

## **Draft State-wide Data and Knowledge Hub Workshop Notes 17<sup>th</sup> July 2009**

---

### **1. Workshop Process**

The participants at the State-wide Data and Knowledge Hub Workshop on the 17<sup>th</sup> July 2009 were presented information about what came out of the two regional pilots, background to the project and recommendations gathered from both pilots and from a state level.

Participants were then asked to review the recommendations in terms of what recommendations may have already been done, or what actions might be contributing to this recommendation and what other recommendations may need to be put forward. This was undertaken in small groups, with participants then being able to add this to all the recommendations which were written on butchers paper and placed on the walls of the room.

As a whole group the participants were asked to prioritise all the recommendations (including any identified new ones) by placing a red tick beside ones which were high impact and low effort (time/cost) and a green tick beside ones which had high impact and required high effort (time/cost). People were asked to place a red and a green tick in each of the three recommendation categories (information technology, communication and governance and facilitation functions) to identify priority recommendations. Recommendations which had no ticks associated were identified as either low priority or may already be undertaken.

In section 2 of this document the top three priority recommendations are documented with their associated action plans. The recommendations in the red boxes were deemed low cost but high impact and the recommendation in the green box was identified as high cost but still high impact.

Section 3 of the document provides comments from participants for the remaining recommendations which should be considered in the remaining part of Phase 1 and into Phase 2 of the project.

This document will be tabled and discussed at the Qld NRM Data and Knowledge Hub State Steering Committee meeting on Tuesday the 28<sup>th</sup> of July 2009 and incorporated into the final report for the project.

## 2. Prioritised recommendations and comments

**Development of an independent state-wide steering committee that coordinates and communicates across existing networks and working groups to ensure NRM information/data/knowledge is better integrated and delivered. This committee will require clear direction & support that will follow a step by step plan according to resources and priorities.**

**(Low costs but high impact recommendation)**

### **Comments from participants**

- Must link in with existing groups/committees
- Needs coordination at a state level with buy in from state agencies.

### **Action Plan**

#### **What?**

- Data and Knowledge Hub State Steering Committee – need to broaden existing membership and keep at a high level (eg. Regional Body CEO, State/Federal Govt Executive).
- Develop theme based working groups to action some of the other recommendations presented at the state workshop.
- Time and dollars allocated for state-wide coordination for the steering committee and liaison with local, regional, state and federal level stakeholders.

#### **When?**

- Revised committee by December 2009, to meet quarterly?

#### **How?**

- Identify key players with the capacity and authority to take action, make change and decisions within their respective organisations.
- Regional interdepartmental committees established (like the Northern DataHub Advisory Group) which would then report up to the state steering committee.
- Members to be champions of change, must report back to their stakeholders about the DataHub concept and get buy in from their organisation.
- State coordinator to regularly engage with members to be able to communicate their relevant information about linkages back to stakeholders and regional knowledge brokers.
- Need to generate list of potential members and possible revise current terms of reference for the existing steering committee.
- Have a rotating chair to ensure independence of committee.

**Develop regional delivery models for knowledge brokers/mentors which foster cross stakeholder engagement and partnership agreements.**

**(High costs but high impact recommendation)**

**Comments from participants**

- State of Environment (SOE) Online partly addresses this – discuss with Vicki Hall (DERM).
- Must share Phase 1 engagement process with others to learn from experience.
- Need buy in from cross regional stakeholders in commitment and resources to ensure the “region” owns the process. If every stakeholder contributed some dollars towards knowledge brokering functions in their region, effective, owned processes could occur.
- Utilise social network analysis to evaluate knowledge sharing at the beginning of phase 2 and at the end of phase 2.

**Action Plan**

**What?**

- Current pilots set up models but have not had time to evaluate implementation.
- Build on existing momentum created with regional networks in Phase 1.
- Look at what others have done (other states, nationally, internationally) and test a few models of what is already working.
- Identify evaluation criteria for Phase 2 implementation.
- A need for the devolution of skills across regional bodies/stakeholders.
- Look at partnership models with multi-stakeholder buy in.
- Need to communicate outcomes more broadly of Phase 1 to ensure buy in for regional delivery.

**When?**

Begin August 2009 and move into Phase 2.

**How?**

- Establish a working group under the steering committee to look at regional delivery models.
- Build on Phase 1 and projects/functions into Phase 2 to ensure momentum is not lost. This includes having dedicated regional brokers and state coordinator role whose sole function is to undertake the objectives of cross regional and state knowledge brokering.
- Decide on other ways to engage other regions/stakeholders not in phase 1 in the knowledge brokering process – e.g. holding priority knowledge sharing forums.
- Have some roles in government (regional/state) and some in regional bodies. Roles may include – communicator, compiler, networker/broker, synthesiser/integrator of derived products.

## Future NRM and related projects need to adopt better records of metadata as part of funding requirements

### (Low costs but high impact recommendation)

#### Comments from participants

- It is impossible to do consistent data capture and it is better to do consistent metadata capture. There are metadata standards that already exist, however there is a need to check these standards and see if they are stringent.
- Government meta-data standard – IS34 exists.
- enQUIRE contains the who and why with some spatial data within or hosted by industry (e.g.. Ag Dat), it also has project level metadata
- DERM Thesaurus needed so that the same terminology is used for describing metadata, this could then be used by stakeholders as well.
- Need to link funding requirements to ensure the full disclosure of metadata is provided.
- QGIS (Qld Government Information Service) - there is the ability of QGIS to host non-Govt data (e.g. regional NRM data-sets); the implications for having no meta-data needs to be better communicated.
- Not all stakeholders receive NRM funding that work in the “NRM” field (NRM is very broad) – need to see how they can get more involved.
- Key stakeholders need to be involved/engaged and where possible commit.
- What metadata is being described? Which bodies hand out funding and who would see this metadata description?
- What we need is not “better records” but rather it is about accessing the records.
- Metadata collation needs to part of project management processes.

#### Action Plan

##### What?

- Better records of metadata should utilise ANZLIC standard for spatial information and library standards for reports.
- Need to ensure this metadata is searchable.
- Could utilise social network tools as a way of gathering metadata.

##### When?

Now

##### How?

- Written into reporting requirements to ensure mandatory adoption.
- Could use Wiki or new Google Wave.
- Need to link to the Library Act and Copyright Act.

### **3. Other recommendations discussed but not prioritised**

- **The Librarian function/position needs to have strong 'people' skills and be able to facilitate a strong cultural shift that will permanently support this function.**

Comments from participants

- Facilitation of cultural change as a key role of the position as well as working with stakeholders.
- Recommendations back up what was identified in the 2008 Scoping Project.
- Need to have dedicated roles in knowledge brokering to ensure the function does not get used for other purposes.
- Need to have a state coordination role to ensure cross regional communication and brokerage of concept with state level stakeholders.

- **The librarian role needs to concentrate firstly on networking facilitation as opposed to the development of an IT solution.**

Comments from participants

- The person(s) need to have an understanding of the big picture of knowledge
- They need to develop an evaluative framework and conceptual model of how knowledge sharing fits into the big picture – who/where/how
- Need to ensure we have succession planning and knowledge capture from existing facilitators (regional and state) in phase 1.
- Need to ensure we continue statewide knowledge sharing around data, information and knowledge initiatives.

- **The librarian role needs to strengthen and maintain cross regional support in order to function properly and to be supported by all stakeholders.**

Comments from participants

- Is this a role of the Regional NRM Groups Collective?
- Many stakeholders in provision of NRM data which will remain a challenge (there is not one level that suits everyone)
- The current pilot seems to work well with regional people taking on a facilitation role with statewide coordination provided by a lead agency.

- DERM facilitates state network for community water quality monitoring officers who act as knowledge brokers – good model – regional bodies, community groups, industry and government working together.
- Long term strategy needed and funding to support existing and additional facilitators.
- **A cost benefit analysis in the next phase needs to be conducted to demonstrate the value of the function(s)/role.**
- **The librarian/broker function to be isolated from funding cycles as much as possible.**
- **The role needs to be unilaterally supported in order to prosper and survive in the long term.**
- **Develop a marketing and promotion strategy in order to keep the function/roles alive and vibrant.**
- **Development of a Qld NRM data, information and knowledge communication plan. This will ensure better communication across stakeholders about what other projects, systems and initiatives are in existence or being planned to assist collaboration and reduce duplication.**

Comments from participants

- Must deliver communication and not just be another plan
- Must make it relevant to all stakeholders
- A lexicon for knowledge and information sharing – a common language is needed
- Coordinated at a state level with links to all stakeholders
- Change name of project to better reflect process – eg. brokering, sharing of information, collaboration
- Need communicate outcomes of phase 1 to ensure buy in
- **An integrated system which combines existing systems and databases which has processes for storing, cataloguing and accessing all forms of NRM information/knowledge/data.**

Comments from participants

- SOE Online partly addresses an integrated system.
- It is impossible to undertake consistent data capture – it is better to do consistent meta-data capture.
- If a meta-data catalogue exists, which states where/which system to access to get the information would be welcomed.
- South East Qld Healthy Waterways Partnership is developing a website tool which interrogates many other databases to provide information to the inquirer – “health – e – waterways” – although water quality data only.
- AANRO database is an integrated system.

- Need to know what single system can be implemented across all parties “interoperable” is more achievable.
- Need to include the currency of the information in the system.
- Need some way of linking all current systems and not create a new one.

- **Current and future NRM database websites to be Google searchable.**

Comments from participants

- Already possible if the database is accessible

- **Data download service is easy to search and download.**

Comments from participants

- Already done – QGIS
- Need a university digital repository for scientific papers

- **System of permanent URLs to be used by government agencies when designing websites (so if content is removed it can still be accessed).**

Comments from participants

- Pandora – National Library of Australia

- **Data blockages unblocked by creating a system of validating confidentiality and access levels.**

- **All government funded data is free and freely useable.**

Comments from participants

- RGC data-share agreement with DERM in place.

- **A consistent structure for data collection created across stakeholders.**

Comments from participants

- Gaps in existing project management processes e.g. metadata collation

- **A peak body established to coordinate aggregated data.**