



Future AGFMA

What We've Heard Report

November 2020





Contents

Section A: Introduction.....	2
Section B: Workshop Summary.....	5
Section C: Survey Summary.....	15
Section D: Next Steps.....	17
Section E: Workshop Responses.....	18
Section F: Survey Responses.....	29





SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

Thank you

First and foremost, the Future AGFMA team wish to thank all of you who have participated in the development of this report whether that be attendees at the workshops recently held across the State or survey respondents. We thank you for the time and effort you committed to participate in a meaningful way. We would also thank you for the respectful and productive approach you took in your engagement with our team across these sessions.

We appreciate the critical role you play in the AGFMA and will continue to play into the future and therefore connecting with as many contractors as possible, both large and small, has been a significant priority in the process of moving towards the Future AGFMA.

In addition to the 14 workshops held at 11 locations across the State, attracting over 600 registrations, we have also received valuable input through an online survey, which received more than 550 responses.

In setting the structure for the Future AGFMA, we committed to a process of transparent communications and consultation, with a focus on gaining as much insight as possible from contractors.

This report is intended to summarise the input received from the contractor workshops and online survey to date, which will be invaluable in informing the way in which contractors will interact within the Future AGFMA.

We have appreciated meeting contractors across the State and again thank you for your involvement and input.

The Future AGFMA Team.





Background

The Across Government Facilities Management Arrangements (AGFMA) is the mechanism by which the South Australian Government ensures over 5,000 government-owned facilities around the State are properly maintained so that they remain safe and fit for purpose for the delivery of the essential community services they support. This includes schools, hospitals, prisons, police stations and most other government buildings.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport (the Department) is the lead agency responsible for management of the AGFMA, which coordinates the use of these arrangements with more than 30 Government client agencies.

Each year, more than 200,000 individual work orders for maintenance and building works, covering 5,000 sites are completed across the State to keep our public buildings safe and properly maintained.

Approximately 98% of these work orders under the AGFMA are delivered by private sector contractors, predominantly small to medium businesses (SMEs).

All work orders issued by the current Facilities Management Service Providers (FMSPs), being, the Department's internal Facilities Services or external provider, Spotless, occur under the AGFMA. In real terms this means current contractors and SMEs performing (for example) breakdown work at a school, or programmed maintenance at a SAPOL site, or project (<\$1 million) work at an SA Health site all perform work under the AGFMA.

The AGFMA has been in place since 1998 and the fundamental structure including systems have largely remained unchanged during this time.

The decision to progress to the Future AGFMA was made by the South Australian Government following a review of the AGFMA to address a number of matters raised by the bodies including the Ombudsman, SafeWork SA and the South Australian Productivity Commission.





What is the Future AGFMA?

The administration and coordination of work under the AGFMA by the two current FMSPs is currently split approximately 50/50 between the Department's internal Facilities Services team, and an external provider, Spotless.

Under the future model, the administration and works coordination role will be entirely met by specialised external FMSPs, who bring the benefits of modern, best-practice systems and processes.

The implementation of a new operating model is expected to improve the safety, efficiency and effectiveness of the maintenance of government assets, while maintaining the vital role that local contractors play in delivering local works.

Importantly, in the future model, the fulfilment of maintenance work orders will continue to be performed by South Australian local contractors and SMEs, including the same contractors that deliver trade services across the State today.

Engagement Approach

The Department employs the following engagement principles:

- 1 Purposeful: We begin every engagement with a clear understanding of what we want to achieve
- 2 Integrity: Engagement will be conducted in a manner that fosters mutual respect and trust
- 3 Respect: We acknowledge and respect the expertise, perspective, and needs of stakeholders
- 4 Transparency: We are committed to responding in a timely, open and effective manner
- 5 Inclusiveness: Broad participation will be encouraged and supported through appropriate participation opportunities
- 6 Trust: We will support open and meaningful dialogue

The workshops, held from 30 September to 2 November 2020, and an online survey which was open for 6 weeks and closed on 4 November 2020, were intended to reach as many existing contractors as possible and to provide a meaningful opportunity for them to provide feedback in relation to issues and concerns, but also to seek input on opportunities for delivering improvements.

The responses in relation to the current and Future AGFMA from both engagement channels have been summarised in the pages that follow, with additional detail in [Section E \(Workshops\)](#) and [Section F \(Survey\)](#). This report aims to explore the feedback that was received from contractors, but does not contain any decisions.





SECTION B: WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Workshop Introduction

Communications about the workshops were distributed through the current AGFMA contractor network, and remain available at the following [link](#) on the 'Contractors – Trade Services' page on the Future AGFMA website.

Both emails and letter correspondence was forwarded to all current AGFMA contractors offering them to register interest in a series of workshops that were to be held from late September through to October 2020.

Over 600 registrations were received with workshop locations driven by demand.

The workshop format was selected so that we could hear from all contractors equally. An independent facilitator was engaged to run the workshops.

All participants were reminded of how valuable these workshops and feedback were to enable the Future AGFMA Team to capture all views and input on how contractors and SMEs saw the best interaction with the Future AGFMA with a short presentation explaining the AGFMA current and Future, the fundamentals of the Future AGFMA, and it's timeline.

A representative from the Office of the Industry Advocate was at the majority of sessions to emphasise the important role of the Industry Advocate as it related to supporting and maximising the involvement of local SMEs and respond to contractor queries.

Three questions were asked in the workshops of all participants across the State;

Q1: What are your top 5 issues of concern? (contractors could provide more if relevant)

Q2: What elements currently work well that you wouldn't want changed?

Q3: What areas would you identify for improvement?

These questions including the group discussions allowed the Future AGFMA Team to hear and record everyone's input and consolidate views on areas of concern, satisfaction, and opportunity, of which below is a summary.

All related responses can be found in Section E (Workshops).





Q1: What are your top 5 issues of concern?

Key Areas

Less or loss of work for local contractors – concern about security of future work

A question often raised by contractors at the workshops was whether the new providers would use local contractors for local work. Specific concerns related to the Providers either self-performing (own trades staff) and/or having their own preferred suppliers and contractor networks that would disregard the current contractor network. If this happened, local site-specific knowledge and relationships with clients that enabled quality and efficient completion of work would be lost and costs for sites could increase.

Example:

Contractors communicated that the asset that is being maintained is likely to have been installed by the same contractor which provides efficiencies and consistent quality. This becomes especially important with assets that may not have been captured correctly on plans.

Equal opportunity – concern job allocation may become unfair

A consistent concern from regional contractors was that jobs were not going to be distributed across all of the contractors in the area, causing local businesses to shut or lose employees. A large amount of both regional and metropolitan contractors were concerned that jobs, especially of high value, would only be allocated to select contractors without opportunity for other tenderers to be considered.

Example:

*Contractors wanted transparency in how to access information about jobs.
Contractors want to be able to bid for local works which it is deemed to not have been the case in other known maintenance contracts.*

Equity in bidding for work – will this remain?

Regional contractors were concerned that bidding for work would not be equitable, where bids could not be compared 'like for like'.

Example:

Suppliers in the regions were communicated as being essential to the community but, potentially slightly more expensive and if opened up to all contractors to tender for, it may result in Adelaide-based contractors potentially offering lower





prices than regional contractors and winning the work based on the job alone and not on any additional on-costs resulting in a higher overall cost to the agency.

Payment Terms

A common worry for contractors was that their invoices would not be paid as quickly by the new providers. Cash flow is critical for small businesses and payment terms between 10 – 14 days is acceptable.

Example:

Contractors communicated examples where payment terms were delayed through loss of submitted invoice or disputing the invoice on the day that payment should be received, and in some cases payment terms extending past 60 days.

Payment Rates / Schedules

Contractors on the whole were concerned they would lose their current payment rates, which they were generally happy with. Contractors were worried that the new providers would get paid a flat rate for jobs, and then negotiate contractor's payment rates down.

Example:

Contractors had heard of other maintenance contracts where what was deemed to be unfair rates had been dictated to suppliers.

Local office – with local contact

A consistent concern from contractors was if local offices would remain, especially in the regions. Contractors highlighted that the quick response times, area and site-specific knowledge, and co-ordination schedules that the existing local contacts provided were invaluable. This allows contractors the ability to efficiently locate sites and assets as well as perform the jobs in a timely cost effective manner.

A large amount of contractors were concerned that the current established relationships, with site representatives would be lost in the Future model, which would complicate the efficiency of their job scheduling, performance, and potentially locating assets on-site.

Inefficiency / red-tape / increased paperwork in a future model

A common concern for contractors was that there would be an increase in paperwork and processes in the new model, which could increase the administrative burden on contractors, the resourcing/labour for which is not cost-recoverable under the current model.





Continuation of pre-qualification – will this change in the future model?

A consistent concern for contractors was that pre-qualifications would be removed or standards lowered, which could affect the quality of works being performed at sites.

Travel rates

A common concern of contractors was whether travel allowances would remain in the future model. The feedback was that travel allowances were important for covering a portion of labour costs when attending jobs, especially smaller jobs.

Will there be add on costs to contractors (i.e. pay for use of portal)

Contractors were worried that there would be on-costs to them to use the providers systems and processes (i.e. online portal) or to be inducted and/or specifically trained.

Example:

Examples were discussed including excessive training costs to be on-boarded and high on-going costs to use a required portal to gain access to work.

Managing contracts to ensure quality standards are maintained

Contractors were concerned about how quality work would be maintained by the new providers. There was concern that only the cheapest bid, rather than the best quality or best value for money solution over the life of the asset would be selected for tenders. There were also queries about how the quality of work of contractors would be maintained, including through pre-qualifications and work audits.

Example:

In the regions it was often discussed that the tight contractor network hold themselves to account as all have a personal interest in the work being performed at the local school or public facility. Quite a few contractors had been performing the work for many years, knew that sites well and the close local contractor network held a high work standard that was maintained through accountability placed on each other.

Contractors communicated knowing each other personally through children going to the local school, or local community activities with an expectation that the work would be of a high standard due to the vested interest and connections to the sites that contractors perform work on.





Communication

A common question from contractors was how the changes and updates on the Future AGFMA would be communicated. Contractors indicated a strong desire to stay informed throughout the process.

Dispute/Grievance process

A consistent number of contractors were querying what mechanisms would be put in place to mediate disputes and/or complaints between contractors and new providers. A large number further questioned what the level of government involvement would be in mediating disputes and/or complaints.

Q2: What elements currently work well that you wouldn't want changed?

Key Areas

Local (regional) facilities management (local co-ordination, knowledge, and availability)

Contractors consistently said that the local office with its site and asset specific knowledge assisted with the efficient location of assets and completion of jobs. Contractors also valued the ease of contact and communication from the local contacts.

Local work by local contractors (knowledge and skill)

A large amount of contractors considered that local jobs performed by local contractors resulted in timely completion of work orders due to benefits in relation to site and asset knowledge, and familiarity with the asset which enabled them to put forward recommendations relating to repair or replacement to benefit the site.

Distribution and provision of local work orders

Most contractors communicated that local works are currently fair and equitable in terms of distribution to local contractors and confirmed that work distribution currently works well. Some contractors commented that the distribution of work orders should be based on value and not quantity.

Payment terms

Contractors on the whole were happy with the current payment terms, noting that 14 days was a reasonable timeframe to receive payment from issuing of invoice. In addition contractors were assisted from time to time and advised prior to the payment due date if the invoice was non-compliant so that it can be rectified and paid within the timeframe.





Payment rates

It was consistent that contractors were generally happy with the payment rates. A number of contractors raised annual CPI increases as an inclusion as part of their payment rates comments. Contractors put forward ideas on how the rates system could be improved, as detailed in the 'Q3: What areas would you identify for improvement' section.

Pre-qualification process

It was commonly identified by contractors that the current pre-qualification system worked relatively well. It was viewed by contractors to ensure the quality of contractors performing the works.

Preferred contractors

Contractors who are preferred contractors with certain sites are happy with this approach, noting that some contractors expressed concern about the ability to become a preferred contractor.

Job priority system

There was consensus among contractors that the priority system for jobs when accurately applied worked well. Contractors indicated that being contacted by phone for high priority jobs would be a preference as not all contractors look at their emails throughout the day. However, contractors identified that some changes could be made to the current application of the priority system (see 'Q3: What areas would you identify for improvement' section).

Q3: What areas would you identify for improvement?

Key Areas

Improved technology and systems – (with no on-cost to contractor)

A commonly suggested improvement was digitisation of currently manual processes and procedures, with the ability to achieve digital sign-off on completed work orders.

Example:

Many contractors communicated that in some cases it took longer to complete the paperwork than to complete the works.

One suggestion included a mobile phone application, where job completion and invoicing could be logged in real time, or offline and uploaded later if network





connectivity was an issue. Another suggested a combined portal system for contractors to upload all their pre-qualification, insurances, and standards information so that it is readily accessible to all parties.

Others suggested a digital signature application, so that site representatives who were not on-site when the job was completed can later sign-off on the job. This is in contrast to the current system where contractors are required to get the manual signature of the site representative to verify that the works have been completed, which contractors reported waste a lot of time particularly on unmanned sites.

Photos of the jobs

Contractors consistently identified that an improvement would be if site representatives attached photographs of the job when logging so that it could be attached to the work order.

Example:

Contractors explained that if there was a photo then the contractor would be able to bring the correct equipment and/or parts to attend to the job efficiently in terms of cost, resources, and time.

Tree removal from a site could require a utility if the limb is small, or a truck if larger.

Significant reduction in paperwork, duplication, and inefficiencies

Majority of contractors identified that the large volume of paperwork was administratively burdensome, particularly where the same information was required to be repeated across multiple forms and submissions. A large amount of contractors also identified that inefficiencies in current processes could be reduced to increase timely completion of jobs and reduce costs to agencies.

Example:

A contractor described a situation in which he needed a part for a job. Instead of being able to use a part that he had in his work van, he had to drive to a supply store to buy it, and then come back to the site with the receipt for the part before installing it so that he could include it on his invoice.

Contractor recommendations on required works

On balance, more preventative maintenance rather than breakdown maintenance was a strong area for improvement, particularly where preventative maintenance or asset replacement would cost less over the life of the asset rather than continually repairing it.





Contractors spoke to improved acknowledgement of their recommendations in regards to the lifecycle of the asset and where replacement would be more beneficial.

Example:

A few contractors communicated continually needing to perform breakdown maintenance on assets, where it would be cheaper over the life of it, to replace it with a new unit and/or take a recommendation for a superior asset from the get-go to avoid excessive preventative maintenance cycles.

Rates – minimum charges (i.e. 1hr); margin on materials

A large amount of contractors identified that an improvement to the current payment rates would be to include a minimum hourly charge. Contractors would also like the ability to charge a mark-up on materials.

Example:

Many contractors gave examples where travel to a site was longer than the job, and in some cases the job took 10 minutes to complete. Contractors identified that the payment for the job did not cover costs or labour or time spent on administration.

A contractor suggested a scheduled sliding scale of material margins, which would decrease for more expensive parts.

Travel charges to reflect vehicle and environment (i.e. dirt tracks)

Contractors commonly suggested that travel allowances paid for jobs should reflect the environment.

Example:

Some sites are located on or off unsealed roads and dirt tracks which take longer to arrive on site than kilometres suggest.

Payment of administration fees

Contractors communicated the ability to charge an administration fee in addition to their rates for the job, to cover resourcing and labour.

Streamlining of procedures and processes

Contractors communicated that an improvement would be to have a streamlined process for inductions and pre-qualifications. Contractors communicated that there was significant administrative burden in the duplication of processes and a singular system would be the preference.





Example:

A contractor spoke of needing to undertake three different induction processes for three different sites from the same agency.

Priority system

A common suggestion for improvement by contractors was the potential for on-going training or simpler documentation for site representatives so that the selection of the correct priorities for jobs is aided.

Example:

Many examples were raised by contractors who experienced situations where a really important job had been marked as low priority, or a really low importance job was marked as high priority. Contractors communicated that the correct selection of job priority was important for their work scheduling.

Quality assurance - monitoring/auditing, contractor KPIs

A consistent improvement suggested by contractors was an increase in works quality control mechanisms, such as job quality auditing. Some contractors expressed a desire to have Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for contractors, so that quality contractors would be retained and safe works would continue to be performed.

Process for mediation/dispute resolution – independent umpire

Consistent with contractors concerns in regards to dispute and complaints management, a high number of contractors thought that a clearly identified dispute resolution process with an independent mediator would be of benefit for conflict resolution between the contractors and the providers.

Better grouping of jobs to locations and coordination of works

Contractors frequently raised that better scheduling and grouping of jobs would create efficiencies and lower overall job costs. Contractors raised that if there was a number of preventative maintenance jobs due in the same timeframe on a single site, these should be scheduled to be performed at the same time if all the works could be performed by the same contractor.

Example:

Many examples were raised when a non-urgent priority was raised on a job, when preventative maintenance was due, resulting in contractors being required on site more than required and in most cases higher costs.





SECTION C: SURVEY SUMMARY

The Future AGFMA Team are committed to transparent communications and consultation, with a focus on gaining as much insight as possible from local contractors. To achieve this a survey was developed to ensure that all views were captured in combination with the current contractor workshops detailed above.

A rating scale was applied which is summarised below with 1 being of limited importance (light blue) and 5 being of most importance (blue).

Key Areas of Importance to Contractors (>75% of respondents rated highly (1-5 rating))

1

Safety



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

2

Local trades performing works



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

3

Quality control



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

4

Local Facility Service office



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5





Additional Areas of Importance to Contractors (>50% of respondents rated highly (1-5 rating))

1

Payment terms



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

2

Agreed schedule of rates



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

3

Travel Allowance



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

4

Ability to suggest improvements



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

5

Contractor on-boarding / registration process



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

6

Satisfaction ratings



■ 1 ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5

Free text responses provided to Questions 3a, 4, 5 & 6 are included in Section F.





SECTION D: NEXT STEPS

Next Steps

The Department is currently reviewing and assessing the input and feedback provided ahead of the critical stage of the contracting process.

It is intended that the information will help inform the way in which contractors interact with the Future AGFMA model, as well as shape the specifics of the fundamentals of the model including:

- Ensuring continued work opportunities for appropriately qualified contractors
- Ensuring that local contractors will continue to perform local work
- Ensuring fair rates (including travel)
- Ensuring fair payment terms.

The Department's response to the feedback gathered from the workshops and online survey will be released via an 'Actions Report' shortly.

Contractor Communication

Registrations and updates for the Future AGFMA are coordinated through the Future AGFMA website: https://dit.sa.gov.au/future_agfma. We strongly encourage you to register at this site if you haven't already.

The previously used Industry Capability Network (ICN) portal for future AGFMA registration has been closed. Our team will be in contact if we need any further details from those who registered via this portal.

The screenshot shows the Government of South Australia website for Future AGFMA. The header includes the logo and navigation links. The main content area features a large heading 'Future Across Government Facilities Management Arrangements (AGFMA)' with a logo showing a house and people. A blue button with a right-pointing arrow and the text 'Subscribe for Updates' is circled in red. Below the heading, there is a section titled 'AGFMA and its Role' with a paragraph of text.



SECTION E: WORKSHOP RESPONSES



Berri Workshop

<p>Concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will local contractors get local jobs? When awarding quotes, will it be 'apples for apples' comparison? Will relationships be built and communication possible if it is run from Adelaide? Will local contractors be able to retain control over large jobs with multiple contractor e.g. allowing local contractor to organise? Local contact for coordinator/office – will there be one? Will there be an equal opportunity to bid for work as well as clear outlines to ensure quotes are to the same scope & specifications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that provider will dictate contractors on pricing Will the schedule of rates be expanded to include all trades? Negotiation of current rates – will a review be scheduled on a regular basis (i.e. 5 yearly) based on market prices and reviews? Will pre-qualification for works as relevant to AGFMA be retained? Will the paperwork be electronic? Currently not allowed to mark-up goods, parts, or subcontractors – will this be the same? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How often will payments be? Will the new provider request much more paperwork than is currently in place? Will the new provider still use existing businesses & how long for? Will we need to upgrade our systems (Work Health and Safety (WHS)) / reporting / invoicing etc.? Will there be new Technical Data Sheets (TDS)? Will preventative maintenance still occur? Will there be one provider or more? Will the providers system cost contractors / sub-contractors more? Will there be a local office? Will jobs have capped prices? This may be problematic for lead on jobs that may have more work orders. Can digitisation of paperwork be done in the new model? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there continue to be paperwork for administration and WHS? How will jobs be allocated? i.e. on specialisation/locality, on continuity of site knowledge base? Will there be transparency in the payment structure? i.e. award rates vs CPI? Concerns regarding travel rates per km vs. truck/trailer, and will travel for the first 30km continue to not be paid? Will the priority classification for jobs and associated payments remain? Will it still be a requirement for contractors to have appropriate safety paperwork when licenced?
<p>What works well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local contact and contractors. Payment terms and processing times are fair. TDSs are clear with requirements. Having set payment rates e.g. hourly call-out rates. Requiring pre-qualifications to ensure current contractors can continue to work for the Department and new random contractors cannot. Pre-qualifications are a good quality control process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local facility office. Current payment terms (local) are very good. Keep the priority system driven by the asset owner. Limits on current jobs without having to quote (i.e. we can charge up to \$2000 with a quick call to site). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preventative maintenance system is good. The local office is good. The phone calls for jobs make it easy. Existing service runs smoothly and is flexible in approach. Experience and knowledge of local offices. Phone calls before getting orders (P1/P2) work well. Rates are fair and acceptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local office's communication and understanding of processing invoices. Payment terms at only couple days at times is good. Personal phone calls with priorities. Sites can request certain contractors with appropriate license/specialisation. Workload is good.
<p>How can they improve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streamline invoicing/paperwork. Quality control - surveys from asset owners. Performance surveys - feedback for contractors. Preventative maintenance review for certain trades e.g. locksmiths (currently none in place). Simplify/streamline/digitise paperwork such as invoices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Go digital i.e. an online portal. There is too much paperwork for preventative maintenance schedule, and there is a need to move to technology. Contractor recommendations/repairs etc. not shared with asset managers on site. Follow up on them would be an improvement. In regards to preventative maintenance schedules, contractors should be able to complete minor works without getting additional jobs. Difficulty accessing sites within business hours. Contractors should be able to access keys. Assets improvements. The current systems are old. All assets should have a preventative maintenance schedule so they don't continuously break down. Streamline inductions for all sites & contractors – have asset/site based inductions (Health /Education). Keep preventative maintenance schedules but expand it to include other assets on sites (i.e. split systems in hospitals). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations followed up by sites. Simpler paperwork. Easier travel mileage process i.e. a phone/tablet application. Simplify site access by having a contact phone number. Contractors are licensed. The system should be automatic and holistic – contractor management/all elements need to be integrated). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One online portal: mobile phone able to put data in offline and loads when in service. All you need to do is scan your invoice. Photos of the job for priority jobs. Site follows up and responds to contractor recommendations. Public liability insurance for small and medium enterprises proportionate to risk and value. Introduce an insurances/licence permits portal and streamline inductions. There should only be 2-3 general inductions (i.e. based on agency such as Education / Health). Pricing structure should be reviewed.



Clare Workshop

Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who decides 'fair' rates? Will CPI increases continue? Concern that fair and equitable rates and travel rates will be lost. Local knowledge – concerned it will be lost. Concerns regarding privatisation of model. Concerns that contractors will undercut during tender process and jobs won't be equitably distributed. Lack of understanding by providers of culture of rural communities – how will this be managed? What processes, inductions etc. will contractors have to do? Will there be supervision/inspections during construction projects? How will projects be scoped if all providers staff are based in Adelaide? Concern about whether local contractors will get local jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will local contractors get local jobs? And will contractors be able to keep 'areas'? Worried about payment rules changing. Travel rates – will they stay? Concern about loss of local contact and knowledge. Will preferred supplier status remain? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the facilitator really use locals, or force lower prices? How long would the contract for contractors be for? Job security. Can we put mark-up on materials? Will there still be a priority system with hourly set rates? Worried the new providers will send preventative maintenance jobs to Adelaide contractors and only send locals for break downs.
What works well?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local knowledge and contact by local office. Priority call outs. Local sites requesting security in contracts. Photos of the jobs before attending site. The system works well overall. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 day payment terms. Knowledge of the local office. Priority system and associated payment rates. Phone notification for priority jobs 1- 2 – 3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relationship, trust, and communication with local offices. We like quoting against regional companies as it is a fair price comparison (unlike quoting against Metropolitan businesses). We like working with all local businesses/trades. It helps with flow of jobs and timelines. Work is shared between local trades/businesses – fair and equitable opportunity and job allocation. Priorities/job importance system.
How can they improve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get paid for quotes (particularly if contractors are required to inspect the site to give a quote). Improve/reduce paperwork – concerns that if there is no local office minor paperwork issues will become far more difficult. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the local content in tenders (i.e. parts suppliers). Simplify tenders and contract conditions. Nominate contractors list/s for tenders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Checks/audits on completed works to improve quality standards. Simplify paperwork and document requirements. Pay travel rates from 0kms, not after 30kms. Minimum charge for any jobs e.g. when a maintenance job is 15 minutes and no priority payment is applicable.

Gawler Workshop

Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns providers not using locals/contractors. Worried about providers making promises and not delivering on them. Concern that there won't be flexibility for jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worried that the providers will use their own staff (self-performance) or their own preferred list of contractors. Concerned that selection opportunities for contractors won't be fair. Will there be an opportunity to get work when registered. Priority call outs should stay (out of hours call outs).
What works well?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preventative maintenance – remain scheduled. Payment terms are fair and reasonable. The pre-existing relationships contractors have– i.e. with site representatives. Relationships, knowledge and experience of the local offices. Fair (no favouritism) distribution of jobs. Keep regular scheduled work. Keep the system the same. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment terms are fair and reasonable. Travel allowances should remain.
How can they improve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum charge for jobs i.e. 1 hour pay rate. Training on the priority system for site representatives. Simplification and reduction of paperwork. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow a fixed margin on materials to be charged. Create a process for job sign-off if site representative is not present. The process to obtain work as a new contractor.

Metropolitan North Workshop

<p>Concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will preventative maintenance and breakdown work continue? How will the work be allocated? Existing issues not being rectified. Will the government oversee performance of the providers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will payment rates be reviewed? Will they be reviewed by government? Worried about loss of current work scope. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep contractors with a site. Will sites be able to choose contractors? Will there be opportunities for small business? Will the payment rates, terms and CPI increases continue? Will the priority job system continue? Concern about losing relationships with regional offices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that workload will decrease and contractors won't get any contracts post-2021. Worried that pre-existing relationships such as with site representatives will be lost. Payment rates – will these stay the same? How many contractors will be able to tender for a job? How will contractors' quality be measured? Will pre-qualification levels stay the same? Will poor performance/poor quality workmanship be followed up on? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be on-going work from new providers? Will there be two providers? Will small contractors be pushed out? Are the new providers going to look after regions and/or Departments? Will contractors be given support training and what platform will the providers use? Will new providers undertake duties in-house or are the providers obliged to use original contractors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the new providers bring in new sub-contractors? Worried about loss of existing contracts. How will tendering for jobs be managed? – i.e. fair allocation. Will payment terms remain the same?
<p>What works well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume of work. Access to the local office and site representatives. Payment terms at 14 days are good. Local work done by local contractors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to apply specialist rates. Fair tendering allocation for project work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The payment rates for priority jobs. Relationships with local office and clients. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships with local office and clients. The payment terms are efficient. The tender process is good. Sites requesting certain contractors (preferred contractors). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preferred contractor system is good. Sites can nominate contractors (preferred contractors). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The payment terms are good. Keep working on existing sites (preferred contractors). The local office which has site knowledge.
<p>How can they improve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality standards being consistent over all areas. Better grouping of jobs. Contractor forums. Being able to charge a mark-up on goods and an amendment of the rates. Better understanding of specialist fields/contractors. Independent umpire between contractors and providers. Review flexibility with jobs. For example, performance of local works while already on-site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value for money reviewed, where focus is not on price. Look at other factors such as quality, more informed selection/application of rates, and whole of life cost. Service/product is fit for service/life cycle including compliance with Australian Standards. Systems improvement and simplification i.e. issuing service records with work orders. Make rates consistent, review the kilometre threshold from when the travel rate applies, and permit reasonable mark-up on materials. Have reasonable audit expectations – i.e. accept 3rd party audits e.g. ISO 9001/AS1450. Veracity of data could be improved. Currently incorrect data on work orders results in loss of efficiency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A more accurate description when placing orders – client to attach photos to work order. Streamline paperwork and invoicing. Minimum charge applicable to jobs or grouping small jobs together so the contractor is not driving 30mins for 30min job. Being able to pick up supplies on the way to jobs, instead of having to sign-on to jobs and then drive back to supply store. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation/scope of works to include more details and be more specific. Auditing of completed jobs for quality control. Minimum standards to apply across all sites. Value for money to be considered when doing breakdown maintenance vs preventative maintenance / equipment replacement. Off-site costs are covered when they are specific to the job. Photos/details to be included when placing orders. This could be done digitally i.e. through a website portal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training for clients on the priority system to ensure that the correct selection is made for the jobs. Being able to charge mark-ups on materials. Consistency of WHS requirements and site access. All contractors should be required to have an identification card. Better balancing work load over 12 months (preventative maintenance) instead of concentrated in periods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technology improvement, such as a work order application. Desire to have an easier invoicing system. Tenders should be focused on the best outcome such as best value/alternative rather than the cheapest. Auditing of works completed should be conducted to ensure quality and safety. Require a consistent system between providers - i.e. inductions, invoicing requirements.

<p>Concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be continuity of work with the different system/change to new system? • Whether contractors will have to sign new contracts? What will the terms of these contracts be? • Will interstate companies need a South Australian presence? • Will current subcontractors, especially those who have registered interest, continue to be communicated with? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that there will be too many facility providers with different separate systems of work induction and safety processes. • Concern that lack of remuneration related to subcontractor management and supplier accounts will continue. • Will safety continue to be appropriately managed i.e. – appropriate subcontractor engaged for high-risk licensed work. • Will jobs be correctly allocated to contractors? i.e. trade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be over-management of sub-contractors? • Concern that new contractors will not be considered in regional areas. • Concerned that there will be no guarantee of work despite having to incur high costs of clearances (5 different ones). • Concern that there will be possible cost cutting by lower quality contractors. • How will the future workflow during transition be managed for contractors? • Will client have a say in the list of contractors in new model? • How will performance of contractors (quality and safety) be measured? What will the KPIs be? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worried that relationships formed will be lost. • Concern that there will be no pre-qualification scalability continuity for businesses of all sizes. • Will there be uniformity of equipment/software across providers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will job allocation by sites be transparent? • Will sites communicate budgets for project/breakdown work to contractors? • Will contractors be updated on investment by sites? i.e. where sites are spending money, what is being planned, what changes are coming etc. • Will there be new opportunities/growth for contractors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will existing relationships change? • What are the opportunities for continued and additional work for contractors? • Some site representatives are not aware of alternative choices for contractors – how will this be managed in the future? • How will job allocation and opportunity be fairly managed?
<p>What works well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional works by local contractors. • Self-managed sites which can choose preferred contractors. • Communication of changes has been working well. • The payment rates are fair and equitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prompt payment terms. • Continuity of work. • Site familiarity by contractors. • Allocation of work is equitable. • Invoicing processes are good. • Priority system works well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally advised 2 weeks in advance on planned maintenance work which helps with planning. • Prompt payment terms. • Preferred contractor status is good. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invoicing/payment terms are prompt. • Existing relationships with site representatives and the local office and contact consistency. • The TDSs are good. • Preferred contractor status works well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual preventative maintenance schedules. • Payment terms and rates are fair. • Orders received middle of the month is good timing for work scheduling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is good that contractors are contacted for their preventative maintenance availability. • Pre-qualifications work well. • Prompt payments. • Rates clarity of 12 months in advance as well as “pre-agreed” travel rates. • Invoice queries are fast. • The tendering process is simple.
<p>How can they improve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility with preventative maintenance flexibility jobs (when job is performed). • The correct priority for works selected is selected (priority jobs system). • Annual schedule for preventative maintenance. • Payment terms and tracking of invoice status could be improved. • In regards to payment rates, CPI increases are not related to awards increases. This should be looked at. • Contractors association in relation to communication of contract conditions would be good. • Transparency with the site representative contact in regards to communications. • Labelling of assets on site and information on them. • One invoicing system to raise an invoice or add an administration fee would be good. • A minimum fee for minor works. • Clearances, inductions and transition period aggregated and simplified. • A minimum of 24-48 hours notices for jobs on sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to service new sites as a contractor. • Education of technical requirements of particular assets to project managers etc. • Allocation of small projects for ‘like for like’ assets without requiring consultancy. • Increased remuneration for specialised trades. • Value for money across the life of the asset, where preventative maintenance or asset replacement is considered instead of continuous breakdown maintenance. • Transfer of risk to consultants. • Simplify the safety reporting system and structure a unified risk assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call for a priority 4 job one week in advance rather than just email so work can be planned better. • Reduction and digitisation of paperwork. • Train site staff in selecting correct priority for priority jobs. • Stop multiple people raising the same work order. • Communicate to contractors the pipeline of work for security and investment by business (like apprenticeships). • Pre-approved parts threshold when doing preventative maintenance work (travel cost wastes money for the Department). • Introduce a mark-up on materials so sub-contracting and supplies procurement can be made easier. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make pre-qualifications scalable. • Review the TDSs. • Asset lifecycle management should be improved. • Flow of critical safety equipment. • The quality of documentation by consultant could be improve • Streamline processes and procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark-up on materials. • Have access to facility managers. • Have more information on jobs/orders. • Being able to contact site representatives. • Sites follow up on contractor’s recommendations and acknowledge them. • Criticality vs. budgets should be reviewed. • Inductions/pre-qualifications are consistent. • Standards across providers are consistent. • Streamline portal/process i.e. digitise paperwork. • Have a better scope of work on quotes with more information. • Consistency across inductions, processes, and inductions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having site contacts communicated. • Having uniform rates which reflect commercial terms and practices by category. • Have a social procurement concept. • Digital transformation (applications etc.) with no on-cost to contractors. • Reporting to contractors annually (i.e. projects for next year), which aids in decision making. • Make the pre-qualifications system less laborious.

Mount Gambier Workshop

<p>Concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much local trade content will be in local jobs? How will it be ensured? How will the work be divided? Will regional work be separated from metropolitan work? How will trades or Small and Medium Enterprises be selected for jobs? Will there be fair and equitable distribution of work? Will the future providers communicate with us? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be opportunities for contractors to move into another area if doing quality work for sites? Will there be a pre-qualification system in place to ensure contractors are reputable? Will there be a tendering process for contractors? How will small contractors be given equal footing for tendering (some may need assistance)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will the payment rates and schedule be? Will the system move to a single contractor model? Concern about losing personal touch with offices and local point of contact. Concerned about unrealistic expectations for regional response times to jobs (i.e. timeframes to complete works). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will agencies doing work outside of the AGFMA ("contract leakage") be managed in the new system? Are the new providers going to ask contractors to retender periodically and on what basis? How will the priority system be defined in the new model? Worried about providers requiring contractors to have additional programs/portals and pay them for it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that contracts will move to time/performance contracts – concern that quality will be lost. Worried about loss of local support office and knowledge. Will local contractors be used? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will it be ensured that local labour will be used and not new external labour? Worried that quality of work/service will be lost. Will existing contracts be extended? How will contractor's value of local knowledge of sites be assessed in tenders? How will local knowledge be preserved by the new providers? Will they have a local presence and be accessible to clients & contractors? What input will sites have to maintain a preferred contractor for their site?
<p>What works well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment term are prompt. Local supervision, site knowledge, and communication by sites. Ability to get variations to jobs, such as upgrades, approved promptly. Programmed preventative maintenance. Current model works well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment terms are prompt. Hourly rates with additional priority call-out fees and travel allowances. Local office staff knowing areas and sites. Continuity of work with long term and consistent allocation of jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites are able to nominate preferred contractor/s. Payment terms are prompt. Payment rates and CPI increases are fair. Long term contracts give security of work. A local contact for sites (site representatives). Material supplied locally is good investment for region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prompt payment terms. Purchase of local materials is good for the area. Personal and trusting relationships with offices and sites, as well as local knowledge. The priority system for call-outs. Current system works well. Preferred contractor status is good. There is no need to retender if 'doing the right thing'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment rates and terms are fair and equitable. Local contacts and knowledge by regional office. Job flexibility is good. Spread of work across multiple contractors in the same trade is equitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local material is used for jobs, which is good for local business. Payment terms are prompt. Payment from date of invoice and not at the end of month. Ability to talk to clients on-site and have direct contact with them makes the job easier. Travel allowances and kilometre rates system is fair. Calling contractors for priority jobs P1- P3, helps with work planning.
<p>How can they improve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of paperwork and administrative burden. Digital sign-off on completed jobs would improve time management and efficiency. Pre-qualification system is consistent across all sites and jobs. An online portal for jobs and submitting invoices would be more efficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital sign-off on completed jobs to increase time efficiencies. An online portal to upload insurance details which is trade specific, so that all information is in one place. More auditing of works to ensure quality. Ensure contractor compliance with standards is audited i.e. WHS requirements, licenses etc. Elimination of sub-contracting requirements in tender if not necessary, and specify qualifications required for the job if necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that all jobs have correct contact and emergency details listed. Simplify excessive paperwork - potentially replace with e-forms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking at sites for trades. Payment rates include payment for time on site and travel that is less than 30km. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that there is a phone contact for priority jobs. On-going work is guaranteed in writing. Annual performance review/reports for contractors to ensure quality works. Spot compliance checks on reports of completed jobs which are not up to standard. Simplification of paperwork. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simplify existing paperwork and digitise forms. Allow space to explain works on one sheet. Travel allowance should be increased to reflect the labour of 2 personnel, which is required for WHS when attending jobs beyond 30kms. Different travel rates should apply for country (remote) as compared to regional and metropolitan. Payment rates should apply for off-site works. Consistency of processes and system across all clients. For instance, one system of project/repair value. Clients should have the ability to modify their own preventative maintenance programs to increase the schedule of maintenance. Contractors should be able to charge a fixed surcharge percentage on top of their invoice to cover administrative costs/labour. Contractors should have access the Department's technical standards to adhere to i.e. technical sheets.

Murray Bridge Workshop

<p>Concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern in regards to a fully digital system, that if the internet service went down in regional areas how would business continuity be managed? Will travel allowances remain? How will payment rates be set? Will they be based on region and/or trade? Will the government have input or approval of the rates? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will we have to retender for the current PM work? Concern that payment rates and allowances will be lost or reduced. i.e. priority/call-out rates, same hourly rates for preventative maintenance and breakdown jobs, and travel allowances. Concern about providers requiring contractors to use a program (i.e. online portal) or have an induction and pay for it. Concern that providers will charge franchise percentages. Concern that pre-existing site relationships will be lost. How will work be divided into areas? What will the 'boundaries' be? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will payment rates be the same? Concerned about loss of pre-existing site relationships. Concerned about providers dictating to contractors what rates can be charged. How will the changes be communicated to contractors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will payment rates be realistic and terms be prompt? Will travel allowances remain? Will local contractors be used for local jobs where possible? Will small businesses be looked after? Will existing pre-qualifications be migrated over to the new system?
<p>What works well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local contacts and offices with local knowledge. Pre-defined payment rates (minimum and maximum). General current payment rate system works. Preferred contractor for local areas recognises that site knowledge is important and site representatives know who to call for urgent work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quite happy with schedule of payment rates. Happy with prompt payment terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payments rates including travel allowances are fair and equitable. Direct site contact makes job easier to do and navigate the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present travel allowances for the regions are good. It is good that there is a minimum payment rate which is pegged to a standard. Payment terms are prompt.
<p>How can they improve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simplification of paperwork including duplication. Less paperwork to be done on site. It should be electronic. Regional job boundaries are good at present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend travel allowance to start from 0kms. Update travel allowance so that kilometres and time to match payment or allow delays in travel. Clarity is required over priority rates vs overtime rates. Preventative maintenance jobs are sent out to contractors at least month in advance. Redefining the priority job system. Contractors get the breakdown work if it is the contractors who have identified the issues. Being able to work during school holidays on education sites. Follow the TDS as part of preventative maintenance. Update preventative maintenance schedules when contractors make changes to records, for example, update an out of hours phone number that is outdated. Minimise duplication of data. Currently the same data is having to be recorded on private records (company), log books, and physical paper work. Log books to reflect the current minister's specification. Clarification and training on how TDS are to be implemented/used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not set any area boundaries so that contractors can work across regions. Permit a mark-up to be charged on materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No third-party invoicing. Contract longevity is improved, for example, beyond 12 months. Bank guarantees should not be required for jobs under 100k. Permit a realistic mark-up on materials to be charged (percentage on top of cost of part). Processes and procedures are digitised to achieve efficiencies. Paperwork and administrative requirements are simplified and not duplicated. Put boundaries around particular regions or towns that are only available to be serviced by local businesses, and have them as smaller regions rather than larger ones. Increase providers' knowledge as to what trades available in the area.

Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that timeframes to perform jobs will be reduced. Worried about whether contractor KPIs will be realistic/achievable, including responses to priority jobs. Will there be penalties for not meeting KPIs? How will contractors be continually communicated with over the change process? Concern about losing the local knowledge of, and relationship with, local offices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the provider going to set the rates or is it going to be monitored? How long are the contracts being awarded for? Will rates/travel allowance be adjusted yearly or is it fixed for the contract term? Is the process when tendering for work or being allocated going to be fair and transparent? Will the priority job rates stay the same? Concern that the providers will charge contractors for their administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will payment rates and travel allowances change? What is the role of the services providers? Will the providers set areas of work or responsibility? Concern that the service providers will take on roles outside the agreed plan. Will the providers support apprenticeships allowing for training and employment? Concern that providers will look to recover margins/costs from small and medium enterprises. Will the providers ensure continuity of work, with set work over a period to allow for employment of more staff? Concerned about the increased administrative burden new systems introduced by the providers could place on small businesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will all government agencies "be" under the Future AGFMA? How will local contractors be defined and protected? For example, can corporate companies set up in the region and sub-contract work to their company? Will the priority system change? Will the P1 – P5 timeframes remain? Will the payment rates be in the contract between the government and the providers, or will they be by agreement by the contractors and providers each year? Will all specific trades be paid the same across the State? Will the payment rates and allowances stay the same? For example, can contractors still be paid for accommodation and travel allowances? How will specialised trades be engaged? Concern that payments due to businesses will be retained over a long period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will businesses have to re-do the pre-qualification processes? Who interprets what a 'fair pay rate' & a 'fair payment term' is? The government or the providers? Will there be workshops to learn the new processes involved for invoicing & meeting all administrative requirements of the new providers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who will the providers be? Concern that the providers will charge contractors to use their systems or charge them on-costs. How do the providers propose to save money? Concern that this will impact on the contractors the providers will use. Will jobs still be allocated equitably amongst contractors? What are the areas going to be? How will they be defined? Are the providers going to have a regional office or is it all going to be in the metropolitan? Are the payment terms going to change or stay the same?
What works well?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local knowledge of local offices, with management by locals. Payment rates are fair and equitable. Generally the system currently works well. Timeframes to complete jobs and the priority system works well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment terms are fair and equitable. Job allocation is fair and equitable across contractors. Ensuring that contractors are licensed/trained/qualified for the job preserves quality and safety. Sign-off on jobs is individually accessed on each job. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The way contractors are contacted about jobs is good, where a call is received for priority jobs. Local contacts on site and at the regional office is good (local knowledge). Payment terms are fair and equitable. The level of autonomy contractors have on jobs is good, i.e. allowing contractors to make repairs, work choices, set cost limits, and define reasonable cost limits. The use of apprentices on jobs is good, as is their payment rates. Preventative maintenance schedules allow for continuity of work. TDSs are helpful for asset servicing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationship with sites is helpful when performing jobs (local knowledge of areas/assets/sites). Ability to train apprentices and have them work on jobs. Level of communication with provider. Payment terms are prompt. Preferred contractors for specific sites and/or assets. The current safety templates (Job Safety Analysis (JSA), Safe Work Method Statement (SWMS)) are good. The value threshold of works before quotes are required (>\$3000) results in efficiencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment terms are great and rates are fair. CPI increase currently works well. Safety systems are efficient. JSAs (tick & flick process on orders works well) and WHS procedure currently works well. Availability and responsiveness of local office. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment terms and rates are fair and equitable. Sharing of jobs between contractors within a region. Continuation of servicing of specific sites through the preferred contractor system. Being able to communicate with a person at the local office.
How can they improve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep it the way it is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel charges should be appropriate for locations attending such as driving in a 4wd, the staffing level required for safety, and remote/after-hours jobs. Opportunity to have input into what is required or site-specific compared to what is requested. No set rates for jobs, but rather each job is priced on its own merits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital systems (technology to reduce paperwork) should be introduced such as job worksheets, lodging of invoices, and importing invoices. Application should have the ability to log information when out of coverage and upload when network in coverage. For long distance travel jobs, two people should be standard for WHS reasons especially where out of network coverage. Apprentices are important to be able to train to maintain a workforce. Ratios need to be a lot higher than they are for AGFMA jobs. We should be able to mark-up materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback on job performance and contractor pricing from sites and the providers would be a good addition. Site contacts should be up to date so that contractors can communicate with the right site contact. Want a fair system, where there is no 'three strikes and you're out'. Training on the changes provided, and support, to make it as easy as possible. A simple system to use would be good. A centralised office would be of value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow contractors the ability to govern what preventative maintenance is required at different sites. Let persons specialised (i.e. plumbers, electricians, pest control, builders) determine what does and does not need to be done as the contractors have the knowledge. Have a local contact for each trade employed within the new providers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updates to the asset database is to ensure that the asset information such as brand, serial number, model type is captured as well as what building and room it is located in. QR scanner on the assets would make correct asset identification easier on-site. Streamline the preventative maintenance system. Update site contact list. Training and support on the changes.

<p>Concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the tender process will eliminate smaller companies who do not have the administrative process to best present themselves through an onerous tender submission. Worried about losing rapport and relationships. Will current contractors have to undergo another process to maintain their position as a preferred contractor? Concerned that the time and budgets for jobs will reduce and restrain the ability to do the work properly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the Industry Capability Network come into play? Concerned about losing the local knowledge and accessibility (easy communication). How will quality work be measured and rewarded? Will clients still have the flexibility to draw on preferred contractors? Will the providers draw on local unique businesses/services, with uncommon speciality services? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worried that contract will simply go to cheapest bidder and affect our contract prices. Will the system be user friendly? Will contractors be compensated for extra administration time and training in the system? Will current preferred contractors still have preferred status in the new model? Concerned about loss of relationship with local sites and offices and the loss of local knowledge. Concerned that there will be a loss of communication to contractors in the new model. Concerned about job loss and losing work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worried about local job loss - keep it local. Worried about contractors being worse off under the changes. Will the new system have manual paperwork or be digitised? Concerned about losing local knowledge. How will tenders be allocated to contractors? The cheapest is not usually the best. Concerned that site representatives won't be able to continue to choose their preferred contractor. Will payment terms and priority calls out stay the same? Concerned that there will be no security of work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be one lead provider? Will there be a schedule of rates? Concerned that local suppliers won't have an opportunity to supply materials for jobs. What will be the compliance on this? Concerned that the providers will charge upfront and on-going costs to be complaint under their system. Concerned that local contract knowledge will be lost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will hourly rates and travel allowances remain? How will asset stakeholder engagement be managed in the new model? Concerned about local job loss. Jobs stay local. 100%. What will design specifications be? Will they be better quality? Concerned that the local office will go. Local office should remain. Will there be a cap on the amount of contractors that can register .e.g. per trade? Concerned that the work won't remain consistent.
<p>What works well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local representatives and knowledge is good. Payment terms are prompt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paperwork on job (e.g. current JSA template) are reasonable. The use of local tradies for local jobs is good. The preferred contractor model is good, where the client has the flexibility to pick contractor. The local office and their knowledge is helpful. The current tender system is a good process. The re-qualification process is reasonable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment terms are prompt. The regional office with regional staff is good for local site knowledge. The preferred contractor system where the asset manager submits list of preferred contractors is good. Payment rates and payment terms are fair and equitable. The work performed under AGFMA is of good quality. The local site contacts is a good system. The distribution of tenders is fair. Preventative maintenance being performed by locals works. P1, P2, P3 of the priority system work effectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local office makes it easy to sort out jobs and paperwork. You can ring someone to get a decision ASAP. P1, P2, P3, P4 of the priority system is good way to categorise jobs and allowances. Payment terms is reasonable. Security of work is good for future planning and hiring. Preventative maintenance system is good for asset maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The priority call out fees are reasonable. The local office/contact is helpful. The payment terms are prompt. Having no job zones gives more opportunity for work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The payment rates are fair and equitable. The quality of work is at a good standard. A local contact for the distribution of tenders. Preventative maintenance remaining local. It is good that we can go directly to the site representative in regards to assets and don't have to go through third-party. Payment of invoices is timely.
<p>How can they improve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digitisation of paperwork. Feedback to contractors when job sites have been lost would be good. Currently contractors receive no feedback on whether it's due to quality/cost etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providers' ability to canvas new services/speciality services in the local area. Local facilitators. Packaging up of jobs would be efficient, such as being able to complete follow up work for preventative maintenances while already on-site. Digitisation of paperwork and processes with user friendly software. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital (application) sign-off on job completion and not needing on-site sign off. Simplification of paperwork. Electronic TDSs. Able to charge for administration time spent on paperwork that is currently not cost-recovered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be able to charge a management fee (i.e. cost + 10%) and administration fee on top of subcontractors invoice. Quotes that are accepted should be paid accordingly. Transparency of transfer of information. Not having set rates, rather have them per job. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors should be able to charge a margin on invoices. Paperwork should be simplified. Increase in security of contract and work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors should be given a phone call for priority jobs P1 to P3 instead of an email. A site register detailing where assets would be great for locating assets on-site. More training to contractors should be given.

Port Pirie Workshop

Port Pirie Workshop					
Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private enterprise is profit driven not service driven. How can you guarantee that contractors won't be driven down on rates or not get jobs? Government should make sure there is a minimum rate so contractors are not done out. What do providers deem as local contractors? Concern that the rates will be less than the industry standard rates and not include rises with CPI. Concerned that there won't be a local contact to speak to the jobs about. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will the payment rates be? Will they be fair? Will the providers have to use local contractors or will the providers just be asked to? Will travel expenses still be reimbursed? Will the terms of payment be the same? Will the communication to contractors still be personal? Will jobs be allocated equitably? Will the work be allocated to big or small businesses? Will computer systems replace the manual state? Will contractors have to pay to comply with the providers systems and processes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be a local presence by the providers? Will the pay rates be fair? How will disputes between the contractor and providers be rectified? Will the government play a role in this? Will preferred contractors continue to have job security? Will the jobs be shared across contractors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will we be kept up to date on the process? Will the priority system stay in the new system? Will our current business details/work capacity be automatically moved to new Provider? Or will we have to re-submit all new information? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will there be a local representative for contracts to engage with? Concerned about the loss of local knowledge. Will local work by local contractors continue? Will the rates of pay, on-call rates, travel allowances, and priority rates stay the same? Will the WHS procedures and processes still be the same (simple)? How much business administration will contractors have to do in the new system? Will it be more?
What works well?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of paperwork and administration is good, do not increase it. The payment rates are fair and equitable. Jobs are allocated fairly across contractors. Payment terms are prompt. Communications from the local office are helpful. The preferred contractor system is good. Time frames to complete works are reasonable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local office has good communication with contractors. How work is shared across contractors is good, it enables job security. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local staff is helpful due to the-specific knowledge for the jobs. The terms of payment are excellent. The schedule of payment rates and increase with CPI are reasonable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rates of pay and increases with CPI and fair and equitable. The payment terms are prompt. Local contractors doing local work is a good system. The priority system is effective. The current level of paperwork is good and should not increase.
How can they improve?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The WHS systems (SWMS (JSA)) should be simplified. The jobs system should be made easier and simpler to work when it comes to receiving work and invoicing. It should not be so labour intensive. The system should be proven and tested first. Allocate priorities when rural/remote. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum fee per job should apply for small jobs. Site representatives should attach photos of jobs, especially for out-of-town jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing paperwork should be transitioned to digital/ email and administrative burden should be kept to the minimum. A minimum hourly rate should apply to jobs. A more even distribution of works & funds across contractors would be good. Allocated budgets for jobs need to be adequate & fair, and there should be ability to have discussions if contractor thinks it is going to be over budget. There is an opportunity for clearer compliance guidelines which are specific to each industry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We want the new system made simpler rather than harder/complex than what it already is. There should be a minimum 1 hour fee applicable to each job. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a minimum 1 hour of pay for jobs (small). With the transition of new systems, there should be an opportunity for staggered implementation so that everyone can get used to a phone application while other formats are still available. Photos of the required work attached with job order would be helpful. More information from the client on the job required.

Walleroo Workshop

<p>Concerns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about loss of local knowledge. If people that allocate the work (jobs) are in Adelaide the providers won't be able to understand the issues and inspect or advise contractors on them. Concern that there won't be fair opportunity to quote to do the work on larger jobs. Will there still be preferred contractors for sites (who have the local knowledge)? Concern about transparency around how a contractor becomes preferred by a site. Will local contractors and apprenticeships still be supported by allocation of local work? Concern that there won't be fair allocation of work between local businesses. Concern that payment terms will increase. Concern that local offices will be replaced by interstate/overseas call centres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the facilitator go out to tender to subcontractors? Do we have to apply again to be used as contractors? Will existing contractors lose their work? Will the payment terms increase? Concerned that providers will charge contractors for software that contractors have to use to get jobs. Will it be written into the contract that job allocations to contractors will remain? Will local suppliers be used for materials for jobs? Will our concerns will be written into the contract between the government and the providers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that we will have to quote for small jobs (<\$3000). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that contractors will have to purchase material from wholesalers in Adelaide and travel to pick up the supplies, instead of using local suppliers. Will preventative maintenance works continue? Will contractors have KPIs and be penalised if they are not achieved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the current payment rates, priority charges, travel allowances, and overnight meal allowance remain? Will there be equal distribution of work across contractors? Will the administrative requirements increase? Will contractors still have to supply supplier invoices for materials? Concern that customer satisfaction rating (currently 92%) will drop.
<p>What works well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local work being distributed to local contractors and not Metropolitan contractors. The priority system works well. The police clearance/DCSI clearances pre-qualifications are good to ensure contractor quality. The payment terms are prompt. The local knowledge and contacts for sites and assets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local knowledge associated with the local office. The payment terms and rates are fair and equitable. Everything is generally working well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of local companies for local works is good. The payment term is prompt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local office and their knowledge in regards to sites and assets is great. The current payment rates are fair and equitable. The established relationships with local offices and clients are excellent. Taking pride in our local apprentices and engaging them in jobs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Payment terms are prompt.
<p>How can they improve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training on the priority system for site representatives would be beneficial. Have had experiences where a priority job has been logged as a P4 when it's a P1, and then ringing to see where you are. Invoicing needs to be streamlined and be able to broken down into GST, itemised services, etc. Invoicing should be digitised so it can be done one a tablet. The job forms should formatted better. A minimum call out fee should apply to jobs. A minimum administration fee should be able to be charged as sometimes the administration takes as long to do as the job did. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electronic sign-off of completed jobs would be good for when there is no-one on-site to sign-off. Usually this occurs where a site representative has been called to attend to something off-site. A fee should be able to be charged if you attend a job and the site is closed. The after-hours call out rates could be improved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pictures of the job (i.e. glass) should be attached to jobs. Flexibility to perform other ad-hoc works on-site should be introduced. For example, you fix a power point and while you're there the site representative asks you if you can do a few other things. A minimum 1 hour rate should apply to jobs. There should be increased training on the job priority system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be determined whether the current priority system will remain or whether it will be improved. Jobs should be able to be signed-off electronically by site representatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish an independent appeal panel to address disagreements between contractors and providers. Improve and facilitate relationships between all key stakeholders. There should be flexibility/opportunity for site representatives to contact contractors, as well as enable work requirements to be modified on-site.

SECTION F: SURVEY RESPONSES



Survey Q #	Question	Responses	Specific Ideas / Improvements
Q3a	Satisfaction - Additional Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment rates and additions (recoverable items under service) - i.e. travel time; parking fees etc. • Importance of local small and medium enterprises and their knowledge. • Ability for contractor to suggest improvements over life of contract. • Too much inefficiency / red tape. • Technology improvements (i.e. applications) required. • Payment terms are working well. • Contractors being updated more regularly on changes including site contacts and assets. • Contractor updates on reform. • Maintaining preferred contractor system. • Apprentices. • A strong safety culture is critical / quality control system required. • Continuity of work. • More action (preventative maintenance / upgrade of old assets) should be taken earlier before they fail (preventative maintenance instead of breakdown work). • Pre-qualification of contractors works well. • Preservation of relationship between local offices (knowledge) and/or clients and contractors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of contractors to include professional services (i.e. architects, engineers etc.). • Multiple preventative maintenance jobs for one site in the same month should be logged for the same job.
Q4	What would you identify as opportunities for improvement in the Future AGFMA?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much inefficiency / red tape / paperwork. • Preservation of relationship between local offices (knowledge) and/or clients and contractors. • Preservation of local offices for rural environments. • Enhanced co-ordination of multiple trades on projects. • Higher focus on mean time to repair a fault rather than purely on-time attendance. • Priority system – on-site staff need not selecting right priority for job (i.e. selecting P1 for non-urgent faults). • Time spent on admin/office work not recognised (i.e. no administration fee). • Simplification of clearances. • Person who refers jobs to contractor should have knowledge of what job requires – i.e. materials required. • Work scheduling – schedule jobs in close proximity to minimise travel between sites. • Agreed material mark-ups. • Apprentices. • Increased knowledge by providers as to what services could be provided by local contractors. • Knowledge of project/contract administration. • Concern about cost cutting and quality of workmanship/materials. • Tailored servicing for equipment instead of standard/one-size-fits all servicing. • Contractors being updated more regularly on changes including site contacts / assets / SAMIS. • Ability to follow up on corrective actions from inspections performed. • Contractor updates on reform. • Forward planning with work orders. • Technology / digital sign-offs for work performed / applications. • More transparency in job opportunities. • Specialised rates. • Preventative maintenance spread more evenly through the year to flatten demand. • Standardised induction and issue common card across all sites. • More equitable and fair distribution of work. • Importance of local small and medium enterprises and their knowledge. • Increased communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakdown system is automated via set supply price lists, and reduction in providing supporting documentation substantiating costs. • Tailored servicing for equipment instead of standard/one-size-fits all servicing. • There are a number of projects that fall under civil construction that do not generally require a commercial builder. Suggest re-establishment of trade groupings to separate out civil contractors. • Create an online portal for breakdown and preventative maintenance jobs for better communication and handling of jobs between the client and the contractor. • To ensure the benchmark of quality, safety and performance is set to an achievable level and reward the companies that exceed or show continued improvement. Those companies that show no or little improvement or fall below the standard benchmark are to be re-educated and penalised with limited or no works until improvements are made. • Elimination of the current requirement to supply data in two forms – i.e. excel spreadsheets and SAMIS database entry. Either one should be acceptable with the ability to populate the second. • The shared travel forms are time consuming, we should just be able to split the travel between the jobs done on that day and write shared travel on the work orders for those jobs. • I think satisfaction rating actually carrying some weight into preferred contractor usage will make a big difference to customer satisfaction. • The electronic work service report is not user friendly for tablets and phones. Too much adjusting is required to get the form filled out. Also then a pre-loaded email address for regularly visited sites, for instance, schools. • Work order portal accessible for contractors to see the status of jobs in progress. • Identification cards for all employees and contractors that are engaged by AGFMA. • A filtered services page by even only two filters: Area of site Service required, then have all registered suppliers of those services in that area listed. It should be able to be sorted by either Price or Rating column. This would allow local trades to compete for works and give the client easy access to alternative options that in many cases are directly supplied at a reduced cost.



5	<p>Are there any other elements not listed in Q3 that work well within the current AGFMA model that you want to see retained?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of local small and medium enterprises and their knowledge. • Regional (local) offices/contacts. • Continuity of work. • Preventative maintenance. • Quality control system – contractors are qualified to perform work. • Increased knowledge of the local office as to what services could be provided by local contractors. • Limit subcontractors per trade. • Payment rates and additions (recoverable items under service) - i.e. travel time; parking fees; time allowances; permits etc. • Payment – schedule of rate works well. • Priority system works well. • Preferred contractors can be requested by individual sites. • Currently good communication with local offices. • Technology improvements – i.e. applications for invoices. • Local management of AGFMA. • Too much inefficiency / red tape / paperwork. • Reduction in invoicing requirements – i.e. carry out some repairs without needing to quote everything prior. • Transparency and role of government and providers established. • Currently level of architectural and engineering input is good. • Australian-owned providers. • Current system works well. • Preservation of relationship between local offices (knowledge) and/or clients and contractors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct contact with on-site staff. • On-going contracts with CPI increases every year, no need to re-tender just rolls over with new order numbers. • Preventative Maintenance Schedules. You are wanting for example: SAMIS Plan - Level – Room. These have been filled in over the last two years, these will not change. Condition however will and we understand this process. The quantity on the schedules should also be improved. When you put in multiples, for example 2 or 3, there is no-where to write the second or third condition of the product. Please can you review this. • A government representative who can oversee the project/risk manager. • Not having a works exceeded limit. • Don't have to sign on and off on jobs. • Photos not compulsory. • Be able to speak to a person when there is a problem. • No portal.
Q6	<p>Is there any additional information or comments you would like the team to consider?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional (local) offices/contacts – local knowledge. • Input from contractors for spec work. • Agreed material mark-ups. • Ensure administration requirements are kept to a minimum. • Transparency and role of government and providers established. • More equitable and fair distribution of work. • Ensure locals are not disadvantaged. • Increased knowledge of local offices as to what services could be provided by local contractors. • Current system works well. • Payment rates and additions (recoverable items under service) - i.e. travel time; parking fees; time allowances; permits etc. • Negotiable rates. • Concern about cost cutting and quality of workmanship/materials. • Australian-owned providers. • Too much inefficiency / red tape / paperwork. • Continuity of work. • Contractor updates on reform. • Technology improvements – i.e. applications for invoices. • Concern around what guarantees will be put in place to ensure local contractors will be used? • Preservation of relationship between local offices (knowledge) and/or clients and contractors. • Concern about cost cutting and quality of workmanship/materials. • Enhanced co-ordination of multiple trades on projects. • Quality control system – contractors are qualified to perform works. • Current system works well. • Importance of local small and medium enterprises and their knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow a 15% mark-up to be charged on material cost to cover overhead of purchase and warehousing services (10%) and a margin of 5%. • Maybe engagement with suitably skilled contractors for reconnaissance works is a better solution prior to planning and engineering documentation. • Simplifying the system for invoicing approval including allowing apprentice rate charges. • I think a quicker method of considering quoted works could save money because if quotes are accepted in real time this would alleviate the need for return to site trips and double handling. • Provide guidance on standards required for installation works for FS contractors as it does not appear to be maintained to the level that is required for larger projects with DIT • Transparent reporting on the percentage of works conducted by direct engagement with local trades and through the local office or other sub-contract arrangements.