

ESTIMATES 2009-2010

Question on Notice

The Speaker

Table of Contents

<u>QoN</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
	Table of Contents	0
245	Legislative Assembly Secretariat Le Couteur.....	1
	Sustainability.....	1
246	Auditor-General Le Couteur	2
	Sustainability.....	2
414	Legislative Assembly Secretariat.....	7
	QTON	7

Sustainability

Caroline Le Couteur: To ask the Legislative Assembly Secretariat

In relation to: sustainability reporting

1. How much energy is it estimated your Agency used for office functions in 2008-09 per FTE and /or per square metre of office space?
2. How does this compare with the Commonwealth benchmark/target of 7,500 megajoules /person / per year?
3. How will you contribute to meeting the Government's target of zero net emissions? What steps do you have in place to reduce Agency energy use?
4. How much is your Agency spending on energy efficiency measures?
5. Is your Agency eligible for the ACT Government energy efficiency loan fund?
 - (a) If not, why not?
 - (b) If yes, have you applied, or will you?
6. How much waste is it estimated your agency generated per FTE in 2008-09?
7. What systems do you have in place for recycling of waste?
8. How much water is it estimated that your Agency used in 2008-09? How much water will you use in 2009-10?
9. Do you use any benchmarks to assess your environment performance? If yes, please detail.
10. What financial savings have you made to date from improvements in your environmental resource efficiency?
11. Do you have a target for future reductions – across energy, water, waste?
12. Does your agency have a Sustainability Action Plan or a Resource Management Plan?
13. What other initiatives / measures are you undertaking to become carbon neutral as required under Action 2 of Weathering the Change?
14. Can you please provide all these answers in terms of office use and other, recognising that some Agencies have specific service delivery needs that are not comparable to other Agencies – ie schools, hospitals, public facilities

Sustainability

Caroline Le Couteur: To ask the Attorney - General

In relation to: sustainability reporting

1. How much energy is it estimated your Agency used for office functions in 2008-09 per FTE and /or per square metre of office space?
2. How does this compare with the Commonwealth benchmark/target of 7,500 megajoules /person / per year?
3. How will you contribute to meeting the Government's target of zero net emissions? What steps do you have in place to reduce Agency energy use?
4. How much is your Agency spending on energy efficiency measures?
5. Is your Agency eligible for the ACT Government energy efficiency loan fund?
 - a. If not, why not?
 - b. If yes, have you applied, or will you?
6. How much waste is it estimated your agency generated per FTE in 2008-09?
7. What systems do you have in place for recycling of waste?
8. How much water is it estimated that your Agency used in 2008-09? How much water will you use in 2009-10?
9. Do you use any benchmarks to assess your environment performance? If yes, please detail.
10. What financial savings have you made to date from improvements in your environmental resource efficiency?
11. Do you have a target for future reductions – across energy, water, waste?
12. Does your agency have a Sustainability Action Plan or a Resource Management Plan?
13. What other initiatives / measures are you undertaking to become carbon neutral as required under Action 2 of Weathering the Change?
14. Can you please provide all these answers in terms of office use and other, recognising that some Agencies have specific service delivery needs that are not comparable to other Agencies – ie schools, hospitals, public facilities

(1) How much energy is it estimated your Agency used for office functions in 2008- 09 per FTE and /or per square metre of office space?

The Audit Office shares its office premises at 11 Moore Street with other ACT Government agencies. The Audit Office occupies approximately 5.86% of the total net lettable area of the building. As the building is privately owned, reliable data regarding water and gas usage is not available. Data regarding electricity usage by the Office is provided by the Property Branch of the Department of Territory and Municipal Services, and is an estimate based on the proportionate area leased by the Office.

It is expected that the Audit Office will consume 46,600 kilowatt hours of electricity in 2008-09. Of this approximately 10% is renewable green energy. This estimate is based on the actual usage of 36,613 kwh for the period 1 July 2008 to 30 April 2009.

The FTE staffing level for 30 June 2009 is 35.01. Therefore, 1,331 kwh of electricity is consumed per FTE staff member. This equates to 93.2 kwh of electricity per square metre of office space.

(2) How does this compare with the Commonwealth benchmark/target of 7,500 megajoules/person/per year?

In 2008-09, the expected electricity consumption by the Office will be 46,600 kilowatt hours of electricity, or 167,760 megajoules. Based on a headcount of 37 staff, this equates to 4,534 megajoules per person for the 2008-09 year. This result is substantially less than the Commonwealth target of 7,500 megajoules per person per year for office tenants light and power.

(3) How will you contribute to meeting the Government's target of zero net emissions? What steps do you have in place to reduce Agency energy use?

The Office has implemented the following measures with the aim of reducing its energy use:

- *The six cylinder vehicles leased by the Office have been replaced with four cylinder vehicles, consistent with Government policy.*
- *Individual recycle paper bins are available at all workstations, as well as a large bin which is located in the Office utility room, to encourage staff to recycle paper as much as possible.*
- *Glass and plastic recycling bins are available in the Staff kitchen facility.*
- *Staff have been provided with instructions to set their default printer options to print double sided and without the use of colour.*
- *The Office encourages the practice of scanning and emailing documents rather than photocopying and faxing documents.*
- *A number of Audit Office staff engage in a 'hot desking' arrangement. This means that they do not have a dedicated workstation but they do have access to a number of desks throughout the Office. This leads to reduced energy consumption as the Office is able to remain in its current premises rather than move to a larger site which would consume more lights, power, etc.*
- *Audit Office's lights have been programmed to switch off automatically at 6:30 pm.*
- *The tenancy has sensor-activated lights which automatically switch off if there is no movement in the Office for a period of 20 minutes.*
- *Staff have been requested to 'power off' their computers and other equipment before leaving work, especially over the weekend.*
- *Energy efficient equipment is leased from INTACT*
- *Photocopy machines automatically switch to power saver mode when unused for a period of 15 minutes.*
- *Current and previous years Audit reports are available on the Audit Office website. This has enabled the Office to substantially reduce the number of hard copy audit reports.*

(4) How much is your Agency spending on energy efficiency measures?

Expenditure on energy efficiency measures has not been separately identified.

(5) Is your Agency eligible for the ACT Government energy efficiency loan fund?

(a) If no, why not?

(b) If yes, have you applied, or will you?

The Audit Office is eligible for the ACT Government energy efficiency loan fund.

The Office has not applied for the funding as there is limited scope for the Audit Office to undertake further energy saving measures.

(6) How much waste is it estimated your agency generated per FTE in 2008-09?

The Audit Office maintains statistics on the number of 240 litre waste paper recycling containers used throughout the year. Based on an estimate for 2008-09 it is expected that 418 litres of recyclable waste was generated per FTE.

(7) What systems do you have in place for recycling of waste?

The Office supplies a separate recycle bin at each workstation for the sole purpose of recycling paper and cardboard. Additional recycling bins are provided in the Office utility room. The staff kitchen has a plastic and glass recycle bin.

(8) How much water is it estimated that your Agency used in 2008-09? How much water will you use in 2009-10?

The ACT Property Branch has advised that information regarding water consumption is not available for the building occupied by the Audit Office.

(9) Do you use any benchmarks to assess your environment performance? If yes, please detail.

The activities of the Audit Office are such that they do not provide a great deal of opportunity to make changes to its environmental performance. Benchmarks to assess environmental performance have not been implemented.

(10) What financial savings have you made to date from improvements in your environmental resource efficiency?

The Office makes its business decisions with regard to possible environmental impacts, however, specific information regarding environment resource efficiency is not separately identified.

(11) Do you have a target for future reductions – across energy, water, waste?

While the Office does not have any formal targets in place for future reductions, it does promote and regularly adopt workplace practices which are aimed at minimising its energy consumption.

(12) Does your agency have a Sustainability Action Plan or a Resource Management Plan?

The Audit Office does not have a formal Sustainability Action Plan or a Resource Management Plan, however, it does take its obligations towards environmental sustainability seriously. In terms of resource management, wherever possible, the Office tracks its consumption against previous years in order to minimise energy consumption.

- (13) What other initiatives / measures are you undertaking to become carbon neutral as required under Action 2 of Weathering the Change?**

In addition to the initiatives discussed at question 3, the Office undertakes to work with the other ACT Government tenants in the building it occupies to maintain a high standard of energy efficiency practices.

- (14) Can you please provide all these answers in terms of office use and other, recognising that some Agencies have specific service delivery needs that are not comparable to other Agencies – i.e. schools, hospitals, public facilities**

The Audit Office has 'office use' only facilities. All answers have been provided in terms of its 'office use' facilities.

QTON

Question 1

- 1) The Chair asked for details of the split up of enhanced accountability as shown in Budget Paper No. 4 of \$554,000.

Answer

- 1) The additional \$554,000 in the Territorial appropriation is comprised:

\$347,000	Additional salary and salary related on costs following revised staff salary allocations issued by the Chief Minister
\$103,000	Remuneration Tribunal increase for MLAs salaries
\$104,000	Provision for increased salaries should the Remuneration Tribunal determine such an increase for the Greens Parliamentary Convenor and Greens Whip

The additional \$150,000 in the Departmental appropriation is comprised:

\$113,000	Funding for an additional committee secretary
\$37,000	On costs associated with additional MLAs staff

Question 2

- 1) The Chair asked for a copy of a benchmarking document.

Answer

- 1) The document is attached.

Question 3

- 1) The Chair asked for details of the costs for additional MLAs for the Assembly.

Answer

- 1) Those estimates are attached.

Question 4

Ms Bresnan asked the Secretariat on 25 May 2009 the following questions:

- 1) I am wondering how much the cost to the Assembly in using the reception room has grown over the past three years or so?
- 2) I know there have been some issues with light and sound in the room at times, I am just wondering if there are any plans to look at improving that.

Answers

The answers to the Member's questions are as follows:

- 1) Bookings for the Reception Room in recent years have been as follows:

2006-2007 - 232
2007-2008 - 238
2008-2009 - 212 (to May)

Bookings for the Exhibition Room have shown greater growth, perhaps attributable to the Reception Room being heavily booked yet Assembly space still wanted.

2006-2007 - 47
2007-2008 - 101
2008-2009 - 115 (to May)

These figures are shown in each year's Secretariat Annual Report.

Besides increased "wear and tear" in the Reception and Exhibition Rooms necessitating more frequent maintenance (eg repainting, cleaning) of those areas, the most significant costs to the Secretariat are those relating to overtime and related expenses (eg meal and fare allowances) incurred to provide a security presence at evening and weekend functions. These costs are by and large recovered through the attendant fee and hourly rate charges.

In 2008 approximately 16% of Reception Room bookings were for after hours functions. To date in 2009 the corresponding figure is 20%. For the Exhibition Room, 12 % of functions were after hours in 2008 and in 2009 to date the figure is 15%.

Charges associated with Reception and Exhibition Room use are stipulated in the Determination of Fees and Charges set by the Speaker under the Legislative Assembly Precincts Act 2001. These charges were adjusted by 10.8% earlier this year, to reflect the CPI growth that had occurred between when the original fees were first determined in September 2005 and September 2008.

Invoices raised for room hire charges in recent years have been as follows:

Year	invoices	value (exc GST)
2006-2007	75	\$15,697.63
2007-2008	88	\$17,130.06
2008-2009	63	\$11,356.75 (to March)

- 2) It is unclear to the Secretariat as to what this refers. However it is believed that the lighting issue relates to a comment that there is too much light on the screen for a clear presentation to be given. The current wiring of the lights is a plug system which we are endeavouring to reconfigure so as to enable the lighting above the screen to be controlled by a single switch.

Regarding audio equipment, it is believed that the comment relates to the way some of ceiling speakers operate (or don't), and the lectern. A speaker was removed from the ceiling to compensate for feedback from the microphone. This will be relocated within the room to give a broader coverage. Also, the lectern microphone is not suitable for softly spoken presenters. A hand held microphone and/or lapel microphone is available for such presentations.

Question 5

The Chair asked the Secretariat on 25 May 2009 the following question:

- 1) What was the cost of the original (security system) roll-out? What was the majority of the cost in cameras?

Answer

- 1) The upgrade of the Assembly's security system was completed in May 2007 at a cost of approximately \$267,000, excluding GST, with approximately half for the CCTV system and half for EACS system. The sum includes management and superintendency cost. As part of

the project, 22 proximity readers were installed. The approximate cost for each reader was \$2,000 (and included the reader, electric door strike, cabling, installation, connection to the security system and commissioning).

To better manage the administration and control of security passes, 70% of which are on issue to non ACTLA building occupants, it was proposed that the existing readers be replaced by a type capable of reading a number of card types, particularly the majority of cards on issue to ACT departmental officials by their home agencies.

In April 2009, in a small adjustment to the new security system, the readers were replaced at an approximate cost of \$900 each (including installation and commissioning, total cost \$17,950 plus GST). Besides providing better control over the passes on issue to non building occupants and savings in Secretariat staff time to create passes for non-building occupants, the change is expected to achieve a one-off saving to the Secretariat of \$8500 in consumables. The adoption of a generic reader is consistent with proposals within ACT Government circles for all staff to use a "whole of government" security pass that is capable of being used to enter most ACT Government buildings.

Clarification of answer given by the Deputy Clerk and Serjeant-at-Arms to Mrs Dunne needs correcting. The Hansard record says:

MRS DUNNE: *It is two years, and at the time we did not foresee putting swipe cards on members' doors?*

The reference to "on members' doors" was misheard and it was thought Mrs Dunne was referring to whether using a generic reader had been considered during the initial security upgrade. The brief for the original security upgrade, developed in 2005 and arising from an ASIO T4 review of physical security arrangements at the Assembly was to replace the existing security system with one offering greater access control over the public/non public areas of the building, and significantly improving the CCTV capability. Extending electronic access control to other areas of the building was not part of the brief, nor was it identified as an issue in the T4 review.

The proposal to install swipe card access to Members' suites arose from the knowledge that the existing keyed system was nearing the end of its life and in need of replacement, and past security issues related to lost or unretrieved keys and perceived unauthorised access to suites.

Question 6

- 1) Mr Smyth asked for details of the costs of the installation of two cameras in Committee Room 1.

Answer

- 1) The cost of the two cameras installed in Committee Room 1 was \$5,430, plus \$500 installation costs.

Question 7

Ms Le Couteur asked the Secretariat on 25 May 2009 the following question:

- 1) How much contamination... do you have of the organic, of the things that are not compostable, how many... plastic bags et cetera, et cetera?

Answer

The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- 1) Upon reviewing the Rudds Report which was handed down to the Secretariat in 2008, there was no audit undertaken of the degree to which contamination of the compost stream occurs with non-compostable items such as plastic bags and so forth.

The most recent audit of the waste management system focused on the degree of compliance with the landfill waste stream and the extent to which potentially recyclable or compostable items were incorrectly deposited.

However, it is true that given the compostable waste is collected from a firm for use at a private worm farm, it is likely that significant non-compliance would be reported by the contractor as a matter of some urgency. To date, the Secretariat has received no reports of this nature.

The Secretariat believes that the most effective way of measuring the performance of the waste management system is to review the degree of compliance with the landfill stream. That is, to see whether

potentially compostable or recyclable refuse is being incorrectly deposited within this stream.

Modern sorting technologies mean that even where a degree of contamination of landfill waste in the mixed recyclables stream occurs, these will be screened out at the processing stage. However, the same will not occur with incorrectly deposited recyclable or compostable materials deposited in the landfill stream – all this material ends up in landfill without any processing.

The ultimate goal of the Assembly's waste management practices should be to reduce the amount of waste to landfill as much as possible.

Correction

In the hearing Mr Skinner, Manager of Strategy and Parliamentary Education stated that 16 per cent of the Assembly's waste went to landfill and that 89 per cent of that 16 per cent should not have been present in the landfill stream.

The correct figures from the Rudds report are that 19 per cent of the Assembly's waste went to landfill during the sample period and that 86 percent of that 19 per cent should have been recycled.

This means that only about 2.5 percent of the Assembly total waste belongs in the landfill waste stream.

Office Smart

Today I launched the Office Smart program of improved waste management on Monday 1 June 2009. The new program will involve the introduction of improved signage, education across the building, and the replacement of landfill bins under people's desks with a new mixed-use recycling bin.

It is expected that these measures will greatly reduce the amount of waste going to landfill through increased recycling and composting rates.

Question 8

- 1) Mrs Dunne asked for details of the costs of retro-fitting modesty panels.

Answer

- 1) A total of 33 desks and mobile drawer units were purchased. To cater for the differing configuration in MLAs offices, some desks were supplied with desk mounted screens and not all desks were required to have modesty panels fitted. The total price of all desks, screens and modesty panels, including freight and installation was \$42,195.00 (or \$1,278.00 on average for each desk and drawer set).

Due to concerns about the effectiveness of the modesty panels supplied, the supplier (Corporate Express) is in the process of supplying a new modesty panel that will function more effectively. The Secretariat acknowledges that the replacement panel is a more expensive item but is negotiating with the supplier to ensure, to the greatest extent possible, that costs are shared in recognition that the initial panel was not suitable.