How to decide what to put in your map of community assets



Written by Peter Bates, peter.bates96@gmail.com

Contents

Introduction	1
Is the information already in the public domain?	2
Inhibit data mining	3
Select fields	4
Obtain consent	7
Verify data	8
Keep a private record as well	.9
Organise the data	10

Introduction

Community asset mapping is a way to discover the people, networks, organisations and facilities in a geographical area. The term 'asset' refers here to all the positive strengths, gifts, resources, talents and passions held by individuals, networks and cultures. It provides a starting point for understanding the community and recognising the potential of every member to contribute¹.

This paper explores the ethical and practical issues surrounding publication of a community map. Resources from other authors are available that describe how mapping can be carried out² and the ways in which findings can be collated and communicated³ directly to ordinary citizens and used by social prescribers⁴ and others in social and health care⁵. Here, I want to discuss why, what, and how information should be placed in the public domain. It has been written in response to the dearth of material on this question⁶.

This guide is being written in the United Kingdom, but international references appear in the text from time to time. A fuller explanation of the approach taken to creating this guide can be found at <u>How-to-write-in-public.pdf (peterbates.org.uk)</u>. It is part of a suite of linked documents made up of the following:

- 1. <u>Detecting dark matter</u> demonstrates that a brief internet search will not locate many community resources and therefore mapmakers need to employ other search techniques
- 2. <u>Introduction to community maps and directories</u> sets out some concepts and explains what people might be doing when they use these terms.
- 3. <u>How to meet your statutory obligations in community mapping</u> brings together the various legal requirements and policy guidance laid upon public services in the United Kingdom.
- 4. <u>How to choose between a community or service directory</u> unpacks the arguments for each option and attempts to show that a community directory is a vital element of local life.

- 5. <u>How to measure the reach of community directories</u> suggests some key performance indicators for checking whether a directory reflects the community it serves and provides some data about what is currently available.
- 6. <u>How to decide what to put in your map of community assets</u> addresses the specifics of how to obtain the data that will form the content of your Directory or map, what counts as data and what should be published.
- 7. <u>How to get your group listed</u> helps community groups decide whether to appear in a particular directory or map. This guide may also be useful to people who commission mapmakers.
- 8. <u>How to name your dragon</u> catalogues the threats to effective mapmaking in uncharted territory
- 9. <u>Goldmining how to find hidden community treasure</u> offers some strategies which might be adopted by mapmakers in searching for community assets.
- 10. The <u>Directory of Directories</u> provides a starting point for people wishing to build a local community directory and the <u>List of Neighbourhood Facebook Groups in Nottingham, UK</u> offers an example of some of the social media sources in one city. The <u>List of English SEND Local Offer</u> <u>websites</u> provides the evidence source for much of the content of these papers.

I am grateful to the many people⁷ who have responded to inquiries and contributed ideas to this group of papers. Please send me your suggestions for further improvements.

Is the information already in the public domain?

If information about a community organisation is already widely known, then the public may consider it to be in the public domain by default, but this is not the case in law. For example, a business which has its name and address posted over the offices, that places adverts in local media and already appears in multiple Directories, may be thought of as in the public domain already. The rights are still there, even if

Question If the same information is found in several online places, can it be regarded as in the public domain?

they are not asserted by the copyright holder. If Directories do not carry a statement restricting the use of the information they contain, then it remains unclear whether they are intentionally placing the information in the public domain, or alternatively may assert their rights at some time in the future. Live Well Cheshire West declare "if the information is publicly available then we add it directly. If not, we would contact the service and ask if they would like to be included within our directory."⁸

 \circ

Organisations that are funded from the public purse are generally accountable to the public, and so information about them is in the public domain or can become so via a Freedom of Information request. When numerous online directories are searched, some information is found in multiple places and then it is much harder to attribute the source or complain that it was collected in defiance of a specific prohibition⁹. The UK Government permits information it supplies to be combined with other sources in this way as long as a general acknowledgement is given to show the sources¹⁰.

Recommendation

Acknowledge your sources when collecting data from other websites.

Inhibit data mining

A specific problem occurs when data listed for one purpose is used for another, as when the Directory of church groups is mined for addresses which are then used for marketing purposes by a pew-making business, when campaigners or vexatious persons¹¹ bombard others with unsolicited and unwanted messages and when criminals and scammers use automatic bots, phishing and malware to steal the person's identity and rob their account.

A wider challenge is the threat of online profiling. In this situation, the fact that a private individual's name is associated with a community group is added to their online profile and used to build a picture of the person's interests and habits. This, of course, is the basis of targeted marketing by Amazon and some other users of big data.

Some sections of the community are especially vulnerable to exploitation and so additional protections may be needed. For example, one directory of churches leaves out email addresses as (i) scammers target religious persons¹², assuming them to be gullible; (ii) they expect churches to lack adequate firewalling and wish to protect them from a bombardment of unsolicited messages, and (iii) they expect churches to be uninformed about how to avoid and report scams¹³. This begs the questions of

Unanswered Question

What would be the threshold at which one would reasonably be expected to seek consent before drawing on data taken from a published database?

what targeted training is available¹⁴, what threshold of risk constitutes sufficient justification for suppressing the information, how other mapmakers address the same issues and whether there are other groups in society who should be afforded similar protection.

While some Directories place no more than one email address on each page¹⁵, this is not a defence against bots that are able to scrape email addresses from anywhere¹⁶. A more effective protection consists of email obfuscation, such as (i) displaying the email address as an icon rather than text; (ii) requiring readers to click an individual 'mailto' link to create a pre-addressed email template¹⁷; (iii) offering an online form instead of publishing the email address¹⁸ to reduce the number of spam messages; (iv) protecting forms with a CAPTCHA to prevent bots from submitting spam messages ¹⁹, and (v) using other tools such as '<u>Hide my Email</u>'. Presenting email addresses in a pdf document is not much better than providing them on a webpage²⁰.

Some directories appear to present information in a way that is designed to facilitate easy access to individual records while inhibiting access to bulk data. This may be by offering information in map format, permitting a search using limited search terms that do not include the 'all' option or avoiding a simple list or spreadsheet format, as this is easy to copy and paste.

Asset maps vary in what they display, particularly when contrasting those produced by researchers and librarians. Researchers like to anonymise their respondents, so the map will show that individuals and groups exist, and the mapmaking process may help them mobilise for community action; but it will not enable map-readers to actually meet them in real life. To switch the metaphor for a moment, the map is rather like the laundry list from a teenager's bedroom – we know the vast array of items that are in there, but the map does not help us to find them. It may provide helpful information for washday or a shopping trip, but it does not locate the favourite hoodie. Librarians take a different approach and prefer maps that help people find named individuals.

A further distinction may be drawn between publishing information that map-readers can collect and gathering information for the benefit of the host organisation. For example, <u>Next Door</u> is an online mechanism for connecting people and encouraging kindness amongst neighbours. People who register are invited to give Next Door access to their whole database of contacts, so that the software can connect people who already use their platform with one another, as well as encouraging non-users to join. Collecting data for marketing purposes is not the same as publishing it for all to see.

Inhibiting the process of gathering data from a website by publishing a definition of legitimate use does not stop misuse. Indeed, one might consider whether mappers heed all online prohibitions or trespass into unauthorised datasets when they collect community information, justifying their actions by convincing themselves that virtuous ends justify shady means.

Recommendation

Seek out skilled and ongoing access to advice about how to publicise useful information whilst maintaining cyber security.

Select fields

Community groups and organisations will want to know what is required of them before applying to be listed in the directory. In <u>Northamptonshire</u>, the online form is provided in sections and will not move on until all compulsory fields are completed, meaning that casual readers cannot see what is to come. In <u>Kent</u>, directory entries are categorised as 'suitable for SEN', Specialist, Targeted or Universal', 'Low, Medium or High needs', Supporting people with a defined type of disability' and 'alternative social care' without any explanation about what these terms mean or how such places legitimately refuse access on these grounds. This will put busy readers off entirely and could increase the number of mock or abandoned submissions to the registration system²¹.

The following different kinds of information may be gathered and mapmakers will need to decide how much of it should appear on their published map.

• **People's names.** Names are treated as personal data and so should only appear in a published map if the person has given their consent. While some bureaucracies avoid revealing staff names by sending unsigned messages or using the bland and anonymous 'The Reception Team²², this may alienate ordinary citizens, since it breaches the common courtesy of name exchange in UK culture and smacks of superiority and control. <u>Rotherham</u>

routinely provides the name of a contact person for each group listed in their directory and <u>Kensington & Chelsea</u> name each staff member working on the SEND Local Offer and publish their Easy Read 'all about me' profile.

- Email address. According to the UK Information Commissioner's Office²³, an organisation's email addresses such as 'office@' may be published, since this is not personal information, but, even so, it is good practice to then email the organisation concerned to let them know that information about them has been published and to invite them to revise it. Competing values are at work when people include their name in their email address as a means of personalising their organisation²⁴, although it does reframe the email address as personal information that requires explicit consent to publish. Publishing an email address also increases the potential for phishing attacks that can install malware (such as ransomware), sabotage systems, or steal intellectual property and money. Almost all community directories²⁵ choose to publish email addresses they are given and whether or not they include a person's name. Organisations that deny their customers access to their email address are perceived as unhelpful²⁶ and government guidance on the matter suggests reducing access to email addresses but does not extend as far as prohibiting the publication of email addresses²⁷.
- **Postcode**. With 1.7 million postcodes in the UK, analysing data in this form is a challenging task for some databases. There is a useful online tool <u>here</u> which matches any postcode to the local authority that provides services to that address. Despite the rollout of postcodes in the UK being completed in 1974 and the availability of an online tool <u>here</u> that will return the postcode when a postal address is submitted, it is still difficult to get comprehensive data submitted to the mapmaker. For example, in a sample of 65 local groups listed on the Scout Association directory, only 29 included a postcode on the list that was returned to the inquirer.
- Other addresses. Many community groups and organisations are run from home rather than an office building and this counts as personal information so should be left off a published map unless the person concerned has given their express permission. <u>Suffolk</u> remind people submitting data to the map that they should not include personal information unless they wish to. <u>Oxfordshire</u> ask inquirers to "Please note that full address does not show on the Internet for any childminder." Templates for submitting data should be clear about the distinction between the venue where a group meets and the correspondence address, which may be the home of the group's secretary. Networks that do not have a fixed meeting place can be located on a map by assigning them to a community centre in the geographical area that they serve, and then checking that the group are happy with this designation. This is not intended to suggest that the community centre had obligations towards the group, but merely to assign the group to an area and so be able to map coverage across a wider patch.
- **Mobile phone** numbers may belong to the community organisation or be a personal phone. Knowing the number does not provide access to any other information about the person, such as their home address, and unwanted callers can be blocked. It helps to remind people that they can specify 'text only' as an initial contact.
- The name of a group, organisation or network is not confidential and may be included in a map without obtaining permission. As a courtesy, most mappers will notify the group that

they are listed and give them the opportunity to amend or remove their entry. White & Foale (2023, op cit) found that they needed to create a system that could handle the fact that a single group or building could be given different names.

- Websites and Facebook pages of community groups are considered to be in the public domain. Some agencies make it clear that they have not vetted or endorsed the websites that appear on their map and so readers enter at their own risk. Mappers may take a brief glimpse at pages to see if offensive or harmful material is present, but do not carry out a thorough assessment and underline to readers that sharing is not endorsing.
- **Descriptions.** Maps sometimes contain a brief description of each group, organisation or network they include. Some mappers seek permission to use a direct quote, perhaps from the group's webpage, so that they capture the essence of the group in the words that the group have chosen for themselves. Others, such as <u>Devon</u> fear plagiarism and like to paraphrase the group's own words or blend elements from several sources to generate a new, original description.
- Opinions. In community mapping, the most useful knowledge is highly subjective and personal, and some of it could cause offence if published. For example, knowing which of two receptionists is especially kind may be vital, but the information may not be well received by the less friendly one! <u>Suffolk</u> offers a 'star rating system' so that the public can post comments about the events, groups and activities that appear in the directory, and <u>Nottinghamshire</u> invite anyone to submit a review of any group or activity that appears within the Directory. Online reviews that may be blunt but should not be defamatory, and so may need to be moderated.
- **Progress.** The record might include progress on making contact, obtaining consent, updating, and collaborative efforts to build the capacity of the community to welcome diverse people²⁸. <u>Shropshire</u> aim to contact each organisation every year to refresh outdated information, and this is noted in a 'date last checked' field. <u>Northamptonshire</u> explain that their duty to ensure that information is kept up to date means that they will make an annual check and remove non-respondents from their directory. Some mappers hold unconfirmed entries in their private record until permission is obtained, while others publish a minimum of data about each unconfirmed item perhaps only the title of the group.
- Analysis and strategy. For some researchers and community development people, the aim is to publish the final consensus, whether that be a plan for developing the community in some way or an anonymised aggregation and analysis of the findings from the mapping process. They may do this in preference to publishing any identifying details of respondents or participants in the mapping process.

Recommendation

Encourage people and organisations to consider online risks and opportunities before deciding what to share via a map or directory.

Obtain consent

Most directories, but not all²⁹, invite readers to submit content for inclusion in the Directory. <u>North</u> <u>Yorkshire Connect</u> publish the name of a group and then, where relevant, declare "The organisation has not provided any details about this service." Since central government registers some businesses, charities, amateur sports organisations and adult education providers and publishes lists of basic information about them³⁰, it is hard to see why that information should be excluded from directories created by the local authority or a more stringent threshold set for consent.

In Rossendale, contributors to the directory must complete an online <u>consent form</u>, while in <u>Kirklees</u>, anyone registering to submit data to the directory must accept the statement "If I provide another person's personal details I have gained their consent". The consequence of requiring active consent is that a map which contains only those people and organisations who have written, submitted and updated their own entry will be incomplete. Indeed, evidence presented in <u>How to measure the reach of community directories</u> suggests that it is rare for as many as 15% of organisations to be included³¹. In another example, eleven of the 28 accounts of mapping projects reviewed by Luo et al (2022) contained no evidence that formal consent had been sought from those who submitted data to the map³², despite these studies presenting their findings as research. In <u>Cheshire West</u>, anyone can submit information about a group on an online form that reads, "If you know of a service that you think should be in our directory please use the form below to let us know about it" and this is then followed up by the directory team who seek a fuller description and consent from the group organisers. White & Foale (2023) found a widespread belief that 'there's nothing to do' was overturned when their audit revealing a plethora of activity³³.

In passing, we note the potential for academic researchers to expect their own stringent ethical standards to be superimposed upon community mapping activities, creating a demand for the following: a participant information sheet in plain language; options for written, recorded and behavioural declaration of consent; multiple declarations of consent covering participation, withdrawal, recording, publishing and other future uses; a cooling off period; ethics committee oversight; and complaints mechanisms³⁴.

Brent takes a different approach by declaring that "All organisations published in our directory have been either been registered by request of the group itself or are a publicly-known local organisation. If you would like your organisation removed from this list, please email our web team...and we will remove your entry from the website." This allows mappers to add 'publicly known local organisations' prior to seeking consent. The GDPR permits such arrangements, as long as they are considered carefully and deemed to be fair and reasonable. Worcestershire invites readers to select the 'Can't find what I'm looking for' button and then submit information about the gaps, which the team then uses as a prompt to carry out a search and invite newcomers to join the directory.

It is helpful to be precise about the particular information that requires consent, especially when dealing with a complex process. In Malherbe's work, for example, one group made a film about their community and showed it to an audience, and then some members of the audience participated in a recorded discussion about the issues presented in the film, including the film's successes, silences and shortcomings. The filmmakers and the audience members whose responses were recorded and analysed gave written consent for their comments to be used by the researcher, while the other members of the audience were not asked to give consent.

Similarly, a Data Controller will be obliged to follow a detailed protocol demonstrating that they have met their obligations towards each data subject. Whether these frameworks are implemented

by research institutions or community-level organisations, they remind community members that bureaucracies are in charge. As such, these processes are at odds with the tacit knowledge and informal mechanisms of accountability that legitimise data sharing in communities and that neatly manage the boundary between acceptable and unacceptable gossip³⁵.

Recommendation

Chart the pathway from hearing a vague rumour about an asset to confirmed, accurate data and then work out how consent and publication fit into that path.

Verify data

A distinction may be drawn between knowledge brokers who provide information about many community assets and those who appear on the map itself, may represent just one life, one group or one network, and have perhaps submitted the data themselves. Both these groups could be asked to give their consent, but the second group will be harder to engage. In <u>Rossendale</u>, volunteers called *'Community Contacts'* reach out to groups and collect information, while *Community Updaters* input the data, *Community Correspondents* attend activities and report back on the positive experiences they find there and *Social Media Gurus* get the stories out on a variety of platforms. Supporting this team effectively could defeat Bloom's judgement that, in general, "the potential for crowdsourcing community information to generate and maintain a community directory remains largely unrealised"³⁶.

The map may be produced in a single session by asking just one person or a diverse group of knowledgeable people to list all the assets they can recall. If the list is a live document, then mappers may continue to load it with additional 'rumours of assets' over the following weeks or months³⁷. For example, <u>North LincoInshire</u> ask visitors to their website, "Do you know of any groups or services in your community that we haven't included in our directory? Let us know about them so we can share them with our readers." Similarly, <u>Norfolk</u> have a 'suggest a service' form and <u>Cornwall</u> invite people to submit information if they 'know of a service or provide a service'. <u>Medway</u> make it slightly more conditional with "If you know of a service that is not listed but wishes to join Medway's Local Offer (for free)" and provide a simple email address where anyone can submit information. Asking anyone to submit data rather than insisting that it must be the organiser will generate rich and unexpected findings, but some information will need validating as the rumour will be out of date, plain wrong in places and affected by the bridging networks of participants. In some communities, that will mean whole sections of neighbourhood life are rendered invisible to these mappers. Asking 'who is not here?' may open up a helpful conversation.

Where this map is a trigger for community development, it may lead to a lengthy process of verification in which the hunches of the initial mappers are checked for accuracy and consent sought to be included on a new, verified map. Alternatively, the map of hunches may be good enough to trigger community development activity that would not be improved by exhaustive checking of the details for each entry. Some have advised that only accurate information should be published in a map^{38, 39, 40} but it surely depends on the purpose to which it is put. Hampshire recognise that anyone can help to correct entries on the map by offering a 'report incorrect information?' form that can be completed by anyone. One mapmaker⁴¹ looks out for the names of individual assets that appear in

many individual maps and so finds the most influential people, networks and groups, as identified by this process of community verification.

When the coproduction values of asset mapping are forgotten, the process of verification can be used to reinforce power differentials. Mappers who are simply local citizens could find that their testimony is deemed untrustworthy until it is confirmed by a professional. In a similar way to the Islington Directory mentioned above, <u>Bromley</u> selects organisations for inclusion in its Directory if they are "recommended by professionals and partner key organisations in the local area"⁴². Handwritten notes might be taken away to an office and converted into entries in an online Directory using software that nobody else understands or can use.

Mapmakers can insist that entries are checked and updated as necessary from time to time. The gentlest manifestation of this approach is to include a field showing the date that the information was last verified. In Buckinghamshire, local authority mapmakers use the power of the contracting or registration relationship they enjoy with some community organisations to insist that the Directory is updated but have limited success with other groups over whom they wield less power. Similarly, <u>Greenwich</u> build an expectation into their contract with commissioned providers to (i) update their entry on the community directory and (ii) publicise the directory. This might enable the local authority to build a canonical list of the organisations they fund, but will reach no further into community life.

North Yorkshire Connect simply remove any information that is more than six months old while Shropshire initiate contact with the group on an annual basis to collect any updates. Buckinghamshire take an even more stringent approach, by (i) sending an email prompt to any group that has not checked and updated its information in the last three months; (ii) archiving without notice any entries that are more than a year old and (iii) deleting any user who has not logged in for 24 months. West Sussex YourSpace retain the right to delete any community group from their Directory if they have not received a reply within six weeks of the annual reminder being issued, although it is not clear how often this right is exercised. East Riding reported that 80% of their requests for an update in 2022 resulted in a response either updating the information or confirming that it was correct.

Recommendation

Will there be any system for checking entries or updating data? How will you motivate people to support these processes?

Keep a private record as well

Your unpublished map will include organisational data and personal data about individuals. This can range from the identity of a key postholder in a community group to a photo of Jim the friendly dogwalker and the name of his dog. The information needs to be split into two kinds information that can be published because it is in the public domain or you have been given permission to publish it, and personal information that must be kept privately as a separate record.

A confidential file is the place to store this additional information that will personalise your community connections. Such community-facing records mirror those kept by health and social care

organisations regarding individual care recipients and are subject to parallel obligations on data handling and confidentiality. Elements that are considered to be personal information are subject to the General Data Protection Regulation, so the data subject has the right to view, amend and have the information deleted.

Consent is often conditional on context and use. For example, members of a mapping group may be willing to share material amongst themselves which they would not be eager to place on a public map. The solution to this in mapping terms is to create different layers, each of which carries its own tailored publishing restrictions.

The process of obtaining consent can be long drawn out and frustrating, so at any point in time, the mapping team will have a considerable list of connections in their pending tray. These include groups that have not yet been located or approached and those who have not yet responded to an inquiry. With limited resources, a mapping team may be unable to visit in person at the precise day and time the group meet, or they may be unable to write a letter to a group that have provided a postal address but no access to email. In this situation, the mapping team may publish no more than the group name, address of the meeting venue, website and Facebook page. Some directory teams choose to publish nothing until they have consent and a full description.

Recommendation

Nominate someone to keep a confidential running record of progress in engaging with community assets.

Organise the data

A map organises data by geographical location, which works well for building-based approaches, but is less helpful when looking for community assets with other characteristics. An alternative approach is to group resources according to the Life Domains that appear in the Inclusion Web⁴³ or a similar taxonomy. However, it is important to see what is lost by adopting this particular taxonomy. For example, the Life Domains approach focuses on activities that promote social interaction and contribution rather than solitary leisure activities which may be another vital aspect of wellbeing, so care is needed in selecting the organisational structure for your map or directory. Using any system of categories will privilege groups that neatly occupy a single space over those that straddle several categories or operate as nomads, moving from one type of activity to another over time. As the volume of information grows it becomes progressively more difficult to remove duplicate entries.

<u>Maptive</u> and similar software⁴⁴ permit customers and citizens to upload data and then choose to password protect the data or make it public. <u>Open Referral UK</u> helps different organisations collect and store data in the same way to reduce duplication. These approaches are very different from sketch maps, 3D models⁴⁵ and graphic facilitation in which the map is hand drawn and annotated with data in a group session at a single point in time. Significantly, these interactive approaches permit the whole process of defining, gathering and collating the data and publishing the map to be a shared experience in the field, in contrast to some computer databases that must be populated by a remote, technically competent office worker. The database or map may incorporate a legend of symbols, colours, lines and abbreviations that some readers find difficult to understand.

<u>Hampshire</u> has chosen to categorise and group its information, so the main directory will contain a single entry on a topic, which then signposts readers to another place where all the examples of that kind of group or activity are to be found. This means that a search of the directory for a specific group may turn up no more than the general heading and a link to the site where more details are on offer.

<u>Devon</u> takes this approach with faith groups by creating a <u>page</u> of links to the major denominational directories rather than reproducing all the individual entries. Since these links are to maps that cover the whole of the UK, this list could easily be copied and posted on other local directories. However, when applied to Nottingham in summer 2023, this approach missed 99 of the 187 churches known to be active and meeting regularly in the city (53%) and underrepresents the Black-led and newer congregations, especially those that meet in community languages other than English.

In contrast, <u>Manchester</u> show all examples of a particular type of group and include a field titled 'Parent Organisation' to show groups that have many branches.

Choosing the most appropriate format for presenting the map is not simply an aesthetic matter, since online resources are inaccessible to digitally excluded persons while sketch maps or booklets may be unacceptable to big data analysts who want to merge a number of datasets. Asking people how they get on with the map or directory will provide an opportunity to make improvements, so long as people feel encouraged to contribute. <u>Walsall</u> asks bewildered members of the public if they are a 'practitioner' or a 'provider' and then pleads "Please try and keep your message as brief as possible. We will contact you if we need further information." In <u>Kent</u>, the only options available on the contact form are "I want to add my business to the directory" and "Other" before being informed that the directory is set up to "support Kent residents find community business support", suggesting that they have little interest in hearing from nonprofits. Contact details are available for <u>Northumberland</u>, served up with a full explanation of the complaints procedure, as if that is the only reason one might wish to be in touch.

Others, such as <u>Warwickshire</u>, provide no mechanism at all on its webpages for submitting information about community assets that are missing from the map, no contact details for the directory itself and direct anyone wishing to give any kind of response towards a general inbox for the whole Council. <u>Swindon</u> manage a different tone with "We're keen to hear your views ... It would be really helpful if you could... Any general comments or feedback is also very welcome...If you would like to provide a star rating... please do."

Recommendation

Collect feedback from people using the map or directory and implement improvements.

¹ Asset-based approaches have arisen from a number of sources, such as Antonovsky (salotogenesis), Seligman (positive psychology), Wolfensberger (social role valorisation), Cooperrider (appreciative inquiry) and others. ² See, for example, <u>How to create an online map of community assets - MyCommunity</u>. Also NICE guideline (NG44) <u>Community engagement: improving health and wellbeing and reducing health inequalities</u> Published: 04 March 2016, para 1.4.2.

³ White S & Foale K (2023) Making a place for technology in communities: PlaceCal and the capabilities approach, *Information, Communication & Society*, 26:6, 1067-1086, DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2020.1767173.

⁴ In the NHS Long Term plan announced in January 2019, NHS England committed to employing 1,000 social prescribing link workers. NHS Digital reported that by March 2021, 1,265 whole time equivalent social prescribing link workers were employed as part of the General Practice Workforce. See <u>https://arc-gm.nihr.ac.uk/news/blog/BLOG-social-prescribing-link</u>. For one account that shows the link between community directories and social prescribing, see Reinhardt G, Vidovic D, Radulescu N, Wotherspoon N (2023). *Toolkit for Social Prescribing: Lessons and Recommendations from a Cross-Sectoral International Social Prescribing Project*. University of Essex Connected Communities project.

⁵ In June 2023, Professor Eiman Kanjo of Nottingham Trent University received approval for an outline bid for the development of an *Artificial Intelligence Centre for Doctoral Training in Social Prescribing and Social Care*. ⁶ One local UK Council suggests that a diverse group of stakeholders in a community create the asset map and then go and find a community organisation willing to publish it on their website. No further advice is given regarding publication issues. See Preston City Council (2016) *The Community Mapping Toolkit*. <u>Community-Mapping-Toolkit.pdf (bettercarenetwork.org)</u>. An inquiry was placed on the ABCD In Action forum on 21/04/2023 and produced no responses. Individual employees are charged with creating a local community

directory but I have not yet found an online forum where these staff can pool their expertise. ⁷ A list of those who have been approached and responded to a request can be seen in *Introduction to*

community maps and directories (op cit).

⁸ Emma Walker (personal communication, July 2023). Inquiry sent to ask what counts as 'publicly available'. ⁹ In one test of this issue by the author, 168 active churches were found that met in a specific local authority area. The most successful church directory found 73 of them (44%), but only one of these did not also appear in other directories, so it would be hard to make the case that information had been found in one place rather than another.

¹⁰ See <u>https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/</u>.

¹¹ Bates P (2018) How to respond to vexatious behaviour.

¹² "Over the years we have had contact from a large number of churches who have been hacked, fallen for scams (often losing money) and had their machines infected. Many churches receive so much spam they end up changing their email addresses." (Personal correspondence, June 2023). Examples that have reached the media include (i) Fraudsters impersonate Archbishop of York in targeted scams on churches

(premierchristian.news), (ii) Tooting church recovers £138,000 lost in scam (churchtimes.co.uk), (iii) Email Scams Targeting Churches - MBS, Inc. (mbsinc.com). Pensions and Scams (methodist.org.uk), (iv) Recent Uptick in Phishing Emails Targeting Churches - Enable Ministry.

¹³ Scams should be reported to the police via <u>Scam emails</u> <u>Action Fraud</u>.

¹⁴ The UK government National Cyber Security Service comment "Users with externally listed email addresses may wish to be given additional guidance around spotting phishing emails."

¹⁵ The <u>Croydon</u> (email inquiry sent 24/06/2023) Directory lists several email addresses on each page of their Directory; <u>Westminster</u> places the group's email on a separate page devoted to information about that one group.

¹⁶ Confirmed by the UK government's National Cyber Security Service who also declare, "We have not provided specific guidance on whether to display multiple email addresses on a single webpage or separate them into individual pages." (personal communication, June 2023).

¹⁷ <u>Newham</u> (email inquiry sent 24/06/2023) and <u>Portsmouth</u> (email inquiry sent 24/06/2023) use this approach.

¹⁸ <u>Rotherham</u> offer groups the choice between publishing an email address or obscuring these details by the use of an online form (inquiry emailed 25/06/2023). The UK government's National Cyber Security Service declare, "We have not published specific guidance on using online forms, CAPTCHA or email icons - these are all common techniques to protect against automated bots and spam. Online forms can prevent bots from submitting spam messages" (personal communication, June 2023).

¹⁹ Solihull use a CAPTCHA to help prevent bots from submitting spam messages.

²⁰ PDF documents can be opened and even a password protected document can be downloaded and then subjected to an infinite series of incremented attempts until the password is revealed. Placing the information in pdf format does not offer any additional protection (personal communication, National Cyber Security Service, July 2023).

²¹ Perhaps these terms are explained to registered users to help them upload data about their group or activity, but locking the definition away from inquirers means that people searching for information cannot find it. Persistent searchers may submit a mock application simply to try and locate the definitions. ²² Wakefield SEND Local Offer team sign emails using this format.

²³ Advice received from ICO telephone helpline May 2023.

²⁴ NHS employees are encouraged to personalise care by the '<u>Hello my name is</u>' initiative. The standard form for NHS email addresses is 'forename.surname@nhs.net'. Similar practices have been adopted by many universities when assigning email addresses to their staff, while the National Cyber Security Service find a

compromise by including their forename but not family name in their autosignature. ²⁵ For examples, see <u>Herefordshire</u> and <u>Westminster</u>. In a convenience sample of 55 community directories

available online in England in July 2023 and related to the SEND Local Offer; (i) all 55 published the email address of the organisation where it was given, and (ii) all 55 included some email addresses that contained identifiable personal names.

²⁶ The telecommunications business O2 have done this.

²⁷ The UK Ministry of Justice advises its own staff to; "Avoid sharing your business email address on the internet. These might be collected and used by automatic 'harvesting' software programs" – see https://security-guidance.service.justice.gov.uk/email/#email-threats. However, "The guidance provided on our website is for MOJ staff and not for any other users." (personal communication from Vinod Patel, MOJ, June 2023). The UK National Cyber Security Service assert, "We don't have specific guidance on using "office@" versus "name@" email formats." (personal communication, June 2023). There is general guidance at Phishing attacks: defending your organisation - NCSC.GOV.UK that encourages organisations to review the information they publish online to minimise the risk of phishing attacks via email messages, but it does not ban the publication of email messages. Apple offer its users a function called 'Hide my Email'.

²⁸ For a list of approaches that build community capacity, see <u>https://peterbates.org.uk/social-inclusion-training-pack/</u>.

²⁹ There appears to be no invitation or mechanism for submitting information to the <u>Rutland</u> Directory (email inquiry sent 26/06/2023).

³⁰ See the <u>Directory of Directories</u> for a list of almost 200 places where information has been mapped for the whole UK.

³¹ <u>AskLion</u> lists only 14% of the active churches in the city – those that run foodbanks are listed, but not all those that provide a significant welcome and invitation to interact, belong, contribute and celebrate. For more on the 'dark matter' that does not appear in Directories, see <u>Detecting dark matter – Peter Bates</u>.
³² Luo et al (2023) op cit.

³³ White S & Foale K (2023) Making a place for technology in communities: PlaceCal and the capabilities approach, *Information, Communication & Society*, 26:6, 1067-1086, DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2020.1767173.
 ³⁴ Suffolk provide an appeal mechanism for all citizens using any of its services and this covers any group or organisation that has been excluded from its Infolink directory.

³⁵ Jolly E, Chang LJ. Gossip drives vicarious learning and facilitates social connection. *Current Biology.* 2021 Jun 21;31(12):2539-49.

³⁶ Bloom G 'Averting tragedy of the Resource Directory anti-Commons: A practical approach to open data infrastructure for health, human and social servces', Chap 4 in Foster SR & Swiney CF (eds) (2023) *The Cambridge Handbook of Commons Research Innovations* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

³⁷ Beaulieu (2002, op cit, p10) suggests the following interview question, "Can you name any organizations that you have participated in or have heard about?"

³⁸ Both care leavers and disabled young people are entitled to have access to information about the 'local offer'. The Local Offer for disabled young people bears some similarities with a community asset map, since it covers education, health, housing, employment, social care, leisure, volunteering and friendships. The Local Offer for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) must be coproduced with the community and be accurate and up-to-date - see <u>Department of Education &</u> <u>Department of Health (2014, updated 2020)</u> op cit, paragraph 4.7 and 4.32-4.56. A list was created in 2020 cataloguing all the SEND Local Offer websites in England – see <u>England's SEND Local Offer websites - Special Needs Jungle</u>.

chapter 3 by Meta P & and Ironside J 'Effective maps for planning sustainable land use and livelihoods' which compares sketch maps with geographical Information Systems. A hybrid that integrates sketching with GIS

data is described by Klonner C & Norze J (2023). Sketch Map Tool. In: Burnett, C.M. (eds) Evaluating Participatory Mapping Software. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19594-5 7.

⁴⁵ A discussion of the comparative merits of 3D maps and electronic databases can be found in

³⁹ The following SEND local offer websites have been contacted: Bedford (inquiry sent 13/03/2023), Essex (inquiry sent 13/06/2023), Peterborough City Council (inquiry sent 16/06/2023).

not endorsing them.

⁴³ See <u>The Inclusion Web – Peter Bates</u>. A discussion about the Life Domains is at <u>Tell me more about the nine</u> Life Domains – Peter Bates. Questions to help mappers in each of the Life Domains can be found under the

Saipothong P, Kojornrungrot W, and David Thomas D 'Comparative study of participative mapping processes in northern Thailand' chapter 2 in Fox, Suryanata & Hershock (Eds) (2005) op cit. The same volume includes

⁴⁰ See the *List of English SEND Local Offer websites*

⁴¹ Heather Keam (personal communication, July 2023).

⁴² Curiously, elsewhere on their site, they declare that "We want everyone to have a say in developing these pages" so the message is ambiguous.

Community Mapping subheading at Subject index – Peter Bates. ⁴⁴ Alternatives include Outpost & Scout, Maptionnaire and Home - Mhor Collective. Listing products here is

How to decide what to put in your map of community assets