

# Observations and Recommendations for Inglert, G. 2025

U. Melb. adv. Professor Alan March, PhD

Graham Inglert, MS candidate

12 Oct 2025

## Overview

Graham requested that I do a limited assessment of his thesis draft and make appropriate recommendations. Graham shared two PDF documents.

1. [Revealing the Barriers and Facilitators Impacting Uptake of Open-Source Software and Open-Access Data Within Built- Environment Professional Practice Using Actor-Network Theory](#)
2. [ANT Coding Master Document](#)

## Observations

1. Abstract theorizes that FLOSS tools and OAD may be related to principles of democracy within practice. By inference, this reader conceptualized a null hypothesis that proprietary tools and data sources may hinder democratic principles and processes in urban planning.
2. Abstract states findings that uptake of open source principles depend on a greater degree to negotiated networks (i.e., what tools do we use to collaborate?) than on technical competency impediments.
3. Abstract proposes that this novel analysis may be first systematic review of FLOSS and OAD in built environment domain.
4. Structure of thesis follows Intro., Lit. rev., Methodology, Results, and Discussion format. Current page count is 82. Recommendations limited to larger ideas and should not be considered a comprehensive list of edits.

## Recommendations

1. Since this is not focused on edits to help the reading flow, then I suggest you may want to read the paragraphs aloud to yourself. This personally helped me when authoring my textbooks to ensure that I did not have any weird sentence constructions.
2. I was compelled by the connections you made between Melbourne and Smart City adoption. The antithesis to this of course is the United States where Smart City adoption is more widely accepted in academia than in real practice. This is important I think, and you may want to discuss this with Professor March to query him if you have made a strong enough connection.
3. Table 1 is effective in showing representative demography. Would it be appropriate and do you have the data that would answer another column: “Uses FLOSS/OAD”? Even if it were a boolean “yes/no” that would be interesting. Even more insightful would be answers such as “extensive/limited/none”.
4. In your lit. rev. did you consider Christopher Alexander? His theories seem sympathetic to open source design as codified patterns. Further, are you aware of Norberg-Shulz and his ideas about the experiential nature of the built environment and social spaces? Again, I may be stretching here but both thinkers seem to eschew capitalist notions of the commodification of design. Ignore this point if it conflates your purpose. I should acknowledge here that you are trying to edit down the number of words. Oops!
5. How deep do you dive on costs of proprietary tools? Section 2.4 made me ask that question. Especially these days with subscription based models, it would be a cool table that shows a workflow, the associated tools, and a running total of the annualized cost to firms, municipalities, and academic institutions. A public company such as Autodesk (ADSK) would have profit statements wherein a clever business analyst could infer what the market is for their basket of goods and services. A quick internet search revealed that they last reported annual revenues of \$6.1 billion and 11.5% revenue growth.
6. Fig. 2 text is too small to read. Can you afford to give this image a full width or are you limited on page count?
7. Table 2. Is routinization a word? I understand your meaning...just wondered if there were a better term.
8. I found more instances of “enrolment” (sic.) If this is an example of my understanding being “Americanized” then please ignore...otherwise do a careful find and replace on the document.
9. You were careful to redact names in the quotes. Check page 52, as you may have revealed a user or associate, “Kath.”

## Concluding Thoughts

1. This was a dense yet enjoyable read. Thanks for asking me to review. I feel confident that you can pare it down to the required maximum word count.
2. I had no comments on the raw data document you shared, except that it was good to confirm how comprehensive the analysis was.
3. Section 1.7 Definition of Terms is so important for the reader. Since I read this in a serial way I was gonna recommend a “glossary,” and lo and behold there it is. If you ever have to present this visually, you might consider constructing some brief subtexts for each term that gives a reader the short definition of each term. For example how to put all of these terms on one PowerPoint slide in 18pt. No small ask! One small possible typo you may want to check in this section, Enrolment: (sic.)
4. Section 2.5 was a critical read for me in order to understand the methodology. Not heard of ANT before and found that section interesting.
5. Looking forward to seeing Figure 1 Research Process Diagram. This should be as helpful for you as for the reader.
6. Love the inclusion of quotes in the text. Found these revealing anecdotes.
7. Section 5.2 addresses your, “Is Melbourne a representative sample of the industry?” question we discussed. To use your language, I would not fret too much over this question, because I would like to believe that Melbourne is a “vanguard” instance that other municipalities may want to emulate. As I was reading it seemed you were fortunate to have your present context availble for this important analysis. I cannot imagine you getting anything useful on this important topic, for instance, from Cincinnati!