

Meeting with Chris Murray (of Powells) 23.3.94
at his office Central Present: Di, Eddie & myself.

- A 1. Can we get copy (unedited) of returns for "other", "geographical details"? No. Extra work not covered in brief.
e.g. photocopying these parts.
- B 2. Is any cross tabulation planned, e.g. by category, LGA etc? No. just raw data.
(See 4)
- How then to handle other details? Summarise.
- C 3. If this is the case why are the forms numbered?
^{Answers}
He did not know. Was done without his knowledge.
He had been approached by 3 committees re this & he had advised that they cut the number off!
- Put to him that as this information would now be available, that it may be useful to break data down to LGA. He did not agree.
(allowing for some who remained nos.)
- Re other/detail data may throw up some considerable new categories etc. This could be commented upon, but he did not miss this & he re-iterated, e.g. a new col in computer spread sheet.
- A. 5. Will the full statistical data be made available?
Ans. Not clear.

6. Confidentiality & Copyright

He holds that Ponders held copyright & that it was up to him (implies it was not so) he would destroy all returned forms when the data abstracted.

NB This ^{may} be the "soft/delict" data will be lost.

Ponders copyright questioned. Dismissed.

Moved. That if anything different were to happen, they would need to receive instructions from D.P.

He claims to respect confidentiality, as referenced to in covering letter.

What access is possible for. (Explained a concerned neighbour may seek this for personal use) He acknowledged this possibility & said that was why he favoured destroying same.

N.B. Newton saw him, same day.

If he were to put in FOI claim, before being destroyed, this ^{may} be a criminal offence?

7. What would his reply be if a Council req.
 A. data for their area? ^{No} It would be up to Ponder bearing in mind that it is not going to be analysis/broke down by DGT. He will check with Ponder & let me know. Policy decision needed by D.P.

- 3a He acknowledged that an individual community
3. could be traced via the number. This of course would only need to apply where the community name is not already provided on the survey form.
8. 250 forms sent out.
- c. Expects 70% return - may be 50%
No comment on reliability of < 50%
- E 9. DOP will need to advise to not destroy, if this is wanted. Tendar may not agree anyhow as it is their copyright!!
10. Re the form
- Q 6. What does "separate community" mean? means a "sub community" or subgroup focusing on some difference.
- Q 11. What constitutes a "separate household"? self determining.
11. The form sent out, is exactly (word forward) as sent to them by DOP. (This could mean after DOP's approval their modifications). They understood this was approved by us, & had our approval. I advised him to the contrary.
12. Di advised him of his DOP-Mo. Herewith for a copy from Macleod.

13. I gave him copy of my letter to his Council re "subdivision".
14. I showed him 'Bachti Story' & 'Community Bld' albums.
15. He advised that one community had received 3 copies of the form.
 (I did not mention case of a non MO person getting a copy) + Biller = 2
16. F He raised with Di (before we arrived) the issue of voluntary rating raised in Bellinger viz "that committee generally" had indicated an interest for concern in DOB's making a voluntary rate contribution. (MO 15A)

I flag that rating is not an issue, & especially not part of this brief. & any comment (if alone proposition) is off place, even if it is brought to their attention at a interview or in a comment on the survey form.

Di TRM 25/3/94 re Fapo 110.5A re Bellinger voluntary rating.

Reply by Dr Q or, Alterations from f.R. & 2/ last of R having
 Ans - To go back to s. 22 Committee for stage 2 if so pleased
 because of costs ought to cover cost to service providers.

DOB. considering if publication / further study to treated as a regional or state matter. Decision esp mid year.

Report by Rob on his meeting with Murray

He said to Rob re the survey we "nearly have it wrapped up".

Note. This was before the closing date of the Survey!!!.

He asked Rob what he thought of the following as an idea.

(F)

Community title be possible for a "200m² envelope" (a nominal figure for the land under a house) the rest in common ownership. To be optional.

c) Rates paid on this. (To see that the rates on 200m² would ^{not} be ~~cost~~ effective to collect.) unless differential rate for same.

b) The individual could borrow from the Bank against this. (No idea but 200m² would be adequate equity!)

d) The spirit of no would prevail.

Things that we need/want out of the Library.

14th issues

D.O.P. 2000 of 26/9/15 subject to

In connection with the above Rides
members of our Com met with Mr Chas Murray in
Lisimore on 23rd March last.

A number of our questions to Chas Murray included
the proposed manner of collecting of the ~~new~~ data.

In view of the fact that Mr Murray^{a)} did not have clear
~~or in some cases any~~ answers to ~~some~~ of our questions

- b) deferred to Ron Pender
for decision
- c) deferred to direction
from your Dept.

We seek your
~~to raise the following matters with you~~
for your comment and where necessary for
your determination, on the following.