



WALIS SMG MEETING MINUTES

DATE: 17 September 2008
TIME: 3:00pm
LOCATION: DOIR
Mineral House
East Perth

Attendees:

Paul Whyte (Chair)	Landgate
Dan Sandison (DS)	WALIS Office
Dave Currell (DC)	Water Corporation
Kim Wearne (KW)	Department of Water
Rob Freeth (RF)	WALIS Advisory Committee (WAC)
Howard Drabsch (HD)	Planning and Infrastructure (DPI)
Rick Rogerson (RR)	Industry and Resources (DOIR)
Kumar Balakrishnan (KB)	WALIS Office
Marion Gilbert (minutes)	WALIS Office
Karen Roberts (KR)	FESA
Adrian Duca (AD)	Treasury and Finance (DTF)
Chris Payne (CP)	Treasury and Finance (DTF)
Philip McGuigan (PM)	WA Local Government Association (WALGA)
Celia Chesney (CC)	Office of E-Gov

Apologies:

Paul Whyte introduced himself as the Acting Executive Director, Information Services, Landgate whilst Mike Bradford is Acting Chief Executive, Landgate. The meeting was opened at 3pm.

Subject to amending the month from June to July, the minutes of the last SMG meeting dated 16 July were accepted as a true and accurate record.



1. COMPLETED ACTION ITEMS

1.1 PROGRESS ON ACTION ITEMS

Actions arising from May 2008 meeting	Action Item	Actioned By	Required By	Status
Update on PIR for SLIP	2008_3/2/1	WO		See below
Proposed survey of agencies using SLIP	2008_3/2/2	WO		To be combined with item 2008_3/2/1
Meeting to be organised between ML, KW and significant DoW staff to discuss custodianship of drainage data issues	2008_3/4/1	WO		See below

Actions arising from previous meetings	Action Item	Actioned By	Required By	Status
Contact DPC to ascertain who might be the lead for Indigenous Health and Education liaison.	2008_1/2	ML		Completed. ML has met with DPC
Look at what examples or standards for Public Private Partnerships/Participation are currently available and develop some principals to be used in guiding the policy.	2008_1/4	WALIS Office		Mark Taylor has provided comments to the WALIS Office for further consideration. Draft paper to be circulated shortly by WO.
Reinforce the role of capitalising on SLIP and identifying new user needs and new scenarios to SLIP OCG, Council and WAC.	2007_6/5/2			
Progress resolution of Infrastructure Planning issues and potential for SLIP Focus Area – Initially through Water Corporation.	2007_5/1/0	DC & ML & HD	After Forum	DC and ML have met to discuss this matter

Updates to Action Items

Taken as Read.

2008_3/2/1 Update of PIR for SLIP – A draft Terms of Reference document is being prepared and progress will be reported at the next meeting.

2008_3/2/2 Proposed survey of agencies using SLIP – combining with the PIR for SLIP and encompassed in the Terms of Reference.

The above two items will be combined.

2008_3/4/1 DoW meeting to discuss custodianship of drainage data issues – The meeting with WALIS Office will not happen until DoW has confirmed where responsibility for addressing the drainage data issue lies within the agency. Kim Wearne has been working to that end but has so far only managed to arrange for an executive level meeting on the 18th September. This

should allow the correct people to be identified for attending the meeting with WALIS Office which will then cover the expectations of the pilot project as recommended in the feasibility study.

2008_1/2 Lead for Indigenous Health and Education – Chris Dorian of DIA, Peter Bowen of NNTT and Dan Sandison from the WALIS Office have commenced discussion on this matter. An initial meeting was held and a core group of stakeholders will be approached to act as a steering group for the project.

2008_1/4 Developing a Public Private Partnerships policy - Currently in the spatial arena, there are very few working examples of public private partnerships. WALIS is in the process of documenting a paper that outlines the issues for our industry and has identified some case studies (although they are also in their infancy).

Mark Taylor has provided the WALIS office with some examples of PPPs.

2. Future SLIP Focus Areas

Marine – a draft business case has been prepared and a workshop with the WALIS Marine Group has been held to discuss the business case. The case is now up for comment and will be presented to SMG out of session when it is completed. Coastal vulnerability is a key theme in the proposal. Links to Federal, Local and State Governments have also been included. RR indicated that Geoscience Australia are the main custodians of the Australian marine data and need to be included in developing the business case.

The group are working toward presenting this Business Case to Treasury for funding.

Indigenous – an initial meeting between Peter Bowen (NNTT), Chris Dorian (DIA) and Dan Sandison (WALIS) has taken place and a draft paper is under development.

Environmental Health – The health project has presented a draft of the feasibility study to the steering committee for comment. The next stage will be to finalise the document and push for funding the program with national counterparts (with WA taking a lead role). In this regard, there are links in the CRC-SI for development of a health intelligence demonstrator project.

Infrastructure Planning – still in the early days, but discussion has commenced with Howard Drabsch and Dave Currell. In the initial stage, Landgate has been tasked with developing a simple planning viewer based on the current WA Atlas framework. Over time, this will morph into a larger system to deliver more business functionality. Richard Mann from the office of Strategic Projects may be a good contact going forward.

On a more general topic of business cases within future focus areas, a discussion took place on whether it was appropriate for individual cases to be put forward to Treasury when they are ready, or if it was better to present all of them together. Debate centred on whether the current projects could all deliver business cases at the same time and it was agreed to let each project go forward when it was ready rather than possibly delaying some business cases while others were being finished.

In terms of agency bids for focus areas this year, it was suggested that due to the recent change in government, the priority for funding projects would be based on election commitments and projects that had high visibility with a connection to an election commitment. It was noted that other new funding would be difficult to gain this year.

A suggestion was made that focus areas could be a part of an Agency's programme of work eg – DPI and Regional Development where the delivery mechanism would be SLIP. The lead Agency would have a funding allocation and this would be embedded into each Agency's submission to Treasury.

3. SLIP MOU Update

A copy of the spreadsheet outlining the Agency status with the MOU was circulated. A separate MOU is being developed for local governments and commercial business and should be ready in about one month. The MOUs for local government are about one week away and the commercial version is about 2-3 weeks away.

4. Strengthening Government Risk Management – draft paper

This paper has been the result of a discussion at WAC regarding making better use of spatial information in the Insurance Industry. The key issue was that in situations where a property is not adequately insured, the government ends up “footing the bill” or to borrow a term from the UK – *the government becomes the insurer of last resort*.

The recent floods in both the UK and USA have demonstrated that the governments didn't understand the level of risk in this area. Due to climate change increasing the risk of inundation, the cost of insuring property is rising. There are less insurance policies being written (contributing to the increasing cost of insurance) and there is the possibility that insurance may not be offered in some areas. All these factors contribute to increased government risk.

As the housing demand increases in Western Australia and more land is being released, there could be an increase in the risk to government. There are examples in the UK and in Gippsland (Victoria) where Councils have *Not Approved* development applications due to possible inundation. If the Australian Insurance industry removes or changes policy relating to flooding, will this mean an increase in risk to government?

The paper poses questions regarding:

- Are we geared up for risk zones?
- Do we have the value of the building sector's input?
- Does government have the information to correctly assess risks?

A suggestion was made that this issue could be raised by the Minister responsible for the Insurance Commission to the Minister for Land Information.

There are examples of government placing a limitation on how far they will take a risk for example in the Medical field.

DOIR noted a case in 2007 where four houses in the Joondalup area were slipping down a sink hole and nothing could be done to save the houses. The Minister took this issue on board and discussions between departmental staff, lawyers for the house-owners and lawyers for the insurance companies and the local council commenced. At this time it was very difficult for the department to engage an independent Geoscience engineer and a lot of finger-pointing was occurring. The Insurance Council did not want to pay out on this claim.

These examples have prompted a question in the draft paper regarding – the need for a higher level of risk assessment. The questions of:

- *“Does the government have enough information to make a high level risk assessment?”*
- *“Can we help – show the value of spatial information”*

FESA has mitigation and recovery plans in place and are increasing their focus on prevention. There are two committees at SMC level and risk assessment is a permanent agenda item. WAC is looking for direction – whom to approach and suggestions on the best approach.

Some suggestions were made that this could be handled Agency to Agency, delivered through WAC and discussed at SMG. Items can always be put up to Ministerial level if required. It was also suggested that the State Solicitors Office (SSO) may need to be brought into this sooner rather than later, if there is a need to talk about legal rights and possible legislation changes. DOIR recommend that we look at a 20 year assessment.

Action 2008_4.4.1: FESA believe that they have accurately assessed the risk and will provide information to Rob Freeth.

Action 2008_4.4.2: Rob Freeth will update the draft paper in consultation with Marnie and State Solicitors Office.

Action 2008_4.4.3: Any feedback can be sent directly to Rob Freeth – rob.freeth@iinet.net.au

Action 2008_4.4.4: WALIS Office will coordinate the liaison with the State Solicitors Office.

Members agreed that there is no need to approach the Insurance Commission at this stage. Any questions regarding liability will need to be discussed with SSO.

5. Update on SLICP

A SLICP submission is being prepared for submission to Department of Treasury and Finance. A brief history of the project was outlined to members. The SLICP has changed over time due to the changes in requests for data and has turned into predominantly an aerial photography programme. There have been increase in the CPI and in the demand for data; however there has not been any funding increase since 1992.

SLICP has not been able to meet the extra demand and hence is losing credibility. Some clients are not bothering to submit requests due to many of their previous requests not being successful. This has led to a rise in problems with acquisition where agencies are going out and doing their own capture – DoW LIDAR for example.

It was noted that the current SLICP Programme is not ideally designed to cater for the current trend towards 'On-Demand' capture. Communication regarding the programme also needs to be improved.

Proposed Solutions

SLICP Treasury bid for increased funding, better targeted funding, and linked to national programmes such as NDEF.

Promotion of iconic data capture projects – spatial data to be recognised as critical infrastructure.

More modern – 3-D imaging.

SLICP Contract – develop a more beneficial full term multi-vendor and sensor platform contract.

Policy – ensure capture is coordinated – linking to procurement policy at state/local level.

Online system – development of policy and online application and tracking system.

KPI's – to be developed for programme.

Ministerial re-launch of a new and improved SLICP with a new name.

A discussion followed what data is to be captured for whom and the difference between SLICP (programme) and SLIP (delivery mechanism). It needs to be a collaborative approach, to show improved communications across departments.

RR suggested the use of LIDAR. In addition, satellite imagery could be used in many cases instead of aerial photography. It was suggested that each Agency could put funding towards a "users pays" type system which would make the whole programme more dynamic and responsive to needs.

WALIS to pursue a survey based on what data has been captured to build a metadata and spatial index. A SLICP online system is to be set up to see where/when and how capture would be taking place for all to see. It was questioned whether the funding to build this online system should be taken out of the total cost of the SLICP contract or whether new monies should be used.

Action 2008_4.5.1: WALIS to pursue funding opportunities to complete a survey to show what spatial data capture projects have been done historically and funding for a "SLICP online" system.

Action 2008_4.5.2: WALIS to set up a SLICP policy working group – members are encouraged to nominate

6. Pricing and Access Draft Policy

The draft policy has been reviewed by WAC and feedback has been received from FESA. A copy of FESA's comments is included at the end of this document.

RF indicated that from a WAC perspective, where data is collected for government business and funded by tax payers, a cost of extraction charge should be an appropriate approach. In addition, RF noted that there is an indirect benefit to the community and the State from the use of this data.

The commercial sector is developing products using the Creative Commons licences.

In the current system, government collects data and charges only for extraction. Nowadays the cost is lower for the provision of access to this data. Perhaps this aspect needs to be taken into consideration in the policy.

Other factors to consider in the policy are when there is a net benefit to the community, and then there is a decrease on the demand of government services. When a charge is incurred it must be transparent. There is a community expectation that government data is correct and up to date. Some elements of the community see data as more of a "service" than a "product".

PW reminded members that demand must be real demand – not just wanted because it is free. RF also reminded members that each custodian has free range to do what they can to the data.

RR agreed that taking these elements into consideration is a common sense approach.

At this point the meeting discussed the specific situation relating to the pricing of DoW LIDAR Data. It was pointed out that this data would be available to the WALIS Community at cost of extraction and distribution; however the question was asked if the data was handed back to the custodian (Landgate) and commercial revenues flowed to Landgate from that, would DoW be compensated for the cost of original capture. It was highlighted that Landgate would review such situations on a case by case basis to ascertain if royalty payments were appropriate. It was also noted that some agencies gave data back to the custodians with no expectations of compensation.

It was raised whether changes to the pricing policy needed to go to Parliament for approval and it was mentioned that previous changes to the Pricing Policy have gone up to Parliament.

A suggestion was made to highlight the key differences between the old and new policies.

Action 2008_4.6.1: RF and WALIS Office to consolidate final version of the policy and forward to SMG and then up to EPC for endorsement – out of session.

In regards to the Creative Commons Licences, FESA have not yet signed off on the Creative Commons bid – refinement of the final licence is taking place.

Celia Chesney (CC) indicated that the Queensland National Government Information Licensing Framework (NGILF) proposal is being put forward as the National Framework very soon. This could have implications to the Western Australian pricing policy and we should take note of what happens in Queensland.

7. Implementation of National Address Framework

CC from e-Government will be taking part in a teleconference on 18 September to discuss the proposal. Landgate is seen to be the custodian of this dataset; however there are many

duplicated datasets. This situation is common across Australia, so there is a great deal of support for this framework proposal.

Key points that will be discussed are –

- Developing the framework;
- Dealing with location address and postal address;
- Authoritative dataset as a standard;
- Web services to be used for verification; and
- How to make this work across jurisdictions

A workshop has already been held with DPC, DPI, Landgate and State revenue to discuss the Proof of Concept for the business case to make it compelling to government. There will be a bundle of documents that will be put forward for approval at the teleconference on Thursday. Fundamentally we will be trying to put WA forward for the pilot, and then take it to government.

Action 2008_4.7.1: Update at next meeting.

8. General Business

FESA – a booklet has been produced showcasing the National Spatial and Information Management working group pilot projects. Additional copies are available from Mark Taylor – mark.taylor@fesa.wa.gov.au

WALIS OFFICE – the Terms of Reference for the SLIP Post Implementation Review (PIR) is being drafted and we hope to have a Consultant on board in October.

DPI – the referential topology issue has been discussed many times. Are we are looking into the spatial relationship versus the quality of the data. Is this a responsibility at agency level or should it be discussed at SMG level?

It was suggested that the referential topology issue be incorporated into the SLIP PIR, however it was noted that this is not a SLIP only issue and there is a potential for collaboration to address this problem at an agency custodian level.

DPI and Landgate have done a fair amount of work looking into referential topology and have previously expressed interest in involving other agencies in their findings to date. Water Corporation stressed that they are taking steps to address any referential topology alignment with their data.

Action 2008_4.8/1: The WALIS office to set up a referential topology working group to further coordinate efforts, a survey to be conducted to assess current impact.

This will be Adrian Duca's last SMG meeting, Chris Payne will take over the role of DTF representative on SMG from the November meeting.

Meeting ended at 4:45pm.

Next meeting details:

Date: 19 November
Location: Water Corporation



Action Sheet

Actions arising from September 2008 meeting	Action Item	Actioned By	Required By	Status
FESA to provide Rob Freeth with information relating to the accurate assessment of risk.	Action 2008_4.4.1	Karen Roberts/ Rob Freeth		
Rob Freeth will update the <i>Strengthening Government Risk</i> draft paper in consultation with Marnie and State Solicitors Office.	Action 2008_4.4.2	WALIS Office/Rob Freeth		
Any further feedback on the Strengthening Government Risk Draft paper to be sent directly to Rob Freeth – rob.freeth@iinet.net.au	Action 2008_4.4.3	All		
WALIS Office will coordinate the exchange of letters re Risk Management Assessment	Action 2008_4/4/4	WALIS Office		
WALIS to pursue funding opportunities to complete a survey to show what spatial data capture projects have been done historically and funding for a “SLICP online” system.	Action 2008_4.5.1	WALIS Office		
WALIS to set up a SLICP policy working group – members are encouraged to nominate	Action 2008_4.5.2	WALIS Office/All		
RF to consolidate final version of the Pricing and Access draft Policy and forward to SMG and then up to EPC for endorsement – out of session.	Action 2008_4.6.1:	Rob Freeth & WALIS Office		
Update National Address Framework status at next meeting.	Action 2008_4/7.1	Office of E-Gov		
The WALIS office to set up a referential topology working group to further coordinate efforts, a survey to be conducted to assess current impact.	Action 2008_4.8.1	WALIS Office		
Possible agenda item for OCG could be the boundary linkage issues	Action 2008_4/8/2:	WALIS Office		

Actions arising from previous meetings	Action Item	Actioned By	Required By	Status
Update of PIR for SLIP	2008_3/2/1	WO		Terms of Reference being drafted
Meeting to be organised between ML, KW and significant DoW staff to discuss custodianship of drainage data issues	2008_3/4/1	WO		To be arranged after DoW internal meeting on 18 September
Contact DPC to ascertain who might be the lead for Indigenous Health and Education liaison.	2008_1/2	ML		ML has met with Premier & Cabinet
Look at what examples or standards for	2008_1/4	ML		In progress – WO

Public Private Partnerships/Participation are currently available and develop some principals to be used in guiding the policy.				developing a policy
Reinforce the role of capitalising on SLIP and identifying new user needs and new scenarios to SLIP OCG, Council and WAC.	2007_6/5.2			

FESA's response SMG Agenda items

With the draft revision of the **Pricing Policy**,

Is it realistic to include use of Creative Commons when it is still being assessed by Queensland and Commonwealth Government for its applicability for the government information industry?

Section 3.3 identifies arrangements for data sharing between State and Local Government only (not Federal/State). Section 3.2 of the revised policy and the current Policy (section 5) also identify State-Commonwealth arrangements. Is this still required in section 3.3?

The last paragraph in Section 3 "chose" should be "choose" the current policy, developed by Treasury, decrees that where the data (contestable and non-contestable) is to be used for commercial purposes (by government or private sector) then a commercial fee must be charged. This policy seems to suggest that this does not need to be applied now. Is that the case?

The current policy states that agencies "must provide metadata" with and data provided. The draft policy seems to suggest those agencies "should ensure that metadata is up to date" but it does not make it compulsory that agencies "must" maintain the currency or provide the metadata with the data.