed to discuss the options for developing such a tool with developers he has working on a separate project.

Next steps and AOB

It was agreed that Gregor Harvie would develop a short document describing a much simpler tool than that described in the brief and that discussions about how to deliver this would be taken offline to see if progress can be made without the need for a further meeting.