

Meeting Minutes from Apps Contest Planning, Thursday, October 8th

Team --

Thanks again for taking the time to meet and discuss some important aspects of our planning for the Apps Contest this past Thursday. Following are some of the key discussion points I captured from our meeting, those that I felt were consistent with the prevailing sentiment and tenor of the discussion overall. Please let me know if I've misinterpreted or omitted anything substantive from our discussion.

Attendees: Ash Shepard, Cort Buchholz, Jon Perr, Mark Chubb, Deb Bryant, Skip Newberry, Bart Massey, Joel Donaldson, Audrey Eschright, Eva Schweber, and Rick Nixon.

Meeting Objective: Discuss key planning aspects with project advisors and how the Apps Design Contest should be structured.

In summary, it was agreed we should simplify the format of the contest as much as possible and promote a more distributed model for prize awards. We should incentivize collaboration over competition, and structure the contest around what we expect will happen naturally when the datasets become available.

Key Discussion Points:

- User accounts requiring sign on for voting and app submission, but not submission of ideas and/or comments/feedback.
- Idea gathering phase should be separate / standalone from the Apps Contest phase; no considerations in judging the app submissions should tie back to individual idea submissions.
- Idea gathering should continue throughout the contest and not necessarily end with the beginning of the apps contest. Ideally, ideas will continue to be posted over time.
- Idea gathering should be judged separately, combining community voting with judging panel voting, throughout the duration of the contest. This will allow for more judging "outcomes" overall and serve to promote continued submission of ideas throughout the contest.
- Ideas should be ranked as great ("blue ribbon"), good ("red ribbon"), and nominal ideas ("no ribbon"); great ideas should be receive higher value awards, good ideas should receive lesser value awards (e.g., gift certificates), nominal ideas should receive [our appreciation]?. In general, awards should be "small" and we should reward as many people as possible for authentic ideas.
- Category awards for Ideas is a possibility for generating more awards and fun with the contest, "craziest idea", for example.
- How to submit an idea should probably be included in a FAQ (essential elements).
- Need to identify how we incentivize collaboration, but need to be careful in not over complicating the intertwining of objectives/criteria. Judging criteria itself is deferred for future discussion.

- We should limit the number of "votes" one can apply to voting for ideas and/or app submissions; votes and app contest submissions will require one to login via OpenID.
- Judging panel needs to be wide spread representation, including members of the community, data owners, someone outside the open source community, someone within the open source community, government, technology, policy, econ dev representation; subcommittee representation for data owners was discussed as a way to help limit the overall number of judges.
- Need to engage community for sponsorship; opportunity to tie Econ Dev to the effort; SAO will be approached for sponsors; sponsors are critical to project leadership image for Portland, regardless of level of sponsorship we need their logos for cachet and credibility.
- Tour de France styled categories for awards should be considered for apps contest (e.g., best sprinter, best hill climber, etc); these may or may not map directly into the judging criteria categories (once determined).
- Contest naming, "Apps for Oregon" conveys action and future intention in title; limits opportunity for government entities outside of Oregon, however. Widespread support for this name, as localized efforts will likely be extended region-wise in the not-too-distant future. May be source of push back from the City Hall and/or local interests and intentions of the contest. Having the City be prominent in imagery and/or callouts to the City itself on the website may help, but not be enough. Initial datasets would reflect Portland Metro only as well, which would be problematic.
- Contest naming, "CivicApps" was discussed as well. CivicApps.org available, which could conceivably lend itself to region or city named host names to accommodate similar future region-wise growth as well, e.g., Portland.CivicApps.org versus Eugene.CivicApps.org, etc.
- "AppBubbler" also suggested, but may be too local to be meaningful to people outside Portland.
- Next steps are for Rick to refactor the plan based on our discussion, and to drive remaining aspects for debate/closure in support of this replanning effort.
- Action Items are for Rick to secure top-level domains for "Apps for Oregon" and "CivicApps".

--Rick

Rick Nixon
Program Manager
BTS Technology Initiatives

Rick.Nixon@ci.portland.or.us

503.865.8447 | cell: 503-550-2037