Summary of Smart Cities, Towns and Regions in Australia Survey
Background

In July 2019 a survey was sent to key smart cities stakeholders to gain feedback on the challenges and opportunities to support smart cities, regions and towns across Australia.

The survey was open for responses over a three-week period during which it was completed by 343 individuals, which represented more than 100 local governments from both urban and regional Australia.

Important Notes

Survey Results

This document contains mostly ‘raw’ data from the survey’s questions.

Survey Design

The survey was designed by analyst Dr Neil Temperley for the Cities Division of the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications. The survey was also reviewed by individuals with industry association, university and Austrade experience.

Surveys always face a dilemma of wanting to ask multiple questions — each with a multitude of specific optional answers. Invariably every survey reviewer wants to add an extra question. Thus, surveys always grow during the design stage and run the risk of creating respondent fatigue. This one is no different.

The survey was designed such that irrelevant questions would be skipped, e.g. a vendor was not shown questions intended for councils. This means that no respondent got to see the full scope of the survey.

Survey Completion

Not all respondents completed the whole survey or indeed every portion of a multiple-choice question. Therefore N (the number of respondents) varies across each question.

Survey Notes

This survey focused on obtaining responses from individuals and their perceptions of the status of smart city developments in Australia. This has a few implications.

• In some cases, there were multiple responses per organisation.
• No response may represent the ‘official response’ for a given organisation.
• Some respondents offered their organisation type but not their organisation’s name.
• In some circumstances we had an interest in obtaining one response per council. So, one individual’s response was selected by the analyst as being representative.
Note
• Each organisation was not limited to just one respondent. One council had six respondents, while most councils had one or two.

Figure 1: Organisation type N=343
- Australian Government 1%
- Other 1%
- University Precinct, e.g. Smart Campus 2%
- Not-for-profit Organisation 4%
- State or Territory Government 4%
- Industry Association/ Peak Body 5%
- Research Organisation/ University Research 9%
- Industry/Vendor 9%
- Consultant 11%
- Local Government/Council/ City 54%

Note
• Not all respondents indicated the specific council for which they work.

Figure 2: Home state or territory for councils that identified themselves N=101
- ACT 1%
- NSW 27%
- NT 2%
- QLD 19%
- SA 6%
- TAS 5%
- VIC 24%
- WA 16%

Note
• Not all respondents indicated the specific council for which they work.

Figure 3: Primary role of respondents in local government N=185
- Project Officer/Manager for a 'smart city' project(s) 24%
- Other 23%
- Project Officer/Manager (non 'smart city' projects) 18%
- C-Level Executive or General Manager 13%
- Smart Cities (or equivalent) Officer 8%
- Chief Information or Data Officer 8%
- Elected official 5%
- Procurement Officer 1%

Note
• Not all respondents indicated the council for which they work.

Figure 4: What has most helped my knowledge? Average N=125 (Ranked by “Much” + “A Great Deal”)
- Participating with overseas support networks or associations 8%
- Oversee delegations or experts visiting Australia 8%
- Study visits to overseas smart cities 8%
- Technology vendors 6%
- Consultants 6%
- Educational/Technical/Professional training 6%
- University experts 6%
- Participation with local support networks or associations 6%
- Partner’s expertise 6%
- In-house expertise 6%
- Collaboration with other councils 8%
- Publications and guides 8%
- Attending conferences 8%
- Public, testing, trialling new solutions 8%

Note
• Answers may have a perception bias. Respondents may not have first-hand experience of the items they criticised or praised.
**Figure 5:** Where are you up to on the journey? N=86

- Smart city/innovation team established
- Digital or smart city strategy document created
- Developed solutions with citizens or partners
- Interdisciplinary not started
- Technology roadmap created
- Project Management Office created
- Data policy created
- Not interested

**Note**
- We selected one response per council.
- This was a multiple-choice question.

**Figure 6:** Is your project on track to deliver? N=80 (Ranked by “Higher” + “Very High”)

- Required finance or resourcing to succeed
- Return on investment
- Ease of implementation/execution

**Note**
- We selected one response per council. This may not represent the council’s ‘official view’.

**Figure 7:** What has driven change? Average N=108 (Ranked by “Higher” + “Very High”)

- Make my city more livable, e.g. attractive
- Save operating costs
- Improve council service delivery
- Desire to innovate
- Sustainability
- Create new industries and local jobs
- Increase tourism
- The Smart Cities and Suburbs program
- Raise international engagement and profile
- Demand by the local community

**Note**
- These are perspectives of individuals/staff from within councils that were successful. This is *not* one result per successful council.

**Figure 8:** What has driven change? Council staff for councils successful in Rounds 1 and/or 2 Average N=37 (Ranked by “Higher” + “Very High”)

- Improve council service delivery
- Make my city more livable, e.g. attractive
- Save operating costs
- Desire to innovate
- Sustainability
- Create new industries and local jobs
- The Smart Cities and Suburbs program
- Raise international engagement and profile
- Increase tourism
- Demand by the local community

**Note**
- The Smart Cities and Suburbs Program funded 81 projects in total.
Figure 9: What has driven change? Council staff for councils unsuccessful in Rounds 1 and/or 2 Average N=31 (Ranked by “Higher” + “Very High”)

Note
- Understandably the Smart Cities and Suburbs program was not ranked as high as with successful councils.
- These are perspectives of individuals/staff from within councils that were unsuccessful. This is not one result per unsuccessful council.

Figure 10: Us and open data Average N=70 (Application of open data ranked by “Mostly True” + “Completely True”)

Note
- We selected one response per council, which may not represent the council’s official position.
- N varies slightly across each question.

Figure 11: What are the measures of success? N=85

Note
- We selected one response per council.
- Multiple choice.
- Local jobs may rank poorly due to the low expectations of establishing a meaningful direct linkage to smart cities projects or the fact that they are long-term measures.

Figure 12: Collaboration and engagement. Average N=260 (Ranked by “Often” + “Very Often”)

Note
- Response by individual.
Note
- Response from individuals not per organisation.

Note
- These may be useful topics for events.
- Procurement has been identified as an issue for many councils yet Procurement including collaborative procurement ranked near the bottom at 21/26.