INSTITUTE OF
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
AUSTRALIA
ACT

02 6154 9800
PO Box 4349 Kingston ACT 2604
admin@act.ipaa.org.au
www.act.ipaa.org.au

ABN 24 656 727 375

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Maximising Value from Data: Navigating the Opportunities and Challenges

Half-Day Conference

Gandel Hall, National Gallery of Australia

17 OCTOBER 2019

Transcript 1: Opening and Keynote

Jill: IPAA is delighted to be partnering with the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet for this half-day conference. IPAA thanks the Department for all their assistance, without which, today, simply, would not be possible.

Jill: Before I proceed with today's event format, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of this land. I acknowledge the Ngunnawal people, the traditional custodians of the land on which we're meeting today. We acknowledge and respect their continuing culture and the contribution they make to the life of this city and this region. I would also like to acknowledge and welcome any Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who may be attending the event today.

Jill: It is my pleasure to introduce Phillip Gould, who, as I said, is the Assistant Secretary from the Office of the National Data Commissioner. He is here representing Deb Anton who was to speak to us as the Interim National Data Commissioner but who, unfortunately, is unwell today, and sends her apologies to all of you.

Jill: A little bit about Phillip: Dr. Phillip Gould has recently been appointed as the Assistant Secretary of the newly-established Office of the National Data Commissioner Branch at the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Having worked in the fields of banking and finance, and holding a Ph.D. in Time Series conometrics and working with the Australian Bureau of Statistics for seven years in methodology and data integration, Phillip holds a valuable breadth of knowledge to support the Office of the National Data Commissioner. In his new role, Phillip will be orchestrating reforms to the Australian data system through new data sharing and release legislation to improve the value of public data. His responsibilities include establishing the Office of the National Data Commissioner to oversee and monitor the integrity of Australia's data system. This will be complemented by forming the National Data Advisory Council to advise the Office of the Commissioner on technical best practise and ethical data use.

Jill: Would you please join with me in welcoming Phillip to the stage?

Phillip Gould: That's quite a lengthy bio I have there. As Jill said, I'm filling in for Deb Anton, who's sick today. She spoke to me last night, she really wanted to be here but she said, "I know you can do it, and it's okay. I've already written this speech for you." So, like a good person, I've decided to instead write my own speech last night, which is written on this fairly tatty piece of paper.

Phillip Gould: I think what I wanted to talk about today was an experience that I had earlier in the week and what it made me think about. I was with Abigail at the ANZSOG lecture series on data. Abigail has someone who works at the Melbourne Institute with her who, I think, embodies so many of the things that we need to get the most out of data to maximise the value from data. This was a young man who was a new father. He was faced with a challenge, and that is working out where to send his child to childcare for daycare.

Phillip Gould: For those of us in Canberra, we have the luxury of relatively short commute. He's based in Melbourne, and that can be one hour plus commute. For him, he had to understand a few things. Firstly, he wanted to make sure that the childcare was affordable. He wanted to make sure that it was quality, but he also wanted to make sure that it didn't add too much time to his already very long daily commute. So, he identified a problem, and he knew how to use data to help solve that problem. He managed to put together different pieces of information, ABS data, Google data, data from childcare providers, all of this information about how long it takes to get to different places, what kind of quality and cost of care was available. Then he was able to wrangle that data, which is often a very difficult thing to do, put it together, analyse it, and come up with an approach which showed him the best childcare centre to send his child to.

Phillip Gould: I thought this was just wonderful watching this person identify a problem and use all of these different rich datasets to solve it. I thought, "Why aren't we doing more of that within government?" The reality is we don't have enough people that can do all of these things. We don't necessarily have the capacity or the opportunity to create these perfect data people who are capable of telling a narrative around data, who are capable of working technically with the data, and also finding and solving difficult problems with data. It dawned on me when I was thinking about this, that the work that we're doing at the Office of the National Data Commissioner, which is to create legislation that will help share data better, is absolutely critical to succeeding in this area. We can't expect any one department or any one group to be able to do everything. We need to see data flow better between I think, departments, but also outside government. We need to draw on the expertise that we have to make better value of data through the academic community, through the business and the non-government communities.

Phillip Gould: That's really something that I feel very passionate about in terms of getting the most out of data. When we do this, though, we have to be mindful that people expect data to be treated with respect and to be safeguarded. At the Office of the National Data Commissioner, we believe that to maximise the value of data, we do need to do more with it. We do need to share more of it. But we also need to treat it with respect and put in the proper safeguards to make sure that the right people are using it for the right purpose. I think many of you would be aware at just how fragile public trust is in the way government handles data. That trust is also fragile in the way the private sector handles it. So, we need to both acknowledge these risks when we talk to the public about what we're doing. We need to be able to provide a good narrative around what we're doing with data and how it's helping people. We also need to have proper rigorous risk management programmes and policies in place.

Phillip Gould: As we go through the conversation today, it's fantastic that we have people from government, from the private sector from the not for profit sector, and the commercial sector, who all can bring unique insights into how data can be better used to benefit society. With that, I will say thank you for coming along today. I hope it's a really enjoyable day. Please keep an eye out on the work that we're

doing at the Office of the National Data Commissioner and putting through on new legislation.

Phillip Gould: Thank you very much.

Jill: Phillip, thanks so much for that introduction to the to the morning or to the half-day. Your comments certainly about trust, I think, would resonate very strongly across the entirety of the audience here today regardless, as you note, of sector in which we work. I think that is a really helpful intro to some core themes beyond the technical which are important to recognise in this discussion.

Jill: Now, we actually have an opportunity for an audience polling exercise, which we're going to do before I introduce our keynote speaker. The question that we came to get some audience views on to start the brains working this morning is, in your respective agency, noting we come from a broad church and people are way ahead of me here, which of the following most hinders your agency's ability to maximise the value of public sector data? We've got a few options there, those being legislation or regulation, cultural issues, capability issues, technical issues or concern about public reactions, and Phillip just touched on that piece about trust.

Jill: One of the beauties of this technology is we can see responses float in as they come in. In fact, a quarter, up to 40%, reasonably stable, commenting on capability issues so people simply not having the staff in your organisations who have the data skills and expertise. There's reasonable representation across concern about privacy and secrecy, cultural and technical. I would suggest there's actually quite a few barriers, I think, that are live for people here.

Jill: Again, Phillip, thank you for your remarks. I would now like to introduce our keynote speaker this morning, who is Professor Abigail Payne. Let me tell you a little bit about Abigail. She is from the University of Melbourne, where, as I mentioned earlier, she is the Director of the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research. Now, the institute has a team of more than 50 academic researchers who engage in research on various microeconomic and macroeconomic topics, including health, labour, education, housing, social disadvantage, macro and public economics. Professor Payne's own work focuses on empirical public economics issues and, particularly, how government policy affects spending and performance. For those of us who follow current debate in the media, we would know how topical that particular issue is at the moment in Australia.

Jill: Abigail's current research includes projects to understand the motivations of donors, the role of government funding and fundraising on giving, and on the delivery of public services by charities. It is my great pleasure to welcome Abigail to the stage.

Abigail Payne: Thank you very much. Thank you for inviting me to give a talk. It's a pleasure. I see a few faces that know me and that I know you, and I see faces that don’t know me. I'm going to tell you a little bit about me in a second, but I want to get going because I only have 20 minutes.

Abigail Payne: Whenever I start working on new slides for a talk, sometimes what I do is I will refer back to other presentations that I've done. One of the things the Melbourne Institute undertakes, in partnership with The Australian, is this little conference called the Economic and Social Outlook Conference. As part of one of those slides, I had used this quote, and so I actually thought it was actually not a bad motivation for this talk especially for this group. This is the honourable Scott Morrison when he was treasurer, where he was talking more about politics and elections, but what we know is that you look around the world, and a phenomenon that we work in today is this notion of the concern that we are disconnected with the public and that there's frustration, disempowerment and that trust by the public.

Abigail Payne: I kind of want to say, "Look if voters think about their own economic and social circumstances when they're voting and they're concerned about trust, how can the government and then I think of it as, as a research helping to inform policy, how can we connect, inform and develop transparent practises and policies where we build trust and eliminate frustration? This is, to me, really what captures one of the values and benefits of data for the government sector.

Abigail Payne: A little bit about me, why am I passionate about data and policy? I think if you understand where I come from, you understand why I really do care about this and why I moved. I moved to Australia three years ago to become the director from Canada. Why would I do that? Well, 40 years ago, I was a child prodigy when I went to university, I wish. I learned how to create computer programmes and I fell in love with economics. I had this very strong technical background in math and computer science, but I also learned the importance of policy through the lens of economics, but I deviated.

Abigail Payne: 33 years ago, I actually became a lawyer. I worked for a firm in Washington, D.C. where a lot of our practise was embedded working with government and working with policy, how do you shape policy, how do you help use government policy for best practises. Now, maybe if I were in Washington, D.C. today, I would have a different lens but when I was there I ever believe and I continue to believe about the good of government and the good of government policy.

Abigail Payne: You are allowed to laugh.

Abigail Payne: After practising law for about four or five years, I decided that really what I was passionate about was economic policy, so I went back for my PhD in economics. I was fortunate that I ended up at a very good university. So, for the last 20 years, I've been working with data, being creative about how do you link data, how do you bring the pieces together, not just for data's sake but to think about how do you frame questions, frame hypotheses to try to understand a range of issues. I'm going to give you some examples from my own work around charitable giving, but I also do work on education. I've worked on judges. I've worked on a whole range of topics.

Abigail Payne: I'm fortunate I've come to Australia, and I think Australia has this this wide ranging availability of data and linking, and an interest and an appetite. What I

really want to be doing and I'm doing it through my researchers, through the institute is saying how do we open up that conversation around collaborating and making the best decisions.

Abigail Payne: Let's get started. Let's first think about informing and shaping policy and practise through the eyes of data. I kind of want to think about who helps to inform and shape policy. When I started working on this slide, I realised the first group is actually our voters and citizens, right? When it comes to the government, it's the voters and citizens that helps shape who gets elected, and who gets elected helps shape how governments are going to operate.

Abigail Payne: We should always keep in the back of our mind what is in the best interest of making society better, whether it's individually or as a group or particular populations. Then we know, we have the policymakers, the parliament, ministers and even department heads that get appointed by our top ministers. They're going to help make decisions, but how do they help make decisions? What's the public servants, the analysts, the service providers, the managers that actually help inform practise and policy, here's what's working, here's what's not working? I think equally important is the research analysis both inside government and outside government. We need all of these players if we really want to help to inform and shape policy, and then things that are sometimes outside of our control or the external forces: a war erupts, a global economic recession, climate change things that we can't necessarily predict but end up kind of landing on our laps. So, we were on this course; we're now having to change course. We always have to be cognizant that we have to be adaptable, able to start changing course and add new information in to continue to do a good job in our work.

Abigail Payne: Why should data help shape and inform us? First of all, it should limit the use of anecdotal beliefs. Almost anything you work on, you will have either a personal experience on or you will know somebody who's going to give you a personal experience. Like when I work on education, often, I'm like, "Well, how do we get more students, especially from underprivileged areas, going to university or VET school or so? I can tell you, when I was growing up, my parents chose to live in a neighbourhood that was half low income, half middle income, and so I saw a lot of those kids that weren't going on. I could just tell you, "Well, based on my experience, this is what we need to do." That was based on my experience, right? Each and every one of you might have different experiences. That's one of the values of data is that, while we want to use information we gather and learn to help inform and shape the questions we ask, what the data do is that it helps us to think about how do we expand the base in which is that a single unique experience or is that a collective experience?

Abigail Payne: Also, in this era of distrust in this era, it helps to promote transparency and understanding the issues. Part of the transparency is kind of making data available and being able to challenge our thoughts and our questions and having constructive dialogues on what is the best practise, what is the best way, what is what is the information, if we have a policy or practise. If it's working here, let's showcase it's working here, but if it's not working here, let's figure out why it's not working and not just say, "Oh, well, it didn't work there, but it we're just

going to keep doing it." This is where the data can actually help shape our future decisions. As I was saying, using this example, it helps to create a continuous framework for evaluation and insight and informing. It's rare that a single study at a point in time for a particular population is going to give you all the answers you need moving forward.

Abigail Payne: With "big" data ... "big" I put in quotation marks because what's big to me is not big to an astronomer who works with billions of observations ... we can think about linked measures that capture the relevant populations and or geographies. When we actually have lots of observations on people, and this is something like, for instance, we get with the census data, it allows us to target our policies. Kind of what I've been kind of thinking about for myself is that, often, we'll have a conversation where we talk about universal policies.

Abigail Payne: Everyone, every young kid should get access to daycare. That might be a universal policy ... to play space. This community needs this particular aspect. This is where what we should probably be doing is saying how do we actually combine the university types of policies with the targeted policies to allow us to better target our audiences. Maybe we have universal daycare, but we offer daycare one way in one community and another way to another community. This is where the value of having the data, the continuous evaluation allows us to be more targeted and therefore more effective in what we do.

Abigail Payne: What are the challenges? Why might there be resistance? Good data development and analysis are not cheap. We have to invest. Sadly, while there may be people in the audience, people who love to work with data, love to clean data, when it comes to policy analysis, that's not the exciting part. The exciting part is actually using the data and actually undertaking the final analysis and making the decisions. You don't get elected on saying, "I'm going to build the best dataset." That's just not going to happen. If you have a budget constraint, which we all have budget constraints, it's very easy to say, "Oh, we can shave off the budget for data." We're going to make short-term decisions that will end up long-term paying. We have to kind of embrace, and we need a voice to say, "Data are important, and it's not just any data. It's good data. It's the good data that require money."

Abigail Payne: I know David is shaking his hands, and he's been in the news lately. He didn't ask me to say this.

Abigail Payne: The other aspect is even if you have the data, you can't rely on one study. I'll give you an example. In education class size, some people will glom on and say, "Oh, we need to reduce class sizes in schools because that's going to get better student improvement." Well, I can tell you, there's a range of studies out there that say class size has no effect and it's not the best tool. You need a range of studies and a way of prodding and pulling, and say, "Will it work for the context in which I want to be using it?" and that also is not cheap to do those studies.

Abigail Payne: The other thing is what I term political will. If you don’t do this study, you don't work with the data, then you can't be proven wrong. One of the challenges and

the conversations we have is it's okay to actually learn that maybe we, we were perceiving things incorrectly. It is rarely that it is a function of right or wrong. It's just it's different. If we really want trust and we want to want to deliver the best goods and services for our public, we should be embracing understanding where things work and where things don't work.

Abigail Payne: This importance of continuous feedback and refinement. This is an aspect in which we tend not to really focus on. We make the decision. We move forward, and then, maybe 10 years later, we're like, "Oh, should we think about changing the policy?" We need to embed in our practises how do we just naturally say how are we going to continue to refine and feedback.

Abigail Payne: In an era of Twitter, fake news, this is something that we have to address. We know there's a lot of misinformation out there. If someone wants to yell, scream, and say, "The sky is green," there will be people out there that will believe the sky is green, even though if you say, "Can you go outside and look up? Does it look green to you?" But I think it is our responsibility to do our best to be out there to say, "No, actually, the evidence says the sky is not green," or "It's green 1% of the time." That's where data and good analysis can help us.

Abigail Payne: There are many ways to collect data. I am agnostic. I tend to work more with administrative data, but we have administrative data, survey-based data, and experimental and field studies. They're all important. Actually, they're most powerful when you combine them. What really you should be relying on is starting first with the question, what's the question, what's the issue you're trying to address, and then you figure out the best practises for what are the best kinds of data.

Abigail Payne: In terms of what type of data, we get cross sectional snapshots. What I would say they're useful for certain types of questions. We can get snapshots over time. For instance, a census data, we get snapshots every five years. We can put them together and say, "How are things changing?" That's incredibly useful. We also get kind of panel or repeated observations of the same people over time. That's really useful too, because you can drill down whether it's an individual, whether it's a business, whether it's an organisation. You can actually see what's happening. In statistical analysis, for the analysis folks that are in here, it actually gives us a lot more tools that we can do for controlling, for un-observables or factors that we may not be able to address in our analyses.

Abigail Payne: The key starting point, though, for evidence-based policy, if you want good is always starting with the question and thinking about the framework for thinking about that question. It's not just grabbing the data, doing a machine learning algorithm and say, "Here's what the data say." That stuff is important but you still need theory, framework, hypothesis to develop it. You need both to go on.

Abigail Payne: Here's some usefulness of administrative data, but also some pitfalls. I'm going to give you as an example, charitable giving and service provision. Why am I using charitable giving? In part because I study it, but in part. Do you guys know that

there's a tax benefit that you can receive? Yes. Do you know that a lot of charities provide services that may have historically been provided by the government?

Abigail Payne: Thank you.

Abigail Payne: Charities is one area and how people give is one area that's actually really tricky to study and understand. It's something I've spent my lifetime working on. One question you might ask is, "Look, if the government is giving you a tax break on your taxes so that you give to donations, that means the government is giving up revenue." A question that government might want to ask is, "Thus, if I'm giving up that revenue, does that actually help build the sector? Are they getting more donations or are they at least breaking even? Because if they're not, maybe there's a better tax policy to put into place or a better incentive to put into place." If government say if we don't want to provide the service, we think that the service could be provided by another organisation. Which is better? It's not clear. Those are questions we really don't know. Sometimes, it's better to have it privately provided. Sometimes, it's better to have it publicly provided. Sometimes, it's good to have both.

Abigail Payne: How do we model giving? I kind of told you, you need a framework. Well, it turns out one of the challenges is that we have to think about how to individuals think about giving. We can't think about it just like you might if you're going to ... Phillip and I, this morning, were like, "We really need a cup of coffee." So, we went around and we found a cup of coffee and that made me happier. You're happy that I'm happy. I could value what's my value of coffee and I knew what my budget constraint was, that I had money in my bank account to cover the coffee, so I could do that.

Abigail Payne: Often in charitable giving, it's not always the case. Charitable giving is such that I'm not the recipient of that. If I give to this gallery, maybe I'm benefiting because I like to come to the gallery but I'm giving it so that you can enjoy. How do we value that? It turns out that's a really tricky question is what do we value? Do I get warm and fuzzy feelings because when I come here, I can say, "Oh, I have to support covering that painting on the wall," or if I see that you're already giving and I can enjoy it anyway, do I just say, "Oh, you're already giving? I don't need to give." That's a really thorny, tricky question. It turns out we have people, both types. We also have people who say, "I don't care."

Abigail Payne: We can think about questions about how do we individually model giving. We can also think about how maybe we bend to social pressure pressures. Any of you got an email saying, because Movember started in Australia, "Hey, I'm growing a moustache." Yep. Was that your favourite charity? Maybe not. But did you give anyway because your friend said, "I'm growing a moustache," and you wanted to say to your friend, "Yeah, I support you." That's another question. How do we bend to social pressure?

Abigail Payne: Then observation across all developed countries, giving us a percentage of GDP has been flat. If any of you are economists, you know, what? Maybe not this year, but generally, we have had economic growth. Shouldn't we see that, as

economies grow, giving us a percent of GDP has also been increasing. That's a big puzzle. We don't understand why is that the case.

Abigail Payne: Do tax incentives matter? I've already raised this. Does it change the nature? It could be does it increase giving? Does it change? Does it favour one part of the population over another part of the population? Lots of questions we can be asking. The big question that's really hard is does impact matter? But I'm not going to get there. I'm it's something I really care about but it's really hard to measure.

Abigail Payne: We have to think about how do we measure giving. Individual donations, we can have tax filer data. But guess what? Only certain kinds of donations can be put on your tax return. You're not going to get the sum of all donors. You're going to get a snapshot of certain types of donations, which is useful. If you look at charity level data, however, what you get is you get here's how much the charity received in donations. You don't know did the charity receive it from a thousand people, from one person. You don't know anything about the donors. Also, it's charities, maybe I give my money, I don't think it's efficient because of this tax price thing. Maybe I give my money to people who are homeless on the street. We never report that. We never know anything about that. But this is also an example where if you use survey data, how many of you, if you don't give, are going to answer truthfully on a survey? How many of you want to admit to being to being the Grinch, "No, I don't care about giving?" That's an example where, on a survey, you may not get truth.

Abigail Payne: The other thing is, how do we capture public support? We get both indirect support but we also get government grants, government funding, so that's also another challenge. I'm raising this as there's actually a lot of power in the data we collect at the government level, at charities level that we really haven't harnessed it to the best of our ability to study these kinds of questions. I thought this was a nice example of how we can get some information, but there's a lot more we could be doing if we were working together.

Abigail Payne: Let's also ignore fundraising, the role of volunteers, capturing impact, and then there's all sorts of statistical issues. As I'm reading this slide, I'm like, "Why do I study?" But it's a very important area to study.

Abigail Payne: One of the benefits to administrative data is that, generally, you capture close to a population whereas surveys, experiments, and case studies with exception of elaborate surveys, like the census, tend to capture parts of the population. When you use surveys, you have to worry about the randomness, but there's a lot of techniques around ensuring that you have a representative sample. At the same time, you also have to say what is a population? For instance, if I want to study who goes to university and I have university application decisions or data on applications, but I want to know what happens if I change policies to encourage more applications, what am I missing? I'm missing the information on the students who aren't applying. I can only use the application data if I think the students who are not applying look like the students who are applying. Odds are, they don't. While I have a population of university going students, if I want to

study a question about getting into university, I need a population of high school students or a population of individuals who could go to university.

Abigail Payne: We always have to think about with any dataset is, even though we have lots of observations, is it representing the population we want to be studying? I could keep going on in that part.

Abigail Payne: Try to get to the next. Thank you.

Abigail Payne: The other benefit is it does capture information of what actually happens. We observe actual behaviour, which is useful, but we also have to think about what was the set of choices. We always need to be caveating on that. We can also capture repeated observations of individuals, which is great. Finally, it allows for the drilling down. It allows us to really kind of think of when we're capturing close to a population, allows us to drill down geographically and do more place based analysis that you can't always get if you're a random sample of populations.

Abigail Payne: Is it cost effective? It's expensive. I think if you do it right, you're working with the right measures, and you're continually improving, I do think it's cost effective, but we could have a debate on that.

Abigail Payne: The challenge what makes it less cost effective is that administrative data are not research-ready. You still have to spend time understanding the data. If I take, for example, simple measure, we're doing a series of projects right now around trying to understand entrench disadvantaged. One of the measures we need is income. What's income? First, we have to decide what is income? What are the resources available to individuals? It turns out that if you use the census data, you get one type of definition. If you use text filler data, you get a different set of definitions. If I use the HILDA data, I get another set of definitions. That's where you need care to kind of say, what is it that we're capturing, and how do we frame our questions to reflect what we can measure? That's where understanding the measures, the verification, the transformation, and the documentation of the data is really important. That's where you need care and time and, unfortunately, resources to do that.

Abigail Payne: Single data usually on the administrative front is not sufficient. You need to link and you get creative around linking, but this is also where it's important to link.

Abigail Payne: Access is usually challenging. This is again, why is it challenging? Sometimes, it's that sensitivity around protection of the data around privacy and security issues, but sometimes, it's like, "If I don’t give you access to the data, then you can't tell me I'm wrong." I heard that a while as a researcher. Then the funding of the development of the research ready data sets. We need to work on breaking down of silos, and we need to think about the importance of care when developing measures of analysis, and then good frameworks for analysing data.

Abigail Payne: The importance of quantitative data is that ... look, I would be remiss if I didn't talk about the new federal legislation that's coming out. There are three kind of critical things that I think are really important about what could come about. One

is enabling greater linking of data that's already being done. This is just going to make it easier to link data and allow departments to work together around the link in the data. I think that's really critical.

Abigail Payne: Second is this importance around transparency, and transparency in knowing who's getting access and transparency around requesting access. Also, finally expanding the ways to house and access data, and creating value added components, this notion of the accredited data authorities. We can't have monopolies where only one unit holds all the data. While being mindful and respectful of privacy and sensitive information so that we can address risk and access issues, we do have to encourage multiple ways of being able to access the data. I'm very optimistic and enthusiastic about what may come about in the in the legislation.

Abigail Payne: How do we make it work? Look, key is government-based, the data developers, analysts, data scientist. That quick survey you did, the capabilities is important. Having thought leaders and having folks that are saying, "I'm going to champion this," is important. But also having I think what sometimes gets mixed is this external based social science oriented researchers that help to develop the theories and the models for what we should be testing and how we should be thinking about things as well as having our capabilities around the statistics, the experts, so that we can use the best tools with the data. But critically is that it's not any one in these three. It's really the importance of collaborations and partnerships. If we're not working together, if we're not talking to each other, we will not achieve the best that we can.

Abigail Payne: My final words is that in preparing this, I kind of did a quick search to see what was going on in Australia. Many of you know Gary Banks. This is from a 2008 report. Sadly, he captured pretty much what I just talked about. While we're thinking, "Oh, this is all new, and we need to get on top of this," this was going on in 2008. It was going on in 1998. It was going on before that. Let's get on with it, and let's make things happen is really what I want to say.

Abigail Payne: In summary, to have foreign practise and policy, we need data. Data are instrumental. That's just a fact. We shouldn't be debating that. Framing the questions is important, so having that modelling is really important. Curating the data, that is a critical component if we're going to make sense. Then to be able to inform practise and policy, we need to be open, willing, and collaborate. Without all of these, we will be unsuccessful.

Abigail Payne: Thank you very much.