	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	1. Whether the then proposed vessel tracking requirements were progressed through a reasonable regulatory impact analysis.		
1.1	The Queensland Government Guide to Better Regulation[1] establishes regulatory best practice for the development of policy and regulation. It aims to ensure the introduction or amendment of regulation is necessary, effective and minimises the burden on affected stakeholders. The department consulted the Queensland Productivity Commission (QPC) about the introduction of vessel tracking by way of a Preliminary Impact Assessment (PIA). This was ultimately endorsed by the QPC. Following the outcome of this process, the department decided to implement vessel tracking by creating a selective market framework of units and suppliers. This framework contains some elements of anti-competitive arrangements which, with full disclosure, may have given cause to undertake a Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS). The department has not sought the advice of the QPC about this framework. Ultimately, the QPC's response was provided to, and considered by Cabinet, before being approved. The lack of full disclosure about the vessel tracking framework was not available in this process.	As part of the PIR: • Provide details of the department's vessel tracking supplier and unit framework to the QPC. Seek its advice about whether this alters its previous endorsement of the PIA, raises implications for anti-competitive arrangements, or a RIS. • Publish the outcome of the QPC advice in the PIR.	Completed – OBPR letter about Ombudsman action item 1 can be downloaded from 'Document library'.
1.2	Limited consultation occurred with the industry about the proposed financial arrangements associated with vessel tracking prior to its implementation. Although the Green Paper[2] and other consultation with the industry[3] included commentary on the proposed vessel tracking	As part of the PIR: • Review the financial information made available to the industry before the department decided on the	In progress

[1] https://s3.treasury.qld.gov.au/files/guide-to-better-regulation.pdf
[2] Fisheries Reform in Queensland (2016) - https://www.cabinet.qld.gov.au/documents/2016/Jun/FisheriesGP/Attachments/Paper.PDF.
[3] The draft vessel tracking policy (https://www.daf.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/1342018/vessel-tracking-policy.pdf) and guidelines (https://www.daf.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/1342019/vessel-tracking-guidelines.pdf) consultation.

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	arrangements, they did not include any details about the likely financial costs involved to enable parties to understand impacts and their scale, including the inability of lessees to access the Queensland Government Vessel Tracking Rebate Scheme (the rebate scheme). The QPC's decision was based on inadequate departmental advice that it had undertaken relevant industry consultation (e.g. green paper) which negated the necessity for a RIS.	approved vessel tracking units and suppliers. • Seek advice from the QPC about the adequacy of the details included in consultation and provided to QPC about the likely financial costs for fishers, including whether on reflection a RIS was required. • Consider, and act on, the advice received from the QPC. • Where the QPC advice supports that a RIS would have been required, or improved information for future regulatory impacts assessments is required from the department, publish this outcome in the PIR.	Completed Completed Completed
1.3	Safety on vessels is an obvious goal for the industry and government. The introduction of vessel tracking required additional electrical equipment and fittings to be installed on commercial fishing vessels. In some circumstances, additional power systems may have been required. The safe installation of such equipment in a marine environment requires compliance with various standards and other requirements so to minimise the risks of potentially serious or fatal incidents. The department has not demonstrated that it has sufficiently considered the safety risks and considerations associated with the implementation of vessel tracking in the PIA, nor as part of	As part of the PIR: • Provide information about the costs involved in achieving safety requirements in implementing vessel tracking on commercial fishing vessels. Seek advice from the QPC about whether this alters its previous endorsement of the PIA.	In progress

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	other stages of the implementation of vessel tracking (see the proposed actions in Issue 3 below).	• Where the QPC advice supports that a RIS would have been required, or improved information for future regulatory impacts assessments is required from the department, publish this outcome in the PIR. More generally, in addition to the steps proposed in Issue 3: • Engage experts (e.g. marine electrical engineer) to strategically review the vessel tracking system with a safety focus (strategic safety review). • This strategic safety review is to include consideration of legislative requirements, safety risk identification and assessment, risk minimisation measures (available and applied) and any obligations / implications that apply to the industry, suppliers and the department. • The department consider the strategic safety review outcomes and take relevant action.	In progress In progress Completed - The Standard Operating Procedure "SOP – Approval of vessel tracking units and providers" has been reviewed and approved to include internal audit recommendations, independent supplier checks and the Ombudsman's proposed actions. Completed – As above

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
		• Publish a summary of the strategic safety review outcomes on its website.	In progress
1.4	Further, commercial fishing vessels can vary significantly in their size, operation and power systems. The installation of vessel tracking units on some vessels has required the provision of additional power systems and other modifications. These practicalities in implementation of vessel tracking have not been recognised in the department's publications, even though such works are a cost on the industry both in installation and ongoing maintenance.	As part of the PIR: • Identify the additional costs incurred by the industry (e.g. provision of additional power systems) in installing vessel tracking units and the ongoing costs associated with such practical requirements. • Review these costs against the advice provided in the PIA to determine whether these were reasonably addressed. • If it is identified that these were not reasonably considered: – identify the implications of this – publish the outcome and justification in the PIR.	Completed In progress In progress
1.5	The estimation of the industry's revenue in the PIA was based solely on one commercial seafood species, mud crab. There is no evidence available to this Office that demonstrates that the mud crab market economics is representative of the economics of the industry in its entirety. Assessments of impacts on industry should be based on reasonable analysis.	As part of the PIR: • Review the economic data identified in the PIA (i.e. that for mud crab) to determine whether this is appropriate and representative of the industry in its entirety.	In progress

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
		• If not considered representative: - revise the model used by the department to estimate the industry's revenue - identify the implications of this not being representative - consult with the QPC about the issue - include the findings of this process in the PIR. • Where the use of the singular species revenue is considered representative (or not), publish the outcome and justification in the PIR.	In progress In progress
1.6	The department has advised this Office that commercial mud crab is caught and sold in high quality and lower quality markets, which occur to differing extents within the industry. Further, the price for mud crab fluctuates considerably due to seasonal, quality and cultural drivers. The PIA applies $60/kg to estimate the revenue of the industry. However, there is limited evidence available to this Office that demonstrates how this figure is calculated or that it is representative of the economics of the commercial mud crab sector of the industry.	As part of the PIR: • Demonstrate that the use of the department's average mud crab price ($60/kg), is appropriate and representative of the Queensland commercial mud crab fishing industry. • Where the application of this $60/kg estimate is not representative: - revise the model used by the department to	In progress In progress

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	The department has advised this Office that detailed economic modelling of impacts could not be undertaken as the core data necessary was not available[4].	estimate the industry's revenue - identify the implications of this not being representative - consult with the QPC about the issue - include these findings in the PIR. • Where the application of this $60/kg estimate is considered representative (or not), publish the outcome and justification in the PIR.	In progress
1.7	In the PIA estimates, the department relied upon the advice of the suppliers of vessel tracking units for the costs associated with unit purchase, installation and polling contracts. However, these costs increased over time. Where the costs changed, the suppliers advised the department, and in turn it published information for the industry. Where such advice about cost changes occurred, it is not evident that the department assessed the reasonableness or implications of such advice.	As part of the PIR: • Undertake a comparison of the PIA estimates for the costs of vessel tracking units and their operation with the actual costs realised since implementation. In completing this, consideration be given to the following: - the 'hidden' charges (e.g. polling contract standby charges, purchase of additional units as backup units, costs associated with unit failure, full costs to lessees, costs of installing additional power	In progress

[4] Attachment 1 to Mr Bolton's letter dated 3 February 2020.

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
		sources for vessel tracking units etc.) - the impacts of changes in cost for units and polling contracts since implementation - the full life cycle costs of vessel tracking units (including replacement of units – be they faulty or reached their end of life). • Publish the outcome in the PIR.	Completed – see Vessel Tracking PI-IAS
1.8	The Queensland Government Guide to Better Regulation[3] provides guidance about the compilation of a PIR. The Queensland Audit Office[5] has published advice about the principles of service management and improvement. This advice is considered relevant in the department's completion of the PIR. The publishing of a PIR is subject to the approval of the Minister or the Cabinet depending upon the circumstances involved. Transparency in understanding the department's findings is important in addressing the complaints and informing the industry.	• The department seek approval from the Minister to publish the PIR.	Completed – PI-IAS approved for release.
1.9	The rebate scheme was established to minimise the impacts on the commercial fishing industry in implementing the vessel tracking requirements. The assistance provided by the rebate scheme was considered as part of the PIA.	• Review and analyse the take up of the rebate scheme by the industry and publish these findings in the PIR.	Completed – see Vessel tracking PI-IAS

[5] Measuring service performance, Fact Sheet, Queensland Audit Office (https://www.qao.qld.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-10/fact_sheet-measuring_service_performance.pdf).

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	2. Whether the vessel tracking trial was adequate to test the performance of the vessel tracking units involved.		
2.1	The vessel tracking trial (the trial) did not test the capability of units and suppliers consistently. The trial tested four vessel tracking units, however, 95% of the units tested were Spot Trace, with only four other individual units being trialled.	• Review the department's procedures for trialling/testing of vessel tracking units and suppliers to support equitable and consistent processes (e.g. minimum number of units for testing, length of time for testing etc.) to reasonably test supplier and unit performance and issues.	Completed – The Standard Operating Procedure "SOP – Approval of vessel tracking units and providers" has been reviewed and approved to include internal audit recommendations, independent supplier checks and the Ombudsman's proposed actions.
2.2	The complainants have provided this Office with information that suggests that the department's publication of the trial results[6] does not accurately report the malfunction rate of the vessel tracking units trialled.	• Review the unit malfunction information collected during the vessel tracking trial with the published information. Provide communication to the industry about the outcomes of the review.	Completed – Interim procedure implemented. Recommendation in Vessel tracking PI-IAS – the Department committed to implementing a long-term exemption process
2.3	Safety risk assessments were not undertaken prior to, or during, the trial to identify potential/actual risks requiring further consideration and action.	• Review the department's procedures for trialling/testing of vessel tracking units and suppliers to include assessments of safety. Where appropriate, engage experts (e.g. marine electrical engineer).	In progress

[6] https://www.publications.qld.gov.au/dataset/e3f0bd7e-27db-4ce8-a125-0515bbf5aaa9/resource/5339089f-4e66-4f03-83fd-80431d2d241d/fs_download/results-of-vessel-tracking-units-trial.pdf

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
2.4	Standard supplier selection processes[7] involve the checking of demonstrated capabilities and performance before being engaged or appointed. The department did not undertake a like process before creating the initial list of approved suppliers. Such checks should be undertaken before a supplier is approved to participate in a trial of their vessel tracking unit. The Crime and Corruption Commission[8] has published a report about supplier selection which identifies issues relevant to the processes applied and guidance to uphold the government's principles in establishing services.	• Review the department's procedures for trialling/testing of vessel tracking units and suppliers to include standard supplier selection processes (e.g. checks of independent reviews and complaints, experience of suppliers etc.).	Completed – The Standard Operating Procedure "SOP – Approval of vessel tracking units and providers" has been reviewed and approved to include internal audit recommendations, independent supplier checks and the Ombudsman's proposed actions.
	3. Whether the selection of vessel tracking providers and approval of vessel tracking systems were reasonably conducted.		
3.1	The complaints to this Office, and those received directly by the department, about the malfunctions and other problems with the vessel tracking units raises concern as to whether the units were assessed to determine if they were fit for purpose for use on vessels operating in marine environments. There is no information available to this Office that indicates that the department had sought, or otherwise obtained sufficient technical and practical advice about the vessel tracking units and their installation to support its assessment and decision making about whether to approve units for use in Queensland.	• Review the department's procedures for selecting and approving vessel tracking units to include obtaining professional technical advice from a person independent of the supplier about the unit which includes: - its suitability (i.e. the unit and its installation) for the marine environment on commercial fishing vessels (including its compliance	Completed – The Standard Operating Procedure "SOP – Approval of vessel tracking units and providers" has been reviewed and approved to include internal audit recommendations, independent supplier checks and the Ombudsman's proposed actions.

[7] See the Queensland Procurement Policy and the associated guidance (https://www.forgov.qld.gov.au/procurement-guides)
[8] Integrity in procurement decision making: An audit of Queensland Health and other public sector agencies - Summary audit report, Crime and Corruption Commission, May 2019 (https://www.ccc.qld.gov.au/sites/default/files/Docs/Publications/CCC/Summary-Audit-Report-Integrity-in-procurement-decision-making-2019.pdf)

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
		with relevant standards and requirements[9]) - consideration of the different power supplies on different vessels and the power demands of vessel tracking units - the practicability of installation on commercial fishing vessels, including the identification of any additional measures that are needed. • With the guidance of an expert, undertake a representative audit of a sample of the vessel tracking unit installations. The focus of the audit is to identify the standards of installation applied, their compliance/otherwise with relevant standards and requirements, identify any safety risks and recommendations for control measures. - Consider the findings of the audit and update relevant departmental documentation and	In progress

[9] E.g. *Electrical Safety Act 2002*, Australian/New Zealand Standard 3000, National Standard for Commercial Vessels published by the National Marine Safety Committee.

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
		procedures to improve the safety associated with the installation and use of vessel tracking units. - Provide communication to the industry about the outcomes of the audit. - Take steps as necessary to remediate/deal with safety issues.	
3.2	The department has responsibility to ensure that units and providers of vessel tracking meet applicable standards[9] and, where these are not achieved, can be effectively addressed. The department's experience with Option Audio highlighted that there was not an effective process to ensure compliance with applicable standards. This has negatively impacted the department's reputation. The department's framework for approving suppliers did not enable it to effectively deal with poor performance of suppliers. The origin of this concern lies with the department's consideration of alternative frameworks for implementing vessel tracking. This Office has not seen evidence of how the department identified and considered alternative frameworks for the implementation of vessel tracking.	• Review options to improve the framework for the provision of vessel tracking that permits the department to effectively deal with poor supplier performance. This should consider the current approach, alternative frameworks and possible legislative changes. • Implement improvements to enable more effectively address poor supplier performance.	Completed – A new Standard Operating Procedure "SOP – Performance management of vessel tracking units and providers" was developed taking into consideration recommendations from an independently executed internal audit and the Ombudsman's proposed actions.
3.3	The department's internal audit report[10] considered its unit and supplier selection process. This internal audit report made a number of recommendations to achieve a more robust and transparent process.	• Finalise the review of the department's vessel tracking unit and supplier processes.	In progress

[9] E.g. *Electrical Safety Act 2002*, Australian/New Zealand Standard 3000, National Standard for Commercial Vessels published by the National Marine Safety Committee.
[10] Internal audit report – DAF - VMS Approved Unit Providers Review, December 2019.

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	Mr Bolton's response advised that the department would implement the recommendations of the internal audit report, including improving its processes by the adoption of the state's procurement principles in establishing approved vessel tracking units and suppliers.	• Evaluate whether the department should establish a new framework for suppliers to the industry.	In progress
	4. Whether the department reasonably managed the performance of Option Audio as a provider of a vessel tracking system.		
4.1	The problems about Option Audio's involvement in vessel tracking unit provision and service is as follows: - It's extent of marine experience and competency - Changing terms and scope of charges (e.g. YB3i 'installation' charges). - The availability of 50 installers across the state, but installations of vessel tracking units were not performed in a timely manner. - Option Audio's YB3i battery specification was substantially greater than as described by the manufacturer. It appears that there had been no modification of the YB3i battery provided in Queensland despite Option Audio's assurance. - The brackets supplied by Option Audio were not as had been specified in its specifications and advertising. The brackets provided were poorly made, had sharp edges and made of unsuitable material. - The wiring looms provided with the YB3i units were made of copper wire, not tinned copper wire, which presented potential electrical safety risks. - The wiring fittings provided and used in the installation of the YB3i units were not of a marine grade which presented potential electrical safety risks. - Option Audio's workmanship in installing the YB3i units was regularly described as being poor with associated safety concerns being reported.	• Review the experience of dealing with the issues associated with Option Audio. Develop strategies for improving the management of the vessel tracking framework. • Provide the industry with advice about the availability of the services of the Office of Fair Trading where concerns about suppliers are encountered under the current framework.	Completed – Review report 'Improved Provider Management' can be downloaded from the 'Document Library'. Completed – The Department's webpage has been updated to include Office of Fair-trading's contact information and available services.

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	- Inconsistently charged the industry for YB3i units and polling contracts. - Unauthorised deductions were made from fishers' accounts. - Delays and, in some cases, no action was taken in providing refunds. These issues resulted in the following impacts: - financial and time impacts on fishers - increased frustration to fishers - increased departmental compliance scrutiny of some affected fishers - significant departmental resources in dealing with Option Audio and the industry - increased cost to the rebate scheme (more than was established by its terms) - ineffectual strategic management of Option Audio. The department was unable to manage Option Audio's performance due to deficiencies with the vessel tracking framework, specifically, there were no enforceable arrangements between the department and Option Audio.		
4.2	The department accessed the rebate scheme to provide funds to reimburse fishers' costs that resulted from Option Audio's service delivery actions. The terms of the rebate scheme do not appear to provide for the use of the allocated funds in this manner.	• Review the department's decision to utilise funds from the rebate scheme, instead of its own budget, to provide payments to fishers in addressing Option Audio performance problems. - Consider the terms of the rebate scheme at the time and whether the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) provided approval for the	Completed – Review report 'Out-of-pocket assistance' can be downloaded from the 'Document library'.

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
		rebate scheme to be used for this purpose. • Take appropriate action where the rebate scheme was not appropriately utilised and report outcomes in the review report.	Completed – As above
	5. Whether the department's system for the verification of vessel tracking unit operation is reasonable considering its intended purpose and locations of use.		
5.1	The department's text messaging service is one of three options currently available to the industry to use to confirm the correct operation of vessel tracking units. Fishers have reported inconsistent receipt of text messages from this service. This includes messages being significantly delayed in receipt or not being received at all.	• Investigate the performance of the department's text messaging service. Identify the extent and reasons for reported problems and develop strategies to minimise the continuation of these problems (where practicable).	Completed – Review report 'Confirmation of vessel tracking unit polling status' is available on the 'Document Library'.
5.2	The department has made commitments to the Government[11] and to industry[12] that it would develop a Commercial Fishing Smart-phone Application (the App) that would provide various functions, including vessel tracking. This vessel tracking data could be utilised should a fisher's vessel tracking unit malfunction. The department has advised that the App would enable tracking of the vessel, even if it is out of mobile phone service reception, and be capable of sending this data to the department when the device comes back into service reception. The department has also advised that the App would be available by the end of 2018. The App is yet to be released. The	• Expedite the implementation of the App. • Provide informative updates to industry about the development of the App and a realistic date that it will be available.	Completed Completed

[11] https://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/documents/tableOffice/TabledPapers/2018/5618T1804.pdf (see page 26)
[12] The department's letter to Authority Holders (Reference: CTS 16779/18) titled "Release of final vessel tracking policy and guidelines".

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	complainants have advised that this technology would be a more practical and cheaper solution than carrying back up vessel tracking units and manual notifications of location to the department. Considering the reported frequency of vessel tracking unit malfunction, the App would likely be beneficial to many fishers.		
5.3	Fishers have reported difficulties in contacting the department outside of its business hours to confirm the operation of their vessel tracking unit. It is commonplace for fishers to leave port at times that are outside of the department's office hours. The department has advised this Office that it is developing the Automated Integrated Voice Response System (AIVRS)[6] which will provide a text message confirmation should the vessel tracking unit be correctly polling.	• Expedite the implementation of the AIVRS. • Provide informative updates to industry about the development of the AIVRS and a realistic date that it will be available. • Assess how the department can provide confirmation of vessel tracking unit polling outside of its business hours. Where issues are identified, implement measures to address the problems.	Completed Completed Completed – Review report 'Confirmation of vessel tracking unit polling status' is available on the 'Document Library'.
	6. Whether the department's communication (e.g. public information, client engagement, responses to client enquiries/complaints) about vessel tracking was reasonable.		
	Nil.	• No suggested actions.	
	7. Whether the department's strategy for achieving vessel tracking compliance is reasonable.		
7.1	The department has implemented vessel tracking which assists with its compliance activities. The department has advised that accurate data is needed to achieve this purpose.	• Analyse the vessel tracking data the department has received to evaluate whether accuracy is sufficient for its compliance purposes.	Completed

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	One complainant has provided data to this Office that indicates the GPS location of a vessel tracking unit's stationary location can be recorded as being variable with a variance of up to 60m between recorded locations. It is unknown whether the department has undertaken any testing or analysis of the accuracy of the vessel tracking data it is receiving and verify that it achieves its intended purpose.	• Publish the results of this analysis in the review report.	Completed – Review report 'Approach to vessel tracking compliance' can be downloaded from the 'Document library'.
7.2	The vessel tracking system may not function for various reasons (e.g. satellite communications being out, system upgrades, vessel tracking unit malfunctions etc.).	• Publish guidance for industry about how the department's compliance action considers such issues.	Completed – Review report 'Approach to vessel tracking compliance' can be downloaded from the 'Document library'.
7.3	The complainants have demonstrated that they have communicated with the department's Vessel Tracking Team about difficulties in complying with the provision of vessel tracking requirements due to the action/inaction of suppliers. However, the department's Boating and Fisheries Patrols appear to have not been advised of these issues. Communication within the department should be improved to appropriately share information to support compliance activities.	• The department develop a communication protocol to ensure appropriate updates are provided to the Boating and Fisheries Patrols about vessel tracking compliance issues where these may be associated with matters outside of the control of the fisher.	Completed – Review report 'Approach to vessel tracking compliance' can be downloaded from the 'Document library'.
7.4	Some complainants have identified that when a vessel tracking unit switches to internal battery power for whatever reason, the unit does not continue to poll at the interval required by legislation (e.g. 5 minutes) but polls less frequently (e.g 2 hourly). Vessel tracking units must be connected and operated from a reliable power supply. There are a number of reasons why a vessel tracking unit may operate on internal battery power, with or without the knowledge of the fisher.	• Review the polling frequency on internal battery power – and consider whether this frequency is appropriate and, if so, explain to industry why.	Completed – Review report 'Approach to vessel tracking compliance' can be downloaded from the 'Document library'.

	Observations	Proposed actions	Status/Outcome
	8. Whether the department has reasonable protections for the secure storage, handling and use of vessel tracking data.		
8.1	The department has acknowledged the significance, sensitivity and commercial value of the industry's fishing data. The current framework for vessel tracking, involves numerous private companies and government agencies, each with varying access to vessel tracking information (the industry's fishing data). These parties include satellite operators, airtime service providers, suppliers, data management companies and various government agencies. The department's internal audit[8] made a number of recommendations to improve the security of this sensitive information.	• Review the action taken on the recommendations made by the department's Internal Audit report. • Publish the outcomes of the review and any further actions the department has taken to strengthen privacy controls.	Completed - Information on data ownership and sharing, and its governance was provided to the vessel tracking working group. Readiness review actions were implemented. A review report outlining the vessel tracking data security and controls is published and can be downloaded from 'Document library'.
8.2	The complainants have suggested that Option Audio, and its agent Marine Care Queensland, may still be able to access vessel tracking data, past and present, of some fishers. It is alleged that with the change of contracts from Option Audio to Pivotel, the login and password details to access vessel tracking data of these fishers may not have been changed. The industry is unaware of this risk and how to fix it. *Rock 7 advice indicates that Option Audio no longer has any accounts which enable access to vessel tracking data.*	• The department work with vessel tracking unit suppliers to provide fishers advice about the login security measures that have been, or can be undertaken to tighten access to their information (e.g. changing of passwords).	Completed - A review report about the vessel tracking provider platform login security is published and can be downloaded from 'Document library'.
8.3	The complainants have raised concerns about the information privacy controls around their vessel tracking information. The department's internal audit report[13] addressed this issue and was further considered in PricewaterhouseCoopers' (PWC) Assurance	• Provide advice to the industry about the data access availability and security controls that exist to each of the entities (i.e. satellite	Completed - Information on data ownership and sharing, and its governance was provided to the vessel tracking working group. Readiness review

[13] Readiness Review of Vessel Tracking System, Internal Audit Report, July 2018.

	Report[14]. Both of these reviews have made recommendations for action. The department has also confirmed it is working towards achieving the requirements of ISO27001 – Information Security Management standard.	service providers, airtime service providers, suppliers, the department, compliance agencies, Trackwell etc.) involved in the vessel tracking framework. This advice is to address the actions taken by the department to implement the audit recommendations and the department's progress to achieve the implementation of ISO27001.	actions were implemented. A review report outlining the vessel tracking data security and controls is published and can be downloaded from 'Document library'.
8.4	FishNet Secure was inadvertently accessible in December 2018. The department has identified the reasons for this and engaged PWC to review this incident. As at February 2020, this audit is yet to be finalised.	• Expedite completion of the audit. • Publish information to the industry about: - this incident and the actions taken by the department to address the problem and ensure security of the information contained in FishNet Secure - the actions the industry can take to improve security of their information in the department's systems.	Completed – A review report about the FishNet Secure breach is published and can be downloaded from 'Document library'. Completed – As above

[14] Assurance report on confidentiality security controls in relation to the Vessel Tracking system - For the period 1 October 2018 through 31 March 2019, PWC, 19 July 2019.

	9. Whether the department's complaint management system was reasonably applied to complaints and communications about vessel tracking from the complainants.		
9.1	The department has adopted a Complaint Management Framework (CMF)[15] which details how complaints are to be handled by the department. The information available to this Office indicates that many of the communications from the industry members were not properly identified as complaints and therefore not managed in accordance with the CMF, rather they were managed by way of ongoing dialogue. This approach led to a lack of complaint resolution and escalated tensions between the department and complainants. The department's Internal Audit[16] identified similar concerns and made various recommendations in response.	• Publish the department's response to its internal audit findings and action taken • Review/audit the department's (Fisheries and Forestry business area) identification and handling of complaints and identify any action required to achieve compliance with the department's CMF. • Action improvements to support the CMF as a result of the review.	In progress In progress In progress
9.2	The *Work Health Safety Act 2011* establishes requirements for the notification of certain workplace incidents to Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ). This Office is aware of some incidents involving vessel tracking units which required notification. This Office is unaware of any such notifications having been made.	• The department investigate the requirements for the notification of safety incidents to the WHSQ, be that by the affected party or the department. - Publish advice to the industry about these responsibilities. - Develop and implement procedures to ensure advice about notification responsibilities be provided to clients where	Completed

[15] https://www.daf.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0008/1475441/complaints-management-framework-daf.pdf.
[16] Internal audit report – VMS approved unit provider review, December 2019.

		potential notifiable incidents may have occurred. • Where the department is aware of notifiable incidents that have occurred involving approved vessel tracking units, develop an understanding of the reasons for the incident and take necessary action to minimise future risks.	In progress