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KEY INSIGHTS (1)

SATISFACTION
Satisfaction with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal is high with 85% of users satisfied with the online portal overall. Although not significantly higher than last wave (82%), this result suggests scores have remained consistently high.

Positive aspects of the portal include:
• Ease of use and navigation (25%)
• Timeliness of results (24%)
• Production of relevant data (22%)

USAGE
Two in three (67%) of the Cultural Heritage Online Portal users surveyed report accessing the portal at least several times a month, with 23% classed as very frequent users and 44% as frequent users. The remaining 33% are classed as infrequent users and access the portal no more than several times a year. Portal access is similar regardless of whether users are from a Queensland Government Department or another organisation.

Ease of Access and Use
Most users find the portal accessible (91%) and easy to use (84%). Although not significantly, this sentiment has increased amongst most groups since last wave, potentially suggesting that improvements made have had a positive impact.

QUERY RESOLUTION
Approximately half (48%) of portal users report always getting the information or outcome they desire, while just under two in five (38%) say they often get their desired outcome. Rate of achieving a desirable outcome has remained stable across waves, organisations and frequency of access.

Follow-up
Approximately one in three portal users have contacted the department in the past 12 months for assistance (34%) with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal and/or to request additional information (30%) following a search request. Most do not need to seek assistance (63%) suggesting these users find the portal informative and intuitive.

Similar to last wave, around half (50%) of all enquiries are resolved on the same day and an additional third (28%) within 1 to 2 business days. This suggests resolution turnaround remains short.

STAFF PERFORMANCE
Users are highly satisfied with how staff handle their portal enquiries. Top aspects of staff performance include:
• Staff knowledge and competency (95%)
• Staff attentiveness (93%)

PORTAL IMPROVEMENTS
Recommendations for improvement largely revolve around the portal itself, with few wanting more detailed/different content made available through the portal directly, a provision currently prohibited by legislation.

Although lower this wave, a few portal users continue to have unrealistic expectations of the portal, largely due to misunderstanding legislation and associated admin policies regarding the provision of information under Part 5 of the legislation.

Some actionable suggestions from portal users include:
• Improve site searchability – ‘street level’ view of the site
• Merge multiple datasets and allow data to be downloadable in GIS format
• Improve process efficiencies – access prior search history and reset password automatically
• Raise awareness of DATSIP’s responsibilities – regarding time management of information requests from party/s

Some improvements recommended are already available through the portal, suggesting there is potential to raise awareness and demonstrate how portal users can use it most effectively, perhaps via portal tutorials.
ORGANISATION TYPE

Though largely not significant, several differences in portal use and satisfaction are present between Government Departments and other organisations.

Trends suggest that those from a Government Department are more satisfied with the portal overall, they also rate accessibility and usability highly. Unsurprisingly, they are more likely to find the portal easy to use and to provide timely information. In comparison to other organisations, Government Departments are also more likely to rate their outcome as desirable.

While, those from another organisation are less likely to be satisfied with the portal and their ability to use it, they are more likely to seek assistance, request additional information and rate staff metrics highly. This suggests they are aware of and taking advantage of the tools available to them.

Government Departments might give the portal more favourable ratings because:

- They know what to expect from a government website/tool
- They are more knowledgeable about the parameters in which the department operates in

FREQUENCY OF USE

As with organisation type, though largely not significant, several differences in portal use and satisfaction are also present for different frequencies of usage.

Those who use the portal less frequently are more satisfied with the portal overall, they are also more likely to rate accessibility, usability and staff metrics highly. Interestingly, they are less likely to rate the outcome they received from the portal as desirable, suggesting that while service elements are satisfactory, novel users have higher outcome expectations.

Less frequent users might give the portal more favourable ratings because:

- Their expectations are lower in comparison to more frequent users
- Their searches are less complex

Less frequent users might rate their outcome as less desirable due to:

- Being unfamiliar with the restrictions placed upon the tool in terms of providing more detailed site content via the portal
INTRODUCTION
RESEARCH BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

BACKGROUND

The Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships (DATSIP) provide information from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Database and Register to land users seeking to comply with their cultural heritage duty of care. The Cultural Heritage Online Portal enables all land users, who have registered for special access, to undertake cultural heritage search requests. These search requests provide land users with information about Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander areas and objects of traditional, customary and archaeological significance to assist land users in meeting their duty of care under the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003 and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Act 2003.

Enhance Research was commissioned by DATSIP to undertake an online survey designed to measure users’ experience and satisfaction with the online portal and assess the service quality provided by DATSIP associated with the portal. This report is a final quantitative evaluation of the findings, and is part of the second wave of research.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The key objective of the survey was to evaluate the Cultural Heritage Online Portal, specifically the percentage of customers satisfied with services provided by DATSIP through the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Online Portal.
METHODOLOGY AND INTERPRETATION

METHODOLOGY

Online surveys were sent to a list of 416 portal users provided by DATSIP between Thursday 1 February and Monday 19 February, 2018.

The online surveys were programmed and managed in-house by Enhance Research. A total of 87 completed surveys were achieved with a response rate of 21.43%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION OF USER</th>
<th>N =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisations</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPORT INTERPRETATION

Please note the following when reading this report:

- Where question response percentages do not sum to 100%, this is due either to rounding or a question allowing multiple responses
- Caution is needed in interpreting data with small base sizes of around n=30 or less
- The base note included on each page throughout the report represents the number of respondents who answered the particular question

Statistical significance testing has been undertaken based on the following:

- Organisation type (i.e. Queensland Government vs other organisations)
- Frequency of access

For the purposes of this report only statistically significant differences of interest are shown, with figures in green or with ▲ being significantly higher than those in red or ▼.
OVERALL SATISFACTION

While the proportion of satisfied portal users has increased this wave (82% to 85%), this difference is not statistically significant, meaning that scores have remained consistently high. Compared to last wave, overall satisfaction has increased for all groups except those who access the portal very frequently. This is largely due to an increase in dissatisfied (20%) very frequent users, a proportion which is significantly higher than those who access the portal frequently (3%) and infrequently (0%).

(Base: All respondents (n=87)
Q3. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.)
SATISFACTION BY SEGMENT

Though not significantly higher, less frequent users and those from a Queensland Government department report higher overall satisfaction with the portal, perhaps due to having lower expectations/being familiar with Government tools.
**POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE PORTAL**

“It is easy to obtain the information I need, and I find it user friendly system to operate.”

“The ability to search by Lot on Plan.”

“User logins and instant searches are a great improvement over the old system. Makes the process much faster, and enables searches to be tailored as required.”

“The results for a sites search are instantaneous (you don’t have to wait for an email from someone at DATSIP anymore).”

“I only use it to search specific lot on plans for recorded sites/items. CH online portal was useful for this.”

When asked about positive portal aspects, approximately one quarter of users cited ease of use (25%), timeliness of results (24%) and production of relevant data (22%) as its most positive elements. Those from a Government Department were particularly likely to find the tool easy to use and to provide timely information.

Some users note that the improvements made to the portal create workload efficiencies.

**ASPECTS OF THE PORTAL THAT WORK WELL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Queensland Government Department</th>
<th>Other Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use/navigate</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant/Timely results/information/reports</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produces the results/data required</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search function/parameters</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All aspects work well</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to access/DIY access</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed results/information provided</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloadable information/data</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping of search/ Location of sites on map</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saves time/effort by autopopulating details/info</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand information/results</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PORTAL USAGE

Two in three (67%) of the Cultural Heritage Online Portal users surveyed report accessing the portal at least several times a month, with 23% classed as *very frequent users* and 44% as *frequent users*. The remaining 33% are classed as *infrequent* users and access the portal no more than several times a year. No users surveyed accessed the portal daily. Portal access is similar regardless of organisation.

**PORTAL USAGE**

- **Daily**: 0%
- **Several times a week**: 23%
- **Several times a month**: 44%
- **Several times a year**: 28%
- **Once**: 6%
- **Very frequent**: 23%
- **Frequent**: 44%
- **Infrequent**: 33%

Base: All respondents (n=87)

S1. How many times in the past 12 months have you accessed the Cultural Heritage Online Portal?
EASE OF ACCESS

Overall, the majority (91%) agree that it is easy to access the Cultural Heritage Online Portal. Although not significantly, this sentiment has increased among all groups since last wave. This could suggest that improvements made have had a positive impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type:</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department (n=40)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation (n=47)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (n=20*)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (n=38)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (n=29*)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (n=87)
Q1a. To what extent do you agree with the following statements...It was easy to access the Cultural Heritage Online Portal? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
Overall, the majority (84%) agree that it is easy to use the Cultural Heritage Online Portal. Regardless of organisation and frequency of use, both accessibility and usability of the Cultural Heritage Online Portal remains consistently high this wave. In terms of frequency of use, this suggests that the portal is user friendly regardless of increased exposure to the portal. Meaning that even novel users of the portal are able to access and use it with ease.

*Base: All respondents (n=87) Q1b. To what extent do you agree with the following statements...It was easy to use the Cultural Heritage Online Portal.? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.*
EXPERIENCE BY SEGMENT

Those who access the portal frequently and those from a Queensland Government department rate accessibility marginally higher than other groups, although this difference is not significant.

Portal users from a Government Department are more likely than those from another organisations to agree (4-5) that it is easy to access, perhaps due to their increased exposure to similar government tools. Regardless of frequency of use, perceptions of usability are consistently high.

Base: All respondents (n=87)
Q1a. It was easy to access the Cultural Heritage Online Portal? Q1b. It was easy to use the Cultural Heritage Online Portal?
CONTACT WITH DATSIP

 Approximately one in three portal users have contacted the department in the past 12 months for assistance with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal and/or to request additional information following a search request. Most do not need to seek assistance (63%), suggesting most users find the portal informative and intuitive.

 While organisation and frequency of use did not impact likelihood to seek assistance, more frequent portal users and those from another organisation are more likely to request additional information following a search via the Cultural Heritage Online portal. This is likely due to consultants and other frequent users needing to fulfil their Duty of Care to commence work on a cultural heritage site.

### SOUGHT ASSISTANCE TO USE THE ONLINE PORTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
<th>% YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REQUESTED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOLLOWING A SEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department</td>
<td>18% ▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation</td>
<td>40% ▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
<th>% YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>65% ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>29% ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>7% ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIMELINESS OF RESOLUTION

Three quarters have had their query resolved within 2 business days (78%), with half of portal users having their query resolved in less than one business day. Very few are having to wait longer, with approximately one in ten (15%) waiting more than three business days. These results have remained stable since last wave, suggesting resolution turnaround remains short.
Approximately half (48%) of portal users report *always* getting the information or outcome they desire, while just under two in five (38%) say they *often* get their desired outcome. Rate of achieving a desirable outcome has remained stable across waves, this suggests regardless of which organisation the user represents or how often they use the portal, over four in five are consistently likely to get a desirable outcome.
OUTCOME BY SEGMENT

Although not significant, less frequent users and those from a Queensland Government department report a higher frequency of achieving a desired outcome. This trend continues to suggest that less frequent users and those from a Government Department are rating the portal highly.

FREQUENCY OF DESIRED OUTCOME ACHIEVED VIA THE CULTURAL HERITAGE ONLINE PORTAL
% ALL/MOST OF THE TIME (4-5 rating)

ORGANISATION

Queensland Government Department
Other organisation

FREQUENCY

Very Frequent
Frequently
Infrequently

Base: All respondents (n=87)
Q2. How often did you get the information or outcome that you needed from the Cultural Heritage Online Portal?
Among portal users who have contacted DATSIP in the past year, there is very strong agreement (95%) that the staff they dealt with were knowledgeable and competent. This sentiment has remained stable across waves and among organisation and frequency of contact.

### Staff Knowledge and Competency

**Organisation Type:**
- Queensland Government Department (n=14*)
  - Total: 7% Disagree, 64% Neither, 29% Agree
  - Wave 1: 91% Agree, 93% Agree

- Other Organisation (n=26*)
  - Total: 42% Disagree, 54% Neither
  - Wave 1: 97% Agree, 96% Agree

### Access to Portal:
- Very Frequently (n=14*)
  - Total: 7% Disagree, 57% Neither, 36% Agree
  - Wave 1: 92% Agree, 93% Agree

- Frequently (n=16*)
  - Total: 6% Disagree, 44% Neither, 50% Agree
  - Wave 1: 93% Agree, 94% Agree

- Infrequently (n=10*)
  - Total: 50% Disagree, 50% Neither
  - Wave 1: 100% Agree, 100% Agree

*Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.*
PERFORMANCE BY SEGMENT

Although not significant, infrequent portal users and those from another organisation are slightly more likely to hold high opinions of DATSIP staff’s knowledge and competence.

CONTACT WITH DATSIP STAFF – KNOWLEDGABLE AND COMPETENT
% AGREED (4-5 rating)

**ORGANISATION**

- Queensland Government Department: 93%
- Other organisation: 96%

**FREQUENCY**

- Very Frequent: 93%
- Frequently: 94%
- Infrequently: 100%

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)
Q6a. Staff were knowledgeable and competent?
KEPT INFORMED

Among portal users who have contacted DATSIP in the past year, there is very strong agreement (88%) that staff kept them informed of everything they had to do to get the information they needed. Again, this sentiment has remained stable across waves and among organisation and frequency of contact.

### Organisation type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department (n=14*)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation (n=26*)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to portal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (n=14*)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (n=16*)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (n=10*)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)
Q6b. Again, thinking of your most recent contact with the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, how much do you agree with the following... I was informed of everything I had to do to get the information I needed? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
Portal users rate the degree to which they are kept informed consistently high regardless of organisation or frequency of contact, though infrequent users and those from another organisation give marginally higher scores.

As with performance ratings, this trend suggests that other organisations and infrequent users continue to rate staff metrics more favourably.
STAFF ATTENTIVENESS

The vast majority (93%) of portal users agree that the staff they spoke to listened attentively to their query. Again, this sentiment has remained stable across waves and among organisation and frequency of contact.

**Organisation type:**

- **Queensland Government Department** (n=14*): 7% Disagree, 57% Neither, 36% Agree
- **Other Organisation** (n=26*): 8% Disagree, 31% Neither, 62% Agree

**Access to portal:**

- **Very Frequently** (n=14*): 7% Disagree, 36% Neither, 50% Agree
- **Frequently** (n=16*): 6% Disagree, 38% Neither, 56% Agree
- **Infrequently** (n=10*): 50% Disagree, 50% Neither

Total % agreed (4-5 rating): Wave 1 Wave 2

- Total (n=40): 93% 93%
- Queensland Government Department (n=14*): 91% 93%
- Other Organisation (n=26*): 93% 92%
- Very Frequently (n=14*): 92% 86%
- Frequently (n=16*): 93% 94%
- Infrequently (n=10*): 92% 100%

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)
Q6c. Again, thinking of your most recent contact with the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, how much do you agree with the following... Staff listened attentively to my query? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
Portal users rate the degree to which staff listen to their query attentively consistently high. Though not significant, infrequent portal users and those from another organisation continue to give marginally higher ratings.
ABILITY TO ANSWER QUERIES

While most portal users’ agree that staff have the ability to answer their queries (85%), this is the lowest performing metric, a trend that is consistent with last wave. Agreement with this aspect decreases with frequency of access to the portal. Interestingly, this relationship mirrors last wave, where those who contacted the portal more frequently felt staff were better equipped to answer their queries.

**Organisation type:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department (n=14*)</td>
<td>7% 14% 50% 29%</td>
<td>91% 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation (n=26*)</td>
<td>12% 35% 54%</td>
<td>83% 88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access to portal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (n=14*)</td>
<td>7% 21% 36% 36%</td>
<td>92% 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (n=16*)</td>
<td>13% 38% 50%</td>
<td>87% 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (n=10*)</td>
<td>50% 50%</td>
<td>77% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)

Q6d. Again, thinking of your most recent contact with the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, how much do you agree with the following... Staff were able to answer my query? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
ANSWER QUERIES BY SEGMENT

Although not significant, again infrequent portal users and those from another organisation are slightly more likely to hold high opinions of DATSIP staff’s ability to answer their query.

CONTACT WITH DATSIP STAFF – ANSWER QUERIES
% AGREED (4-5 rating)

**ORGANISATION**

- **Queensland Government Department**: 79%
- **Other organisation**: 88%

**FREQUENCY**

- **Very Frequent**: 71%
- **Frequently**: 88%
- **Infrequently**: 100%

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)
Q6d. Staff were able to answer my query?
PORTAL IMPROVEMENTS
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

While users are generally satisfied with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal, suggestions for improvement indicate users still have high expectations for the portal. These improvements largely revolve around the portal itself, with the majority being actionable or already available.

Some suggestions for improvement indicate a possible lack of awareness among portal users of what is currently available, what can be improved on and what is beyond the scope of legislation. As a result, users’ suggestions have been grouped into the following categories; (1) currently available, (2) actionable and (3) non-actionable (i.e. restricted by legislation).
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (CURRENTLY AVAILABLE)

Suggested improvements that already exist largely revolve around the Public Map and Resources page:

1. **Enhance understanding of the public map** – Users want the public map to allow them to search specific locations (i.e. some via linear polygon searches), they also want the option to widen the scope of their search and search for multiple properties simultaneously. Others want details of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander party/s to be available (i.e. some when hovering over the map), and some want the ability to upload shape files.

2. **Address lack of awareness regarding the map and it’s capabilities** – Some simply do not know the public map and resources page exists, and desire a similar tool to assist them with their enquiries. Despite the provision of MapTips and other navigation tools, some of those who are aware of the public map and resources page still find it hard to navigate.

3. **Update sites regularly and raise awareness about shortcomings** – Some want awareness to be raised that some sites are yet to be recorded, and therefore consultation may be needed to determine if Duty of Care still exists.

This suggests there is the potential to raise awareness of the tools available in the public map and how portal users can use them most effectively. A tutorial video introducing the public map and demonstrating it’s tools (e.g. finding Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander party/s ) could rectify these issues.

“Label claim areas on the maps when searching the database.”

“I would like to be able to input a GPx and kmz/kml point or line for data search, the search function doesn’t work well for linear searches (roads, powerlines).”

“Be able to import locations (drilling, etc) to search if a project has AP.”

“Updated contact details for Aboriginal Parties, and titles for each contact, e.g. Contact Officer, Director, etc.; which can change month to month.”

“Ability to interrogate reported sites spatially.”

“I would like to see an interactive map interface where you could see if any heritage sites are nearby to any work being done.”

“Greater mapping capabilities are also needed so we can relate the data to real places and topography.”

“It could be more user-friendly. Navigating the website can be a little confusing at first.”

“Better awareness raising targeting land users, project planners, government agencies and developers that hundreds/thousands of sites are still to be recorded...If developers don’t see an Aboriginal site flagged on a CHU site search report, they then assume that there is no Aboriginal heritage at all to be concerned about and that there is no Duty of Care.”

Base: All respondents (n=87)
Q8. What improvements would you like to see made to the Cultural Heritage Online Portal?
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (ACTIONABLE)

Moving forward, portal users would like DATSIP to:

1. **Improve site searchability** – Some want a ‘street level’ view of the site, similar to Google Maps.

   “Alternate mapping - street level to better ensure assessment of scope of work against noted locations.”

2. **Merge multiple datasets and allow data to be downloadable in GIS format** – As with last wave, users want data to be available in a GIS format as the current PDF/.doc outputs are incompatible with modern GIS analysis. They would also like the ability to download multiple datasets at once.

   “Data sets available in GIS format along with those presently available.”
   “I would be great if I could get a full set of data as a geodatabase or the likes for our works/maintenance coverage area rather than submitting smaller search areas and then having to merge it all back together again.”

3. **Improve process efficiencies** – Users want a to be able to access prior search history and reset their password automatically (i.e. not have to call the office to reset).

   “It is also inefficient, impractical and arguably unprofessional to expect each heritage assessment to start ‘from scratch’, with no reference to what has already been completed.”

4. **Raise awareness of DATSIP’s responsibilities** – Some users want DATSIP to implement time-frame restrictions on how long Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander party/s can take to respond to their requests. As this is not DATSIP’s responsibility, there is an opportunity for DATSIP to address this need and raise awareness of their obligations.

   “Time limits for steps in the process and further steps to follow when seeking a response from community. One key issue is the delays associated with seeking responses from community.”
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (NON-ACTIONABLE)

Although lower this wave, a few portal users continue to have unrealistic expectations of the portal, largely due to misunderstanding legislation and associated admin policies regarding the provision of information under Part 5 of the legislation. Currently, the provision of more detailed site content cannot be made accessible through the portal, and users are referred to the relevant Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander party/s who have permission to grant requests for such additional information. While a few portal users disagree with this policy, the majority accept it.

Other unactionable suggestions for improvement include:

1. **Provision of more detailed (and up to date) information** – This includes the type/location of heritage, site name not just ID, original recorder, and site status. Users want site status to be updated (i.e. if it has been relocated, mitigated, destroyed) and searchable via the Public Map.
   - **Accurate location data** – As with last wave, some perceive GPS coordinates displayed in the current portal to be inaccurate or out of date.

2. **Immediate access to non-restricted site cards and reports** – Users want site card and cultural heritage report access eligibility to be widened beyond Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander party/s and land users/consultants.

3. **Authorisation through verbal means** – Users want challenges to obtaining party/s authorisation for site information to be mitigated, by allowing said authorisation to be provided in a verbal as well as written format.

   “More or complete cultural heritage sites and finds detailed in search results.”

   “More detail on what features of heritage value are found within the buffer around our site or point of interest, what the feature/artefact is etc.”

   “An indication to the extent of a site. An indication as to whether the site is still physically present or is only a record of a previously existing site.”

   “Approved users need to be able to access site cards and previous heritage reports (contingent on any secret/sacred restrictions). It is impossible to fulfil Duty of Care responsibilities under the Act without access to these documents, not least because locational data in the database is so inaccurate, it is often necessary to re-locate sites based on written descriptions.”

   “There is nothing in the legislation that prohibits the release of detailed information. It is instead the responsibility of the Chief Executive to decide (Part 5, Div 1, S38(2)). The legislation also states that the Chief Executive must provide information to a person carrying out a duty of care to ensure that they satisfy the Duty of Care requirements.”

   “Some Aboriginal Parties do not respond to emails, calls, meeting requests etc to discuss CH matters in an area where their claim was dismissed/withdrawn, making it impossible or extremely un-timely to get written authorisation for further site information.”
RESPONDENT
PROFILE
DEMOGRAPHICS

GENDER

53% 41%

AGE

18 - 24 years 1%
25 - 39 years 26%
40 - 54 years 45%
55+ years 18%
Prefer not to say 9%

Base: All respondents (n=87)
**FIRMOGRAPHICS**

### ORGANISATION TYPE

- Queensland Government Department: 46%
- Heritage Consultant: 11%
- Other private sector organisation: 10%
- Local Government: 9%
- Government-owned corporation: 8%
- Mining or resources sector: 3%
- Legal firm: 2%
- Commonwealth Government Department: 0%
- Other: 9%

### EMPLOYMENT

- Employee: 60%
- Supervisor/Team Leader: 16%
- Manager: 7%
- Senior Manager: 5%
- Other: 13%

Base: All respondents (n=87)