Community consultation feedback and outcome July 2020

In 2020 the Australian Digital Inclusion project team sought feedback on a reimagined Australian Digital Inclusion Index. Submissions closed 13 March 2020.

Feedback was received from the following stakeholders:

•	Australian Communication		
	Consumer Action Network		

- Australian Library & Information Association
- Digital Futures (Tasmanian Government)
- Infoxchange
- Low Income Measures Assessment Committee
- NBN co
- Digital Media Research Centre, QUT
- State Library of Queensland
- The Smith Family
- Western Australian Office of Digital Government

- Adult Learning Australia
- Digital Capability Development Unit (Queensland Government)
- Good Things Foundation Australia
- LEEP
- Office of the eSafety Commissioner
- Public Libraries South Australia
- South Australian Council of Social Services
- Tasmanian Council of Social Services
- The University of Sydney
- Western Sydney University

This document summarises the feedback received, and details how that feedback has informed the ADII 2.0.











TOPIC	FEEDBACK	RESPONSE
INDEX ARCHITECTURE		
Should the ADII 2.0 include emerging technologies?	Yes. Stakeholders specifically highlighted the benefits emerging personal digital access technologies can provide people with disabilities.	ADII 2.0 captures data about individual access to and use of emerging personal technologies such as voice-controlled speakers and smartwatches.
Is data allowance a relevant measure of personal access given the rise of 'unlimited' plans?	Yes. Although 'unlimited' plans are increasing, they are not an enabler of digital inclusion for all.	ADII 2.0 continues to capture data about data allowance.
Does 5G access indicate higher quality mobile internet access?	Yes. However, stakeholders cautioned that 5G could be a proxy for wealth and/or other privilege(s).	ADII 2.0 captures data about 5G access.
What digital skills are most important today?	Stakeholders highlighted issues of online safety (including privacy and scam awareness).	ADII 2.0 Digital Ability measures are based on the Internet Skills Survey developed by researchers at the London School of Economics. This
	Stakeholders also highlighted the need for a digital skills framework to unify digital inclusion efforts nationally.	will dramatically enhance the value of ADII 2.0 data by allowing international comparability.
How useful would an evaluation tool based on the ADII 2.0 be?	This would be useful but would need to consider the differing duration of digital skills programs.	Noted. The tool is still to be scoped.
GEOGRAPHIC REPORTING		
How important are state/territory scores to users of the Index?	State and territory scores are valuable from an advocacy and funding perspective, and useful for comparing with NBN uptake data. Stakeholders expressed concern about the impact of sample size on smaller states and territories.	ADII 2.0 will retain most state and territory scores. The sample size for ADII 2.0 is 2,000. Statistical modelling based on ABS regions will provide more granular detail than what was previously available.
Would you conduct ADII 2.0 surveys or undertake spatial statistical modelling? Would aligning to ABS	Yes. However, stakeholders noted their ability to do so would be constrained by resourcing. Yes.	ADII 2.0 will be aligned with ABS
regions assist with the usability of the Index?		regions.











DEMOCRATIC COHORT		
DEMOGRAHIC COHORT REPORTING Are the demographic and socio-economic reporting categories of the ADII enough? What other cohorts would stakeholders like data on?	Stakeholders requested a more intersectional framing of demographic cohorts. Stakeholders highlighted the need for: representative Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander inclusion within the data; a more expansive understanding of disability; and the ability to capture data on the digital inclusion of those in transient housing.	ADII 2.0 uses ABS demographic cohorts to enable statistical modelling. Although intersectional framing of these is out of scope for ADII 2.0, stakeholder interest suggests qualitative research with specific cohorts would be valuable. The ADII research team is also developing an ADII 2.0 data collection tool that would be available for community groups to undertake their own research. The ADII research team is available for partnerships to undertake research deep dives. The sample size for ADII 2.0 is 2000. ADII 2.0 uses ABS demographic cohorts and statistical modelling will enable some insight into cohorts such as people with disability. ADII 2.0 will not capture data for those in transient housing. However, the project team developing an ADII 2.0 data collection tool that would be available for community groups to
Are there preferred ways of	Stakeholders requested inclusion of	undertake their own research. The ADII research team is available for partnerships to undertake research deep dives. ADII 2.0 will capture data on
recognising and measuring	multiple forms of income support.	multiple forms of income support.
demographic groups?		' '
DATA REPORTING AND		
AVAILABILTY		
Would the release of more	Yes. Ideally, this would be at the	Noted.
detailed data be of value?	regional and Local Government Area level.	Detailed data will be released on the ADII website.
In what format and at what level of granularity would this be most useful?	CSV or JSON.	Noted. CSV files will be made available on the ADII website.











CUSTOMISED PUBLIC DIGITAL INCLUSION SURVEY AND REPORTING TOOL		
Would stakeholders use the ADII 2.0 to collect their own data?	While deemed useful, stakeholders were concerned that improper use might damage the ADII 2.0 brand. In addition, stakeholders noted their ability to collect data would depend on resourcing.	Noted.
ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK		
	Stakeholders disagreed with the proposed removal of 'places of internet access'.	ADII 2.0 will continue to collect data on 'places of internet access'.
	Stakeholders encouraged consideration of the difference between access and accessibility for people with disabilities.	The quantitative methods underpinning ADII 2.0 will not enable consideration of the difference between access and accessibility. Stakeholder interest, however, suggests qualitative research on this topic would be valuable.

Suggested citation:

Thomas, J., Barraket, J., Wilson, C., Holcombe-James, I., Brydon, A. (2020). *Community Consultation Feedback and Outcome: The Australian Digital Inclusion Index*. Melbourne: RMIT and Swinburne University of Technology, and Telstra. DOI: 10.25916/ttjz-hx31.









