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## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 2016 9:21 AM |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Fwd: org charts |

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Phillipa Ormandy
Date: Fri, Jan 15, 2016 at 7:50 PM
Subject: Re: org charts
To: Andy Schilled

Andreas, thank you they will be fine.

However I need your input for two particular issues;
a) can you please identify to the extent you can for me the Groups or teams from any program ( to the best of your knowledge obviously) that are mapped to

- NESP ESA
- LMOS
- MNF
- ACCSP/PACSAAP

That will greatly assist me.
Thank you again.
Happy Friday!
On Friday, 15 January 2016, Andy $\square>$ wrote:
Ken, Phillipa,
after sending an email to Tamara and asking her to get latest org charts from RP PAs $547 F$
web site!

I suggest we use these as (initial) reference.
Andreas

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 2016 9:20 AM |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Fwd: Options |



I agree - let's overshoot first. Yes, we need input from Jeff and Lyndelle.

## Ken

On Mon, Jan 18, 2016 at 6:39 AM,
Good morning Ken and Phillipa,
As a starting point for our discussions tomorrow please find attached some of my preliminary thoughts re staff reductions.

In essence, I think we should aim for $\sim 120$ staff (option 3 "High" in my table) because it would allow a clean cut in terms of eliminating all capability associated with "public good/Government-funded climate research"). I we aim for less we will inevitably face the problem of keeping some of the climate scientists (who will no longer be aligned with the new CSIRO strategy). If we go for more, we will loose important non-climate related capability. For further discussion.

I looked predominantly through the capability lens but hope that my tentative analysis can be complemented by a BD analysis from Phillipa.

Hopefully Jeff McCulloch will be able to send us his template by tomorrow.
Andreas

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 20169:18 AM |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Re: org charts |

On Thu, Jan 21, 2016 at 1:41 PM, Phillipá Ormandy
Andreas
Will send results of mapping of NESP ESA later tonight - but it's worse than we thought. Still working on some of caveats so will send to you and Ken later with notes.

```
On Saturday, 16 January 2016, Andy Schille wrote:
    Hi Phillipa,
```

Tentative answers below re "can you please identify to the extent you can for me the Groups or teams from any progran ( to the best of your knowledge obviously) that are mapped to

- NESP ESA
- IMOS
- MNF
- ACCSP/PACSAAP"

Best,
Andreas

- NESP ESCS (based on December 2015 research plan):

RP1: Decadal Modelling and Carbon Cycling (Matear); Broadscale Observations and Dynamics (Wijffels); Coastal Sea Level Extremes and Waves (Melnnes) + Kevin Hennessy (RGL)
RP2: Ocean and coupled modelling (Marsland); Climate Products and Services for Impact and Adaptation (Clarke); Continental Scale Biogeochemical processes (Canadell) + Tony Hirst (RGL)

IMOS: (facilities run by CSIRO):
Argo floats: Broadscale Observations and Dynamics (Wijffels, RP1); Satellite Remote Sensing (King, now in RP3); Ships of Opportunity (Rudy Kloser, RP4); Multidisciplinary Underwater Network (Tilbrook, RP1); Deep Water Moorings (Trull and Sloyan, RP1); Western Australian Moorings (Feng, RP3); Acidification Moorings (Tilbrook, RP1); Satellite Ocean Colour (Nick HardmanMountford; RP3)

MNF (all in RP5): it is difficult for me to separate RP5 in IMOS and MNF staff as many work in both areas (based on past information from Mark Underwood this was close to 50:50): Information and Data Centre (Brodie); Data Acquisition and Processing (Hawkes); Geophysical Survey and Mapping (Martin); Hydrochemistry (Rayner); Seagoing Instrumentation (Thomas)

PACCSAP: finished
$\operatorname{ACCSP}(15 / 16):$

## Component

### 1.1 Global carbon budgets, analyses and delivery



Component 1.
Global and
regional carbon budgets

The Australian
1.2 terrestrial carbon budget: The role of vegetation dynamics.
1.3 Palaeo carbon cycle
dynamics.

(RP1 and RP2)

Component 2.
Land air
(observations and ${ }^{2.1}$ processes)

Aerosol and its impact on Australian climate

Reducing uncertainties in climate projections by understanding, evaluating and intercomparing climate change feedbacks


Attribution, projection and mechanisms of climatic extremes and change, modes of variability and regional
 weather systems.

Component 5. Earth systems modelling and

ACCESS coupled climate model development

5.2

ACCESS carbon cycle modelling


Development of the ACCESS Earth System. Model for aerosol and chemistry


Component 6.
Australia's future 6.1 climate

Regional climate projections science


Understanding and narrowing uncertainties 6.2 in tropical

Australian rainfall projections

Evaluation of tropical
6.3 cyclone development in the Australian region

Attribution of extreme
6.4 events: mechanisms anc methods
change on the ignition
6.5 of bushfires and the Australian carbon budget


Component 7.
Management and 7.1
communication
ACCSP management and communication


On Fri, Jan 15, 2016 at 7:50 PM, Phillipa Ormandy


Andreas, thank you they will be fine.
However I need your input for two particular issues;
a) can you please identify to the extent you can for me the Groups or teams from any program (to the best of your knowledge obviously) that are mapped to

- NESP ESA
- IMOS
- MNF
- ACCSP/PACSAAP

That will greatly assist me.
Thank you again.
Happy Friday!

On Friday, 15 January 2016, Andy Schiller wrote:
Ken, Phillipa,
after sending an email to Tamara and asking her to get latest org charts from RP PAs 5 47F
$\square$ I found these almost up-to-date (Oct 2015) versions on the
CSIRO web site!
I suggest we use these as (initial) reference.

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 Niarch 2016 9:16 AIV |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Fwd: just notes from the meeting- only to aid memory |



Scenario 1
Moving out of Climate Research and reducing effort in public good research in other programs
RP1 Teams 8 FTE 53
RP2 Teams 10 FTE 54
Total 107
Scenario 2
a) Reduction in public good research while maintaining and honouring commitment to large scale programs and maintaining current cohort of postdocs and supervisors.
So only keeping from RP1 and RP2
-ACE CRC
-BlueLink

- Moorings, Argo IMOS
-Postdocs
FTE consequences $=22$
So Total becomes 75
Scenario 3
Scenario 2 above plus NESP ESA ( $\sim$ numbers need to be calibrated with 54 above mentioned in RP 2 and need to be either added or subtracted)
and remove RP5 + move to data centre FTE 9
Total ~depending on NESP ESA numbers for 16/17 as still not planned but
Total becomes 84
To make 100 another 16 FTE to be identified from between RP3 and 4.
If any further additions are added back in from the areas identified above, that same number will need to be identified from RP3, 4, or 5 .

Other notes, potential for transfer of pure MNF RP5 personnel to be transferred to MNF (organisational nil sum gain, but reduces numbers in O\&A).

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 2016 9:15 AMV |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Fwd: RP1 and RP2 org charts |

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Phillipa Ormandy
Date: Fri, Jan 22, 2016 at $6: 35$ AIVI
Subject: Re: RP1 and RP2 org charts
To: Andy Schiller

Sadly I don't have the last changes we made as I was calling out and Ken and you making ticks- and then I was talking to Mark Bazzacco wile you and Ken had that last discussion.
,
On Friday, 22 January 2016, Andy Schiller wrote:
Note re RP1: the attached RP1 map is the old (highlighted) map. It does not include updates as suggested by Ken on Tuesday (e.g. we keep all of the Ocean Prediction and Monitoring Research Group. I am not a $100 \%$ sure about some of the changes he might have forwarded to Jeff. Only way to find out is to get Ken's list (or if you have accurate records of our meeting).

Andreas

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schille |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 lviarn_ 016 g.14 AvI |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | [WARNING: MESSAGE ENCRYPTED]Fwd: lists updated |
| Attachments: | RP2_Oct_15_v1_Lee.docx; RP1_Oct_15_v1_Lee.docx |


| From: Ken Lee |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: Sat, Jan 23, |  |
| Subject: lists updated |  |
| To: Phillipa Ormandy |  |

## Earth System Assessment

OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

*Redundancles
** Remaining staff enable the retention of ACE CRC, BlueLink, IMOS/Moorings/ARGO program, SAR commitments, etc.

## Ocean \& Climate Dynamics Program

## s47C, s 47F, 47E(c)

$\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{CsiRO}$
$\mathrm{Hbt}=$ Hobart
Asp $=$ Aspendale
$\mathrm{D}=$ Docklands

[^0]FIt $=$ floreat
TL n Team leader
Aff = Affilliate
Int $=$ |ntertusht|
$v s=$ Vacatlan Scholer
$\mathbf{S}=$ Student
HF = Honorary Fellow

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 Marai_UTO .14Ravi |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Fwd: Sheeet for Tim.xlsx |
| Attachments: | Sheet for Tim.xlsx |

Forwarded message ---------
From: Phillipa Ormandy
Date: Sat, Jan 23, 2016 at 3:18 PN
Subject: Fwd: Sheet for Tim,xlsx


Lists so far, our total reaches 108/9 names but not FTE. Please note this list does NOT include the following-

- any RP3 or 4 names yet- hopefully later today or early tomorrow, -any term appointments due to expire before 30 June or June Nov this year or pending retirements, -one CSOF3 admin position and an RPD position (salary loading) which will be the result of combining two programs into one,
47E(c), s 47F who falls into the second category above we think,
NB request, only for RP 1 are we sure of the postdoc appointments which are underlined but queried. we have no line of sight on the rest of the postdoctoral appointments, which you can hopefully clarify

Phillipa

s47C, 47E(c), s 47F
s47C, 47E(c), s 47F

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Attachments:

Andy Schiller
Sunday, 13 M
Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart)
Fwd: draft discussion points.docx
draft discussion points.docx
$\qquad$

## Forwarded message ----------

From: Phillipa Ormandy
Date: Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 6:39 PM
Subject: Fwd: draft discussion points.docx
To: Ken Lea Andy Schiller
extremely draft points for you to consider. Ken please see notes in bold at the bottom result of discussion with Rob Lorimer post your Alex discussion.
can't do anything more on numbers until I see Jeff's stuff.
It is also I think a strong point to make that while the QUANTUM of reduction was unknown, this approach (ie the areas we would reduce work in) was the position reached by the BUET prior to the Deep dive. Therefore this is the considered approach of those working in this area.

It is of course impossible to cut this pie in any way that won't have political ramifications as well as financial implications.
over and out.


## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 2016 9:07 AM |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Fwd: FYI from across the pond |

$\qquad$ Forwarded message
From: Ken Lee
Date: Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 8:43 PM
Subject: FYI from across the pond
To: Phillipa Ormandy $\quad$ Andy Schiller $\square$, tim w

Some suggested names
s47F, s47E(c) acoustic technician. We are moving to more science based approaches. Previously expressed interest in leaving.
s47F, s47E(c) statistical technician. Doesn't fit very well - can get support from Data 61.
s47F, s47E(c)
observational ecologist -- often under allocated.
Others
s47F, s47E(c) - marine biologist - underallocated.
s47F, s47E(c) - programmer but underallocated
s47F, s47E(c) - programmer/data person - - underallocated.
Would tend to go with observational ecologists/marine biologists as we more to more quantitative methods.
Generally would only go with three. I think Andy has to cut deeper, even if he meets his target (of around $\$ 10$ mill) still much lower earnings than me but with significantly more staff ( 80 vs 100 ).

David


## Staff Overview

- Target reduction in staff 100 FTEs
- Based on the interim iteration of data provided by O\&A:
- a headcount reduction of 115
- an FTE reduction of 110 of which 100 have been identified
- Of the 100 FTEs, 86 FTE's have planned deployments in 15/16
( $\sim 86 \%$ deployment rate vs non-impacted staff $69 \%$ deployment rate)
- Of the 86 planned FTEs, 74 ( $86 \%$ ) are planned within O\&A and 12
(14\%) to other BUs (NMF, Energy, L\&W have the greatest impact)
- The impacted 14 FTE non-deployed staff are assumed to be approp funded.



## All project revenue potentially impacted

This table identifies $\$ m$ revenue at risk based on the deployment of identified staff to planned projects (secured revenue). The \% columns classify identified staff as a \% of total planned FTE's for the sum of projects in each BU. Deployment \%'s $>20 \%$ are considered at serious risk.

| Total Sum of Rev. Plan 2016 |  |  |  | \%-4. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Row Labels |  | r:0-5\% | 20\% | -50\% | 00\% |
| AAHL | 11.70 | 11.70 | - | - |  |
| Agriculture | 81.43 | 80.74 | - | - | 0.69 |
| CASS | 30.80 | 30.80 | - | - | - |
| Data61 | 7.29 | 7.29 | - | - | - |
| Energy | 47.04 | 46.77 | - | - | 0.27 |
| F\&N | 11.39 | 11.39 | - | - | - |
| H\&B | 16.89 | 16.89 | - | - | - |
| IM\&T | 7.88 | 7.88 | - | - | - |
| L\&W | 29.67 | 29.54 | 0.13 | - | - |
| Manufact | 28.95 | 28.95 | - | - | - |
| Min Res | 21.39 | 21.18 | 0.22 | - | - |
| Not assigned | 8.75 | 8.75 | - | - | - |
| NRCA BU | 6.04 | 6.04 | - | - | - |
| O\&A | 42.14 | 32.70 | 1.83 | 0.60 | 7.01 |
| Coastal D\&M | 9.12 | 9.12 | - | - | - |
| Earth Assess | 5.27 | 0.72 | 0.19 | 0.18 | 4.18 |
| Eng \& Tech | 5.58 | 5.23 | 0.22 | - | 0.12 |
| Marine R\& | 15.36 | 15.32 | - | 0.04 | - |
| O\&C Dynamics | 6.82 | 2.31 | 1.42 | 0.38 | 2.71 |
| Services | 13.08 | 13.08 | - | - | - - |
| Grand Total | 364.43 | 353.69 | 2.17 | 0.60 | 7.97 |

## Project Opex associated with impacted capability

This table identifies $\$ \mathrm{~m}$ opex project planned in projects where identified capability is deployed to. The \% columns classify identified staff as a \% of total planned FTE's for the sum of projects in each BU. Projects with deployment $\%$ 's $>20 \%$ are considered at serious risk, therefore potential opex savings.



## Summary

-Based on the data provided by O\&A:

- a revised target FTE reduction of 110 (headcount reduction ~115)
- Of the 110 FTEs, 100 FTEs have been identified and modelled. The remaining 10 FTEs are
yet to be identified \& the associated impacts assessed.
- 45 FTEs are eligible for recruitment in growth areas
- An investment reduction equivalent to 65 FTEs will occur from 16/17
-The financial impacts of the 100 FTEs are as follows:


## Financial Impacts

## External Revenue

Projects with identified staff deployments exceeding $20 \%$ of total project planned FTEs has $\$ 7.6 \mathrm{~m}$ of revenue at risk in $15 / 16$ (of which $\$ 7 \mathrm{~m}$ has deployments exceeding $50 \%$ ). The estimated reduction in revenue is revised to $\$ 5 \mathrm{~m}$ as there will be growth revenue associated with 45 FTEs but this will take time to secure. $\$ 5 \mathrm{~m}$ is an indicative number that will be considered in more detail.

In addition Ag has $\$ 0.7 \mathrm{~m}$ and Energy $\$ 0.3 \mathrm{~m}$ of revenue at risk. Staff transfers maybe an option to consider.

## Salary Costs

The estimated salary cost saving (net reduction) of 65 FTEs @ avg $\$ 135 \mathrm{k}$ p.a. $=\$ 8.8 \mathrm{~m}$
The estimated redundancy cost of 110 FTEs @ avg $\$ 100 \mathrm{k}$ each $=\$ 11 \mathrm{~m}(\$ 10 \mathrm{~m} 15 / 16, \$ 1 \mathrm{~m} 16 / 17)$
Opex
Projects with identified staff deployments exceeding $20 \%$ of total project planned FTEs has planned project opex in O\&A of $\$ 2.7 \mathrm{~m}$ in $15 / 16$. This is an initial estimate that requires refinement back to net 65 FTE reduction.

Direct Approp:
A very rough approximation of direct approp attributable to the net reduction in FTEs is $\$ 6.5 \mathrm{~m}$ (Salary $\$ 8.8 \mathrm{~m}+$ Opex $\$ 2.7 \mathrm{~m}$ - Risked External Revenue $\$ 5 \mathrm{~m}$ )


## Key Risks

- O\&A has a current staff level of $\sim 400$ FTEs. The proposed change is 110 FTE redundancies $=27.5 \%$
- This level of upheaval is very significant and will be a major distraction to not just the directly impacted staff but also management and indirectly impacted staff. Business as Usual productivity levels will be significantly impacted for 12-18 months.
- There has been no provision made for "disrupted external revenue" during the transition phase of reducing staff by 110 and then recruiting 45 into growth areas
- Some long standing government clients will be impacted by this realignment. This will require some management given that we are electing to make these changes rather than forced by government funding changes.
- O\&A is embarking on international growth which is traditionally expensive and has a long incubation period. The out year budgets require much deeper analysis than was possible in a week.
- This is a significant cultural change. Whilst clearly flagged in the 2020 Strategy, it will take time to transition staff and implement modified pricing strategies.

[^1]On Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 4:56 PM, Andy Schiller wrote:
Ken,
Alex's questions relate to HR and finance, so the accurate answers might have to come from Mike and Tim. Below, I can only provide some indicative information.

- Is it correct that impacted staff have a higher ( $86 \%$ ) deployment rate than non impacted ( $6 \% \%$ )?

Comment AS: I don't know where these numbers originated but I know that in RP1 and RP2 a large percentage of staff with fractions of unallocated time work on appropriation-funded projects. In RP1 alone I estimate the associated costs in FY 15/16 to be between \$34 m (similar to last FY). It is hard to believe that non-impacted staff in combined RP1-RP5 would have a lower deployment rate, given current demand in, e.g., RP4 and RP5.

- How would have this picture changed in July 2016 post ACCSP? see below.
- How much of the $\$ 7 \mathrm{~m}$ forecast revenue loss would have been lost anyway due to the end of the climate change science program in June 2016?

Cai knows better than me the accurate difference in external revenue between ACCSP and NESP. From memory, it is between $\$ 2.5 \mathrm{~m}$ and $\$ 3 \mathrm{~m}$ loss in external revenue for combined RP1 and RP2. Not sure how this translates to deployment rates. $\$ 2.6 \mathrm{~m}$ would translate to approximately minus 20 FTEs (at an average cost of $\$ 130 \mathrm{k}$ ).

Andreas

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From:
Date: Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 6:43 AM
Subject: Coasts
$\square$

Hi Ken
Thanks for the conversation today and I understand who difficult this is, but also how quickly senior management translate a table for discussion into reality without due considerations

As we agreed the overall hstrategyfor Coasts is one of refocus and growth particularly in the following areas:

- Data management and Visualisation
- Restoration ecology and engineering
- Aquaculture

There is also the opportunity with restructure to bring in teams and individuals from other parts of O8A to build critical mass.
This will occur for remote sensing staff based in RP1 form July 1 but there also opportunities to bring the some of the sea level team with Kathy Mcinnes into Coasts

There remains considerable opportunities around bjotechnology but this opportunity needs to be better realised than it has to date. Presently much of the capability we have is either underutilised and/ or generally deployed level

It should be noted that CSIRO has committed to a $3 \%$ Indigenous employment by 2018; our current level of $1.2 \%$
is entirely based in Coasts
In terms of reductions these can be comprised of a number of categories The numbers in the fracker refer to the total number of positions for each category:

## Positions

$\square$

- Coastal Morphodynamics-s 47F, 47E(c)
- Western Modellor -

Positions seeking LWOP (1)
$\square \square$

- Question- how do LWOP positions get treated in this exercise

Other Positions require gxonsidereation over long term utilisation and output (5-7)
47E(c), s 47F low utilisation and engaged in other BUS; approaching 60-could also be transferred to another BU

- 47E(c), s -has increasingly gone part timed not producing much
- 47E(c), s 47F - Works with 47E(c), s 47F and in other BUS. Good chemist could be used more productively with the right leadership
- 47E(c), s 47F Group-term appointments- there are i would say 2 positions that have had IMOS money ceased and hard long term to find funding for. Not sure which of the group
- 47E(c), s 47F -term appointment, was previous on a redundancy list
- 47E(c), s 47F difficult HR case, 47E(c), s 47F bit if 47 comes back we didn't want 47 ; if the other BU accepts 47 then its another positions we can include in head count


## TIER 2 CONSIDERATIONS

s 47F, 47E(c)


Cheers

Andy
Dr Andy Steven
Research Director- Coastal
Oceans \& Atmosphere Flagship, CSIRO
41 Boggo Road, Dutton. Park QLD 4102, Australia
$\mathrm{P}+61738335570 \mid \mathrm{M}$ s47F mdy.steven@csiro.au
Skype: andysteven9 or +61731033580

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schille |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 2016 9:03 AM |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Fwd: Coasts |

---------- Forwarded message -..-------
From: Ken Lee
Date: Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 8:49 PM
Subject: Re: Coasts
To: Andy Schiller

Yes we got it!
Ken
On Tue, Jan 26, 2016 at 5:40 PM, Andy Schiller $\square$ wrote:
Good - together with David's 3 staff that should give you peace of mind when you announce that 10 FTEs will be reduced in RP3 and RP4.

Andreas
Duplicate email - removed

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkvilie)

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 2010 8:O5 AIVI |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Re: Urgent question |

On Thu, Feb 4, 2016 at 11:04 AM, Ken Lee P wrote:
---------- Forwarded message
From: [Sue.Brown@csiro.au](mailto:Sue.Brown@csiro.au)
Date: Thu, Feb 4, 2016 at 7:59 AM
Subject: Urgent question
To:

Question that needs an answer is:

Can I also get some further details on what the impact is on NESP? The sections on oceans and atmosphere is quite confusing - talks about ongoing funding for climate science work being provided at a reduced level within NESP, but then also that CSIRO aims to continue to fulfil its NESP obligations.

I only need a few sentences at most, but want to make sure I have the right words. Thanks for your help. As mentioned, deadline is 11.45 am EDT - sorry!

Sue

Dr Sue Brown

Executive Officer to Dr Alex Wonhas - Executive Director Environment, Energy and Resources

CSIRO
E sue.brownecsiro.an $\mathrm{I}+61.26276 .6960 \mathrm{M}$

PO Box 225 Dickson ACT 2602 Australia
www, csiro.au | wow, csito, aw/energy

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schiller Mry 2016 8:54 AM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 2016 |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Re: Response |

On Thu, Feb 4, 2016 at 11:17 AM, Ken Lee $\square$ wrote:
Can I also get some further details on what the impact is on NESP? The sections on oceans and atmosphere is quite confusing - talks about ongoing funding for climate science work being provided at a reduced level within NESP, but then also that CSIRO aims to continue to fulfil its NESP obligations.

1) CSIRO is involved in 5 of 6 NESP Programs....for O\&A only impact will be on the NESP climate Hub.
2) For the NESP climate Hub - anticipate reprioritization there may be a reduction of work by CSIRO scientists in some areas - some work anticipated to be picked up by other NESP partners... what can Cai do. maybe name some areas we are retaining for example...
3)do we mention contract variation? or just reallocation of workload and resources...need to bee a broad as possible.

Ken

| From: | Andy Schiller |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 20168:54 AM |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Re: Background info |

Subject:
Re: Background info

## On Thu, Feb 4, 2016 at 12:29 PM, Ken Lee $\gg$ wrote:

Here are a few points I would like to make about retaining NESP fund without ACCESS.

1. Our investment in ACCESS, which is at $\sim \$ 3 \mathrm{~m}$ cash, or some $\$ 5.4 \mathrm{~m}$ all up,including overheads, is not sustainable, if NESP is the only fund available for this.
2. NESP will fund ACCESS at around \$500k p.a., external (\$1m if counting our co-investment), and mostly in two projects. 1)
Participating in IPCC AR6 model experiment ( $\$ 250$ p.a. external), and 2) ACCESS model improvement ( $\$ 200 \mathrm{k}$ p.a. external). The total of $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$ p.a. NESP external will not justify our investment in ACCESS in the long run.
3. We can deliver most of the NESP science related to ACCESS. The science in CMIP6 experiments can be delivered by using outputs from other models (there are some 30 models). We can shift some of the fund for ACCESS improvement to climate variability and predictability (we only have $\$ 100 \mathrm{k}$ p.a. from NESP), or/and to strengthening Argo work, which collect data to improve prediction models.
4. The other $\$ 1.5 \mathrm{~m}$ NESP fund goes to water, extremes, climate projections, and Argo. We can deliver most of this work in the restructured O\&A. If a small portion cannot be done, we can subcontract to universities.

Cheers,
Cai

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Lee, Ken (O\&A, Kensington) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, 5 February 2016 10:59 AM |
| To: | O\&A All Staff, Affiliates and Support-DG; O\&A Executive Team-DG; Creagh, Ben |
| Subject: | (Comms, Dutton Park) |
|  | O\&A Update |

## Colleagues

You will have all read the email from our Chief Executive Larry Marshall updating staff on some of the major areas CSIRO will be re-focussing investment in the future in order to bring the organisation in line with the new strategy.

While this new focus has clear implications for the entire organisation, there are important aspects that will impact Oceans and Atmosphere some of which have been subject to media reports.

The implication for O\&A is a net reduction in our appropriation base. This will translate to a reduction in 100 FTE of our current staffing. Over the next two years we will have the opportunity to create up to 35 FTE new positions in
?w areas of research to enable our capability mix and activity to better align with CSIRO's innovation-strategy. This will require significant reductions in some areas, to enable growth in others.

These impacts will affect all as aspects of O\&A however most of the reductions will be concentrated in Ocean and Climate Dynamics and Earth Systems Assessment.

The areas identified for growth include:

- growing our capability to prepare for and respond to the challenges related to driving forward the Biue Economy,
- increasing our ability to understand the cumulative impacts of Blue Economy developments such as new fisheries and resource projects to minimise their impacts and provide communities with trusted information about those projects, and
- improving our monitoring and decision making systems to ensure the quality and sustainability of our marine ecosystems.
To expand on this i will be conducting an all-staff briefing to provide you with further information and respond to questions you may have, as well as make you aware of the measures we have in place to ensure all staff are fully supported throughout this process.

In addition to the Leadership Team I will also be accompanied by Alex Wonhas, Sector Executive, Environment, Energy and Minerals.

Details of the all staff video conference have been sent for later today.

I appreciate your support of your colleagues at this time while we work through the impacts on our Business Unit. Our HR team and CSIRO's EAP Provider Converge (1300687 327) are also available to talk with you.

## Regards

Ken and Andreas

| Kenneth Lee, Ph.D. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Oirector $\}$ Oceans and Atmosphere |  |
| CSIRO |  |
| Ekendee (i)csiro.zu T +61854368629 d | s47F |
| A 25 Dick Perry Avenue, Kensington, W hatp://www.csiro.au | Austro |

Dr Andreas Schilier
Science and Deputy Director ; Oceans and Atmosphere CSIRO

E andreas schiler@csiro.auT +61362325300
s47F A GPO BOX 1538 , Hobart, TAS 7001
http://www.csiroau

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Lee, Ken (O\&A, Kensington) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, 5 February 2016 8:15 PM |
| To: | Underwood, Mark (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | RE: RF5 Redundancies |

Mark:

Fully understand your concerns. As you know, in the Deep Dive Larry noted that we have to make cuts to free up funds to change our directions...it's a case of prioritization and finances \{as we have to meet our external earning targets.

The IDC Team was identified by the \% of personnel within the group with $>50 \%$ appropriation. Without your input consider it a placeholder....we can discuss alternative choices within RP-5. 1 know it's a difficult decision but to support development of autonomous platforms on new $\$$ - we have to generate it within.

Look forward to a chat next week.

Sen

From: Underwood, Mark \{O\&A, Hobart
Sent: Friday, 5 February 2016 12:30 PM
To: Lee, Ken $\langle\mathrm{O} \& A$, Kensington $\rangle<$ Ken.Lee@csiro.au>
Cc: Underwood, Mark (O\&A, Hobart) [Mark.Underwood@csiro.au](mailto:Mark.Underwood@csiro.au); Whittle, Michael (HR, Hobart)
[Michael.Whittle@csiro.au](mailto:Michael.Whittle@csiro.au)
Subject: RP5 Redundancies

Hello Ken,
I understand the need for all programs in O\&A to make some cuts as part of a reshaping exercise in these difficult times.

## s47C, s47E(c), s47F

If you are open to it, I would like to consider some other options for redundancies from within my program that might be of similar magnitude, but which will not have the same potential strategic risks. i could share these with you either later today or early next week. I have been in discussion with Mike Whittle (cc'd here) and he would be able to assist me in this process.

Iflag that any redundancies will obviously have a negative impact on the surplus that RP5 had been planning to deliver to the BU , but $\{$ am sure that you and Tim are factoring that in.

Cheers,
Mark
Mark Underwood
Research Program Director, Engineering and Technology

CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Phone: +61362325402 | Mobile

## PLEASE NOTE

The information contained in this email may be confidential or privileged. Any unauthorised use or disclosure is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you. To the extent permitted by law, CSIRO does not represent, warrant and/or guarantee that the integrity of this communication has been maintained or that the communication is free of errors, virus, interception or interference.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Andy Schille |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, 13 March 2016 7:36 AM |
| To: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | Fwd: Our business case |
| Attachments: | Confidential - O and A Business Case DRAFT February 2016.docx |

Forwarded message ----------
From: Ken Lee
Date: Sat, Feb 20, 2016 at 4:46 PM
Subject: Fwd: Our business case
To: Andy Schiller

## Forwarded message ----------

From: Michael Whittle
Date: Fri, Feb 19, 2016 at 1.30 PMI
Subject: Our business case
To:

For your consideration this weekend.
Please advise me if OK or any modifications.
I will then send to Lyndelle on Monday.

Request for Approval to proceed to Implementation of Business Unit Restructuring - Oceans and Atmosphere

| Case Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business Unit : | Oceans and Atmosphere |  |  |  |
| Total number of staff in affected areas: | 227 |  |  |  |
| Total number of staff likely to become potentially <br> redundant: | 100 |  |  |  |
| Total number of staff impacted by early term <br> ends: | 15 |  |  |  |
| Location of potential impacts: | Canberra, Hobart, <br> Brisbane, Perth, Darwin, <br> Lucas Heights, <br> Melbourne |  |  |  |

## Principles:

- The CSIRO Values drive all actions
- Staff are respected and supported. (This includes those directly/indirectly affected and those who are involved in implementation)
- A clear rationale for the decision is determined which is credible, can be clearly articulated and aligned to Business Unit/organisational strategy.
- CSIRO's agreements with employees and their representatives are honoured.
- The organisational requirements and change management principles are met in a timely way and disruption is minimised where possible.
- Communication to internal and external stakeholders is honest, clear and timely.
- Confidentiality at all levels is maintained.
- There is a commitment in maintaining the reputation of CSIRO.

NOTE: If there are any changes to the capability areas a revised business case is required prior to implementation

Contex - cicumstances that haye wa to the proposed yestructinitg

## Backaraing

(History of capablity area, changes and impacts, advice as to whether the work or capability areas affected will cease altogether or, if not, an indication of how and by whom the work will be performed in the future). Include a summary of changes in this area over the last three years.

In response to the CSIRO 2020 Strategy and to support the implementation of the O \& A Business Unit Strategic Plan 2015/16, the leadership team within O \& A have identified the need to reshape the current capability profile in the Business Unit to allow more focused delivery into identified research strategic priorities that present strong science and impact opportunities including potential for growth of external revenue.

The proposed reshaping of capability across O \& A has been foreshadowed in the O \& A 'Deep Dive' presentation on 4 December 2015.

Predicted staff reduction as a result of O\&A's restructuring proposal is up to 115 headcount. This includes 100 redundancies and 15 term appointments that will cease. We will not progress with 3 planned replacement recruitments.

The details of the proposal are provided in the following business case:

| Details of the capability affected including number of potential staff impacts and changes (Research / Support, Location, Timeframes). <br> Note: Do not include names of people potentially affected. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Description of capability: |  |  |  |  |
| Capability | Reason for the change | No. of staff impacted | Planned reduction (FTE) | Functional areas, locations |
| Analysis of climate variability, extreme weather \& climate services for adaptation | In alignment with the strategic directions of CSIRO, we are reducing research in regional climate variability and weather extremes. | s 47F, 47E | (c), s47C |  |
| Provision of climate services and knowledge brokering; | We are reducing work in knowledge brokering services provided by the climate products and services. |  |  |  |
| Marine biogeochemical modelling on global scales for climate applications and multiyear climate modelling and analysis | We will no longer conduct research in multi-year, multi-decadal prediction, seasonal forecasting and impacts. |  |  |  |
| Collection, processing and analysis of ocean carbon data | Due to insufficient demand for this work, we will reduce the Ocean Carbon observations capability by 1 FTE. This will be mitigated through VRS. |  |  |  |
| Projection of seal level rise on global scales | We will discontinue research in sea level rise, which means reduced scientific capablitity, Research support staff will be transferred |  |  |  |
| Advanced software engineering and design | We are no long going to create new complex multi-purpose software. We will be reshaping the capability and move to commercial software and maintenance of existing software |  |  |  |

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { ROMS Modelling and } \\ \text { nearshore wave } \\ \text { modelling and analysis }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { We have consolidated our research } \\ \text { in Coastal Sea Level Extremes and } \\ \text { Waves. We no longer require } \\ \text { expertise in ROMS modelling. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Processing and analysis } \\ \text { of satellite terrestrial, } \\ \text { sea surface temperature } \\ \text { and ocean colour data }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Due to reduced demand for remote } \\ \text { sensing capability, we will reshape } \\ \text { this function within O\&A. We will } \\ \text { cease work in satellite remote } \\ \text { sensing and we will have a reduced } \\ \text { need for research support across } \\ \text { remote sensing functions }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Model analysis of Indo- } \\ \text { Pacific Dynamics }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { We no longer need research support } \\ \text { in Indo-Pacific Dynamics research } \\ \text { due to reduced demand. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Processing of XBT } \\ \text { observations }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { We no longer require advanced skills } \\ \text { in processing of ocean observations. } \\ \text { This redundancy will be mitigated by } \\ \text { VRS. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Reactive gases } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Reduced requirement for work in } \\ \text { aerosols research has led to a } \\ \text { reduction for project support } \\ \text { requirements. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Turbulence Modelling } & \begin{array}{l}\text { We will no longer undertake } \\ \text { research in turbulence modelling. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Greenhouse gas } \\ \text { research }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { We are going to cease our Antarctic } \\ \text { work. In addition, reduced } \\ \text { requirement for work in major } \\ \text { greenhouse gases research has led to } \\ \text { a reduction for project support } \\ \text { requirements. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Synthetic Greenhouse } \\ \text { and Ozone Depleting } \\ \text { Gases }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { There is a reduced requirement for } \\ \text { Gases lesearch input in Reactive }\end{array} \\ \text { Greenhouse and Ozone Depleting } \\ \text { Gases research has resulted in a } \\ \text { reduced need for research and } \\ \text { project staff. }\end{array}\right\}$

s 47F, 47E(c), s47C
$\left.\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Management of impacts } \\ \text { of biodiversity }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { We are experiencing a reduction in } \\ \text { demand for research in the } \\ \text { management of impacts of } \\ \text { biodiversity. We will consolidate and } \\ \text { reduce this team by up to 3 FTE. }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Biogeochemical } \\ \text { modelling }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { We plan to strategically reshape the } \\ \text { group into the Blue Economy } \\ \text { research. We will reshape this team } \\ \text { for more marine biotechnology } \\ \text { focus. We will reduce this capability } \\ \text { by 1 FTE. We may be able to mitigate } \\ \text { this via VRS }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Bio-acoustics technical } \\ \text { capability }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { We have a requirement for more } \\ \text { specialist, scientific skills. We will } \\ \text { reshape the program with a } \\ \text { reduction in bio- acoustic technician } \\ \text { skills. We will reduce by 2FTE. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Marine ecology } & \begin{array}{l}\text { We will reduce our focus on } \\ \text { Northern Australian fisheries. We } \\ \text { will reshape this capability by moving } \\ \text { towards more specific spatial } \\ \text { management and assessment skills. } \\ \text { We will have reduced demand for } \\ \text { high level marine ecology skills, and a } \\ \text { corresponding reduction in research } \\ \text { support. We will reduce this } \\ \text { capability by up to 4fte. This may be } \\ \text { mitigated by VRS. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Enall vessels } & \begin{array}{l}\text { We no longer have a requirement for } \\ \text { management and field } \\ \text { instrumentation } \\ \text { theoretical economic modelling. We } \\ \text { have a requirement for more applied } \\ \text { economic modellers. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { There is a reduced requirement for } \\ \text { programming skills in this area. We } \\ \text { will reduce this capability by } 1 \text { FTE. } \\ \text { This may be mitigated by VRS. }\end{array}\right\} \begin{array}{l}\text { Aligning with our strategy of } \\ \text { reducing efforts in WA due to } \\ \text { reduced demand, we will reduce the }\end{array} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}\text { After evaluation of the services that } \\ \text { the engineering workshop delivers, } \\ \text { we will reduce the capability within } \\ \text { this team by 1FTE without impact to } \\ \text { delivery and outputs of this team. } \\ \text { We may be able to mitigate the } \\ \text { reduction through the acceptance of } \\ \text { a VRS. }\end{array}\right.\right\}$



| Details of activities taken to mitigate staffing impacts |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actions taken to deploy capability and mitigate potential redundancles to date |  |  |
| No action. |  |  |
| Location of afected capabily |  |  |
| Please highlight here if the potential impacts are on a regional site and if so the total potential impact on the regional site. |  |  |
| Aspendale - <br> Floreat - <br> Hobart - <br> Black Mountain - <br> Yarralumla - <br> Dutton Park - <br> St Lucia - <br> Darwin - <br> Lucas Heights - |  |  |
| Pan le consintation and communieation strategy den and the Change Management plan |  |  |
| Internal (As well as consultation with staff, this se consutation as well as broacer change manageme consultation clause of the CSIRO Enterprise Agree attached. | tion will also cover union nt methodology to be us ment). If in a separate | engagement and Refer to ument it can be |
| Action | Date | Responsibility |
| Business Case 1 submission | 19 February 2016 | Director |
| Approval to proceed with planning for restructuring including Ministerial approval | 7 March 2016 | ED Environment; GM HR Services |
| Consultation with BUs and key stakeholders | Commence from approval and continuing through March 2016 | Director, Science Director, Researo Directors, |
| Communication with Staff Association outlining our intention to commence communication and consultation processes regarding potential restructuring (3a) | Commencing 14 March 2016 | Director |
| Communication and consultation with all staff high level background for proposed restructure, likely number to be impacted and process to be followed <br> - Director's communication to all staff including process <br> - Program level communication | Commence 14 <br> March 2016 <br> Immediately after union consultation | Director, Researo Directors |


| Invitation for and receipt of <br> input, feedback and possible <br> mitigation strategies <br> Invitation to register for <br> Redundancy substitution |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Finalisation of feedback and input <br> from staff and stakeholders; <br> Assessment of impact and final <br> outcomes and decisions. | End March 2016 | Director, Science <br> Director, RDs and <br> HRM |
| Communication of outcomes and <br> decisions to staff, stakeholders and <br> union | End March 2016 | Director, Science <br> Director's communication to all Research <br> staff |
| Site and/or program level <br> communication discussion as <br> required | Directors <br> (Supported by HR) |  |
| Consideration of Voluntary <br> Redundancy Substitution | Commence <br> February 2016 | Research <br> Directors and HR |
| Individually impacted officer (first <br> letter) | End March 2016 | Research <br> Directors <br> supported by HR |
| Period to consider mitigation and <br> VRS register | Week Three and <br> Week Four March | Director and RDs |
| 2016 |  |  |

## Implementation plan including the implementation Timeline

This section should also contain details on the process/method that is proposed to be used to identify potentially redundant officers (including their levels, functional area). Please refer to Redeployment and Retrenchment provisions of the CSIRO Enterprise Agreement

Following consideration of those officers registered for redundancy substitution, in situations where individual officers need to be identified from a group of officers the following process will be used.

- Affected officers will be informed of process to be undertaken;
- They will be provided with the opportunity to make comment on the process and raise any concerns;
- The line manager with the appropriate delegation will make the decision;
- Affected officers will be provided with the opportunity to provide information and/or names of people who can be contacted in relation to the assessment;
- In making his /her decision the line manager may take into account the views of other line managers and may involve them in the process;
- Affected officers will be offered the opportunity to provide a short written statement, if they choose;
- Affected officers will be advised of the date by which the assessment will be completed and will be given an opportunity to review their assessment and to provide comment on that assessment; and
- After consideration of all inputs a final decision will be made and affected officers advised of the outcome verbally and in writing, with detail around the decision.


| Risk | Impact | Mitigation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sustainability and vitality affected at regional sites | Staff morale | Rigorous and transparent assessment of impacts. Strategic reviews and plan for future of affected regional sites prepared. |
| Interventions by important stakeholders external to the Division | Reputational damage | Careful identification of critical stakeholders and implementation of communication plan. |
| Impact on CSIRO in light of recent political statement by Prime Minister about new funding arrangements. Could cause political embarrassment. | CSIRO and government. | Media statements prepared outlining situation. Communication team to prepare response. Ensure CSIRO management are fully informed. |
| Failure to deliver required capability to key projects as a result of reduced staffing. | Continued contraction in labour budget | Thorough examination and report of project commitments by RDs, GLs and TLs. Risk management by O\&A Leadership Team to ensure project deadlines are met. |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uncertainty created during the consultation and decision phase | Staff | Communication plan including process and timelines clearly articulated and implemented. <br> Clarity of role, responsibility and accountabilities for leadership. <br> Access for staff to line management and Leadership and support from HR and EAP available. |
| Disgruntled staff | Affected staff 'Survivors' | Communication plan including process and timelines clearly articulated and implemented. <br> Implementation planning takes account of need for managing the impacts for those not directly impacted. <br> Access for staff to line management and BU leadership and support from HR and EAP available. |
| Legal and procedural risks | BU leadership and Organisation | Attention to procedural hygiene and procedural fairness principles. <br> Attention to health risk assessment and psychosocial risk assessments. Assessments to be undertaken prior to commencement of process. |
| Negative media coverage | All staff; O\&A leadership, organisational reputation | Internal consultation and communication plans. <br> Robust media and communication strategies developed and implemented. |
| Adverse internal stakeholder reaction | Internal relationship damage e.g. across BUs Loss of partnerships and project opportunities | Targeted consultation and communication strategies and plans. |
| Declining confidence in future of BU | Staff, BU leadership. | Communication plan including process and timelines clearly articulated and implemented. <br> Change plan includes strategies for communication and consultation across whole BU with support and guidance for line management. <br> Ensure access for all staff to line management and divisional management and support from HR and EAP available. |
| Declining confidence in BU and organisational process | Staff <br> BU leadership. Organisational leadership. | Communication plan including process and timelines clearly articulated and implemented. <br> Change plan includes strategies for communication and consultation across whole BU together with support and guidance for line management. |


|  |  | Ensure access for staff to line <br> management and divisional management <br> and support from HR and EAP available. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Long term capability <br> development | Viability of <br> science quality <br> and delivery into <br> the future | Strategic workforce plans clearly aligned <br> with capability strategy. |
| Leadership fatigue | BU leadership. | Change plan includes clear articulation of <br> responsibilities and accountabilities for <br> leadership team. <br> Support by Organisational leadership is <br> clear and partnership model with HR is <br> adopted. <br> EAP support offered and use of Manager <br> hotline encouraged. |
| HR fatigue | HR staff. | Change plan includes clear articulation of <br> responsibilities and accountabilities for HR <br> team. |
| Partnership methodology with BU |  |  |
| leadership established. |  |  |
| EAP support encouraged. |  |  |
| Access to Enterprise HR support. |  |  |

## RTanned Stakeholder Engasement

Please indicate any political or regional issues and the strategies, communication plans and timelines to be taken to engage with stakeholders including the Minister, as necessary.

A detailed communications and engagement plan will be prepared, which covers the following aspects:

- Consistency of messaging with broader organisational communication about strategic directions.
- External engagement with key stakeholders and clients as required.

Any other relevant information


| General Manager, HR |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Executive Director/DCE |  |  |  |
|  | . |  |  |


| From: | Walton, Tamara (O\&A, Hobart) on behalf of Lee, Ken (O\&A, Kensington) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, 24 February 2016 4:47 PM |
| To: | O\&A All Staff and Affiliates-DG |
| Subject: | All staff meeting |

## Dear all:

Thank you all for your time today in the all staff meeting, and lapologise if it seemed a little rushed towards the end.

Let me reassure you that this is not the end of the conversation. I will be travelling around and visiting each site so that I can hear your views face to face; I'm in Floreat on Friday and in Yarralumla and Aspendale next week and I will be getting round to the other O\&A sites over the next couple of weeks. We will also arrange more all staff briefings as needed over the coming weeks and as soon as I can I will be informing you about what the changes and refocus for O\&A will look like.

In the meantime I want to reiterate that I welcome your frank views and feedback, please feel free to email Andreas it me with your comments and suggestions. While I may not have specific answers to your questions at the time, I will continue to communicate those questions up the line.

Please take care of yourselves and your colleagues during this difficult process and I strongly urge you to access support should you need additional assistance. Here is a link to the Employee Assistance Program http://my.csiro.au/Business-Units/Science-Strategy-and-People/Health-Safety-and-Environment/eap.aspx and you can also speak to your HR or HSE representatives on site,

## regards

Ken

Kenneth Lee, Ph.D.
Director | Oceans and Atmosphere
CSIRO

Éken.lee@csiroau T +61864368629 M s47F
A 26 Dick Perry Avenue, Kensington, WA 6151, Australia
http://www.csiro.au

## PLEASE NOTE

The information contained in this email may be confidential or privileged. Any unauthorised use or disclosure is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender by return email. Thank you. To the extent permitted by law, CSIRO does not represent, warrant and/or guarantee that the integrity of this communication has been maintained or that the communication is free of errors, virus, interception or interference.

| From: | Oke, Peter (O\&A, Hobart) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, 26 February 2016 8:06 AM |
| To: | Lee, Ken (O\&A, Kensington) |
| Cc: | Schiller, Andreas (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | FW: RP1 consultation since November 2015 |
| Attachments: | O\&CD Program BD Discussion 2015 11 November.docx; OCD Program Discussion - Nov |
|  | 2015.docx; OCD Program Update-11 Nov 2016.docx; Ocean Intelligence.docx; FW: RP1 |
|  | consultation since November 2015 |
|  |  |
|  | Follow up |
| Follow Up Flag: | Completed |

Ken - I see the consultation issue is hotting up.
At a meeting I had with my staff earlier this week, this issue came up. I pushed back, but they resisted. So I prepared a document detailing the consultation l've done with them since this process started. The information is all here in this email.
ihe email attachment (FW - RP1 consultation ...) includes an attachment listing all the meetings I had with staff.

The doc attachments I include here are my meeting notes, or minutes from my meetings. At some point in November, I noted likely areas of contraction (Climate Change and global sea-level rise). As noted in the document, this was my view on the natural consequence of ACCSP ending. I wasn't quoting the BUET - I presented it merely as my own speculation.

Along this process, l've consulted with my staff regularly - expressed their views about growth areas, BD opportunities etc to you and Alex. I can see this has had impact - as argued below. I'm arguing to my staff (to a few trouble makers) that this constitutes consultation. I really believe it does.

Perhaps in preparing the documentation outlined in the Gazette today - you could at least summaries this consultation. I'm happy to prepare such commentary.

I hope this helps. I'm happy to discuss.
Kind Regards
Yeter
Dr. Peter Oke, Ocean Climate Dynamics Research Director (acting)
CSIRO Oceans \& Atmosphere
GPO Box 1538, Hobart TAS 7001. Australia
Phone: +61 362325387 Mab s47F
http://www.cmar.csiro.au/staff/oke/

From: <Oke>, O\&A <Peter>, Peter Oke [Peter.Oke@csiro.au](mailto:Peter.Oke@csiro.au)
Date: Thursday, 25 February 2016 5:08 pm
To: Ann Thresher [Ann.Thresher@csiro.au](mailto:Ann.Thresher@csiro.au)
Cc: Mark Green [Mark.Green@csiro.au](mailto:Mark.Green@csiro.au)
Subject: Re: RP1. consultation since November 2015

Ann - Thanks for your reply.
I'll insert specific responses below. But up front, let me make a few statements.

First - As an employee, I want to respect, maintain, and hold management accountable to the conditions in our EA.

Second - I'm no expert on what constitutes consultation and what doesn't. It's been my intention to consult as much as possible, for reasons outlined below.

When I took the role of acting Research Director and it became clear that things were heating up (with the announcement of the Deep Dive), I made a very conscious decision to entrain our staff as much as possible. With the announcement of the Deep Dive, it became clear that our program was going to be judged by the ET. Aspects of our work to be judged by the ET would apparently include our past performance, the strength of our portfolio, and our alignment with $\operatorname{CSIROs}$ strategic direction. At this point, I made the very deliberate decision to engage with as many of our people as I could. Two things motivated me. First - because l'm acting, I don't feel like I have the fuil delegation ... formally I do ... but perhaps not "spiritually". Second - because I'm frankly not across all aspects of our Program, I knew that we'd all benefit from close engagement with our staff - especially our science leaders. So, at that time, I initiated weekly meetings with our Group Leaders (a group of 5) and fortnightly meetings with our science leaders (a group of about 20+; we called these meetings "business development meetings" - now changed to Science Opportunity Sessions ... SOS). At these meetings I sought our staff's view on the following:

- Our portfolio ... what it looks like, where are the strengths and weaknesses;
- Our opportunities ... looking for new initiatives and new opportunities;
- Our future ... likely areas of contraction and growth;
- Our alignment with CSIRO's strategic direction (with specific reference to CSIRO's new initiatives like the AcceleratiON Program and more recently the Lean Launch Pad ... our program submitted 6 "ideas" to the LLP this month as a result).

In preparing documentation for the Deep Dive, I engaged our staff many times to identify how we align with the identified growth areas (which I understand were defined mid-last year during a meeting of our Program's Leadership). As a result of these interactions, I proposed many changes to the Deep Dive docurnentation. Most of the changes I proposed were included in the final submission to the Executive team. To me ... this was consultation. I consulted staff - understood their view - represented their view to our BUET - who then included this in documents presented to the ET for consideration at the Deep Dive.

During theweeks around the Deep Dive, I also made representation for our Program to the BUET and the ET (including meetings with Alex Wolhas). Each time I made such representation, I met with our staff prior to the said meetings and discussed each opportunity. I sought advice on what the agenda should be - what things I should promote etc. After each meeting, I reported back to staff to discuss what happened and sought advice on next steps.

Some of the impacts of this consultation made it all the way to senate estimates. In November, we identified Geo-Engineering and Climate Services (we were calling it "Climate innovation" to try to appeal to Larry et al). Prior to Christmas, we met with Alex Wonhas and promoted opportunities in three areas:

1. Geo-engineering (or Climate Intervention) ... Larry et al have translated this into "climate mitigation"
2. Climate Services (e.g., for agriculture) ... This was also identified by Larry in his emails to all staff
3. MetOcean ... this was not strongly supported and didn't go further.

What does this mean? I consulted with staff ... identified areas of growth for our Program ... represented these to our BUET, then to CSIRO's ET, and this has influenced ET's position ... and influenced outcomes, including areas of growth (l.e., new positions and retention of staff). To me ... this closed loop is what we need ... and what I think we should expect under our EA.

Other detailed comments are below.
Kind Regards
Peter

[^2]From: <Thresher>, O\&A <Ann>, Ann Thresher [Ann.Thresher@csiro.au](mailto:Ann.Thresher@csiro.au)
Date: Thursday, 25 February 2016 3:23 pm
To: Peter Oke [Peter.Oke@csiro.au](mailto:Peter.Oke@csiro.au)
Cc: Mark Green [Mark.Green@csiro.au](mailto:Mark.Green@csiro.au)
Subject: Re: RP1 consultation since November 2015
Thanks Peter - I was constructing an email to ask you for this.
If this does actually constitute consultation, then it might well make the court case go away. I note that no mention is made of whether budget limitations, staff allocations, potential redistribution of effort or the like was discussed in any of these meetings prior to the announcement on 4 Feb . I'm sure a lot of people attend a lot of meetings but whether relevant issues are discussed is what's important.

## re: budget limitations

I've mentioned budget limitations at most meetings with our staff. I attached the minutes from the RP1 BD meeting on 11 November (not prepared by me ...).
re:staff allocations
ve explicitly discussed staff allocations with staff at meetings during November 2015. My own notes I used (perhaps the dates of the file will confirm that I haven't modified this --. "OCD Program Discussion - Nov 2015.docx")
re: potential redistribution
I discussed this explicitly with staff at one (or more) of the BD meetings in November. See my notes in the document called "Ocean Intelligence.docx". It states an area of contraction is "Climate change research" and "Global sea-level rise"

Regarding these documents. They are on my computer, with the Date modified some time in November 2015. I'm happy for anyone to check.

Simply informing staff about decisions taken is not consultation. Genuine consultation occurs when you (as Research Director) are told that there is an issue (funding, redirection of priorities) and there will potentially be ramifications (redundancies) unless measures are taken and then input is requested about possible actions. Consultation doesn't mean everyone needs to be asked for an opinion but our information right now is that even Ken was blindsided by this which strongly implies you weren't told about it either. So consultation doesn't seem to have included the people who actually might have made meaningful comment. But I'm happy if you can refute this. And I note that the EB requires that the Staff ssociation be told when any move of this magnitude, which will have a significant impact on staff, is considered (which reeds to be well before a decision has been made).

As noted above, regarding the trail of impact of discussions re: Geo engineering and Climate Services ... I strongly believe that we consulted, listened, and influenced outcomes to the highest level of our organisation. This "trail of influence" is repeated here:
Some of the impacts of this consultation made it all the way to senate estimates. Prior to Christmas, we met with Alex Wonhas and promoted opportunities in three areas:

1. Geo-engineering (or Climate Intervention) ... Larry et al have translated this into mitigation
2. Climate Services (e.g., for agriculture) ... This was also identified by Larry in his emails to all staff
3. MetOcean ... this was not strongly supported and didn't go further.

What does this mean? I consulted with staff ... identified areas of growth ... represented these to our BUET, then to CSIRO's ET, and this has influenced ET's position ... and influenced outcomes, including areas of growth (l.e., new positions and retention of staff). To me ... this closed loop is what we need ... and what I think we should expect under our EA.

Regarding 'bringing staff down' by questions about consultation, this is the message I'm getting from everyone I talk to.
Yes - I see that.

I genuinely think that there has been consultation - with real impacts, as noted above. I think l've successfully empowered our staff to influence outcomes. They did influence outcomes. Perhaps things would have been much worse if this consultation didn't occur.
I've heard a lot of staff promoting disastrous outcomes from this, which are simply not true.
Last week - or perhaps the week before - you tried to insist in one of our meetings that 100 FTEs would be lost from our two climate programs. I told you it was wrong. But you pushed. You're wrong on this. I was telling you that you were wrong. Despite that, staff heard you say - and and insist on - this and their anxiety increases unnecessarily.
Similarly, when you say there's been no consultation - staff feel like they can have no influence and have had no incfluence. I fact, they have had significant influence. To some extent, they can feel some satisfaction (albeit bitter sweet) that they influenced the outcome positively.

It's uppermost in many people's minds given that the target and method of implementation/notification has baffled them. How did we arrive where we are and who is directly responsible? Vocalizing this is necessary if we're to see how we arrived at this point.

These are questions for those that made the ultimate decisions - the ET.
In my view .. The ET ran a process of review. They looked at each BUs Programs (they looked at all nine BUs). They considered documentation provided to them by the BUs (I describe above how our staff influenced that documentation). The ET then made decisions about how they will allocate funds ... with implications on staff numbers. It's their job to decide how to spend the funds allocated to our organisation. We're now implementing those decisions.

These are fair questions and attacking the messenger is not helpful.
I know all about attacking the messenger ... it happens to me several times a day. That's fine -it's part of my role right now.
But Ann - as a senior member of our Program, you have considerable influence. You can raise the spirit, or bring it down. You can promote anxiety, or provide some assurance. So l ask you to please try to help me and others look after our staff. Soon, things will be clear. Until then, we need to help staff cope with this awful and uncertain situation.

The feeling is that, if there were even a rudimentary understanding of what we do, then the plan as put forward appears rushed, and illogical. This is further magnified by the fact that management is only now thinking about the full ramifications and is not yet able to end the uncertainty.

Consider the alternative.
There's an announcement that there are 100 FTEs lost and here's a list.
Or ... there are 100 FTEs lost, and our leadership team will try to figure out the best way to retain a workforce that can function properly and deliver impact. I've met with our staff every week since these announcements. Feedback from staff has influenced the outcomes. I've visited Aspendale twice since the announcements (I will again on Monday). It takes time - and l'm including our staff as much as I can.

Sorry to be long winded! But these are important issues and resolving them will decrease stress, not increase it. As scientists, we are evidence driven and like to see the paths we've been led down. If something is logical, then it is more acceptable.

1 agree.
I will pass on your list to the SA. Hopefully it will help them in their dispute with CSIRO.
My goal is not to avoid a dispute if it's warranted. My goal is to look after staff and seek the best outcome in this difficult situation.

Again, thanks for taking the time to put this together.

Cheers, Ann.
*** $* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$

Dr. Ann Gronell Thresher Phone: (03) 62-325-419
Scientist-in-charge of Operations: (Int'l) (61-3) 62-325-419
Argo/SOOP
Fax: (03) 62-325-123
CSIRO Division of Marine and
Atmospheric Research
GPO Box 1538
Hobart, TAS 7001
(Int'1) (61-3) 62-325-123

Australia

From: <Oke>, O\&A <Peter>, "Hobart)" [Peter.Oke@csiro.au](mailto:Peter.Oke@csiro.au)
Date: Thursday, 25 February 2016 12:07 PM
To: Ann Thresher [Ann.Thresher@csiro.au](mailto:Ann.Thresher@csiro.au)
Subject: FW: RP1 consultation since November 2015

Ann - For what it's worth ... I note your questions about consultation with staff relating to our current situation, I compiled a list of meetings that have involved consultation with RP1 staff over recent months. I've highlighted meetings l've attended, as acting Research Director, with RP1 science leaders (in bold); and with all RP1 staff (red; at least all staff on each site). l've also included (but not high-lighted) meetings l've had with all of our
RGLs, our BUET and the CSIRO's ET. Every time l've met with our BUET or with anyone from CSIRO's ET, I consulted with our staff before the meeting, and reported back after the meeting. I've reported as openly as I'm allowed (noting the confidential nature of discussions relating to redundancies). During this period, I've listened to all staff, who've been given many opportunities to provide input, and represented our staff's views to our various levels of management. I'm not sure how I could have provided more consultation opportunities to our staff - but l'm happy to take advice.

Since the Deep Dive was announced, there's been fewer than 80 working days - and during that time l've consulted with our staff, or represented views from our staff on over 40 separate occasions.

I'm happy for this to be forwarded to the union. l'll probably send it at some point myself.
Kind Regards
Peter
Dr. Peter Oke, Ocean Climate Dynamics Research Dírector (acting)
CSIRO Oceans \& Atmosphere
GPO Box 1538, Hobart TAS 7001. Australia
Phone: +61362325387 Mob
s47F
http://www.cmar.csiro.au/staff/okel

## Anevski, Pam (C\&G, Parkville)

| From: | Oke, Peter (O\&A, Hobart) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, 25 February 2016 12:07 PM |
| To: | Thresher, Ann (O\&A, Hobart) |
| Subject: | FW: RP1 consultation since November 2015 |
| Attachments: | RP1 consultation since November 2016.docx |

Ann For what it's worth Š I note your questions about consultation with staff relating to our current situation, I compiled a list of meetings that have involved consultation with RP1 staff over recent months. I've highlighted meetings I've attended, as acting Research Director, with RP1 science leaders (in bold); and with all RP1 staff (red; at least all staff on each site). I've also included (but not high-lighted) meetings I've had with all of our RGLs, our BUET and the CSIRO's ET. Every time I've met with our BUET or with anyone from CSIRO's ET, I consulted with our staff before the meeting, and reported back after the meeting. I've reported as openly as I'm allowed (noting the confidential nature of discussions relating to redundancies). During this period, I've listened to all staff, who've been given many opportunities to provide input, and represented our staff's views to our various levels of management. I ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~m}$ not sure how I could have provided more consultation opportunities to our staff but I ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~m}$ happy to take advice.

Bince the Deep Dive was announced, there's been fewer than 80 working days and during that time l've consulted with our staff, or represented views from our staff on over 40 separate occasions.
$I^{1} \mathrm{~m}$ happy for this to be forwarded to the union. I'll probably send it at some point myself.

[^3]
## RP1 consultation since November 2016

Drafted: 25/2/2016

Tues, 10/11:

1. Wed, 11/11:
2. Thur, 12/11:
3. Mon, 16/11:
4. Tues, 17/11:
5. Wed, 18/11:
6. Fri, 20/12:
7. Mon, 23/11:
8. 
9. Tues, 24/11:
10. Wed, 25/11:
11. 
12. Thur, 26/11:
13. Fri, 27/11:
14. Sat, 28/11:
15. Tues, $1 / 12$ :
16. Wed, $2 / 12$ :
17. Thur, 3/12:
18. Fri, 4/12:
19.10/12:
20.Mon, 14/12:
19. 
20. Wed, 16/12:
21. Mon, 21/12:
24.Tues, 22/12:
22. Tues, 5/1:
23. Fri, 8/1:
24. Tues, 19/1:
25. Wed, 20/1:
26. Thur, 21/1:
27. Mon, 1/2:
28. Tues, $2 / 2$ :
29. 

33.Wed, $3 / 2$ :
34.
35. Fri, 5/2:
36.9-11/2:
37.Fri, 12/2:
38.Tues, 16/2:
39.Wed, 17/2:
40.Thurs, 18/2:
41.Fri, 24/2:
42.
$1^{\text {st }}$ meeting invitation for DD Mtg
RP1 science leaders (HBA-only)
$1^{\text {st }}$ BUET DD meeting
RD + RGL meeting (DD update)
RP1 science leaders (ASP-only)
$2^{\text {nd }}$ BUET DD meeting
RP1 science leaders (HBA+ASP)
MCV Discussion (RD + 3-4 staff)
Decadal Prediction Discussion (RD + 3-4 staff)
Geo-Engineering Discussion (RD + 3-4 staff)
$3^{\text {rd }}$ BUET DD meeting (RD + BUET)
RP1 all-staff update (HBA-only)
RP1 all-staff update (ASP-only)
RD + RGL DD update
$3^{\text {rd }}$ BUET DD meeting
DD rehearsal - BUET + Alex (RD + BUET)
$4^{\text {th }}$ BUET DD meeting
$R D+R G L D D$ update
DD with Larry et al. (RD + ET)
RP1 (HBA+ASP) staff update on DD
RD + RGL meeting
RP1 operational meeting
RP1 Science leaders (HBA+ASP)
prep meeting for mtg w/Alex (RD + 3-4 staff)
Meeting with Alex (RD + BUET)
RP1 Science Leaders (HBA+ASP)
RD + staff, Geo-Engineering discussion
RP1 Science leaders (HBA+ASP)
RD + RGL meeting
RD + RP1 (ASP) "show and tell"
Program operational meeting
RP1 Science leaders (HBA+ASP)
RD + RP1 (ASP) response to feedback
RD + Team meetings (ASP)
RD + RGL meeting
O\&A all staff meeting
BUET meeting (re Redundancies plans)
RP1 (HBA+ASP) staff update
RP1 Science leaders (HBA+ASP)
RD + RGL meeting
RP1 (HBA+ASP) staff update
RP1 (HBA+ASP) staff update
O\&A all staff meeting


[^0]:    Asp $=$ Aspendale
    D = Docklands

[^1]:    

[^2]:    Dr. Peter Oke, Ocean Climate Dynamics Research Director (acting)
    CSIRO Oceans \& Atmosphere
    GPO Box 1538, Hobart TAS 7001. Australig,
    Phone: +61 362325387 Mob:

[^3]:    Kind Regards
    Peter
    Dr. Peter Oke, Ocean Climate Dynamics Research Director (acting)
    CSIRO Oceans \& Atmosphere
    GPO Box 1538, Hobart TAS 7001, Australia
    Phone: +61362325387 Mob: s47F
    http://www.cmar.csiro.au/staff/oke/

