Consultation Process, Transparency and Psychological Safety

Earlier communication regarding headcount and roles

- **Q1.** In early meetings, employees were advised there would be no loss of headcount and potentially additional headcount. Some employees understood this to mean there would be no loss of roles or employment.

  How does this earlier communication align with the current proposal, which identifies roles for deletion?

  A. Earlier discussions always focused on the proposed new capabilities for TDS and the expected increase in overall headcount. They did not address individual job losses or represent that every existing role would continue unchanged.

  An increase in overall headcount can occur alongside changes to individual positions, including roles proposed for removal, redesign or creation as part of the future structure.

  We acknowledge that some employees may have understood the earlier messaging differently. The detailed position impacts are now set out in the proposed RMP and will be considered before the structure and RMP are finalised. Any impacted employees will also have the applicable RMP stages open to them, including applying under the EOI stage or the mobility process.

Psychological safety during consultation

- **Q2.** Employees have raised concerns that they do not feel safe asking questions or providing critical feedback because of concern about potential negative consequences.

  What measures are being taken to ensure employees can participate openly and safely in the consultation process?

  A. Employees are encouraged to raise questions, concerns and alternative views as part of the consultation process. Providing feedback or participating through a representative will not, in itself, result in adverse treatment.

  Employees had several options for providing feedback, including through the consultation form, by email, through their manager (individual and team meetings), in meetings with a support person, or through the PSA and Legal Aid NSW PSA representatives.

  Any concern about adverse treatment arising from participation in consultation should be raised so that it can be appropriately addressed.

Adequacy of the consultation period

- **Q3.** How can the consultation process be considered meaningful and informed when employees have not been provided with sufficient detail regarding proposed changes to existing roles and are expected to assess a significant organisational restructure within two weeks while maintaining full BAU responsibilities?

A. We acknowledge that employees have been considering a significant proposal alongside their BAU responsibilities. Employees have been able to use work time to review the consultation material and engage with managers and TDS Executive, including through additional meetings where further discussion or clarification was sought. The consultation period was considered reasonable having regard to the information provided and the opportunities for employees and their representatives to participate. Feedback received through consultation will be considered before the RMP and structure are finalised

- **Q4.** What considerations were given to determining that a two-week consultation period would be sufficient given the scale and complexity of the proposed restructure?

A. The consultation period was considered reasonable having regard to the nature of the proposed changes, the information provided and the opportunities for employees and their representatives to participate. We also considered the volume and type of feedback that was received as the consultation period progressed.
Employees have been able to use work time to review the material, seek clarification and engage with managers and TDS Executive where required.
All feedback is being considered before the RMP and structure are finalised.

- **Q5.** How has management accounted for employees' ongoing operational responsibilities when determining the consultation timeframe? Has dedicated work time been provided?

A. We acknowledge employees have continued to manage BAU responsibilities during consultation. Employees have been able to use work time to review the material, prepare feedback, seek clarification and engage with managers and TDS Executive where required. These arrangements were intended to provide employees with a reasonable opportunity to participate in consultation alongside their operational responsibilities.

- **Q6.** How can employees provide meaningful and informed feedback where updated RDs, specific changes to duties and delegations, or operational implications of changed reporting arrangements have not been clearly communicated?

A. We acknowledge your view that further information is required. However, the concern does not identify a specific role description, duty, delegation or reporting arrangement where information is considered insufficient, and we have not received any specific feedback of this nature form our people
Employees and their representatives as part of the consultation were able to identify specific information gaps, seek clarification and raise concerns about proposed role impacts during consultation. Any specific matters raised are being considered before the RMP and structure are finalised.

- **Q7.** Will management consider extending the consultation period to allow employees sufficient time to review information, seek clarification, consult their union and prepare informed submissions?

A. The request to extend the consultation period has been considered and declined, and the consultation will conclude as scheduled.

Employees and their representatives have had opportunities to review the material, seek clarification and provide feedback through the available consultation channels, including during work time.

Feedback received during consultation is being considered before the RMP and proposed structure are finalised.

- **Q8.** Where additional information or updated RDs are provided after consultation has commenced, will employees receive a further reasonable opportunity to consider and respond before decisions are finalised?

  A. Where new or revised information materially changes an employee's proposed impact, the implications will be considered as part of the consultation process before final decisions are made, including whether a further opportunity for the employee and, where applicable, their representative to respond is appropriate.
  An update or clarification will not, in itself, result in an extension.

Consideration and response to feedback

- **Q9.** Will changes arising from consultation occur before final approval, rather than during implementation?
  A. Yes. In some cases that has already occurred and be within the updated final RMP

- **Q10.** Will employees and the PSA receive a consolidated response showing the feedback received, management's response and what changed as a result?
  A. Employees and PSA will be advised of consultation outcomes and Final RMP

Notification of directly affected employees

- **Q11.** How many employees were emailed on the morning of 20 October 2026 with less than 24 hours' notice to attend an individual “directly affected” meeting?
  A. Referring to the PSA email dated 4 November and noting that you will be sending this Q+A correspondence to all your members, due to confidentiality we are unable to provide employee specific information on this

Evidence and Rationale for the Proposed Operating Model

Problem the restructure is intended to solve

- **Q12.** What specific organisational, operational or service-delivery problems is the proposed restructure intended to address, and what evidence demonstrates that the current structure is contributing to those problems?

A. The proposed restructure is intended to strengthen TDS's strategic capability, service delivery, governance and accountability, and establish a more contemporary, service-oriented technology operating model.

The RMP identifies fragmented capability ownership, unclear accountabilities, duplicated effort, inconsistent service delivery and limited visibility of technology priorities as areas the proposed operating model seeks to address.

- **Q13.** What measurable outcomes or improvements are expected from the proposed structure, and what measures will be used to determine whether those outcomes have been achieved?

  A. The proposed structure is intended to strengthen strategic capability, accountability, governance and service delivery, improve technology maturity and project delivery outcomes, and reduce operational risk.
  The RMP sets out these intended outcomes but does not prescribe specific performance measures or targets for assessing them.
  If the proposed structure proceeds, appropriate measures for monitoring the effectiveness of the operating model can be considered and reviewed as part of implementation.

- **Q14.** If post-implementation review shows that the proposed structure has not achieved its intended service, operational or workforce outcomes, what process will be used to reassess the operating model and make further structural or resourcing changes?

  A. If the proposed structure proceeds, any future structural or resourcing changes would be considered through the applicable organisational processes at that time.

Basis for structural decisions

- **Q15.** What analysis supports the deletion or redesign of each affected function?

  A. The proposed role removals and redesigns reflect the broader TDS operating model and workforce design set out in the RMP, including future service needs, capability requirements, clearer accountability and organisational priorities.

- **Q16.** What alternative structures were considered and how were they assessed?

  A. The proposed structure was informed by consideration of the current TDS operating model, future capability requirements, an independent review and relevant NSW Government technology operating models.

- **Q17.** Where there are two roles with the same or substantially similar RDs but only one role is retained, what objective criteria and assessment process determined which position would continue?

  A. We had one example of this and the RMP approach has been discussed and will be adjusted accordingly. The role filling stages set out in the RMP provides further detail.

Operating Model Review evidence

Context: The ICT Operating Model Review was commissioned to identify current-state gaps and pain points, develop and assess future-state options, consider workloads and service delivery, identify required skills and capabilities, consider career pathways, recommend a preferred operating model and provide an implementation roadmap.

- **Q18.** Can the findings, analysis, options assessment and recommendations arising from that review be provided to employees so they can understand the evidentiary basis for the structure on which they are being consulted?

  A. The independent review was only one input into developing the proposed structure but is not being provided as part of the consultation material.
  The rationale, proposed operating model and role impacts relevant to consultation are set out in the RMP.

Stage 2 operational analysis

Context: Employees were advised in March 2026 that Stage 2 of the Operating Model Review would examine processes, workloads and service delivery and inform team structures, reporting lines and ways of working.

- **Q19.** What workload and service-delivery analysis was completed through Stage 2, and how did those findings inform the proposed staffing levels, particularly Service Desk Level 1 and Level 2?

  A. The proposed Service Desk staffing levels form part of the broader TDS operating model and workforce design, having regard to future service requirements, capability needs, service ownership and the proposed allocation of support functions across TDS.
  The RMP does not rely on a specific workload measure as the sole basis for the proposed Level 1 or Level 2 staffing levels. The proposed arrangements reflect the future operating model and remain open to consultation.
  Feedback regarding Level 1 or Level 2 workload, service impacts or staffing requirements is being considered before the RMP and structure are finalised.

Timing of operational data

Context: First Time Fix statistics were requested from Service Desk management on 23 October 2026, after formal consultation had commenced.

- **Q20.** What Service Desk performance, workload and operational data had been considered when developing the proposed structure, and how will information subsequently gathered during consultation be considered before the proposed structure is finalised?

  A. The Service Desk information subsequently requested was for a separate operational and business as usual purpose and was not part of developing the proposed RMP.

Workforce Planning, Workload and Capacity

Work performed by deleted positions

- **Q21.** For each TDS role proposed for deletion or reduction, what existing functions and accountabilities will:
    - cease;
    - transfer to another role or team;
    - be automated, moved to self-service or otherwise changed; or
    - continue elsewhere?

  A. The RMP sets out the proposed organisational and position-level impacts, including roles proposed to continue, change, be redesigned, removed or created.

  Detailed allocation of individual functions and accountabilities will be addressed through implementation with the relevant person and their leader where relevant.

- **Q22.** Where work will transfer or continue elsewhere, what analysis demonstrates that the receiving roles or teams have sufficient capacity and capability to undertake it?

  A. The proposed structure is designed to increase capability and capacity across TDS and better align functions with future service requirements.
  Where functions are proposed to move, associated capacity and capability requirements form part of the proposed operating model. Specific concerns regarding workload or service impacts will be considered before the RMP and structure are finalised.

Service Desk workforce modelling

- **Q23.** What workload and capacity modelling supports the proposed Service Desk structure?

  A. The proposed Service Desk structure forms part of the broader TDS operating model and workforce design, having regard to future service requirements and capability needs.

  Feedback regarding workload, capacity or service impacts is being considered before the RMP and structure are finalised

- **Q24.** How was the current distribution of work between Level 1 and Level 2 assessed, and what analysis supports reducing Level 2 capacity while retaining additional Level 1 capacity?

  A. Please refer to Q23 answer

Manager Service Desk functions

- **Q25.** What analysis was undertaken of the functions and responsibilities currently performed by the Manager Service Desk, and where will each of those responsibilities and accountabilities sit within the proposed structure?

  A. The proposed change reflects a shift toward stronger service management, continuous improvement and customer-focused service delivery.

The RMP proposes a new Service Delivery Manager role focused on service management, service lifecycle, reporting, continuous improvement, service levels and KPIs.

Technology, Digital Services & Partnerships management structure

Q26. What analysis supports the proposed management structure within Technology, Digital Services & Partnerships, including reporting relationships and spans of control, and how has management capacity been assessed against the number and complexity of functions for which each manager will be accountable?

A. The proposed management structure has been developed having regard to the TDS operating model, service and capability requirements, functional accountabilities and the independent ICT review. Reporting relationships and spans of control have been considered in the context of the nature and complexity of the functions being managed, with the aim of providing clear accountability and appropriate management oversight.

Business Partner resourcing

- **Q27.** What workload, demand and organisational analysis supports the proposed Business Partner structure across Grades 7/8, 9/10 and 11/12, and how will the responsibilities, accountabilities and capability expectations at each classification be differentiated?
  - **A.** The respective responsibilities and capability expectations are reflected in the proposed role descriptions and remain open to consultation before the RMP and structure are finalised
- **Q28.** Business partnership and stakeholder engagement activities are also currently undertaken through operational service-delivery roles. How was this existing work considered when determining the number, classification and required capacity of dedicated Business Partner positions?

  A. In developing the proposed model, consideration was given to business engagement and partnering activities currently undertaken across TDS, with the proposal intended to provide greater dedicated business-partnering capability.

Future ICT Service Delivery Model and Shift-Left Strategy

Level 1 and Level 2 service model

- **Q29.** Does the proposed reporting structure reflect an intention to change the current service-delivery model, particularly the allocation of application-specific support between Level 1 and Level 2?

  A. The proposed Service Desk arrangements form part of the broader service management and delivery model set out in the RMP. Detailed operational allocation of support activities between Level 1, Level 2 and specialist teams will be addressed through implementation where relevant.

- **Q30.** Will Level 1 become the primary point of contact for all application-related enquiries, with Level 2 responsible for escalations?

  A. The proposed Service Desk arrangements form part of the broader service management and delivery model. Detailed allocation and escalation of application support between Level 1, Level 2 and specialist teams will be addressed through implementation where relevant.

- **Q31.** How will Level 1 employees be adequately trained before changes to escalation arrangements or Level 2 staffing take effect?

  A. Where changes to Service Desk responsibilities or escalation arrangements require additional capability, appropriate training and knowledge transfer will be provided as part of implementation.
  This will support employees to undertake any changed responsibilities before the relevant arrangements are implemented.

- **Q32.** What safeguards and escalation arrangements will ensure complex incidents and business-critical application issues continue to be resolved promptly?.
  A. Appropriate incident management and escalation arrangements will continue to be maintained to support timely resolution of complex and business-critical issues.
  Any changes to those arrangements will be addressed through implementation to support service continuity.

Shift-left, automation and self-service

- **Q33.** Given the 2021 ICT Environment Review identified self-service, automation, process optimisation and capability uplift as mechanisms to reduce support demand, what analysis was undertaken before determining the proposed capacity of specialist resolver groups to identify work that could instead be shifted left through self-service, automation or increased Level 1 resolution?

  A. The proposed structure is based on TDS's current and future service and capability requirements. The 2021 ICT strategy and related material reflect an earlier point in TDS's development and do not, of themselves, determine the proposed future operating model. Detailed decisions regarding self-service, automation and allocation of support between service tiers are operational matters that can be considered through implementation and ongoing service management.

Service transition and project involvement

- **Q34.** How does the proposed TDS operating model ensure Service Desk representation in project planning, change management and transition-to-support activities so that operational readiness, customer impacts, knowledge, training and support requirements are addressed before services enter production?

A. The proposed operating model is intended to strengthen service management and transition-to-support arrangements.
Where services move into BAU support, appropriate operational readiness, Service Desk engagement, knowledge transfer and training requirements will be addressed through implementation.

Role Descriptions and Assessment of Role Change

Accuracy and availability of RDs

- **Q35.** Can all proposed RDs be reviewed for accuracy, consistency of role titles and current organisational terminology before finalisation, including references to ICT rather than TDS and inconsistent role titles?

  A. Yes. All proposed role descriptions will be reviewed as part of the consultation process, taking into account feedback received. This will include checking accuracy, consistency of role titles and alignment with current organisational terminology before finalisation.

- **Q36.** Can employees be provided with both the current and proposed RDs so changes to responsibilities, capabilities and expectations can be meaningfully compared?

  A. Current RD's are available on our Intranet site and the new RDs are available on the TDS RMP Sharepoint page. P&C are another avenue in which employees can request RD's.

No/minor change assessments

- **Q37.** Where existing roles are described as having "no/minor change", what methodology was used to reach that assessment where proposed RDs contain broader responsibilities, additional technical requirements or increased capability expectations?

  A. The proposed RMP applies standard role-impact categories based on the nature and extent of changes to a role's responsibilities, scope, reporting arrangements and purpose.

  Where changes are more significant, the role is considered through the appropriate redesigned or new-role classification. These proposed classifications remain open to consultation and will be reviewed before the RMP and role descriptions are finalised.

- **Q38.** How were updated RDs assessed against the overall capability requirements of the team, particularly where other roles and associated capabilities are proposed for removal?

  A. Proposed role descriptions were developed having regard to future team capability requirements, the NSW Public Sector Capability Framework and relevant role-description guidelines

- **Q39.** Where reporting lines have materially changed but the RD has not, how was the impact on responsibilities, accountability and role scope assessed?

A. A change in reporting line does not, of itself, mean a role's core responsibilities, accountability or scope have materially changed.
Where the reporting change results in a substantive change to the role, this has been considered through the consultation process.

Generic RDs

- **Q40.** Where roles previously reflected specific duties and specialist responsibilities but have now been consolidated into generic RDs, how will distinct role complexity, specialist expertise and responsibilities continue to be recognised?
A. Generic role descriptions provide consistent role purpose, capability and accountability expectations for roles at the same grade. Specialist expertise and responsibilities will continue to be recognised through functional responsibilities, work allocation and the capabilities required to perform the assigned work. Where responsibilities are materially different, these will be reflected and assessed in accordance with the RMP and applicable role evaluation processes.
- **Q41.** Will employees be expected to perform all duties contained within a generic RD, including duties outside their current area of specialisation?

A. No. Generic RDs define the overall role requirements; they do not mean every employee will perform every listed duty. Work will be allocated having regard to functional requirements, relevant capabilities and expertise.

Employees may undertake other duties within the reasonable scope and classification of their role as operational needs change.

- **Q42.** How will individual responsibilities and performance expectations be defined where employees at the same grade perform materially different functions?

A. Individual responsibilities and performance expectations will reflect assigned functions, work priorities and relevant capabilities, consistent with the role description and classification.

Application and Platform Specialist

- **Q43.** Why do Grade 7/8 Application and Platform Specialists have a common generic RD while proposed manager positions are aligned with individual technology areas such as Pega/Salesforce, MWZ, Operations and Microsoft?

A. A common Application and Platform Specialist RD provides consistent role expectations while allowing specialists to work across assigned technology streams.
The manager roles provide technology-specific leadership, prioritisation and oversight for their respective streams.

- **Q44.** How will specialist responsibilities and technical requirements for individual platforms be defined?

A. Specialist responsibilities and technical requirements will be aligned to the relevant platform or technology stream, within the common role expectations and capability requirements established for the role.

- **Q45.** Will managers responsible for specific technology platforms have RDs reflecting their specialist accountabilities?

  A. Yes.

Senior Business Analyst RD

- **Q46.** The proposed Senior Business Analyst RD appears to have an incomplete or omitted Behavioural Indicators section. Can a complete and final RD be provided to affected employees before any assessment, recruitment or placement process involving this role commences?

  A. Yes we will update that as we go through the finalisation of the RDs.

Records & Information reporting arrangements

- **Q47.** There appear to be inconsistencies between the proposed organisational chart and the RMP regarding reporting arrangements for Records & Information. Can the intended reporting structure be clarified and the relevant consultation documents corrected so employees can accurately understand the proposed model?

  A. The intended reporting arrangement is for the Principal Manager, Corporate Records and Information to report to the CIDO, with the Records and Information team reporting through to the Principal Manager.
  If there is an inconsistency in the consultation material, please identify the specific document or reference so it can be reviewed and corrected where required.

Role Evaluation, Classification and Capability Requirements

Consistency between grade and capability

- **Q48.** How were capability requirements used in evaluating and grading proposed TDS roles, given apparent inconsistencies where some Grade 7/8 roles have broader capability requirements than Grade 9/10 roles, and where the Service Delivery Manager and Principal Manager Service & Business Partnership share capability requirements despite different classifications?

  A. The proposed role descriptions have undergone an assessment against the NSW Public Sector Capability Framework and relevant role-description guidelines in line with the whole of NSW Government approach.
  Capability requirements and classifications will be reviewed as part of finalising the role descriptions, taking into account feedback received through consultation. Any identified inconsistencies will be considered through that process.

Application Specialist functions

- **Q49.** What analysis determined that responsibilities and capabilities currently associated with the Senior Application Specialist could appropriately be incorporated into the Grade 7/8 Application and Platform Specialist role, and was this considered as part of role evaluation and grading?

  A. The proposed Application and Platform Specialist role was developed having regard to the future capability requirements of the Applications function and the NSW Public Sector Capability Framework.
  The proposed responsibilities, capability requirements and classification will be reviewed as part of finalising the role description, taking into account feedback received through consultation.

New technical capabilities

- **Q50.** Where proposed RDs introduce new or expanded technical expectations such as DevSecOps, CI/CD pipelines and automation workflows, what capability-gap analysis has been undertaken and what training, development and transition arrangements will be provided?

  A. The proposed technical expectations reflect the future capability requirements of TDS and will be considered as part of the review and finalisation of the role descriptions.
  Where implementation identifies capability gaps associated with changed responsibilities, appropriate training, development and knowledge transfer will be provided to support employees in undertaking those responsibilities.

Project management

- **Q51.** Project management appears to have changed from a complementary to a required capability. What change in role responsibilities necessitated this, and how was the revised capability requirement considered when determining role equivalence and classification?

  A. Project delivery has been an existing capability across ICT and Digital Transformation and continues within the combined TDS function. The proposed structure builds on this existing capability while strengthening project delivery and change capability across TDS.
  Where project management requirements are reflected in proposed role descriptions, they will be considered as part of the review and finalisation of those roles, including against the NSW Public Sector Capability Framework and consultation feedback.

Formal role-evaluation process

- **Q52.** What job-evaluation process was applied to materially redesigned roles?

  A. Materially redesigned roles have been assessed having regard to the NSW Public Sector Capability Framework and relevant role-description guidelines.
  Proposed role requirements and classifications will be reviewed as part of finalising the role descriptions, including consideration of feedback received through consultation.

Business Analysis classifications

- **Q53.** What role evaluation and workforce analysis determined the proposed mix of Business Analyst and Senior Business Analyst positions, and how are the responsibilities, capability requirements and accountabilities differentiated between these classifications?

  A. The proposed Business Analyst and Senior Business Analyst roles were developed having regard to future TDS capability requirements, the NSW Public Sector Capability Framework and relevant role-description guidelines.
  The respective responsibilities, capability requirements and classifications are reflected in the proposed role descriptions and will be reviewed, including feedback received through consultation, before finalisation.

Cyber Security Governance, Independence and Leadership

Removal of dedicated Cyber Security leadership

- **Q54.** What objective criteria and assessment process were used to determine that the Principal Manager Cyber Security & ICT Risk position should be removed, and how was that decision assessed against the ongoing need for dedicated cyber security leadership, incident accountability, strategic direction, organisational risk management and continuity of capability?

  A. The proposed removal reflects the broader shift to an integrated Enterprise Architecture, Risk and Cyber Security operating model, with strategic cyber security and technology risk accountability proposed to sit with the Director, Enterprise Architecture and Risk while retaining dedicated specialist cyber security capability.
  Leadership capacity, accountability, continuity, escalation arrangements and the balance between strategic and operational cyber security remain relevant considerations through consultation before the proposed structure is finalised.

Operational cyber security leadership

- **Q55.** Under the proposed structure, who will hold day-to-day operational leadership and management responsibility for cyber security, including responsibility for prioritisation, escalation and coordination of work?

  A. Under the proposed structure, cyber security responsibility would sit within the Director, Enterprise Architecture and Risk portfolio, supported by dedicated specialist cyber security roles.
  If the proposed structure proceeds, detailed operational accountabilities, including prioritisation, escalation and coordination arrangements, will be clearly defined through implementation.

Independence of cyber security assurance

- **Q56.** Under the proposed operating model, how will cyber security assurance maintain appropriate independence from operational technology decision-making, including clear separation of responsibilities and effective mechanisms to challenge and escalate technology decisions where security or organisational risk concerns arise?

A. The proposed model will maintain appropriate cyber security governance, risk and assurance arrangements.

If the proposed structure proceeds, decision rights, escalation pathways and the separation between strategic assurance and operational responsibilities will be clearly defined through the operating arrangements.

Consistency across Principal Manager roles

- **Q57.** What objective criteria and assessment process were applied across existing Principal Manager Grade 11/12 roles to determine which functions would be retained, redesigned or removed?

  A. The proposed management structure reflects the future capability and leadership requirements of each TDS function rather than applying a uniform management model. For Cyber Security, the proposal introduces broader strategic leadership while retaining and increasing dedicated specialist cyber security capability.

Accountability, Role Boundaries and Service Ownership

Overall accountability and role boundaries

- **Q58.** Where responsibilities overlap across proposed TDS roles or teams, what analysis has been undertaken to clearly define service ownership, accountability, decision rights, escalation pathways and role boundaries within the future operating model?

  A. The proposed RMP establishes the organisational structure, functional accountabilities and role framework. Detailed service ownership, decision rights, escalation pathways and interfaces between teams will be clarified through implementation where required.

User access and permissions

- **Q59.** The proposed Application and Platform Specialist RD includes user access and permissions within platform administration, while these activities are also currently undertaken by the Service Desk. How will responsibility and accountability for access and permissions be defined between the Service Desk and Application and Platform Specialists to avoid duplication or unclear ownership?

  A. The proposed roles establish some broader functional responsibilities. Detailed ownership of access and permissions between the Service Desk and Application and Platform Specialists will be clearly defined through implementation to avoid duplication and ensure appropriate accountability.
  Any feedback on proposed role boundaries is being considered before the RMP and role descriptions are finalised.

Applications and database capability

- **Q60.** What assessment has been undertaken of the impact of the proposed structure on specialist application and database capability, including potential knowledge loss, succession planning, key-person dependencies and continuity of specialist expertise?

    A. The proposed structure has been considered having regard to future capability and service requirements, including the need to maintain specialist technology capability and continuity.

    Risks relating to specialist knowledge, succession, key-person dependency and continuity will continue to be considered through consultation and implementation, with knowledge transfer, development and transition arrangements applied where required.

Transition of database responsibilities

- **Q61.** Where database responsibilities or capability will move between roles or teams, what transition and knowledge-transfer arrangements will apply to ensure continuity of database support and specialist expertise?

    A. As TDS has increasingly adopted cloud platforms and applications, the database capabilities required to support the environment have also evolved. The proposed Data Services Administrator role is intended to provide capability aligned to these future requirements.

    Where responsibilities change, appropriate knowledge transfer, development and transition arrangements will be addressed through implementation to maintain continuity of support and specialist expertise.

Transition, Operational Risk and Service Continuity

Operating-model risks

- **Q62.** What risks have been identified arising from the proposed structure, including risks to service continuity, workload and capacity, knowledge retention, specialist capability and transition, and what controls or mitigations are proposed?

    A. A key objective of the proposed structure is to reduce operating risk by strengthening capability, accountability, governance, service delivery and operational maturity across TDS. The RMP also recognises transition risks associated with organisational change, including service continuity, workload, knowledge and capability. These will be managed through implementation, including appropriate transition planning, knowledge transfer and capability development.

Transition plan

- **Q63.** What transition plan will apply between the current and proposed operating models, including arrangements for BAU support, knowledge transfer, training, escalation pathways and maintenance of service continuity during implementation?

A. Transition arrangements will form part of implementation and will address service continuity, BAU support, knowledge transfer, training and appropriate escalation arrangements.
These arrangements will be developed as required to support an orderly transition to the future operating model.

Customer and organisational impact

- **Q64.** What assessment has been undertaken of the downstream impact of the TDS restructure on Legal Aid NSW and its customers, including service availability, incident resolution, application support, technology delivery and business continuity?

  A. Downstream service impacts have been considered as part of the proposed operating model, including service continuity, application support, incident management, technology delivery and business continuity.
  The proposed structure is intended to strengthen capability, service delivery and operational resilience across TDS. Any specific downstream risks identified through consultation or implementation will be considered and managed through appropriate transition arrangements.

Stakeholder and Customer Consultation

- **Q65.** Which business areas, service owners, operational teams and customers were consulted or provided input during development of the proposed TDS operating model, particularly where service-delivery responsibilities, staffing or support arrangements are changing?

  A. Development of the proposed operating model included engagement with TDS Principal Managers where relevant, the Executive and the CEO.
  Formal consultation provides the broader opportunity for employees, representatives and stakeholders to identify impacts or propose alternatives. Feedback is being considered before the RMP and structure are finalised.

- **Q66.** Who was consulted regarding the conclusion that reducing Level 2 Service Desk capacity would not negatively affect service delivery?

  A. Relevant TDS leadership was engaged in developing the proposed operating model, including consideration of the Service Desk arrangements.
  Feedback received during consultation regarding Level 2 staffing, workload, capacity and potential service-delivery impacts will be considered before the RMP and structure are finalised.

Lessons from Previous ICT Reviews and Restructures

2023 Service Desk restructure

- **Q67.** What assessment was undertaken of the effectiveness of the 2023 Service Desk restructure, including whether its intended improvements in workload management, service delivery, career progression, succession planning and operational sustainability were achieved?

  A. The current proposal has been developed having regard to TDS's current and future service, capability and workforce requirements.
  Service Desk workload, service delivery, capability and sustainability have been considered as part of the proposed operating model. Relevant feedback received through consultation will be considered before the RMP and structure are finalised.

Organisational learning

- **Q68.** How have the findings and intended improvements identified through previous ICT reviews and restructures been measured and incorporated into the current operating- model design?

  A. The current proposal has been developed having regard to TDS's current and future service, capability and workforce requirements.
  Previous reviews and organisational changes provide relevant background, but the proposed operating model is based on the requirements identified for the future TDS function.

Business Analysis Structure

Allocation of BAs across delivery streams

- **Q69.** How will Business Analyst resources be allocated across the proposed delivery streams, including the number and classification of BA positions intended to sit within each stream?

  A. Business Analysts will have defined line-management arrangements but will operate largely as a shared TDS capability, allowing resources to be allocated across initiatives according to business priorities, demand and capability requirements.
  This approach is intended to provide greater flexibility, consistency and effective use of Business Analysis capability across TDS.

Capability mix across delivery streams

- **Q70.** What is the rationale for one delivery stream containing a Senior Business Analyst while another contains a Solution Architect, and what analysis determined the appropriate capability mix for each stream?

  A. The proposed reporting arrangements reflect line management and do not mean that Business Analysts, Senior Business Analysts or Solution Architects are exclusively allocated to a particular delivery stream.
  These capabilities are intended to be deployed across TDS initiatives according to business priorities, project needs and capability requirements.

BA professional practice leadership

- **Q71.** Will the Senior Business Analyst have responsibility for professional leadership across the BA function, including consistent standards, methods, mentoring and quality assurance?

  A. The Senior Business Analyst may have a role in supporting consistent BA standards, methods, mentoring and quality across the function. The detailed professional leadership and operating arrangements will be determined as part of implementation.

- ***If not***, where will responsibility for BA professional practice sit?

  A. See above answer.

- **Q72.** How are Business Analysts, the Senior Business Analyst and Solution Architect intended to work together, and how will their respective responsibilities and decision- making boundaries be defined to avoid gaps or duplication?

  A. Business Analysts, Senior Business Analysts and Solution Architects will largely work across different initiatives according to business priorities and project requirements.
  Where these roles work together, their respective responsibilities and decision-making boundaries will be defined through the relevant project and delivery arrangements.

Project Delivery and Change Governance

Overall accountability

- **Q73.** Who will hold overall accountability for Project Delivery and Change under the proposed operating model, including responsibility for delivery outcomes, standards, prioritisation and performance?

  A. The CIDO

Senior Project Manager role

- **Q74.** What analysis determined that the Senior Project Manager role is no longer required, given its current responsibilities include work arising from the demand pipeline, major BAU initiatives, accommodation projects and ITSM change management?

  A. The proposed Project Delivery and Change structure was developed having regard to future TDS capability requirements and the required mix of project management, business analysis and solution architecture capability.
  The proposed structure retains two Principal Project Manager roles while introducing Senior Business Analyst and Solution Architect capability to support the future operating model.

- **Q75.** Where will these existing responsibilities sit within the proposed structure, and what assessment was undertaken to determine that the receiving roles or teams have sufficient capacity to absorb this work alongside their existing project commitments?

  A. The proposed Project Delivery and Change structure was developed having regard to future TDS capability requirements and the required mix of project management, business analysis and solution architecture capability.
  Resources will be deployed across initiatives having regard to the project pipeline, organisational priorities, funding, demand and available capacity.

Management of delivery resources

- **Q76.** Where will management responsibility sit for Project Delivery, Business Analysis and Solution Architecture resources, including allocation of resources across competing initiatives?

    A. What is the intent of this question?

Principal Project Managers and Principal Change Manager

- **Q77.** How are the Principal Project Managers and the Principal Change Manager intended to work together, and how will their respective accountabilities, decision rights and responsibilities for project delivery and organisational change be differentiated?

  A. This is BAU and are not impacted areas of TDS

Resource allocation and standards

- **Q78.** Who will be accountable for resource allocation across projects, consistent delivery standards and performance across the Project Delivery and Change function?

    A. What is the intent of this questions?

Enterprise Architecture, Solution Architecture and Risk

Breadth of Director responsibilities

- **Q79.** What assessment was undertaken of the scope and capacity of the Director Enterprise Architecture & Risk role, particularly the capacity of the role to maintain sufficient focus on Enterprise Architecture while also carrying proposed responsibilities across risk, cyber security and operations?

  A. The proposed Director, Enterprise Architecture and Risk role reflects the identified need for stronger strategic technology leadership and integrated accountability across enterprise architecture, technology risk and cyber security.
  The proposed model was informed by broader organisational consideration, including independent review and input at senior executive and governance levels.
  The scope, capacity and operating arrangements of the proposed role will be considered alongside consultation feedback before the structure is finalised.

Enterprise and Solution Architecture

- **Q80.** How will Solution Architecture align with Enterprise Architecture under the proposed structure, including responsibility for architecture standards, design authority, technology decision-making and assurance?

  A. Enterprise Architecture will provide overarching architecture direction and governance, with Solution Architecture supporting solution design and delivery within that framework. Detailed decision rights and assurance arrangements will be defined through the operating model.

Architecture, Cyber and Risk accountabilities

- **Q81.** How will accountabilities and decision rights be separated across Enterprise Architecture, Solution Architecture, cyber security, risk and technology operations to ensure clear ownership while retaining appropriate independent challenge and assurance?

  A. The proposed operating model establishes the overarching accountabilities across architecture, cyber security, risk and technology operations.
  Detailed decision rights, escalation pathways, assurance and interfaces between these functions will be maintained through the relevant governance arrangements and further defined through implementation.

Placement, Mobility, Recruitment and Employee Opportunities

Suitability assessment

- **Q82.** The proposed new roles have been described as being subject to a suitability assessment. What does a suitability assessment mean in practice, what criteria will be applied, who will conduct the assessment and how will employees be advised of the outcome?

  A. Stage 2 suitability assessments will be undertaken in accordance with the assessment methodology set out in the RMP and the requirements of the relevant role.
  The assessment method may vary depending on the role and circumstances, and employees will be advised of the applicable process and outcome as it progresses.

- **Q83.** Where an employee is placed into a role following a suitability assessment, what will their employment or placement status be, and will they be required to participate in any further recruitment or comparative assessment process at a later stage?

  A. Where an employee is successfully assigned to a role through Stage 2, that assignment completes their placement through the RMP role-filling process.

Stage 2 Expression of Interest process

- **Q84.** How will Stage 2 EOI opportunities be communicated or advertised to affected employees, and what information will employees receive regarding eligibility, assessment criteria and the selection process?

  A. Eligible employees will be advised of available Stage 2 EOI opportunities and the applicable process, timelines and eligibility requirements.
  Relevant role descriptions will be available to support employees in considering available roles. Assessment will be undertaken against the requirements of the role in accordance with the Stage 2 assessment methodology set out in the RMP, and employees will be advised of the outcome.

- **Q85.** Who will conduct the Stage 2 EOI assessments, what assessment method will be used, and what objective criteria will decisions be based on?

  A. Principal Managers will be responsible for the Stage 2 assessment process and will follow the requirements of the RMP and applicable hiring processes.

Assessment methods may vary depending on the role and circumstances for example how many applications are received, with decisions based on the requirements and capabilities of the relevant role

- **Q86.** Will employees with limited direct experience in a proposed role, but who demonstrate relevant transferable capabilities, interest, and potential, be considered where training and development could reasonably address identified capability gaps?

  A. Yes. Relevant transferable capabilities and experience may be considered as part of the Stage 2 suitability assessment against the requirements of the role.
  Where an employee is assessed as suitable and any capability gaps can reasonably be addressed through development, appropriate training and development can be considered.

- **Q87.** What consideration has been given to training, developing or upskilling existing employees into new or changed roles before affected employees are displaced or enter mobility?

A. Employees will be considered for relevant roles through the applicable RMP process and must meet the required suitability and capability requirements.
Where an employee is assessed as suitable and any capability gaps can reasonably be addressed through development, appropriate training or upskilling may be considered before progression to workforce mobility in the earlier RMP stages.

Eligibility for new roles

- **Q88.** Will employees be able to express interest in at-grade opportunities across different functional pillars within TDS where they have relevant or transferable capabilities, or will EOI opportunities be restricted according to an employee's current functional area?

  A. Yes. At appropriate stage of the RMP.

- **Q89.** Where an employee's existing role is assessed as having no/minor change and the employee is directly assigned, will that employee nevertheless be eligible to express interest in or apply for new roles created through the restructure?

  A. Yes. At the appropriate stage of the RMP.

Mobility and the Christmas/New Year period

- **Q90.** How will the timing of the restructure and mobility process take account of the Christmas/New Year shutdown period, including reduced recruitment activity and availability of hiring managers and decisionmakers, to ensure affected employees are not disadvantaged by circumstances outside their control?

  A. The implementation schedule takes account of the Christmas/New Year shutdown period. Where relevant processes pause during this period, applicable timeframes will be adjusted accordingly.
  Relevant mobility and role-filling activity will continue in the new year.
  Impacted employees case by case will be managed through these stages.