

# AusSeabed Steering Committee

Meeting no. 7: 25<sup>th</sup> November 2020, 10:00-13:00, Online

Notes prepared by Aero Leplastrier and Hannah Evans

**Attendees:** Ralph Talbot-Smith (WA DoT), Tara Martin (CSIRO MNF – Vice Chair), Clive Fraser (FrontierSI), Kim Picard (GA—Chair), Hugh Parker (Fugro), Kevin MacKay (NIWA), Mary Young (Deakin), Aero Leplastrier (GA—Secretariat/A/g Secretary), Tim Ingleton (NSW DPIE), Nigel Townsend (AHO), Hannah Evans (GA—Observer/Secretariat), Gretchen Grammer (SARDI), David Crossman (IIC Technologies Australasia), Iain Parnum (Curtin University), Cath Sampson (Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment)

## Meeting Overview

### *Actions list*

*Table 1. Action list with updates on continuing actions from the previous Steering Committee meetings (SC.4, SC.5, SC.6) and new actions raised during this Steering Committee meeting (SC.7)*

	Action	Responsible Party	Date for Completion	Comments/Status
SC.7.1	<a href="#">Complete retro survey</a>	Remaining SC	4 <sup>th</sup> December	Closed: Survey has been completed and individuals new to the committee engaged in person
SC.7.2	Begin development on Satellite Derived Bathymetry Guidelines, including the formation of a Working Group (if required), and provide update at the next meeting	NT	March	Working group has been established and is progressing. This work will be tracked as part of the 2021/22 work plan.
SC.7.3	Discuss Executive Board Pitch and progress based on comments provided by Steering Committee in session	KP, TM	8 <sup>th</sup> December	Pitch presented to EB in December.
SC.7.4	Send out Communication and Engagement Strategy for review to working group (with understanding that it may be further distilled into internal and external versions at a later date)	AL	11 <sup>th</sup> December	A draft is being prepared and will be sent to SC for review after which time content will be separated out into a comprehensive Communications and Engagement Strategy, a quick

SC.7.5	Refine the Communication and Engagement Strategy and provide to SC for comment	DC, GG, RTS, RH, TI, AL	Feedback: 14 <sup>th</sup> January 2020 Distributed to SC on 1 <sup>st</sup> February	start guide, and a mechanism for establishing a yearly outreach plan.
SC.7.6	Provide feedback on First Nations Collaboration Strategy	All SC	SC feedback due: 11 <sup>th</sup> December	Feedback incorporated into draft and meeting held. Decision made to discontinue with draft as First Nations representatives had not yet been consulted or invited to collaborate on the document.
SC.7.7	Review draft of First Nations Collaboration Strategy and establish a forward plan for consultation.	TI, KP, AL, HE, TM, GG	31 <sup>st</sup> January 2020	Decision to reach out to NMSC and AMSA to affirm whether the ASB program should carry on individually or align with a larger national movement
SC.7.8	Conduct out of session meeting to discuss outreach for 2021	RTS, KP, AL, HE, MY, IP	14 <sup>th</sup> December	Closed: Meeting should focus on developing a targeted plan of outreach for the 2021 deliverables and discuss forward planning for known 2021 engagement opportunities in the <a href="#">Engagement Calendar</a> .
SC.7.9	Provide comment on 10 year plan	All	December 18 <sup>th</sup>	Closed: Tara to summarise the plan in one-page for distribution with the minutes
SC.7.10	Progress National Priorities Layer Framework workshop plan	AL, HE, IP, CF, NT	Meeting: Jan 2021 Workshop: March 2021	Closed: Interest from NESP in this work and agreement from AHO that the name should be changed to National Areas of Interest. Workshop has been postponed but community scoping work will continue
<b>Actions carrying over from previous meetings</b>				
SC.6.1	Review skills matrix and representative networks to ensure that end-users are represented	KP & TM to lead all SC response required.	February	To do.
SC 6.8	Have another planning meeting to establish the comms strategy and outreach for the upcoming webinar	TI, AL, RTS, others.	9 <sup>th</sup> July 2020	
SC.5.15	SC members to provide image and bio for AusSeabed website	KP, KM, TM, TI, IP, HP, NT, MY, CF, EH	3/07/2020	Nigel will get an answer to us in the next couple of weeks.

SC.4.21	Organise a meeting with Jacqui Brown's project leads	TM	?	Jacqui is in support of the idea and Tara is now following up with two of Jacqui's project leads to look into the Oceans and atmosphere modelling work to inform AusSeabed's future 10 year impact plan on what kind of development/integration would be useful from a climate change modelling perspective.  Update pending.
SC.4.31	Discuss potential of Secretary support for AusSeabed	KP	27 <sup>th</sup> July 2020	Raised during July EB where Kim highlighted the cost associated with Secretary duty and comms preparation (>100k). All acknowledged the hard work that is needed, but offered no solution other than GA to keep it.

## Meeting notes

*Meeting opened 1000*

### 1 Introduction

#### 1.1 Welcome

- The meeting opened with an Acknowledgment of Country
- Achievements since the last meeting (July) were raised and thanks extended to the Steering Committee for sharing the load
- The Committee agreed to postpone the Retro Session (agenda item 9) to the next meeting (proposed to be March 2021)

*Action SC.7.1 Remaining SC members to complete retro survey*

#### 1.2 Other Business

- None raised

## 2 Minutes & Actions

### 2.1 Minutes

**Outcome sought:** Endorsement of meeting 6 minutes & endorsement of expedited out of session endorsement and publication process moving forward

**Result:**

- Meeting 6 minutes endorsed for publication
- Expedited process endorsed (two-week turnaround for meeting minutes)
- Confirmation was provided from the secretariat that actions resulting from each meeting will be clearly provided in a follow up email

### 2.2 Actions

- Outstanding actions were followed up with the group and an updated list is provided above [Table 1]. A live list of the actions resulting from steering committee meetings can be found on the **AusSeabed GovTEAMS Community** under the **General** thread in the **Files** section. Anyone who has not been able to access/set up GovTEAMS needs to contact [Aero](#).

## 3 Work Plan Update

### 2.1 Work Plan Progress Report

**Outcome sought:** That the Steering Committee discuss the updates provided in the Work Plan Quarterly Progress Report

**Result:**

- KP presented the quarterly progress and noted that some items have had to be adjusted with more realistic timelines (based on emerging obstacles/COVID19)
- Key updates were highlighted within section themes:
  - Governance
    - MS5: Economic Benefit Analysis delayed. KP advised this task is likely to be completed within the financial year
  - Engagement and Communication
    - MS9: Workshop plan with WAMSI delayed. KP confirmed this task remains in discussion

- RTS advised West Australia is expecting a big jump in the amount of data that becomes available next year and recommends planning for March
  - MS12: Guidelines delayed. The Committee agreed this task would be worth pursuing
    - NT advised he will begin development of Satellite Derived Bathymetry (SDB) Guidelines this year
    - The Committee approved NT's intentions with acknowledgment of the community gap in understanding of SDB use cases
    - RTS advised there is pre-existing information on SDB from ESRI that may assist development of the guidelines and agreed to send a copy to NT
- Accessible Data and Layers
  - MS16: HIPP data available on AusSeabed noted as at risk. NT advised the limitations from Defence are being worked through, however there are internal delays that will delay milestone progress into the new year
- Infrastructure Development
  - MS17: Survey Coordination Tool uptake noted as at risk due to lack of community uptake and Steering Committee drive. KP confirmed this task will be progressing
  - MS18: Package service for multibeam data submission notes as at risk. KP advised other priorities have emerged and therefore this task has been delayed
  - MS19: QA tool delayed. Whilst development does include leveraging on existing capabilities, final integration has delayed completion
    - KP advised a Minimum Viable Product is on track to be out in January which volunteer surveys will be able to utilise
    - NT advised that there are opportunities coming up to support this task at AHO
  - M23 & M24 were highlighted as dependent on ARDC funding
- KP highlighted the benefit of the Work Plan in providing achievable and directive targets

*SC.7.2. Begin development on Satellite Derived Bathymetry Guidelines, including the formation of a Working Group (if required), and provide update at the next meeting*

## 4 Executive Board Pitch

**Outcome sought:** That the Steering Committee critique the upcoming Executive Board Pitch

**Result:**

- KP advised the Committee that during Executive Board Meeting #4, the Executive Board requested guidance on how to pitch AusSeabed to their executives within funding requests. KP therefore agreed to develop a pitch to be presented in Executive Board Meeting #5. KP confirmed there are 7-10 days left to polish the message.
- KP presented draft pitch slides, covering:
  - The problem AusSeabed is trying to solve
  - The opportunities AusSeabed have (based on communities interest/uptake and funding opportunities)
  - What AusSeabed needs (\$/year)
  - The opportunities/impacts this \$/year will have
  - Ways AusSeabed could achieve this \$/year figure:
    1. Executive Board co-funding
    2. Additional (external) funding is sought
  - As well as the pros and cons of each
- The floor was opened for comment
  - A third option encouraging proportionate contributions from the Executive Board, rather than equal, was proposed
    - As the pitch was based on providing equal benefit, it was generally agreed that the third option would be unnecessary to include. However, if some entities could not afford equal contribution, it was agreed that further discussion/agreements could take place
    - This explanation was recommended to be included within the pitch
  - There was general agreement that internal funding (i.e. from Executive Board organisations) is required to establish AusSeabed as a sustainable initiative
  - RTS highlighted the time and effort required to process historical data and proposed additional funding be requested within the pitch to achieve it
  - There was discussion on AusSeabed avenues for generating revenue
    - NT advised it may be worth providing clarification on any possible revenue

- There was general agreement that AusSeabed could potentially charge for intensive processing, but should not charge for simple publication (i.e. data delivered at standard)
  - RTS raised concern over potential ongoing development costs associated with technological evolution
  - CS highlighted differing delegation requirements associated with financial brackets. For example, ministerial delegation greatly increases the effort and time required for funding approval and may not be worth the increase in funds from, for example, SES approval. Worth revising pitch in light of these brackets.
- There was discussion on external sources of funding
  - CF asked whether there are any major beneficiaries, not involved in the Executive Board, that may be willing to give upfront funding
    - DC proposed GEBCO/Nippon Foundation, considering their financial support for Seabed 2030
    - KM advised financial support is only given to surveys mapping gaps in data coverage (e.g. Falkor are currently being paid for extra days to map gaps)
    - KP proposed brainstorming philanthropists that may want to fund Australian contributions to Seabed 2030
  - KM proposed pitching to global organisations (e.g. United Nations) from a global benefit perspective
  - RTS offered the relative newness of AusSeabed as a reason for the original lack of funding from private organisations and proposed that, with the current momentum, it may be worth attempting to pitch to private enterprises/philanthropists
  - Conservation came back to general agreement that focus should be on securing funding from internal Executive Board organisations prior to seeking funding for additional activities (e.g. processing historical data)
- There was discussion on the perceived role of state governments in funding AusSeabed activities
  - GG advised that the South Australian government is likely to need demonstrated use cases prior to committing to funding
  - CS proposed that before going to externals, there needs to be demonstrated longevity of the AusSeabed program as well as demonstrated outputs for end users. CS advised that there is still work to do and uncertainty on timeframes which would deter external support

- KP advised funding is needed to get to the outputs and agreed Commonwealth commitment should be a first priority
- TI proposed that whilst states often have their own programs, they will benefit from the ability to send data down the portal line and have it accessible through AusSeabed. TI didn't see avenues for additional funding at a state level at the moment, but believed improving state level processes and protocols will result in increased uptake of AusSeabed tools and resources
- RTS advised that AusSeabed benefits will be recognised through HIPP data, especially in West Australia. As a large state, AusSeabed contributing to survey efforts is useful. Additionally, coastal erosion is a big focus, and the lack of bathymetric data limits modelling opportunities
  - NT advised that whilst HIPP data is not permissible on AusSeabed yet, the program is ongoing and the data remains available to state authorities. There is still state value through regular means and more surveys are due to be shared from WA in the coming future
- RTS advised that direct benefits can be communicated through “wow factors” like 3D modelling footage and there should be effort into creating such products that are attractive to state and industry managers. There was discussion on the worth of including a “wow factor” (i.e. demonstration of data acquisition) in the pitch
  - AL drew attention to the average length of time it takes to deliver large amounts of processed data to the public (NT advised planning, collection, processes, acceptance and sending to AusSeabed is on average an 18 month project). There was general agreement that AusSeabed's “wow factor” is the ability to deliver data to the public once it's ready to be delivered, rather than following a long wait period or having to complete bespoke requests; it is rapid publication
- KP compared funding challenges to “what came first: the chicken or the egg?” and advised that it would be beneficial to be at the table when proposals are being committed to (e.g. IMSA), so that AusSeabed are a part of the picture

*SC.7.3. Discuss Executive Board Pitch and progress based on comments provided by Steering Committee in session*

## 5 Communication and Engagement Strategy

**Outcome sought:** That the Steering Committee discuss the Communication and Engagement Strategy

**Result:**

- The efforts of AL, RTS, Rodney Hoath (WA DoT), TI, GG, and DC were acknowledged for the work put into this Strategy so far

- AL presented a summary presentation on the Strategy, covering:
  - The proposed medium/s
    1. An overarching document with guidelines and templates, etc.
    2. An accompanying strategy plan that ensures targeted approaches and effective lead times
  - The proposed communication objectives
  - The proposed engagement objectives
  - The proposed contents
  
- The floor was opened to the Committee to provide comment
  - KP proposed the inclusion of sustainable funding in the list of engagement objectives as well as ensuring an understanding of shared ownership (of AusSeabed by the community) is embedded throughout the materials
    - There was general agreement that the longevity of AusSeabed as an enduring initiative should be established/promoted within the strategy
  - There was discussion around the proposed length of the document/s, with general agreement that it may need to be made shorter
    - CS proposed some sections be moved to the appendices to make it more concise
    - TM raised concerns over volunteer engagement with lengthy documentation (in relation to KP's comment on shared ownership) and proposed creating a second version that provides only the essential information
    - HE advised it would be possible to dedicate a section of the AusSeabed website to outreach documentation and templates to encourage use and community ownership
    - Overall, it was accepted that there is value in creating a comprehensive document, with understanding that it may be distilled into multiple documents (e.g. internal versus external versions) at a later date
  
- It was agreed that the Strategy document would be distributed to the Steering Committee to provide comment and endorsement

*SC.7.4. Send out Communication and Engagement Strategy for review to working group (with understanding that it may be further distilled into internal and external versions at a later date)*

*SC.7.5. Refine the Communication and Engagement Strategy and provide to SC for endorsement*

## 6 First Nations Collaboration Strategy

**Outcome sought:** That the Steering Committee discuss the draft First Nations Collaboration Strategy & that the Steering Committee determine a forward plan for the First Nations Collaboration Strategy

**Result:**

- TI and HE provided context for the proposed layout and themes, as well as an outline of the preliminary stages of development
  - The process so far has involved scoping existing policies/strategies and collating information from a number of online sources
  - Current progress/discussions are surrounding what AusSeabed can do as an overarching initiative, considering some organisations already have policies/strategies in place
  - RTS relayed positive feedback from WA DoT regarding the draft work circulated so far
- There was general agreement that AusSeabed serves a useful role as a repository of information, which could extend to this space
  - There was recognised potential for AusSeabed to act as a point of reference on how to collaborate with First Nations groups, including materials that would assist surveyors to communicate survey logistics, impacts and benefits
- An understanding of the time required and current pressures on First Nations peoples to respond to engagement requests was instilled
  - There was discussion concerning possibilities of a liaison between surveyors and First Nations
  - RTS advised there is an uptake of ranger groups in WA that could provide useful contacts
    - NT advised AHO are currently working with Sea Rangers
- There was general agreement that “closing the knowledge loop” should be a priority (i.e. ensuring engagement is ongoing and the impacts of the surveying is communicated back to the First Nations groups involved)
  - TM advised this was a key outcome of CSIRO discussions during NAIDOC week
- There was discussion surrounding other organisations currently working on resources/contact lists (E.g. Parks Australia and Aims), which may be interested in collaboration
  - There was general agreement that each organisation has individual goals, but there is potential for collaboration on shared resources. Ultimately, final resources will need to align with AusSeabed program goals.
- KP proposed updating the National Priorities layer to include First Nations cultural sites, including sites that First Nations peoples do not want mapped, as a possible strategy deliverable

- Following on from “closing the knowledge gap” the importance of collaborating with First Nations peoples in all aspects of development was discussed in relation to the forward plan
  - It was acknowledged that early collaboration with First Nations peoples would encourage the AusSeabed community to understand First Nations needs/aspirations and embed them within the Strategy
  - It was noted that there should not be an expectation of free collaboration/input from First Nations peoples
- As an unfunded initiative, it was agreed to socialise the current document with the SC for comment before pursuing existing First Nations partnerships (e.g. internal staff)
  - A more comprehensive forward plan is proposed to be developed during a meeting in the New Year

*SC.7.6. Provide feedback on First Nations Collaboration Strategy*

*SC.7.7. Review draft of First Nations Collaboration Strategy and establish a forward plan for consultation.*

## 7 Webinar Review and Forward Plan

**Outcome sought:** Assess the potential of the AusSeabed webinar series to continue as the program’s annual outreach campaign and discuss other upcoming opportunities for the engagement calendar.

**Result:**

- It was noted that there is community interest in in-person engagement, however online options should be considered for international attendees
- Action SC.7.8 was established as a means to further this agenda item as well as review/update the outreach opportunities calendar

*SC.7.8. Conduct out of session meeting to discuss outreach for 2021*

## 8 10 Year Plan

**Outcome sought:** That the Steering Committee endorse the 10 Year Plan

**Result:**

- Review of the 10 Year Plan (agenda item 7) was moved to out of session task

*Action SC.7.9 Provide comment on 10 Year Plan*

## 9 National Priorities Layer Value Proposition

**Outcome sought:** That the Steering Committee discuss the value of revisiting the National Priorities layer and if endorsed, that the Steering Committee determine a forward plan to progress a new National Priorities layer

**Result:**

- There was general agreement that there is value in progressing a revised layer and that it is a good time to be revisiting the process (it is in the 2020/21 Work Plan)
  - The key reason to move forward was that the original intention of the NPF was to deliver a comparable layer of National priorities which isn't possible under the current mechanism as it only delivers a national layer of immutable organisational priorities.
  - RTS expressed concern over individual organisations having capacity to mark all areas as high priority as well technological barriers some users may experience. RTS proposed implementing a review process instead of progressing NPF mechanism work
    - A review process was considered to be more labour intensive in the long term and not meet the tool's purpose or the community's need
  - The possibility of having a layer that allows for comparisons in priority at a national level to be made was endorsed as reasoning to progress (i.e. a tool that takes in information and outputs a justified priority ranking)
  - It was acknowledged that it will be challenging to formulate a national perspective, rather than individual
    - CS proposed it necessary to embed a comprehensive understanding of AusSeabed's purpose throughout development to inform the priority rankings
    - Similarly, DC noted a resulting tool would need to be managed centrally with clear stated justification of/reasoning for rankings, in relation to AusSeabed's purpose
  - It was generally accepted that if development does not progress (i.e. no agreements are made in the next stages), the layer should be renamed to remove "national"
- KP advised that development of an accepted framework should be the focus moving forward, rather than the specifics of a tool
- IP and NT volunteered to progress workshop preparation with AL that will take place in February – March 2021
  - NT advised AHO are currently developing a risk assessment tool that may assist development of a new National Priorities Framework

*SC.7.10. Progress National Priorities Layer Framework workshop plan*

## 10 Next Meeting & Other Business

The AusSeabed program has been awarded an Australian Research Data Commons Platform Grant to realise a new project, Global Multi-Resolution Topography (GMRT) for Australian coastal and ocean models. With a total investment of \$816,000, including \$374,000 from ARDC, this project will deliver a prototype platform enabling end-users to develop comprehensive bathymetric models to serve multiple applications (e.g. coastal erosion and storm surge modelling, marine spatial planning, biodiversity assessment). This is a great step forward for the AusSeabed end-user community as it will bring efficiencies and consistency, improved quality of outputs, and most importantly, greater accessibility to this type of data. The project will see GA partner with BoM, James Cook University, Deakin University, CSIRO and Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory from the USA.

Next Steering Committee Meeting #8 will focus on the Work Plan and the ARDC project

*Meeting closed 1310*



**AUS**  
SEABED

## Appendix A: Agenda

# AusSeabed Steering Committee Meeting No. 7 Agenda

**Date:** Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> November 2020

**Venue:** Online

**Time:** 1000–1300 AEDT (0700–1000 AWST)

**Coordinators:** Kim Picard, Aero Leplastrier, Hannah Evans

### **Join Zoom Meeting:**

<https://zoom.us/j/91887880066?pwd=SEV2NjIWS201THFWeG5hMklvMHRQdz09>

Meeting ID: 918 8788 0066

Passcode: 871360

## Agenda

Time	Item	Action	Lead	Duration	Paper
<b>Introduction</b>					
10:00	Welcome and Acknowledgment of Country		KP	20mins	
	1. SC#6 Minutes <i>Review out of session</i>	Endorse	AL		Yes App A
	1. Action List	Update	AL		Yes
<b>Governance</b>					
10:20	2. Work Plan Update and 3 Month Outlook (Priorities and Risk Management)	Inform	KP & AL	20mins	Yes. App B
	3. Executive Board Pitch	Discuss	KP	25mins	No
11:05	<i>Break 10mins</i>				
<b>Outreach</b>					
11:15	4. Communication and Engagement Strategy	Discuss	AL	15mins	No
	5. First Nations Collaboration Strategy <i>Review out of session</i>	Discuss	TI/HE/ AL	15mins	Yes App D
	6. Webinar Review and Forward Plan	Discuss	AL/HE & TI	15mins	No
<b>Governance (continued)</b>					
12:00	7. 10 Year Plan	Endorse	TM	20mins	No
<b>Tools</b>					
12:20	8. National Priorities Framework Value Proposition	Discuss	AL & HE	20mins	Yes App E

	<i>Review out of session – write use case if possible</i>				
<b>Conclusion</b>					
12:40	9. Retrospective <i>Complete poll out of session</i>	Discuss	KP	15mins	TBC
	10. Next Meeting/Other Business		KP	5mins	No
13:00	<i>Meeting Close</i>				