

Intergovernmental Committee Surveying and Mapping

I have completed by initial review of the activity as attached to the ICSM RWG Priority Activities 07-09 with respect to Recommendation No 3.

Recommendation 3: That additional variable of traffic volume, design speed, travel distance, route numbering, population measures and structural considerations, be investigated for possible inclusion as additional determinants of road classification type, either within the classification itself or in additional guidelines or decision trees.

Why: The consideration of additional variables to aid in decision making has the potential to reduce the degree of subjectivity involved in classification- but only if such variable allow for consistent, repeatable and comparable evaluation.

How: There is a potential for each of these variables to be investigated independently. However, considerations of Traffic volume and structural (design) consideration (obtained most readily through RTA's) does overlap with research requirements highlighted in Recommendation 1. (modelling of Dual carriageways, Roundabouts and Entry/Exit Ramps). Again it must be emphasised that these additional variables may only be found to be suitable for inclusion in additional guidelines or decision trees to aid in classification determined -rather than contained in the classification definition itself.

I initially decided to find what was available in the form of some background information on the on the datasets lists and whether they are readily available to be included within a national larger dataset and their status.

I received answers to these general questions from the following states

Victoria Roger Clark and Stuart Ballingall.

New South Wales Greg Smith

Queensland Brendan Henry A/Manager (Roads Information Data Centre)

Western Australia Flori Mihai (Manager Data Planning and Standards, Asset and

Network Information Branch)

South Australia Rob Middleton, Systems Support Manager, Road Information

Services Section, Transport Services Section, Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure.

Northern Territory Ivan Price, Spatial Systems Manager, Northern Territory Land Information System, Department of Planning and Infrastructure, Northern Territory Government.

Tasmania Steve Sellers, Project Team Supervisor, Geodata Services Branch, Information and Land Services Division, Department of Primary Industries and Water.

The information is just a simple answer given to the questions I have raised and is no way an obligation on behalf of any of the organisations to supply the described information; the information however, does give us an insight into what is available from broad perspective.

Tasmania also included responses included from a number City Councils as well which have not been incorporated into the document, they were from Glenorchy City Council, Launceston City Council and, Sorell Council and Huon Valley Council.

I would like to thank all parties for their participation in the survey.

The above people have supplied information based on the criteria listed below.

The Questionnaire encompassed the following:

Dataset:

Traffic Volume

Coverage: eg. State Wide; urban centres.

Accuracy:

Content:

Availability:

Is it spatially enabled?

Who holds the data?

How is it held?

Do wish to have this data made available to external users?

Is the data maintained?

Could updates be supplied to say mapping agencies for dissemination?

Dataset:

Speed Zones (authorised)

Coverage: eg. State Wide; urban centres.

Accuracy:

Content:

Availability:

Is it spatially enabled?

Who holds the data?

How is it held?

Do wish to have this data made available to external users?

Is the data maintained?

Could updates be supplied to say mapping agencies for dissemination?

Dataset:

Travel Distance

Coverage: eg. State Wide; urban centres.

Accuracy:

Content:

Availability:

Is it spatially enabled?

Who holds the data?

How is it held?

Do wish to have this data made available to external users?

Is the data maintained?

Could updates be supplied to say mapping agencies for dissemination?

Dataset:

Route Numbering

Coverage: eg. State Wide; urban centres.

Accuracy:

Content:

Availability:

Is it spatially enabled?

Who holds the data?

How is it held?

Do wish to have this data made available to external users?

Is the data maintained?

Could updates be supplied to say mapping agencies for dissemination?

Dataset:

Structural (Bridge Weights et al)

Coverage: eg. State Wide; urban centres.

Accuracy:

Content:

Availability:

Is it spatially enabled?

Who holds the data?

How is it held?

Do wish to have this data made available to external users?

Is the data maintained?

Could updates be supplied to say mapping agencies for dissemination?

The returns are supplied in the attachment Reportrta.xls

Recommendations:

- 1) A Federated model approach which though simplistic is effective i.e. if data is required it should be obtained from the primary source of that information. Data specific to the roads should be obtained from the respective roads organisations in each state.
- 2) It was stated on a number of occasions that third parties have already received roads type of information from these bodies and now possess "all the data for that particular state" this I believe requires better truth in labelling as though the data may be a "the best available". But from my contacting the various states there is obviously serious shortfalls in completeness as indicated by the replies I have received on the datasets requested.
- 3) A number of the Road Management Authorities expressed concern if they were not involved in the supply of the data in that the potential shortfalls in currency and accuracy would not be disseminated to the users.
- 4) If the data was appropriated by the various jurisdictions then there is considerable resource activity required in
 - a. capturing data
 - b. overhead of integrating datasets some may require spatially orienting the data in the DTDB.
 - c. revisit of the data model to enable to components not normally associated in the Digital Topographic Database.
 - d. If the jurisdiction responsible for DTDB are not the primary source of capture of the original dataset. If there are technical queries about the data they would have to be referred back to the supplier.

- e. There is also the overhead of obtaining the updates in order to maintain the dataset are also a resource implication.
- f. Legal ramification if the data got out of date i.e. Speed zones and or weight restrictions that could be subject to change.

5) A number of the states have indicated that not all the information is available and is not readily accessible please see the attached individual report for ease of comparison.

Conclusion:

There is a real resource impact of establishing such a process if the data is supplied through the topographic data structures now in place. A far more effective solution is to go directly to the source of such information and obtaining the metadata for all the components that are available and eliminating the need of double handling and integrating the data within the topographic environment.

Ian Paxton,
Manager Regional
Department of Land and Property Information
NSW Department of Lands