



TRANSPORT AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr SR King MP—Chair
Mr LL Millar MP
Mr BW Head MP
Mr JR Martin MP
Mr LA Walker MP
Mr TJ Watts MP

Staff present:

Dr J Rutherford—Committee Secretary
Mr Z Dadic—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC BRIEFING—AUDITOR-GENERAL REPORT NO. 18 2021-22 TITLED *ENHANCING GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT*

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, 29 AUGUST 2022

Brisbane

MONDAY, 29 AUGUST 2022

The committee met at 8.59 am.

CHAIR: I declare this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into Auditor-General report No. 18 for 2021-22 titled *Enhancing government procurement* open. My name is Shane King, member for Kurwongbah and chair of the committee. I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay our respects to elders past and present. We are very fortunate to live in a country with two of the oldest continuing cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people whose lands, winds and waters we all share.

With me here today is Lachlan Millar MP, the member for Gregory and deputy chair; Mr Bryson Head MP, member for Callide; James Martin MP, member for Stretton; Les Walker MP, member for Mundingburra; and Trevor Watts MP, member for Toowoomba North. On 14 June 2022 Queensland Audit Office report No. 18 for 2021-22 titled *Enhancing government procurement* was tabled. On 20 June 2022 the report was referred to the Transport and Resources Committee for detailed consideration. The purpose of today's hearing is to assist the committee with its consideration of this report. This briefing is a proceeding of the Queensland parliament and is subject to the parliament's standing rules and orders. Only the committee and invited witnesses may participate in the proceedings. Witnesses are not required to give evidence under oath or affirmation, but I remind witnesses that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. You have previously been provided with a copy of instructions for witnesses so we will take those as having been read. I also remind members of the public that they may be excluded from the briefing at the discretion of the committee.

I remind committee members that officers are here to provide factual or technical information. Any questions seeking an opinion about policy should be directed to the minister or left to debate on the floor of the House. These proceedings are being recorded and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and are subject to the committee's media rules and the chair's direction at all times. You may be filmed or photographed during the proceedings and the images may also appear on the parliament's website or social media pages. I ask everyone present to please turn mobile phones off or to silent mode. I ask that responses to questions taken on notice today are provided to the committee by 4 pm Tuesday, 6 September 2022. That would be appreciated.

BAILEY, Ms Sharon, Deputy Director-General, Queensland Government Procurement, Department of Energy and Public Works.

NEWBY, Mr David, Director, Financial Reporting, Queensland Treasury

RYAN, Mr William, Head of Fiscal, Economics and Fiscal Policy, Queensland Treasury

CHAIR: We now welcome officials from the Department of Energy and Public Works and Queensland Treasury. I invite you to make a short opening statement, after which we are sure to have some questions for you. Can we start, please, with you, Ms Bailey?

Ms Bailey: We have only, as an opening statement, to say that both the Department of Energy and Public Works and Queensland Treasury welcomes the QAO's report and we look forward to working together to implement the recommendations on the data.

CHAIR: Queensland Treasury?

Mr Ryan: I endorse Ms Bailey's comments.

CHAIR: I will now turn to the member for Gregory for questions.

Mr MILLAR: Your departments each contributed to the joint response to the report that is contained in appendix A. Are there some particular aspects to this response that you would like to note for the committee?

Ms Bailey: I think only that we have come a long way in our collection and usage of data, but we still have some way to go. There is a great deal of richness in the data that Queensland Government Procurement brings in. We effectively take expenditure data in from the SAP and non-SAP systems across the budget sector agencies, which I think is somewhere in the order of 27 million rows of data, we then cleanse that to turn it into procurement data so that we get rid of

anything—grants et cetera—that is not related to procurement and then are able to analyse that against our categories so we are getting a much better sense of the procurement data. That said, there is still a way to go. We know that there is still some way to go. I think that was one of the pleasing things about the audit report: it was very supportive of that journey that we have been on and is pushing us to continue. I think we are very happy with that. We have worked very closely with Queensland Treasury in the past and will look forward to formalising that working relationship as a part of the report.

Mr MARTIN: In relation to the collaborative contracts, page 6 or 7 of the report outlines a good example of collaboration where the department saved taxpayers \$42 million in 2019-20 and \$35 million in 2020-21 for the electricity contract. I was wondering if you could elaborate on any other collaborative contracts that you might be looking at and if you could share any examples with the committee.

Ms Bailey: There are a range of ways that we are working on those contracts. There are the whole-of-government arrangements like the electricity arrangement and the Queensland travel arrangement. In terms of the travel arrangement, we were able to negotiate return of credits as a result of all of the travel that was cancelled or delayed during COVID. We were able to negotiate credits on that and have that held over and returned to government departments. I will try to get for the committee the exact amount of that, but it was significant. Through those arrangements we have great relationships with our suppliers and are able to negotiate those sorts of things.

The other things that we have are standing offer arrangements and preferred supplier panels. They are common use arrangements whereby we and the owners of those arrangements do the due diligence and checking upfront so we are making it much easier for budget sector agencies to access those suppliers knowing that that due diligence has been done and that we have negotiated for better prices and, importantly, that the quality of service is clarified. That saves time for people on the other side when they are doing the buying. I am now struggling to think of exactly the number of whole-of-government arrangements just like the electricity approach, but we seek to do that so that we are driving prices down. On the electricity arrangement, prior to that arrangement coming into place we were buying off spot pricing which you can imagine is incredibly volatile. Being able to lock in a 10-year agreement with CS Energy has enabled us to stabilise that. I think we have seen the fruits of that, particularly over the last six months where pricing for electricity has gone through significant increases. We have been able to work with the supplier to bring that down and to have a great deal. It is not only the upfront deal, it is the ongoing supplier management.

Mr WATTS: I am trying to understand the 23,592 mobile devices and telephones across 20 departments that remain unused. Have any of the departments investigated how many of these phones were not used but were still there for a legitimate reason or how many remain unused going forward?

Ms Bailey: That is a particularly salient example of part of the impact of COVID-19. What you saw at the time of that data being collected was a mass exodus from a range of our budget sector agencies and other government owned corporations and a lot of people working from home, which did leave a lot of those devices, whether they were sitting on desks or in meeting rooms, unused. At the moment what is happening is, with the return to the office, agencies are going through and auditing all of those devices to see which they can get rid of. I know that they are in the process of doing that. We do not have figures on exactly where they are up to, but each agency is going through that process. I think part of it is the discussion around how people use the office and how people use flexible working arrangements, whether they are working from the distributed work centres now or working from home and what equipment do we need to put in place to support that. Certainly it is a bit of an ongoing development with agencies working through each of their uses and then thinking that there are always going to be some that are unused.

We do keep a range of devices for community disaster recovery. We will have some devices ready to be deployed in the case of a disaster. Things like when people who do not want to use their own mobile device but they have to travel for work, we have some to provide. There will always be a portion that will look unused in any data collection, but certainly we do not want them to be to that level. It has been an audit by agencies, piece by piece, to try to clarify what they need and what they do not need and slowly getting rid of those they do not need. I am hoping that that has been brought down substantially.

Mr WATTS: Going forward in that audit, are you looking at classifying things such as emergency disaster relevance or our spare pool so that we can see what is planned excess for a legitimate reason and what is just poor procurement? Is there a data collection method that will highlight that going forward so that we do not end up with this unknown, very large number of devices into the future?

Ms Bailey: We are working with agencies to try to clarify how they report and how they classify various things, whether it be devices or other goods and items. Certainly I have not heard people talk about separately classifying things, as you say, that are put aside for a particular purpose, but that is an excellent suggestion and I am sure we can talk that through with agencies. In the Queensland government we have category management which is effectively across six categories. We try and categorise the procurement and common use arrangements and collaboration through departments using those categories. The ICT category is a big category of spend for us and I think that is an excellent thing for them to be thinking about—how we categorise some of these devices—and I am certainly happy to raise it with that committee.

Mr WATTS: Certainly from our point of view it is not a matter of just highlighting you should not have phones for emergency disaster relief, the question is how many. I think getting those classifications right is something that will be important. Further to that, it is trying to understand the cost of those 23,000 devices because some of those might be simply a sim card sitting in a cupboard and some of them might be contracted with a phone. Is that being looked into?

Ms Bailey: Certainly each department is in the process of looking at their spend and their usage statistics and thinking that through. I think it has made people stop and think, seeing that in the report so starkly stated. It was a bit of a call to action for agencies.

CHAIR: If I could go further into that, and it might be a bit too much into the detail, but in a previous hearing we heard about that number and we were all a bit shocked. Some of them were sim cards and it was highlighted to us that some of those sim cards may have been sitting in an emergency device, that is why they were unused, because the emergency device was not required to be used, such as one that someone wears around their neck in case of a fall. Would that be the case? I am not going to ask how many of those there were or anything like that, but can you clarify that because we had heard that previously.

Ms Bailey: Indeed. Certainly some of those would have been in that category. It is just difficult to understand how many. Having had such a stark number presented to us, it has been a bit of a call to action to be very clear about that.

Mr WALKER: I have two questions. The first one is I think I heard you say a moment ago what the definition is of what is an unused device. We could all have a different interpretation of what is unused and I think that is something we need to look at. Is that what you are trying to say?

Ms Bailey: Indeed, also a definition of which are regularly in use and which might be put aside for special usage. Certainly in the time of COVID when people were leaving, a lot of those devices, if they were landlines or if they were teleconference phones in meeting rooms, would have been unused. The question then is are they now back in use and supporting functions now that people are back in the office and how much. It is also how many of those do we need ongoing. It is a bit of both.

Mr WALKER: Where I am sitting now I have three sim cards. The definition could shift a little bit. That is why I wanted to get some clarity on what they are looking at and the definition so every department works from the same definition. On page 10 of the QAO report it notes that only two departments were identified as classifying their purchases at a detailed level to enable effective analysis. Is this correct and, if so, are any of the other 18 departments considering following the lead of the departments that are noted here?

Ms Bailey: I might start and then hand over to my Treasury colleagues on that one. All agencies are classifying and understanding to a different degree. The two agencies reported on page 10 are using the universal classification—the UNSPC, the United Nations Standard Product Code. Those two organisations are the Department of Transport and Main Roads and Queensland Health. Both are very large organisations. Now I am going to get into the detail of procurement and finance systems. Both of them have their own instance of the SAP system which makes it easier to classify and roll out a major change like that. They have done that. They both obviously have very large spends and it is in their interests to be able to classify in consistent way so that they can do the analysis and drive savings through understanding.

They are both decentralised systems. The Department of Transport and Main Roads and Queensland Health operate their procurement through their health and hospital services and Transport and Main Roads regional offices which makes sense given the spend is so close to those offices. In so doing they needed a system that was able to aggregate up in a very consistent way and so that is what they have done. Other departments use different systems. Smaller departments are less sophisticated. While from a selfish point of view it would be wonderful if everyone used UNSPC, it is a major change for departments, particularly for small departments, to implement and we are conscious of that and want to work with them. William or Dave, do you have anything to add?

Mr Ryan: I think the only thing I would add to what Sharon has said is that the two agencies that are using the codes are very big procurers. They have quite sophisticated financial support teams in place. They are in the category councils. They head up the health category council and the transport category council. They enjoy that sophistication because they have the support mechanisms to enable them to undertake the degree of procurement that they need in the course of their business. David, I do not know if you want to say anything further.

Mr Newby: Just to add that all agencies record types of expenditure. This is not so much in terms of procurement, but more in terms of the requirements for the ABS which is coming from the IMF ultimately. There is something called COFOG, which stands for the Classification of the Functions of Government, in Australia. That is taking the major areas of expenditure that the government undertakes. For instance, health would be split into medical products, outpatient services and hospital services, and there is detail below that. As I say, that is more in terms of the reporting that we do to the ABS and national accounts than from a procurement point of view.

Mr WATTS: Comparing COFOG and UNSPC, are definitions standardised and terms standardised so that they are interchangeable across those two different constructs of recording?

Mr Newby: No.

Mr WATTS: Very helpful.

Mr Newby: It is a bit ironic that it is ultimately coming from the United Nations, but the IMF classifications are, I guess, for different purposes.

Mr WATTS: Is one of the problems in recording this information that we do not have a standard set of definitions? To me, across all government departments a ream of paper is a ream of paper—and I use that as a silly example, obviously things are more complex than that—but it would seem that the first step in this is to have standard definitions so that procurement becomes interchangeable across departments regardless of the recording method.

Mr Newby: Yes, and the issue is what we are doing it for at a high level of government in terms of our reporting obligations is not as specific as the UN procurement requirements. It is something of a burden in terms of the United Nations requirements. The detail of that can possibly only be borne out by large departments that have the staff.

Mr WATTS: An administrative burden versus an outcome benefit, is that effectively what you are suggesting?

Mr Newby: I know that even reporting what we require for the ABS is quite a burden on departments as it is. I think to add the United Nations requirements as well might be a bit overwhelming for smaller departments.

Mr HEAD: The agency responses we have on hand here were prepared a few months ago. Has there been any progress on the implementation of these recommendations? Would you like to give the committee an update?

Ms Bailey: Absolutely. You will note we have been working with our colleagues in Treasury on understanding our respective roles. We have worked together informally. We are in the process of working up memorandums of understanding to formalise that data sharing because we do it on a bit of an ad hoc basis at the moment. We are in the process of doing that. We have had the data strategy. The final recommendation in regard to data strategy has been verified and endorsed and is now in the process of being implemented.

Mr Ryan: While Sharon finds her brief, I will add that it is not specifically a recommendation, but the QAO did make reference to the Queensland Treasury is looking at its whole-of-government financial management systems and looking at upgrading the systems that we have in place. We are undertaking a business case throughout the remainder of this year. Queensland Government Procurement will be a key stakeholder in that exercise to see how our respective responsibilities and systems can work to provide an efficient and effective outcome for Queensland government expenditure going forward.

Ms Bailey: We are working with each of the category councils, the six category councils, on how we report on those things and how the data strategy supports them in that reporting. We are looking at 2023 and 2024 to start to develop that. We are also looking to replace QTenders and our Queensland contracts directory which will further support that and that should be happening in 2023. Hopefully those two pieces of work will come together.

Mr WATTS: In relation to Queensland Government Procurement centrally collecting departments' transactional data from the financial system and using it as a basis for procurement, in today's world where inflation is running out of control, having a system that is looking back is not necessarily the most efficient way versus a system looking forward. Is there any suggestion that we should be adjusting ourselves in that environment?

Ms Bailey: I will refer to Treasury as well. It gives you retrospective data, you are absolutely right, and, of course, it is important to be looking forward with procurement. While it will support it in the today's-date environment, it has some lag function. Each agency has to have an agency procurement plan. We work with them to support them in that and through that to clarify their significant procurement going forward as well as the general procurement—the business-as-usual procurement. Part of that process is to ensure that they are meeting their government targets and that they are working with ethical suppliers, but also to analyse their spend and be clear about what it is moving forward.

What I think we would like out of the MOU and working with Queensland Treasury is to get a little more of that prospective view because, of course, Treasury is working with agencies on their funding and their understanding of their business cases moving forward. If we bring those two sets of data together then we are giving a much better sense and supporting agencies in a much better way in terms of what they are buying and ensuring that they are buying well. It is also that value-for-money piece of ensuring not only that we are estimating value on price, but also on those broader factors, the whole-of-life costs, as well as ensuring the broader objectives around Queensland businesses and regional businesses having good access to that spend.

Mr WATTS: Does that potentially bring us back to the definition and the data recording in terms of if we are looking at accounting records versus a regional procurement, are we talking about exactly the same thing across departments and is it comparable? The real issue for me is government is a big beast and we would like to be able to use that to our advantage. To do that standard data collection, the standard accounting methods of recording to make sure we are comparing apples with apples rather than not knowing, is that work going on across departments?

Ms Bailey: It certainly is. One of the benefits of centrally enabling and having central data collection is that we can report on that data in a very consistent way so that when we cleanse the data we are applying a consistent framework across all departments' data. We would love it if it were more detailed and what the UNSPC gives you is that capacity to drill down a little further in a more standard way, and the promise of that is clarifying where aggregated demand will help agencies more. We have a little sense of it at the moment. I would hate to give the committee the impression that we do not have any sense of it. We do, but it is at a higher level than we would like. What the UNSPC and tools of that calibre give you is a more detailed level of spend that is consistent and then you get a picture of where agencies, where they are not already, can work together to aggregate that demand and potentially negotiate a far better deal with suppliers on that. Certainly in terms of regional spend and how we classify Queensland based businesses and other jurisdiction businesses, that is all very consistent and centrally enabled.

Mr WATTS: Just to expand on that, are there some items that are negotiated for all departments because they meet that standard classification—obviously there are some big ticket items we can see fall into that—versus some unique procurement requirements of particular departments which therefore might not fit the same category and understanding the nexus between those two and working out how much energy and effort goes into that? My question is, if departments are siloing, how do we know that?

Ms Bailey: Part of the category management approach in those six categories that I talked about—general goods and services; building, construction and management; transport and infrastructure services; information and communications technology; medical services and products; and social services—is to try to get some consistency and collaboration across government in those areas. Those category councils negotiate a range of standing offer arrangements and preferred supplier panels so that we can drive a better spend and better value out of that. If you look at general goods and services, which is a category that falls under my management, we negotiate the whole-of-government electricity arrangement and the whole-of-government travel arrangement so that every department can buy off that arrangement and have access to the deals that have been negotiated there. Because we have a sense of the spend going forward in those areas, we have a fairly good sense of the prospective spend, we can negotiate very good deals with suppliers.

In other areas, for example things like stationery, which is common usage, general office goods, we can negotiate a standing offer arrangement with the suppliers so that agencies have that good mix of flexibility but standardisation. Those arrangements have a number of suppliers on them.

We try and get some diversity in those suppliers so that we have suppliers that are regionally based, suppliers that are small to medium enterprises, Indigenous procurement and social ventures. We pre approve them, we do all the due diligence, we tender for people to be on those arrangements and then agencies have a choice of a number of suppliers to buy from. Generally agencies do buy from those standing offer arrangements because we try and make it easy for them to do that. Every now and again there is some leakage where agencies have found another supplier that might meet their need. We try and talk with agencies about that to drive them to the panel, but also to let us know if there is a supplier that is meeting a unique need for them and how we can then get them on to the standing offer arrangement so that we are cutting down that red tape.

Mr WATTS: In relation to the nexus between regional suppliers or the regional guy—I want to make sure local business is getting an opportunity. There is a value and service requirement in there but also the potential for leakage. If another supplier has been found, what process exists within the department or across this category council to make sure that that is getting picked up and someone is helping them potentially jump through a better procurement process so they can get themselves onboarded properly?

Ms Bailey: We are auditing each of those arrangements. If I take general goods and services, for example, we look at those arrangements and talk with our suppliers about those arrangements and how much use they have gotten out of them, because sometimes people can be part of those panels or standing offer arrangements and not have people buy a lot from them. We tend to survey our suppliers to make sure they are being used and if they are not, we talk with them about why that might be. Sometimes suppliers are very happy to be on those standing offer arrangements even if they are not getting a lot of use because they can point to it as saying they have been endorsed by government to supply. They have met government standards and that gives them a certain standing in terms of working in the private sector market as well.

We look at the arrangements to try to ensure we do have regional suppliers because it is easier for our regional offices to buy from regional suppliers but also we do want to support them. It is part of the Buy Queensland approach, so we want to support as many Queensland businesses as possible. We audit those arrangements, we check people's business statements by making sure they are registered in Queensland to ensure they are actual suppliers.

Where we have suppliers coming and talking to us about having missed out on a tender opportunity, we work with them and support them through a range of programs that are run through our department, through the Department of Employment, Small Business and Training and through the department of state development which are aimed at trying to get businesses tender ready, getting them to understand how to put their best foot forward in tenders and, possibly before that, making a decision about whether they want to supply to government. Is that something they want to do given sometimes government has a little bit more red tape than other buyers?

Mr WATTS: Really?

Ms Bailey: I know. In the early stages it is helping businesses make that decision about whether this is worth their while; is this something they want to do and are they ready to do; or is it something they might want to do when they are slightly more mature? It is about helping businesses with some of those decisions. Then when they have made that decision, it is about helping them put together their value propositions so they are able to very clearly and succinctly state that to government. Some of that infrastructure is working with them to get them tender ready.

If they miss out on an opportunity to be on a standing offer arrangement or on another procurement, we are working with our buyers to make sure they give suppliers feedback and give them very clear feedback about why they missed out on that opportunity which will hopefully help them with the next opportunity. It is trying to wrap those services around our suppliers to give them the best possible chance of being able to supply to government. It is critical to provide them with that support given that sometimes, as you have noted, we can be a bit of a tricky buyer; we do require other things.

I also note that—and I talked earlier about replacing QTenders and replacing things like the Queensland contracts directory. That is really aimed at making it easier to do business with government. One of the things we are aiming to do when we replace QTenders is to make it a 'tell us once' approach. At the moment each time suppliers put in a tender for government they have to do things like upload their insurances, fill out the details and register with us. We are hoping the new system will be a 'tell us once' system—to register once and upload your insurances once. That will take out a whole heap of time and effort for suppliers and we will be able to do some of that validation very quickly for them. That is the promise. There is never one silver bullet. There is a range of things

we need to be doing to support Queensland businesses and part of it is that underlying system. The current QTenders—you may not have had a look at it recently. If you did, you would see that it is a bit clunky and difficult to manage, so doing that will assist suppliers.

The other thing I note we have is the forward procurement pipeline, which is on the QTenders site. It is a place where we will upload all of our opportunities across government for procurement going forward. I am happy to provide the committee with the link to that. That is a tool whereby suppliers can log in and just have a look at what procurement is coming up. We have tried to make that tool searchable by region, procurement type and spend type so that people can get themselves ready for the opportunities that are coming up and are aware of that.

The other thing that we promote is the Queensland contracts directory, which again will be having a little makeover. Some of those small to medium enterprises may not want to tender directly with government, but they may want to be in those bigger companies' supply chain. If they know about those opportunities coming up, they can get themselves ready because they often know about the big suppliers that are close by, and look at what opportunity there is to be in the supply chain.

There is a range of things we are trying to do to wrap around businesses. We know that we still have a way to go. We are getting there. Towards the end of every year we have a series of Buy Queensland roadshows—they will be coming up in October/November—whereby we try to get out there and liaise with businesses on the ground and make them aware of those opportunities but also hear from them about the difficulties they are having in interacting with us. That helps us continue to improve.

Mr WATTS: I am trying to understand. In terms of setting and monitoring KPIs and managing those KPIs in regards to all of this work, whose responsibility is that?

Ms Bailey: It is a tiered responsibility. At a whole-of-government level we report on things like the SME target and the spend within Queensland and the regional suppliers spend—so spend with Queensland businesses and regional spend. We work with our colleagues in the Department of Employment, Small Business and Training to report against the now 30 per cent SME target and we work with our colleagues in the Department of Seniors, Disability Services and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships to report against the Queensland Indigenous Procurement Policy three per cent target. Then it is working with the category councils. We provide data to them so they can report against each of their category plan targets and then we work with the agencies so they can report. There are tiered KPIs. We look at how we can use the centralised data to support that reporting.

CHAIR: I want to go back to the energy deal that you worked out that saved quite a bit of money. I noticed that CS Energy is the vendor you used, which is a Queensland government owned corporation. It is a government buying from a government owned corporation. Is there any rule specifically around that, because we are getting a discount from ourselves?

Ms Bailey: When working with government owned corporations, which within the legislation do have the need to work commercially—it would be terrible to say that they are hard to deal with. They are not hard to deal with but they do—

CHAIR: I used to work for one.

Ms Bailey: You understand then. It was certainly a commercial arrangement. Previously, the spot pricing was a commercial arrangement as well. It really is about working through a deal over the 10 years. That was a very complex tender process. It was a two-stage tender process. Because we were changing the model, we had to go out and talk with suppliers about that change of model and the change of tender and work with them to define the tender a little further. It was a two-stage process; it was collaborative in that way and working with the market to understand the market and understand what might be possible going forward; and then having a quite competitive tender process to ensure we were getting a very good deal out of that.

It was a long-term process. It was negotiated—I think the whole process was over a 12-month period and then there were some quite intense negotiations to get us to the level we are at now. Certainly it was commercial. I do not think there were a lot of favours in there. Obviously it was in everyone's interest to come out with a very good deal.

CHAIR: Thank you all very much. That will conclude the briefing. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee's webpage in due course. I declare this public briefing closed. You were going to provide that link to the QTenders future site where you said that vendors can see—

Ms Bailey: The forward procurement pipeline?

CHAIR: That is what it was.

Ms Bailey: We will certainly send that across.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. It is much appreciated.

The committee adjourned at 9.41 am.