



Office of Environment & Heritage

Government Building Retrofit Program
2012 - Review of Small Sites Pilot
Lessons Learnt

31 August 2012

Contents

1	Executive Summary	3	
2	Background	6	
2.1	Scope of work		6
2.2	GBRP pilot		6
3	Consultation Results	8	
3.1	Consultation themes		8
3.2	Overall satisfaction		8
3.3	Program objectives and scope		8
3.4	Timing of program funding		9
3.5	Program implementation delays		9
3.6	OEH stakeholder management		10
3.7	OEH expertise, skills and resources		10
3.8	OEH program development and implementation		11
3.9	Program benefits and outcomes		11
3.10	Procurement methodologies		12
3.11	Agency engagement and impact		12
4	Recommendations	13	
4.1	Resourcing and skills		13
4.2	Project measurement and verification		13
4.3	Stakeholder engagement and communication		13
4.4	Procurement panel arrangement		13
4.5	Timing of program funding		14
4.6	Support for future programs		14

1 Executive Summary

Optimiss Services Pty Ltd (Optimiss) has been appointed by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) to conduct a review of the NSW Government Building Retrofit Program - Small Sites Pilot Program (GBRP). This initial review is to capture lessons learnt during the pilot program implementation and management.

We have carried out a series of consultation interviews with stakeholders (identified by OEH) and program managers to seek their views on the GBRP pilot program implementation and management. These included Sydney and regional representatives from OEH in addition to applicant agency project and program managers.

The GBRP was a regional pilot program that was run during 2011-2012 in the Hunter, Illawarra and Circular Quay precincts. It was designed to assist budget dependant agencies improve the energy and water efficiency of existing Government owned and tenanted buildings. The GBRP provides sites with an energy and water saving opportunity report that identifies small scale retrofit opportunities such as LED light fittings, dual flush toilets, water saving shower heads and taps and timer units to control use. The technical specifications required to deliver the water and energy savings were detailed in technical specifications provided by OEH to the participating agencies. The procurement options for the installation of the water and energy saving devices is discussed and agreed with participating agencies. Funding for the installation was then transferred to the agency from OEH and was sourced from the NSW Climate Change Fund.

Agencies reported an overall high level of satisfaction with the GBRP, the OEH staff and the projects which were implemented during the pilot program. They reported high levels of satisfaction with the objectives of the GBRP, the administration and delivery of the GBRP by OEH and the receipt of external funds to develop and deliver these water and energy savings projects.

Many projects have not yet commenced installation and some sites are still having their retrofit items installed. As a result, it appears that there is insufficient information available yet to quantify savings achieved for the GBRP or for the individual sites.

Our consultation with OEH and agency representatives identified a number of themes consistently:

Unique nature of program	The GBRP was unusual for OEH in its requirement for hands on project management and the delivery of capital works upgrades, the OEH had not experienced direct capital works delivery (on behalf of other agencies) and required time to establish new systems and processes.
--------------------------	---

Program objectives	Agencies reported a high level of support for the objectives of the program and the availability of funding to support their energy and water savings initiatives.
--------------------	--

Timing of program funding	Most agencies faced difficulties in implementing their project before the pilot program completion date. This was due to various program delays that impacted on the delivery time at the end of the project period.
---------------------------	--

OEH Stakeholder management	Agencies reported a high satisfaction with the service provided by the OEH project team.
----------------------------	--

OEH expertise, skills and	Agencies valued the OEH technical expertise, commitment to the program and flexibility in tailoring programs to their requirements.
---------------------------	---

resources	However some variances were noted in cost estimates and in the site audit recommendations versus the operational site requirements. A strength of the program design was the ability for agencies to assess the audit data and discuss operational requirements.
OEH program development and implementation	OEH underestimated the time required to develop the program.
Program benefits and outcomes	Whilst this was a water and energy savings program, it was also an opportunity to engage in changing behaviour in Government agencies. There has been limited knock on effect from the program and this has been due to low levels of communication and engagement and limited funding.
Procurement methods	The range of procurement options was valuable to agencies, however the templates and guidelines used were often not appropriate for the scale of the work.
Agency engagement and impact	There were missed opportunities for OEH and agencies to communicate the objectives and successes of the program.
Continued support for the program	There was strong support from all agencies involved for a continuation of the program.

After reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of the pilot program process, we have made the following recommendations for consideration should the GBRP or a similar program continue under the management of OEH:

OEH team skills	<p>While technical audit and procurement skills are crucial for the OEH team to have access to, the OEH program team will also require strong project management, financial management skills, stakeholder engagement and customer service skills.</p> <p>Protocols and process frameworks developed by the current team should be formalised as program guidelines moving forwards.</p>
Project measurement and verification	<p>A clear set of quantified performance indicators should be defined for the project prior to recommencing. This will allow an assessment of whether the program has achieved its objectives.</p> <p>It will be important to engage with agencies early in program discussions to identify how savings will be identified and to verify any metering systems established.</p>
Stakeholder engagement and communication	<p>The introduction of a formal communications strategy should be considered for any future program that provides recognition of the project implementation team and results.</p> <p>OEH should consider the development of promotional material for agencies to use and should provide it from the start of the agency involvement in a project.</p>
Procurement panel arrangement	Establish a panel contract arrangement to pre-qualify organisations to participate in the program. This would allow the use of standard documentation for engaging with contractors and reduce much of the paperwork and administration for each site implementation.
Program timing requirements	If the program implementation delays identified in this report can be addressed and agencies engaged with in this process earlier in the year, this should avoid the current frustrations for agencies in the

implementation.

Support for future programs

In order to maintain the current high level of customer satisfaction with the OEH management of the program, it will be important that the program governance is service delivery focussed and that the agencies involved are considered from a customer perspective that allows them ownership of the projects.

2 Background

2.1 Scope of work

Optimiss Services Pty Ltd (Optimiss) has been appointed by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) to conduct a review of the NSW Government Building Retrofit Program - Small Sites Pilot Program (GBRP).

The NSW Government GBRP pilot program was allocated \$6.4M over two years on projects to progressively improve the water and energy efficiency of existing Government owned and tenanted buildings in NSW. OEH has been responsible for the delivery of the GBRP program. Now that the pilot program is complete, OEH would like to identify lessons learnt from the implementation of the pilot program and identify recommendations moving forward with the implementation of an ongoing GBRP program.

We have carried out a series of consultation interviews with stakeholders (identified by OEH) and program managers to seek their views on the GBRP pilot program implementation. These included Sydney and regional representatives from OEH in addition to applicant agency project and program managers.

OEH provided a list of topic areas and questions for internal and external interviews. These are at Appendix A.

A list of OEH and agency representatives that we consulted is at Appendix B.

The intent was to capture the lessons learnt in designing and delivering the GBRP. We have focused on identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the pilot program process and areas of improvement as well as aspects that have worked well.

2.2 GBRP pilot

The GBRP was a pilot program run during 2011-2012 and was designed to assist budget dependant agencies improve the energy and water efficiency of existing Government owned and tenanted buildings. The GBRP provides sites with an energy and water saving opportunity report that identifies small scale retrofit opportunities such as LED light fittings, dual flush toilets, water saving shower heads and taps and timer units to control use. The technical specifications required to deliver the water and energy savings are detailed in technical specifications provided by OEH to the participating agencies. The procurement options for the installation of the water and energy saving devices is discussed and agreed with participating agencies. Funding for the installation was then transferred to the agency from OEH and was sourced from the NSW Climate Change Fund.

OEH was responsible for the delivery of the GBRP and provided a number of procurement options to meet the needs of agencies in the GBRP pilot.

The GBRP was unusual for OEH in its requirement for hands on project management and the delivery of capital works upgrades to buildings ranging from \$400 to over \$0.5 million. Until the GBRP, the OEH had not experienced direct capital works delivery (on behalf of other agencies).

The objectives of the GBRP were to:

1. Identify and implement water and energy saving projects that reduce the exposure of frontline government services to rising utility prices.
2. Road test a cost effective model that replaces old and inefficient fixtures, fittings and appliances across a number of government buildings and determine the most efficient delivery model for a state-wide roll-out.

3. Build the capacity of frontline service delivery agency staff to improve the energy and water efficiency of their buildings through training, communication and engagement projects.
4. Support local employment opportunities.

The pilot program was delivered in three areas:

- Illawarra
- Lower Hunter
- Circular Quay Precincts

As at the end of June 2012, 100 small site projects had committed to implement and 54 site projects had either started or completed.

3 Consultation Results

3.1 Consultation themes

The questions provided by OEH provided covered all areas of the GBRP from procurement methods to the funding process and employee and executive interest. However, given the broad and differing experience of the GBRP by agency stakeholders we followed the lead of the interviewees and focused on the areas that they were interested in discussing. From the series of interviews a number of areas were raised consistently:

- Timing of program funding
- Stakeholder management
- OEH expertise, skills and resources
- OEH program development and implementation
- Program benefits and outcomes
- Procurement methods
- Agency engagement and impact

The overall stakeholder opinions and comments for the GBRP are as follows.

3.2 Overall satisfaction

Agencies reported an overall high level of satisfaction with the GBRP, the OEH staff and the projects which were implemented during the pilot program. They reported high levels of satisfaction with the objectives of the GBRP, the administration and delivery of the GBRP by OEH and the receipt of external funds to develop and deliver these water and energy savings projects.

All agency respondents were keen to be involved in a similar program in the future and most reported that they would have suitable facilities for project delivery in wider NSW areas.

Many of the agencies involved reported difficulties with the timeframe for the GBRP. The delays in implementing the pilot program initially created a time pressure in the latter part of the GBRP for ensuring funding and project delivery before the June 30 2012 deadline. As an example, 56 Fire and Rescue sites were identified as potential projects and inspected but only 18 sites were retrofitted in the time available for the GBRP. Reasons for the delay and time pressures were identified as:

- OEH underestimated the amount of time needed to establish robust governance arrangements and systems to deliver the program
- Lack of engagement or skills and resources internally at agencies to program manage project delivery and implementation
- Lead times for sourcing technical equipment for installation in regional areas
- Procurement process delays

3.3 Program objectives and scope

The scope of the GBRP was stated as:

Projects delivered under the GBRP will deliver an estimated 8 gigawatt hours of electricity and 78 million litres of water every year. This will deliver a saving of \$1.1 million in utility bills by 2012-13 and include a minimum of 60 buildings.

Consultation with the OEH program management team revealed a view that these objectives were not rigorously developed but that they were inherited from an earlier Cabinet minute for a statewide program with a potential budget of \$72M rather than limited regional program that was implemented with a budget of \$6.4M. However as at the end of June 2012, 100 small site projects had committed to implement through the GBRP and 54 site projects had either started or completed.

For this review, we have concentrated on capturing lessons learnt for the process of managing and implementing a program of this kind for OEH. In terms of assessing the performance indicators above for the pilot program, it is not possible to judge the success of the GBRP against them as they have not been clearly defined. Many projects have not yet commenced installation and it appears that there is insufficient information available yet to quantify savings achieved for the GBRP or for the sites. Many sites are still having their retrofits installed.

The Opera House has reported that it appears to be achieving 50% savings in the Playhouse and measured savings of 32% in the Central Passage after the lighting retrofit. However these projects are quite unique in their large size and the nature of their use and are not comparable to the majority of the small regional sites in the pilot program. The Opera House has also experienced problems with its metering of usage, having installed meters but discovered that a number of meters were not installed correctly to the monitoring system or that there were faults in the meters. They had issues with three of their ten meters.

To do the measurement and verification for projects properly it appears that there is a need to install the meters first and to ensure that they are correctly working prior to the retrofit installation.

3.4 Timing of program funding

Consistent feedback across most agencies included difficulties in meeting the requirements of the GBRP funding in terms of receiving the funds and completing project implementation. The main concern was that funds provided by OEH under the GBRP program were required to be spent before the end of the financial year 2011-12. This restriction occurred as a result of the Government financial budgeting process and the closing date of the funds availability from the Climate Change Fund. This funding requirement caused difficulties for many of the agencies and had in some instances a material impact on specific projects funded by the GBRP.

In the project funding process, agencies are contracting with service suppliers and are required to make the payments to those suppliers, so the only way to manage the GBRP site implementations is to identify the cost and transfer the funds to the agency and have the agency manage them. This was not raised as a major issue, but was mentioned by the OEH team and several agency representatives as not being an ideal funding arrangement.

3.5 Program implementation delays

Most agency representatives and OEH staff felt that the GBRP implementation was delayed at the start of the GBRP which materially impacted on the extent of delivery. The implementation delays were created by the following factors:

- OEH had limited experience in managing end to end capital works programs and needed to establish a framework of processes, procedures and responsibilities for the GBRP management.
- Time required to recruit people with the relevant skills.

- The original objectives for the GBRP were revisited by the initial OEH program management with a view to widening the scope of the GBRP to more complex projects.
- Some agencies reported delays in getting engagement and support internally for their participation in the GBRP.

OEH staff have developed a number of protocols and process frameworks for the program implementation during the pilot program and these should be captured and formalised moving forwards with an expansion of the program. As an example, the OEH program management team had developed a GBRP Energy and Water Efficiency Assessment Protocol and a framework of steps required throughout a project site assessment, scoping, installation and delivery.

3.6 OEH stakeholder management

All agencies reported that their engagement with the OEH program management and technical team was excellent. In particular the flexibility of the OEH team in tailoring their approach and adjusting to the individual requirements of each agency and their site requirements was noted.

It was considered critical that OEH has team members in the regions where the projects were being delivered to build relationships with the local agency representatives and provide immediate onsite support and oversight.

3.7 OEH expertise, skills and resources

Most agencies had a high regard for OEH's expertise. Specifically agencies greatly appreciated the detailed specifications of products for the building retrofits, which they saw as a critical part of OEH's management of the GBRP. It was generally agreed that agencies do not have the internal capability to efficiently scope or deliver projects of this kind and particularly would not have the ability to scope the technical specifications required for the retrofits.

There was also appreciation that OEH went to great lengths to be flexible with the products once the technical specifications were finalised.

A couple of agencies indicated that some of the cost estimates of both the products and the installation varied significantly from the actual cost. Variances were often cheaper however during June prices were increased by providers. The causes of the variance included:

- going to market late in the financial year when there is a premium on construction services
- not considering travel times for remote buildings
- incorrect labor cost estimates being used
- the limited availability of some products regionally
- the need to undertake works to aesthetically adapt new products and fittings into older buildings.

benefit pilot program that OEH team have more knowledge of price estimates of various retrofit items

State Property Authority did also report that the range of options for water and energy savings which were prescribed by the OEH team were not necessarily appropriate for the nature of their office buildings.

The Department of Attorney General & Justice mentioned that site audit reports sometimes had a disparity between the theoretical recommendations and the operational requirements, for example, OEH recommendations to have timers turning lights off in a courthouse at night when the judges often need to be there working late in to the evening and low levels of light recommended for security areas where the lighting needs to be higher than normal. Agencies

were satisfied that the program allowed for their input and discussion to the actual installation in terms of being able to assess the audit data and discuss the differences and options required.

3.8 OEH program development and implementation

There was a noticeable difference between the internal and external stakeholders views on the OEH's organisation and management of the GBRP. Agencies had mainly positive points to make about OEH's organisation and support. However from the internal point of view there were a number of difficulties that resulted in long lead times to individual project implementations.

The following views were held by internal OEH stakeholders:

- OEH underestimated the amount of time needed to establish robust governance arrangements and systems to deliver the program.
- There was no internal technical capability, procedures or systems in place to undertake retrofit works. Time was required to contract technical capability, then develop appropriate procedures and systems to reduce OEH risk. This allowed OEH to create confidence for the agency to allow OEH to undertake the identification and specification of retrofit works.
- The delivery of the projects were rushed in the last six months of the GBRP.
- The GBRP was designed to increase the energy and water efficiency of buildings through implementing small and simple projects that addressed projects like the installation of energy efficient light bulbs and water efficient flush systems and shower heads. However the initial GBRP program management was delayed when these objectives were reviewed to consider potential broader project objectives such as improvements to air conditioning systems.

3.9 Program benefits and outcomes

The key desired outcomes of the GBRP program was to reduce electricity and water usage in government owned buildings. As of 30 July 2012 there has not been sufficient time to monitor and verify most of the projects that have been completed and many other projects have yet to be implemented. -

The Opera House has completed some main parts of their program of works and have managed to verify the results of the upgrading of lights in the Central Passage and is near to completing verification of the Playhouse retrofit savings. The results show reductions in electricity usage of around 32% and 50% respectively which were very close to the costs savings estimated by the Opera House team.

A secondary benefit desired by OEH included increasing the awareness of small capital upgrade programs that are (relatively) simple to implement at low cost and have significant environmental and financial benefits. This secondary educational benefit proved to have been achieved at some agencies. Several agencies including RailCorp and Transport for NSW indicated that they may look to self fund similar programs in the future. Fire & Rescue reported that the site audits for projects which were not implemented are still useful for them in highlighting potential future retrofit work to do.

In addition to increasing awareness of simple asset retrofitting programs and the benefits that they receive, other benefits for agencies have included increasing the general awareness of the GBRP program in many of the agencies' asset management departments and providing knowledge transfer from the OEH team to those departments.

It was acknowledged by many agencies that whilst this was an energy and water savings technology program it was also an opportunity to encourage behaviour change and awareness at

agencies to change bad practices, for example, turning off lights at ambulance stations or sports and recreation facilities.

Many agencies reported a desire to carry out similar projects in the future however they all reported that limited funding for these smaller projects will prevent them from doing so.

Fire & Rescue reported that some of the retrofits highlighted other building problems which they had to address, for example, the restricted water shower head installation created problems with water pressure in the building which had to be addressed. They considered this positive overall but negative in that they had to find additional funding for the unforeseen work.

3.10 Procurement methodologies

The GBRP program was designed to have a flexible procurement and delivery framework. In all cases the agency's stakeholders greatly appreciated the flexibility the framework provided.

The State Contracts Control Board (SCCB) guidelines and templates were used for the procurement processes and this was generally considered good however some of the administrative requirements from these template arrangements were substantial and not necessarily appropriate for the nature of projects, for example, the requirement for a ten page environmental assessment for a light fitting retrofit. A suggestion was made that if the program continues and has the objective still of being a simple water and energy savings program, it would be easier to establish a panel contract arrangement to pre qualify organisations to participate in the GBRP. This would allow the use of standard documentation for engaging with contractors and reduce much of the paperwork and administration for each site implementation.

3.11 Agency engagement and impact

Whilst all agencies and OEH stated that their objective was to broaden engagement within agencies on water and energy savings and sustainability overall, agencies reported a mixed level of engagement from their executive and staff. Approval for receiving the funds involved sign off by the senior executive at the agency but their engagement generally appears to have been limited to approval signatures only. However Fire & Rescue did report that their executive was very engaged in the process and had used internal communication to engage with staff on the subject.

Agencies such as Fire & Rescue report that they had a bottom up approach to implementing the projects which made it difficult to get internal traction and overcome resistance to the the site retrofits from field staff. If they had the opportunity to participate in a future program they would ensure an early top down approach and mandate was in place to ensure greater traction for the site retrofits. The importance of having an internal champion was raised by several agencies.

It was also felt at OEH and within agencies that there had been missed opportunities to communicate success stories and spread the word of the program objectives. Communication had mainly been limited to the project team levels between the agencies and OEH and had not been in place between the OEH and agency executive teams. Greater communication could have increased the knock on effect for the program in terms of encouraging agencies to carry out similar retrofitting programs at their sites.

4 Recommendations

If the GBRP or similar program was to continue, under the management of OEH, there are a number of recommendations that should be considered to ensure that the lessons are learnt from this pilot program:

4.1 Resourcing and skills

It is clear that the OEH program management team provided a valued service to agencies in the GBRP. However while it is crucial for the OEH team to have access to technical audit and procurement skills, the program team also requires strong project management, financial management, stakeholder engagement and customer service skills. This needs to be recognised in the resourcing of the team in the future and lends weight to having a local team in place if regional delivery continues.

OEH staff have developed a number of protocols and process frameworks for the program implementation during the pilot program and these should be captured and formalised moving forwards with an expansion of the program.

4.2 Project measurement and verification

A clear set of quantified performance indicators should be defined for the project prior to recommencing. This will allow an assessment of whether the program has achieved its objectives.

Post project evaluation will be essential to determine whether the program has met its overall objectives of providing water and energy savings for the Government. As projects are completed and metering or usage data becomes available, it will be important to collate this data and analyse savings for the justification of future program funding.

Equally, should the program continue, it will be important to engage with agencies early in program discussions to identify how savings will be identified and to verify any metering systems established.

4.3 Stakeholder engagement and communication

There were missed opportunities for OEH to engage at a senior level with the Chief Executives of the participating agencies in terms of enhancing engagement on sustainability projects such as GBRP and promoting the value of OEH.

The introduction of a formal communications strategy should be considered for any future program that provides recognition of the project implementation team and results.

There is also an opportunity to increase engagement with staff at agencies through supporting the agencies to tell good news stories and demonstrate value of the retrofit programs and OEH. OEH should consider the development of promotional material for agencies to use and should provide it from the start of the agency involvement in a project.

4.4 Procurement panel arrangement

If the program continues, it may be possible to establish a panel contract arrangement to pre-qualify organisations to participate in the GBRP. This would allow the use of standard documentation for engaging with contractors and reduce much of the paperwork and administration for each site implementation.

The proposed panel contract arrangement should be investigated with a set of specified standards about what agencies are able to purchase for retrofit projects, this will then allow them to access a broad range of contractors to implement delivery. A regional based panel arrangement would need to be put in place to cover regional projects.

4.5 Timing of program funding

The financial year end time pressure will continue with the program should it continue. Given Government financial budgeting requirements, there will always be a need to meet budgets for the program annually. However, if the program implementation delays identified in this report can be addressed and agencies engaged with in this process earlier in the year, this should avoid the current frustrations for agencies in the implementation.

4.6 Support for future programs

All agencies consulted were keen to continue to take part in any continued Government building retrofit program and many reported that they are likely to have potential sites across the state including metropolitan areas.

Agencies report that they have learnt lessons internally in terms of processes, procedures and internal engagement in order to implement retrofit programs at their sites more efficiently.

In order to maintain this level of customer satisfaction, it will be important for any continued Government building retrofit program that the project governance is service delivery focussed and that the agencies involved are considered from a customer perspective that allows them ownership of the projects.

Appendix A - Questions

Exploring the strengths and weaknesses of the user experience for participating agencies:

- What was your role in the GBRP?
- Why did your agency/site join the GBRP?
- What did you get out of it?
- What were the benefits?
- Were there any unexpected benefits?
- How did you find the funding agreement process?
- Are you satisfied with the items installed? If not, why not? Do you have feedback on the quality of the items installed?
- Are you aware of the savings expected or achieved to date from the GBRP? Have these been communicated within your organisation? If so, how? Were there any benefits in doing this? (e.g. secure support to do additional work or initiate new sustainability activity)
- Did the GBRP create opportunities for other energy efficiency initiatives (within or beyond participating agencies)?
- If you hadn't participated in this program would you have implemented any of the upgrades to the property?
- How you rate the GBRP in terms of value of money?
- How you rate the level of support from OEH?
- How you rate the delivery model? Do you have any suggestions for improvement?
- How would rate the procurement method used by your agency used? Could it be improved?
- Would you participate in this program again?
- Do you have any suggestions for how can it be improved especially if it was rolled on a larger scale?
- Who else knows about the GBRP and work undertaken in your organisation?
- Has the Executive been engaged about the GBRP? If so, how much?
- Would you do anything differently if were to participate again?

Appendix B – Consultation List

- Bernard Carlon, Divisional Director, SPD, OEH
- Matt Clark, Director WEP, OEH
- Jill Pattison, Senior Manager, Sustainable Government, OEH
- Samantha Phillips, Government Building Retrofit Program Manager, Sustainable Government, OEH
- Aaron Bristow, Hunter Coordinator, Sustainable Government, OEH
- Tony Hodgins, Senior Project Officer, Government Building Retrofit Program, OEH
- Mark Squires, Manager Hunter Region, OEH
- Simon Wallace-Pannell, Manager Illawarra, OEH
- Paul Suter, Sustainability Program Manager, State Property Authority
- Matt Brown, Senior Project Officer, Properties and Venues, Sports and Recreation
- Warren Gibson, Area Manager – Property Services, Fire and Rescue
- Shane Rosskelly, Senior Environmental Specialist, RailCorp
- Judy Brady, Heritage & Environment Officer, Department of Attorney General and Justice
- Glenn Hodges, Manager Building and Security Services, Australian Museum
- Shelly Rowell, Manager Sustainability and Energy, Opera House
- Robyne Stewart, Senior Project and Planning Officer, Corporate Services, Ambulance Service NSW
- Geoff Baker, Regional Projects Coordinator, Public Works South Coast
- Keith Mc Dermott, Program Manager, Property Group, NSW Police Force
- Nathaniel Galindo, Manager – Environmental Program Delivery, NSW Police Force
- Peter Quinlivan, Senior Policy Officer – Procurement Framework, Family and Community Services
- Bernie McMahon, Acting Manager Engineering & Assets, Hunter Residences, Family and Community Services
- Tissa Liyanage, Sustainability and Compliance Manager, Transport Shared Services, Road Maritime Services

Other staff were identified for the consultation but were unavailable due to being on leave during the consultation process (completed by 27th July), these were:

- Ian Smith, Regional Operations Coordinator South Coast, National Parks and Wildlife Service
- Bill Lyon, Centre Manager, Berry Sports & Recreation Centre, Sport & Recreation