

1. **MC** Thank you and congratulations, we're getting away on time. That very rarely happens. Good morning and welcome. My name is Madonna King and I'm your MC for the next couple of hours for the Solomon Lecture delivered by Professor Anne Tiernan and hosted by the Office of the Information Commissioner here in Queensland. Let's dispense with the housekeeping issues first up, and that means could I ask you now to turn your mobile phones to silent. The bathrooms are located downstairs on level zero, via the lift and to the right or, alternatively, past the Edge Coffee Shop on level 1. And in the unlikely event of an emergency we would just follow closely the instructions given to us by staff. The meeting place is out these doors in the big green area between the two buildings. Please join the conversation this morning. If you're on Twitter it's @QLD_OIC #solomonlecture and #RTID2016 because it is Right to Information Day. This morning I'd like to start by acknowledging the traditional owners of this land on which we gather and pay respects to their ancestors who came before them and to their Elders, past, present and future. And I'd also like to acknowledge several people with us today, Jenny Mead the Acting Information Commissioner, Clare Smith who is the Right to Information Commissioner and one of our panellists this morning, Professor Anne Tiernan of course from Griffith University who will deliver the Solomon Lecture. Linda O'Brien also from Griffith and Chair of the Open Data Institute of Queensland, and CEO Maree Adshead. Phil Clarke the Ombudsman here in Queensland, good to see you here. Mike Summerell the State Archivist. Alan MacSporran QC the Chair of the Crime and Corruption Commission. And of course Ian Stewart our Police Commissioner. Good to see you Commissioner too. Bridget Hewson the Deputy New Zealand Ombudsman is on holidays in Brisbane and has dropped by, and thank you and welcome. And Professor Anna Stewart from Griffith University, the presenter of the 2013 Solomon Lecture. Could I also acknowledge and welcome viewers watching via the livestream throughout Queensland as well as the Information Access Commissions across Australia and New Zealand. The Solomon Lecture is named in honour of Dr David Solomon who was the Chair of the Independent FOI Review Panel appointed by the Queensland Government to review the State's FOI laws in 2007 and 2008. And it was Dr Solomon, who I'm proud to say is also a friend of mine, who delivered the inaugural 2009 lecture. Since then we've had several luminaries here doing the lecture, including Don Watson, Dr Nicholas

Gruen, Professor Geoff Gallop and of course Professor Anna Stewart. And today we have Professor Anne Tiernan. Anne is incredibly experienced across the areas of research, education, public policy, public administration and public sector governance. The author of half a dozen books, she's consulted at all levels of government. She's served on the Board of Commissioners of the State Public Service Commission and is a member of the Queensland Public Records Review Committee. Indeed, the Institute of Public Administration Australia awarded Anne a national fellowship in recognition of her outstanding contribution to the study and practice of public administration. And today Anne adds the Solomon Lecture to her long list of contributions to public debate. Please join me in welcoming Professor Anne Tiernan the Director of the Policy Innovation Hub at Griffith University.

2. **AT** Thanks very much Madonna. And thanks to the Office of the Information Commissioner for the invitation to deliver the 2016 Solomon Lecture. I'd also like to begin by acknowledging the traditional custodians of the land the Turrbal People and by paying my respects to Elders past, present and emerging, and to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. And as Madonna said, I'm delighted to follow a long list of distinguished speakers who have delivered the Solomon Lecture, including our colleague Clare Stewart from Criminology at Griffith who's done some sensational work with the Commissioner of Police and others in opening very important data sets. This year's theme, Open Government in Action, is particularly apt for the topics I want to talk about today in this lecture. Now of course as Madonna has said David Solomon played a leading role in reforming public administration in Queensland and nationally. And among his most enduring contributions, as many of you in this room will know, was as Chair of the independent panel that reviewed the Freedom of Information Act 1992 which was repealed and replaced by the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Information Privacy Act 2009. Dr Solomon delivered the inaugural lecture as Madonna has said and went on to serve as Integrity Commissioner from 2009 to his retirement in 2014.

Now as outlined today in what I've got to say the Right to Information framework is one of the key foundations that position Queensland as a genuine leader in community-led policy and service provision. I believe individuals and communities that are empowered with information, data and the tools to use

them can inform and shape outcomes to enhance wellbeing and grow productivity. Their expertise and insights can also result in better, more effective, efficient and locally responsive services. Now before I begin I should declare that my commitment to collaboration stems from the benefits it gives me on a daily basis. I want to acknowledge the support and assistance of a network of outstanding colleagues from Griffith University in preparing my remarks today. At least one of whom I can see and another is on the panel. My university was designed to be different: to be inclusive, progressive, innovative and deeply engaged in the problems and issues of our times. Griffith has a distinctive mission: serving the community and striving for equity of access and opportunity are two of our founding principles. These values and a 40-year tradition of excellence and inter-disciplinary research and teaching for social and community impact has enabled Griffith to attract, and you'll forgive me, some remarkable people, both scholars and professional staff. I owe big debts of thanks to the following colleagues, great leaders all of them, who have really helped to shape my thinking in preparation for the lecture. They include Linda O'Brien the PVC of Information Services at Griffith and Chair of the Open Data Institute of Queensland, who you'll meet on the panel shortly. Professor Lesley Chenoweth PVC and Provost at Griffiths Logan Campus which hosts the *Logan Together Initiative* that I want to talk to you about today. Lesley also leads the Equity portfolio at Griffith. She's a tireless champion for the disadvantaged and anyone who works in that sector will know that. Professor Sheena Reilly PVC of Griffith Health who has an extraordinary passion for open data in the service of early childhood development, particularly the development of language. Matthew Cox, Director of Logan Together who is leading this very interesting policy experiment. And Professor David Hogan whose pioneering data analysis is underpinning much of what's being achieved for children in Logan. And lastly, the team at the recently established Policy Innovation Hub. Which was established by Griffith earlier this year, amongst other things, as a platform for collaboration between government, the community sector and research experts. In this capacity we partnered earlier this week with the Community Services Industry Alliance to host a visit by Professor Ian Harper, who people will know Chaired the Competition Policy Review that delivered its final report to the Federal Treasurer in March 2015. That Review's recommendations that

competition and user choice will be introduced into the human services will be a very significant reform and a very challenging one aimed at boosting productivity growth in some of the fastest areas of public expenditure. But Professor Harper is lead author of another report, the Purpose of Place Reconsidered, that Deloitte released earlier this year. It's an interesting and timely report and I commend it to you. It recognises what many of us know intuitively: that where we live, work, meet and recreate, when we get to do so, directly and indirectly influences our health and wellbeing. Now I know that every day because I work at Griffith Southbank Campus. Ian Harper is also interested, like we are, in the role data and information can play in energising place. The report identifies 10 dimensions of prosperity. Which I've got there on the slide for you to have a look at. He says that in the knowledge economy establishing a rich information infrastructure can be as important to catalysing prosperity in place as building physical infrastructure, and that individuals, communities, businesses and governments share responsibility for creating places that will flourish rather than languish. The report identifies four dynamic forces that catalyse and drive virtuous circles of prosperity in place. These are people, community, technology and governance. Now these forces, the report argues, are enabled by collaboration and collaborative effort. And I'll get to how that happens shortly. But first some context.

This year Australia marked 25 years of uninterrupted economic growth. An outcome widely attributed to the bipartisan commitment of the Hawke, Keating and Howard governments to complex and often contentious economic reforms that made the Australian economy more open and resilient to a variety of external shocks, including the 2008 Global Financial Crisis. Now incredibly, that was almost a decade ago. More recently it's become an article of faith that a crisis has engulfed Australia's political culture. This was a theme of Paul Kelly's 2014 book *Triumph and Demise*, which chartered the end of the reform era and the descent into tribalism and hyper-partisanship that has characterised the Rudd, Gillard, Rudd and Abbott years. Laura Tingle's Quarterly Essay, *Political Amnesia*, and her earlier one *Great Expectations*, captured well I think some of the drivers of democratic discontent and our system's apparent incapacity to deal with it.

Another commentator who's known to Queensland analysts, George Megalogenis, also wrote recently in the Quarterly Essay, *A Balancing Act*, that

the nation's policy frameworks are broken. He argues the prevailing economic orthodoxy, premised on openness, is no longer fit for purpose for an economy in transition. Inequality, already in evidence, risks becoming entrenched as Australian households assume ever greater levels of debt and workers face the triple threat of digital disruption, intense international competition, and predictions that the world economy has entered a period of sustained low growth. Megalogenis argues that Australia remains unnecessarily exposed to an extended crisis in capitalism because our leaders have stopped thinking. They behave as if a better system will fall out of the sky and relieve us of the responsibility for making our own future. He argues what is missing at the moment is genuine political insight and, that the challenge of government in the 21 Century is to think for the long term. Now that's very consistent with the findings of most of my research. And I know is of concern to anyone who is interested in good government and effective public policy.

Now just a few weeks into the new Federal Parliament there's little evidence I think of long term deep policy thinking at Commonwealth or State levels. Nor is it clear that the outcomes of the July 2 Federal election have been learned. Now in my view those lessons were that inequality, economic insecurity and concerns about fairness are key drivers of democratic discontent. The second one is that policy makers and their advisors, both official and partisan, need to develop better informed, more nuanced understandings of the communities that they're elected to serve. And the third one is that place is assuming a much greater significance in an increasingly complex, diverse and spatially differentiated governance context. The demographic and spatial dimensions of policy problems, taken together with community concerns that national and local elites lack understanding of their issues are giving rise to demands for devolution and local control. This is most strongly reflected in the UK of course where nationalist movements in Scotland, Wales and Ireland are demanding new and different relationships to be negotiated with Whitehall and regional governance in the wake of the Brexit. But it was evident too in voting patterns here at the July Federal poll. And in the private member's bill brought into the Queensland Parliament the other week by the Katter Australia Party for North Queensland to become its own State. So I'm very conscious, and indeed I'm probably a big contributor to the chorus of complaint about our politics, but I'm interested to move beyond diagnosis and lamentation towards what can be

done. And I see some green shoots that give me cause for hope. My optimism is founded on the demonstrated capacity of individuals and groups to act together in their shared interests towards a common purpose. Outside the bubble of politics and debates taking place within the elite, often narrow and increasingly aging circles of the mainstream reform discourse numerous local efforts and example all across Australia are lending weight to a more confident view. So for this year's Solomon Lecture I propose to focus on one such initiative: The Logan Together Project. And the central role that data is playing in helping to inform that project's understanding of the health and wellbeing of children in Logan. And importantly, too, how to provide effective and efficient targeted interventions to address entrenched disadvantage.

The work of the Logan Together team and the data specialists who are supporting it, many of whom work with Linda, has open the eyes of this policy generalist to the transformative potential of data to improve public policies and services, and particularly to the ways it can leverage disperse resources, capacities, experience and expertise to focus on complex problems. Now because I'm a political scientist it would be remiss of me not to say that Logan Together also has the potential to illuminate some contemporary themes in the theory and practice of public administration and governance as well as of course in social policy. These include, amongst others, citizen engagement and policy design and co-design, place based policy, and investment approaches such as have been adopted in New Zealand - and I'll be fascinated to talk to our colleague who's visiting on holidays - and more recently in Australia as Christian Porter announced last week at the National Press Club with the launch of the Australian Priority Investment Approach to Welfare.

So let me talk a little about Logan Together, a project that aims to improve the health, social and academic outcomes of around 45,000 children aged zero to eight in the Logan local government area just south of Brisbane. The project director Matthew Cox describes it as an internet generational community uplift project focused on child development from pre-conception through pregnancy, birth and early childhood to age eight. It aims to support approximately 9,000 children who are vulnerable on one or more of the Australian Early Child Development Census domains. Now as the name suggests Logan Together is a collaboration of the kind the Deloitte Report envisages. It involves around 130 partners from all tiers of government, the community and private sector

and from universities, as well as the parents and carers of children in Logan. Griffith University's Logan Campus provides the backbone organisation for the project. And like other collective impact initiatives, Logan Together is premised on the community playing an active role in co-designing and planning the delivery of projects in support of the goal of child development. In the past 12 months more than two and a half thousand people have been engaged in consultations to produce the Logan Together roadmap. The roadmap identifies priority projects to address developmental vulnerability among young children in Logan and a blueprint for turning that roadmap into reality. Launched in August 2015 after 18 months of consultation, negotiation and development, Logan Together is a key part of a two-year action plan that flowed from the Logan City of Choice Summit hosted by Logan City Council in February 2013. That was a response to community conflict that attracted intense and very negative media scrutiny. Implementation of the action plan is overseen by an independent cross-sector leadership team that comprises community and government representatives, elected officials from the three tiers of government, and subject matter experts drawn from universities and the not for profit sector.

Now the concept of collective impact, which is the driving philosophy behind Logan Together, recognises that traditional top-down often siloed approaches to social policy have been unable to create and sustain large-scale change. The proliferation of multiple, often unco-ordinated programs and interventions fragments effort and it bring a range of other unintended consequences. Collective impact models seek to overcome these and other shortcomings of those earlier approaches by bringing together stakeholders from multiple sectors under common goals with a common information base and measuring tools to tackle big social problems. Now of course as the organisation in Logan Together are finding this implies a quite different approach to centralised traditionally top-down bureaucratic models that still predominate in our service delivery systems despite 40 years of reform. It requires a different mindset from all partners. A mindset that's more experimental, more adaptive, more open to learning, and to the experience of what works. Now inevitably that poses challenges, both to the status quo and to the principles of standardised provision that have characterised our system. It also creates a responsibility

to allow it to happen without criticism when inevitably when you're innovating and experimenting you experience failure.

Now the four dynamic forces of people, community, technology and governance are all there in Logan Together and the City of Choice initiative of which it's part. And both are fantastic examples of what my discipline of political science calls the new public governance. New public governance recognises that as a result of 40 years of public sector reform governments now work with and through networks of webs of organisations to achieve shared policy objectives. Delivery change have you know become much more complex and they have to be steered rather than managed through traditional hierarchy. And if we consider the delivery systems of education, health and transport it's clear that networks act as comprising public, private and not for profit providers as well as those who receive services are part of that mix. These disparate players exist in relationships of inter-dependency. They must bargain and exchange resources, money, expertise, information, staff, and work with others to achieve their desired ends. They rely on each other to deliver results.

Now figure two gives you, oh not figure two, but this slide, gives you some insight into the governance structures that have been put in place to support Logan Together and the City of Choice initiative. It's not easy. But I can say from the involvement that I've had in discussions and workshops with people in that network that all of the players involved are conscious of its potential. They're working really hard to find ways to overcome the barriers to collaboration that are inherent to siloed funding arrangements based on hierarchical chains of accountability to parliament. They're trying to exercise discretion and professional judgment about how outcomes can be achieved for vulnerable children across different regimes. They're engaging in continuous communication and negotiation that characterises the collective impact approach while at the same time dealing with the hundred things every day that on the front page of the Courier-Mail. So the project enjoys really strong support from elected representatives at all levels of government. And that's very interesting. And it's been well supported by officials, not for profit and other collaborators, including our staff, students, alumni and friends.

So for my purposes today it's important to understand how central data is to the Logan Together initiative. Like similar whole of population collective impact projects in the United States and Canada, Logan Together has made significant investments in collecting and analysing data about the health and wellbeing of children at the individual and population levels. With partners in all three levels of government Logan Together has developed detailed reports that establish the baselines and initial analytic framework for understanding the wellbeing of children in Logan through available data. A collaboration with the Office of Government Statistician - Queensland is the only State to have one - and State Government agencies is linking information about children at risk in Logan to provide longitudinal data about their interactions with the health, education and social support systems. Data's been used in a range of very interesting ways: to create the case for change; to develop narratives that explain Logan Together's intent – I think that roadmap is a pretty effective example of policy communication that I use with my students – that convey the deep sustained disadvantage experienced by families and children in parts of Logan, and to help prioritise projects and interventions. Those collaborations have underscored the promise and potential of data to illuminate complex problems, but also, you know for mine, the appetite and willingness of the different sectors to co-operate, to learn, and to share how intervention strategies can be improved.

Now some of you will be thinking well place based strategies aren't new. And indeed they're not. There's a long, if sporadic tradition, of interest in local and regionally based policies. Place based policies have emerged internationally as a means of addressing wicked policy issues, those that have complex, interacting causes and require the involvement of multiple actors to develop a co-ordinated response. Now Tim Riddell, who'll be known to some of you, notes that Queensland represents an important laboratory for experimentation in spatially sensitive policy and programs. He cites the Goss and Beattie eras as periods when the role and nature of community and citizen participation were significant policy themes. But of course places always loomed large for policy and administration in Queensland going back to the federation debates, that felt eerily similar recently. But they became particularly salient between 1998 and 2001 when the One Nation party secured 11 seats in the Legislative Assembly. Data showed that voter disillusionment and despair was correlated

with spatial disadvantage and clear patterns of regional economic and social decline. And Riddell, for people who are interested, documents a range of spatially responsive policy initiatives that put community and place at their core. Now the demise of One Nation in Queensland Legislative Assembly and the long mining boom obscured for a time I think the differential economic performance of Queensland places and the prospects of many of our people. At the same time, and particularly during the Rudd and Gillard years, the spatial dimensions of social disadvantage become part of the policy mainstream. So many place-based initiatives sought to improve rates of preschool education, literacy and numeracy, school engagement and school retention by encouraging locally responsive initiatives.

So in some ways Logan Together is once more into the breach of place-based policies. Everything old may be new again, but I'm cautiously optimistic that we now have the tools and policy framework of sufficient maturity to maybe make reform stick. It's never been easier to link open and shared data from multiple agencies to create understanding, policy insights, and improve service interventions, and to provide platforms for local innovation. The early evidence suggests that the City of Choice agenda is acting as a catalyst to local innovation. An ecosystem of individuals and organisations from Logan, but also from elsewhere, has begun to evolve. Professor Lesley Chenoweth and the Logan Together team host frequent visits from bureaucrats, elected representatives and community groups keen to learn more about Logan Together. Those groups are connecting with people and experience to develop knowledge and thinking that can be adapted to problems and issues in their place. Policy tourism, as Lesley and Matthew sometimes jokingly describe it, shows the knowledge economy in action. The Deloitte Report, that Ian Harper was lead author on, provides an accessible explanation for why that might be so. In the knowledge economy the interaction of people with ideas, expertise and capacity sparks new connections and product and service development. That the productivity of workers increases when they're in close proximity is known as the economics of agglomeration. Put simply, cause it's too early in the morning, our knowledge builds on things that we learn from the people around us. We're seeing it in Logan supported and enabled by government bodies, but the relationship with the university is also critical.

Now being Director of the Policy Innovation Hub allows me to work across the four academic groups at the university: arts, education and law, business, health and science. And it gives me amazing insights into things that are going on in our five different places across our five different campuses. I also work closely with colleagues across Queensland Government. Currently in a part time role as Assistant Commissioner, Collaboration in the Public Service Commission for a long time my work has involved spanning the boundaries between government, universities, the not for profit sector and through my research, and certainly not in any partisan way the domain of politics. And these experiences are why I believe Queensland has a comparative advantage in creating the data and information ecosystem necessary to support innovation across all of our places. It's an opportunity just waiting to be seized. The favourable policy environment created by Queensland's Right to Information Laws and the push model of proactive disclosure, as well as some of the cross-sectoral collaborations that are developing under the Queensland Government's Advance Queensland agenda and the Commonwealth National Innovation and Science agenda are critical enablers of that comparative advantage. The partnership between the Queensland Government and the Open Data Institute of Queensland, that the Minister for Innovation Leanne Enoch announced recently, to maximise the benefits of having open and transparent access to data is a case in point. ODIQ, and Linda can talk about this, as part of a global network connects, equips and inspires people to innovate with data.

Now the potential for information and data to create jobs and opportunities enjoys broad acceptance in Queensland both within and outside government. But we have more than a theoretical commitment to knowledge based innovation. We have much of the capability. Queensland is unique in that governments and universities have made strategic investments in research, data and knowledge infrastructure. Efforts are underway across the State on both sides of that partnership to explore how these critical assets can be better aligned and co-ordinated so they can be leveraged to create shared value. We also have the elements of human capability needed for innovation. Beyond the information science, digital research and analytical skills that exist among perhaps especially in universities but in industry, government and communities as well, there are deep relationships among networks of people who share a

commitment to the prosperity and wellbeing of our State as a whole and our own places. The long track record of collaboration between governments at all levels and the State's universities is a second foundation in my view that underpins our unique advantage.

Now substantial international literature points to the potential of university/business/government collaborations in catalysing local innovation and in fostering new industries, new skills and, critically, the human capital needed to support them. It describes a broad range of interactions between researchers and research organisations and larger communities and industries for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge, understanding and resources, in a context of partnership and reciprocity. This is the essence of network governance. These developments reflect growing recognition about the role of knowledge as being fundamental to value creation in an increasingly global post-industrial knowledge economy. But rather than being embedded in organisations of course knowledge exists in and is disbursed across inter-sectoral and inter-organisational networks. Now as we've seen its potential to spark creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship comes through human interaction. The potential of engagement to support innovation is especially valuable when, as in Logan Together, it is multi-disciplinary, collaborative and problem oriented.

And there's a lot that I could say about Queensland universities role in economic and social development, particularly in their local regions. Importantly this morning though they're anchored to place. Universities are significant employers and key stakeholders whose activities in research and teaching, capital investment and facilities, thank you, and long term commitment to particular place, directly impacts their local economy. These agglomeration effects apply as much in the arts and humanities disciplines, the cultural and civil and social capitals they help to foster, as to the science, engineering, technology and maths disciplines that predominate about many of our debates about innovation.

UNESCO has a research program dedicated to the ways community university engagement can support human flourishing, life-long learning and the civic capacity, sustainability and wellbeing of communities, regions and nation states. Universities attract knowledge workers and, importantly for local

innovation systems, engagement activities, spaces and places where diverse groups of people gather and interact. They are rich repositories of knowledge, data, information, insights, expertise and networks. Their core mission is to develop and grow human capital at all phases and stages of learning. From pre-conception, as we've seen in Logan Together, to the end of life. Now like Logan the State of Tasmania has grasped this potential. The data shows that Australia's most government dependent State has the lowest levels of educational attainment, lower even than the Northern Territory. Tasmania is indeed a tipping point. The role of the university has again proved crucial. Peter Rathjen, Vice Chancellor of the University of Tasmania, the island State's only university, has recently announced a bold plan to lift overall levels of educational attainment. The university will offer a new class of degrees: shorter, cheaper, more vocationally oriented associate degrees. Major infrastructure investments in the university's campuses will allow these courses to be taught in Hobart and Launceston and Burnie in the State's economically depressed north.

Griffith University established the Logan campus in 1998 for reasons that included recognition that rapid population growth in that corridor between Brisbane and the Gold Coast, that many of you spend your lives on, would need to be accommodated. But another key rationale was to give access to disadvantaged students with no family history of tertiary education. Community campus has become a national showcase of place based innovation and social inclusion. It's become a community hub for cultural and sporting events.

Now communities will continue to be frustrated by the lack of co-ordination between government programs and services, at the lack of awareness and understanding of the dynamics of local service systems, and the tendency to blame shift across silos that citizens neither care about nor respect. They assume we're making the links that they've become accustomed to from other sectors. They can't understand why they should have to re-enter their details or repeat their story again and again in the digital age. And when we say we have no authority to share their information they say you never asked. Most are willing to share, and our colleague Sheena Reilly has data to show this in the health domain, when the rationale is explained to them. For example, if anonymised data is used in pursuit of better outcomes for their children or in

safer communities in the work that Anna and the Queensland Police Service are doing. Meanwhile, as Linda can elaborate on during the panel discussion, government agencies invest in bespoke rather than open collaborative platforms. And whilst universities nationally are significantly investing in advanced data capabilities to advance research these developments are often divorced from governments open data initiatives.

So the point is that the information, data and knowledge that we need largely exists. What we lack, or what we need to develop, are the policy and legislative frameworks, collective will and partnership models, that will allow us to connect and deploy that powerful resource in the service of priority problems in place. Now of course none of what I've described this morning is easy. There are many barriers and impediments to collaboration. They're real and present. Addressing and overcoming them will take time, imagination, leadership, patience, incentives and investment. I'm optimistic that that can and will happen. But we need urgently to mobilise people, community, technology, governance and collaborative platforms to enable it.

The value of inter-disciplinary perspectives and of leveraging networks of disbursed expertise has been a core theme in what I've tried to say this morning. The problems we face as a society are so wicked and complex that they exceed any of our individual and organisational understanding, capacity or resources. And along with many others I believe our combined commitment, energy, insight, networks and resources will be the source of new different and more creative ways of approaching problems and issues that matter for us and for our communities. This can be done, through blending the disciplines, but combining too the power of data evidence and research, with the professional expertise of those from the frontline. And that's what is so apparent in the Logan Together story. And the wisdom of lived experience from the people who are consuming and need services. This is what Beth Simone Noveck head of the White House Open Government initiative in the first Obama administration, now Director of MIT's governance lab calls smarter governance. She argues that the promise of opening government is that by connecting government institutions to people and organisations with diverse forms of expertise governments will be able to produce better results.

Governing openly stimulates new ideas. But it also attracts a greater diversity of ideas and approaches to solving those problems.

Let me conclude with what I think are three lessons from the Logan Together experiment of data enabled collaboration in place. The first, I alluded to earlier, that we should take an organic approach and give it time to grow and take root. Let's nurture it as a policy experiment and have the patience to wait and see how collective impact works with the support and involvement of partners and the community in place. Matthew often remarks that Plan A, the approach to social policy over recent decades, isn't working. He describes Logan Together as Plan B. You can't be a policy entrepreneur unless you have big claims. I think it's our responsibility and it's in our collective interest to ensure that all children have the best possible opportunities or at least that they get to meet Queensland benchmarks in terms of child development and wellbeing. A second lesson is to understand that innovation and productivity are in fact the small incremental improvements that are within all our power to make. And here I echo former Governor of the Reserve Bank, Glenn Stevens, who describes productivity as every day doing a thousand things a little better than yesterday. People who know me or have been in my classes know I get very, what would be the polite word this morning? Irritated by the fascination with huge blueprints. A lot we can do and we need to do it. We have the dynamic forces of people, community and technology lined up here in Queensland as I've argued. We need now to more strategically develop the fourth, the governance arrangements to support and enable collaboration. I've argued, and Linda can explain this in much more detail, that the basic architecture and capability is already here. Our challenge and our opportunity is to link it and to share it, much as libraries underpin the democratisation and dissemination of knowledge and the development of human capital that flowed from that in the Industrial Revolution.

A final lesson from Logan Together, and much else that I've reflected on in today's lecture, is that we shouldn't wait for somebody else to act. For a range of reasons that are well known to you, and I could recite them for you but I decided not to, our political processes are really struggling to adapt to the pressures of 21st century governance. I don't believe the loss of institutional memory and capacity for deep policy thinking have been deliberate. I've argued elsewhere that they're the unintended consequence of almost 40 years

of constant change and reform. Many people are alienated from and have lost trust in political processes and institutions. But those institutions are us. The time for audience democracy, as it's sometimes described, sitting on the sidelines and having a lot to say, has passed I think. It's time to rediscover our agency and our collective potential. Queenslanders and Australians have demonstrated this capacity many times in the past. And I can point you to a range of essays in the Griffith Review Fixing the System edition if anybody wants to challenge me on that. A shared platform for collaboration is a start. The what and why are in the data. The how and who rests with us. We can be the ones who collaborate and act to fix the system harnessing our comparative advantage for our collective good.

Thank you.

3. **MC** Yeah. Thanks Anne. And please join me in acknowledging Professor Tiernan one more time. Thank you.

4. (applause)

5. **MC** Now we'll get our panel conversation underway. And I'd like to invite the Right to Information Commissioner Clare Smith and Ms Linda O'Brien the Pro Vice Chancellor, Information Services at Griffith University to join me to do that. Clare brings a wealth of experience to the Right to Information Commissioner role having worked in government agencies and statutory integrity bodies for three decades. A former Assistant Crown Solicitor she practised in the field of information rights and responsibilities for almost 20 years. And Linda O'Brien before her current role worked in senior positions in several Australian universities including Principal Information at the University of Melbourne, Vice Principal of Information at the University of Melbourne, and Vice President University Services at the University of Newcastle. She is also importantly the Chair of the Open Data Institute Queensland, which you've heard Anne refer to and we'll come to a little bit later in our chat. And I want to get back to where Anne was taking us in her Solomon Lecture and the importance of that open information, but can I start with you perhaps Clare. It's actually Right to Information Day. And the Right to Information Act 2009 as everyone in this room knows changed the way we see the release of data, the aim being the

provision of information would be more proactive than reactive. Is that working in the way that you would like?

6. **CS** Short answer, yes. It can be better. Days like today are important to reinforce the fact that what the Act has said and is saying to government is that government information is a public resource. Open government, engaging with the community, giving them information, reasons why you made your decisions, it gains community trust and community engagement.
7. **MC** You said it could be better. Just briefly describe how.
8. **CS** I think it's important for people in government to realise it's not just an obligation, but that it benefits. It's cost effective. So it's explaining that. And that's what the push model has done. Can I say that the cultural change in Queensland is great. We did a self-assessment audit. So we've asked all the agencies that come under the Right to Information Act, and that includes public universities, hospitals, local Councils, public authorities as well as the large departments, and we asked them do you think there is a culture of releasing information and 84% said yes.
9. **MC** So what's been, how did you make that cultural shift? Because that's a big issue isn't it?
10. **CS** Look, the legislation itself was led from the Premier at the time. It was clearly communicated. And it still needs to be clearly communicated from leaders down. Active leadership about it. It's not something that just happens one day when you publish some policies on your departmental website. It's updating it. It's thinking when we've done this project let's put it out there. Are there things we should do to make sure that people's privacy isn't impacted. But it's constantly re-evaluating it and realising the usefulness of it.
11. **MC** Before I go across to Linda, one more question. In your position as Right to Information Commissioner, what do you think could be done, what's a couple of things that could be done to facilitate more open information in this State?
12. **CS** I think I've sort of touched upon that. It really is keeping it front of mind, recognising that it's useful information that you can get community feedback if you let them know what information you hold. You're seeking community engagement, you're letting them know the reasons for your decisions. People

don't become suspicious of government is a sound basis for that. So I think that's what needs to change. People need to realise that we should open that information up and not to be afraid. As I said, there will be sometimes errors. We get complaints about privacy breaches. And often the individual says all I wanted was an apology. Now maybe that's not the case, but I think often that is the case. Because there is going to be some administrative errors. It's not due to you know political corruption or even negligence, it's just a mistake.

13. **MC** Yeah. And as Anne said you know mistakes will be made. But we'll come to the privacy issue a little bit later. Linda, can I bring you in here. We hear about the importance of open data or open information as many people would prefer to call it. And we've heard from Anne how it can be used so well in a particular region. But from where you sit what do you see as the chief benefits of more open information being more readily available?
14. **LO** Chief benefits. There are many. And I'm really interested in the concept of open innovation through information. So that might be shared information as well as truly open. And I think there's a huge opportunity here to create what I call an information ecosystem that starts to blend the sort of work we're creating through research with government data and with data from not for profit and commercial sectors potentially, to create this really rich environment that fuels research and innovation but also practise in service. And I think one of the interesting things just listening to the comments about Right to Information, we live in a world now where everyone carries around a mobile phone. There's more mobile phones in Australia than people. And that doesn't just make you a consumer it makes you a provider.
15. **MC** Yeah.
16. **LO** So we're now all contributing to that information space. And if you think about recent disasters and the roles that individuals can play in information sharing it's about how we start to re-conceptualise what an information ecosystem would look like for Queensland that would drive benefit across so many domains.
17. **MC** So you're the Chair of the Open Data Institute Queensland and Anne said you can tell us a little bit more about it. I don't understand what it actually does to facilitate that environment of more open information.

18. **LO** Sure. So ADI comes out of the UK. It was founded by Sir Tim Berners-Lee who was the founder of the internet as we know it today. And he's really passionate about the democratisation of knowledge and the empowerment of the individual and their agency. And he formed the Open Data Institute in the UK and their 26 nodes globally. We're the only node in Australia. And our whole raison d'etre is about connecting, equipping and inspiring people about how to innovate with data. So we run lunch time seminar series. We're currently running a consultation around the open data policy for Queensland Government. We do a lot in terms of training and development, and we work with partners to do that. But it's really to help educate people to see the potential and the benefits.
19. **MC** When you say people. Individuals? Agencies?
20. **LO** Individuals and agencies. And it's not just government. We've had a lot of interest. On our Board we have Laing O'Rourke and Microsoft, you know so we've, you know Telstra is on our Board, (unintelligible – (ui)) here in Brisbane. And they're really committed to seeing the potential of unlocking the power of data to create public value.
21. **MC** So why does someone become a member? Do you seek out members to make it big? Or is something where people knock on your door?
22. **LO** We seek out partners. And we have many. I guess we're attempting to live, part of what Anne was talking about, this idea of building a collaborative network that benefits everyone.
23. **MC** Yeah. So how has that worked in the UK, given it's been operating so long over there?
24. **LO** So in the UK they've had very significant government funding. So that's really what kicked off the Open Data Institute over there. So it's been very much initially a creature of government and now they're looking at how they make that self-sustaining. But it's a very large entity there. There's about 70 staff I think. We have one person here. And they've really become the go-to place around data. We don't necessarily have those aspirations, we're about joining hands with all the other agencies that can contribute to create this environment that we'd like to see in Queensland.

25. **MC** Anne, can I bring you back in here. Do you think people have any understanding of how much information is available to them if they go looking?
26. **AT** Can I tell you that people with PhD's who've been around public administration and public policy for like 30 years didn't know what was available. It's sort of blown my mind the data and information capacity that exists in Queensland. And you know I'm not talking comparative advantage. I don't make outlandish claims usually, people who know me. So we have an amazing capacity here. The universities are part of a not for profit organisation. That's one of the partners in ODIQ. There's tremendous co-operation with government agencies. Anna has worked with the QPS. You know Griffith houses the secure crime lab, you know under ASIO level security. There's amazing information that exists. Now what do people want to do with it? They want to create insights that are going to make better policies. Linda, we were talking earlier about the UK not understanding the value of some of the data that it held. You should tell people that story cause that blew my mind as well.
27. **LO** Okay. It's just a really interesting example of the Post Office in the UK and the postcode data. So all the addresses in a postcode, a data set, are used for research purposes, used by innovators, entrepreneurs, so they could build their app that told you stuff about your suburb or whatever it might be. When they privatised the post the data went with the privatised company who then sold access to the data. Now they've got a really rich public asset. It might seem trivial, but it's actually a valuable piece of data that was handed over. And I guess I raised this with Ian Harper yesterday, because it's great that we want to see contestability in the human services market, but let's not give away our data with the service. You know we really need to see that this data's an asset that's of value to the community broadly.
28. **AT** Why I wanted to get Linda to tell that story is because I am a policy generalist. I've done a lot of policy work, but I had never thought about that. And I think some of the, you know we were talking about this you know in the colleagues that I mentioned about why is it that people don't understand or can't make the most of. None of us are information scientists. But information science exists. There are people with the skills and capabilities to do that. So you know I'm anxious in my own data that I create to make sure that it's organised and

available. I can't go on complaining about the institutional memory problem in government if the data that I create kind of isn't warehoused somewhere. So I think it's about for all of us...

29. **MC** Well not only warehoused, curated in a way that people understand.
30. **AT** Exactly right. So
31. **MC** So alright, so you keep referring to its role in policy.
32. **AT** I do.
33. **MC** What about its role in business?
34. **AT** Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.
35. **MC** And I don't know who wants to answer this. But I want to open a hairdressing salon in Norman Park. What kind of information would be available for me to make sure that I can either A, provide a service, but more importantly make a big profit?
36. **AT** You would be amazed.
37. **LO** Yeah. So we actually did some work in Logan around this.
38. **MC** And you might look at me and think I need a hairdressing salon.
39. **LO** It's really quite interesting, because there's data locked away at local government level, State and Federal that's valuable to you, as well as material that researchers may have collected.
40. **MC** Like what?
41. **LO** They're all in separate data sets. So if you want to know, so one of the projects we worked on with Logan was where would you put a health centre. So what are the transport routes. What's the demographic? What's the age grouping across the suburb. What sorts of people live in what parts of the suburb? And what are their requirements. What's the health profile. There's all this sort of information that would lead you to make saner and more sensible decisions about where you might locate such a thing. So if it's a hairdresser, similarly you could get demographic data. You could get data around the wealth or otherwise of the families in the target area. You could look at transport routes

if you think people won't have parking. You know so all these sorts of things add to the richness.

42. **MC** And is there an issue there in whether people pay for that data because I'm doing it for a business as opposed to providing a service?
43. **LO** Well I would argue that everyone benefits if you create a business.
44. **MC** Yeah.
45. **LO** And so I mean and if I use you know my dear colleague on our Board, Ryan McNamee who's the global CIO for Laing O'Rourke, I mean one of his passions is that he would like to be able to walk down a street in Brisbane, look at his phone through some virtual reality apps that show him where all the services are. Where all the power...
46. **MC** Yeah. Like public toilets along George Street.
47. **LO** Well, and he wants to see where the power lines are and where the water is and where, and everybody that builds in that region will benefit, will get faster builds, lower cost, less disruption, less health and safety issues. You know everyone benefits. So I think it's about appreciating a lot of the assets we sit on collectively are of value to everyone. They're pre-competitive.
48. **MC** So we're talking about what is available, but Anne this ties in with Logan Together I think.
49. **AT** Mmm.
50. **MC** What do you think are the community expectations in this space?
51. **AT** Yeah. And look I think this is one of the very important things for us to do is to document and learn and understand what's going on. Because Logan is a community that has had any number of interventions. One after another after another. What's really interesting to me as a political scientist is the kind of the capacity, the community capacities to organise around this cross-sector leadership table. And you know that group has you know a single mum of very limited education, the local Federal, State and Council member, and people who are being held to account really. And there are debates going on. Now, I'm not naive about the potential for those things to be really difficult, but we've

got, you know we have to make sure that it doesn't become all about government, all about universities, all about you know us and experimenting on people you know because we think what's good for them. I think the real opportunity of Logan Together is to empower people with information themselves about the things that they can be doing during you know pregnancy, in reading and helping their children learn.

52. **MC** But do you think more broadly there is the expectation that I should be able to get the history of the surgeon who's operating on me tomorrow, every school result from the school my children go to, mostly which is available I guess.

53. **AT** Sure.

54. **MC** But that community expectation of everything from waiting lists to judicial decisions.

55. **AT** Yeah. Look I mean I think it's going to be different. I mean we're looking at a very specific cohort of development of really vulnerable children from zero to eight. But we know, and this is kind of a policy tourism point, Sheena Reilly the head of health is a speech pathologist by discipline. She's the head of the health group. She's had people on the basis of what people have heard and learned about Logan Together, from Gold Coast communities going we've looked at, you know like ordinary people, we've looked at the early childhood development indicators for our children over the last three Census results and we're worried about their school readiness. Can you open a clinic? You know why aren't we getting a clinic in Nerang. And so she's very interested in the extent to which communities will drive this stuff themselves. Lesley's had a group from Hervey Bay jump on a mini-bus and come down for policy tourism, to have a look at how some of what's happening there in terms of data, information, thinking, partnership can be deployed around youth unemployment.

56. **MC** So Clare the same question to you in terms of the expectations coming in to your office and what the community expects to be available to them?

57. **CS** There was a survey done, it's 2010 now, that the office did about community's expectation about personal information the government holds on you, how

much do you expect to get that information. Nine out of 10 people expected to get all the information the government held about them.

58. **MC** On them individually?

59. **CS** Yes. Then it was what about government information generally. And two-thirds had an expectation that they would get all the information the government holds. So it's a very high expectation. For personal information nine out of 10. 90%. You will get that normally.

60. **MC** You know cause it's very tricky. I'm thinking Ian Stewart's sitting here in the front seat, but you know to know how many break-ins were in my suburb last night or whether someone recently released from jail has moved into the school next door to my kids. You know that in the public arena can play out two ways can't it?

61. **CS** Yes. And the Police crime statistics map that the Police introduced a number of years ago now, so the crime stats are there. You can click on your suburb. They made sure that it was a general. Like you might put where the burglaries are and just a centre point, it wasn't over the house, or the drug house, which probably everybody in the suburb does know anyway. So there's that level.

62. **AT** (ui) could be reporting (ui).

63. **CS** Yeah. I get a bit concerned with the privacy hat on about knowing if the person who's just been released from prison and done their time they're now living in the street. I have a bit of a concern about vigilanteism. But again that's a discussion, a policy consideration.

64. **MC** And a balance really isn't it?

65. **CS** And a balance.

66. **MC** So, okay. You mentioned Christian Porter in your Solomon Lecture Anne.

67. **AT** I did.

68. **MC** And I'm wondering in what you're all saying whether this offers a really new tool for government in the way Christian Porter announced last week flagging using data analysis to pick up those really in need of welfare, or is it more a

means for people who aren't in government to find solutions a little bit like Logan Together.

69. **AT** Look, I think both. I think it was really interesting and kind of a bit of a missed opportunity in Christian Porter's address was that something that has been happening in New Zealand for five years, the investment approach to welfare that's really about uplifting, now they're on the same side of politics, but in a way the kind of the binaries were created in what was actually a really very exciting thing in terms of Australia adopting an investment approach and using these actuarial models to sort of you know map the prospects and trajectories of young carers or whatever. But in the rhetoric it kind of very much very easily went to the oh well those people and they'll consume all this you know welfare and nothing will ever happen. The New Zealand model is more about if we've got people out of the game we've got a big loss of productivity. And we have to get people to a level. And that's already, they've save a billion dollars in their welfare budget through the welfare approach. So I think, you know I've got sort of, on the one hand I really commend him for doing that, cause I think you know Plan A is not working. And on the other hand you know we need to give people agency. The prospect of people making decisions themselves and understanding the language gap that opens up you know between 18 months and three, between children of professional families and others, the vocabulary gap that makes your school readiness just so impaired by the time you're five years old. If people understood that they would act. So we have to kind of find ways of, you know data's only, and information's only useful if people have the capacity to use it. So tools become the issues.

70. **MC** And I can see you nodding. You want to add there?

71. **LO** Yeah. The personal agency thing I think is absolutely critical. Because I think we now live in a society where we're happy to give away a lot of information about ourselves and share it where we can see benefit back. And if I just use an example from the world of research, there's now a global researcher identifier. So this is owned by the researcher. They create their own. But once they've created it they can link that to all their publications and grants and other information. And they can make that as open as they want. So it puts the agency in the hand of the researcher, but it allows them to create this ecosystem drawing data from other places. If we could think about something

similar in the case of an individual within a community and give them that agency. So yes they can get information from different parts of government at different times, but how do we let them see this and manage this and know who they wish to share it with.

72. **MC** All of this involves leadership. And then when we looked at the diagram that you put up Anne there was no one person leading it.

73. **AT** That's right.

74. **MC** And when you were talking about a cultural shift Clare you were talking about everyone moving to understand this. Do we have to understand that this is leadership from the grassroots that will determine how much information is released and how it is used? Or what's the role of the leadership of people say in this room in this debate? Clare?

75. **CS** Well, I think it's really leadership from the top down. I think the community often doesn't know what information to ask for. And that's why there has to be engagement with the community. And what Linda's doing working with the government is to look at the data sets I understand and to see what's being accessed and to work out what information the community could need or does want and to put it out there in a useful means. I know we're all technology mobile phones etcetera, but there are people in the community that don't access that. There's the elderly, there's people who can't pay for their Bigpond this month, or you know their iPad's been stolen. So I think it's capturing it not just through electronic websites but also talking to people in the community as well.

76. **MC** Do you want to add to that Anne?

77. **AT** Oh look, I really agree. Because, but I think this is why I talk about human capital. You know governments and universities are in the business of educating and disseminating knowledge to people. And that needs to really begin early. I put a fatwa on education curriculum as a policy instrument in any of the proposals that my students put to me. I just have a, it's not allowed. So I'm not suggesting we need to do new things in the curriculum necessarily, but you know I mean ODIQ does data, what do you call them? Data, not architecture workshops with people?

78. **CS** Yeah. So open data workshops. Yeah.
79. **AT** Yeah. That teach people how to use the techniques. I mean I think, you imagine, you know say disaster resilience is an area that we think has phenomenal potential for productivity gain in Queensland. You know \$16 billion from 2010/11. If people had better understood and managed their own risk, if people had known about the extraordinary climate models that have been developed, you know other things, and were able to kind to see that information in place they'd be much better able to make decisions about insurance, about a whole variety of things. But how would they know how to do that. We need to educate them. But there is an employment dimension to this I think that we're not exploring. And I'd like to see the most vulnerable, the people who you know people who have just you know been displaced by the mining downturn or whatever re-tooled for these kind of purposes.
80. **MC** Okay. So just picking up what you said there, and Clare can I talk to you about the balance here. So much information is being published in so many ways. And in researching this I was looking at what is available and I couldn't make sense of a lot of it. And that's my training.
81. **CS** Yeah.
82. **MC** So is there a role for government, or where is the role to actually deliver this information in a meaningful way, curated so that people actually understand the information they're being given?
83. **CS** Well, again that's the two-year project I think that's on the run now. It's talking about what information do we all hold. We talk in the Right to Information Act about putting your policies and your procedures up on the website, looking at administrative access schemes, so people can get information without going through the formal access request. But the whole general information that's there I think that's why this, I think it's a two-year partnership will look at what do people want, how can they meaningfully access it. So that it can be a description. This is what we hold, this is how you can get it.
84. **MC** And there's a role for government there you in curating it?
85. **CS** Well certainly. Again public universities are captured by the Right to Information Act. So it's a general umbrella about public resource, government

information that is in our control or possession is yours unless, again, on balance it's against the public interest to release it.

86. **AT** And the Productivity Commission has got a big inquiry into this at the moment.
87. **MC** Yeah.
88. **LO** Yeah. I think there's a real opportunity though here for the entrepreneurs and innovators. And I would again point to a project we're involved doing where we created an app. It was a student driven project which showed all the disability services on the Gold Coast by location. So it's a free app, anyone can get it. But it's built on public data. So I think for the public agencies it's making it findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable in a way that makes sense and then allowing others to innovate on the back of that to create new opportunities.
89. **MC** So staying with you. With the onus on organisations so much to release data what are the issues with the integrity of that data? Because some of it might be historical. Some of it I guess would be hand keyed.
90. **LO** Yeah. And this is where there needs to be really good metadata, data about the data that explains the context in which it's made open. And I think all too often that's the excuse for not making it open. But in fact by opening it up people will find the flaws in the data. That's how you'll get better data quality. And it will drive people to think about putting in place better processes to ensure their data's of quality.
91. **MC** So there might be mistakes along the way in the process you're saying?
92. **LO** Absolutely. And I think if government agencies now appreciate that at the end of the day this data's going to be a public resource they'll think differently about its creation and the processes that it goes through before it gets there. So it's really thinking about that at inception to make sure you've got (ui)...
93. **MC** It's a hard thing for an organisation though isn't it? Release all this crime data and oh there's a big mistake you know. And the public understanding of that for example.
94. **LO** Yeah. I think that you know I guess for me you know I trained as a librarian, I'm passionate about making information assessable. And the more

transparent you can be, albeit putting those caveats around it, the more you've got a chance of improving the quality of what you're doing.

95. **MC** Absolutely. And when we were having a pre-chat you raised the issue of trust in this space.
96. **AT** Yeah, yeah, absolutely.
97. **MC** Just talk about that for a moment.
98. **AT** Yeah, well I mean you know one of the really disappointing things about the Census fail was some of, you know before whatever happened on Census night, was some of the you know political discourse in the lead up to it. You know you can't trust it you know. I always say to people the government's not organised enough to impress you, okay. And that's no offence to you know anyone in this room. But you know really they got lots of other things on their mind. You know go the cockup every time. But you know it's seldom different to that. But I mean you know I think that's disappointing. I think we need to, I mean it reveals Madonna a generalised anxiety in our community I think about the political processes in public intuitions. And there's people who are you know who are freewheeling on that for their own political benefit but with no solution. So that's why I kind of favour the local, the organic, the things that people are doing together to build trust. It will take a very long time for people to say oh well you know I'd trust the ABS again, and yet ironically 95% of people filled out their Census form. So Australians are kind of goody-two-shoes at one level, kind of cynical at another. So you know I think this is the nice thing about Logan Together and some of the other things that are happening is that people are trying, testing and learning. And I say that for a reason. One of the other pieces of Christian Porter's announcement the other week was a \$96 million fund to try, test and learn. So of course you know my ears went up. And I thought to myself well with the comparative advantage we have, with the problems we know we face, with the architecture already here, and the policy framework, where's Queensland in that?
99. **LO** Yeah, so I guess just to echo that point...
100. **AT** That's my challenge.

101. **LO** There's a whole bunch of Australian organisations passionate about this and they happen to be posted out of Brisbane. You know the AusGOAL which is concerned with the Australian Open Government Access and Licensing framework, the CO's here. The Australasian Open Access Strategy Group that grew out of QUT, it's based here. We've got...
102. **MC** But in a way because we're talking about open data geographic locations are less important really.
103. **AT** Well (ui)...
104. **LO** Except that it's a knowledge cluster. If you take the place piece...
105. **AT** It's a knowledge cluster.
106. **LO** If you take the place piece it's a knowledge cluster.
107. **MC** Okay. So just on this then, and talking about trust, Clare you raised the issue of privacy a moment ago. Can I ask you about how much information should be de-identified? Because if you de-identify it too much it's probably useless, if you don't de-identify it enough you'll have a real headache.
108. **CS** That's right. And it is a balancing act. And it depends for the use and where that information is going to. For instance, with research you can put terms and secrecy and security conditions on it so it's sort of a closed group that are looking at that data. If it's just to be used to inform the community at large where to place a health centre it can be much higher, more de-identified. But that is a balancing act. And each time you get a project, each time you're collecting information, that's what we ask the agency to look at. Should we advise the person when they give it to us this is the use we want to make of it and get them to tick yes or no so it can go, so there's no surprises for them.
109. **LO** Yes. So I guess I'd just pick up on that though, and this is where we need a whole new way of thinking about permissions. Because if you're collecting the data for research purposes you can also de-identify that and make it more valuable to others. So we keep locking it away in the conditions we put around that research use.
110. **MC** Yes.

111. **LO** We need to re-think the whole way in which we're thinking about permission. So that if we're amassing quality data we can repurpose it for multiple benefits.
112. **MC** And I'm thinking things like child protection or domestic violence for example where information could be so crucial but take all the de-identification away from it and it may be a lot less...
113. **LO** Yeah, so it's seeing it as a continuum I guess. And I think we've siloed the research conversation from the public benefit conversation, you know and that's why Queensland Cyber Infrastructure are partners with us. We're trying to see about how we join around a community, so health is one we're talking about with Sheena on the Gold Coast, how we create a data environment that can facilitate research and deep understanding but also be used for public value.
114. **MC** Okay. And Clare did you want to add anything there?
115. **CS** Just to say that the Information Privacy Act and the privacy principles allow in most cases for the sharing of personal information. That's not the blocker. Often there can be legislation, so people receive it and are told to deal with it confidentially. But the government, there's a Bill before the Parliament at the moment dealing with sharing information, dealing with family and domestic violence. So there's also policy considerations that government's looking at at the moment.
116. **MC** Okay. Anne said the basic infrastructure to do all this, or architecture I think is the word you used, is already here.
117. **AT** Mmm.
118. **MC** Linda, we're moving to a future where everything is connected. Almost everything is a data point in real time.
119. **LO** Absolutely.
120. **MC** Do you think we're geared up with the IT systems to make that work?
121. **LO** I think where I see that happening in real time is in the world of research. But we're not taking those learnings back into practice as well as we might. And that's certainly part of the National Science and Innovation agenda, that

Australia has a real problem with what we're doing in research being translated into better practice on the ground. And I think there's this amazing window of opportunity to demonstrate how to do that in Queensland (ui)...

122. **AT** And that's why I wanted to make the argument in the lecture that what we've got to create is the shared platform, the collaborative platform, because actually none of us have all the expertise that we need, but everybody's got something. And actually Queensland's got a lot more of this than most other jurisdictions by virtue of the infrastructure, the people, the cluster, but also I think the Government Statistician is hugely important. And also the commitment. I mean you know this is a small policy class that you know there's a lot of consensus around this you know. I think it's in Victoria that only one or two of the universities are in the shared infrastructure. Here all of them are.
123. **MC** Alright, so on the universities, and I'll go to Linda on this if that's possible. I read Ian Fraser, Professor Ian Fraser's biography, and he's a scientist. He developed the cervical cancer vaccine, but what shocked me was even in Australia now you might have one university in Melbourne, one in Perth and one in Queensland all paid through public funds all doing very similar experiments. Should there be a pressure on universities, given that most of their research is publicly funded, that those kind of experiments or research be done across universities, not be owned by specific universities?
124. **LO** Yeah, look, and that already happens through a range of initiatives, collaborative research centres being one. I think in Queensland we actually collaborate exceptionally well. There is always the case, and you know malaria's one I'm familiar with, where you've got two different research teams working on solutions, but they're quite different solutions. And you do actually want to encourage that diversity of research, because you don't know which of those innovations are going to actually yield benefit. But certainly there is a bit shared investment in national collaborative research infrastructure. And I think Queensland's probably a showcase in terms of the way it does that. But we are part of that network. And Australia is seen as world-leading in the sharing of research data. So there's a research data alliance globally, and Australia was really the foundation start-up for that that meets in Europe. So we've got a great base from which to take that.

125. **MC** Yes.
126. **LO** I think there's always that competitive pressure. So there is always that competition as well as collaboration and that's how we play both those things to mutual benefit.
127. **AT** And that was the point I wanted to add if I might, about I mentioned incentives. And universities respond to incentives. And higher education policy and funding has been very kind of unstable in the last few years as you'd understand. But people in higher education policy were really surprised when the universities stopped doing applied work to publish in international journals. Because you know...
128. **LO** That's cause they incentivised it. Yeah.
129. **AT** That was cause of how it was incentivised. So we need to think about...
130. **MC** How that's done.
131. **AT** ...incentives and alignment. And so those are some of the points I was trying to.
132. **MC** Alright. We need to bring this to a close. But can I end on the future. In five years where should we be? And what do each of you think is the single biggest thing that needs to be done in the short term to ensure that is the case? And if I can start at that end and work my way down to Anne. Linda?
133. **LO** Sure. Five years. I'd like to think we had a really clear understanding and processes and governance in place so that we were creating an information ecosystem that benefited research and the public generally and incentivised innovation in a new way. And that would be across the open shared close domains of data. It would be nice to think we had the frameworks in place, governance and other things to make that possible and we'd removed some of the barriers to making that...
134. **MC** Think that's possible?
135. **LO** We'll give it a kick along for five years. I'm always one for big ideas. And you know let's make a try and see how we go.
136. **MC** Clare?

137. **CS** Five years' time. I'd like to see less external reviews in our office. Because I think just to get everybody in government to realise you release information as a matter of course. It's just, yeah it's what you do.
138. **MC** Yes. Okay, a very noble aim. And let's hope in five years it is the case. And Anne? Last word to the Solomon Lecturer giverer.
139. **AT** I don't want to wait five years. I want Queensland to back itself. If Victoria ends up with all that money out of the Try Test Learn Fund I am going to cry my eyes out. So you know it's a call to action really. I think we've got great capacity here. What I'd like is people to stop looking everywhere else for the solution and start looking to themselves in their capacity and to act. And I'd like them to get involved. And in five years' time we'd every one of those 9,000 kids meeting those developmental objectives, and that'd be a huge benefit to all of us. And you think of all the other areas that we could grow the productivity and performance and get ourselves up from being one of the least well-performing States economically.
140. **MC** Ladies and gentlemen, please put your hands together for our panel.
141. (applause)