



Australian Government

**Australian Customs and
Border Protection Service**

Customs and Border Protection National Consultative Committee Technology Sub Committee

Meeting Minutes - Thursday 25 March 2010

Location: Level 5 Customs House, 1010 La Trobe Street, MELBOURNE

Meeting Commenced: 1400

Attendees: Mr Joe Attanasio – Chief Information Officer, Customs & Border Protection (CHAIR)
Ms Sue Pitman – National Director, Trade & Compliance, Customs & Border Protection
Ms Robyn Miller – A/g National Director, Cargo, Customs & Border Protection
Ms Danielle Yannopoulos – A/g National Manager, Client Engagement & Cargo Systems, Customs & Border Protection
Mr Anthony Seebach – National Manager Trade Services, Customs & Border Protection
Mr Steve Moore – Director Industry Engagement, Customs & Border Protection
Ms Jeannette Walsh – CBPNCC Policy and Service Delivery Sub-Committee Secretariat
Mr Dane Cupit – CBPNCC Technology Sub-Committee Secretariat

Mr Zoran Kostadinovski – Customs Brokers & Forwarders Council of Australia
Mr Paul Alexander – Shipping Australia Limited
Mr Eddy DeClercq – Shipping Australia Limited
Mr Peter Blanchard – TradeGate Australia Limited
Mr Leon Ball – Cargowise
Mr Peter Kosmina – 1-Stop Connections Pty Limited
Mr Geoff Clark – Conference of Asia Pacific Express Carriers
Mr Brian Lovell – Australian Federation of International Forwarders
Ms Judith Walsh – Australia Post

Welcome

The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees and outlining the genesis of the sub-committee, drawing references to the following:

- ANAO audit recommendations concerning the building of stronger relationships between Customs & Border Protection and both in-house and third party software developers and providers.
- Recent Customs and Border Protection National Consultative Committee (CBPNCC) discussion and decisions.

The Chair explained that the intent of this initial meeting would be to meet potential sub-committee members, establish a terms of reference for the sub-committee and discuss themes for future sub-committee meetings. In particular, Mr Attanasio explained that this sub-committee would not be discussing details of operational issues, as this was the mandate of the Service Delivery sub-committee. The Technology Sub-Committee intended to have a focus on strategic interaction between the software development community and Customs & Border Protection.

Mr Attanasio outlined the current whole-of-government environment. He outlined a number of key government focuses, including Green ICT, whole-of-government procurement and the government's data-centre strategy, and how these things influenced Customs & Border Protection's prioritisation and resource allocation.

Mr Attanasio explained that the key challenge for Customs & Border Protection was to meet the Agency's obligations to Government and continue to service and support mission critical systems. He explained that this would mean a greater emphasis on re-use of existing ICT, sharing with other agencies and industry, and increased partnering.

Purpose

Mr Attanasio then outlined the recommendations from the ANAO, which were for Customs & Border Protection to work with third party and in-house software developers to:

- Establish quality criteria for third party software developers;
- Establish appropriate test regimes;
- Examine two-way continuous improvement;
- Develop and publish statistics on third party software; and
- Develop protocols and standards for quality assurance.

Mr Attanasio invited the group to provide thoughts and views on this.

Group Discussion on ANAO Recommendations

Australia Post representatives asked what the scope of “technology” meant, and if it extended to operational technologies such as x-ray. Mr Attanasio and Ms Miller explained that the term, as it applies to this sub-committee, is limited to information and communication technologies. Operational technologies, such as those used in the Container/Cargo Examination Facilities, would be discussed in the Service Delivery Sub-Committee meetings.

Mr Kosmina questioned the meaning of “quality criteria and statistics” on third party developers. Ms Miller explained that the ANAO recommendations were aimed at the introduction of an accreditation system for third parties. She also explained that Customs & Border Protection had considered this recommendation and concluded that market forces negated the need for the Agency to impose additional assurance processes on third party developers. Mr Attanasio added that quality criteria should have a focus on the interfaces between third party developers and Customs & Border Protection.

Group Discussion on Sub-Committee Membership and Terms of Reference

Mr Attanasio asked the group to consider who should form the quorum for this sub-committee.

Mr Kostadinovski asked whether AQIS should be part of the membership. Mr Attanasio accepted that AQIS would be worthwhile including in the group. He also explained that he had recently established a Border Management Chief Information Officer forum and that he would consider who on this group may also be able to contribute to the Technology sub-committee.

Mr Clark stated that day-to-day problems should reside with the Service Delivery sub-committee and that discussions on interfaces with software houses should be the domain of the Technology sub-committee. He was particularly keen to ensure that discussions with a “business model” focus should be held by the Service Delivery and Policy Sub-Committees and not be brought to the Technology sub-committee.

The group agreed with this and added that the Technology sub-committee should have a strategic focus.

Ms Miller provided the view that the Technology sub-Committee should be used to inform investment in technology.

Mr Blanchard asked whether there was an obvious point at which discussions around technology would move from current state to future state. He asked whether Customs & Border Protection had formed a view on the replacement of the Integrated Cargo System.

Mr Attanasio explained that Customs & Border Protection was currently undertaking some re-living and remediation of existing systems. Ms Miller explained that Customs & Border Protection have given consideration to the eventual replacement of the ICS, but were still reviewing what could or should be replaced as opposed to opportunities for enhancement, and that the Agency may decide to take a componentised approach to this.

Mr Kosmina stated that the focus of the group should be on what technology should be used to support the business changes discussed in other forums, particularly the Service Delivery sub-committee.

Ms Walsh (Australia Post) explained that she believed the Service Delivery sub-committee would provide the business/operational requirements for the Technology sub-committee to consider.

Mr Kostadinovski stated that the membership needed to be software development experts, not business representatives.

Mr Blanchard questioned where issues like authentication should be discussed. Mr Attanasio explained that where discussion on topics like authentication sat would be somewhat dependant on timing. If there was an urgent operational impact resulting from authentication, then the Service Delivery forum would be the appropriate place to raise the topic. However, if the topic was being raised in the context of longer term consideration about authentication, then it may sit with the Technology sub-committee.

Mr Attanasio also gave a brief overview of the whole-of-government consideration of authentication currently being undertaken.

Mr Lovell asked whether all IT issues from the Service Delivery sub-committee meetings would be brought to the Technology sub-committee. Mr Attanasio explained that doing so may add time to resolving day-to-day or tactical technological problems. Ms Miller stated that where Service Delivery issues had technological implications, the analysis of these issues would be collaborative and consultation would be broad-based, and the preference was to keep these matters within the ambit of the Service Delivery sub-committee.

Ms Pitman stated that the Technology sub-committee should be striving for assurance around the ANAO findings, information sharing between members, strategic planning and experience sharing.

Mr Blanchard expressed the need for the group to understand the currency of the Customs & Border Protection 2015 Enhanced Trade Solutions strategy. Ms Miller gave an update of work being undertaken on this program, and explained that there was nothing material in this work which would alter the directions being taken, or the approaches currently being taken to resolving existing sub-committee matters.

Mr Blanchard asked about 24-hour advanced cargo reporting and whether it should be being discussed by the Technology sub-committee. Ms Miller stated that this initiative was considered to be non-viable at this point in time, and that Customs and Border Protection have gone to great lengths to have an active engagement strategy on anything likely to impact on industry out of the Enhanced Trade Solutions program of work. She also indicated that some new light had been shed on the Authorised Economic Operator initiative, in respect of benefits that had not previously been identified.

Mr Ball indicated that he believed the forum should be used to raise matters that software developers had identified in their dealings with their own clients, and felt that a mix of development and business representatives would be of benefit to the sub-committee discussions. This was agreed to by the group.

Future Sub-Committee Meetings

Mr Attanasio explained the need for the group to meeting before the next CBNCC meeting in order to be able to report to that group. This was generally accepted.

Mr Attanasio closed the meeting and called for any out of session views on the sub-committee's terms of references, and views on membership. In particular he sought for the group to provide feedback on the notion of a membership that changed depending on the particular topics or issues being discussed. He invited the group to provide views on these items to his office and to the Technology sub-committee secretariat.

Meeting Closed: 1455