| Number | Content of submission | Theme |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | Treasury to share information for maximum public engagement. Reported in the Australian Financial Review on February 22: "Treasury will accept more external advice after a review identified economic forecasting flaws that led successive governments to spend big under the misapprehension of relentlessly strong resources-led growth." I have written about Treasury's poor forecasting previously (here is a visual summary), and I agree with the AFR article: bad forecasting has led to bad policy. Much is made of budget transparency, but little is made of forecasting transparency. The assumptions of Treasury should be open to the public. If Treasury will accept more external advice, it should not keep the information it shares with external parties confidential. Treasury should share its information openly for maximum public engagement in forecasting, rather than accept the biases of a few external parties. Interestingly, the US has included participatory budgeting in its October 2015 OGP commitments. I am not advocating participatory budgeting, only participatory forecasting. | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.2 | Implement the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative in Australia. | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.3 | PIAC recommends that the Commonwealth should publish, and negotiate for all state and territory government agencies to publish, the aggregate amount paid in legal settlements and ex-gratia payments to non-employees by government agencies in each financial year. (Recommendation 5) | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.4 | Establish a publicly available register of the beneficial ownership of companies. | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.4.1 | This is a commitment in the UK National Action Plan 2013 to 2015. This would build on the current ASIC company registry, but would require the disclosure of beneficial owners, people who directly or indirectly own or control a company. It would need to be an offence for a person to register a company and not disclose the beneficial owners and an offence for a person to be a beneficial owner and not to have disclosed that fact. Shell companies with hidden ownership are used in a variety of transnational crimes, from tax evasion, to money laundering, to bribery to the financing of terrorism. The current ASIC database does not require the disclosure of beneficial owners, which has allowed front people to be used to hide the real owners of businesses involved in criminal activity. The UK Government revealed that 6,150 people currently act as directors of more than 20 UK registered companies, with some people being directors in over 1,000 companies. A research report by World-Check had previously shown that almost 4,000 people who are appear on various international watch lists are registered as directors of UK companies. This included 154 people allegedly involved in financial crime, 13 individuals wanted by Interpol for alleged terrorist activities and 37 accused of involvement in the drugs trade. No such data has ever been publicly disclosed for companies registered in Australia. Research by Findley, Nielson and Sharman also found Australian corporate service providers were near the top of corporate service providers in terms of being willing to set up an untraceable shell company even when there was significant risk the company in question would be used for illicit purposes. The World Bank and UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) published a report reviewing some 150 cases of corruption where the money from laundered. In the majority of cases: •A corporate vehicle was misused to hide the money trail; •The corporate vehicle in question was a company or corporation; •The proceeds and instruments of corruption consisted of funds in a bank account; and •In cases where the ownership information was available, the corporate vehicle in question was established or managed by a professional intermediary. In two-thirds of the cases some form of surrogate, in ownership or management, was used to increase the opacity of the arrangement.In half the cases where a company was used to hide the proceeds of corruption, the company was a shell company.One in seven of the companies misused were operational companies, that is 'front companies'. An OECD report into foreign bribery released in December 2014 found that in 25% of foreign bribery cases, the illicit money was channelled through shadowy secret companies. The report listed the ways law enforcement was tricked by "… subsidiary | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.4.2 | In 2015 the Australian Government endorsed the G20 High-Level Principles on Beneficial Ownership Transparency (see http://www.mofa.go.jp/files/000059869.pdf ). Those principles provide a measure against which the implementation of this commitment might be monitored. | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.5 | High level summary of today's discussion. There were 9 people on the call: Andrew, Ashok, Cameron, Chandi (no microphone), Kevin, Rosie, Mark, Dez and myself. Within this theme 5 categories of actions were discussed: 1) Transparent forecasting of budgets - revenue modelling and spending; 2) Campaign finance; 3) Ownership of companies; 4) Transparency of procurement and grants; 5) Performance indicators and reporting of program spending. I encouraged participants to connect their suggestions to the two Grand Challenges set by the Government and consider how they might be delivered as an OGP commitment. The OGP NAP template was shared as a guide. We also discussed the need for agencies will need to take on responsibility as lead agency for the delivery of actions and the need to cluster actions if we are to narrow them down to 5-15 commitments for the NAP. Some participants will now add their actions to other them to other theme areas to reflect connections to Grand Challenges and other actions suggested. A general overview of the event on the 11th April was provided including how actions outside the Grand Challenges would be dealt with - i.e. commitment templates would be developed and actions could still be pursued but they are unlikely to be included in the NAP. The question of budgets for delivery of OGPAU commitments was raised and budget cycles were discussed. Ongoing engagement among participants was encouraged - participants will comment on this wiki and consent was provided to share emails among the group. A follow up call for this theme will also be scheduled for next week. Amelia http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Action%20Plan%20Template% | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.6 | Greater transparency in public procurement: Governments should publish in a timely manner the selection criteria and the method of award of any contract before the procurement process commences; Governments should collect and disclose the identity and beneficial ownership of all bidders; Full details of awarded contracts should be disclosed and the details of completion of the contract should be published in a timely manner with any alterations to the terms of the original contract also disclosed; Independent monitoring of all stages of the procurement process with a robust, transparent and effective appeals process should be accessible; Information on public procurement should be available in open data format – non-proprietary, searchable, sortable, platform-independent and machine-readable. Note: This needs more detail to be an actionable item. Have asked for more specific details from the proposer.(note updated 23/12 - TB) Move the OAIC function into the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.7 | Adopt 360Giving Data Standard in publishing grant data and build/leverage analysis tools to ensure grants are directed equitably and strategically. http://www.threesixtygiving.org | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.7.2 | The Commonwealth government is introducing grants.gov.au Similar to AusTenders, grants.gov.au is intended to publish as open data grants administered by all Commonwealth agencies and is supposed to come online over the coming year. Currently grants are published in a variety of formats (html, pdf, csv, excel) and the Guideline 412 applying to grant reporting is interpreted differently from one agency to another which makes the data difficult to work with. Some quality issues such as DSS grants providing only location of head office as opposed to the location where money is spent have been highlighted as a persistent issue in the ANAO Report Delivery and Administration of Grant Programmes published on 15 March 2016 http://www.anao.gov.au/Publications/Audit-Reports/2015-2016/Delivery-and-Evaluation-of-Grant-Programmes | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.8 | Participatory budgeting Participatory budgeting relies on deliberation for its success. I.e. "Voting" (if required) is the end stage of a long process which draws people into exchanging views, values and ideas, better understanding each other and leading to better developed policy, which may be agreed by consensus. There is now a wealth of experience of how to make this work well and flaws to avoid. A good starting point would be to require Federal MPs to use participatory budgeting techniques to decide on projects to be funded under the "Stronger Communities Programme" ($150,000 per MP) | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.8.1 | My views on participatory budgeting is that it needs to be prefaced by budget transparency. There is a great deal of obfuscation in public debate regarding government spending which can be addressed through supporting budget transparency projects both technically and financially. These projects require open budget data and also information regarding how funding flows to the states and local government. Comprehensive and accurate budget transparency projects need to be based on detailed understanding of the inner workings of how government administers funding, the kinds of questions that are not always addressed in public facing documents. I'm starting a list of these on GitHub for developers working on budget apps at https://github.com/forkinthecode/Budget-Transparency If you know the answers to the current questions - I'm all ears! Breaking participatory budgeting down to specific programs is one way to avoid dealing with the bigger questions of where money is going overall geographically & politically however these are very important questions that attract the interest of the public, NGO's, media & government alike. The Commonwealth has done a good job with federal budget data both in opening it and receiving ongoing feedback as to how it can be improved however there is no infrastructure in Australia to fund these kinds of civic-lead projects that to be done properly require significant input of expertise, labour and public engagement. Such projects are not traditionally business oriented so unlikely to attract the interest of startup venture capitalists but the value of better analysis of spending patterns can not be overlooked. | Fiscal Transparency |

| 1.9 | Improved reporting of expenditure, major projects and departmental reporting<br>1) Regular publishing of government expenditure<br>records down to $1000. Currently federal government contracts over $10k<br>are reported in Australia through the AusTender website and<br>ondata.gov.au however, there are a lot of expenses below $10k that<br>arguably would be useful to know. In the UK they introduced expenditure<br>reporting per department monthly at https://data.gov.uk/data/openspending-report/index<br>2) A public register of all gov funded major projects (all types) along<br>with status, project manager and regular reporting. This would make it<br>easier to track major projects and to intervene when they are not<br>delivering.<br>3) Update of PBS and Annual Report templates for comparative budget and<br>program information with common key performance indicators and reporting<br>for programs and departmental functions. Right now agencies do their<br>reporting in PDF documents that provide no easy way to compare outcomes,<br>programs, expenditure, etc. If common XML templates were used for<br>common reports, comparative assessment would be easier and information<br>about government as a whole much more available for assessment.<br>(Full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Fiscal Transparency |
|---|---|---|
| 1.10 | Governments don't know how to buy free software. Despite open government policies highlighting benefits of open source software and open standards, government uptake<br>of open source is surprisingly low. Why? Because government purchasing practices inadvertently favour proprietary software and vendor lock-in tactics over collaborative business practices used by open communities. There are multiple aspects to this, which should be understood, leading to updated guidelines to government purchasing practices. Some considerations include: How to compare long term value of open source and proprietary business models. How to assess the health of an open source community and associated rate of innovation in order to properly assess the value of open source.How to assess a product's claims of standards compliance. Some companies dissuade standards use by pricing extra for standards use, or limiting standards based functionality.How to assess the quality and applicability of a standard, and whether to invest in influencing the development of the standard.Typically government officials have mandate to solve department-wide problems, however open source and open standards based solutions will often be best justified at a Whole-Of-Government, or Whole-Of-World level. One particular argument is "If I invest in an open standard, or open source, I will see minimal immediate benefit, but long term will see international adoption which will lead to advancement of my local goals."Government's asymmetric spending of discretionary budgets at year-end disadvantages fee-for-service business models typically employed by open source businesses. | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.11 | The Australian Government should endorse the principles of open contracting. In doing so Australia will build on the existing foundation of transparency in procurement and contracting and, in consultation with civil society organisations and other stakeholders, Australia should look at ways to enhance the scope, breadth and usability of published contractual data."<br><br>And as a complimentary measure, the Australian government will promote the principles of transparency and accountability in all government-funded construction projects in the domestic and international arenas, including, in the period up until 2018, working with others in government (eg Infrastructure Australia and in state counterparts) and civil society to identify suitable projects for the application of the Construction Sector Transparency Initiative (CoST) in Australia, and using its bilateral and multilateral relationships to encourage the establishment of at least four new national CoST programmes in countries where DFAT is working. The Australian Government will continue to play a role in transforming the transparency of global development assistance by publishing information on official development assistance (ODA) in line with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) Standard, so that Australian assistance can be tracked through the delivery chain. In the 2014 Aid Transparency Index (http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/index/2014-ati/ ) Australia's performance was rated to be Fair. It would be a great step forward to aim to improve that rating to the Very Good category as a measy | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.11.1 | My apology for the 'typo' I suggest that an aspiration for Australia's aid transparency to be assessed as in the Very Good Category might be a measure of Australia's increased aid transparency. | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.12 | The government has been incrementally improving its public reporting. The Federal Budget papers and supporting are now made one the same evening or soon after thanks to the efforts of data.gov.au, and the ATO is publishing an extract of tax statistics several years after the year in question.<br>With regard to the expenditure reporting, the lack of standardisation of programme naming schemes, and machinery of government changes, makes it rather difficult to track expenditure across financial years. This is largely because it is reported at an aggregate level in the budget papers. Seeing as agencies have to track at a finer level of detail for the purposes of running the programmes themselves, they would have the information within their individual financial management information systems. All of this information would be passed between agencies as part of any Machinery of Government change, so the information is not lost. Perhaps as well as the budget papers, if agencies could report (at least at an aggregate / programme level) the level of expenditure (Capex and Opex) for each programme we would attain greater visibility to how each agency is delivering the programme.<br>On the revenue side, the ATO captures all of the information, and seems to have internal processes to filter the data to protect the privacy of individuals prior to publication. It would be beneficial if that information on taxation revenue was available to the public sooner. In a perfect world, published at the same time as Final Budget Outcome (FBO). This would provide people with (at a year level) a view to detail as to government expenditure, and the revenue (or debt) that was taken on to achieve the outcomes from that expenditure. | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.2 | See the Open Contracting Data Standard - http://standard.open-contracting.org/latest/en/) by the Open Contracting Partnership - http://www.open-contracting.org | Fiscal Transparency |
| 1.3 | Australian Governments are committed to substantial investment in infrastructure. To ensure the integrity, efficiency and effectiveness of that investment, Australian Governments should endorse the principles of open contracting (http://www.open-contracting.org/). In doing so Australia will build on the existing foundation of transparency in procurement and contracting and, in consultation with civil society organisations and other stakeholders, Australia should look at ways to enhance the scope, breadth and usability of published contractual data." http://www.open-contracting.org/data-standard/ | Fiscal Transparency |

| 2.1 | Open up the procurement process to facilitate greater participation and public sector innovation<br>There's scope here to link the Government's OGP commitments to a new initiative in its National Innovation and Science Agenda, which states: "We will challenge small to medium enterprises to deliver innovative solutions for government, rather than tendering for an existing product."<br><br>Opening up the procurement process in this way -- over and above mere transparency – will facilitate greater participation and public sector innovation. It requires a commitment to an open innovation model, replacing or expanding existing tendering systems with open innovation platforms. A culture of openness early in policy program development is needed; current procurement focuses on outputs rather than outcomes, with little early external participation to validate the appropriateness of the outputs.<br><br>Innovation Australia's 2014 submission to the Inquiry into Commonwealth Procurement Procedures articulated it this way: "Agencies contemplating tenders should be required to give adequate notice of their intentions and take submissions regarding innovative possibilities." | Fostering Innovation |
|---|---|---|
| 2.2 | Wisdom Pledge. Firstly, the first step is to make a wisdom pledge which is a commitment to consider Zero Marginal Cost technologies to pursue Society Growth ( wisdom.to/pledge ) . Secondly, the Australian Government could consider a Network Democracy platform which restores the balance with real-time, comprehensive citizen participation across government, democracy and industry" ( wisdom.to/networkdemocracy ). Network Democracy could provide transparent participation and collaboration across every government department and agency. Thirdly, Health Wisdom could provide nationwide collaboration between doctors, patients, nurses and other caregivers ( wisdom.to/health ). This could evolve in the Australia Wisdom Network which crowd creates Network Society ( wisdom.to/australia ). | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.3 | Encourage and enable the delivery unsolicited proposals if they are in the public interest<br>Establish an open and transparent process to encourage unsolicited proposals from the public, business and industry. This would enable all levels of business to contribute not only ideas but infrastructure, services, and alternative business models to support the delivery of public services and infrastructure. The process could be made more open and efficient by: 1) creating an online platform to crowd source and encourage proposal pitching; 2) inviting public participation through a representative sample of the population who would be able to develop a criteria for evaluation and / or consider the proposals on an occasional basis / biannually or quarterly through a deliberative process that considers context, impacts, requirements to deliver and weighs up pros and cons of various options suggested. 3) A format or basic criteria for proposals and pitches so the public know what they can expect and proposals are well formed for consideration. 4) An internal taskforce to coordinate (and communicate) Government processes to enables the delivery of these proposals including transparent approval process, allocation of funding and other support mechanisms provided. This process could start small as a pilot with a stated quantity of funds and public resources allocated to invite and encourage proposals and a criteria establish to evaluate them. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.4 | Procuring innovation. To genuinely innovate the Federal Government should establish processes that enable collaboration inside and outside of the public sector, especially when problems are complex and input is required from non-government organisations to test understanding and explore potential impacts. To enable collaboration in these matters Government need to be able to procure services to co-design, prototype and test solutions when outcomes can not be known, and those involved need to provide fluid services. The responsive nature of this type of services design and solving problem makes it almost impossible for Government and its service providers to define exactly what will be required when the project commences. While it is commonly understood that this type of responsive service and collaboration is required, it is not currently possible to procure these types of services within traditional procurement models.<br><br>Increasingly, and especially in the context of start-ups, small and agile innovators and innovative companies, Government need to be able to procure innovators, not innovations. The ability to more rapidly identify players - people and organisations - who not only 'get it' but have even a remote chance of 'getting it done' in areas where new ideas, different approaches and genuine innovation is being sought is itself a key challenge. Agencies need scope to find and engage individuals whose experience, insights and approach make them ideal partners forexploration phases, and when continuing and evolving innovation.<br><br>Government also should consider supporting people and the organisations they need to involve when co-designing, prototyping and testing ideas and approaches. The current focus on procurement process, especially when innovative outcomes are being sought, can itself generate adverse outcomes in terms of efficiency, fairness and productivity. Asking people and organisations good at the new dynamic of design, rapid testing of multiple prototypes and eventual scaling of successful solutions, to bend their skills to participate in slower more cumbersome, complex and time consuming procurement processes is limiting the scope of providers and creative options available to Government.<br><br>Perhaps there could be a different space seyt up adjacent to the more formal procurement process with clear expectations set (and adhered to) about the ability to play in the larger and more formal procurement processes when it comes time to buy a solution at scale.This additional space would provide for the necessary legibility of process (who is involved, on what terms etc) while at the same time providing for more flexible and less onerous process provisions to nurture faster, more open and iterative conversations and exchanges. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.4.1 | I agree with this suggestion.<br><br>The following is an expansion on the ideas and a possible action item for OGPAU.<br><br>It is difficult to introduce innovation into government or any large organization. Christensen described it in "The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail". What is true for commercial organizations is relevant to governments.<br><br>The best chance of government innovation is to leave existing systems as they are. Instead of trying to change existing systems keep innovation outside existing systems. But have ways to allow innovations to connect to existing systems. Existing systems can then evolve. The way we connect systems is the key to innovation adoption.<br><br>Innovation requires the participation of organizations who have the responsibility for "business as usual". They need to co-create the innovations with an eye to integration if successful. This co-creation should also involve the parties who are the beneficiaries of government services.<br><br>A dampener on innovation is the political process. Innovation requires a by-partisan approach. Keeping innovation out of the political process benefits all. Innovation and change is an ongoing process not a once off. It goes beyond the electoral cycle. Arranged well all parties can share in the credit and take no blame.<br><br>Within these constraints we can structure a process for innovation. A possible process may be along the following lines.<br><br>An innovation must be demonstrable "in the small". It must be something that will work with a few participants. This is Minimum Viable Product idea.<br><br>An innovation must integrate with existing systems without changing existing systems. This means systems are autonomous. Neither depends on the other.<br>An innovation is co-created. Possible participants are the proposers, agencies and the beneficiaries of the services.<br><br>An innovation must be able to show how it adds value to the community. Value extends beyond monetary measures. When realised the monetary value is available to fund future innovations. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.5 | Enabling place based reform through cross sector collaboration<br>The Federal Government should lead the collation of place-based data – both activity and outcome data – and support localised sense making.Open data that builds understanding of the outcomes of citizens will create the enabling conditions for place based reform.However, open data in itself is not enough.Data needs to be shared in ways that are useable and easily consumable - preferably in visual form.And further, the Federal Government needs to play a role in supporting sense making through analysis and dialog.Place based reform is dependant on inputs and processes that build a shared understanding of complex problems and shared approaches to making large scale social change.<br><br>Two live examples of the need for open data, that is citizen centred and visual is Maranguka's Justice Reinvestment Initiative for Bourke and Empowered Communities.PM&C is involved in both the emerging initiatives.<br>Place based reform process will improve the delivery and cost-effectiveness of public services.Localised change agendas - developed by all sectors - will guide the design and delivery of public services so they better meet local priorities, are more flexible and responsive, and are less duplicative and fragmented.priorities, such as child development, poverty reduction, crime prevention, employment and housing. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.5.1 | This suggestion seems consistent with the UK's approach of "City Data Infrastructure" discussed for example here: http://theodi.org/smart-cities and here: http://theodi.org/data-infrastructure | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.5.2 | Yes, Yes and Yes. If this can be done using open APIs and access to open and shared data (see post my in service delivery) and supported by external parties (who community data warehouse like www.communityinfo.org.au) this isn't just possibility is can happen quickly and cheaply! | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.6 | Superannuation. Require that .5% of superannuation is put into Venture Capital (Innovation) Projects | Fostering Innovation |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.7 | Open Data/Open Government Cooperative Research Centre. BudgetAus<br>I can't see this Commitment idea in any of the themes so I'm adding it here: An open data/open government Cooperative Research Centre would provide the infrastructure and research commitment required to make use of open data in the Australian context for policy, business and research purposes. It would also hook up the government's Innovation program with the open government agenda. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.8 | Innovations of their nature are difficult to procure as they are unknown. Innovations can be procured by procuring experiments. The procurement process assumes the government knows what it is buying.If it is an innovation then it is unknown. Buying or promoting the unknown is risky.<br>One way to introduce innovations is to do it as a co-creation activity in isolation and as an experiment.The experimental method looks for failure.If the experiment fails that is a success.If the experiment does not fail the innovation is a success.<br>We have an innovation to open personal data to the person.It could be used for a co-creation experiment. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.9 | Commitment : Reform the procurement process making it easier for people and businesses to work with, and collaborate with government.<br><br>The closed nature of the existing procurement panel process to get on a government supplier list, is an obstacle for government agencies being able to innovate, and find new service providers and SMEs to work with or collaborate with.<br><br>The existing categories use old terminology and do not reflect contemporary roles and services. The government should open the lists and create new service categories to enable fresh people, ideas, approaches, and techniques. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.10 | Addresses : Fostering Innovation, Access to Information, Public Participation, Improve Public Service Improvement and Delivery<br><br>Commitment : Review the Australian Intellectual Property Rules with public and private sector participation. Create and publish useful, open and educational information for government staff, and service providers and citizens about where rules apply and where there are exceptions, particularly in relation to procurement.<br><br>Context :<br><br>The Australian Government position on IP can be confusing, is at times contradictory and can be easily misunderstood by internal government staff as well as external service providers.<br><br>Across agencies and all levels of government across the nation different rules apply. There is a lack of consistency, transparency and explanation as to why there are different stances with regard to IP and copyright.<br><br>For example - the default position for the Australian Government and NSW Government is that ICT providers and SMEs to retain their IP in order to benefit from their ideas and foster innovation. However, this seems to change between agencies and jurisdictions. It would be enormously helpful to provide clarity around IP and copyright to make it easier to do business with and collaborate with government.<br><br>Suggestion:<br>It is the opportune time review this, provide frameworks and scenarios of best practices to complement the launch of the National Innovation and Science Agenda.<br><br>This will help drive government and private sector innovation, encourage collaboration with government, researchers and universities.<br><br>To help foster content innovation, a review of how Crown copyright is used and applicable, and a move to a creative commons licensing frameworks is required. Content should be able to be openly shared and reused, and where appropriate distributed through multiple channels to reach the broadest possible audience.<br><br>This will encourage the uptake of creative commons, as well as provide opportunities to create an ecosystem of content innovators and the creation of original local content in collaboration with agencies and other organisations such as museums. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.11 | It would be great to be able to have groups of students involved in the innovation process around open data with government agencies. They will provide a valuable perspective, as digital natives, future users and employees of government agencies. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.12 | Many agencies of a reasonable size have an internal software development capability. These intrepid souls cut the code to build and maintain software capability to deliver agency outcomes. In some cases these solutions are delivered to citizens with the high transaction variety now fall within the Digital Transformation Office remit.<br>To support Open Government, perhaps start small and encourage Agencies to share code amongst themselves as a stepping stone to open the software to citizens. Agencies could publish their internally developed code (production versions) to a central repository that could be indexed and searched by other agencies. Perhaps an Agency only version of the GitHub used by the DTO? This would help promote reuse within Agencies and allow the public service and its agents with a broader mechanism to solve challenges. Perhaps with such a mechanism once software is considered mature enough it is published externally so it can be made "Open" to the community at large. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.13 | Innovation requires the right environment. Innovative ideas that eventually turn into successful products, services or processes are rewarded in the private sector. However, in the public sector, it is usually a pat on the back- there is seldom any reward. If an idea fails in the public sector, the consequences are negative for everyone in that chain of command: negative press coverage, complaints from the public, questions about sensible resource utilisation... You can imagine the headlines in the newspaper!<br>In a society that punishes failures disproportionately compared to rewards given to winners, innovation will remain stagnant. Let us call this the external innovation culture since it is external to the group that is trying to innovate.<br><br>The fear and reluctance for trying out new ideas is compounded in an environment where there is no profit motive. In an environment where status-quo is the norm, and management does not like to go out of its comfort zone, established norms or ways of doing things is not questioned, and anyone who does so is ignored, frowned upon or gently cast aside. I call this the internal innovation culture. This internal culture has to change to make governments more innovative, transparent and efficient.<br><br>Solutions<br><br>Changing the External Innovation Culture<br>Political consensus will greatly help soften external culture. If the major political parties are agreed upon trying out, for example, 20 new ideas at CentreLink, the risk of criticism towards the ruling government and department head would greatly be reduced even if half of them fail. If such a consensus is arrived at, accompanied by enthusiastic participation from civil society or groups, then the risk of negative media coverage will also be reduced. The overall winner would be an innovative public services.<br><br>Changing the Internal Innovation Culture<br>Hiring workers from outside the APS into all levels of the APS, particularly the higher EL1, EL2 and SES levels will infuse a new way of thinking. This can be done, for example, by including prominent players from the private sector in hiring panels of SES jobs. This will infuse new blood into the APS. Once we have people within the APS who think outside the box, who do not hesitate to be different and act different, they will innovate (or at least encourage and allow innovation by others). They will be less risk averse and more tolerant towards failures. They will provide innovative solutions to customers without customers having to come up with new ideas. The current system of a public service that is desensitised to public needs will change over time.<br><br>Changing the internal and external innovation cultures will help citizens be served better, reduce corruption and lead to adaptation of new technologies and methods, thereby lead to a strong participatory democracy and improve transparency, This will in turn improve innovativeness. Innovation begets innovation! | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.14 | Rather than focus on innovation, reward and promote solutions in local communities and public service delivery. Develop simple payment models that pay 5-10% of savings. Innovation is about investment in outcomes not investment in innovation as an activity. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.15 | Innovations of their nature are difficult to procure as they are unknown. Innovations can be procured by procuring experiments. The procurement process assumes the government knows what it is buying. If it is an innovation then it is unknown. Buying or promoting the unknown is risky.<br><br>One way to introduce innovations is to do it as a co-creation activity in isolation and as an experiment. The experimental method looks for failure. If the experiment fails that is a success. If the experiment does not fail the innovation is a success.<br><br>We have an innovation to open personal data to the person. It could be used for a co-creation experiment. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.16 | I can't see this Commitment idea in any of the themes so I'm adding it here: An open data/open government Cooperative Research Centre would provide the infrastructure and research commitment required to make use of open data in the Australian context for policy, business and research purposes. It would also hook up the government's Innovation program with the open government agenda. | Fostering Innovation |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.17 | 6 people attended this call: Ken, Kevin, Ashkor, Rosie, Andrew and I. We discussed: 1) Procuring outcomes not services - actions suggested by Martin, Kevin, Andrew and whether this went some way to addressing Marcus' suggestion; 2) The importance of building capabilities, empowering and supporting those wishing to innovate and use data and empowerment possibly through a CRC as suggested by Rosie. I mentioned Brentyn's suggestion, Kerry Graham's suggestion and ODI, Code for Australia, Open Australia were discussed as key ways to support those wishing to use data to innovate and open gov. 3) 'Cross fertilisation' - the importance of enabling innovation, codesign and collaboration across sectors - was discussed in relation to the two points above. Ashkor has added some points about how Government agencies might better enable this to this theme. 4) Program design and delivery - how effectiveness if measured was raised. I suggested this by added to the improving services and open data themes. The need to connect actions to challenges was discussed as was the importance of pilot projects and milestones. Thanks to everyone who participated. Amelia | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.18 | Superannuation into Social Impact Bonds: Require 1% of Superannuation goes into Social Impact Bonds with Government Guarantees | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.19 | Require that .5% of superannuation is put into Venture Capital (Innovation) Projects | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.2 | Fostering innovation<br><br>There are some important comments already noted here but to add to them, the panel process could be improved by providing a mechanism to track projects or related work through the panels.<br><br>This is just a start and I look forward to participating further in the development of the OGPau - Australian Government NAP on behalf of Adelphi Digital. | Fostering Innovation |
| 2.3 | Fostering innovation<br>- Action: Innovation in government<br>- Description: Pilot program to capture and measure government innovation activity (activity/output, outcome and impact indicators). | Fostering Innovation |

| 3.1 | Practical aspects of using and maintaining information. Australia has an open by default policy for government data. A great first step, but of minimal value until the data is readily usable. Yes, a bus timetable is useful when a paper copy of it is distributed to commuters every 6 months. But it is super useful when bus timetables are integrated with real-time bus and traffic data travel plans can be adjusted accordingly. This is facilitated by the concept of "mashable government" where government data is made available in machine readable form via standards based Application Programmer Interfaces (APIs). Cross agency integration of datasets can open up significant value, but usually requires addressing of technical, financial, legal and social challenges. Agencies need to agree upon common formats for common datasets (typically through use open standards). Who benefits from aggregated datasets is usually different to those who collects and maintains the data. As such, solving integration issues often requires creative, cross-agency, business cases to be crafted. The National Action Plan should discuss: Mashable Government, APIs, use/extend/create open standards (in that order), writing business cases to identify high value datasets, and cross-agency funding of data management strategies. | Freedom of Information |
|-----|-----|-----|
| 3.1.1 | Agree. Usability of open or shared data remains one of the biggest challenges. Until this challenge is addressed open data cannot possibly deliver outcomes near to the prospectus of promise it was sold on. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.1.2 | Absolutely - This is an important part of PiaWaugh submission Mandated open Application Programmable Interfaces (APIs) for all citizen and business facing services delivered or commissioned by government | Freedom of Information |
| 3.2 | Adoption of rightoknow platform for whole of gov with central FOI register and publications, and a central FOI team to work across all departments consistently for responding to requests. Currently doing an FOI request can be tricky to figure out (unless you can find community initiatives like righttoknow which has automated the process externally) and the approach to FOI requests varies quite dramatically across departments. A single official way to submit requests, track them, and see reports published, as well as a single mechanism to respond to requests would be better for the citizen experience and far more efficient for government. (Full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Freedom of Information |
| 3.3 | Review of Australia's access to information law and practice<br>Commitment: To undertake a review of the Freedom of Information Act and its implementation by agencies and ministers by a panel of experts drawn from government and civil society to report<br>within 6 months on ways to improve and enhance Australian law and practice in accordance with widely accepted best practice standards in this country and internationally.<br><br>Rationale: Access to government information, guaranteed by law, is a cornerstone of democracy. As former Australian Information Commissioner Professor John McMillan said recently (http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/commitment-to-freedom-of-information-bolsters-our-democracy/news-story/a76fe5aa312e04ff728d4fe9b80bd09a)<br><br>"The FoI Act ushered in a new era of open government in 1982. Ever since, government in Australia has been more responsive, engaged and transparent. The Australian lead was followed in many other countries. And yes, the FoI Act is not perfect. It doesn't balance well the administrative demands on government with the ideal of public access to government information. Many recommendations for reform have been made during the past five years by the OAIC and others. There has been scant government consideration of those proposals, at least outside the bunker. There is an urgent need for constructive debate on future directions in FoI. No political party can truly claim to subscribe to a policy of open government while this impasse continues."<br><br>A wide range of experts outside government have serious concerns about the current state of the law and the practices adopted in many government agencies. The development of the national action plan provides the opportunity for discussion and debate about much needed reform.<br><br>The Centre for Law and Democracy (Canada) rated the Federal FOI act 51 of 104 right to information laws reviewed, awarding 83 points out of a possible 150. Since that assessment the Government announced its intention to abolish the Office of Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC). If the bill, still before the Senate, passed into law a further drop in international standing would follow.<br><br>Serious consideration of other reforms will be constrained while the Government maintains its position that the OAIC should be abolished and in the meantime that funding for the office not extend to the full range of its functions.<br><br>Recommendations put forward but not discussed "outside the bunker" to use Professor McMillan's words, include those contained in the Australian Law Reform Commission 2009 report Secrecy Laws and Open Government; the report by Dr Allan | Freedom of Information |
| 3.4 | Australia's independent watchdog and advocate for open government. As a number of others have proposed the Government should withdraw the Freedom of Information Amendment (New Arrangements) Bill which has been before the Senate since October 2014 and not brought on for a vote because it does not enjoy majority support. In the meantime reduced funding for the OAIC has meant the office does not carry out some functions conferred on it by Parliament and has a limited capacity to carry out others. As Dr Lidberg's research identifies, cultural change in the direction of openness and transparency is more important in achieving the objectives that underpin freedom of information than changes to the law, but clearly culture and a modern well balanced law that reflects Australian and international good practice are both important. Australia cannot credibly support the OGP and explore reforms on the home front to advance transparent open government and increased citizen participation while planning to abolish the office of information commissioner, the body established by parliament to play a key role in advancing those same objectives. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.5 | Amendments to FOI laws- Based on the article and my other research (2001-2016) here are my recommendations re information access in Australia's OGP national plan in dot points.<br>•Culture change of the administration of FOI is more important than legal reform and change. Put more effort into FOI guidelines issued from ministers and heads of department – see the WA example in the article. These guidelines should make it clear that the task of public servants is to facilitate FOI requests and that a fast as possible processing time should be a priority.<br>•Re-fund the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC). Re-appoint the Information Commissioner and FOI Commissioner.<br>•Aim to change the current 'pull' information culture to a 'push' one. All information should be considered public and the public servants should have to justify why a generated document should not be public.<br><br>Legal reforms:<br>•Amend FOI laws to include a FOI/Information Commissioner in all Australian jurisdictions modelled on the OAIC<br>•Implement the FOI disclosure logs across all FOI jurisdictions and task the FOI/Info commissioner with following up the implementation and use of the disclosure logs. ALL<br>•Scrap the $30 FOI request fee – it sends the wrong signals.<br>•Introduce a public interest request category – if the request qualifies in this category – processing fees should not be charged. The default should be not to charge fees.<br>•Amend the FOI laws in all Australian jurisdictions to include all government agencies modelled on best practice legislations in countries like Sweden and the US where no government agencies are exempt. Exempting agencies signals secrecy instead of transparency. Documents from security agencies may be redacted, but it is an important step in changing the administrative culture from secrecy to openness. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.6 | Transparency on customs data. Follow the example of other countries, such as the US and India, and make customs data publicly available, so that government is not hiding where companies are sourcing products from. Making key data about imported products publicly available would allow greater ability to detect where Australian importers are dealing with suppliers where there is the presence of criminal activity, human rights abuses and/or unlawful environmental destruction and the source jurisdiction has failed to take effective action to stop the criminal abuse. This would have a deterrent impact on the risks Australian importers are willing to take in dealing with suppliers where there is significant risk of criminal activity and human rights abuses being present, out of concern of reputational risk.<br><br>Currently information about imports is recorded through the Australian Government's Integrated Cargo System (ICS) and includes the type of product, quantity, the supplier and the recipient. In other jurisdictions, including the United States, the EU and India, this data is made publicly available. However, import data collected through Australia's ICS is not made public. Limited statistical data from ICS is made available to the Australian Bureau of Statics for research purposes.<br><br>In the jurisdictions where customs data is publicly available there is no evidence of any significant impact on commercial activities or the proper functioning of markets. There is evidence that it has assisted importers in those jurisdictions to be made aware of risks of human rights abuses and criminal activity in relation to suppliers they are sourcing from. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.7 | Strengthen FOI Freedom of Information<br>1. Reverse the proposed changes to the OAIC regime by withdrawing legislation to abolish the Office, re-instating funding to the level<br>necessary for it to be able to fulfilits freedom of information, privacy, and information policy functions , and ensuring the prompt appointment of a new Australian Information Commissioner and Freedom of Information Commissioner.<br>2. Establish a comprehensive review of the FOI Act, as proposed by the 2013 Hawke Review (rec 1).<br>3. Add to the list of items suggested by Hawke for consideration a. the addition of public interest tests to other exemptions such as the exemptions for trade secrets etc and breach of confidence; b. the removal of exclusions for specific bodies, including national security agencies and parliamentary departments; and c. the implementation of further measures to improve the transparency of government procurement processes and government contracts. | Freedom of Information |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3.8 | Ensure better Freedom of Information. Societies are not served by secretive governments and indeed democracies are better for opening up the processes that form policy and theadministrative framework of government, both parliament and the public service.<br><br>Actionable 1: Remove the Bill to abolish the OAIC. Fund the OAIC to ensure proper resources to fulfil role to a high level and to avoid backlogs.<br><br>Actionable 2:Improve data publishing including publishing ministerial and briefings as a matter of course to allow public participation in the formation of policy.A working group might ascertain the appropriate time period before publication.<br><br>Actionable 3:Look at removing all agency exemptions to the FOI Act including parliamentary departments and national security agencies.There are existing exemptions that agencies might utilise in weighing up FOI applications for information, especially around national security.<br><br>Actionable 4:Implement workshops within the public service to ensure that staff are aware of agency obligations under the FOI Act in the same way that mandatory security awareness workshops are managed.<br><br>Actionable 5:Centralise the FOI disclosure logs to one site with each agency can access using their own password for uploading documents.A user-friendly search function using keywords would harness documents from a number of different agencies on a particular topic. This would aid in academic research as well as expanding information available for citizens to make informed choices.It also would reduce pressure on FOI if information is easily sourced.<br><br>Actionable 6:Include private contractors in the FOI Act to ensure proper scrutiny of the use of public monies. Transferring the same standards of governance, accountability and transparency to businesses that perform government functions is a fundamental aspect of democracy. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.9 | Amend the FOI act Amend the Commonwealth FOI Act to make the section 47 exemption (trade secrets or commercially valuable information) subject<br>to the public interest test, at least where s 47(3) applies (i.e. government-held trade secrets or commercially valuable information. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.10 | Introduction fo a fair use exception to copyright law. Australia's Copyright legislation creates many problems for libraries, cultural and education institutions to manage and reuse government resources. The review conducted by the ALRC on 'Copyright and the digital economy' addressed many issues and its recommendations would go a long way to improving access and use of government information.<br><br>The ALRC was asked to consider whether the current exceptions and statutory licences in the Copyright Act are adequate and appropriate in the digital era. The Report, tabled on 13 February 2014, is the result of an 18-month Inquiry during which the ALRC produced two consultation documents, undertook 109 consultations and received 870 submissions. The Report contains 30 recommendations for reform. The key recommendation is for the introduction of a fair use exception to Australian copyright law. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.11 | At present government agencies ask people for information that the agencies then check. Instead allow people to confirm information about themselves before passing it on to agencies. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.11.1 | However, it should be noted that 90% of all FOI request are for personal information held by organizations. Accordingly this proposal has been moved to public service delivery because it is about improving the efficiency. It could possibly fund FOI requests of all types from the savings made on personal information FOI. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.12 | Encourage government agencies to follow Privacy Principle 12. In particular 12.4(b)."give access to the information in the manner requested by the individual, if it is reasonable and practicable to do so". | Freedom of Information |
| 3.13 | Reinstate the OAIC by withdrawing legislation to abolish the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner, re-instating funding for the OAIC to fulfil its mandate in relation to<br>freedom of information, privacy, and information policy, and ensuring the prompt appointment of a new Australian Information Commissioner with full powers. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.14 | Establish a review of the operation of the OAIC to commence at the start of 2017 and to cover the period from its creation in 2010 to the end of 2016. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.15 | My suggestion is that most Cabinet papers be released within weeks of Cabinet decisions, excluding those documents relating to security, defence or international relations. The 20 year rule is unnecessary for the majority of Cabinet documents. Where Cabinet papers touch on commercial-in-confidence matters, then a process of redaction will be necessary.<br><br>Timely release of Cabinet documents will help forge a community consensus on difficult but necessary reforms/decisions by disclosing all information used to make those decisions. Over time it will also promote a culture of evidence-based policy development.<br><br>Where a Cabinet decision does not follow bureaucratic advice and underlying evidence, then this is clear to the community, and it is then up to the Cabinet to publicly justify that departure.<br><br>It is desirable that a Federal Cabinet be free to make decisions against bureaucratic advice (e.g. to fulfill an election promise), but the community will benefit from knowing where and when then these differences arise and the basis on which advice bureaucratic advice was not taken. | Freedom of Information |
| 3.16 | Review of Australia's access to information law and practice. Commitment: To undertake a review of the Freedom of Information Act and its implementation by agencies and ministers by a panel of experts drawn from government and civil society to report within 6 months on ways to improve and enhance Australian law and practice in accordance with widely accepted best practice standards in this country and internationally.<br><br>Rationale:<br>Access to government information, guaranteed by law, is a cornerstone of democracy.<br><br>As former Australian Information Commissioner Professor John McMillan said recently (http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/commitment-to-freedom-of-information-bolsters-our-democracy/news-story/a76fe5aa312e04ff728d4fe9b80bd09a)<br><br>"The FoI Act ushered in a new era of open government in 1982. Ever since, government in Australia has been more responsive, engaged and transparent. The Australian lead was followed in many other countries. And yes, the FoI Act is not perfect. It doesn't balance well the -administrative demands on government with the ideal of public access to government information. Many recommendations for reform have been made during the past five years by the OAIC and others. There has been scant government consideration of those proposals, at least outside the bunker.There is an urgent need for constructive debate on future directions in FoI. No political party can truly claim to subscribe to a policy of open government while this impasse continues."<br><br>A wide range of experts outside government have serious concerns about the current state of the law and the practices adopted in many government agencies.<br><br>The development of the national action plan provides the opportunity for discussion and debate about much needed reform.<br><br>The Centre for Law and Democracy (Canada) rated the Federal FOI act 51 of 104 right to information laws reviewed, awarding 83 points out of a possible 150.<br><br>Since that assessment the Government announced its intention to abolish the Office of Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC). If the bill, still before the Senate, passed into law a further drop in international standing would follow.<br><br>Serious consideration of other reforms will be constrained while the Government maintains its position that the OAIC should be | Freedom of Information |
| 3.17 | Kevin and Ken joined me on this call and our discussions focused on Kevin's suggested actions around the use of personal data and the release of publications. I suggested Kevin connect his actions to a) the management of data as a resource; and b) ways personal data might be used to improve public services. He will also add a comment to the opendata theme. Ken will add a comment about the release of publications to the opendata and resource management themes. Amelia | Freedom of Information |

| 3.18 | OGP Access to information/FOI points Dr Johan Lidberg, School of Media, Film and Journalism, Monash University | Freedom of Information |
|---|---|---|
| | I've pasted the abstract, discussion and conclusion from a research article that will be published in the July edition of the Australian Journalism Review. The article is under copyright, so I can't paste the full paper here – but the abstract and discussion and conclusions provides the core of the findings and argument. The article will be available in full from July 2016. | |
| | The points below also applies to some of the actions needed in the Open Data section, | |
| | Based on the article and my other research (2001-2016) here are my recommendations re information access in Australia's OGP national plan in dot points. | |
| | • Culture change of the administration of FOI is more important than legal reform and change. Put more effort into FOI guidelines issued from ministers and heads of department – see the WA example in the article. These guidelines should make it clear that the task of public servants is to facilitate FOI requests and that a fast as possible processing time should be a priority. | |
| | • Re-fund the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC). Re-appoint the Information Commissioner and FOI Commissioner. | |
| | • Aim to change the current 'pull' information culture to a 'push' one. All information should be considered public and the public servants should have to justify why a generated document should not be public. | |
| | Legal reforms: | |
| | • Amend FOI laws to include a FOI/Information Commissioner in all Australian jurisdictions modelled on the OAIC | |
| | • Implement the FOI disclosure logs across all FOI jurisdictions and task the FOI/Info commissioner with following up the implementation and use of the disclosure logs. ALL | |
| | • Scrap the $30 FOI request fee – it sends the wrong signals. | |
| | • Introduce a public interest request category – if the request qualifies in this category – processing fees should not be charged. The default should be not to charge fees. | |
| 3.19 | Metrics to assess utilisation of information access rights: State and Territory Information Commissioners/Officers/Ombudsmen responsible for upholding, reviewing and determining information access rights have agreed to collectively contribute to the development of a set of metrics to assess public utilisation of information access rights in Australia. These measures may include: | Freedom of Information |
| | Applicant by type<br>Application rates per capita<br>Reviews as a % of application numbers<br>Release rates<br>Refusal rates | |
| | The development and collection of data to inform an assessment of the utilisation of information access rights within Australian States and Territories is unprecedented. The metrics will assist in building a more complete picture of open government, with a focus on use of traditional and established 'pull pathways' to access information rights. Benefits include increasing awareness and transparency of citizen activation of these rights to access government information, together with a comprehensive quantitative data set to use as a baseline for future evaluation. This baseline and the assessment approach more broadly may be applied to contribute to the overall assessment of Australia's Open Government National Action Plan. | |
| | NSW Information Commissioner, Elizabeth Tydd<br>WA Information Commissioner, Sven Bluemmel<br>Victoria Acting Freedom of Information Commissioner, Michael Ison<br>QLD Information Commissioner, Rachael Rangihaeata<br>NT Information Commissioner, Brenda Monaghan<br>SA Ombudsman, Wayne Lines<br>Tasmania Ombudsman, Richard Connock | |
| 3.20 | The Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC) has provided a submission to the consultation. A summary is available of our recommendations relevant to freedom of information: | Freedom of Information |
| | - PIAC recommends that the Australian Government commit to restoring funding for the OAIC across the forward estimates, or create an effective alternative that can properly perform the functions that the OAIC was created to fulfil. (Recommendation 2) | |
| | - PIAC recommends that the Government implement the following recommendations of the Hawke Review:<br>• certain agencies should be required to justify their complete exemption from the FOI regime to the Attorney-General within a twelve-month period (Recommendation 19);<br>• the Act should be amended to provide that the Information Commissioner can declare requests to be 'vexatious requests' rather than empowering the Information Commissioner to declare applicants to be vexatious applicants (Recommendation 32); and<br>• FOI applicants should have a period of exclusivity with documents they have requested before those documents are publicly released (Recommendation 37). (Recommendation 3, PIAC submission) | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4.1 | Adoption of the recommendations from the Independent Parliamentary Entitlements System Report. I also wholeheartedly support the recommendations of the Independent Parliamentary Entitlements System Report (https://www.dpmc.gov.au/taskforces/review-parliamentary-entitlements), in particular:<br>Recommendation 24: publish all key documents online;<br>Recommendation 25: more frequent reporting (of work expenses of parliamentarians and their staff) on data.gov.au as a dataset;<br>Recommendation 26: improved travel reporting by Parliamentarians.<br>(Full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Government Integrity |
| 4.2 | Better transparency and reporting of contracted work. A consistent reporting approach and public access to details of outsourced contract work with greater consistency of confidentiality rules in procurement. A lot of work is outsourced by government to third parties. This can be a good way to deliver some things (and there are many arguments as to how much outsourcing is too much) however, it introduces a serious transparency issue when the information about contracted work is unable to be monitored, with the excuse of "commercial in confidence". All contracts should have minimum reporting requirements and should make publicly available the details of what exactly is contracted, with the exception of contracts with national security where such disclosure creates a significant risk. This would also help in creating a motivation for contractors to deliver on their contractual obligations. Finally, if procurement officers across government had enhanced training to correctly apply the existing confidentiality test from the Commonwealth Procurement Rules, it would be reasonably to expect that there would be less information hidden behind commercial in confidence.(Full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Government Integrity |
| 4.3 | Retrospective open calendars of all Parliamentarians business calendars. Constituents deserve to know how their representatives are using their time and, in particular, who they are meeting with. This helps improve transparency around potential influencers of public policy, and helps encourage Parliamentarians to consider how they spend their time in office. (full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Government Integrity |
| 4.4 | Apart from the obvious actions required in the area of training, having an efficient feedback system to report lapses, incorrect advice/actions and inappropriate conduct by government officers is imperative as a corrective mechanism. Most departments have a feedback system, but their effectiveness differs a lot. (Generally. the more vulnerable and less privileged the average client is, the overall experience including the feedback system is at a lesser standard. eg: Centrelink has a fairly good feedback system while DIBP send the complaints back to the same regional office back to the hands of APS3 level officers who - according to the Audit Office - have had minimal training on important aspects of their work.) These systems should be substantially improved with a goal to minimize ombudsman referrals. | Government Integrity |
| 4.5 | Restore the public's trust in government by improving accountability and transparency within the public service. It is often the case with many commonwealth and state government departments that customer service officers are not familiar with their line of work, which in turn is an impediment to the efficient delivery of services. Lack of training may be one of the causes. Pure incompetence may be another. In any case, this situation needs to be improved, not least because some of those who are affected wouldn't even know they are! (ie. they are compelled to believe what they are told).<br>Any ideas on how this might be translated into an actionable and measurable commitment would be welcome. | Government Integrity |
| 4.6 | Parliamentary integrity in line with international better practice. Ensure that parliamentary integrity provisions are in line with international better practice Justification: Members of Parliament are public officers and as such must put the public interest ahead of all personal and other private interests. Unethical or corrupt behaviour is incompatible with their entrusted responsibilities and undermines and detracts from their performance of their parliamentary duties and hence the performance of their parliament.<br>Australia recognised this when it pledged to support the Harare Commonwealth Declaration 1991. The Declaration provided (amongst other things) for Commonwealth countries:<br>"to work with renewed vigour, concentrating especially in the following areas:<br>· the protection and promotion of the fundamental political values of the Commonwealth;<br>· democracy, democratic processes and institutions which reflect national circumstances, the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary, just and honest government."<br>That pledge clearly indicates that the democratic system, of which Parliament is the peak institution, should function according to the rule of law, justice and honesty.<br>More recently, international standards for parliaments were established by the Recommended Benchmarks for Legislatures, adopted in 2006 by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the UNDP andthe World Bank. The recommendations include:<br>10. Ethical Governance<br>10.1 Transparency and Integrity<br>10.1.1 Legislators should maintain high standards of accountability, transparency and responsibility in the conduct of all public and parliamentary matters.<br>10.1.2 The Legislature shall approve and enforce a code of conduct, including rules on conflicts of interest and the acceptance of gifts.<br>10.1.3 Legislatures shall require legislators to fully and publicly disclose their financial assets and business interests.<br>10.1.4 There shall be mechanisms to prevent, detect, and bring to justice legislators and staff engaged in corrupt practices.<br>Each House of Parliament should adopt its code of conduct independently as each is autonomous from the other House. Neither House of the Parliament of Australia has adopted a code of conduct.Comparable parliaments, such as the UK House of Commons at Westminster and the Canadian House of Commons, have well-established and highly developed integrity systems including codes applying to their Houses and Members of Parliament.<br>However, codes of conduct and like instruments (e.g. code of ethics; conflcit of interest code) do vary widely in their provisions and effectiveness. Accordingly, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association commissioned Recommended Benchmarks for Codes of Conduct Applying to Members of Parliament, published in 2015. These recommendations specify the principles that should be incorporated in a code of conduct and complementary provisions, having regard to local circumstances e.g. the size | Government Integrity |
| 4.7 | Government openness - efficiency and effectiveness Lack of openness means that those parts of the public that must comply with government direction do not have a full understanding of what they are supposed to do or why they are doing it. Lack of compliance leads to enforcement actions that are expensive.Some of these would be unnecessary if the government told people what they needed to know.<br>Lack of openness leads to sloppy and incompetent decision making within government because undisclosed processes are not open to question and therefore not open to correction.This disconnects the government from the population.It also starts to erode the government's wisdom as this disconnection limits learning.Eventually, the government is sufficiently disconnected from reality to be unable to governproperly because lack of openness includes lack of effective feedback.Thus, without accurate information on what is happening, poor decision making on the information available and inability to effectively harness the people to act in a timely manner the government stops being able to respond to events in real time.This is rarely good for a governments continued existence.It could be argued that openness is a method for staying in power. | Government Integrity |
| 4.7.1 | Very true. Some government departments, however, do not usually need to respond to events in real time, but just provide services and make decisions on a "one to one" basis. Openness to them, is about having to be accountable. By keeping their processes undisclosed (and quite often undefined!) and their clients in the dark, they do not have to operate to the same level of accountability, which means lesser costs (untrained/ improperly trained staff, outdated systems, no feedback mechanisms) to them but higher economic and emotional costs to the community. Also note that there is at least one commonwealth department whose clients are predominantly non-citizens who do not have a say in the democratic process! My point is, it is not always in the government's interest to be open, which is why active campaigning is always necessary. | Government Integrity |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4.8 | Network Democracy (http://www.wisdom.to/networkdemocracy ): restoring the balance with real-time, comprehensive citizen participation across government, democracy and industry / part of Australian Wisdom ( www.wisdom.to/australia) Network Democracy ( http://www.wisdom.to/networkdemocracy ) is a sub-set of Australian Wisdom. Please see Australian Wisdom submission on 'Public Participation' theme page and http://www.wisdom.to/australia .<br><br>One network could provide comprehensive citizen participation, governance, transparency, wisdom and access to government and industry. Stage 1 would deliver Government Wisdom with a specific focuson collective governance. Stage 2 could deliver broader citizen participation. Stage 3 could deliver build on collective government wisdom and include the democratic process. Additional stages could include industry/sector governance and other aspects of society.<br>The article explores 4 opportunities for real-time, comprehensive citizen participation in society:<br>- Government Wisdom: government reduced to "things" in the Internet of Everything. It provides a more efficient and effective means to organise government. It also facilitates transparency and accessibility to every "thing".<br>- Citizen participation (or Wisdom): Government Wisdom provides the means for "active participation of the people, as citizens, in politics and civic life. Citizens and the community have access to every "thing" in real-time. The initial focus could be governance, decision-making and financial financial "things" across government departments and agencies;<br>- Democracy Wisdom: real-time distributed community participation, contribution and governance across the process of democracy<br>- Governance wisdom (industry): this provides the means of distributed community participation, contribution and governance across industry participants. Community review could ensure communityinterests are also considered.<br>Government Wisdom is a subset of Network Society. presents an opportunity to achieve a rapid increase in productivity, accessibility, transparency, accountability (including reducing corruption) and citizenparticipation in Society. The focus within this article is government governance, decision-making and collaboration.<br>Government Wisdom comes "Over the Top" and links to governance "things" within the Internet of Everything (IoE) across government departments and agencies. It acts as an aggregator of information, but also reveals knowledge and coordinates action toward outcomes. All "things" that embody government can be defined in a single page. Everyone, anywhere can access every "thing" within government.<br>Every aspect of government can be reduced to things and books. Things across can be combined into books in an exponential number of ways for multiple purposes. Things can be combined in dynamic ways in unlimited combination. You can see how things are connected. This means that knowledge and outcomes can be achieved by simply creating, viewing or things on mobile devices.<br>The government is reduced to things and books which can be shared with other bureaucrats and citizens. With every thing accessible to everyone everywhere, there is a profound impact upon productivity, efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, | Government Integrity |
| 4.9 | Ensure that parliamentary openness procedures are in line with international good practice. This suggestions builds on Henare's intial suggestion of "Endorse the Declaration on Parliamentary Openness.'<br>Parliaments must constantly renew their commitments to transparency and citizen engagement. Due to the rapid pace technological change, there's a need clear for periodic reviews of policies that influence parliament's ability to engage; and it is often helpful to institutionalize this process for periodic review. The Declaration on Parliamentary Openness states that "Parliamentary transparency policies shall be publicly available and shall specify terms for their periodic review to take advantage of technological innovations and evolving good practices." As early as 2004, the conclusions of a 2004 Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and World Bank Institute study group on access to information noted that "[c]onsideration should be given to regular parliamentary review, for example on a biannual basis, of implementation of the access to information regime." (Mendel, 2005). The Global Centre for ICT in Parliament (2010) has also established that parliaments should elaborate "strategic plans, updated regularly, for the use of ICT that directly improve the operational capacity of parliaments to fulfil their legislative, oversight, and representational responsibilities."<br><br>Recommendation - Institutionalize a regular legislative openness review, in the rules of procedure or in other procedures and practices that involve the participation of local civil society experts, leading to both changes in policies and potential commitments.Actively engage with the government in the development of parliamentary openness commitments in future OGP action plans; either fully integrated intothe countries action plan or as a separate appendix, focused solely on the legislature.Conduct a parliamentary information audit to ensure that necessary information is made available in accordance with international good practice.Form or formally task a committee or other body within parliament to monitor parliamentary openness and citizen engagement efforts.Engage in international fora dedicated to sharing international good practice, including the OGP Legislative Openness Working Group, to actively learn from other peer institutions regarding emerging best practice on parliamentary openness.suggested and open for further discussion at https://forum.opengovernment.org.au/t/open-parliament/18/3 | Government Integrity |
| 4.9.1 | The Australian Parliament has already done or in the process of doing much of this, according to the Clerk of the Senate, who has advised that the:<br>"Australian Parliament does have an ICT Strategic Plan and we are developing a broad strategic objective list that would take these matters into account." | Government Integrity |
| 4.10 | I am advised that "legal advice not obtained for purposes associated with litigation is not protected by legal professional privilege.For all except those authorities which are subject to FOI laws, such advice is covered by the ordinary rules which protect privacy.Authorities which are obliged to obey FOI laws will or will not be required to disclose the advice depending on the application to it of FOI principles."<br>However, if the legal advice is related to a litigation, it is a well established principle that that is protected from disclosure. That protects the interests of both the person launching the litgation and the person or organisation defending it. However, note (from guidance on similar English law):<br>"The test for disclosure where public interest immunity is claimed The CPIA1996 s.21(1) abolished the old common law rules in relation to the prosecution duty of disclosure and put in its place a new statutory framework. S. 3(6) (in relation to initial disclosure) and s.7A(8) (in relation to the prosecutor's continuing duty) state that "material must not be disclosed…to the extentthat the court, on an application by the prosecutor, concludes it is not in the public interest to disclose it and orders accordingly."<br>The main categories of sensitive material:<br>*National security/Affairs and interests of state<br>*Journalists' sources<br>*The prevention, detection & investigation of crime<br>*Material relating to children or young children<br>These are just the most commonly occurring examples and thus this list should not be regarded as exhaustive. It is also important to remember that each case turns on its own facts and even cases involving the same type of documents may result in different disclosure decisions."<br>Thus in the case involving the ACT Government, whether the advice received by Government can be disclosed seems to very much depend on the nature of the case. Is the proposal for a simplified means of reviewing<br> refusals based on legal advice? If so, please clarify. | Government Integrity |
| 4.11 | Perhaps there is a general issue here of the privilege attaching to legal advice (at least when given to Government). It is not my expertise but I'll ask around. | Government Integrity |
| 4.12 | Provisions of reasons for decisions and easy reviews to rebut these and access to legal advice on the basis for decisions. Often decisions are made within Government that have profound affects on their citizens.The Government gets tax payer funded legal advice to limit the rights of their own citizens and then refuses to provide the reasons for their actions, except that it is confirmed by "legal advice".One example relates to the classification of foster carers as not workers or volunteers for the purposes of work health and safety.While the Government in the ACT stated that this was the case "based on legal advice", carers were unable to get access to this advice and question it. The regulator also used the "on legal advice" defence, which leaves citizens with little to base their objections to policy on. | Government Integrity |
| 4.12.2 | I am advised that "legal advice not obtained for purposes associated with litigation is not protected by legal professional privilege. For all except those authorities which are subject to FOI laws, such advice is covered by the ordinary rules which protect privacy. Authorities which are obliged to obey FOI laws will or will not be required to disclose the advice depending on the application to it of FOI principles."<br>However, if the legal advice is related to a litigation, it is a well established principle that that is protected from disclosure. That protects the interests of both the person launching the litgation and the person or organisation defending it. However, note (from guidance on similar English law):<br>"The test for disclosure where public interest immunity is claimed<br><br>The CPIA 1996 s.21(1) abolished the old common law rules in relation to the prosecution duty of disclosure and put in its place a new statutory framework. S. 3(6) (in relation to initial disclosure) and s.7A(8) (in relation to the prosecutor's continuing duty) state that "material must not be disclosed…to the extent that the court, on an application by the prosecutor, concludes it is not in the public interest to disclose it and orders accordingly."<br><br>The main categories of sensitive material:<br><br>*National security/Affairs and interests of state<br>*Journalists' sources<br>*The prevention, detection & investigation of crime<br>*Material relating to children or young children<br>These are just the most commonly occurring examples and thus this list should not be regarded as exhaustive. It is also important to remember that each case turns on its own facts and even cases involving the same type of documents may result in different disclosure decisions."<br>Thus in the case involving the ACT Government, whether the advice received by Government can be disclosed seems to very much depend on the nature of the case. Is the proposal for a simplified means of reviewing refusals based on legal advice? If so, please clarify. | Government Integrity |

| 4.13 | Private Sector Whistleblower Legislation. Deliver legislation to protect whistleblowers exposing fraud, corruption, tax evasion and tax avoidance in the privatesector, to match legislation to protect whistleblowers in the public sector. The protection of whistleblowers is specifically in the Open Government Declaration under "Implement the highest standards of professional integrity throughout our administrations".<br><br>Research by the Australian Institute of Criminology (Australian Institute of Criminology, Fraud Against the Commonwealth 2010-2013, Canberra, July 2015) found that over the 3 years between 2010 and 2013, there were at least 265,866 incidents of suspected fraud reported by Commonwealth entities.<br>- Each year, substantially greater numbers of external fraud incidents were detected than suspected internal fraud incidents.<br>- Fraud involving financial benefits was the most frequently reported category of external fraud.<br>- Over the 3 years, the number of fraud-related corruption increased substantially from 37 incidents in 2010-2011 to 163 in 2012-2013.<br>- While the cost of this fraud is hard to quantify and figures may vary, a conservative estimate is approximately $530m over 3 years, with increases from $119m in 2010-2011 to $204m in 2011-2012 to $207m in 2012-2013.<br>- Over the 3 years, external fraud accounted for $521m while internal fraud amounted to $9.1m or 1.7% of the total reported fraud losses.<br>In relation to external fraud:<br>- risks arise in connection with the provision of new benefits, the introduction of new taxes, procurement practices, government-funded programs and the use of consultants; and<br>- the relationship between corruption and collusion between external actors and those public servants working within government.<br>The legislation to protect private sector whistleblowers should be based on the recommendations of the Senate Economics Committee report 'The performance of the Australian Securities and Investments Commission'.<br>The Senate Economics Committee report on ASIC recommended (Recommendation 15):...protections for corporate whistleblowers be updated so that they are general consistent with and complement the protections afforded to public sector whistleblowers under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 2013. Specifically, the corporate whistleblower framework should be updated so that:<br>•Anonymous disclosures are protected;<br>•The requirement that a whistleblower must be acting in 'good faith' in disclosing information is removed, and replaced with a requirement that a disclosure:<br>oIs based on an honest belief, on reasonable grounds, that the information disclosed shows or tends to show wrongdoing; or<br>oShows or tends to show wrongdoing, on an objective test, regardless of what the whistleblower believes; | Government Integrity |
| 4.14 | Establish a federal ICAC Actionable 1: Form a working group that would consult with the public,community groups and legal, government and business organisations on the establishment of an Independent Federal Corruption Commission with proper powers (to be decided) to take and act on complaints of corruption within government. The body would also take a role in advising on anti-corruption measures and guidelines for the public service and parliament. | Government Integrity |
| 4.15 | The implementation of the Register of Lobbyists was a good beginning in increasing transparency however there is much room for improvement.Forexample currently there is a requirement for Lobbyists to list owners. Many of the Lobbying companies list as owners various anonymous entities, for example, as holding companies, consolidated funds, investment funds or trusts. Without knowing the beneficiaries of these anonymous entities, there is no real transparencyaround potential conflict of interests.See random sample below (list of owners to be found at the bottom of each entry on the Register):<br>Statecraft: http://lobbyists.pmc.gov.au/register/view_agency.cfm?id=66<br>Barton Deakin: http://lobbyists.pmc.gov.au/register/view_agency.cfm?id=338<br>Burson-Marsteller Pty Ltd: http://lobbyists.pmc.gov.au/register/view_agency.cfm?id=88<br>Hawker-Britton: http://lobbyists.pmc.gov.au/register/view_agency.cfm?id=96<br>CGP Solutions Ltd: http://lobbyists.pmc.gov.au/register/view_agency.cfm?id=265<br>Actionable 1:To ensure the published list of owners is full and complete naming all the beneficiaries.Where there are extensive and complex financial networks (and/or where there are shareholders over a certain number), the exact relationship to the lobbying entity and any subsidiaries should be listed. Smaller family trusts and other business entities should stipulate all beneficiaries.<br>Actionable 2:End the scoping study for the sale of the ASIC Register. Make Register free and easy to access.This would make it easier to ascertain ownership and beneficiaries of business entities. ASIC entries should include all beneficiaries not only the name of the administering accountant. This would not only assist in improving transparency around lobbying but also around corporate arrangements in general.<br>Actionable 3: Institute a ban on former politicians, especially Ministers taking up positions in lobbying organisations, corporations orin associations involved in lobbying activities on behalf of members.This is particularly relevant where a Minister with former portfolio responsibilities might enter into a business relationship post- politics that directly relates to their former role; and would be perceived as conflict of interest whilst in the performance of parliamentary duties.In other words remove the 'revolving door' between government and business interests. A working group might determine a reasonable period of time to elapse, if any, before being able to take up such a role post politics.<br>Actionable 4:Design a plan to reform political donations.The best option would be to ban donations altogether to remove any conflict of interest and interference in the democratic process. A working group formed to establish a system of taxpayer funded revenue being used for limited campaigning such as for brochures (letterboxing), shared time for candidates on ABC television and radio to outline their policies. The Americanisation of political campaigning that requires large sums of money to travel and spruik does not contribute to the democratic process. Essentially all that voters require is a comprehensive understanding of policies each candidate/party brings to the electorate so that each can make an informed choice without the distraction of spin.Ideally, get rid of the travelling campaign buses which are distractions from real intentions.Stick with policy outlines that are easy to understand including funding.This would also make any taxpayer funded contributions to candidates affordable and | Government Integrity |
| 4.16 | Establish a federal ICAC To build greater confidence and legitimacy in the parliament and ensure that issues of potentially corrupt behaviour are<br>addressed via an independent mechanism, rather than directly by parliamentary peers or departments under the instruction of a federal minister, establish a federal equivalent Ro the NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption empowered to investigate potentially corrupt behaviour by politicians, their advisors and senior public servants.<br><br>This step would raise the transparency and build trust in government and help counter Australia's slide on international anti-corruption measures. The specific scope of investigation powers should be determined through the involvement of a citizen's panel and be a transparent process such that Australian citizens can have confidence that the mechanism will meet its goals of providing an independent review of potentially corrupt or inappropriate conduct that is currently self-investigated by parliament and agencies.<br><br>Given that Australia's Special Minister of State, who is currently responsible for investigating such matters, recently stepped down due to a police investigation into his own conduct, and recent public concern and scrutiny over conduct by other parliamentarians, the creation of this mechanism would go a long way towards restoring confidence in the Australian parliament and support the OGP' anti-corruption goals. | Government Integrity |
| 4.17 | The options are clear and well-known, especially in NSW where the State regulation of donations and expenditure is well-developed. Further reforms and international comparisons are outlined in the excellent report: "Political Donations. Final report of Panel of Experts" by Schott, K., A. Tink, and J. Watkins, 2014. Premier Baird has accepted the recommendation that he advocate a similar Australia-wide scheme. That would be a great starting point. | Government Integrity |
| 4.18 | Improve transparency around political donations. To improve transparency around political donations, pass legislation that establishes a single independent entity that administers all political donations; managing collection, distribution to the nominated party or individual candidate and public reporting. This should be achieved through a digital system that collects, distributes and reportsseamlessly - making the details of the legal entities making the donation public along with the donation amounts at the time the donationis made, and detailing any subsequent actions (such as where a party or candidate rejects the donation due to conflicts of interest, links to crime or other reasons). Political parties should be legally forbidden from receiving donations from outside this mechanism, and individuals, groups and organisations should be forbidden from offering donations outside this mechanism. The system should be audited annually and be<br>paid for by taking a small percentage of donations made (2-3%). The system should have front-end tools for individuals, political parties and organisations to embed donation taking systems into their own sites,so that from a donater's perspective it functions identically to makinga donation directly to a political party or organisation.<br><br>This approach would allow real-time reporting of total donations by candidate, party and overall - where they are coming from and build a history of where specific donors have made donations to the same party and candidates.<br><br>Unless there is a compelling reason to support anonymous donations, all donations of any amount should be tracked through this system, with randomised verification and checking methods to minimise the ability of donors to conceal the entity making the donation.<br><br>In the future it would be possible to extend this system to state and local elections as a central system for managing and reporting all political donations across Australia, reducing the capacity of organisations and wealthy individuals to inappropriately influence MPs or parties and creating true transparency across the entire system. If possible the system should be designed as an open source solution and the code made available for scrutiny. | Government Integrity |
| 4.19 | Endorse the Declaration on Parliamentary Openness. | Government Integrity |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4.20 | All Commonwealth, state and territory parliamentary and local council proceedings should be made available via live web streaming with accessible closed captions, using open standards rather than requiring proprietary plugins. These streams should be accessible permanently and released under a creative commons licence that allow them to be embedded on other websites.<br><br>Hansard transcripts of parliamentary, committee and council proceedings should be made available within a reasonable timeframe not less than two weeks. They should be accessible via API, searchable by speaker (including committee witnesses), and published in well-formed HTML (not just PDF). These transcripts should also be released under an appropriate accessible licence.<br><br>Official witnesses that appear in camera should be identified in these records, even if the content of the discussions is not.<br><br>Parliamentary departments and councils should report quarterly on the percentage of proceedings that were made available via accessible formats, and the average and longest time for initial proof transcripts to be released. | Government Integrity |
| 4.21 | Australian Government's commitment to the UK PM's Anti-Corruption Summit in May 2016.Transparency International Australia is fully supportive of the leading role played by TI UK in working closely with the UK Prime Minister's office to develop a sound and achievable agenda for the upcoming Anti-Corruption Summit in London in May 2016. Transparency International's priorities for the summit are listed below. We strongly urge the Australian Government, in the spirit of Open Government, to not only make public commitments to the final priorities at the Summit, but to also take a leading role in establishing open data as a core component of those commitments made by world leaders gathered at that time. We also encourage the Australian Government to develop and ongoing follow-up plan out of the UK Summit that forms a part of the OGP National Action Plan on the topic of anti-corruption.<br><br>TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL PRIORITIES FOR THE LONDON ANTI-CORRUPTION SUMMIT<br>Corruption has a corrosive impact on prosperity, growth, security, and the fight against extreme poverty. Transparency International believes the London Anti-Corruption Summit provides a unique opportunity for global leaders to signal intent at the highest level for tackling corruption head-on through concrete, ambitious commitments that can be implemented over the next five years. Global leaders must form a united front in the face of corruption and take action so that:<br><br>- Corrupt groups and individuals are not able to act with impunity and get away with their crimes.<br>- Businesses receive no benefit from taking part in dodgy deals and operating in the darkness.<br>- The people who are hurt most by corruption receive justice.<br>The London Anti-Corruption Summit should generate time-bound commitments that will:<br>1. Prevent corruption: Make it harder to hide and transfer and benefit from the proceeds of corruption by championing full beneficial ownership information transparency.<br>2. End Impunity: Improve the way law enforcement agencies in key countries and between banks, business, civil society share and act on intelligence, related to risk and suspicions of corruption.<br>3. Empower and support citizens to seek justice: Promote accountability and citizen engagement on corruption, and protect activists to do their work.<br>The Summit should also ensure that the tools and mechanisms are in place to ensure effective implementation and monitoring of the commitments over a 3-5 year period.<br>Finally, whilst the UK's leadership in convening the Summit is welcome, it remains crucial that the UK gets its own house in order. This is most evident in the need for the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies to adhere to the same standards in the UK with regards to beneficial ownership transparency. They must be required to publish time-bound plans of action for adopting public beneficial ownership registries. | Government Integrity |
| 4.22 | Integrity of Resource Management. Lead Agency: Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet<br>Outline<br>The more effective management of public resources is increasingly recognised as requiring high standards of integrity by public officers. These ethical standards depend on an integrity system led and practiced from the highest level of the public sector and followed at every level. The integrity system depends on both structure and culture, and the interaction between them, for its effectiveness.<br>Effective integrity systems have been shown to expose unethical, improper and illegal activities that were otherwise undetected despite their damaging impacts on the efficient and effective use of public resources (e.g. reports by NSW ICAC, Qld CCC, Vic IBAC). Effective integrity systems reduce the risk of ineffective management of public resources.<br>The integrity system must operate across all arms of the system of government and recognise that Members of Parliament are public officers who, as such, must put the public interest ahead of all personal and other private interests. Unethical, improper or corrupt behaviour is incompatible with their entrusted responsibilities and undermines and detracts from their performance of the parliament and hence the effective management of public resources.<br>Australia recognised this when it pledged to support the Harare Commonwealth Declaration 1991. The Declaration provided (amongst other things) for Commonwealth countries:<br>"to work with renewed vigour, concentrating especially in the following areas:<br>• the protection and promotion of the fundamental political values of the Commonwealth;<br>• democracy, democratic processes and institutions which reflect national circumstances, the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary, just and honest government."<br>That pledge clearly indicates that the democratic system, of which Parliament is the peak institution, should function according to the rule of law, justice and honesty.<br>More recently, international standards for parliaments were established by the Recommended Benchmarks for Legislatures, adopted in 2006 by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the UNDP and the World Bank. The recommendations include:<br>10. Ethical Governance<br>10.1 Transparency and Integrity<br>10.1.1 Legislators should maintain high standards of accountability, transparency and responsibility in the conduct of all public and parliamentary matters.<br>10.1.2 The Legislature shall approve and enforce a code of conduct, including rules on conflicts of interest and the acceptance of gifts.<br>10.1.3 Legislators shall require legislators to fully and publicly disclose their financial assets and business interests.<br>10.1.4 There shall be mechanisms to prevent, detect, and bring to justice legislators and staff engaged in corrupt practices. | Government Integrity |
| 4.23 | The Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV), the umbrella body for Victoria's 79 local Councils, is proposing that the Federal Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development could deliver more focussed and responsive regional development programs and services by increasing transparency and public participation. This would occur by establishing an online register of Community Plans on a regional basis across Australia. In Victoria there are now in excess of 700 Community Plans, which are documents produced as a result of community-driven processes to identify community priorities in rank order (with number 1 being the most important). These community plans are owned and developed by the community, with the local Council playing a supporting role. In most cases community members have voted to determine the highest priority projects. Community Plans are produced in every State and Territory across Australia but in most cases they are not utilised in the development of regional plans by State and Federal Governments, who produce regional development plans and strategies that are often not addressing the priority needs of local communities.<br><br>By way of example, the Golden Plains Shire Council has about 20 Community Plans documented on their web site at https://www.goldenplains.vic.gov.au/page.aspx?u=345<br>Golden Plains Council has a population of some 18,000 people and some 4,000 are involved in the community planning process. It was only via the community planning process that the Council identified, by examining the common priorities across a large number of community plans, that there were very significant deficiencies in post- hospital specialist health care in the area. This has triggered a revolution in health services in the region in the last 5-10 years, supported by State and Federal Governments.<br><br>Proposed by Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) via John Hennessy<br>The suggested Community Plan register would group and summarise community plans by region and would be updated whenever the community plans are updated (usually every 1-3 years). This information is currently not aggregated except by individual Councils, and so is usually not utilised by State and Federal Governments in developing policies or strategies for regional development. The ability to be able to identify local and regional community priorities from a single source has the potential to transform regional service delivery so it is more responsive to local priorities rather than adopting the usual cookie cutter' approach of programs being developed by bureaucrats on a 'one glove fits all' basis. Policy and program developers would be able to rapidly assess where the gaps are in service delivery: for example, are roads or health or learning or broadband solutions most needed by local communities? If the Federal (and State) Government is to become more agile, efficient and effective, it needs to ensure its resources (programs and services) are more focussed on addressing priority local community needs. In the past decade there has been a massive amount of waste and duplication with Federal and State Governments producing a range of regional development plans, most of which have sat on the shelf with very little, if any, action. The National Online Community Plan Register would be the first step to more community-driven public services. | Government Integrity |
| 4.23.1 | In Western Australia there is legislative requirements for all local governments (approx 140) to have Strategic Community Plans in place (reviewed every 4 years) These Plans are developed through a process of community and stakeholder engagement and outline community aspirations/priorities for each local government area. The Corporate/Business Plans for each local government then outline how they will respond and contribute to these community priorities and may include the role played - e.g. Provider, Partner, Funder, Regulator, Monitor, Facilitator, Advocate. Local governments have a wealth of information about their local communities, if there was a process to aggregate all this local knowledge up into one location/data set it would provide a great learning opportunity for Federal government initiatives - so rather than go out to engage again with the community - it may be that the the knowledge already exists - gathered through existing engagement processes. The challenge is how to collate this information. | Government Integrity |

| 4.24 | Four people attended this event: Kat, Tim, Ken and I. The discussion focused on the Grand Challenges and event on the 11th April. I was asked about the involvement of agencies in this process, I referred to the IDC list and participation in the upcoming event. We discussed agencies who might become lead agencies if these actions were taken up, and the differences between parliamentary integrity and executive integrity. I reminded everyone that while a commitment template could be developed at the 11th April event around other Grand Challenges and that they would be considered by Government now and in the future (between NAP's), they would be unlikely to be included in this NAP. I encouraged participants to consider how actions might be delivered as part of the other two Grand Challenges selected by Government. A follow up teleconference will be scheduled for next week, in the lead up to the 11th April event. | Government Integrity |
|---|---|---|
| 4.25 | Actionable 1: Form a working group that would consult with the public, community groups and legal, government and business organisations on the establishment of an Independent Federal Corruption Commission with proper powers (to be decided) to take and act on complaints of corruption within government. The body would also take a role in advising on anti-corruption measures and guidelines for the public service and parliament. | Government Integrity |

| 4.3 | 2016-2020 focused on alcohol-related cognitive impairment and dementia and alcohol-related suicide in the Australian midlife women cohort, 35 to 59 years of age.<br><br>Research portfolio with the NHMRC, ARC and PHCRIS<br>http://www.phcris.org.au/roar/profiles/index.php?id=11044 OGP Commitment activity suggestion<br>Need: Keeping and building on 'corporate memory'<br>Activity to meet this need<br>Formal requirement for government staff, five years from retirement, to mentor younger employees for 12 months. Agreement of the organisation, retiring employee and the younger employee that 'shadowing' is an important work task of both employees and a formal part of their professional development. The basic process is below and this is expected to evolve through individual and organisation involvement and need.<br>1. 'Shadow' a senior government employee (who has more than 15 years of government work experience) with the senior employee purposefully showing and explaining their most valuable work tools and likely barriers;<br>2. Attend structured meetings to learn from the senior employees long-term lived experience of developing positive work relationships, dealing with intricate organisational knowledge, managing transitions and agile change.<br><br>How it works<br>The mentoring program has rules and requirements similar to staff training but the content is the lived experience of the senior staff member's work history. Particularly the technological, social, political, work/home balance and economic capital useful in enabling more efficient organisation policies, plans and processes. This activity also refines career path planning and professional development decisions. I strongly suggest that more places for females and minority groups be allocated to this program to increase government staff diversity.<br>The benefit to the senior mentor includes reflecting upon new insights, perspectives, information offered by the younger person. Noting when their work and life experiences are of benefit and can improve current and planned projects. Also, as the senior employee retires, the organisation may decide to contract the retired person to 'soft mentor' senior executives.<br>Monitor and evaluate<br>Such employee interaction needs to be a work duty with details of how selection of mentor/mentee occurs, how work is planned with privacy/confidentiality clauses, the means to review progress and ways to stop the interaction when required. Reporting on the process is required at 3 month intervals. A common report is prepared as well as individual reports. Work completed during these interactions will carry both people's names for transparent recognition and appraisal. An employee who has observed the interactions is also required to evaluate the benefits, challenges and problems at 6 and 12 months. | Government Integrity |
| 4.4 | The action is to introduce a representation performance reporting system for Members of Parliament, which includes release of an annual report on the way in which each member represents their electorate. measured against their own commitments documented in a publicly available "Statement of Approach" prior to election.<br><br>The system would work as follows:<br>Each election candidate would lodge a "Statement of Approach" with the Electoral Commission prior to the election.<br>The Statements of Approach would set out how that candidate proposes to represent the electorate - both in terms of regular communication and the extent to which they commit to using participatory and deliberative processes for decision making.<br>The Statements of Approach would be formatted in a common format (decided by the Electoral Commission using a sound public consultation method), to improve comparability, and available on-line as well as in public libraries, Council offices etc.The purpose of the standard template would be to improve voters ability to compare candidates.An annual assessment of each Member and Senator, against their own commitments in their own statement, would be made each year and reported publicly. Initially the assessment could be made by the Departments of the Senate and House,<br>This would sit alongside with their annual disclosures of donations and convicts of interest - and be easily publicly accessible.<br>The assessment method would be developed by a participatory process such as a randomly selected Citizen's Jury or Civic Council.<br>Civil society organisations should be supported to play a role in ensuring widespread public input into development of the template, the assessment process and, potentially, the assessments themselves.<br>The system should be developed in year one. In year two sitting parliamentarians could be required to complete the template and be assessed in year 2 and annually until the following election, at which time the full system (involving candidates) would be put in place.<br><br>This Action will improve the way Australia delivers public services and manages public resources because it will improve the accountability between elected representatives and the people they represent. Itwill increase Australia's performance against all three OGP Principles: Accountability, Transparency and Public Participation | |
| 4.5 | introduce a representation performance reporting system for Members of Parliament, which includes release of an annual report on the way in which each member represents their electorate. measured against their own commitments documented in a publicly available "Statement of Approach" prior to election.<br><br>The system would work as follows:<br>Each election candidate would lodge a "Statement of Approach" with the Electoral Commission prior to the election.<br>The Statements of Approach would set out how that candidate proposes to represent the electorate - both in terms of regular communication and the extent to which they commit to using participatory and deliberative processes for decision making.<br>The Statements of Approach would be formatted in a common format (decided by the Electoral Commission using a sound public consultation method), to improve comparability, and available on-line as well as in public libraries, Council offices etc.The purpose of the standard template would be to improve voters ability to compare candidates.An annual assessment of each Member and Senator, against their own commitments in their own statement, would be made each year and reported publicly. Initially the assessment could be made by the Departments of the Senate and House,<br>This would sit alongside with their annual disclosures of donations and convicts of interest - and be easily publicly accessible.<br>The assessment method would be developed by a participatory process such as a randomly selected Citizen's Jury or Civic Council.<br>Civil society organisations should be supported to play a role in ensuring widespread public input into development of the template, the assessment process and, potentially, the assessments themselves.<br>The system should be developed in year one. In year two sitting parliamentarians could be required to complete the template and be assessed in year 2 and annually until the following election, at which time the full system (involving candidates) would be put in place.<br><br>This Action will improve the way Australia delivers public services and mangoes public resources because it will improve the accountability between elected representatives and the people they represent. Itwill increase Australia's performance against all three OGP Principles: Accountability, Transparency and Public Participation | Government integrity |
| | B. Issues included in the ART Revision of 29/01/2016 Draft of Background Material (included at - http://ogpau.wikispaces.com/Background+of+open+government+in+Australia ) as requiring inclusion and attention in our first National Action Plan (references to supporting information and details is provided with each issue raised).<br>1. Parliament. Establishing a Parliamentary Integrity System which includes:<br>(a) development of codes of conduct for members of the House of Representatives and the Senate consistent with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association's Benchmarks (para 1.4.1 (c);<br>(b)a Parliamentary Integrity Commissioner (para 1.5.1);<br>(c) an independent system to review claims of public interest immunity by the Executive in response to requests by Parliamentfor the production of documents (para 1.5.2) | Government integrity |

| 5.1 | http://opendata-aha.net/you-can-contribute-to-the-open-government-national-action-plan/ | Engagement for OGP |
|---|---|---|
| 5.2 | This is welcome news, and appreciate the thought that has gone into design of consultative steps so far.<br><br>Two comments.<br><br>One, you state<br>"At this stage, it is envisioned that the first Australian Government's NAP will focus on the two OGP grand challenges of:<br>• Improving Public Services – measures that address the full spectrum of citizen services including health, education, criminal justice, water, electricity, telecommunications, and any other relevant service areas by fostering public service improvement or private sector innovation; and<br>• More Effectively Managing Public Resources – measures that address budgets, procurement, natural resources, and foreign assistance."<br><br>Many outside government might ponder the 'envisioning' without outside input that led to this choice of these two challenges from the five laid out by the OGP, leaving this challenge off the agenda:<br>". Increasing Public Integrity—measures that address corruption and public ethics, access to information, campaign finance reform, and media and civil society freedom."<br><br>Two, experience elsewhere suggests an advisory body or stakeholder group can enhance the partnership concept and add value. There is no mention of such a body in the published material. NZ, well into the process is just one of many countries that have now gone down this path.<br>http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA1508/S00042/advisory-group-for-open-government-partnership-appointed.htm<br><br>Looking forward to taking things forward. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.2.1 | The omission of a majority of the five Grand Challenges seems incompatible with the very purpose of OGP, all the more-so when those selected do not include:<br>Increasing Public Integrity—measures that address corruption and public ethics, access to information, campaign finance reform, and media and civil society freedom.<br>Australia's slide down the TI Corruption Perception Index reflects the increasing evidence of improper, unethical and illegal actions amongst both public officers (including a few MPs) and those who they regulate. We must arrest that slide with its risks to Australia's governance, reputation and economy. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.3 | m writing on behalf of the Steering Committee of the Australian Open Government Partnership Network (AOGPN).<br><br>The AOGPN was established in December 2015 as a coalition of individuals and organisations for the purpose of engaging with government in the development of Australia's Open Government Partnership (OGP) National Action Plan and participating in efforts to enhance and improve democratic practices in Australia and the Asia-Pacific region.<br><br>The network will provide a forum for the exchange of information and ideas on areas for reform, seek to ensure the action plan is developed in the true spirit of partnership, and work to assist government in the determination of priorities for consideration.<br><br>Current Steering Committee members are:<br><br>Dr David Solomon (Accountability Roundtable), Chair<br>Dr Nicholas Gruen (Open Knowlege Australia)<br>Jon Lawrence (Electronic Frontiers Australia)<br>Dr Johan Lidberg (School of Media, Arts and Journalism, Monash University)<br>Phil Newman (Transparency International Australia)<br>Kat Szuminska (OpenAustralia Foundation)<br>Craig Thomler (Gov 2.0 Advocate)<br>Peter Timmins, Convener<br>A number of other organisations and individuals have joined or are in the process of doing so.<br><br>At the invitation of the OGP Support Unit, Kat Szuminska attended the Civil Society Leaders Workshop in The Hague from 21-23 January.<br><br>The Network has a webpage at www.aogpn.net and will shortly have a more comprehensive web presence, encouraging other organisations and individuals to contribute to the second phase of the consultation now underway.<br><br>The following issues and concerns arise from what we have seen so far as the government moves ahead on this important initiative.<br><br>Low key initiative<br>Given the importance of reform and the opportunity provided to improve how government operates including through citizen | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.4 | I am encouraged that the Australian Government is progressing to membership of the OGP, particularly considering the foundational principle of engaging civil society in government decision-making. This is increasing being demonstrated in social purpose programs where those the programs are intended to impact are engaged in the decisions on the design, delivery and evaluation of those programs.<br>However, I am surprised that the current engagement for gaining membership does not embody that very principle. Informations session in four major cities and limited consultation structures immediately disengages and potentailly loses the trust of many sectors of civil society. It is those most disadvantaged that will be impacted most by this approach to 'engagement' | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.4.1 | For example, PM&C could prepare information suitable for connecting with Indigenous Australians and utilise extant AG, State and Territory structures to engage. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.5 | Just a couple of comments, now that we're getting to the point of doing things globally.<br><br>You'd appreciate that there's a parallel org to the ogp – the civil society end of gov – so we'll be able to give you some comparative feedback on how you go about building the Action plan.au. http://www.ogphub.org/napreview-pilot/<br><br>Obviously one of the major products of these plans will developing is a "Citizen's Engagement Platform" (built around a citizen's ID). So we can expect (with your imagination) that ad hoc/buckshot approaches like the gov 2.0 taskforce will start firming up into a platform which may be used by gov, and civil society, groups around the world. http://open4m.org/about-us/<br><br>You're very lucky to have many existing groups of correspondents in various countries already that span between the internal groups of a government and the civil society groups with which they coordinate "actions". e.g. http://forum.opengovernment.org.uk/groups/ogp<br><br>One more note as you say "NZ and other governments have generally established their groups after getting the national action plan developed". That's not what they are telling others. "New Zealand (as one) is in the process of setting up a Stakeholder Advisory Group to assist with developing, implementing and evaluating their plans". http://www.ogphub.org/blog/advancing-ogp-in-asia-pacific/<br><br>Personally I prefer the way you're going about it – keeping things open. As Shreya (your OGP contact in Singapore) says in the doc above, "The important thing now is to sustain the positive momentum generated by OGP and create permanent dialogue mechanisms, with clear terms of reference, representation drawn from groups that go beyond the 'usual suspects' and regular meetings to strengthen the impact of the OGP process on government-civil society engagement and to mitigate against risks posed by changes in leadership."<br><br>"Citizen's Engagement Platform" (as the English call it). "Permanent Dialogue Mechanism", "Knowledge Exchange"; call it what you want. That's one deliverable which every gov wants delivered before the "action" really starts. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.6 | Establish a formal mechanism such as a high level inter agency or cross jurisdictional group to ensure co-ordinated consideration of OGP, SDG and related strategic policy challenges across the Australian Government.The establishment of a multi-stakeholder OGP Australia oversight group, comprising government, civil society and the private sector to ensure ongoing commitment to fulfilling OGP obligations and to guide the ongoing OGP process, implementation, monitoring and reporting. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.7 | To foster effective engagement between government and non-government entities, thereby supporting more inclusive and open governance, create a formal review and engagement mechanism for interaction with the government by civil societies to aid in future OGP planning cycles and other policy formulation and decision-making processes. | Engagement for OGP |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5.8 | TIA congratulates the Australian Government and Prime Minister Turnbull for the recent decision to commit to finalizing Australia's membership of the OGP, and for the proactive approach it is taking to public consultation in the development of the first Australian Government National Action Plan.<br><br>The OGP requires broad consultation in the development of the NAP – from the public, civil society and the private sector. TIA's comments come from its perspective as the leading civil society organization promoting transparency, integrity and accountability, and fighting corruption.<br><br>Introduction<br><br>Now that it has decided to commit to finalizing its membership of the OGP, the government is moving with commendable speed to draft its first National Action Plan by May 2016, for government consideration in June 2016, and a launch in July 2016. This speed does bring risks – that the first National Action Plan is essentially a 'goodwill' document, not ambitious enough and not containing commitments of substance. The second risk is that to meet these tight timelines the consultation process will be structured in a way which downplays the opportunity for real input from civil society and other non-government sectors. The Government and its advisers may take the view that it is better to have a first NAP, however imperfect, and that the NAP process and content will be much more satisfactory the second time around. TIA's job, and that of civil society generally, is to participate as fully as possible in the development of a first NAP which is ambitious in scope and commitment, and flags priority areas for future NAPs. TIA is committed to membership of the Australian Open Government Partnership Network recently constituted<br><br>The remainder of this short paper flags some initial comments and areas of interest to TIA.<br><br>Increasing Public Integrity<br><br>The OGP – Australia website has already indicated that the first National Action Plan will focus on two of the OGP's five 'grand challenges': Improving Public Services, and More Effectively Managing Public Resources. This decision was made without public consultation on whether other 'grand challenges' should have greater priority, especially Increasing Public Integrity ('measures that address corruption and public ethics, access to information, campaign finance reform, and media and civil society freedom'). Successive Australian Governments have made considerable and sustained progress in improving public services and more effectively managing public resources, whereas limited and patchy progress has been made in the areas of corruption and public ethics, access to information, and campaign finance reform. In other words, there is much more to do in relation to increasing public integrity. TIA recommends that the Government include Increasing Public Integrity as one of its initial 'grand challenges'. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.9 | Vision<br>There is not much in the way of a vision in the published material.<br><br>Perhaps we couldn't do much better than draw on the Open Government Declaration thus:<br><br>"The Australian Government with input from its citizens is committed to improved democratic practices in line with the OGP Open Government Declaration:<br>•"to promote transparency, fight corruption, empower citizens, and harness the power of new technologies to make government more effective and accountable."<br>•"to uphold the value of openness in our engagement with citizens to improve services, manage public resources, promote innovation, and create safer communities"<br>•"to embrace principles of transparency and open government with a view toward achieving greater prosperity, well-being, and human dignity in our own countries and in an increasingly interconnected world."<br><br>Grand Challenges<br>It is disappointing that the published material in parts suggests important decisions about 'grand challenges' that may limit commitments the government is prepared to consider have been made without any consultation.<br><br>For example these statements:<br>"through consultation, the aim is for the first Australian Government's National Action Plan to include ambitious actions that support the OGP grand challenges of improving public services and better managing public resources… Contributions for the NAP will be considered in the context of what will improve public services and improve management of public resources, as well as what will benefit the public, provide opportunities for business and support innovation in Australia."<br><br>However another sentence brings transparency and accountability and public engagement into the picture:<br>"Australia's membership of the OGP is an opportunity to improve public service delivery, increase the transparency and accountability of government, and encourage greater public engagement. It also an opportunity for the public, civil society, and the private sector to contribute ideas for how government can achieve those goals."<br><br>Unilateral decisions about the scope of what will be considered would be an unfortunate start to a "partnership."<br><br>Consultation should commence and proceed on the basis of OGP guidance that the plan in its final form should "consist of a set | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.10 | Utilize the IAP2 (International Association for Public Participation) Core Values and Quality Assurance Standards for Community and Stakeholder Engagement as the benchmark for public participation for government to incorporate into the way they involve community in decision making processes | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.11 | It is essential to have true collaboration between the government and the public. This is not achieved by the government dictating what the grand challenges should be. The process that has been adopted in relation to this negates the whole purpose of collaboration and exchange of views. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.12 | Endorse the Joint Declaration on Open Government for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda-the Sustainable Development Goals- and reflect OGP goals and ambition in Australia's implementation plan.<br>Consult with current OGP member countries in the region (Indonesia, Republic of Korea, Mongolia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines) to identify how and in what manner Australia can assist in deepening and extending the growth and enhancement of open, transparent and accountable government in the Asia Pacific region; support and engage in regional and bilateral initiatives that promote OGP goals and principles. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.13 | The Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC) providing a submission to the consultation. Below is a summary of PIAC's recommendations relevant to engagement for OGP. (Please note, other recommendations regarding public participation are also relevant, which are available in that Wiki theme).<br><br>- Australia's consultation process in the development of the National Plan should maintain the spirit in which the OGP was created and focus on genuine partnership and collaboration in order to facilitate improved governance.<br><br>- PIAC recommends that:<br>• a list of all stakeholders who have contributed to the consultation be made publicly available to demonstrate the breadth of stakeholders who have participated; and<br>• further consultations should be advertised more widely, and engage with private companies, legal and human rights groups, academics and Indigenous organisations. (Recommendation 1) | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.14 | 1. Establish a team with a mandate to broadly improve both public sector and broader public understanding of open government and related issues.<br><br>Justification, public sector:: There is a significant knowledge and understanding gap when it comes to communicating with agencies and local governments, and we need to see communication being one of the major focal points for any reform effort. At the moment, there are a bundle of things we're trying to break through, from the inevitable 'but this will just mean more work and cost us money' or 'but this is OUR agency's special project', to some agencies not having a good basic understanding of either the technological aspects or what we're even trying to achieve.<br><br>Justification, broader public: There needs to be more attention given to communicating with the broader public about what we're trying to achieve, how it's going, what's been delivered, and really showcasing work that has a broad public interest (frequently maps / social sciences / citizen science) in the context of open knowledge. Things that aren't necessarily economically material, but are important because they raise levels of public expectation and awareness, ensuring that engaging citizens with data remains a priority for future governments.<br><br>2. Establish a local government (and potentially small-agency) support program to give hands-on assistance in scoping and delivering meaningful projects.<br><br>Justification: small agencies and certainly local governments will need more than funding to deliver change – there's a big need for mentoring and practical assistance. This obviously going to be much harder than just providing funding, but these are very small organisations and won't get past the stage of developing ideas and scoping a project without both the enthusiasm and support of others working in the space. (This is not a role for consultants - the engagement has to come from within the public service to begin with.) | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.15 | The non-profit sector in Australia takes responsibility for delivering hundreds of thousands of essential services as well as managing public resources. The Australian Charities and Non-profit Commission has details of over 53000 organisations that are required to categorise their activities and say whose benefit they are working for. The government use this to include them in relevant policy and budgeting discussions. The Government could then create an ongoing dialogue mechanism with these organisations. This could include a system that automatically invites them to participate in policy and budgeting reviews that effect their areas of expertise and experience. There should also be a budget associated with facilitating participation for the organisations, given that there are many small and resource-limited. Australia needs their frank and fearless advice. | Engagement for OGP |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5.16 | There is a large amount of data collected by various government departments on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and organisations. It is therefore important to ensure that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander sector is engaged throughout all stages of the project. There is often a level of caution among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and organisations because of the way data has been used against us in the past. These sensitivities can not be overlooked.<br><br>There is also conversations about who owns the data collected. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander orgs are required to report their data and there is ongoing tensions about who owns that data. Specifically with the AIHW. Data ownership and Intellectual Property needs to be considered from an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander point of view.<br><br>Working with the sector on National Action Plan is vital to consider and address their issues effectively. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.16.1 | Great to see this input. It would be good to know what kind of stakeholder engagement occurs between the AIHW & the sectors it collects data from (and provides it to) and how that compares with the principles & themes of the Open Government Partnership so we can frame up Commitments & actions which better reflect people's needs. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.16.2 | I agree completely and would like to ask if there has been any engagement with Australia's First People's to this point? Is the National Congress of Australia's First Peoples engaged in the Consultation? | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.17 | If the first National Action Plan does not address all Grand Challenges, that will leave Australia with incomplete fulfilment of its OGP membership obligations and without commitments related to the remaining Grand Challenges which complement and strengthen actions included in that first NAP.<br>Accordingly, it is proposed that this first NAP include a commitment to prepare the second NAP within which are to be included commitments related to any Grand Challenges not addressed in this first NAP | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.17.1 | I agree with Ken completely. His comment follows the teleconference yesterday and add an important additional point to the summary of the conversation which Amelia posted earlier today. We recognise that it will be important that in addressing the 2 Grand Challenges proposed by Cabinet it will be impossible to ignore the need to increase public integrity if Public Service is to improved and Public Resources are to be managed effectively. We also recognised the challenge of engaging the private sector is integral to the challenge to ensure effective management of Public Resource as Governments increasingly partner with the Private Sector or contract services to the Private Sector. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.18 | The Action Plan implementation process should be designed to include an iterative approach to reinvent learnings, progress, standards, principles in order to modify accordingly.<br>How will the action plan evolve with learnings as it is implemented?<br>• Survive MOG<br>• Be bipartisan<br>• Widen participation during implementation<br><br>Response to suggested actions from participants in Engage2Act unconference on 23/3/16 | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.19 | The Productivity Commission recently announced a public inquiry to 'investigate ways to improve the availability and use of public and private sector data.'<br><br>'The Commission is required to:<br>-look at the benefits and costs of making public and private datasets more available<br>-examine options for collection, sharing and release of data<br>-identify ways consumers can use and benefit from access to data, particularly data about themselves<br>-consider how to preserve individual privacy and control over data use.'<br><br>It would have been good to have this report ready now for use in planning the National Action Plan however when the report is available it ought to used to inform the implementation of action plan Commitments. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.20 | An education campaign to inform the public about relevant 'entry points' into government departments to initiate opportunities for public participation - this requires government to establish information around how, when, why they engage the public and make this public - so increasing accountability for government. In addition it may contribute to a common understanding of what is and what is not community engagement/public participation. The IAP2 Quality Assurance Standard for Community and Stakeholder Engagement may be a useful resource. http://www.iap2.org.au/documents/item/391<br>An awareness and information around opportunities for the public to participate mean that they dont have to wait to be 'invited to participate', but are empowered to demand involvement in decision making. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.21 | This idea has been added to this theme at the request of Amelia Loye as a way to provide some infrastructure to ensure the ongoing implementation of the National Action Plan.<br><br>An open data/open government Cooperative Research Centre would provide the infrastructure and research commitment required to make use of open data in the Australian context for policy, business and research purposes. It would also hook up the government's Innovation program with the open government agenda. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.22 | Engage with regions - not just capital cities<br>Tap into existing resources:<br>e.g. telecentres in WA, One stop shop, video links etc State Government Regional Department - who do we link with?<br>Tasmania have a regional engagement system too<br>Whatever advisory body is, should have a board member of IAP2<br>Mechanisms for review and audit process for standard - how can we learn, review and improve | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.23 | Summary of teleconference 30/3/16. Seven people attended this call: Peter, Rosie, Ash, Ken, Greg, David and I. Engagement to develop the OGP was discussed initially. Questions were asked about engagement with and from the private sector and the need to develop messaging for that audience / potential data users was discussed. The limits of the Grand Challenges was raised. Whether themes were helpful was also openly discussed. The group was also informed by one participant that an independent researcher had been appointed in 2014 to review Australia's implementation of the initial OGP commitment. The question about the continuity of the NAP if Government of Australia changed was also raised. There was also a question about whether / how commitments that could not be delivered over two years would be dealt with - now as the first NAP is developed, and in the development of the next NAP. The importance of cultural change and the role of time in raising awareness / encouraging engagement was discussed. I suggested the group contact the OGP team with some of these questions.<br>The rest of the call focused on five topics: 1) Engaging to deliver commitments and actions - with civil society and the States; 2) Engaging to report NAP progress, and encourage greater engagement in Open Government across Australia; 3) Engagement for development of the next NAP; 4) Independent NAP review process. When discussing 1) the group felt multi-stakeholder working groups would be required to help deliver OGP NAP commitments. Across the states and in some cases with civil society. The discussion around point 2) included the importance of storytelling, the need for a communication plan and forum / mechanisms that enable the reporting of both NAP progress, and encourage stories from those sharing from those releasing data, using data, increasing public participation and opening government across Australia. I made the commitment to ensure that everyone participating in the workshop on 11th April could participate in a discussion about ongoing engagement. Amelia | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.23.1 | The teleconference discussion focused heavily on measurement, reporting & accountability as opposed to Commitment ideas that could ensure engagement between the NAP actions and greater society. Monitoring the progress of action milestones is important but I don't think in and of itself that such monitoring (done by a small group) will ensure the success of the NAP. I think the success of the NAP will be determined by actions put in place to increase awareness, engagement & opportunities for co-creation of policy. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.3 | nDF would also recommend use of a Citizens' Jury or similar deliberative mechanism using randomly selected participants to finalise the National Action Plan. This could be incorporated as part of Stages 3 and 4 of the development process which has been designed by the Australian Open Government Partnership and would be an incredibly powerful way to set the tone for future openness and transparency. The clear message which would be conveyed through convening a Citizens' Jury to respond to the question of "How can we govern ourselves better?" is profound. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.4 | 4. Overarching Commitment ; when considering each proposedcommitment and the changes proposed,the NAP commit toidentifying all relevant risks to the integrity of the performance of the proposed changes and the action needed to address them.<br><br>Whatever specific commitments are made and pursued in the NAP,this will be imperative for a successful implementation of those commitment. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.5 | In the course of the discussion, particularly under the themes of Open Data, Public Service Delivery, and Resource Management, it emerged that to ensure that action in those areas will be successful, it will be necessary in the NAP to adequately address the need to change cultures within government and the major weaknesses in the Commonwealth Government Integrity system, particularly especially those that can impact adversely on policy decisions and procurement decisions.<br>In addition, in relation to Open Data, it will necessary to address the need for an appropriate review of the system in place for its development. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.6 | Customer-designed information platform pilot<br>Description: Identify three existing service areas with Commonwealth, state and local government delivery, for example innovation or small business. Develop a customer-designed information platform focused on increasing information accessibility about available government services to enable people to more effectively navigate and participate in programs and access services. It is not anticipated the platform would create a new centralised information portal, rather it would focus on 'front end' collation and presentation of information and enable responsible areas to manage the 'back end' functionality. While government would enable and coordinate development, customers (randomly selected) would be invited to co-design and test the platform. | Engagement for OGP |
| 5.7 | A. Agreement on a Vision Statement.This requires resolutionbefore we embark upon the consultation process to choose the grand challenges to be addressed and the specific Commitments to be chosen for inclusion in the National Action Plan.(See Attachment A below for theART Proposed Vision Statement.For background material, - http://ogpau.wikispaces.com/Vision+for+open+government+in+Australia ) | Ongoing engagement |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6.1 | Publish What You Pay (PWYP) Australia believes that the OGP can be used by Australia to improve extractives industry transparency. We support the comments made below by TIA and strongly endorse Australia progressing with implementation of the EITI standard. We also support the introduction of mandatory disclosure legislation that requires extractive companies listed or based in Australia to disclose all payments made to governments on a country-by-country and project-by-project basis. This legislation should be harmonised with existing laws introduced by the European Union and Governments in Canada and the United States to the extent that that is possible. | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.1.1 | We fully support the position of PWYP Australia on the implementation of EITI standards in Australia and the introduction of mandatory disclosure legislation similar to the ones in Canada and the US. This will complement our work on transparency and accountability of the mining sector in the Philippines. | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.1.2 | Publish What You Pay UK strongly supports the recommendation of PWYP Australia for extractives industry transparency under Australia's OGP NAP, comprising Australia progressing with implementation of the EITI Standard and the introduction of mandatory disclosure legislation to require extractive companies listed or based in Australia to disclose their payments to governments on a country-by-country and project-by-project basis. Miles Litvinoff, Coordinator, PWYP UK | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.1.3 | The ONE Campaign, an international advocacy and campaigning organisation with more than 7 million members globally, fully supports increasing transparency in the natural resources sector through mandatory disclosure requirements and the EITI, and endorses the recommendation of PWYP Australia. | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.1.4 | SJ Around the Bay is a network of parish social justice groups in the Catholic Diocese of Broken Bay, located the northern region of Sydney and the Central Coast. This network. This network support the work of PWYP and the implementation of the EITI and mandatory disclosure of of payments made by companies, on a country by country and project by project basis. Such transparency with promote a greater level of trust in the community of what large corporations are doing both within Australia and overseas. It will also enable fact based discussion on the just distribution of the benefits of the extractive industries within the community. Increasingly people are viewing multinational companies with suspicion and hostility. As they push their way into the lives of ordinary citizens, invading farm lands, spoiling the environment and depriving indigenous communities of their humble means of survival (particularly in many poorer countries), they are judged as being powerful, undemocratic and representative of the rich and greedy. This is a strongly growing trend. While the executives of such companies are legally required to maximise the financial benefits of their shareholders rather than required to act in a way that is in the best interests of the public generally, there is a social divide that is likely to grow. Transparency is in the best interests of the community. | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.2 | Sign the Joint Declaration on Open Government for the Implementation of the 2013 Agenda for Sustainable Development http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/attachments/OGP_declaration.pdf | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.3 | Implement the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative in Australia. Establish a publicly available register of the beneficial ownership of companies. Greater transparency in public procurement:<br>Governments should publish in a timely manner the selection criteria and the method of award of any contract before the procurement process commences;<br>Governments should collect and disclose the identity and beneficial ownership of all bidders;<br>Full details of awarded contracts should be disclosed and the details of completion of the contract should be published in a timely manner with any alterations to the terms of the original contract also disclosed;<br>Independent monitoring of all stages of the procurement process with a robust, transparent and effective appeals process should be accessible;<br>Information on public procurement should be available in open data format – non-proprietary, searchable, sortable, platform-independent and machine-readable.<br>Note: This needs more detail to be an actionable item. Have asked for more specific details from the proposer.(note updated 23/12 - TB) Move the OAIC function into the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.4 | 2. FOI<br>(a) In relation to the OAIC,the Government take action forthwith to<br>• withdraw legislation to abolish the OAIC, and<br>• allocate the resources necessary for it to fulfil its statutory role as soon as possible. (Para 4.3)<br>(b) An independent review of the operation of the FOI system including<br>• obstacles to the effectiveness of the FOI system, and<br>• whether the objects of the FOI Act, the OGP commitments and principles,and the public office public trust principle are being served and<br>• recommendations for improvements (para 4.2)<br>othe regulation of election funding, to be addressed by a Commitment to adopt a national scheme for the regulation of funding and campaign spending by political candidates and parties as recommended by the Schott Report and advocated by the Premier of New South Wales. (Para 5.3.2)<br>o in the regulation of lobbying, including its limitation to third-party lobbying, lobbying of ministers and parliamentary secretaries, its failure to require the contemporaneous recording and publication of lobbying activity, and the inadequacies of limits on former members of Parliament's and public servants gauging in lobbying activities (5.3.3)<br>(Note concluding material, para 5.4 and part 6.) | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.5 | Improve access to national data on mining and resource exploration and production projects for citizens<br>The Australian Government could ensure all national, state and territories datasets related to mining and production and associated infrastructure are published in a format easily accessed and understood by citizens. This open dataset will establish transparency and drive public participation in the development and management of Australia's natural resources.<br>The Australian Government is best placed to coordinate and publish national data related to mining and resource production applications and projects and their status.<br>To deliver this the Government will need to support collaboration between all agencies, states and territories and create a way to enable them to effectively share and publish data in a consistent national structure. This data should be updated daily or weekly, shareable, and be open in allowing companies and citizens to build on and reuse the data. | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |
| 6.6 | Create community-focused content explaining mining, resources and energy project processes<br>The Australian Government could provide a single national source of easily understood community-focused information about our natural resources, mining and production processes, and the rights of citizens and industry. This will foster more open and better informed discussion between citizens, industry and agencies about management of Australia's natural resources.<br>With more state government decisions on resource projects becoming a part of the national conversation, the Australian Government has the opportunity to create the foundation for an informed discussion by providing national content, including relevant details for each state and territory.<br>Educational content created for citizens will transparently explain the different natural resources in Australia, their uses and values, and the process and impacts of mining/extraction. The participation and cooperation of each state and territory in providing information about relevant local rules and legislation, will ensure openness is delivered nationally. Content will be published on a national website and licensed under creative commons to encourage redistribution and reuse. | Government Data for Access to Information and Transparency |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7.1 | Hansard, legislation and policy discussion should be available in the JSON format<br>Publishing debates, reports, bills and acts using the JSON standard will mean Australia could have the world's first truly 'programmable' government.<br><br>There would be two main advantages. Exposing this material as a JSON (and a RESTful JSON API) will allow a new breed of analysts and thinkers to work with the content, easily integrating it with other programs and existing interfaces.<br><br>The second would be to ready Australian policy makers with the burgeoning field of 'smart contracts', distributed data and decentralised organisations. New technology (including blockchain) depends on this format. The possibilities range from automating the calculation rates, duties and penalties to crowdsourced-drafting of bills and regulations. | Open Data |
| 7.1.1 | Provide linkages between the law that requires data to be collected and the published open data | Open Data |
| 7.1.2 | One potential step is to create a data register by agency on what data they hold, what state it is in, and what access is permitted. This could become a bi-annual report to government and available to all agencies to help those making decisions to understand where the data supporting their decision process may already exist and be sourced.<br><br>It could then be reviewed and released publicly (where there's no security implications), providing insights for industry and the civic sector on what data is potentially accessible from government to inform economic and social decision processes, as well as providing a gap analysis on what data government doesn't hold and a runway for individuals and organisations to request specific datasets to be publicly published as open data, or selectively shared with researchers to inform future policy work.<br><br>From this a high value data list could be determined through the interaction of the various players. | Open Data |
| 7.1.3 | Such a list should identify gaps in data, so that social and environmental impacts can be covered comprehensively. OGP must be about more than "how to make money out of government-generated data" | Open Data |
| 7.1.4 | Creating the opportunity and mechanism for the public to contribute to this list is a good way to engage a broad audience with open data, to move beyond the current focus on the interests of developers and the short term thinking of hackfests. The health and welfare communities have specific data-sets in mind that they wish to have opened to improve policy outcomes. Providing a formal opportunity for these groups (and the wider research community) to provide input into such a list would build both interest and trust in open data/open government. | Open Data |
| 7.1.5 | Establish a single place to discover all consultations, publications, policies - it is currently difficult for people to contribute meaningfully to government because it is hard to find what is going on, what has already been decided, what the priorities of the government of the day are, and what research has been conducted to date. | Open Data |
| 7.1.6 | Establish a participatory budget approach. Each year there should be a way for the public to give ideas and feedback to the budget process, to help identify community priorities and potential savings. | Open Data |
| 7.1.7 | Establish a regular Community Estimates session. Senate Estimates is a way for the Senate to hold the government and departments to account however, often the politics of the individuals involved dominates the approach. What if we implemented an opportunity for the public to do the same? There would need to be a rigorous way to collect and prioritise questions from the public that was fair and representative, but it could be an excellent way to provide greater accountability which is not (or should not be) politicised. (full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Open Data |
| 7.1.8 | Establish a regular Community Estimates session. Senate Estimates is a way for the Senate to hold the government and departments to account however, often the politics of the individuals involved dominates the approach. What if we implemented an opportunity for the public to do the same? There would need to be a rigorous way to collect and prioritise questions from the public that was fair and representative, but it could be an excellent way to provide greater accountability which is not (or should not be) politicised. (full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Open Data |
| 7.1.9 | Can we incentivise senior management/elected reps to be responsible for engagement themselves- i.e. personally Response to suggested actions from participants at the Ark Community Engagement Conference 22/3/16 | Open Data |
| 7.1.10 | Data sets held should be included in the list of materials subject to the pro-active publication provisions of the FOI act. | Open Data |
| 7.2 | Develop a central register of all public research undertaken, or to be undertaken, by federal agencies that provides details of the scope and links to publicly reported outcomes. Over time could be linked to the raw data for reuse by other agencies/external entities per other open data and internally could become a mechanism for agencies to find existing research relevant to policy processes and to collaborate on research projects where the similar data collection could serve the goals of different agencies. Potential to expand to states & local gov in longer-term as a central public research repository and matching system. | Open Data |
| 7.2.1 | Can be connected to Tanya O'Dea's proposal: Develop a federal research register | Open Data |
| 7.3 | Many government organisation are ready to publish their data as open data, but if each organisation publishes the same data with different columns and schemas it will be hard to aggregate. If there was some guidance and support to create a wiki or resource where these standards could be interactively developed it would be of huge assistance. A good example of this is http://opencouncildata.org/ but needs more support and adoption. | Open Data |
| 7.3.1 | here's some more standards to consider adopting http://queensland.theodi.org/home/resources/standards/ | Open Data |
| 7.3.2 | Refer to my comment on StephenGates' proposal: Assist the 500+ local councils that haven't yet published open data to do so | Open Data |
| 7.4 | Suggestion to meet - *Access to Information, *Open Data and *Openness in Natural Resources areas<br>NEED: Extending access and use of existing Australian best practice information by Government institutions and participating community groups<br>BACKGROUND: I have observed over many years the National Parks and Wildlife Services and aboriginal groups trying to work towards an ongoing collaboration. What I don't understand is why the Service staff do not check for current successful 'collaboration' programs (or part thereof) in their own Service to share with the people involved in the project. An example of a successful program is that of Mungo National Park.<br>STRATEGY AND MEASUREMENT: To expand use of valuable information by Government and Community groups.<br>A five step process can begin<br>Gather and make best practice collaboration program reports easily findable (a one stop shop);<br>Notifying (regularly - twice a year) all regions that this 'one stop shop' is available, and that<br>A Service person or persons are required to log in to this 'shop' each month, search for information associated with their annual projects, and distribute the results (via email with links or as paper copies for people without email) to people responsible for project delivery and all members of the project team; including the Community groups.<br>All project leaders must personally load their final reports to the 'shop'.<br>These logins are recorded and reported.<br>There may be a better way - but I haven't witnessed use of current successful processes in the Service and local aboriginal group discussions. | Open Data |
| 7.5 | Activity - Sharing Best Practice across government and government funded organisations<br>OGP Sharing Best Practice - activity suggestion<br><br>Need: An easy way to find best or good practice examples across and within government and government funded organisations<br><br>OPG category - *Access to Information, *Open Data and *Openness in Natural Resources areas<br><br>Background<br>I have observed over many years the National Parks and Wildlife Services and aboriginal groups trying to work towards an ongoing collaboration. What I don't understand is why the Service staff do not check for current successful 'collaboration' programs (or part thereof) in their own Service to share with the people involved in the project. An example of a successful program is that of Mungo National Park.<br><br>Strategy and Measurement<br>To expand use of valuable information by Government and Community groups. A five step process can begin<br>• Gather and make best practice collaboration program reports easily findable (a one stop shop);<br>• Notifying (regularly - twice a year) all regions that this 'one stop shop' is available<br>• AND that<br>• A Service person or persons are required to log in to this 'shop' each month, search for information associated with their annual projects, and distribute the results (via email with links or as paper copies for people without email) to people responsible for project delivery and all members of the project team; including the Community groups.<br>• All project leaders must personally load their final reports to the 'shop'.<br>• These logins are recorded and reported.<br><br>There may be a better way - but I haven't witnessed use of current successful processes in the Service and local aboriginal group discussions. | Open Data |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7.6 | Problem: Many reports and resources commissioned by government departments and agencies are not made public.<br>This could be addressed with 3 strategies:<br>1. Review and strengthen guidelines for making information resources commissioned or produced by government departments and agencies public to ensure all material is made public unless there are identifiable security or other justifiable reasons not to do so.<br>2. Set targets and measure results for open publishing and use of creative commons licenses<br>3. Develop a government open access policy similar to the ARC and NHMRC<br>An open access policy should be adopted for all government funded research published in academic journals. These could be similar to that of the ARC and the NHMRC and should also encourage use of open access journals where available.<br><br>This proposal would also require the established of a government document repository or some other solution for effective storage, discovery and access - this has been submitted as a separate item. | Open Data |
| 7.6.1 | It is, if the reports are made public. If they aren't its either an FOI issue, a management issue or an openness issue. Reports are withheld for a variety of reasons and public servants needs to be clear on what these are and be able to justify not making a report public. We have the Gov 2.0 theory but not yet the practice. | Open Data |
| 7.6.2 | As I hear it, the problem with many reports and resources commissioned by government departments and agencies not being made public is implementation of existing policies, guidelines etc. As Amanda points out "We have the Gov 2.0 theory but not yet the practice."<br><br>We need suggestions that will improve compliance, as well as plugging any holes found in policy.<br><br>Sharing b | Open Data |
| 7.6.3 | This suggestion closely aligns with concept of a "Gov API" or "Mashable Government". Pia Waugh describes the end goal: https://www.dto.gov.au/blog/making-government-discoverable/<br>To achieve "Gov API" in a long term sustainable manner is non-trivial, but can be broken down into many small steps. Key concepts which need to be considered are:<br>Open Standards facilitate wide scale and long term interoperability. However there is tension between "quick fixes", or "vendor lock-in APIs" versus open standards adoption.<br>Adopting existing international standards is often an option and should be encouraged where available. Contributing to development of international standards is time consuming, and involves long term commitments to do well.<br>It is important to enable whole-of-government strategies while also facilitating rapid innovation.<br>Maintenance strategies: IT assets, such as government data, rapidly become dated and need refreshing and/or archiving. As such whole-of-life maintenance strategies should be considered.<br>Business Cases: (This is worthy of a suggestion by itself). Government agencies should be provided with strategies and guidelines to write business cases to predict the success versus cost of different Gov API strategies. Typically government officials have mandate to solve department-wide problems, however solutions will often be best justified at a Whole-Of-Government, or Whole-Of-World level. One particular argument is "If I invest in an Open Standard, or Open Source product, I will see minimal immediate benefit, but long term will see international adoption which will lead to advancement of my local goals." | Open Data |
| 7.7 | Problem/issue to be addressed<br>Publications and other resources produced or commissioned by government departments and agencies are notoriously difficult to find and access for a number of reasons including having publication withheld, or disappearing from online access due to poor management practices and lack of a public repository for government material.<br><br>Main objective<br>Improve the discovery and accessibility of government publications, data and other resources to maximise long term public access and use of government research and information by investing in publishing infrastructure, principles and practices.<br><br>Strategy: Establish an open publications repository for government documents<br>Establish a public, open access, online, whole-of-government publication and resource repository for publishing and ongoing access and management of government publications.This could utilise and extend an existing external repository to integrate with other policy resources (using APO for example apo.org.au), use a government-run system (data.gov.au) or be a new product developed for this purpose. It should be interoperable with data.gov.au and other data sources to link publications and date and would be to be harvested by Archives and other organisations as required but also be public facing and dynamic to work with the fast pace of public policy. | Open Data |
| 7.7.1 | This could be connected to my proposal for a research directory and Tanya's proposal above. | Open Data |
| 7.7.2 | Yes, I agree. The collection of publications and metadata about research, agencies, etc can all be part of the one database. | Open Data |
| 7.8 | This comment is provided by the National Archives of Australia (the National Archives). The National Archives was established by the Archives Act 1983 as an executive agency of the Australian Government, although it has existed in various forms since the 1940s. The National Archives is the lead agency for ensuring transparency and accountability in government through its legislated role of setting records and information management requirements for Australian Government agencies, and preserving and providing a public right of access to government information.<br><br>Open government increases the transparency and accountability of government, encourages greater public engagement, strengthens governance and improves public service delivery. The National Archives plays a key role in open government by promoting the creation, management and preservation of authentic, reliable and usable Commonwealth information, and facilitating access to this information.<br><br>The Archives Act 1983 provides a broad definition of records and effectively covers all information created, used or received in the course of Commonwealth business. Under the Archives Act 1983 (Cth) (Archives Act), the National Archives:<br>•identifies the archival resources of the Commonwealth;<br>•preserves and makes the archival resources of the Commonwealth accessible;<br>•oversees Commonwealth records management;<br>•determines standards and provides advice to Commonwealth agencies; and<br>•imposes recordkeeping obligations in respect of Commonwealth records.<br><br>Ready access to this information is vital for maintaining the transparency of the democratic process and the accountability of successive governments, and is integral to a successful open government policy. It is from this perspective and with this legislated role that the National Archives provides the following observations and comments on the Vision and the framework for the National Action Plan.<br><br>Vision<br>The National Archives supports a Vision that commits to the improved management of, and accessibility to, information and records. A key element of this is a move to fully digital information management and business processes across the Australian government sector. This aligns with key commitments identified in the National Action Plans of the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. It also aligns with the example Vision statement provided that 'Open government in the 21st century needs to translate to digital processes and reporting to improve transparency and accountability'. This has already been achieved by a number of initiatives which the National Archives is currently leading including earlier access to government records, the Digital Continuity 2020 Policy, an end-to-end solution to manage digital government information, and modernisation of the Archives Act. | Open Data |
| 7.9 | With regard to models for such an enterprise, I can only endorse the NZ comparison and strongly recommend that you look at the UK initiatives in relation to open government and open data. Placing the open data strategy within the ambit of the National Archives. along with Her Majestys' Stationery Office, focuses on government information across all sectors – creation, use, reuse and preservation.<br>http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/united-kingdom | Open Data |
| 7.10 | Open data can provide useful input to both Grand Challenges of Improving Public Services and More Effectively Managing Public Resources. The government has done its own research on the benefit of administrative open data sets published by the Productivity Commission (2012-13). I think a useful goal for the OGP National Action Plan would be to compile a list of high value data-sets that can be used to contribute to better policy, transparency and accountability and then oversee the release of these data-sets along with implementing a feedback process to ensure the data produced is usable. This list should be created in collaboration with the public and provide a standard to facilitate maximising the value that can be created through open data. | Open Data |
| 7.11 | Develop a federal research register<br>To allow more informed citizen participation in policy debate, make a commitment to publish (redacted only where absolutely necessary) all business cases for major government initiatives and all independent evaluations of policies and programs. In the case of proposed initiatives, it would allow citizens to be aware of the options considered and the relative pros and cons of each proposal; in the case of evaluations, it would allow citizens to be aware of factual information about the success or failure of policies and programs. Citizens deserve to be able to make up their own minds based on factual information, not through the lens of the 'spin' of either government or opposition, and to question decisions which do not appear to be supported by the facts or independent recommendations - or at least require the government to be more accountable to the public for the decisions it makes. | Open Data |
| 7.11.1 | This could be connected to my proposal for a research directory - which had a goal of informing government agencies of the research activities by other agencies and supporting more collaborative research across portfolios where this was cost-effective. The public exposure of this research, base, benchmarking & comparative (policy) to the public at an appropriate point in the policy formation process, with appropriate privacy management, would support more informed and factual policy debates and reduce the hyperbole and misreporting we see in current policy discussions. | Open Data |
| 7.12 | Comment: Open Data Institute in the UK has run a highly successful challenge series, whereby social/economic/environmental challenges are solved. Building on Code for Australia's idea, this is something that could be achieved locally in Australia. | Open Data |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7.12.1 | A link to the Open Data Challenge Series as mentioned above by way of example, seems to have disappeared. Here it is: http://theodi.org/opendatachallengeseries | Open Data |
| 7.12.2 | Articulous worked with ODIQ and the Brisbane City Council recently on a cut-down version of the challenge - Brisbane Open Data Project - part of which was for their citizens to address the issues of sustainability, liveability, safety and driving economic growth.<br><br>We propose upscaling this ODI challenge model trailed with BCC and engage with the broader Australian community on a range of issues at a federal level particularly in the areas of health, sustainability and innovation. Let's hear what the burning issues are and:<br><br>- identify potential solutions using open data<br><br>- collaborate with data custodians to ensure access to data that is capable of helping understand or solve the specific challenge, and<br><br>- work with industry partners, developers and digital innovators to create solutions. | Open Data |
| 7.13 | Baseline the maturity of the open data publishing practice of all Australian Government Departments and Agencies using a free online tool such as the Open Data Institute's Open Data Pathway. This is a great way to benchmark the 'now', guide each Department in setting targets (the 'where') and develop a practical action plan (the 'how'). It also results in more meaningful measurement of progress as we move forward. | Open Data |
| 7.13.1 | A link to the Open Data Pathway as mentioned above by way of an example mechanism for elevating open data publishing practice is available here: http://queensland.theodi.org/home/services/pathway/ | Open Data |
| 7.14 | In August 2015 the NZ Government agreed to establish a Data Futures Partnership, a cross-sector group of influential people working together to drive high-trust and high-value data use for all New Zealanders. Australia could take a similar approach, and in particular use and adapt the 'catalyst project' seed funding model NZ is developing to foster more data driven innovation, more open data release, and more effective trusted data sharing.<br><br>Background:<br>The NZ Data Futures Forum consultation process found there are likely to be huge economic, social and environmental opportunities from treating data as a national strategic asset. It also found that driving social and economic value from data requires a collective effort across the public, private and NGO sectors.<br><br>It noted that:<br>1. The data-use ecosystem is hard to navigate - Data practices and relationships are complex and emerging, and the existing institutions and frameworks are not designed for the emerging environment. There is no clear, authoritative guidance for Ministers and policy makers, or for the people and organisations sharing and using data.<br>2. Potential for much greater data sharing - Public and private sector organisations have rich data but are unwilling or feel unable to share – because acceptable boundaries for sharing and reuse may be unclear.<br>3. Tenuous trust - Public trust in the data-use ecosystem is tenuous and, once lost, trust can be hard to restore. Maintaining trust is vital to ongoing data innovation, including Government's reuse of data to drive investment decisions and target services. There is no independent trusted forum for an inclusive conversation on data use.<br>4. Potential for more data reuse and innovation to create economic and social value - People and organisations are not using data as much as they could to create value – because of lack of understanding of the value, lack of access to data, fears of negative reactions, or practical barriers such as no data standards or lack of analytics capability.<br><br>The Data Futures Partnership is focusing on three streams of work:<br>- Catalyst Projects to demonstrate the value of data use, and help create ethical and practical frameworks.<br>- Diagnose and fix ongoing and emerging issues in the data-use ecosystem.<br>- Facilitate a conversation with New Zealanders about the potential value of data use, and to understand their feelings and perspectives on data use. | Open Data |
| 7.15 | TOPICS<br>Open Data. A linked data system would:<br>- Present the complete picture without administrative boundaries on topics that interest citizens and governments<br>- Connect the data silos by creating standardised APIs across agencies<br>- Create a standard workflow for releasing, updating, and using open data by processing all datasets in the same manner through an automated and repeatable process<br>- Generate five-star open data for all datasets.<br><br>PRINCIPLES<br>- Transparency. An improved workflow for releasing data through an automated linked data workflow will contribute to greater transparency.<br>- Technology and Innovation. Linked data introduces an innovative system and approach to managing transparency as well as managing public contributions to open data, fostering increased usage for all.<br><br>What successful implementation of the idea would look like<br>A linked data portal will achieve the following:<br>- Relevant and easy access to government data by citizens<br>- Specific and focussed search, as well as discoverability of data<br>- Easy publishing and automatic extraction of topics from data, decreasing the amount of processing<br>- Workflows for any data contribution.<br><br>Government<br>1. Lisa wants to release her agency's education data, currently stored in proprietary formats, so that it can be used for a consultant to develop an app<br>2. She uploads the data into the linked data portal<br>3. The portal automatically extracts entities in the data (eg: 'University of Sydney', 'CSIRO', 'National Portrait Gallery') and locations (eg: 'Brisbane', 'Carlton VIC')<br>4. The portal then creates an API (Application Programming Interface) for the consultant to develop the app<br>5. Lisa can re-upload the data at any time to update.<br><br>Citizens<br>1. Mustafa is researching primary schools for his family around his suburb of Carlton, Victoria | Open Data |
| 7.16 | Open Data in Regional Australia: Articulous recently worked with a consortium of local government council's in regional New South Wales on a pilot project to mitigate the health issues associated with the increase in the number and severity of recent heatwaves that have been linked to climate change. This pilot is at the start of a 5 year lifespan and it would be invaluable to incorporate open data from the specific fields of climate and health to enable a much more targeted and rigorous engagement of the potentially effected population. Often in regional areas specific individuals or clusters of citizens are hard to service or even locate due to their geographical isolation. | Open Data |
| 7.17 | There are a number of posts, in different themes across the wiki, suggesting a directory / portal / list of open government & open information initiatives and resources etc. For example, see "Compile a list of high value data-sets" by BudgetAus below & and Pia Waugh's submission: http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/.<br><br>In my opinion much of the right model for such a portal would be that provided by the EU Open Data Monitor (http://opendatamonitor.eu/) as proposed below by StephenGates ("Bring the Open Data Monitor to Australia to help in the discovery and assessment of open data quality").<br><br>The role of a similar portal in AU would be to provide a central catalogue/directory view of initiatives & information and to foster and document the likely disparate usage terms & conditions, formats and interfaces underlying the information & resources. The portal should not, I think, provide any underlying centralised data storage nor identity / access management function to information and resources. | Open Data |
| 7.18 | The United States and other countries have established teams responsible for 'declassification', or opening, of government archives that were closed under past decisions. Access norms and expectations change. Such a group could be established and managed by the NAA to ensure that these valuable government records, covering all aspects of Australian life, are made available to the Australian people in a timely manner. | Open Data |
| 7.19 | Currently Commonwealth agencies operate under two different sets of rules and accompanying approaches to the release of information. FOI, which is limited by its use of the word 'document' in reference to information that can be requested, and open data policies, aimed at structured information. This is an unhelpful distinction. All formats of information - from databases to documents and everything else should be easy to apply for under FOI, and all should be eligible for proactive release. Suggest necessary amendments to FOI legislation to remove use of 'document'. | Open Data |
| 7.19.1 | Correction: there aren't only two sets of rules - there are lots more eg privacy law, archives law, But the intention in this comment is to focus on the tension between FOI's 'documents' and open data :) CF | Open Data |
| 7.19.2 | This is just one aspect that illustrates the need to modernise the FOI act, made all the more urgent by the transition by government agencies to entirely digital work processes. Section 17 of the FOI act and its reference to computers is straight out of-well 1982, when the law came into effect. My proposal for a short review is in the Freedom of Information theme. | Open Data |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7.20 | Open Data can dramatically decrease the real and opportunity costs to not for profits and other organisations. We have seen the power of shared measurement in many of the collective impact initiatives in the US and there is an increasing call for 'population level' data sets here in Australia to assist collaborations report and mobilise around common agendas. Without access to timely and quality data these efforts will be stalled. There is a moment in time while people are putting together dashboards/scorecards etc to enable these communities - health, education, employment, justice, economic data is all necessary and needs to be accessible in raw formats (and not 3 year old data sets). How can communities hold not for profits and government to account if they can't access timely and accurate data? For better outcomes we need data to benchmark and track outcomes and also understand the context of these communities. | Open Data |
| 7.21 | Using Open data to get the best talent into Government Departments, changing work culture: Transparency in Hiring and Promotions in government departments and business units<br><br>Some departments advertise with the clear intent to hire, some advertise just to meet the legal requirements. Frequently, some departments or business units carry out hiring and promotions internally because of a culture of everyone "fit in". In such instances, there are no new ideas coming in, there is no one to question internal decisions (because all employees are made of the same mold). This culture perpetuates itself. This results in a lack of Innovation in policy making, lack of innovation in other fields including procurement and infrastructure development (including ICT, communication or implementing OGP ideals). There is no dissent- because there are no dissenters.<br><br>Actions Item:<br>Each subunit of each government department should be required to disclose on its own website and its hiring advertisements as to the absolute number of new hires from outside the group in the past one year, and the number hired internally- including contractors already working there. Such data should be provided/published in a form that can be scrapped by open-data bots and consolidated for access by the public.<br><br>To make OGP successful, we need to have employees at Departments wanting to do the right thing. | Open Data |
| 7.21.1 | I agree that this is a grave and timely issue. Let me introduce commitment 20 from the current French NAP, which is very related:<br><br>DIVERSIFY RECRUITMENT WITHIN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS<br>LEAD INSTITUTIONS: Ministry for Decentralization and the Civil Service<br>STAKES<br>The civil service has a duty to be exemplary by reflecting the French society it serves, with its diversity and its evolutions.<br>CONTEXT & AIM<br>The State undertakes to facilitate the recruitment of diversified profiles that not only reflect French society, but also that are necessary to support the administrations through digital and open government evolutions.<br>ROADMAP<br>   Develop new access channels to the civil service, to improve its opening to society<br>- In the Bill on ethics and the rights and obligations of civil servants, insert measures to renew access channels to civil service and open them a larger diversity of profiles<br>- Renew the preparatory classes mechanism for access to competitive examinations of category A in the three branches of the civil service, particularly by increasing by 25% the number of places offered in the integrated preparatory classes preparing candidates for the competitive examinations for entry to the civil service from 2015. The objective for 2016 is to double the number of students, to reach 1,000 places<br>- Develop apprenticeship in the civil service by multiplying by 10 the number of apprentices, to reach an objective of 4,000 by the beginning of the 2016 school year and 10,000 for 2017<br>   Address discriminatory biases upon entry into the civil service<br>- Upon request from the Prime Minister, launch an expert appraisal mission on discrimination issues<br>- Modify the texts on juries and selection committee's composition for each ministry to open them to at least one member outside the recruiting administration<br>- Generalize training courses on discrimination prevention for all future members of juries and selection committees<br>- Generalize the procedures for the quality certification of human resources departments in order to evaluate all their procedures with regard to any discriminatory risks. Ashok, your proposed action is very simple and costs almost nothing to the departments, but arguably the first step towards addressing this problem. Hopefully, it becomes part of a commitment. Even if it does not, simple things like this could be easily implemented IF the government is willing... | Open Data |
| 7.22 | Open Data - dealing with cross jurisdictional issues: Many policies dealing with the every day lives of people are administered by states which makes the state agencies the custodians. Such data-sets are important to the issues that the health and welfare sectors would like to see opened for better policy & funding transparency. Other than the Australian Institute of Health & Welfare, the only other avenue of collaboration between jurisdictions in relation to the collection of data that I am aware of is the Cross Jurisdictional Open Data Government Community Forum which is a quarterly meeting that discusses open data case studies and issues.<br><br>I propose this cross jurisdictional committee be used to create a structure or process (separate to their private meetings) whereby the public can engage with the states to begin to harmonise the open data-sets that are produced by each state and territory so that data-sets on similar topics in each jurisdiction (eg traffic, crime) can be published in a consistent manner with regard to the fields they contain, the frequency with which they are updated and other characteristics that affect their re-use as open data. | Open Data |
| 7.23 | 3. Establish and enforce metadata standards for publishing data and publications<br>- Establishing document/resource ownership can be a challenge sometimes when it comes to government publications. It would be helpful if resources were more clearly marked than they are currently. Parent/child relationships would be a good place to start. Eg: Australian Government, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, Office for Women. Copyright ownership also needs to be reformed to be more consistent. In the example given, resources can labelled Copyright Commonwealth of Australia OR Copyright Australian Government OR Copyright Office for Women. A publishing standard, which ONLY attributes copyright to the 'master' owner, would be a great reform. | Open Data |
| 7.24 | 2. Discover, access and management of government publications<br>- Another observation (and this mainly applies to state government departments) would be to stop uploading reports as Word docs. PDF should always be the default format, especially helpful for researchers that need to keep pagination consistent for citation purposes. | Open Data |
| 7.25 | Just to pick up on some of the points raised by Amanda Lawrence - in relation to government publications<br>2. Discover, access and management of government publications<br>- Most federal and state government publications are usually 'findable' close to release date. Older publications can be a bit more problematic. NLA and Trove collections are often a first port-of-call for researchers trying to receive historical publications. Allowing third party repositories, that have the (content management) systems to publish associated copyright information, to archive such documents improves the chances of policy researchers to retrieve and evaluate publicly-funded policy resources. | Open Data |
| 7.26 | 1) XML feeds for all parliamentary data including Hansard, comlaw, annual reports, pbs', MP expenses and declaration of interests in data form with notifications of changes. This would make this important democratic content more accessible, easier to analyse and easier to monitor.<br><br>2) Publishing of all the federal budget information in data format on budget night, including the tables throughout the budget papers, the data from the Portfolio Budget Statements (PBSs) and anything else of relevance. This would make analysing the budget easier. There have been some efforts in this space but it has not been fully implemented.<br><br>(Full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Open Data |
| 7.27 | FOI requests (ongoing as well as closed) and their outcomes (and documents provided to applicants) should be published on the Home Page of the department or business unit. For example, CentreLink should have a link to all FOI related matters. If it is not possible on the top of the page, a link should be provided at least at the bottom of the Home Page. Data format should be open data bot scrappable. | Open Data |
| 7.28 | Achieving internal Transparency within government departments and sub-units using bot scrappable open data. In government departments, when new positions or groups are created, the business unit would be required to inform all employees in that group (and all its cohorts and parent groups up to the first SES level) about the rationale for creating the position or group, source of funding, and goals for the new group or position. This will prevent new groups or positions being created without being much thought over long term needs, and also prevent groups just because funding is available or it fancies a particular person. This would, at least in a small way, insulate interference from elected leaders or lobby groups.<br>Policies and decisions made by such newly created groups can potentially become an impediment for other groups, they can become ill-managed and wasteful. Instead of a lean and efficient government, we could be left paying the salaries of a group for decades, this group being a hindrance, rather than help, to better governance. Keeping information free flowing and open will prevent frequent occurrences of such cases. Before the creation of such a group, data should be published in a form that can be scrapped by open-data bots and consolidated for public viewing. When there is a need to be become transparent, there will be caution | Open Data |
| 7.29 | Personal Data has value. By making it Open to the person the person can realise the value. What and how to make it open depends on context; as it does with all data.<br><br>Instead of thinking of Open Data we can think of Open Access in Context. Applications define context. Rather than think of opening data we can think of opening applications. With personal data we have the added complication of privacy. Allowing individuals to use approved applications to access personal data removes the privacy issue.<br><br>We can use the same approach for all data. That is, Open Data through Open Access in context | Open Data |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7.29.1 | Trial opening applications instead of opening data. Organizations holding data are responsible for the data. They can approve applications that access data.<br><br>To that end an ogpau action item could be:<br><br>Run one or more trials using open applications on personal data.<br><br>Reinvest part of the savings or income generated from the open applications to fund further trials. | Open Data |
| 7.30 | Summary of Open Data teleconference 30/3/16. Eight people attended this teleconference: Ash, Ken, Kevin, Linda, Tim, Mel, Rosie and I. We discussed the need for data standardisation, cultural change, greater transparency around data sets available, participation in the release / prioritisation process and accessibility of open data sets released across Australian States. Participants felt that the Federal Government should play a coordinating role and that cross-jurisdictions structures should be established and managed by Federal Government to coordinate this. There was mention of an Open Data Steering Committee and COAG. The group felt that engagement between those responsible for the release of data was as important as well as executive commitment, and the importance of cross-jurisdictional engagement from staff in similar agencies across was emphasised. A communication strategy and 'How to guide' was also suggested by participants as other ways this coordinating body might to make these processes, and data release across Australia more transparent, increase awareness of it's value and promote use. Amelia | Open Data |
| 7.31 | List of high value open data-sets. Perhaps I was not clear enough. The list of high value data-sets I suggested as a an OGP Commitment is not intended to be decided by government but by the public. | Open Data |
| 7.32 | While everything could be considered data, for most people data is different to publications or other kinds of resources. Its great and important to make more data available but other resources such as government reports and discussion papers, submissions, FOI type material, archival material etc are very badly managed and are highly likely to be overlooked if the theme is Open Data. Why wouldn't FOI be part of this theme? Is it because information is not considered data? It doesn't make sense to separate them. Moving away from a data only focus would also help to engage many people who aren't necessarily interested in data but do want better access and management of other types of Public sector information such as government publications and records of many kinds, both public and restricted.<br><br>If you did this then you can see we have a few main suggestions. If you look at the list below its basically:<br>1. discovery, access and management of data, including publication of specific, high value datasets<br>2. discover, access and management of government publications<br>3. Establish and enforce metadata standards for publishing data and publications<br>4. collation of data on government activities such as research projects, donations etc<br>plus if you take the ideas from FOI it covers<br>5. Greater support for FOI and the OAIC,<br>6. Copyright reform to introduce fair use or fair dealing type legislation<br><br>I'm not trying to reduce anyone's ideas here, just to show how data is related to and part of the wider government information ecosystem, including legislation, and it might be more productive to have an overall strategic approach to information, not just data. | Open Data |
| 7.32.1 | Amanda Yes "data" needs to be seen in the broader context of information. FOI reforms in 2010 included a small step in extending pro-active publication requirements. Data sets ( and format issues) should be subject to mandatory provisions of the FOI act not as now left to discretion. | Open Data |
| 7.33 | Assist the 500+ local councils that haven't yet published open data to do so: Do this in a standard way that helps people answer questions without knowing what jurisdiction they're in | Open Data |
| 7.33.1 | Part of this approach should include support for standardising how data is collected and published by local councils (or for a standardised subset of data collected alongside any jurisdiction-specific data), or providing mapping of council data to a common central standard with a data quality metric (such as the 5 star system) to allow effective comparison and aggregation of data across LGAs. This would also help address reuse as there is far more economic and social value (and hence incentive) in developing a service that is national than a service that is functional and accurate for only one LGA, or necessitates a great deal of data matching and cleaning at significant expense for 500+ datasets with slightly different collection and publishing standards.<br><br>I recognise that data standards are painful to negotiate and implement and often fall foul of specific interests, but if this process can be negotiated, the outcome provides broad and deep value and long-term savings. | Open Data |
| 7.33.2 | Another idea is, given that the majority of councils publish on data.gov.au, streamline the data publishing pipeline to make it easy to publish high quality data.<br><br>E.g.<br>- upload data<br>- nice UI to add contextual information about the data<br>- automatically infer a schema from the data<br>- optionally allow the user to refine the schema (e.g. a column identified as a string, could be a set of valid values. Let the users define these)<br>- check the data against the schema and report errors<br>- allow the user to fix errors or publish with data quality statement<br>- publish to CKAN<br><br>On the consumer-side, display the human-readable context, schema and data quality statements and make machine-readable versions available programmatically.<br><br>Many of the components to do this already exist as part of the Open Knowledge Frictionless Data project http://data.okfn.org/ | Open Data |
| 7.33.3 | Local Councils tend to collect and manage highly valuable local-centric data. In our experience gained working with private sector consumers of data, demand for local-centric data far outweighs supply. It is so important to help local government become gold star publishers through guides and tools which make it EASY. These suggestions are great. | Open Data |
| 7.34 | Release all data maintained by the Public Sector Mapping Authority as Open Data: Fund the PSMA to continue their good work but publish the data openly.<br><br>The Queensland and Federal Infrastructure Plans both identify data as a key enabler to get the most from our infrastructure investments. Releasing a national transportation network should be one of the first objectives. | Open Data |
| 7.34.1 | PSMA has released it's Admin Boundaries as open data - is this proposal still relevant or can it be redefined to more specific datasets? | Open Data |
| 7.34.2 | https://www.psma.com.au/products/transport-topography<br><br>https://www.psma.com.au/products/postcode-boundaries | Open Data |
| 7.35 | Bring the Open Data Monitor to Australia to help in the discovery and assessment of open data quality:<br>http://opendatamonitor.eu/<br>http://project.opendatamonitor.eu | Open Data |
| 7.35.1 | Perhaps a good commitment to be delivered in partnership with one or more civic societies. Government could fund, civic society could execute. | Open Data |
| 7.35.2 | Great suggestion Craig. The open data monitor is a collaboration between a number of organisations http://opendatamonitor.eu/frontend/web/index.php?r=site%2Fimprint<br><br>Perhaps the Open Data Institute and/or a University could run the project in Australia. | Open Data |
| 7.35.3 | The ODI would be happy to Stephen. | Open Data |
| 7.36 | Adopt Open Data Certificates to demonstrate publisher best practice, so open data can be used with confidence:<br>https://certificates.theodi.org/en/<br><br>ODI Queensland are localising Open Data Certificates for Australia http://queensland.theodi.org/home/projects/odc/ | Open Data |
| 7.36.1 | Open data certificates are all about building and promoting trust and confidence in using data. This is critical in order to address one of open data's biggest challenges: USABILITY of open or shared data. We are hoping to complete our localisation work in the next few months as we finalise and eliminate as much complexity as possible via the 'help guides'. It would be great to see these applied across all open data portals in all Australian jurisdictions. | Open Data |
| 7.37 | The internet of things is coming and Australia's open data platforms aren't ready. They generally publish snapshots of databases and present them as CSV files.<br><br>Prepare a strategy and reference implementation for how all levels of government can collectively publish sensor data and it be easily joined together and interoperate to solve real-world problems. | Open Data |
| 7.37.1 | An API-based approach would be valuable for this - perhaps building on the work done at the DTO pre-November 2015 that I'm not sure has been pursued as vigorously in the last few months. | Open Data |
| 7.37.2 | Some good work being dome in this space by GOV.UK<br>https://gds.blog.gov.uk/2016/03/11/getting-from-data-to-registers/ | Open Data |
| 7.38 | Publish machine-readable metadata with your open data. Make open data easy to process and understand. Adopt a standard such as:<br>- CSV for the Web by W3C https://www.w3.org/TR/2016/NOTE-tabular-data-primer-20160225/<br>- Data Packages by Open Knowledge http://data.okfn.org<br><br>to describe the most common open data format Comma Separated Value (CSV) files | Open Data |
| 7.39 | Data is well covered by comments- but the use of it is not. Require models used on Open Gov data, and results of the analyses done, be made cc0 and visible: Require models and analyses done on Open Gov Data be fed back to open gov repositories and the models themselves be declared cc0...and available | Open Data |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7.40 | Proposal: Streamline government IT purchasing practices to understand, then capitalise upon the opportunities of open technologies: open source, open data, open standards, open architectures.<br><br>Government IT investment would benefit greatly from increased adoption of open technologies, however government purchasing practices inadvertently favour proprietary, vendor lock-in strategies over open business models. A paper should be written exploring the fundamentals behind this dilemma, leading to changes in purchasing practices, and the provision of purchasing guidelines for assessing the difference between different open products, and comparing the value of open and proprietary business strategies. | Open Data |
| 7.5 | Identify a process for Government agencies to share what data sources they are working on so as to avoid duplication but also to share costs in developing data<br>Public Service Delivery - how Government works with other agencies, the community and industry, how citizens find services Again, the USA have established a Digital Strategythat requires all Federal Government Agencies to identify what they are doing to provide open data (https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/egov/digital-government/digital-government.html#milestone-1-1) and although this has been enforced within the Federal Government, local American state governments are also using the strategy to guide the their digital strategy work (I worked on one for dc.gov but there was no facility to share with other state governments), there was no facility to publish along with the Federal agencies to allow sharing and understanding between all levels of government.Australia could benefit from ensuring whatever the NAP involves that all state and territory governments also participate and that there is a way to ensure a sharing of knowledge, skills and costs.<br><br>An example of where data projects can be shared is in the mapping space; there are various other government departments who are working on mapping solutions and who are making great headway in the UX and access of data particularly in the mobile space and this could be where the National Map and other government departments should pool resources to provide improved mapping facilities (including the data they are gathering and providing) but having some standards and guides in place for mapping usability and accessibility. | Open Data |
| 7.6 | Reporting of data and information<br><br>With the establishment of the Public Management Reform Agenda (PMRA) there will be a change in how information is reported by government departments and agencies, the old structure of an annual report will be replaced by information that is more useful for the public (and more user friendly to read and understand) – data will play a big part in this change of reporting – it will especially be important for making graphical and interactive content to match the strategic goals and objectives of an organisation – it will also need to be updated more regularly and the reporting mechanism will be fluid – data will be used to help not only inform but also highlight important information usually lost in content of a report. | Open Data |
| 7.7 | National Metadata Standards<br>- Description: Development and adoption by all Australian government jurisdictions (and local governments) of national metadata standards for key open data categories and spatial data sets to ensure national consistency in publication and improved accessibility and use for data end users and the public. A key objective should be to enable greater transparency and comparability of public administration services across the nation. | Open Data |
| 7.8 | Identify ways to manage and view sensitive data – not just for security reasons but for a person's privacy<br><br>There is comment by Amanda Lawrence posted on the Open Data theme: This theme should be Open Access to Information - or something similar - not 'open data'. Specifically her item no. 4:collation of data on government activities such as research projects, donations etc<br><br>There will need to be guidance and standards around access of data where the research projects can identify individuals, who, how and where this data is available will need to be considered carefully (we have been doing some work recently with a research institute in NSW and the data and statistics they have available could identify individuals if not managed with clear security access measures)<br><br>The USA have identified this in their plan and are looking to "Streamline the Declassification Process", the Australian NAP will also need to consider this aspect to ensure national security and privacy issues are not compromised. | Open Data |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8.1 | as well as involving community, there is a wealth of expertise within private-sector that can be brought to government projects - whether they're at idea or funded stage | Public Participation |
| 8.2 | Establish a public engagement and collaborative approach to the development, implementation and monitoring of all major public policies. Establish an education program to support and upskill citizens to better engage with government. | Public Participation |
| 8.2.1 | Determine requirements for engagement based on IAP2 standards not a single standard across all public policy processes. Response to suggested action from participants in IAP2 P2 for OGPAU teleconference 21/3/16 | Public Participation |
| 8.2.2 | o Like to see a step back to ensuring that the community can be well informed<br>o Careful with over-engaging, as this will 'cheapen' the process of engagement<br>o That 'sensible' costing of these actions is considered<br>Response to suggested actions from participants at the Ark Community Engagement Conference 22/3/16 | Public Participation |
| 8.3 | Improve the democratisation of public problem solving and government's capability to engage citizens and organisations in addressing social and governance channges by implementing a whole-of-government challenge platform with agency training and support methods in order to support government agencies to put out both 'grand challenges' for the design/conceptualisation of solutions to large problems (ie the design of Canberra and the Opera House) and for small challenges (ie the design of tools and messages to promote healthy eating by children). This could be strongly based on the US model (www.challenge.gov).<br>Proposed by Craig Thomler | Public Participation |
| 8.3.1 | My intent with this suggestion was to support how government raises, manages and sources potential solutions for policy challenges with the public, rather than on the side of opening government to citizen-led engagement.<br><br>As such while a challenge platform could eventually allow for citizen-led challenges, the intent is to provide an alternative and broader approach for agencies which buttresses some of the flaws in procurement processes by providing a mechanism to engage on smaller challenges, in non-monetary ways and to attract broader responses and ideas from the community than is possible in a procurement approach (which only reaches a small subset of entities with potential solutions).<br><br>Extending a challenge platform to citizen/industry initiated challenges would be a (distant) future stage, or better managed through a different process (per the NSW & Vic government approaches or a petition-based approach). | Public Participation |
| 8.3.2 | "Establish an open and transparent process to encourage unsolicited proposals from the public, business and industry. This would enable all levels of business to contribute not only ideas but infrastructure, services, and alternative business models to support the delivery of public services and infrastructure." leads to 'all lobbying (unsolicited proposals) be required to go through an open and transparent process, easily accessible by all'. | Public Participation |
| 8.3.3 | Yes: 'all lobbying (unsolicited proposals) must be required to go through an open and transparent process, easily accessible by all' | Public Participation |
| 8.4 | In support of more direct democracy and broadening the role of citizens in governance outside of the electoral cycle, introduce a capability for citizens to introduce legislation into parliament for debate and a vote, borrowing from the models introduced successfully by Estonia and Sweden. This would involve a series of gates that a piece of prospective legislation would have to meet before being submitted to parliament, including receiving initial support (X supporters online), being framed as legislation (through the support of a volunteer/part-funded legal capability), being modelled (with the support of the affected portfolio agencies) and then receiving a level of community support that indicates a significant desire for the legislation (X supporters online). When it goes to parliament for debate and voting, the votes for, against and abstentions should all be captured and reported with the legislation for transparency reasons. | Public Participation |
| 8.4.1 | There could be a commitment to trial this with a small number of Bills and review within the first National Action Plan period. | Public Participation |
| 8.4.2 | How about making sure that people can participate with the open system we have- local MPs, the political system? Response to suggested actions from participants at the Ark Community Engagement Conference 22/3/16 | Public Participation |
| 8.5 | Commit to a six or eight week public exposure period for all laws before they are voted on by parliament, with a capability for individuals and groups to propose amendments and identify issues with potential laws before they are put into practice. Ensure that the exposure occurs in a public manner, potentially with the capability for individuals and organisations to register for alerts by topic for laws that impact on their lives and activities. Create a review and response mechanism that ensures that all considerations raised are addressed publicly in plain english such that the rationale behind the purpose and specific wording of each law are clear to the people that it is to be enforced on. Currently the exposure period is quite short and is not well promoted, thus often laws are passed with little scrutiny and with significant drafting flaws, which are only identified in later implementation and must be amended over time. The process above would significantly reduce the error rate in legislation and add an extra consultation step for addressing specific aspects of laws that have not been fully considered in relation to the citizens and organisations affected. | Public Participation |
| 8.5.1 | This needs to be supported by a default requirement for consideration of each Bill by a parliamentary committee which invites submissions and holds public hearings, as happens in New Zealand and many other parliaments. | Public Participation |
| 8.5.2 | Appropriate period of time should be determined by level of impact. Base standards on the IAP2 standard and core values - including quality assurance standards and timeframes. Formal guidance for Federal Government agencies may need to be developed. Response to suggested action from participants in IAP2 P2 for OGPAU teleconference 21/3/16 | Public Participation |
| 8.5.3 | o All laws could be impractical, perhaps a focus on areas of public interest<br>o Conversation around 'what do we want to be engaged on?' e.g. should we be leaving policy around nutrition and food to the experts to legislate, or do we include the community in something they don't necessarily have expertise in it<br>o More thought around timeframe- flexibility.<br>o Matrix- pt system. Determine point system to create time weighting<br>Response to suggested actions from participants at the Ark Community Engagement Conference 22/3/16 | Public Participation |
| 8.5.4 | o Important to seek views of the wider community. Give equal weighting to community views? What happens with vocal groups that may be the minority gets heard without the consideration of other non-vocal groups<br>o Mechanism to provide access to information on policy consent<br>Response to suggested actions from participants at the Ark Community Engagement Conference 22/3/16 | Public Participation |
| 8.6 | To mitigate the current state where agencies all consult citizens to different degrees and via widely different methods, develop whole of government guidance and consultation capabilities that focuses on evidence-based policy development over Ministerial fiat. Currently some agencies employ advanced online consultation tools and/or wide-reaching community engagement, while others employ very basic and opaque techniques, often with consultation methods selected and funded on a project by project basis with wildly different approaches and techniques for engagement even when similar topics are being considered. A central capability with clear and public guidance on how and when agencies must engage the public and stakeholders would remove a great deal of the ability for departments or Ministers to rule by fiat, with limited or 'hidden' consultation (such as burying a white paper deep in a website, or holding consultation events with a specific limited set of stakeholders unknownst to the broader community affected by policy changes). This should include a central register of all government public consultations, including mechanisms for people and organisations to register for alerts for consultations touching on their areas of interest. This approach would help normalise the consultation process for citizens, who would be able to easily discover consultations on topics of interest to them from different agencies through a central location, would be able to respond to consultations in a more standardised and user-friendly way, and would provide support for a broader range of consultation approaches for smaller agencies that otherwise cannot afford to employ techniques which may be more effective than those they currently use. The likely end solution would integrate technologies from different consultation providers, as well as custom functionality (which may be paid for by a group of agencies to share costs) as well as consultation support and training services to ensure that consultations are designed and executed to deliver effective outcomes. Note that I have witnessed a number of 'wasted' consultations where the process, response mechanism, or framing approach resulted in limited usable responses - a waste of public money and potentially politically dangerous where the government receives an inaccurate picture of community views - addressing this area in the manner outlined would significantly reduce this waste and likely reduce the overall cost of consultation across the entire government. Proposed by | Public Participation |
| 8.6.1 | Base standards on the IAP2 standard and core values - including quality assurance standards and timeframes<br>Formal guidance for Federal Government agencies may need to be developed<br>IAP2 code of ethics - transparency of release really important<br>Register for alerts - and notify of opportunities<br>Should it be a whole of Government approach- State and Local included as well?<br>Not one size fits all - enable space for agencies to pick tools and approaches.<br>Adopt the National General Assembly of LG - 7 core values of public participation, request Australian Government demonstrate these<br>Lift actions to be more general values based<br>Clarity around terminology - working group<br>Working group - key people in each Government agency<br>IAP2 to make a submission<br>PM&C Director of engagement should lead<br>Response to suggested action from participants in IAP2 P2 for OGPAU teleconference 21/3/16<br>Should trial new approaches on pilot projects | Public Participation |
| 8.6.2 | o Centralised access to information i.e. what are all the projects happening in my area<br>o To ensure accessibility through a limited range of platforms/channels (with online and offline)<br>Response to suggested actions from participants at the Ark Community Engagement Conference 22/3/16 | Public Participation |
| 8.6.3 | That recognises that diverse publics require different approaches and consideration to support participation, and us underpinned by human rights / social justice principles.<br><br>Principles:<br>• Keep it real, lean and nimble<br>• What we are learning<br>• How can we improve<br>• Are we maintaining our purpose and first principles<br>Response to suggested actions from participants in Engage2Act unconference on 23/3/16 | Public Participation |

| 8.7 | This looks like a good consultation process Pia and Co. It is clear what will happen next and how we might get involved, it's been well promoted (but I am actively tuned in), there is sufficient time for those interested to consider information presented, there are multiple methods (and points in the process) to provide input and for Gov to consolidate, respond to and consider it. I hope we will also see good use of citizen engagement, technology and data to understand social issues / community needs and refining service delivery; and support the potential in our community to manage public resources. I would also like to see public participation in the way we deliver, report and monitor delivery of this National Action Plan – not just public reporting. | Public Participation |
|---|---|---|
| 8.8 | D. Public Participation<br><br>There are already some ways citizens can contribute to the democratic process.For example, there are opportunities for public participation in some reviews, audits and parliamentary inquiries. This could easily be expanded.<br><br>Actionable 1:Form a working group to discuss areas in which it would be possible to involve public participation in policy formulation to build upon those already available.This could be facilitated by opportunities to submit ideas regarding how technology might assist in increasing public participation as well as any risk management aspects. | Public Participation |
| 8.9 | Open Source Package for Consultation and Collaboration. There are many open source apps that can be used for both engagement and collaboration. The quality, interoperability and ease of installation in this area has gone up dramatically. Australia could lead the way by creating a special, open source technology package that makes deploying and customising these apps far more accessible to government IT departments. Interoperability with proprietary tools would also be possible. This would allow innovative engagement and collaboration projects to get off the ground more quickly for less money, with more connectivity between projects.<br><br>This approach solves three critical challenges in the use of online for citizen engagement:<br><br>1. Duplication: Government spends too much time procuring and setting up online engagements, and not enough time making them succeed<br>2. Dissipation: Government is forced to rebuild their audience for each new consultation, rather than maintaining a base ready-to-engage citizens who can be proactively invited<br>3. Fragmentation: Insights from each consultation are stored separately in different data formats, preventing the government from discovering trends and insights from across all consultations<br><br>To support this outcome, we propose foregrounding the principles of open innovation and genuine collaboration, to allow the Government to continuously improve the platform by:<br><br>- Accessing the full range of the nation's digital innovation talent base, both within and outside government<br>- Partnering with other governments, both domestically and globally, to add value to the system<br><br>Further, we recommend a "community source" solution that uses open source software best practice, supported by strong collaborative governance to decide the content of the codebase and the software roadmap. We also recommend use of standard software frameworks such as Ruby on Rails and Django (Python), as well as open data standards, to ensure that all components of the system are developed in a way that is accessible to a range of providers and participants across the nation. Benefits of this approach include:<br><br>- Avoiding license fees and pay-per-user models that make the system prohibitively expensive as soon as you are successful (ie at large, national scales)<br>- Future-proofing the system to enable integration of other open source and proprietary engagement solutions | Public Participation |
| 8.10 | People's Food Policy Process for Australia: Since the food system is foundational to all life, and existing and future wellbeing and sustainability, it is imperative that the voices of as many Australians as possible should be heard in developing a coherent, long-term, fair and sustainable food policy for Australia.<br><br>This links very clearly to the pillar of citizen participation, leading in turn to more responsive, innovative and effective governance. Similarly the development of an authentically participatory process links directly to the two grand challenges prioritised by the Australian government, i.e. 1) "Improving Public Services" - especially health, education, and water - by fostering public service improvement or private sector innovation; 2) "More Effectively Managing Public Resources" includes measures that address budgets, procurement, natural resources and foreign assistance.<br><br>An excellent model for a participatory process of engaging with large numbers of citizens in the development of a national food policy is the People's Food Policy Project of Canada, which produced the ground-breaking report: "Resetting the Table": http://foodsecurecanada.org/people-food-policy. This was adapted at a smaller scale in Australia in 2012-3 by the Australian Food Sovereignty Alliance with the development of the People's Food Plan for Australia: http://www.australianfoodsovereigntyalliance.org/peoples-food-plan/. Earlier participatory policy development processes that had significant and important outcomes, as well as very well-regarded and transparent processes, were the Purple Sage project - https://vwt.org.au/1998/11/purple-sage/ - and the WaterMark project - https://vwt.org.au/2007/11/water-mark/ - both led by the Victorian Women's Trust.<br><br>As a first step, I would encourage the Australian government to endorse the Urban and Regional Food Declaration, which has been developed by Sustain: The Australian Food Network (www.circlesoffood.org) and can be read here: http://www.circlesoffood.org/urban-and-regional-food-declaration/. The Declaration has been endorsed by the City of Melbourne, Mornington Peninsula Shire Council, the City of Ballarat and the City of Greater Geelong, as well as numerous other institutions and organisations. | Public Participation |
| 8.11 | Public participation principles: Public participation in government needs clear definition of what 'government' is. The Parliament and executive government have been elected to act on behalf the people – they need to be kept accountable and responsible for their decisions. The administrative arm of government is usually tasked with the research (including community consultation and engagement), development (including co-design and collaboration) and implementation of policies, services, programs, etc.<br><br>Public Participation in each of these two 'government' arenas should not have a blanket approach applied.<br><br>We need to be sure the differences are articulated and then a set of principles is developed to be applied to each. These principles should include, at the core, a commitment to open government and public participation and should be underpinned by a diversity, inclusion and human rights framework. | Public Participation |
| 8.12 | A Facebook for Public Participation: Digital platforms have made real time data a reality for many spheres of life but has yet to find its way into public participation in government, policy and feedback. Rather than invest in yet more out dated surveying approaches and technologies, we could bring real time data and feedback into selected areas of government. Just imagine if this Wiki was data powered and visualised, we wouldn't just know that there were 67 comments, we would have breakdowns of those comments by theme and topic or wordcloud, we could get a sense of the breadth of participation by location, electorate, demographics etc.<br><br>Examples could include using real time data and dashboards to report on:<br>Management of public resources (budget vs actual)<br>Public service improvement<br>Indicators of private sector innovation.<br><br>In terms of actions:<br>1. Narrowly pinpoint a problem worth solving (eg measure the outcomes - not outputs - of the federal Innovation Statement in terms of fostering private sector innovation)<br>2. Identify the owner (ie Christopher Pyne)<br>3. Formulate this as a challenge for the upcoming GovHack event<br>4. Collaboratively define success indicators and measures (startups AND corporates)<br>5. Fund/support incubation of an MVP to beta stage. | Public Participation |

| 8.13 | Public Advisory Panel: Public participation in government should be in public hands.<br>There should be a peak public organization – called, say, Public Advisory Council (PAC) - which:<br>• monitors government activities<br>• maintains a data base of public organizations and individuals with interests in particular issues<br>• assesses which government activities appear to require public participation<br>• determines the nature and extent of the participation needed<br>• advises interested public organizations and individuals about the requirement<br>• assists organization and individuals in preparing material and participating, particularly those with limited resources<br>• collects, collates and analyzes material from them<br>• also, of its own volition, collects, collates and analyzes material including by professionally conducted, reliable and valid quantitative and qualitative surveys (as advocated by Bob Douglas in his suggestion)<br>   with the use of unprofessional surveys, as currently are prolific and which misrepresent public opinion, being proscribed<br>• prepares and makes submissions based on that information<br>• prosecutes the public case with government, opposition and cross-bench Members of Parliament.<br>The system would not preclude interested organizations and individuals from making their own submissions and representations. The PAC could also act unilaterally if it identified an activity in which no known public organizations or individuals had an interest.<br>Advantages would include:<br>• the potential for a single, powerful submission embracing a wide-range of public opinion, simplifying the task of government.<br>• resourced-starved Opposition and cross-bench MPs would receive the same powerful submission rather than a collection of submissions with which they have to deal.<br>• (One of the first issues the PAC should deal with would be the lack of resources available to Opposition and cross-bench MPs – democracy would be enhanced if they were to have far greater resources)<br>• most importantly, public participation would be controlled by a public organization, devoid of government involvement<br>This would be a major organization which would be:<br>• financed by government using a fixed formula which guarantees minimum funds<br>• staffed by a highly-qualified meritocracy of personnel from a multiplicity of disciplines<br>• have a structure which would enable it to cover all government activities e.g. it could have as many advisory panels as there are ministerial portfolios.<br>This suggestion arises from a decade of individual advocacy for greater public/client involvement and benefits in legal regulation, stemming from being a victim of a major fraud in an Adelaide law firm's trust accounts.<br>The fraud exposed the near-monopoly in the development and administration of legal regulatory systems (they are state and territory responsibilities). | Public Participation |
|---|---|---|
| 8.13.1 | I firmly support this proposal. I have previously published a proposal for a Public Interest Council which, I would argue should have at least similar if not superior standing to The Committee for Economic Development of Australia (CEDA) .The paper is available as the closing essay in a volume published by Australia21 about public Interest .http://www.australia21.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/ATT00055.pdf. | Public Participation |
| 8.14 | All government engagement feedback should be kept in an accessible permanent archive. All comments collected from government engagement processes could then be accessed in the future becoming a record of the methodology, level of engagement and the nature of the dialogue. This would become a ongoing testament to the progress of public participation in Australia as well as a useful archive of comments on important issues through history. | Public Participation |
| 8.15 | All government agencies across all levels should be able to run their own engagement programs, using their own methods, with their own tools, in their own time. This means providing guidance, principles and support to government rather than rules and regulations (beyond jointly agreed minimum standards). | Public Participation |
| 8.16 | As per my comment on the Engagement theme, it is vital that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and organisation are engaged through all stages of the process. There are numerous issues and concerns about the large amount of data collected by various government departments and who owns the data. There has also been concerns about how data has been used against us in the past.<br><br>There should be a seperate engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and organisations to give adequate consideration to our issues and concerns. | Public Participation |
| 8.16.1 | The key to good engagement is to involve those affected in the development and design of the engagement process. For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people from a Non English Speaking Background, people with intellectual or physical disabilities, children, youth, seniors and other people - all should have the opportunity for input into the engagement process for whatever the project or activity may be. | Public Participation |
| 8.16.2 | Posting a couple of relevant documents to this for future reference:<br><br>Engagement with Indigenous communities in key sectors, Resource sheet no. 23 produced for the Closing the Gap Clearinghouse<br>http://www.aihw.gov.au/uploadedFiles/ClosingTheGap/Content/Publications/2013/ctgc-rs23.pdf<br><br><br>Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2014. Developing the National Early Childhood<br>Development Researchable Data Set. Cat. no. PHE 179. Canberra: AIHW.<br>http://www.aihw.gov.au/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=60129549617 | Public Participation |
| 8.17 | Statistical publications are the bedrock of evidence based policy. Public participation in the commission and classification of these publications is needed to make data collection legitimate and to make the statistics more informative and consensual.<br><br>Deliverables:<br>Contracting: To create a fund and trial participatory budgeting of representative surveys and statistical reports on social groups that petition for this information..<br>Creating:To hold randomly selected juries to decide upon issues in the australian standard classifications of census groups. For example, the Australian Standard Classification of Religious Groups.<br>Publishing: To provide and monitor discussion fora on each of the method papers, classification descriptions, and statistical reports that are on the australian bureau of statistics website.<br>Publishing:To provide information on how and why the report was commissioned whether it was for operational purposes, in response to a department, minister or parliamentarian, or whether it was part of the participatory budgeting process requested by citizens. | Public Participation |
| 8.18 | I recently read the unflinching external review report on the DTO's Gov.au "alpha" release [www.dto.gov.au/standard/assessments/gov-au-alpha/] and it made me wonder what would happen if we applied the discipline and structure of good digital asset design - in this case, rebuilding the federal government's web front end - to the business of policy making.<br><br>The question forms part of a longer standing speculation about the relative lack of progress we've witnessed in the application of the tools, culture and practice of "digital transformation", which have mostly been used in a service delivery context, to the way we conceive of, and execute, the policy process.<br><br>By and large, the deeper reaches of the policy world have been relatively "transformation free", at least in the sense we've witnessed how the mantra of digital disruption has upset many of the instincts and habits of work in other part of the public sector. That has been the result, I think of a mix of pragmatism (start at the relatively easy end of the spectrum with service delivery) and more or less stout resistance from those anxious, for a whole range of reasons, to preserve and entrench the inviolability, and even elements of the mystery of their work.<br><br>What struck me about the external review report, written by reviewers from the UK's Government Digital Service (on which the Australia DTO has been closely and deliberately modelled), is the combination of three factors which framed the task of designing and implementing a digital service or asset.<br><br>The first factor is an agreed, accessible and authoritative basis of design 'rules' and principles that define the context and process of design, build and implementation; in this case, the whole process is governed by the DTO's design rules.<br>The Digital Service Standard [www.dto.gov.au/standard] consists of 14 principles or criteria against which all digital design and delivery should be judged. Their purpose is simple:<br>The Digital Service Standard establishes the criteria that Australian Government digital services must meet to ensure our services are simpler, faster and easier to use. Meeting the criteria means we can consistently provide high quality services and satisfy our users' needs.<br>Some of the criteria include "understand user needs", "...use an agile and user-centred approach," "measure user satisfaction and... measure and report other metrics publicly" and "make sure the service is simple enough that users success first time unaided."<br><br>The second factor is an open process of external review designed to hold the people doing the actual work to account. But, although the approach can be tough and uncompromising, it doesn't appear to be undertaken in a traditional "audit" mode which | Public Participation |
| 8.18.1 | Now That's a Grand Challenge and a half, one that requires a big shift in culture which at present prefers closed rather than open processes.<br><br>Peter Shergold's recent report wants stronger protections for public service thinking, John Lloyd describes FOI as "very pernicious' and John Fraser said the important stuff doesn't get written down these days. Such a culture change needs constant leadership from the top and reinstatement and funding support for the watchdog and advocate of open government, the Office of Australian Information Commissioner, an office the government still maintains should be abolished despite the fact a majority in the Senate opposes the necessary legislation to achieve this. | Public Participation |

| 8.19 | Provide a way for citizens to easily engage electronically with government agencies. To engage with citizens government agencies needs ways to know who they are talking to. Another way of expressing it is that citizens need ways to tell agencies who they are.<br>There are two general approaches to identification. One approach is the single identity approach. This is often called single signon.<br><br>The alternative approach is to take advantage of existing identity systems. This approach gives citizens ways to link their existing identities. Using this approach a citizen can identify themselves to an agency. Once identified with one agency the citizen can reuse their identity with other agencies.<br><br>This approach leaves data in data silos. It protects data through the use of approved applications. It provides a private secure identity system. It requires no new legislation or regulations. It is low cost. The system is agnostic to who owns the data silos. This means it integrates with civil society and with private industry identity systems.<br><br>An action item for OGPau is to.<br><br>Trial a system where citizens have access to information about themselves in existing systems. Citizens verify their identities each time they engage with an agency. A citizen's online identity is the combination of all existing identities.<br><br>(note privacy principle 12.4b states that an organization holding data about a person should: "give access to the information in the manner requested by the individual, if it is reasonable and practicable to do so".)<br><br>Once a person has a connection with two agencies the person can copy data from one agency to the other. The trial system will do this for any task requiring the reuse of personal information. There are hundreds of potential trial situations.<br><br>The savings generated from the first implementations can fund implementations for other applications. The government will only need to seed fund the first application.<br><br>Advertise to agencies whether they would like to participate in an innovation trial on sharing personal data across agencies. | Public Participation |
|---|---|---|
| 8.19.1 | An alternative to this action item that achieves the same purpose.<br><br>For Open Government to work we need citizen engagement. The mechanics of engagement matters. Personal data in government systems are in self contained data silos. Taxation data is separate from Health data which is separate from Law Enforcement etc. For a meaningful engagement with citizens it is important to maintain these silos.<br><br>The Australia Card and other national id proposals were attempts to link data silos. The reasons to do this were claims of efficiency of administration. But, when we hard link personal data silos the efficiencies prove to be imaginary. This happens because the functions performed within the data silos interact. These interactions make it difficult for each individual system to change and adapt. The interactions increase costs that soon overwhelm any savings.<br><br>In Australia the latest attempts to integrate data silos are mygov and ehealth. Both have proved to be expensive and have increased costs. This has happened because both use the same identity across personal data silos. This creates a hard link across silos. A hard link is when something about a person changes in one silo it changes in the other silo.<br><br>Both mygov and ehealth are being overhauled. These attempts will have limited success. The reason is that the overhauls continue to use a common identity.<br><br>The alternative to using a common identity is to continue to use different identities for different data silos. To communicate across silos we link common data across data silos. But we do it without using a common identity. This is a weak link because changing data in one silo may not change it in other silos.<br><br>Open Government initiatives will fail if citizen engagement uses one identity for all engagement. The Open Government movement should use different identities for different engagements. It is important to maintain personal data silos for different government services.<br><br>A possible action item for Open Government is.<br><br>Open Government engagement uses different personal identities for different types of engagement. | Public Participation |
| 8.20 | In the book Bringing Citizens Voices to the Table by Carolyn Lukensmeyer she says that:<br>"This book has a very specific objective: to see our nation's practice of democracy reflect the aspirations for self-governance that were embedded in our founding documents; to actually be a governing system "of the people, by the people, for the people."We must have systems and mechanisms in place to achieve that goal. So, as we call on citizens, decision makers, and our federal government to adopt new citizen engagement practices, we must simultaneously commit to building the infrastructure that will support those efforts. Together, new practices and underlying supports can generate a strong, reinforcing pattern of authentic democratic behavior. " Carolyn's book outlines seven requirements:<br>A legislative mandate for participation<br>Safe, accessible physical spaces<br>Broader access to technology<br>A facilitation infrastructure<br>An organizational infrastructure<br>A trustworthy, fact-based media<br>Robust civic education<br>Perhaps we need to consider what this infrastructure looks like now, identify where is already exists and then build on this as part of a National Action Plan | Public Participation |
| 8.21 | An easy way to find and read summaries of Agreements made by the Australian Government with major global institutions (e.g., the United Nations). In each agreement summary a clear statement in the Introduction that outlines which Government policy/ies, department/s or authority/ies are responsible for its application and ways citizens can to access the original and complete Agreement.<br><br>To expand awareness and use of such valuable information by Community groups, Local, State and Federal Governments and the Private sector. A seven step process can begin:<br>-Update/Introduce Government, community and private sector leaders to the Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Multi-stakeholder partnership process https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdinaction<br>-Announce who is the Australian representative at the next UN High-level Political Forum of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, 11 - 20 July 2016, New York and provide a Briefing package to civil society organisations, the media, the private sector and government institutions, e.g., https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/majorgroups/national-capacity-building<br>see Preparing for action: Post-2015 national briefing package and Preparing for Action: Post-2015 National Briefings Explanatory Note<br>-Provide Local Government Libraries easy access to the SDGs promotion resources<br>https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdinaction/publications<br>https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdinaction/meetings<br>- Notifying (regularly - twice a year) all Regional Development groups with updates on ways to take actions, and case studies of best practice, to meet the SDGs<br>https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdinaction/documents<br>- Introduce Business and Community Awards for progressing SDGs and achieving innovative outcomes<br>- Integrate via the Open Government Partnership infrastructure the Australian activities related to SDGs and six monthly reports on policy/ies, department/s or authority/ies actions to reach SDG goals. Thes Activities and Actions are reported to Australian local communities, the United Nations and Federal Parliament annually.<br><br>A current and important example<br>World leaders on 25 September 2015 at the United Nations, adopted the Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1), which includes a set of 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to end poverty, fight inequality and injustice, and tackle climate change by 2030. The SDGs enable integration of multiple previous Agreements regarding People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace and Partnerships (https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs). There is a vast resource of evidence-based methods to achieve SDGs available through the United Nations (https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/capacity-building) and examples of Government bodies incorporating the SDGs in | Public Participation |
| 8.21.1 | How could this action add to the Australian Treaties Library website? | Public Participation |

| 8.22 | Management of data collected though engagement - 'invited data': Establish systems, protocols and procedures to ensure that data collected through citizen, community and stakeholder engagement can be shared across agencies while ensuring privacy is retained.<br><br>Having a centralised system to track and coordinate engagement activities and enable the sharing of data collected across agencies and projects will also make the time and money invested into participation in engagement more efficient for both stakeholders and government. It will enable greater coordination when addressing social issues, measure and monitoring social impacts and outcomes, and refine services and programs.<br><br>These systems and processes need to be designed with respect to privacy, enabling consent and self-service and by segregating data and user access, but they are essential if we want to build on existing data, understand trade offs and impacts, and work together more effectively to address complex problems. They enable participation beyond consultation and are necessary for collaboration - across agencies and with parties outside of Government.<br><br>Systems implemented will need to enable the analysis and reporting of both qualitative and quantitative data, AND support communications and the management of relationships generated through engagement. Agencies will need to work together to determine appropriate reporting metrics, taxonomies and user access. | Public Participation |
|---|---|---|
| 8.23 | A three yearly, publicly commissioned and funded, statistically valid random survey of voters in every electorate, to assess satisfaction and experience of open democracy and identify concerns. Currently, the polling of the Australian population about their concerns and aspirations is undertaken by political parties, media groups and those with a particular axe to grind. Many of us have our own view about why the Australian electorate is currently disenchanted with our democracy but we lack the essential data, based on neutrally funded and neutrally conducted, comprehensive, systematic surveys.<br><br>I propose that the Commonwealth Electoral Commission, should, every three years, commission a statistically valid random sample of voters from each Australian electorate to be interviewed using an interview schedule, which asks open questions about general life satisfaction, work/life balance, childcare, employment opportunities, education opportunities, health care experience, political representation, views on the environment, defence policy and spending, levels of taxation, housing opportunities, transport infrastructure, community engagement, sense of security, the role of government and the private sector and the basic assumptions underpinning the operation of the economy.<br><br>The results of this survey should be made available to every voter, in the period that precedes the subsequent federal election. We all accept our responsibility to be counted in the census. I suspect that most Australians would similarly welcome the possibility of providing their views in this way as their contribution to open government. | Public Participation |
| 8.23.1 | I wanted to say how much I like this idea proposed by Bob Douglas. Given that it is coming up to Census season, the idea that rather than treat Australians as passive recipients of policies derived from a mandatory survey like the Census (the design of which it would appear Australians have very little say), an alternative/complimentary survey that actually asks Australians what they want and are concerned about seems more in line with policy co-creation and principles of the OGP. | Public Participation |
| 8.24 | Public Participation around complex subjects: There has been good progress in bi-directional communication between citizens and government. There are now excellent tools to run YES/NO polls past many people to gauge community sentiment. A challenge worth tackling is how to enable public debate and evidence based decisions on complex topics - such as Climate Change. Complex systems require significant time to understand, which makes them susceptible to misdirected influence from vested interest groups. Questions to consider:<br>Who will fund "trusted experts" to research and advise on complex issues so they can make informed decisions?<br>How can a community vote on complex subjects?<br>How do you address the signal-to-noise ratio within community discussions?<br><br>More discussion here: http://cameronshorter.blogspot.com.au/2016/03/open-government-lessons-from-open.html | Public Participation |
| 8.25 | Always-on community listening: Initiate an always-on program of listening to the community, using both digital and face to face methods of community listening and engagement. E.g. Using social media monitoring and other analytics tools, map key concerns and pain points of community members to geographic data; use this data to underpin ongoing conversations and workshops with local communities that are focused on their needs and concerns first, not the priorities of policy-makers. | Public Participation |
| 8.26 | Enable full and equitable participation in new policies and programs. This could be achieved by bringing together broad and diverse groups from across civil society to form a panel whose remit was to interpret, evaluate, and in some cases paraphrase new policies and programs. Thereby enabling deeper understanding and broader civic engagement across the community. This would result in the Australian public being better placed to make important decisions around the policies and programs that affect them. | Public Participation |
| 8.27 | Summary of public participation teleconference 30/3/16. Nine people attended: Alvaro, Leanne, Ken, Bob, Ash, Marcus, Kevin, Rosie and I. Bob spoke to his suggestion of a national survey and at the start of the call the group touched on the differences between actions suggested and participatory, representative and deliberative methods to engage / increase participation. This group felt that before talking about methods and suggested actions, the Federal Government should declare a commitment to increase public participation and define principles that could be applied / demonstrated by agencies. They worked together to shape up this commitment statement: "We value the wisdom of members of our community and will create diverse opportunities for them to work on issues that affect our communities." When shaping up this statement the group briefly spoke about culture, public servants as citizens, that not all residents are citizens, and that public participation should be then having a say. Potential lead agencies discussed included the DTO, PM&C, Public Service Commission and the role of the Governor General. The group felt that PM&C should lead this commitment and work with agencies to deliver the first action / define principles for public participation, and that agencies could then deliver some of the actions suggested to demonstrate commitment progress and reporting against principles. Milestones / actions under the commitment could include the digital, participatory, deliberative, representative methods to increase participation suggested under this theme. Amelia | Public Participation |
| 8.28 | Australian Wisdom Network ( www.wisdom.to/australia ) : The Zero Marginal Cost path to Society Growth, universal public participation, democratisation of every sector and economic/government transformation. "Today, the main contradiction in modern capitalism is between the possibility of free, abundant socially produced goods, and a system of monopolies, banks, and governments struggling to maintain control over power and information .... Everything is pervaded by a fight between network and hierarchy. Paul Mason"<br><br>'You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete' R. Buckminster Fuller.<br><br>The Australian Wisdom Network ( www.wisdom.to/australia ) is a new model based upon Zero Marginal Cost Network to crowd create economic transformation, government transformation and Network Society and achieve Society Growth for all Australians.<br><br>Australian Wisdom Network applies the Network Society development model to deliver the "1 Australia in 1 Global Village" objectives of 'Society Growth', Minimum Life (enhanced Basic Income, Economic Transformation, Government Transformation and to accelerate the evolutionary Shift from Industrial Economy to Network Society. Zero Marginal Cost Networks (internet, massively scalable 'blockchainified' databases, wisdom networks, mobile devices, distributed apps, distributed databases, open source software etc) and the resulting Network Society development model offer a superior, efficient, effective global and costless means to organise society (sectors, countries and the Global Village) and focus community wisdom on society outcomes and a Minimum Life (enhanced 'Basic Income') for everyone.<br><br>If Australians sat down with a blank sheet of paper today, this is the 'Australia' they would design for tomorrow. It is a quick, easy and comprehensive paradigm (or platform) shift using current technologies. Simply, every 'thing' in every sector across society has a virtual representation in a society-wide, blockchainified, massively scalable databases accessible to everyone. Wisdom Networks organise and focus the wisdom of crowds around every 'thing' in society, everywhere for everyone via mobile devices. The outcome is a real-time, Zero Marginal Cost, transparent and accessible Network Society that delivers a Third Industrial Revolution jump in productivity and quality of life for everyone. The crowd can begin with a small problem and expand to sector, country, region and the Global Village.<br><br>Australian Wisdom enables the 3rd Industrial Revolution, distributed prosperity, distributed governance, economic transformation, government transformation, all-inclusive citizen empowerment, democratisation across every sector, regional/global integration, regional integration and accelerates the shift towards a Network Society and a global humanitarian platform. | Public Participation |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 8.28.1 | Comment on the ideal organisation to deploy was also requested.<br><br>The ideal organisation to deploy Australia Wisdom (within government) would be the Digital Transformation Office. Approximately, 30 people would be required and it would cost a few million dollars. In its current form, the DTO is a service provider to other government departments. Other government departments still make the decisions as to the degree of transformation that the DTO can enable.<br><br>The DTO may need to follow the Malaysian model and be given statutory powers to implement Australian Wisdom across government. A discussion of the Australian vs Malaysian approaches is provided in the article 'What is Transformation? 4 Purposes of Government 'Transformation' departments (theatre, advisory, incremental, metamorphosis). Examples: Australia, Malaysia' at http://www.wisdom.to/transformation.html .<br><br>In fact, Australian Wisdom can operate independently of government. It can be launched and the people use it directly to manage their 'things' across sectors in society (health, education, equity market, innovation, governance, government etc). People can add their 'things'. Australian Wisdom can also scrape things from the internet.<br><br>Deployment and direct benefit to citizens is not conditional upon government involvement. However, it is appropriate for government to implement Australian Wisdom society wide. Government defines the rules of society and has a significant impact on structure. It can legislate the stump jump plough (Industrial Economy) or the Combine Harvester (Network Society). Perhaps, the time is right to structure society as networks given the recent drive to transform Australia. Government could transform Australia very quickly. It will take decades for undercapitalised entrepreneurs to achieve the same outcome using a bottom up approach. | Public Participation |
| 8.28.2 | There is another deployment option that may be more appropriate given the responsibility for Society is divided across government departments (at federal, State and local levels). It may be simpler to just have one organisation like the DTO that launches one network and make it directly available to all Australian citizens. However, it could also be done incrementally by individual government departments. A Wisdom Network could be downloaded by anybody in Australia (just like Wordpress for web sites) and deployed by the smallest or largest communities with a common interest. These individual communities then mesh into the larger Australian Wisdom over time.<br><br>In this comment, we'll introduce an Australian people-driven society, provide a quick sector overview and then provide specific wisdom networks that could be launched by various Australian government departments. Any of these could spawn or be part of the Australian Wisdom Network. Without proactive action by Australian government, it will take decades for undercapitalised Australian entrepreneurs and citizens to achieve the Network Society. With proactive action by the Australian government, Australia could accelerate the inevitable evolution from Industrial Economy to Network Society and usher in a new era of prosperity.<br><br>Society Growth is people driven by real-time citizen demand (citizen participation and contribution) in wisdom networks across society<br><br>SOCIETY GROWTH IS PEOPLE DRIVEN BY REAL-TIME CITIZEN DEMAND (CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND CONTRIBUTION) IN WISDOM NETWORKS ACROSS SOCIETY<br>The 'Industrial Economy' model for determining '(economic) growth' is planned and expanded by government and industry which organises money, infrastructure, hierarchy, centralised decision making, annual planning cycles and markets to determine society focus and expansion. The people in a Network Society drive Society Growth with real-time knowledge, planning, effort and broad consensus captured and applied in all 'Community of Common Interest' wisdom networks across society. Priorities, effort and outcomes are determined by real-time citizen activity across society in real-time networks.<br><br>Any individual could download and deploy a wisdom network in 90-180 days to focus wisdom to focus local, national or global wisdom on community of common interest, society problem, need or challenge. Society Growth is dynamically with real-time citizen demand for network features, sector, country, regional and global networks satisfied by any individual creating a wisdom network in 90-180 days.<br>Entrepreneurs, governments, telcos and industry build a supply of wisdom networks that present the people and society with opportunity for Society Growth. Wisdom Network demand (citizen participation and contribution) determines where society expands by prioritising features, functions, wisdom and effort amongst competing local, sector, country and global networks. | Public Participation |
| 8.28.3 | The 3 parts of this discussion have been consolidated into the article "Our submission to the Open Government Partnership (OGP) team in the Australian Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet ... includes departmental recommendations" at http://www.wisdom.to/ogpau . This articles may provide some formatting, extra images, and an Appendix of selected extracts from the Australian Wisdom page ( http://www.wisdom.to/australia ). | Public Participation |
| 8.29 | Governments should be required to summarise in writing, with data, the reasons for what they are doing across as many areas as possible - Government should not be "secret politician business". This would impose a discipline on the Government and allow more people to engage in an informed way about Government decisions. We would be equipped to question our elected representatives about what they believe in relation to specific issues that they have voted in favour of as a matter of accountability and responsibility to us. When Governments enact legislation, they set their own goals re that eg compliance with Human Rights Act or "financial implications". It would become a way of reflecting afterwards and ensuring they understood what they were doing and why BEFORE hand! | Public Participation |
| 8.30 | Participatory budgeting to allocate grant funding: Enable public participation in the allocation of funds to non-government organisations through the use of participatory budgeting techniques. This would not only open government though public participation and increased the transparency of these processes, it would also help to ensure that funds available are being allocated to deliver public services and programs that the community value. | Public Participation |
| 8.30.1 | Note that this can be implemented in several ways.<br>1) Allocating a budget that community organisations could bid for, with a public assessment process and some form of voting on which grants are provisioned. This may need the establishment of a platform for civic bidding (several open source ones exist), which could be extended for state and local governments as a central capacity.<br><br>2) Pursuing a co-funding approach whereby agencies partner with a crowdfunding platform and nominate a program area. Prospective grant recipients put their projects on the crowdfunding platform and must raise a certain proportion of their needed funds from the public, at which point the government will provide a proportion. This approach has been used successfully by both the Tasmanian and WA governments in the last few years. it requires less infrastructure provision by government and mitigates some risk by demonstrating community support for the specific programs (through community crowdfunding dollars raised).<br>3) Providing funds to a third-party organisation which then manages the community-based participatory budgeting process. This approach allows a specialist to manage the voting process and provides independence from government political processes to create a perceptually fairer process and allows more expertise to be engaged in supporting the voting process (which is important as the public is not commonly used to this approach). It does require careful selection of the third-party to ensure perceptions of bias are minimised. | Public Participation |
| 8.30.2 | CORRECTION: Participatory budgeting relies on deliberation for its success. I.e. "Voting" (if required) is the end stage of a long process which draws people into exchanging views, values and ideas, better understanding each other and leading to better developed policy, which may be agreed by consensus. There is now a wealth of experience of how to make this work well and flaws to avoid.<br>A good starting point would be to require Federal MPs to use participatory budgeting techniques to decide on projects to be funded under the "Stronger Communities Programme" ($150,000 per MP) | Public Participation |
| 8.30.3 | Thanks Craig and Ken, I love the way you have built on this suggestion. My vision is similar to the one I outlined for unsolicited proposals. A combination between participatory and deliberative methods. That the allocation of funds be determined by three levels of public participation: 1) public pitching / crowd sourcing of ideas or solutions (participatory and inclusive); 2) public prioritisation through voting and discussion forums online using a set of criteria by a representative sample of the population (representative - could be a jury); and 3) that the funds be issued by a citizens jury who cross checks the criteria against options and reports back to the community. I don't mind the idea of crowdfunding as a way of boosting ideas / pitches - I think this should be optional rather than a necessary part of the process. | Public Participation |
| 8.31 | Create a working group to devise better means of public participation. D. Public Participation<br><br>There are already some ways citizens can contribute to the democratic process. For example, there are opportunities for public participation in some reviews, audits and parliamentary inquiries. This could easily be expanded.<br><br>Actionable 1: Form a working group to discuss areas in which it would be possible to involve public participation in policy formulation to build upon those already available. This could be facilitated by opportunities to submit ideas regarding how technology might assist in increasing public participation as well as any risk management aspects. | Public Participation |
| 8.31.1 | I have an action orientation and would need to see a clear framework under which this working group would be committed to actual outcomes, not simply a report. Talk is easier than doing and it is preferable to pilot several different ideas cheaply than to talk them out in a smaller circle of participants. | Public Participation |
| 8.31.2 | As Evelyn says, there are a range of ways in use; It is a matter of being familiar with them and selecting the best for each particular matter. The newDemocracy Foundation <newdemocracy.com.au/> is one of several good sources. | Public Participation |
| 8.31.3 | o Lack of measure- how to evaluate and communicate the effectiveness of the changes<br>o Deliberate process- citizen juries/reference groups<br>o Technology needs to offer a great user experience- e.g. no point offering a portal for submissions if 'citizens' are not able to submit successfully<br>Response to suggested actions from participants at the Ark Community Engagement Conference 22/3/16 | Public Participation |

| 8.32 | Adopt IAP2 principles and standards for engagement practice: The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) is the peak body representing engagement professionals around the world. A number of key principles have been developed globally that are recognised as best practice for engagement and public participation. IAP2 Australasia, is Australia and New Zealand's leading Association advancing the practice of public participation.<br><br>IAP2 was founded on the belief that those who are affected by decisions have the right to be involved in the decision making process. Since 1998, IAP2 Australasia have been supporting people who implement public decision making processes by offering training and resources and promoting the principles of community and stakeholder engagement.<br><br>We are well known for our Core Values, Code of Ethics for practitioners and the Public Participation Spectrum. In 2014 it was recognised that the practice was changing and expanding to include community-led engagement and new tools and training have been developed to meet this need. The communities of Australia want to have their voice heard more than just at election time. IAP2 Australasia supports OGP in Australia for this reason and encourages all levels of government, and the private and not-for-profit sectors, to embed engagement principles into the fabric of decision making processes.<br><br>Most recently IAP2 globally released the Quality Assurance Standard for community and stakeholder engagement, which can be used to measure any community engagement process. We encourage any actions under OGP to consider and implement this standard as the base or foundation framework. http://www.iap2.org.au/resources/quality-assurance-standard<br><br>IAP2 Australasia defines community and stakeholder engagement as a planned process with the specific purpose of working across organisations, stakeholders and communities to shape decisions or actions in relation to a problem, opportunity or outcome.<br><br>IAP2's core values define the expectations and aspirations of the public participation process - all 7 must be considered in any engagement process. They can be found on Page 10 of the Standards above. Engagement practitioners agree to uphold these values and code of ethics (page 9). Across Australia we are seeing a significant increase in government agencies agreeing to these principles and undertaking training to ensure they can put these into practice.<br><br>The IAP2 Public Participation spectrum provides a quick reference to the levels of community engagement available to adopt. It recognises that not every project will require intense collaboration and some will require more than information delivery. It is about selecting the right level based on the needs/constraints of the decision maker and the potential impacts on stakeholders. Though the Spectrum is presented as linear it is not designed to indicate that you should move along the Spectrum. Each | Public Participation |
|---|---|---|
| 8.4 | Action: Public participation champions<br>- Description: Conduct a brief review of successful government public participation activities to identify necessary and desired skills and capabilities of high-performing communities. Key community representatives (members of the public not engagement specialists) to be identified as champions for local areas to work with governments to raise awareness and build community capability in engaging effectively with government. Additionally, governments would be encouraged to disseminate information internally to build a partnership approach. | Public Participation |
| 8.5 | Public participation<br>- Action: Public participation champions<br>- Description: Conduct a brief review of successful government public participation activities to identify necessary and desired skills and capabilities of high-performing communities. Key community representatives (members of the public not engagement specialists) to be identified as champions for local areas to work with governments to raise awareness and build community capability in engaging effectively with government. Additionally, governments would be encouraged to disseminate information internally to build a partnership approach. | Public Participation |
| 8.6 | To open up government the Australian Government should embed in legislation a clear and defined process for use of randomly selected citizens to inform decision making around trade-offs, strategic planning, major policy initiatives or challenges where there are a divergence of views and potential solutions.<br>This should be specifically applicable in areas where subjectivity (therefore distrust or fear of corruption) is a large factor.<br>This would improve the way Australia engages the full spectrum of its population in contentious issues, ensuring greater transparency by increasing public participation.<br>This recommendation would provide a legislative platform for use of what are known as Citizens' Juries. These juries are an innovative means of involving everyday people in the process of government decision- making and are genuinely pioneering, with each one acting as a practical example of open government in operation. Legislating for their use would enshrine the right of citizens to deliberate on issues of real import; and would set a global benchmark for transparent and trust in government thereby doing much to combat the cynicism and suspicion that is so prevalent in modern democracies. | Public Participation |

| 9.1 | Establish or support ongoing spaces // events for industry, community and government to come together and work on solving civic issues i.e. building civic technology, making budget data more accessible or testing viability of new technologies or programs in government. Something like this: http://www.meetup.com/Civic-Lab-Melbourne/events/228102061/<br>Mechanisms to monitor and track progress: no. of gov, community and private sector participation, no. issues worked on, no. of technology developed, no. of people learning new skills i.e. visualising data, no. challenges government puts forward to the community<br>What organisations would be best placed to implement the idea: Code for Australia has been running a program to do this exact thing in Melbourne. A similar space in other capital cities could be great. | Public Service Delivery |
|---|---|---|
| 9.1.1 | Could be implemented in cooperation with civic societies or universities | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.1.2 | Open Data Institute in the UK has run a highly successful challenge series, whereby social/economic/environmental challenges are solved. Building on Code for Australia's idea, this is something that could be achieved locally in Australia | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.1.3 | The link I created to the Open Data Challenge Series as mentioned above appears to have disappeared. Here it is: http://theodi.org/opendatachallengeseries. | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.2 | It is often the case with many commonwealth and state government departments that customer service officers are not familiar with their line of work, which in turn is an impediment to the efficient delivery of services. Lack of training may be one of the causes. Pure incompetence may be another. In any case, this situation needs to be improved, not least because some of those who are affected wouldn't even know they are! (ie. they are compelled to believe what they are told). Any ideas on how this might be translated into an actionable and measurable commitment would be welcome. | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.3 | Keeping and building on 'corporate memory'<br>OGP Commitment activity suggestion<br>Need: Keeping and building on 'corporate memory'<br>Activity to meet this need<br>Formal requirement for government staff, five years from retirement, to mentor younger employees for 12 months. Agreement of the organisation, retiring employee and the younger employee that 'shadowing' is an important work task of both employees and a formal part of their professional development. The basic process is below and this is expected to evolve through individual and organisation involvement and need.<br>1. 'Shadow' a senior government employee (who has more than 15 years of government work experience) with the senior employee purposefully showing and explaining their most valuable work tools and likely barriers;<br>2. Attend structured meetings to learn from the senior employees long-term lived experience of developing positive work relationships, dealing with intricate organisational knowledge, managing transitions and agile change.<br><br>How it works<br>The mentoring program has rules and requirements similar to staff training but the content is the lived experience of the senior staff member's work history. Particularly the technological, social, political, work/home balance and economic capital useful in enabling more efficient organisation policies, plans and processes. This activity also refines career path planning and professional development decisions. I strongly suggest that more places for females and minority groups be allocated to this program to increase government staff diversity.<br>The benefit to the senior mentor includes reflecting upon new insights, perspectives, information offered by the younger person. Noting when their work and life experiences are of benefit and can improve current and planned projects. Also, as the senior employee retires, the organisation may decide to contract the retired person to 'soft mentor' senior executives.<br>Monitor and evaluate<br>Such employee interaction needs to be a work duty with details of how selection of mentor/mentee occurs, how work is planned with privacy/confidentiality clauses, the means to review progress and ways to stop the interaction when required. Reporting on the process is required at 3 month intervals. A common report is prepared as well as individual reports. Work completed during these interactions will carry both people's names for transparent recognition and appraisal. An employee who has observed the interactions is also required to evaluate the benefits, challenges and problems at 6 and 12 months. | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.4 | This comment is provided by the National Archives of Australia (the National Archives). The National Archives was established by the Archives Act 1983 as an executive agency of the Australian Government, although it has existed in various forms since the 1940s. The National Archives is the lead agency for ensuring transparency and accountability in government through its legislated role of setting records and information management requirements for Australian Government agencies, and preserving and providing a public right of access to government information.<br><br>Open government increases the transparency and accountability of government, encourages greater public engagement, strengthens governance and improves public service delivery. The National Archives plays a key role in open government by promoting the creation, management and preservation of authentic, reliable and usable Commonwealth information, and facilitating access to this information.<br><br>The Archives Act 1983 provides a broad definition of records and effectively covers all information created, used or received in the course of Commonwealth business. Under the Archives Act 1983 (Cth) (Archives Act), the National Archives:<br>•identifies the archival resources of the Commonwealth;<br>•preserves and makes the archival resources of the Commonwealth accessible;<br>•oversees Commonwealth records management;<br>•determines standards and provides advice to Commonwealth agencies; and<br>•imposes recordkeeping obligations in respect of Commonwealth records.<br><br>Ready access to this information is vital for maintaining the transparency of the democratic process and the accountability of successive governments, and is integral to a successful open government policy. It is from this perspective and with this legislated role that the National Archives provides the following observations and comments on the Vision and the framework for the National Action Plan.<br><br>Vision<br>The National Archives supports a Vision that commits to the improved management of, and accessibility to, information and records. A key element of this is a move to fully digital information management and business processes across the Australian government sector. This aligns with key commitments identified in the National Action Plans of the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. It also aligns with the example Vision statement provided that 'Open government in the 21st century needs to translate to digital processes and reporting to improve transparency and accountability'. This has already been achieved by a number of initiatives which the National Archives is currently leading including earlier access to government records, the Digital Continuity 2020 Policy, an end-to-end solution to manage digital government information, and modernisation of the Archives Act. | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.5 | Improve natural resources data publishing and reporting. | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.6 | Towards equality and fairness in service delivery by the Department of Immigration and Border Protection: LEAD AGENCY: Department of Immigration and Border Protection<br><br>ISSUE TO BE ADDRESSED<br>The DIBP employs personnel at key decision making positions without sufficient mandatory training/ professional development(1), and are left to perform their duties according to their own ideas, opinions and value systems.<br><br>MAIN OBJECTIVE<br>1. Clearly define all aspects of each decision making process and set clear guidelines.<br>2. Provide comprehensive training for ALL case officers (including junior case officers) and make CPD mandatory for all decision-makers.<br>3. Routinely test decision-makers' knowledge in order to maintain a satisfactory standard.<br>4. Encourage the use of support mechanisms (eg: Citizenship Helpdesk) when in doubt.<br><br>OGP CHALLENGE ADDRESSED<br>IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICES<br>RELEVANT TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF<br>TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY, PUBLIC PARTICIPATION<br>MILESTONES<br>{TO BE FURTHER DISCUSSED}<br><br>REFERENCE<br>1. Administering the Character Requirements of the Australian Citizenship Act 2007<br>http://www.anao.gov.au/Publications/Audit-Reports/2010-2011/Administering-the-Character-Requirements-of-the-Australian-Citizenship-Act-2007 | Public Service Delivery |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9.7 | PIAC - Recommendation regarding public service delivery: The following recommendations are drawn from the submission of the Public Interest Advocacy Centre (PIAC) to this consultation. Many of these related to the pro-disclosure and release of information that would assist in improving public service delivery:<br><br>- PIAC recommends that a national consultation be undertaken to identify nationally significant datasets that should be prioritised for public release. (Recommendation 6)<br>- PIAC recommends that the Commonwealth Government should consult with the Australian Securities and Investments Commission, the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the insurance industry, consumer advocates and lawyers to identify opportunities to make available actuarial and statistical data relating to mental illness. (Recommendation 7)<br>- PIAC recommends that that Council Of Australian Government Energy Council require that energy retailers report the emissions intensity of all energy sales they enter into within the National Energy Market to supply customers. (Recommendation 8)<br>- PIAC recommends that the States and Territories be required to disclose the results of their audits of the energy efficiency of their public housing stocks and the reports on the implementation of cost-effective upgrades. PIAC also recommends that consideration is given to sourcing such information about residential tenancies and owner occupied housing and making it publically available and accessible. (Recommendation 9)<br>- PIAC recommends that a wide-ranging consultation be undertaken to identify nationally significant datasets within the criminal justice area. (Recommendation 10)<br>- PIAC recommends that the Australian Government commit to ensuring that state-based police forces, the Australian Federal Police and any other relevant agencies be required to publish statistics regarding how many times Tasers have been used in the jurisdiction, in all relevant modes, including the age and gender of the person on which it was used. (Recommendation 11)<br>- PIAC recommends that the Australian Government work with the states and territories to ensure consistent reporting regarding self-harm incidents that occur in police and corrective services custody. (Recommendation 12)<br>- PIAC recommends that the Australian Government work with state and territory governments and relevant agencies to apply the recommendations of the ERA (or similar measures) on a national basis across the corrections system. (Recommendation 13)<br>- PIAC endorses the recommendation of the Australian Human Rights Commission that the Australian Government should expedite the ratification of OPCAT. (Recommendation 14)<br>- PIAC recommends that the Australian Government should encourage a culture of disclosure, with a specific focus on departments engaging in national security or policing issues, at both a federal and state/territory level. (Recommendation 15) | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.8 | Connected useful information: To open Government the Australian Government could release government- managed and outsourced health and community services information through increased accessibility to both open and restricted data to drive better ways to deliver services. There are examples of this overseas and in Australia (with the foundations already established)<br><br>This would increase the transparency of government and promote the value of sharing information to deliver better outcomes for the public.<br><br>Access to public information from different sources increases the opportunities for multi-disciplinary and cross-portfolio approaches to address social problems | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.9 | To achieve this:<br>- need better data sharing (open data, interoperablity)<br>- develop single sign on, govt portal, that uses identity management - allows the individual to access information about themselves, anywhere, anytime on any device. This would also allow govt to post specific information to individuals that are relevant to them (could build on the My Gov system)<br>- specific projects in specific areas that identify (using data & qualitative methods such as ethnographies) to determine what works, what doesn't, gaps etc and re-investment or reallocate money accordingly, and get out of initiatives that are not delivering<br>- co-design/co-create with local community based on above information | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.10 | Create, manage and preserve information digitally to support transparency, accountability, citizen engagement and ongoing access to, and re-use of, valuable government information: Commitment: The Australian Government will create, manage and preserve information digitally to support transparency, accountability, citizen engagement and ongoing access to, and re-use of, valuable government information.<br><br>Meets principles: Transparency, Accountability, Public participation<br><br>Addresses Open Government Partnership Grand challenges: More Effectively Managing Public Resources<br><br>The creation, preservation and management of, and public access to, records and information is the cornerstone to transparency and accountability in the Australian government. These records and information provide evidence of decisions and actions of the Australian Government and are a unique source of information about the nature of the Commonwealth Government and its activities. Without robust information management in government, there is no transparency or accountability, no evidence of government decisions, and no protection of citizens' rights and entitlements. Creating, preserving and managing these records and information digitally not only supports business efficiencies but also encourages citizen engagement and timely access to, and re-use of, Australian government information.<br><br>As the lead agency for information management in the Australian government, and the custodian of the most valuable government records, the National Archives will continue to move Australian government agencies to digital information management practices, implement strategies to support the ongoing preservation of, and timely access to, valuable digital government information, and participate in legislative reforms to streamline access to government information by citizens. | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.10.1 | Digital information management involves important shifts in our current law and practice regarding information access for example (and there are others) as Section 17 of the act stipulates, the current (since 1982) central focus on 'documents'. My proposed review of FOI against modern internationally accepted best practice standards posted under Freedom of information theme. | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.11 | Mandatory APIs for all citizen and business facing services delivered or commissioned by government: Mandated open Application Programmable Interfaces (APIs) for all citizen and business facing services delivered or commissioned by government, to comply to appropriately defined standards and security. This would enable different data, content and services to be mashed up by agencies for better service delivery, but also enables an ecosystem of service delivery beyond government.<br><br>(Full blog post on my personal submission at http://pipka.org/2016/03/28/my-personal-ogpau-submission/) | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.11.1 | Absolutely agree with APIs for citizens and business facing services or commissioned by government - This would open government by reducing the issues around "politics of data" where public service staff are cleaning up data to republish as open data - which is in the end different to the information they are using for their business. | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.11.2 | brilliant! I completely agree. Without APIs, the whole Open Data concept can easily go down the drain. In fact, an API common to all APS departments would be wonderful! Not sure if a common API is feasible though, but at least Department specific APIs | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.12 | An open government plan in every government agency: Information policy and management<br>Require each government agency to develop, publish and implement an open government plan based on the Principles on open public sector information. (http://www.oaic.gov.au/information-policy/information-policy-resources/information-policy-agency-resources/principles-on-open-public-sector-information) | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.13 | Summary of Public Service teleconference 30/3/16. Seven people attended this call: Kevin, Maree, Ash, Des, Ken, Cameron and I. We discussed actions suggested on this page. In response to the grand challenges / civic lab suggestion the group felt that more data was required before these / and the effort contributed could be maximised. Civic spaces were discussed as physical and online spaces and the need to leverage what's been done internationally and nationally was emphasised. The sustainability and need for consistent funding of these kinds of initiatives was also discussed. Two-way mentoring, and the need for staff to be given time to share lessons / build skills / have capacity for innovation was discussed briefly. The group felt a cultural shift would be needed for the digital healthcare platforms suggested here, and that issues with the current e-health system should be examined and addressed as this is explored further. The group largely supported API's, but felt a commitment and mandate would be needed first with clear data standards and that their value should be determined before that commitment was made (and evaluated) so they were sustainable. Amelia | Public Service Delivery |
| 9.14 | The Australian government needs to deliver a simple, secure, inexpensive, and interconnected healthcare platform that enables all stakeholders to coordinate effectively, regardless of their location/locale. This vendor neutral platform should enable auditable collaboration across open, shared and linked data as well as permission-based cooperation around confidential data and cost/service level transparency. Delivery of this platform will address the issues involved in providing an integrated healthcare ecosystem to an ageing population across urban, suburban, rural and remote locations while also addressing the imperative to lower costs and eliminate wastage due to systemic errors and inefficiencies. | Public Service Delivery |

| 10.1 | Improve public access to information and increase public participation: OGP category - Legislative Openness, Access to Information, Open Data and Openness in Natural Resources areas

Suggestion:
To help better manage natural resources, the Government could improve transparency and community engagement by proactively publishing useful information about extractive industry and energy projects. To make it easy for citizens and industry to engage with natural resource development decisions, ensure open access to important information such as locations of activities and environmental reports.

Successful implementation
This could be achieved by creating a single open, national platform for mining and resources project information that contains up-to-date information about:
• the type of resource and project
• locations of proposed and current activity and infrastructure
• the decision-making process and applicable legislation
• status of projects
• links to public environmental and economic impact reporting
• company details
• links to community consultation events

Data and content on this platform will be available in a uniform, open, shareable format with permissible licences.

Context:
Most people don't understand government and industry processes and rules. Information from government and industry is siloed, lacks context and not written in plain english. Current delivery mechanisms rely on domain knowledge and specialised software. Interrelated legislation is complex and varies by location. Company documentation and environmental reports are difficult to access.

People feel they are not part of, and cannot contribute to, decisions relating to their community or projects of national significance. When people do discover information either through the media or word of mouth, it is often too late to participate and have an impact on decisions. Situations escalate and clashes occur. | Resource Management |
|---|---|---|
| 10.2 | Data management to assist Australia to meet its 'Paris Agreement' obligations: Executive Summary

There is a need to strengthen the amount and quality of information on climate change that is collected, published and monitored for the Paris Climate Change Agreement. This is in harmony with Australia's recent signature to the Open Government Partnership (OGP) being a voluntary, multi-stakeholder, international initiative intended to "promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance". The OGP Agreement explicitly requires each country to "co-create a National Action Plan (NAP) with civil society." It follows that members of civil society including individuals and climate action organisations are expected to contribute to the NAP.

To assess compliance with the Paris Agreement, Australia must produce and publish information on:
• what is being done,
• how well it being done, and
• what more needs to be done.

Lead Agency: Department of Environment

1) Justification
Australia and all other countries at COP21 (December 2015) committed to the UNFCCC Paris Agreement. Fulfilment of the provisions of the Agreement is necessary but not sufficient to avoid catastrophic climate change. The crucial importance of the reduction in carbon emissions and the necessity of further action to keep global warming less than 20C above pre-industrial levels, preferably no more than 1.50C, is clearly stated in the preamble to the Agreement itself (Appendix 1).
The Paris Agreement requires countries to create, collect and share knowledge needed to plan, implement and monitor action to meet these global warming targets (Appendix 2). Australia, as one of the world's leading sources of research and knowledge in climate change, has both a domestic obligation and a duty to the international community to develop and use these resources for the good of all. | Resource Management |
| 10.3 | Summary of Management of Resource teleconference 30/3/16. 10 people attended this teleconference: Ken, Kim, Michael, Jessie, Ash, Brett, Mel, Mark, Tim and I. The group discussed the EITI, how it might be implemented by the Australian Government and how it could improve transparency including disclosure of payments and company ownership, standards and data release. This discussion included the need for legislative changes and a multi-stakeholder group / centralised approach to meet EITI requirements. The group also felt that a centralised place for information about these kinds of resources and how they were being used and managed across Australia was necessary and that companies might be encouraged or required to publish data as well as open data from Government on this kind of platform. The group spoke to the need for increased access to open data and data standards to enable this. Participants also spoke to the metrics and the need to look at more than those required by the EITI/ transparency but also those that could support improved resource management in Australia and the measurement and management of local social and environmental impacts. The importance of this data and these kinds of platforms for transparency, to enable public participation and ensure accountability was emphasised. Amelia | Resource Management |
| 10.4 | Coal Seam Gas Requirements: o Triple bottom-line assessment of local, state and national costs and benefits of coal seam gas production.
o A system for the fair and equitable distribution of revenues, royalties and benefits to affected landowners, constituencies, states and territories.
o A system for reasonable prioritisation of Petroleum title allocation, with a focus on land fit for few alternative uses, and minimised risk and disruption to the environment, aquifers, agricultural farmland, and local residents.
o Long-range environmental impact assessments and impact mitigation strategies for the development of existing and future CSG export ports.
o An impact assessment, impact mitigation strategy and crisis management procedure addressing the significant increases in tanker and bulk carrier traffic through The Great Barrier Reef. Considerations should include impacts on the environment and other industries including fishing and tourism.
o Recommendations for suitable legislative changes to ensure socially and environmentally responsible current and future development of this fledgling industry.
o A requirement that seams are tested for BTX prior to drilling.
(Note: these hydrocarbons are soluble in water…); that BTX containing areas are excluded from development.

• A revision to the PETROLEUM (ONSHORE) ACT 1991, enabling the better protection of landowner and locally affected constituent interests. This may include a requirement of prior consultation and agreement from land owners and councils for the temporary or permanent use of their properties and passageways for the purposes of CSG exploration and mining;
• A revision PETROLEUM (ONSHORE) ACT 1991 - SECT 47 'Application of Epis', so that any holder of a Petroleum license are subject to state or federal an environmental planning instruments as appropriate.
• The cessation of CSG development in populated areas.
• Cessation of CSG development in populated, prime agricultural and environmentally sensitive land and coastal areas until effective and enforced regulation of this industry is introduced which ensures the long term, priority protection of the environment and locally effected populations. | Resource Management |