



# FREIGHT DATA REQUIREMENTS STUDY FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE BASE

A Research Report for the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities

28 February  
2019

## Contents

Appendix A. Findings and evidence base.....	1
---	---

## Tables

Table 1 Relationship between recommendation, findings and evidence base .....	1
---	---

## Appendix A. Findings and evidence base

**Table 1 Relationship between recommendation, findings and evidence base**

No.	Recommendation	Finding	Evidence supporting Finding
1	DIRDC to champion a nationally consistent policy direction for Australian freight data	Freight data not consistent across jurisdictions	WP2 (Finding 18; s5.2.18)
1(a)	A nationally consistent approach to data standards, harmonisation and coordination across jurisdictions.	Lack of coordination, standards and harmonisation of freight-related datasets Potentially large gains from coordinating existing datasets	WP1 (Survey) [DN: Ali, we need all your survey etc data] High-level economic impact analysis (chapter 8 of this Draft Report)
1(b)	Encouraging open data principles at the state and local government level, (particularly recognising the public good nature of data collected by governments and funded by the taxpayer).	Government-produced datasets not readily or freely available to stakeholders Private-sector data sets not readily or freely available to stakeholders	WP2 (Finding 18; s5.2.18); WP3 (section 5) WP2 (Findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 15; section 5.2)
1(c)	Further investigating solutions to find a workable balance between private ownership of data and public benefit from aggregating and sharing firm-level data.	Firms (SBE's in particular) not prepared to share commercially sensitive data 'Competition' identified as the most important barrier to sharing	WP1 (survey finding) WP1 (survey finding)
1(d)	Strengthen, and (where useful) streamline, existing freight data proposals, pilots and programs.	We found 52 promising proposals, pilots and programs Some programs are similar and could be streamlined (eg. Trade Community System and Customs Integrated Cargo System)	WP3 (section 3.4) WP3 (section 3.4)
1(e)	That consideration be given to development of a National Freight Movement Model (NFMM), building (if and where efficient) on existing state-based and private sector models.	We found a lack of integration and consistency of data across states	WP2 (Finding 18; s5.2.18); WP3 (section 5)
2	Establish the Office of the National Freight Data Coordinator		
2(a)	National focus.	Freight data collection does not currently have a national focus	WP2 (gap identification) WP1 (Survey finding, esp. MBE, LBE, IA)

No.	Recommendation	Finding	Evidence supporting Finding
		Lack of visibility at the supply chain level (i.e. an 'end to end' view)	
2(b)	Trusted by both industry and government (in this regard, a relatively independent government agency is more likely to be successful).	Government is not trusted by industry to collect data Lack of trust between stakeholders to share data Lack of traction from previous industry reform efforts Identified barriers to sharing	WP1 (survey) WP1 (survey) WP1 (survey) WP1 (survey)
2(c)	A focus on hosting, collection and dissemination to meet the needs of stakeholders, (as opposed to analysis or preparation of reports for Ministers).	Collection agencies (as opposed to analytical agencies), are more trusted Agencies independent of Ministerial control are more trusted	
2(d)	An initial focus on data standards, and fostering harmonisation and concordance across jurisdictions (and internationally where feasible).	There is likely to be significant gains from coordinating existing freight data, before undertaking new collections	WP2 (Finding 18); WP3 (existing programs); WP4
3	Roles and responsibilities and initial work programme of ONFDC		
3(a)	ONFDC to establish a republishing or 'hosting' website with the mission to republish all data collated from government agencies across the Federation.	Data across jurisdictions (public) and between firms not harmonised, standardised or even visible Industry wants a 'one-stop-shop'	WP1 (survey)
3(b)	Resolve standards, particularly in relation to: (i) data definitions, (ii) data formats, (iii) level of aggregation/granularity for similar (but heretofore incompatible) jurisdictional data.	We identified numerous issues in relation to data harmonisation, concordance and standards (as part of the gap analysis)	WP2 (most findings); WP1 (survey);
3(c)	(To foster 3(a) and (b)), encourage the sharing of data, especially government data. As part of this, develop sharing protocols and agreements, informed by industry and government needs and capabilities.	We identified a strong reluctance to share data, especially among smaller firms	WP1 (survey)
3(d)	In terms of purchasing and publishing privately owned data (such as that produced by Google, Tom Tom and others), the ONFDC should purchase freight movement or other datasets with a national scope on behalf of all Australian jurisdictions.	Lack of real-time data	WP1 (Survey)

No.	Recommendation	Finding	Evidence supporting Finding
3(e)	Develop software (API's) to automate data collection.	We found that there was a lack of data automation relative to international best-practice	WP4 WP2
3(f)	Reach an industry consensus on what are the highest priority freight data gaps. This task will require further analysis related to understanding the costs of benefits of addressing data gaps, on a case-by-case basis. As a general observation, it would seem that a focus on building datasets to support: (a) freight productivity, and (b) community safety, would be most beneficial.	We found 18 significant freight data gaps The industry (stakeholders) have different views about the main priorities	WP2 (section 5.2) WP1 (survey)