



17.4 Confidential QoN - Civil Service Review

Report Reference	GC220510Q17.4
Council Member	Councillor – Bruce Hull

CONFIDENTIAL MOTION

That pursuant to Section 90(2) and (3)(d) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the Council orders that all persons present, with the exception of the following persons: Chief Executive Officer, General Manager City Services, General Manager City Development, General Manager Corporate Services, Manager Operations, Manager Office of the Chief Executive, Chief Financial Officer, Unit Manager Governance and Council Support be excluded from the meeting as the Council receives and considers information relating to provision of consultant support for the ongoing Civil Service Review, upon the basis that the Council is satisfied that the requirement for the meeting to be conducted in a place open to the public has been outweighed by the need to keep consideration of the matter confidential given the information relates to commercially sensitive pricing information.

QUESTION

With regards to the consultants (Duckpond) engaged to conduct the Civil Service Review, what was the total cost of the work done by this consultant to conduct the Civil Service Review?

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Nil

Response Received From	Manager Operations – Russell Troup
Corporate Manager	N/A
General Manager	Acting General Manager City Services - Mathew Allen

STAFF COMMENTS

The Civil Service Review is being undertaken and led with internal resource utilising existing budget. Duckpond Solutions was commissioned to support the “How” focus area of the ongoing Civil Service Review. Specifically, the scope of the engagement was to provide specialist support to process analysis and optimisation.

Expenditure was \$36,457.75 excl GST.

The justification for this appointment was to assure timely delivery of the overall review and to bring specialist process optimisation insight from other industry.

The City of Marion has one staff member with the requisite skills and experience to undertake this work. However, the process mapping and optimisation process involves full days of observation followed by analysis and reporting of findings. In this case, scope also involved participation and objective presentation of findings in workshops with respective crews to get their input toward process improvement.

For existing staff to perform this work, the time required would have been 22 weeks as opposed to 6

weeks using a consultant. The estimated 18-week difference has considerable implications. Firstly, time implications on overall review critical path delivery timeframe. Secondly, there are associated cost and opportunity cost implications arising from delay to implementation of efficiency improvements. Although not yet confirmed, the payback period would be well within the difference between consultant and staff performing this work.

Although pre-emptive, early indications support considerable operations process-based efficiencies, but they are contrasted with some potential under-investment across some asset classes and activities. The full review will holistically analyse, reconcile, and rationalise findings.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1. In accordance with Section 91(7) and (9) of the *Local Government Act 1999* the Council orders that this report, *Civil Service Review*, any appendices and the minutes arising from this report having been considered in confidence under Section 90(2) and (3)(a) of the Act, except when required to effect or comply with Council's resolution(s) regarding this matter, be kept confidential and not available for public inspection for a period of 12 months from the date of this meeting. This confidentiality order will be reviewed at the General Council Meeting in December 2022.**