

Ben Oakley 23/06 4:25 pm

Hey team! Just messaging here so that everyone's in the loop. [REDACTED] from Spark called Rach this morning with some concerns about the level (and nature) of info that we've requested for the RCS. He also indicated that some of the other large RSPs have the same concerns. Not a big issue, given we are specifically seeking feedback on the draft info request, but they have again requested a workshop to discuss. I spoke to [REDACTED] this afternoon to get some more context - Spark's main concern is the volume of data and why it is all necessary, and the privacy aspects of customer-related data, which they said will require a s98. I think we should plan for a workshop after we have received written feedback on the draft request, but before we issue the final requests. This could include more information on what we want to analyse and why the info we're asking for is necessary, but also include more detail on how we intend to manage the data (consistent with how we are managing large, sensitive databases in our other regulatory systems). Anyway, something to think more about next week!


HL: Thanks Ben. I understand the RPS team have had some issues getting information out of payment providers so I'll have a chat to that team next week so if any learnings we can use from that space.

15/06 8:46 am

And one more re this para in comms to accompany info requests:
After some initial consultation with the sector, we get a sense of support for the study based on the proposed dataset and the value this will provide. Specifically, detailed, quality data pertaining to coverage enabling transparent mapping of what services are offered where.

Any further 'plugs' re why RSPs will like this study? Or could the above be worded better / more precisely? Is the value different for the big guys vs the little guys?

John Gandy 15/06 8:53 am

 I think different parties see different value Trish - Chorus sees that it will promote their agenda of fibre as deep as possible into rural areas, and that this will require government assistance, Spark (and probably One) think it will highlight the value of FWA. WISPA/ISPANZ want it to demonstrate the value of their offering in 'niche' rural areas - they all think they are hurt by the anecdotes of bad service and crap quality, and see the good about getting a good, factual picture of what is happening in rural telco.

And one more re this para in comms to accompany info requests:

After some initial consultation with the sector, we get a sense of support for the study based on the proposed dataset and the value this will provide. Specifically, detailed, quality data pertaining to coverage enabling transparent mapping of what services are offered where.

Any further 'plugs' re why RSPs will like this study? Or could the above be worded better / more precisely? Is the value different for the big guys vs the little guys?

JG: I think different parties see different value Trish - Chorus sees that it will promote their agenda of fibre as deep as possible into rural areas, and that this will require government assistance, Spark (and probably One) think it will highlight the value of FWA. WISPA/ISPANZ want it to demonstrate the value of their offering in 'niche' rural areas - they all think they are hurt by the anecdotes of bad service and crap quality, and see the good about getting a good, factual picture of what is happening in rural telco.

12/04 4:30 pm

Hi Ben, Hi Kate -

In my session with Robert today re the risk assessments (we completed 😊)... we talked about the TOR and he

Hi Ben, Hi Kate -

In my session with Robert today re the risk assessments (we completed 😊)... we talked about the TOR and he indicated that the scoping workshop is essential - (Kate, will talk about arrangements) - but also that Legal need to have an early contribution in terms of setting out the legal framework - e.g. setting out legitimate legal purpose for data gathering, confidentiality clauses, privacy act, etc. I've just come off a call with Hannah, and discussed the tight timeframe, limited notice of the specific requirements of her/legal, and options on how we move forward. Note she is on leave from 14-25 April.

I think this is our first project issue to log.

- I need to come back to Hannah tomorrow (early afternoon) and advise whether we require Mark to attend the workshop (to be scheduled) in her absence
- Hannah suggested that the **Backhall Project Study** might be useful in terms of a legal framework - how do we get a copy of that? She also reference **detailed advice that Richard Davidson has prepared re s9a**. It might be useful for Robert/John to canvas this work ahead of the TOR scoping workshop?
- Robert also suggested Rachael Coyle may be good to have at the workshop - as an SME / additional legal hat in the ring. Thoughts? Hannah suggested that we record the session, and she can review when she is back.
- In order to have a draft TOR discussed at Division on 3 May, we need to have the draft completed (including all internal reviews) done by 26 April - the day that Hannah is back. This does not feel feasible.

Can we please discuss tomorrow - Kate, can you schedule? - I'm ok to meet at lunch time if required.

Tuesday, 2 May

2/05 9:15 am Edited

Good morning - just confirming the purpose for the data session:

1. Collective understand of what is available now and in scope for this project

- of that, what is 'current'

2. Outside of that, what other data does this project seek to collect?

Good morning - just confirming the purpose for the data session:

1. Collective understand of what is available now and in scope for this project

- of that, what is 'current'

2. Outside of that, what other data does this project seek to collect?

RD: I think it goes in (at least) two steps - do we know what the data is and would it be in scope and secondly at what level of granularity will it be required in - I see that this is sort of covered in availability/coverage but then I assume a lot of this info is aggregated so the step after that is to determine (geographical) gaps and if it is possible/worthwhile requesting it so that it is either capable of geospatial manipulation or whether it falls into a complementary category for the purpose of understanding its usefulness in the immediate timeframe and whether or not it would be useful to gather now in anticipation of the copper deregulation review and/or to augment our understanding of services in rural areas, something like that?

JG: I am with Robert. Most of this information will not be geospatial, so will be of limited use beyond being a 'sanity check' at an aggregated level. I have had a look at the list (back in there now to refresh my memory) - I think I will need to go through line by line and assess (with Robert's help) - it'll be a solid day's work I think, and then go through my view with Robert. Maybe can get to it later in the week...

Released Under Official Information Act 1982