

Digital Service Standard – Feedback and Actions Register

Feedback/request	Action taken	Notes/comments
Andrew Morrison		
<p>(Via comment on slide 5) - Will we also explore the development of EX metrics as a part of this? https://www.forrester.com/blogs/ex-measurement-best-practices-metrics-and-data-sources/</p>	Noted.	We are still working out the specifics of how the metrics will be applied and if different metrics are required from an internal to government perspective. We will review this link in that context.
<p>(Via comment on slide 6) Will the scope also explore the development of EX metrics as part of this?</p>	<p>No action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any exemption policies, and if so, to what do they relate? • To whom is this applicable? • How does one get an exemption? Must they apply? • How is the exemption outlined, and what is the process? Is it a case of 'if you tick the following boxes, then you get one' or is it more like 'tell us your situation and we can go from there'? • Who developed this policy? • Who was this in consultation with? • Does someone own this, currently, is it updated, at all? • Why do you have an exemption policy? What is it that made you think that this would be needed? • Did you pre-emptively create the policy, or did it come off the back of people expressing the need for such a policy? • What are the implications of someone being exempt from the main policy? 	We consider this is incorporated as part of criteria 9 and 10. We also note that the DSS should not be applied in a linear way and therefore it will be applied consistently throughout the project lifecycle. We will make sure the guidance reflects this.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What exactly does the exemption mean, is it merely a deadline extension? taken 	
(Via comment on slide 6) 'clarify your objectives' – may want to clarify what our definitions of success are for the service	No action taken	We consider this is incorporated as part of criteria 9 and 10. We also note that the DSS should not be applied in a linear way and therefore it will be applied consistently throughout the project lifecycle. We will make sure the guidance reflects this.
(Via comment on slide 6) 'Do you understand the policy lever this service is trying to address? The impact to the citizen?'	Added policy as part of the following dot point: <i>Understand how your service supports delivery of policy and strategic government initiatives such as the Data and Digital Government Strategy.</i>	Agreed. We have updated the text accordingly.
(Via comment on slide 6) If we are removing the 'Don't forget the non-digital experience' should we be encouraging at this stage to also identify how the service can be accessed outside of the scope of digital to keep the services in alignment at least?	Added a dot point to refer back to Services Australia's Customer Experience Standard. <i>Consider the non-digital experience through Service Australia's Customer Experience Standard</i>	We have been working with Services Australia on their multi-channel <i>Customer Experience Standard</i> , so have referred to this as the appropriate angle for considering the non-digital experience.
(Via comment on slide 7) – There is a train of thought around Personas being dead, and a shift to mindsets. May be worth considering if we want to articulate that explicitly. https://www.nsw.gov.au/onecx/blog/designing-content-for-customer-mindsets https://govservicedesign.net/programme/mindsets-vs-personas	No action taken	We do not have a lot of detail about this concept. Lisa will reach out to Andrew to discuss further.

<p>https://codefor.ca/blog/goodbye-personas-how-mindsets-can-help-you-build-empathy-and-reduce-bias</p>		
<p>(Via comment on slide 8) It may be also worth around digital inclusivity also around bandwidth, device (mobile vs desktop), connectivity (poor or sporadic internet availability)</p>	<p>Updated to incorporate language from the DDGS around digital inclusion on Slide 8.</p> <p><i>Consider the non-digital experience through Service Australia's Customer Experience Standard</i></p>	<p>We have been working with Services Australia on their multi-channel <i>Customer Experience Standard</i>, so have referred to this as the appropriate angle for considering the non-digital experience and those with poor connectivity.</p>
<p>(Via comment on slide 8) Should we call out explicit standards such as the Flesch-Kincaid readability test, and factor that into the AGA as a standard?</p>	<p>Have included a reference to the Australian Government Style Manual.</p> <p><i>Use plain English to support people to understand what they need to do, through the Australian Government Style Manual.</i></p>	<p>We have referred back to the Australian Government Style Manual to support alignment with Government requirements. We could connect to the other resources mentioned in the criteria's resource section (once built out).</p>
<p>(Via comment on slide 9) - Would we also activity encourage engagement with states and local for a true-joined up experience? So 'For Bonus Points - join up with the states!'</p>	<p>Updated slide 9 to include:</p> <p><i>Consider how you can link-up with existing state and territory digital services, where appropriate.</i></p>	
<p>(Via comment on slide 9) - Not only ask for it once, but from the outside, architect what you must have, and what is nice to have. What will you do with the data from a cybersecurity perspective? Only use it for the transaction and then discard it? Keep it ongoing? Will you make that data available to other services or systems?</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>	<p>We consider this is addressed in criteria 7.</p>
<p>(Via comment on slide 9) - Also support interoperability between sharing common datasets (open data)</p>	<p>Updated slide 9 to include:</p> <p><i>Encourage interoperability between sharing common datasets (open data).</i></p>	
<p>(Via comment on slide 10) – Should we be also encouraging to seek out during this stage what are the security requirements, or breach notification</p>	<p>Updated slide 10 to include the following dot point:</p>	

<p>requirements? The Cybersecurity theme may not be strong enough in this message</p>	<p><i>Consider the cyber security requirements needed to support your service.</i></p>	
<p>(Via comment on slide 11) - Are we actively dropping the making 'source code open by default' principle? Is there a reason that we aren't encouraging the share-back approach?</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Chris has highlighted a preference to move away from open source to open standards. It would be good to understand the two sides of this argument a bit further – we will schedule some time with you to discuss.</p>
<p>(Via comment on slide 11) - Could we make this stronger to help understand at this point what the spectrum of reuse may be? The service they are designing could be anywhere on the spectrum of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-use of documentation/process (business case, architecture, operating models, procurement approaches) 2. Re-use of the system (make the system modular/configurable so that it is relatively easy to provide a copy of the service or solution to someone else to build upon/extend your solution or change it slightly) 3. Is it a candidate for a white-label service (or components of your service)? What components could you white-label to allow others to use in real-time also? (an API gateway to a service, a dataset). What costs or operating model should be considered? <p>I think this is an important piece, as it really goes to re-use. Reuse doesn't have to be the whole system, but we should try to articulate what parts could be re-used.</p>	<p>Updated Slide 11 to include:</p> <p><i>Understand what processes or documentation could be re-used.</i></p>	
<p>(Via comment on slide 12) - Including data lifecycle and retention management. Do you need to store it? What is the risk of capturing it and being able to</p>	<p>Updated slide 12 with the following dot point:</p>	

<p>use it, vs storing it and increasing risk around compromise?</p>	<p><i>Consciously consider the data lifecycle, including how you will collect, manage, store and use data.</i></p>	
<p>(Via comment on slide 14) - There is a risk that if the question of 'how will you monitor your service' isn't asked earlier on, all monitoring will be retrofitted. This means it could impact on the way that solutions are architected - or worse impact on the WofG ability to be able to aggregate and monitor performance. We should relatively quickly try to establish some baseline metrics that agencies should capture at a minimum.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>	<p>While we understand your point, the DSS should not be applied in a linear way and therefore it will be applied consistently throughout the project lifecycle. We will make sure the guidance and detailed documentation reflects this.</p>
<p>(Via comment on slide 14) - This will also have importance of 'how will you monitor' for Employee or Internal Experience. Will employee services need to report against WofG measurements?</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We are still working out the specifics of how the metrics will be applied and if different metrics are required from an internal to government perspective.</p>
<p>Lauren Mills</p>		
<p>Align the language used in the DSS to the DGGS eg. 'connected services' instead of 'joined-up' services, 'all people in the business' instead of 'everyone'.</p>	<p>Updated criteria 3 and 4 to reflect the DDGS language.</p>	
<p>Section 47E</p>		
<p>(Via DSS consultation) Feedback from agencies is that there is no guidance on how to ensure accessibility</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Agreed. As discussed in our follow up meeting, we are keen to provide as much guidance and support to agencies as possible on accessibility. We have been meeting with a number of stakeholders who have got resources that we could potentially link to, but any further suggestions, please send through.</p>
<p>Section 47E</p>		
<p>(Via comment on slide 8) - Defence model incorporates the consideration of fundamental inputs they have eight standardised elements:</p>	<p>Updated Criteria 1 – clarify your objectives to include the following:</p>	<p>A very good point, but we consider this fits well in the first criteria as people are considering the objectives of their service.</p>

<p>Organisation, personnel, collective training, major systems, supplies, facilities, support, command and management. Obviously not all relevant but they go to considering all elements of success are considered and not overlooked. A good example I have found was where a focus was on building a plane but everyone forgot about alterations to the runway. If you are joining up services they need to design in consideration for not only users but those integrating with the service.</p> <p>Design for everyone is implied but might need more detail</p>	<p><i>Consider the fundamental inputs and integration required for your service.</i></p>	
<p>(Via comment in slide 8)- people may consider from only a UX perspective rather than a back-end perspective</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
<p>(Via comment in slide 9) - Can reference AGA on reusable technology</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>	<p>This is reflected on slide 11 – criteria 6.</p>
<p>(Via comment in slide 10)- There could be a missing piece around POCs and pilots to build trust through testing and design. smaller investments over large big bang approach that try's to do too much but then doesn't deliver.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We will build on this throughout the detailed DSS document and guidance.</p>
<p>(Via comment in slide 12)- Consider adding in a reference to check AGA for the latest advice and guidance,</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>	<p>We consider this is covered on slide 11 under criteria 6.</p>
<p>(Via comment in slide 14)- Agree there should be something about establishing a what good looks like before you even start and understanding desired end state and mapping out how you PLAN to get there. Metrics should be set around success milestones ie if your not adding value along the way</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>While we understand your point, the DSS should not be applied in a linear way and therefore it will be applied consistently throughout the project lifecycle. We will make sure the guidance and detailed documentation reflects this.</p>

then you should be considering stopping or amending your path.		
(Via comment in slide 14)- Also reference to check AGA on latest advice.	Updated slide 14 to include the following dot point: <i>Check the Australian Government Architecture for the latest guidance on whole of government measurements.</i>	
(Via comment in slide 16)- Consider adding in AGA or have a separate mapping to AGA as the AGA has relevant domains and capabilities across the DSS for agencies to reference real life examples and support from agencies who have developed before or lessons learned. Given its evolving mapping can easily assist agencies find what they are after. Team could assist with this.	Updated slide 16 to include AGA in the 'Enabling and supporting Components' section	
Section 47E		
(Via email) notes the differences between the DSS as a policy and as a standard	Noted.	
Section 47E		
(Via email) 'design for everyone' is redundant if not all digital products are made accessible to WCAG standards	Noted. Updated slide 8 to include the following dot point: <i>Design your service to meet latest WCAG AA guidelines.</i>	
(Via comment in slide 4) Section on procurement? APS should be following Australian Government ICT Standards for Accessible Procurement ... https://www.financeminister.gov.au/media-release/2016/08/22/access-technology-made-easier for more detail on state government implementation see procurement section at:	Noted.	Given we are not setting policy in the DSS, we have not reflected this. Noting that we consider this is an interesting idea, we will share it with out procurement colleagues here in the DTA.

<p>https://www.accessibility.sa.gov.au/policy/south-australian-government/online-accessibility-policy</p>		
<p>(Via comment on slide 5) - Working in State Government, this was the single point of failure for the old/current standard. The Digital Service Standard was quoted as a reason why internal solutions were not being made accessible (out of scope) when teams redevelop internal facing solutions such as intranets, learning management systems, records management etc. In general APS and State Gov staff are trying to do the right thing but just having the scope as public facing seems at odds with the quoted move to increase employment opportunities for people with disability in the APS (if internal solutions are not being made accessible, how are we going to attract and keep staff with visible and hidden disability?).</p> <p>For an example of internal facing see scope at: https://www.accessibility.sa.gov.au/policy/south-australian-government/online-accessibility-policy</p>	<p>Updated slide 5 to include the following dot point:</p> <p><i>Internal to government (staff facing) services, such as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Intranets</i> • <i>Learning management systems</i> • <i>Records management system</i> 	<p>We may reach out to you to understand this one further and how we can build out the definition in the detailed DSS document.</p>
<p>(Via comment in slide 5)- Why just 'high volume'? Shouldn't this be setting the standard required from/expected by government for all digital channels whether public facing or staff facing? APS as the employer of choice etc.</p> <p>SAGOV experienced the same issue when redesigning their policies, when should the new policy apply, as in it's not feasible or realistic to retrofit existing/old solutions</p>	<p>Noted. Updated to remove 'high volume' as language could be confused with 'existing high volume services'.</p>	

In the end settled on "All new or significantly upgraded SA Government online applications" after wide-ranging consultation ... sets clear expectation going forward and draws line in the sand etc etc etc		
(Via comment in slide 5)- change to 'internal and public facing	No action taken.	We are trying to demonstrate that the same criteria applies with the addition of internal services so have kept this slide as is.
(Via comment on slide 8) - Change to "Design your service to meet the latest WCAG level AA guidelines" ... future proofing and will help to keep the standard current and in line with international best practice. This will also align it with the Data and Digital Strategy ("ensuring all websites and services meet the latest Web Content Accessibility Guidelines")	Updated to 'Design your service to meet latest WCAG AA guidelines.'	Updated to align with the DDGS language.
Section 47E		
(Via DSS consultation in reference to slide 5)- make the language stronger	Updated slide 5 to include the following dot point: <i>Internal to government (staff facing) services, such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Intranets</i> • <i>Learning management systems</i> • <i>Records management system</i> 	We may reach out to you to understand this one further and how we can build out the definition in the detailed DSS document.
Section 47E		
(Via DSS consultation)- What strategies do we have in place for measuring when services need to be retired?	Noted.	We consider this is incorporated as part of criteria 9 and 10. We will make sure the guidance reflects this.
Section 47E		
It would be beneficial to continue to emphasise the core principle of discovery first, following by testing of concepts/prototypes and then attempting to	Noted.	We will consider this as we build out the detailed DSS documentation.

<p>deliver the product or service. Whether this takes on the old 'discover, alpha, beta, live' or possibly a re-arrangement of the 10 principles to articulate the importance of a staged approach.</p>		
<p>How are we considering the non-digital experience/channels? It's important to draw attention that digital or one channel is unlikely in any service and that designers, researcher and developers need to consider the integration to deliver a seamless experience. This should consider things like digital literacy or experience overlaps.</p>	<p>Added a dot point to refer back to Services Australia's Customer Experience Standard.</p> <p><i>Consider the non-digital experience through Service Australia's Customer Experience Standard</i></p>	<p>We have been working with Services Australia on their multi-channel <i>Customer Experience Standard</i>, so have referred to this as the appropriate angle for considering the non-digital experience.</p>
<p>Slide 7 - User researchers prefer "behavioural archetypes" or "user types" which may have been mentioned in slide 6 by other commenters. There is an ongoing debate in this space and the language may shift over time, but there is a preference for this language currently over "personas". The first article you provided to the group when seeking feedback also outlined the reasons for this language.</p>	<p>Updated to include the below dot point:</p> <p><i>Identify your user groups and any behavioural archetypes that need consideration.</i></p>	
<p>Slide 18 - There are a number of external forums that this can be tested with. This includes the "Data and Digital Professions members' community" run by APSC Digital Profession.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We are running a session with the Digital Profession community in 2 weeks to take them through this.</p>
<p>(Via email) It's worth considering how these guidelines will be used by non-government designers, researchers, product managers, and developers as a signpost for best practice. It is extremely valuable to have something with gravitas to point to when you are working in the private sector. To this end, it might be beneficial to reach out to private sector users for feedback about accessing the standard and any additional</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>If you have any suggested private sector partners that we could engage with, we would appreciate you passing on their details.</p>

considerations. This will go toward furthering the DTA's strategic position as a trusted authority on digital best practice.		
The BCG report looked across jurisdictions to evaluate similar schemes. There is benefit in sharing more widely to test new DSS concepts with agencies.	Noted.	
Section 47E		
(Via comment on slide 6) A Privacy Impact Assessment or threshold assessment can assist and support this	Included a dot point re PIAs on slide 12: <i>Undertake a Privacy Impact Assessment to understand the privacy implications of your service.</i>	We have strengthened this as part of criteria 7.
(Via comment on slide 7) Recommend that a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) or at a minimum Threshold assessment be conducted to map or identify to ensure privacy compliance is addressed as the forefront of any new system/project.	Included a dot point re PIAs on slide 12: <i>Undertake a Privacy Impact Assessment to understand the privacy implications of your service.</i>	We have strengthened this as part of criteria 7.
(Via comment on slide 7) The Following OAIC Consumer data Right Privacy Safe Guidelines may need to be considered. https://www.oaic.gov.au/consumer-data-right/consumer-data-right-guidance-for-business/consumer-data-right-privacy-safeguard-guidelines	Noted. We will link to this as part of the resource section for Criteria 5 and 7.	
(Via comment on slide 12)- Consider future use of the data, eg they might want to survey participants. or use it for law enforcement., etc	Updated slide 12 to include the following dot point: <i>Consider and communicate any future uses of the data (including if it will be made open and or shared).</i>	We will add further details about what those future uses could be in the more detailed version of the document.

(Via comment on slide 14)- Consider establishing a 12mth or 6mth review/audit.	Noted.	We will consider specific timeframes for review/audit as we build out the detailed DSS documentation.
(Via comment on slide 15)- Consider publishing updates, results and findings.	Updated slide 15 to include the following dot point: <i>Consider publishing updates, results and findings, to promote transparency.</i>	
Section 47E		
(In reference to slide 13)- It's hard to measure 'excellent' services, it's a nebulous term	Updated to change 'excellent' to 'high quality'	
(In reference to slide 6)- Add – Focus on the benefits for customers rather than the solution	We consider this is covered under criteria 2 – Understand User Needs.	
(In reference to slide 8)- Include alternatives (other channels) for the service to cater for all Australians	Added a dot point to refer back to Services Australia's Customer Experience Standard. <i>Consider the non-digital experience through Service Australia's Customer Experience Standard</i>	We have been working with Services Australia on their multi-channel <i>Customer Experience Standard</i> , so have referred to this as the appropriate angle for considering the non-digital experience.
(In reference to slide 12)- Add - Clearly communicate when your data will be made open and or shared	Updated the following dot point to include 'clearly' <i>Consider and clearly communicate any future uses of the data (including if it will be made open and or shared).</i>	
(In reference to slide 15)- Add - Conduct regular user and system testing to ensure that changes applied are fit for purpose	No action taken.	We consider this is included in Criteria 2 – understand user needs.
(Via email) - What's missing – Build Support - Build the capability of staff to support the service etc. (this would fit under Action Mission 5 Data and Digital Foundations and would link to the APS Reform Agenda)	Updated slide 15 to include the below dot point: <i>Invest in your people by building the capability of staff to support the service.</i>	

(Via email) - User and system testing is missing from the design and build of services	No action taken.	We consider this is included in criteria 2 – understand user needs.
(Via email) How will you measure the DSS?	No action taken.	We are proposing to use our new digital service measurements to help measure the success of the DSS. This builds on the work Nous did for our branch last financial year. Happy to take you through this if you have any questions.
(Via email) Needs to be more aligned to the DDGS – e.g. simple and seamless services	Updated criteria 3 and 4 to reflect the DDGS language.	We will continue to incorporate the DDGS language throughout the more detailed DSS document.
(Via email) Are there checks and balances in place for a new service before it goes live – i.e. to check that it meets the DSS?	Noted.	We are currently discussing how we can best incorporate the DSS under existing IOF process (e.g. through Contestability and Assurance states). Grateful for any thoughts you might have on this.
Lucy Poole		
(Via consultation with Lisa) Would like to see something in here about considering Indigenous Inclusion	Updated slide to include the following dot point: <i>'Consider First Nations digital inclusion in respect to access, affordability, and digital ability'</i>	NIAA have a First Nations Digital Inclusion Plan (2023-26) https://www.niaa.gov.au/indigenous-affairs/economic-development/first-nations-digital-inclusion-plan The dot point added is a direct reflection of the language used on their website
Section 47E		
(Via email on slide 6) - it might be helpful to encourage consideration of any interdependencies such as systems, processes or policies that relate or could be impacted by transitioning to or making major changes to a digital solution.	Updated slide 6 to include the following dot point: <i>Consider the fundamental inputs and integration required for your service – including systems, processes and policies.</i>	
(Via email on slide 7)– the guidance around conducting regular user research and observation points seem to fit more within the 'monitor' element, especially if this is a transition to a new	Noted. We have included the following dot point to slide 7:	We consider that regular user research sits better under this criteria as the 'monitoring' criteria is more around understanding the success of a service. We also note that the DSS

<p>digital solution and the current users are not offered a digital option. It may need to be refined to guide the initial user consultation and exploration of available digital technologies to support user needs. Further, a point about involving users in the development, build, and testing of the initial design.</p>	<p><i>Involve users in the development, build and testing of the service.</i></p>	<p>should not be applied in a linear way, so agencies will be using it at different points.</p>
<p>(Via email on slide 8)– this seems to overlap with the previous element and might need to consider the cultural diversity within the Australian citizen base. There are over 3 million migrants and about 30% of citizens that were born overseas and English is not their first language (in some regions up to 60% of citizens are born overseas). In addition, there are different levels of digital literacy, provision of internet connectivity, and barriers to access such as those with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups within the population (e.g., prisoners, domestic violence, refugees, etc.).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Based on feedback from stakeholders, we consider that it is important to keep criteria 2 and 3 separate. Criteria 3 is very much about increasing accessibility and inclusion in digital services. In the detailed DSS documentation, we will be sure to draw out the differences between 2 and 3 in a more clear way.</p>
<p>(Via email on slide 9)– the more commonly used digital systems term could be ‘connected’ rather than ‘joined-up’. An issue that is often raised around connected services is the limitations of citizen consent and the obligations under the Privacy Act, especially in relation to the use of personal or sensitive information.</p>	<p>Updated criteria 4 to reflect the DDGS language of ‘connected’.</p>	
<p>(Via email on slide 10)– it may be beneficial to consider the selection of providers and their sub-contractors within this element. It could also be helpful to reference alignment with the whole-of-government Hosting Strategy and compliance with the Hosting Certification Framework requirements for providers that host government data. In addition, a point about budgeting to seek expert</p>	<p>Updated slide 10 to include the following dot point: <i>Understand how your service will align to the Whole of Government Hosting Strategy and the Hosting Certification Framework.</i></p>	<p>We will build out the broader guidance on this as part of the detailed DSS document.</p>

<p>advice for the legal, security, and other aspects of the design. Another important consideration could be having a mechanism for users to report bugs, security issues, lodge a complaint and escalate, if needed.</p>		
<p>(Via email on slide 11)– I’m not sure if using an & and dropping the ‘of’ is appropriate for a standard. There are digital government systems that are used by Australian citizens located offshore (e.g., DFAT, Defence, born overseas, on holiday) It could be good to add a point about any relevant international standards and requirements such as the need to process international payments. Another consideration is sector specific standards and patterns such as the Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) standard for exchanging digital health data for use in a variety of settings and systems.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We will build out the broader guidance on this as part of the detailed DSS document.</p>
<p>(Via email on slide 12)– some data has legislated retention obligations that may need to be considered, such as those within the National Archives Act. There are also requirements under the Privacy Act that may need to be considered around the collection, use and storage of different types of information. Some specific uses and sectors have additional ethical and legal obligations such as ethics for medical research or specific legislation for systems such as the My Health Record Act and Rules.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We will build out the broader guidance on this as part of the detailed DSS document.</p>
<p>(Via email on slide 13)– perhaps another consideration is the need to balance the use of new technology with the rate of user adoption, user expectations and perceptions (may not want the</p>	<p>Updated slide 13 to include the following dot point:</p>	

<p>government to be leading edge) and trust of the technology. It also requires funding a significant change management effort to train citizen or APS users.</p>	<p><i>Understand the rate of adoption of new technologies and if users would want to see it in a government service.</i></p>	
<p>(Via email on slide 14)– it may be relevant to refer to the whole-of-government Digital and ICT Benefits Management Policy, noting that it is voluntary but offers policy standards, assessment criteria and guidance on measuring the benefits of a new digital solution. Another consideration would be transparent reporting of the appropriate measurements of the success and user satisfaction with the solution. The Benefits Management Policy could also be flagged in the first element ‘clarify your objectives’ as best practice is to consider the metrics that will be used and/or reported to demonstrate the objectives have been achieved.</p>	<p>Updated slide 14 to include the following dot point: <i>Consider and apply the Whole of Government Digital and ICT Benefit Management Policy</i></p>	<p>We consider that the transparency piece fits best in criteria 10 (as it currently sits).</p>
<p>(Via email on slide 15)– it could be valuable to consider a broad range of stakeholder and user feedback for continuous improvement. For example, global trends, consultation across government with service owners of similar solutions, following online relevant technical and user forums, etc. I suggest the regular user research and observations point may belong here too. the service owner may also want to understand and schedule regular meetings with providers to have input into the technology roadmap for the solution. For example, what are the technology providers plans to improve or release new versions and what is the duration of the support for the version in use. Another consideration may be incorporating a</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We consider this is included as part of criteria 2. We will be sure to link back to it as part of the more detailed DSS document.</p>

<p>mechanism for users to provide immediate feedback on the user experience.</p>		
<p>(Via email) Does the proposed scope of the new Digital Service Standard meet your expectations? What is your overall impression of the proposed scope of the Digital Services Standard? The draft has a good coverage of the generic scope of a new digital service. There are some opportunities for minor refinements that are outlined above. I also agree with the comments Andrew Morrison has added to the slide deck. I'm not an expert on usability and accessibility standards that have been referenced by Cliff Edwards.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Have updated accordingly.</p>
<p>(Via email) Do any statements stand out more than others? I was a bit unsure of the difference between 'understand user needs' and 'design for everyone'.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>As highlighted above, based on feedback from stakeholders, we consider that it is important to keep criteria 2 and 3 separate. Criteria 3 is very much about increasing accessibility and inclusion in digital services. In the detailed DSS documentation, we will be sure to draw out the differences between 2 and 3 in a clearer way.</p>
<p>(Via email) Are any statements obsolete/ redundant? Which, if any, statement may be obsolete or redundant? I wonder if the 'Understand User Needs' and 'Design for Everyone' statements could be combined.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>(Via email) Are any statements unattainable? Which, if any, statements are unattainable? I'm not sure if all service owners would have sufficient and current data to make 'data-driven decisions'. Perhaps 'evidence-based decisions' could more achievable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We will consider this as we build out the detailed DSS documentation and guidance.</p>

<p>(Via email) Is there anything that you think that we have missed? What's missing? I think there are other Australian and International standards, policies, and frameworks that could be relevant (see above). Some guidance on considering sector-specific requirements may also be helpful. There are also government targets for SME, Net Zero Emissions, Indigenous Participation, etc. that may need to be factored into the Standard.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We will incorporate these as part of the detailed DSS documentation.</p>
<p>(Via email) Is there anything that you consider needs more emphasis in the Standard? What needs more emphasis? Its not entirely clear if the use of the Standard is mandatory and if any reporting, assurance checks, etc. may be required.</p>	<p>Updated slide 3 to include the following dot point: <i>Better enforce the use of the Standard across agencies.</i></p>	
<p>(Via email) How could we enforce the DSS to ensure it meets its intended purpose? In addition to the answer to the question above, I wonder if the approach required to foster use of the Standard is enforcement or education and awareness through the provision of additional guidance materials such as templates, links, resources, etc.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We are currently putting together a list of guidance materials and resources that we can connect agencies to. We would love any suggestions you may have in this space.</p>
<p>(Via email) Could anything be done to improve/ drive sentiment/ commitment? What could be done to improve or drive sentiment and commitment to the applying the Standard? There are only two resources referenced at the start of this presentation and both are non-government sources. I'm not sure if this is demonstrating sufficient research and consultation was conducted to develop/improve this version of the Standard. It could be good to state the problem that this version</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>This is an early draft and we have a plan to engage heavily across government over the coming months commencing week of 14 August. We have also already commenced informal engagement with agencies.</p>

<p>is designed to solve and the value proposition it offers to benefit the service owner. Examples: Will this save you time or money or both? Will it prevent user issues and what types?</p>		
<p>(Via email) Do you know of any stakeholders or forums we should consult with externally? Who should we consult with on this draft Standard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Industry and Community Peak Bodies b. Office of the Australian Information Commissioner c. Australian Cyber Security Centre d. Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (insights on Consumer Data Rights currently for banking industry but may expand) e. Other government departments and agencies (federal, state and local levels) 	<p>Noted.</p>	
<p>Section 47E</p>		
<p>(Via email) The revised DSS principles align well with the Contestability perspective and should result in better outcomes, in particular the shift towards ongoing assessment throughout the lifecycle of the service. Some specific favourable commentary regarding the transaction threshold was received as stakeholders have raised this question with us in the past.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We will continue to engage with you over the coming months about how we can support the Contestability role and what guidance is required.</p>
<p>(Via email) The team would be a keen to see visualisation of the changes between the existing, and future DSS and understand the delta between the two.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>We have included a slide in the pack to support this.</p>
<p>(Via email) The rationale behind open-source vs open standards would be good to share. There is a very that the DTA has historically been a champion for use of open-source technologies.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>The CEO has highlighted a preference to move away from open source to open standards. It would be good to understand the two sides of</p>

		this argument a bit further – we will schedule some time with you to discuss.
(Via email) The team is keen to see how the underlying execution, processes and assessment will work. DSS is currently considered as part of the existing DCAP processes so this will result in some changes in this space.	Noted.	We will continue to engage with you over the coming months about how we can support the Contestability role and what guidance is required.
(Via email) As communicated in the session, Agencies routinely express concern with the quantity of data the DTA already asks for as part of Wave and other data collection mechanisms.	Noted.	We are looking into how we can reuse existing data collection mechanisms to reduce burden on agencies. We would be interest in discussing this further with you to understand where the pain points are.
(Via email) The DSS content aligns with the AGA in specific areas such as re-use, so it is worth noting that Contestability is working with the AGA team to align processes and understand the re-use mandate and its enforceability. Our interest is in ensuring that agencies are consulted, aware of their obligations, and are provided with sufficient tools to successfully comply. This extends to understanding Contestability's' role in any assessment or enforcement activities.	Noted.	We will continue to engage with you over the coming months about how we can support the Contestability role and what guidance is required.

Released under FOI Act