



Inquiry into Appropriation Bill 2026–2027 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2026–2027

Answer to question taken on notice

Asked by: Ms Chiaka Barry

Addressed to: City Renewal Authority

In relation to: Lockbridge contract for business case and advisory services

Hearing: 3 August 2026

Uncorrected Proof Transcript: pp 120-121

Transcript provided: 5 August 2026

Answer Due: 12 August 2026

Mr Gillman took on notice the following question(s):

THE CHAIR: I just have a question around single select consultancy contract worth around \$975,000 awarded to Lockbridge for business case and commercial advisory services. In a question on notice 1179, it was indicated that only Lockbridge could provide that service, and I was just wondering whether they are actually the only ones who can provide business case and commercial advisory services in Canberra. Then I also just looked at the website. The contract has gone up to 1.5 million, so I just wanted to understand what the big variation is in the contract.

Mr Gillman: So it was not a direct source contract, the 900 odd thousand. I cannot remember the exact number of it. But that was an open tender process. It was a subsequent stage of work that was self-sourced because of all the prior knowledge that Lockbridge had, having worked on the project for some period of time, that there is an exemption under the Procurement Act which allows for that. That is the reason for that extra \$400,000 being added to their contract value. That was the subject of probity and legal advice at the time. So that was not the original contract and at the moment we have not expended beyond the original contract value. That is uncommitted capacity that we have retained.

THE CHAIR: I am sorry, just for my benefit, so the original contract was for 975,000 and that was through an open tender process; is that right?

Mr Gillman: Correct, yes.

THE CHAIR: Okay, and then subsequently the 400,000 variation—is it a variation or is it in addition to—so how did the 400,000—

Mr Gillman: We—for transparency purposes, it was treated as a direct source procurement.

THE CHAIR: Okay. So why, then, did not you procure that if it is a direct source and it is a continuation of the work? Why was not it done initially?

Mr Gillman: Because of all the knowledge that Lockbridge had gained, and if a new consultant were to come on board, would have had to invest in and develop, and that would have caused considerable inefficiency, but also extra cost. So, that was the reason that it was determined that Lockbridge were best placed. Also—

THE CHAIR: I am so sorry. The question I have is why was not it part of the initial tender process?

Mr Gillman: Okay, sorry. I misunderstood.

THE CHAIR: No, that is okay.

Mr Gillman: With the business case—I will take that on notice and will come back, but we also did not know what paths we would be taking in subsequent business cases after doing the first piece of work, so it was subject to significant uncertainty, but I will take the proper answer on notice and come back to you, Ms Barry.

Mr Craig Gillman, Chief Executive Officer, City Renewal Authority: The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The additional work associated with Lockbridge's contract comprising variations totalling \$492,419 (including GST) was not included in the scope comprised in the tender process because it was not reasonably foreseeable at the time the procurement was undertaken. The original procurement sought business case and commercial advisory services based on the scope known at that stage of the project. As the work progressed, the project evolved and additional requirements emerged that necessitated variations to complete the services.

Approved for circulation to the Select Committee on Estimates



Signature:

Date: 11/08/2026

By the Chief Executive Officer, Craig Gillman