



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT AND CITY
SERVICES**

(Reference: [Inquiry into the effectiveness of Fix My Street](#))

Members:

**MS L CASTLEY (Chair)
MR A BRADDOCK (Deputy Chair)
MR T WERNER-GIBBINGS**

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

WEDNESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 2025

**Secretary to the committee:
Mr J Bunce (Ph: 620 50199)**

By authority of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory

Submissions, answers to questions on notice and other documents, including requests for clarification of the transcript of evidence, relevant to this inquiry that have been authorised for publication by the committee may be obtained from the Legislative Assembly website.

WITNESSES

CHAN, MS YU LAN , Acting Chief Operating Officer, City and Environment Directorate	35
CHEYNE, MS TARA , Attorney-General, Minister for Human Rights, Minister for City and Government Services and Minister for the Night-Time Economy	35
MARRIAGE, MS SUE , Acting Executive Branch Manager, City Presentation, City and Environment Directorate	35
MARSHALL, MR KEN , Executive Group Manager, City Operations, City and Environment	35
MUDGE, MR WILLIAM , Chief Information Officer, City and Environment Directorate	35
RAMPTON, MR TIM , Executive Branch Manager, Roads ACT, City and Environment Directorate	35

Privilege statement

The Assembly has authorised the recording, broadcasting and re-broadcasting of these proceedings.

All witnesses making submissions or giving evidence to committees of the Legislative Assembly for the ACT are protected by parliamentary privilege.

“Parliamentary privilege” means the special rights and immunities which belong to the Assembly, its committees and its members. These rights and immunities enable committees to operate effectively, and enable those involved in committee processes to do so without obstruction, or fear of prosecution.

Witnesses must tell the truth: giving false or misleading evidence will be treated as a serious matter, and may be considered a contempt of the Assembly.

While the committee prefers to hear all evidence in public, it may take evidence in-camera if requested. Confidential evidence will be recorded and kept securely. It is within the power of the committee at a later date to publish or present all or part of that evidence to the Assembly; but any decision to publish or present in-camera evidence will not be taken without consulting with the person who gave the evidence.

Amended 20 May 2013

The committee met at 4.00 pm.

CHEYNE, MS TARA, Attorney-General, Minister for Human Rights, Minister for City and Government Services and Minister for the Night-Time Economy

CHAN, MS YU LAN, Acting Chief Operating Officer, City and Environment Directorate

MARRIAGE, MS SUE, Acting Executive Branch Manager, City Presentation, City and Environment Directorate

MARSHALL, MR KEN, Executive Group Manager, City Operations, City and Environment

MUDGE, MR WILLIAM, Chief Information Officer, City and Environment Directorate

RAMPTON, MR TIM, Executive Branch Manager, Roads ACT, City and Environment Directorate

THE CHAIR: Good afternoon and welcome to the second public hearing of the Standing Committee on Transport and City Services for its Inquiry into the Effectiveness of Fix My Street. Yesterday, the committee met with accessibility advocates, individual users and community groups, and today we will hear from Tara Cheyne, MLA, Minister for City and Government Services.

The committee wishes to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands we are meeting on, the Ngunnawal people. We wish to acknowledge and respect their continuing culture and contribution they make to the life of the city and this region. We would also like to acknowledge and welcome other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who may be attending today's event.

This hearing is a legal proceeding of the Assembly and has the same standing as proceedings of the Assembly itself and therefore today's evidence attracts parliamentary privilege. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as contempt of the Assembly.

We are not inviting opening statements, so we will kick off. Yesterday I heard a lot about Snap Send Solve. I know you have talked about it and we have heard about it before, but I just do not understand it. I believe you have considered it, looked at it. If I could understand why it is not an option or is it an option, just some information about that.

Ms Cheyne: Yes, sure. I will hand over to Ms Chan in a moment. When I became minister at the end of December 2024, certainly Snap Send Solve came to my attention, particularly as a responsive web design and it seemed to be integrated relatively well in some other councils. It almost had a bit of a gamification element to it; I think you can win prizes for submitting things.

We met with the CEO of Snap Send Solve—by “we”, I think definitely Mr Mudge was there and maybe Ms Chan was there as well—perhaps in January 2024 to better understand whether there was any possibility of better integration and also what was happening to Snap Send Solve requests that people were using and submitting.

So we were hearing from the community a little bit there was real interest. They enjoyed

the interface of Snap Send Solve, but in terms of hearing back, less responsive. It effectively turned out that Snap Send Solve was just not integrated with our systems and was emailing a redundant inbox. So not ideal, not an inbox that anyone was monitoring.

I think we had a really helpful, wide-ranging discussion, but the platform that Fix My Street is on together with the platforms that sit behind it, that is where we saw the most value-for-money investment in better integrating those than adding in yet another platform to engage from the customer. But I will hand over to Ms Chan who will explain in more technical detail.

Ms Chan: Thank you, Minister. Good afternoon, and I have read and acknowledge the privilege statement. As the minister said, Fix My Street is actually a range of different systems that get information from the customer to various operation systems through to the crews that need to actually action the job. With apps such as Snap Send Solve, it just sends an email so we do not have any control over what information the customer actually enters in. Sometimes there is not enough information to work out which team it is, sometimes the address might be incorrect. So we do not have any control over what the customer sends through those third-party apps. We have put a lot of effort into making the Fix My Street front end a lot easier and clearer so that people understand what information the operational crews need so we get the right information that flows through the system straight to the crew that needs it.

With the third-party apps, as the minister said, it sends an email into our email system. What we have through Fix My Street is the information goes directly to the street lights, or the trees or the roads area, for example. With Snap Send Solve it just goes to an email inbox. It needs manual intervention then to look at the email, work out which team it might be, send it to the team, the team has to work out is it the right information because it has not gone on automatically through the usual information flow that a normal Fix My Street report would go through.

In some cases as well with Fix My Street, if you go to the front landing page it says to you what information you can report through Fix My Street and what needs to be reported elsewhere. For example, shopping trolleys, we do not do those; that will be whichever supermarket chain needs to handle those. We have got information on our Fix My Street landing page about how to report those and it takes you straight to the right link to do that or matters that might be with Icon Water or Evoenergy so the customer is not coming into us and landing us with something we are not able to help with and they cannot get it resolved.

But with Snap Send Solve there were a range of those kinds of things that people were trying to report that come through to us and we cannot really do anything with those. So we have instead put a lot of effort into making the front end easier for people, because we understand that is why people want to use the apps—they find it easy just to interact with and send information.

THE CHAIR: That is what we heard yesterday, especially from Craig Wallace, for instance. If you are there you can see it, you can take a photo, put it straight on an app. People do find it hard. I know the money was put towards the platforms, but do we have any understanding of what it would cost to send an email to the correct email and what

it would cost for you to do that manual triaging to send it to the correct group?

Ms Cheyne: I think it is difficult to quantify. This is the point where I would like to offer the committee a behind-the-scenes demonstration of the Fix My Street platform so you can see the front end all the way through the different back ends and the work that is being done. Because I think it is helpful actually visualising it and seeing what the changes are and the wealth of data that sits in the back end—like, every footpath is mapped, and I think it is every tree is mapped. So those things are all really useful for us in identifying what needs to be done, adding it to programmes or schedules or identifying if it is already part of routine maintenance. The integration of the Fix My Street and Salesforce platform is much quicker for us than to get an email that we then have to effectively copy and paste and put into our own systems.

In terms of the website and app, but when I look at the Fix My Street website, this is a website-responsive design for mobiles, so it is optimised so it works pretty well on mobiles. I appreciate that people have to log in.

THE CHAIR: Can you explain why that is important?

Ms Cheyne: I can in one moment; I will just finish this train of thought before my ADHD takes us off on another journey. So while we are on this, it looks good and you can effectively click on through and upload your photo. It is a lot cheaper for us to do that than to do an app, and I would say the functionality is the same. A lot of people I find who are commenting on Fix My Street have not seen or have not logged in from their mobile for a while. It has not always looked like this, but this has been some of the investment we have done in the last two years.

On anonymous requests, this is something that I really ummed and ahed about. Effectively, what we learned when we really started doing a deep dive in about January last year was anonymous requests were taking up a lot of time in that the way people were providing information might be vague. A whole lot of people it turns out when they are selecting the location they might mean a footpath that is down the road, but they are programmed to select their home. Not helpful. So then our people might come and look at this person's home and the footpath in front of it and it is fine, but then they have got no contact details to call them and say, "Hey, did you actually mean that place or did you mean somewhere else?"

We have now done some limits in terms of making sure you are really selecting where the issue actually is, but having non-anonymised reports allows us both to keep people updated on the progress or to let them know whether it is now being attached to routine maintenance or if it is part of a future program of works, but also where there is not enough information on what is going on here, they are able to call. I can tell you, I have had crew call me and they are like, "What are you talking about?" Very helpful, and I am like, "It's down here and to the right, and I think it's still there." But having that conversation means in real time they are able to go and find it. Whereas you can see how inefficient and costly it can be if someone rocks up to an area, cannot see anything, cannot find anything that needs to be fixed, and then the customer is angry and puts in another request and the original one is not able to be closed off.

So that is why we made that change. But importantly, you can still submit a request

anonymously, but you have to call the contact centre. That allows that conversation to happen so we can say, “This is why we prefer you to attach your name to it. But if you don’t want to of course that’s fine, but you’re not going to get an update.”

THE CHAIR: You referred to the various triage teams. How many people work as part of that? Is it one per team? What is the resourcing?

Ms Cheyne: So probably two parts to this answer. The first is that, again, when I became minister we had almost 40,000 open Fix My Street requests, which just was daunting and felt really quite impossible. So there was effectively a team stood up and that team has evolved over time now to do some of this triaging. So we were in what I call the mowing crisis where it was just constantly raining and then sunny, and so we were just being bogged and not able to get to what we wanted to. But people putting in requests for mowing in a reactive way, not particularly helpful. It is on a program, best thing to do is stick to a schedule rather than just jump at every request that is being put in.

Also, we did have some anonymous complaints or requests that had very little information to them. And so I made a decision that those would be closed because what could we actually do with them. So we had that team originally deployed to effectively do some data review so that we were focusing on not just the overwhelming volume but what are actually requests that we can action. Then there have been officers since who have been embedded across the operational areas of the agency, and that is where Mr Marshall can expand.

Mr Marshall: I think the question was how many people are in the triage team. So I guess the triage function happens in a number of different ways and via a number of different resources across the whole workflow. But in the team that the minister is referring to that was established last year, there are four officers who support the operational teams in ensuring that some of that housekeeping was taken care of first. And then on an ongoing basis those staff members support our operational teams by making sure essentially that jobs that are not automatically allocated correctly or are complex in some way find a home, and if they need to move between teams they are moved through the process so that they can be fully responded to.

So there were circumstances certainly we were finding where the information that was attached to the request or the nature of the request itself engaged a number of different teams or other complexity, and those jobs were tending to get lost in the system. So the process of them being handed off from one team to another was not always effective.

So the primary role now, going forward, of that team of four people is to monitor the flow of jobs coming in, watch out for those circumstances where there is likely to be a fall down of the automatic allocation and prioritisation processes and make sure those jobs are navigated through the process.

There are also other resources that were stood up last year along with that where the focus is more on analysing and learning from those cases where the outcome was not what we would have wished for and using those to inform improvements to the system itself.

MR BRADDOCK: Talking about Fix My Street software as it currently stands, figure 2 of the government submission highlights the improvements made to the citizen communication through the remediation program. I just wanted to check whether all the elements identified in figure 2 are currently in place for Fix My Street as accessible by residents of the ACT?

Ms Cheyne: Let me just pull it up.

MR BRADDOCK: Page 12 of the government's submission.

Ms Cheyne: Whether all of those ticks are currently accessible?

MR BRADDOCK: Yes.

Ms Cheyne: That is my understanding, but Mr Mudge might correct me.

Mr Mudge: Thanks, Minister. Just going to page 12, that is the work by the various touch points, is that what we are talking about?

MR BRADDOCK: Yes.

Mr Mudge: Sorry, I could not quite hear the question.

MR BRADDOCK: The question is: for residents accessing Fix My Street right this moment, is that the experience that they are having?

Mr Mudge: Yes. Not for all job types, but for most of them. We have automated feedback when they submit, there are updates when people need to provide more information and closure emails. I think the very last one we implemented from November last year where we have got that sort of five smiley to not-so-smiley feedback loop as well to figure out which job types are more problematic than others.

MR BRADDOCK: So you said not for all job types. Is there a reasoning behind which job types may tick off these elements and which may not?

Mr Mudge: There are some very different and complex workloads depending on the job type. There are 117, I think, different job types that you can submit. Some get outsourced to third-party vendors and are more automated, and we cannot control all of those individual touch points.

Ms Cheyne: Street lights is a good example.

Mr Mudge: Yes, it is. Street lights is a good example where we have made some really significant improvements over the last 12 to 18 months. A bit like the email example for Snap Send Solve, that used to get emailed across to the third-party provider, now a full real-time automatic system sends it across. They address it in their system, send a closure message back to us and we can notify the citizen straight away as well. That has not just resulted in many, many fewer touch points for staff and citizens but it has also improved the average time to close for certain jobs from 30 days down to, I think, three, from memory.

MR BRADDOCK: Yesterday we received evidence of a case study from Pedal Power who logged jobs to track the, through this workflow, and they found that a number of these elements were not met. You might have to take it on notice when we actually publish that evidence tomorrow.

Mr Mudge: Yes, and it will also depend on when they last submitted. We certainly looked through the submissions to the inquiry and quite a few who said, “I didn’t get X” or “I am missing this,” had submitted a job before we made the recent improvements that will address their concerns. So that might be the case, but I would need to look at the specifics of it as well.

Ms Cheyne: So I can just give you some high level examples. There might be a footpath request that the panel in the footpath is lifting, or whatever that might be. That might be something our crews are able to attend to immediately with their grinding machinery or it might be more significant and we need to add it to a program of works or it might already be in a program of works. So that is kind of the different journey that that might take.

Pedal Power might also be using Fix My Street to say, “There is a missing link here.” So a missing link might be a few centimetres but it might also be a kilometre. So, again, those suggestions are triaged according to profile, need, other data and what we might have on hand. So those are probably some immediate examples that would not follow that trajectory.

MR BRADDOCK: We might park that question because we will put it on notice once the evidence is published.

Ms Cheyne: Okay.

MR BRADDOCK: The next question I had was in terms of this concept of no wrong door. We cannot expect the residents of Canberra to be able to identify whether something is actually an ACT governance asset or does it belong to another entity like Icon Water or ActewAGL. We have received evidence that the ACT government is basically feeding back to the resident who has made the Fix My Street request saying, “You need to go and contact these people.” Why do we not just forward that request onto the relevant agency?

Ms Cheyne: Because both we lose control of the communications and so does the resident. So if our systems were better integrated with our telcos and our utilities providers—sure—referring it on would be fine, or if the numbers of requests that we were getting were smaller—sure—we would be able to have that incorporation. We do not. Where our investment has been is making sure that within our own remit, our own ACT government assets, the front end to the back end are all talking to each other.

One of the anomalies that is not consistent with that is street lights and that is its own separate process. But effectively yes, we could absolutely just hit forward. But that means—let’s say it is Icon—if Icon responds to us then we need to take the information and respond to the constituent. The constituent might be unhappy and so then the constituent provides more information through us back to Icon. You can imagine that

every time there is a touch point, that is a cost.

And so without having integrated systems where it makes sense and where entities like Icon or Evo have their own portals for issues to be submitted, it is more efficient for everyone—including the constituent—to go directly to the person who is responsible for the asset. Then they can get the updates directly rather than through a third party.

MR BRADDOCK: How is the constituent necessarily meant to know that this is the relevant pathway they should follow in the first case without accidentally going to the wrong entity?

Ms Cheyne: Well, the first thing is to look. If it has a “T” on it, that is Telstra. You would be surprised just how often we have those and people do not necessarily know. If it looks like there is burst water it could be us with the stormwater network, but it is potentially more likely to be Icon Water. If there is an electricity line down, it is not us; it is going to be Evo. So those things I think are relatively straightforward, but where we think there might be some confusion or where we can assist people we do provide some extra information when you are submitting the form.

Ultimately, we would like to capture people as they are submitting so they do not waste their time following it through and then getting a “Go away”—it is not a “Go away”; it is a “Please go here.” Ideally, we would like to capture them before then. And so where we have seen things that are consistently reported to us in those different job types, there might be something that comes up saying, “Hey, did you know XYZ?”

A good example might be graffiti. Sometimes we get people writing in about the legal graffiti walls saying there is graffiti on a legal graffiti wall. So now when you go to report graffiti it actually says, “If it is relating to a wall, maybe just check that it is not one of our legal graffiti sites before you report it.” So we are trying to be useful to people rather than waste their time.

MR BRADDOCK: There was feedback received in terms of the ability to be able to see if someone else has already logged a request on a particular issue. That could be really useful in preventing duplicate jobs and requests coming in. Has the government given consideration to such a capability, and if not, why not?

Ms Cheyne: Yes, we did. In fact, it did exist for a period of time. It sounds eminently sensible until human behaviour is factored in. I expect all of us have experienced where someone goes, “There’s an issue on my street. Let’s get all my neighbours to submit the same Fix My Street.” That immediately goes into the system and people have to review it. We now have much more sophisticated triaging and identification of similar jobs, and you can see that in that figure we were talking about, but probably two years ago we did not. And so there was a perception in the community that the more people that submit a job the more likely it is to get attention. That is not great for a whole lot of reasons. It is effectively saying the squeaky wheel gets the attention rather than the issue that is of greatest importance or greatest safety concern.

Also it gives an impression that reactive maintenance is our posture. We actually want to move away from reactive maintenance because the costs start compounding pretty considerably. So doing things proactively and keeping things to a schedule, especially

where they are routine like mowing, weed spraying, those sort of things, that is where we want to be putting in the effort.

So you can see how someone might be like, “Hmm, streetlight. Well, nothing’s happened. But the government has identified it so ten more of us need to submit a Fix My Street.” Now the systems are much better at identifying the same jobs. It does not mean that your specific request is lost, but it does mean that on our back end we are not having to send it through to the team over and over to go, “Oh, yeah, got this one. Oh, yeah, we’ve got this one.”

Especially with streetlights, if there is a fault and it has been more than 10 days—guess what—it is a cable fault; I can guarantee it in most cases. That takes a long time for us to find a solution to, often because getting into where the fault actually exists requires going underground and all sorts of other things. So lots of people submitting about a fixed light that is broken is not going to help us do it any faster effectively. In fact, it may slow it down.

MR BRADDOCK: My question was actually coming at it from the other way—if someone goes on to the site and sees someone has already logged a job about the broken street light, they may not bother.

Ms Cheyne: You would think that is how people behave, and it is not.

THE CHAIR: So there is no way to see that? There is no reporting, is there? No.

Ms Cheyne: Perhaps if you went to log it and then the system was like, “No, someone’s has already logged it.” But I think there is variability in that you might think it is a streetlight issue but it is something else and then you miss the opportunity to record it. So we prefer people to report it, but our back end system consolidates duplicates, and that is where we want the effort to be. We do publish a lot more information than we ever have about routine maintenance and when you can expect things to happen. Cable faults, in particular, have their own web page.

MR WERNER-GIBBINGS: You did touch upon this at start—an investigation of the utility Snap Send Solve, but my question is a bit broader. Have other models or mechanisms been considered either replace the Fix My Street system or be in addition to? Has that sort of stuff been checked out?

Ms Cheyne: To an extent. I would say in my time—that is probably the extent I can talk about—probably in that January, February, March period I was meeting with depot crews—new minister out and about trying to understand issues—and I saw the pressure on our crews that Fix My Street and the requests being put through it was putting on them. Again, mowing is a great example. It was sunny than rainy constantly and that meant the ground was always wet—perfect growing conditions. But it meant that mowers effectively could not get to mow the grass because they would get bogged.

And I can tell you now, if you have met any of our amazing mowing operators, they love mowing. They are good at it, they are experts at it and they love nothing more than the mowing season getting underway. And not being able to get out there and mow has a big enough impact on their mental health then having thousands of Fix My Street

requests coming through saying, “Hey, you missed a spot.” “Hey, this is growing really quickly.” “Hey, why have not you come to this bog yet?”

So there was a point when I did consider turning off Fix My Street completely simply because the backlog was so great, because of the mental health impacts it was having on our operational staff and because it effectively was not connecting to the back end properly either. And so, as you heard, things were bouncing around. But what we were able to do with a dedicated team was effectively bring people together and start mapping things better and integrating things better.

I am glad we did not turn it off. In fact, I think as much as Fix My Street as a brand can get a bad rap, the fact that we have seen requests from the community largely stay consistent over the last few years shows that by and large it still is trusted as a model for the community. You might get frustrated with it, you might not always get the response that you are looking for, but by and large people are finding it easy to use.

MR WERNER-GIBBINGS: That is interesting. You have talked, Minister, about the upgrades and the changes to the way the system works, and some of those changes have been implemented quite recently. Is the impact of those changes to enhance Fix My Street being measured? How do we know if they are making a difference?”

Ms Cheyne: I think probably the best example I can give you is that the average resolution time for Fix My Street requests in 2023 was 99 days; in 2024 it was 34; and this year it is 16. It is a whole range of different things, but jobs are not duplicated so crews are not going to a job that has already been addressed and has been done because we are able to identify where there are duplicates. The system enhancements mean that when you put a request in, it is more likely to go to the right area than it previously was when it would be bouncing around and being referred to different entities. I think that stat speaks for itself, but I think Ms Chan has something to add, which would be helpful.

Ms Chan: Thank you for the question. Another statistic that might be helpful is Fix My Street handles almost 50,000 reports every year. Prior to the improvements we would have had at any given time, around about 38,000 jobs open. Currently that is down to about 12,000 because things are getting resolved faster but also potentially because people are getting the information that they need.

One of the other things we have done is a lot of improvements to provide information back to the customer—when things are in progress, when things are closed. We are trying to give them better information about where their job is up to, if something is being resolved, what that means and how that has happened. So these are the ways that we look at what the system tries to achieve, and they are some of the figures to show that.

THE CHAIR: Minister, you referred to the mowing team. Does a request go straight to the mowing team? Like, do the boots-on-the-ground people see that request or does it go to a team that triages it for them? I know you have got a plan; maybe mowing might not be the right one.

Ms Cheyne: Ms Marriage can talk about what it looks like from once we get through the customer-facing to how it translates to our crews.

Ms Marriage: The requests go immediately out to our regional teams, depending on where the location is identified in the request. They then have a depot support officer out there who does the first assessment and works out which of the crews needs to go out there, and if it requires inspection whether it requires just immediate action. So that accounts for mowing, spray programs, cleaning programs, litter picking. All of those things go out directly to those regional crews.

THE CHAIR: When Transport Canberra and City Services merged with environment and planning how did resourcing go? Did we have to lose any staff in the teams out in the areas? Have we managed to maintain the same staff allocation?

Ms Cheyne: There is no considerable change in terms of FTE for crews on the ground as a result of the MOG. What I would say—in fact, Ms Marriage and I were talking about earlier today—is opportunities lie in better understanding in terms of management of some assets. For example, the Parks and Conservation Service are weed management experts and have a range of exciting equipment available to them. We also have weed management experts in City Services who are doing the urban areas. Sometimes those urban areas are right up against land PCS manages, and now the teams are not merging necessarily, but they are communicating, sharing resources and identifying what might be the best approach to the management there. So while the MOG has not delivered an FTE uplift in and of itself, a capability and capacity uplift I would say is underway.

THE CHAIR: I am interested if you could explain the ratio of admin, IT staff and boots on the ground. Do we have an understanding of what that looks like?

Ms Cheyne: I think I am going to take that on notice. But what I can talk about broadly is there are three regions—the north, central and south. They then have smaller depots that report to regional managers. Charnwood is like a little satellite depot, but Belconnen is the big depot. Then Nicholls is the other depot in the north. They are all filled with operational crew. Then regional managers work to a handful of people in Sue's team who do mowing coordination, planning, and then there will be some fleet and other admin. Then as it relates to Fix My Street, we have had a task force that has been operating to effectively drive these improvements.

THE CHAIR: Okay, you will take that on notice.

Ms Cheyne: Yes, we will give you the numbers, but that is kind of what it looks like.

MR EMERSON: I want to ask about follow-up at the end of jobs specifically related to footpaths. When someone reports a damaged footpath that is in urgent need of repair, hopefully someone comes, marks it for repair and it gets repaired. All clear. What is the process when someone comes to have a look and says, "Look, these are aesthetic cracks; it's not really a trip hazard and we've got all this other work we've got to do"? How is that communicated back to the person who logged request?

Ms Cheyne: Great question. There are probably a few people who can assist with this, but this is one of probably the most recent improvements that is still rolling out. What I would say is probably one of the most frustrating things for any of us, MLAs or

otherwise, is putting in a Fix My Street and then getting an email or checking your account and it says it is resolved. And you do not know what that means. Resolved could be closed because what are you talking about? Resolved could be that it is aesthetic only and we are not going to do anything. It could be, “We addressed it that day, and when you next see it you’re going to be impressed.” It could be anything.

And so what we have been working on the last little while—by little while I would probably say from March this year; I think May is when we really started putting in a lot of the changes—is that our crews who are out there are able to select that something might be added to a routine maintenance schedule and that this is going to be picked up in the usual workload. They might be able to say the issue has been added to a program of future works.

If someone is requesting something new that requires a capital expenditure we might say, “This might not be the best way to request this. It might be better through a budget submission,” or something like that. And then to the matter of what you are talking about, what I would hope is that now—again this is pretty recent—that our crews are able to say, “Appreciate that’s not pleasant to look at, but it’s functional and there’s not a safety issue identified. We’ll keep monitoring it, but for now, no action.” That might not be satisfying to the person making the request but, ultimately, we trust our crews as well. Mr Rampton might be able to expand.

Mr Rampton: Thanks, Minister, and I have read and acknowledge the privilege statement. For everybody’s awareness, I met with Mr Emerson this morning and we talked around paths for half an hour, and it was a really good conversation. We talked about how when we do get a request through Fix My Street, the system then flicks it straight to our asset database and our asset management system. Our inspectors we have across our asset base will get out there as quickly as they can.

When they go out to site—particularly with path—we have a rating system, everywhere from one to five. One, would be we need to do something immediately, we need to do a make-safe treatment—that could be to use some cold mix or may be a grinding methodology—everything down to a five, which could be some cracking that does not necessarily represent a risk or a trip hazard and is generally cosmetic. So we are categorising live in the field.

That then comes back to our operational teams and we will then either create packages for our external contractors or use our internal crew to look to action those items. Generally we bunch it up geographically so we get efficiency in what we do and we can then get more done per day. That is generally how we would do it from when it comes through on Fix My Street through to my team.

MR EMERSON: Then in terms of that final point the minister was talking about, are we now at the point where that kind of assessment is being communicated back to the person who has lodged that request, or is that something that is to be rolled out in the coming months?

Mr Rampton: As the minister said, it is early in that process. We are working through that with our triage team at the moment so the feedback can go to the team which then send out the appropriate response.

MR EMERSON: So not happening yet, but coming. You mentioned, Minister, it is one of the things we hear about the most—it is marked as complete but they did not do anything. It might be frustrating, but I think people would say think it was fair enough if they knew you had looked at it and you are not going to fix it. Then they would not need to log in again and report it because it has been marked complete.

Ms Cheyne: Exactly right.

MR EMERSON: Yes. Or it might be one of us.

Ms Cheyne: Yes. And ultimately in my Tara Perfect World I would love it to be so integrated then and there that we can say, “Yes, inspected, confirmed, and this is the action,” and then when it is resolved, again, take a picture there, send it through so it is actioned when it is resolved send through what the resolution looks like. But the reality is we do have different levels of computer and app literacy among our crews; they may be mowing experts and road and footpath experts but might not necessarily be as functionally across what they might need to do. And this is a big change ultimately. This is probably the change I have wanted to see the most and that I have probably personally driven the most, but I do recognise it is going to take time. So going through those triage officers who are embedded in the team is a good first step.

MR EMERSON: When a case is closed and the resident is not really happy with the fact that it has been closed, based on what they are seeing, how is it then matched? Some people will say, “Okay, I give up on it and I am cynical about using Fix My Street”. Others will lodge another request for the same item. If they do that second option, how is that then connected with their initial request, and is there a way to communicate with them why this happened?”

Mr Rampton: It is similar to when we will get multiple requests for an outage on a streetlight. We may get 10 work requests but it ends up into one work order where we align them and we say there is only one problem. So, for example, if we have gone out to a path and done a make-safe treatment, we may then close that particular work order or request, but then we will also created another work order for the replacement of that panel at some point into the future. It is probably that part that does not necessarily get fed back, and I think that is an area we could improve on.

MR EMERSON: So even when that happens down the track, you are not going to really be able to report back if the initial request has already been completed, as in, “By the way, a couple of years ago we put in the asphalt and it was looking a little bit better and now we are finishing the job with a replacement panel”?”

Mr Rampton: I think it should probably be, “We’ve made the site safe, and yes, we’ve put it onto a program for future replacement.” It is probably harder for us to come back at a later date and say, “Hey, we did that for you.”

Ms Cheyne: Not off the table, but let’s get our comms right in the first instance.

MR EMERSON: The first part first, yes.

Ms Cheyne: Yes.

THE CHAIR: How does the other category get monitored? That was a question that we had from one of the groups yesterday. Is that part of the triage team?

Ms Cheyne: I cannot answer that, so someone put your hand up.

Ms Chan: There is a category called “City Services—Other”. So we do try to make the categories very clear and easy for the person just to select and click. But we do have that other category. If something comes in from the other category, it is mainly triaged by the triage team that Mr Marshall described.

THE CHAIR: This question came from Mr Wallace yesterday. I am wondering if there is a rolling program to consider issues mainly with regard to accessibility footpaths. If you are blind or in a cart, how do we manage that? Is there a proactive way that your teams look at footpaths in the ACT or are we just relying on people taking the photo and submitting the jobs?

Ms Cheyne: It is both. Again, perfect world, no jobs would have to be submitted, we would be across them all, we would have a plan and we would be able to detail that. Honestly, I would prefer it to be 80 per cent that and then 20 per cent of what have we missed or what has changed or what has happened recently that we need to know about that we have not seen?

I think probably two years ago Fix My Street, for some people became a. “Nothing will happen unless I report it”. Not ideal. And like I said, that is where the costs compound. We are pretty clear on roads and then I will go to paths, but for roads there is an annual road resurfacing program. We publish that at the start of each financial year or a little bit after. That shows this is where roads are going to be treated and what the treatment will be. Because we can only real do hot mix when it is warm and cold mix when it is cold.

Then there are other works where, as we said, we may not be replacing an entire path but replacing a few panels in a footpath. Those are identified on a weekly basis on the community path website. Again, our weekly maintenance page lets people know which suburbs are going to have that repair done and what streets and then you can go through and see exactly where you can expect to see that.

Then there are the missing links that we know about, and some of those we have at various stages of feasibility, design and then construction. Then there are others that we know, so those ones are published. And then there are other ones that we know of that we might not necessarily have the budget or be able to address.

But if there is an accessibility concern I would say that is elevated above something that is a nice-to-have or a desire line or something like that. So when I talk about accessibility, I am probably talking about kerb ramps in particular.

Mr Rampton: I was just going to add to that. Definitely where we are notified of a member of the public who is struggling with accessible access that it is given a higher priority than other jobs. Our team are always on the lookout for those sorts of things in

the network when they are out inspecting. But we do have quite a range of age of suburbs that were built with different standards and things like that. So there are a lot of areas that do not necessarily have kerb ramps and things like, but if we have a specific user who is struggling in an area, we look to try and help if we can.

THE CHAIR: I appreciate that. I think the concern from the community is whether it is up to us to them to tell you or is there a rolling program? It is comforting to know that people are watching as they are out and about and I would hope then an issue would be put on the list.

Ms Cheyne: We try to be transparent about what we know and what we are doing to the extent that we can. But we always welcome hearing feedback, especially if it is really affecting a particular user who desperately needs that access.

MR BRADDOCK: We spent a lot, in terms of making the back end of the system more efficient and effective. How do you essentially ensure that the front end is what the consumer actually needs and is able to interact with in an effective way as well?

Ms Cheyne: Great question. There have been quite a lot of improvements at the front end, some of which I have touched on so I will not go into considerable detail with things like, “If you’re wanting to report this, this might actually be the better pathway,” or “Please make sure you’re reporting the location of the issue, not your home, unless it is out the front of your home.” That really was an issue that was coming up a lot.

There has been a lot of thinking done about do we base the pathway for a request from the location and then what is the issue, and then the issue in a more specific way, or do we go what is the issue first and then identify the location. So that mapping has been under constant review. And as I think Mr Mudge said, there are over 110 different pathways of reporting different things to make sure they go to the right team. And it can just really depend on who is responsible for an asset, even within government.

We have tried to make it so it is reasonable for the consumer or the customer and do the fixes on our end to make sure it gets to the right team and that it is intuitive rather than forcing them to think like us and have intimate understanding of what our asset base is and who is responsible for what.

I am always happy to take more feedback, but there has been a lot of work over the last little while, and I think we have done a pretty great job, especially when it comes to the responsiveness of the website on mobiles. And I know, because I use it often.

But Ms Chan and Mr Mudge can talk you through some of the other changes that we have made.

Ms Chan: Thank you, Minister. The minister has already covered some of the things we try to do to make it easier before the customer even starts the form. So the weekly update information about what mowing programs and regular programs are happening, that is already on the front page. Having on the landing page what Fix My Street can address and what it cannot address, these are things before people even get to the form to try and make it easier for them to get the outcome they want.

Once you do get into the form, we have moved some of the topical issues up the front. For example, during the election period the critical thing that people wanted to report was signage. We put that up front so it was easier—a button to click to find that easily.

We do want to make sure that people provide enough information for us. So there has been a lot of thought put in to making that easy for people to provide the right information. We have put in the right guidance for people. There is now a map function where people can pin the address.

We have tried to make it with the categories that there are fewer clicks for people. For example, on the streetlights, bright streetlight was a common issue, so that is now a dropdown thing you can click on. We have separated, for example, mowing from maintenance. We have tried to make those categories clearer for people to select the right categories so that it goes through to the right team.

MR BRADDOCK: Ms Chan, sorry to interrupt, but the question was more about by what process are we getting that user feedback or input into process rather than the actual improvements themselves. They are great to hear about, but I want the confidence that the consumer is not lost when you are designing the system.

Mr Mudge: I am happy to talk to that a little bit. We take across the territory a user-centric, design-thinking approach when we design new systems or major improvements. For Fix My Street, in particular, a couple of years ago we commissioned an external firm that came in to help us with that. They looked at what Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane do. They did user research interviews with representative members of the public to ask if you were using this system, what makes sense and what does not? They even did some fairly technical A/B-type testing to figure out which was more intuitive or easier to use. All of that sort of reporting is fed into our backlog and guides future work as well. So getting actual end users into that testing work is really important.

Important as well, as the minister said, is responding to people logging things. This was a bit difficult. I think I mentioned earlier, we have now got that one to five rating that is helping inform what we should look at next.

MR BRADDOCK: Is it possible to get a report on that consumer rating feedback they provided, or just further information? I would just be interested to see the consumer feedback.

Ms Cheyne: Yes, we will see what we can give you.

Mr Mudge: It is about 58 per cent net positive over the last six months. It has not been going long enough to do much trend analysis, but we have certainly got some data.

Ms Cheyne: I would say it is a start. It is not detailed analysis, because you can imagine that people are unhappy if you do not do exactly what they would like or imagine the fix to be. But it could also be the process just did not meet their expectation. So they are the things that over time we would like to delve into further, but having a net positive is certainly a good start.

MR WERNER-GIBBINGS: I have got two questions—you might be able to just answer them with a number. A submission yesterday from Living Streets said the time taken for Fix My Street for an experienced occasional user is 30 minutes per report. I think by now I am an experienced occasional user, and 30 minutes is longer than I take. Do you have data on how long it takes to lodge a report through Fix My Street? Can you take it on notice perhaps? Is that measured?

Ms Cheyne: Let's see what we have. What I can tell you is Fix My Street will log you out.

MR WERNER-GIBBINGS: After how long?

Ms Cheyne: Not very long, because guess who starts Fix My Street requests and then gets distracted? Me. And so I often come back and say, "What happened," or "How come I'm on the Access Canberra web page?" It is because it has logged me out, and that is because I am signed in with my digital account and that is to keep those things intact and not susceptible to outside forces. So it does log you out if you are inactive. So that might skew our stats as well.

I would be enormously surprised if there was any indication that people are taking half an hour of clicking around, cannot find what they are looking for, logging in, logging out, whatever it might be, to put a report in. There are effectively five steps on average, given what the issue is. If it is requesting something new, that might be where we are asking for some more detail, so at least it is captured even if we are not able to action it because it requires budget funding or whatever that might be. That might take someone a bit longer to write out.

But I would say with the combination of taking the photo, identifying the location on a map, providing a brief description of what the issue is and what you want changed, effectively identifying the asset that needs repairing and then getting to a confirmation page, that should be pretty quick. I would love to get some examples from them about what they might be experiencing that is taking 30 minutes. I think it would log you out if it was taking that long, but maybe only if you are inactive. Anyway.

THE CHAIR: On behalf of the committee I would like to thank our witnesses today who have assisted the committee through their experienced knowledge. We also thank broadcasting and Hansard for their support.

There have been some questions taken on notice. If any member wishes to put a question on notice, please upload them to the portal as soon as possible but no later than five business days from today. The meeting is now adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 5.02 pm.