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Resolution of appointment

At its meeting on Thursday, 19 February 2015, the Assembly passed the following resolution:

“That:

(1) a Select Committee on Estimates 2015-2016 be appointed to examine the expenditure proposals contained in the Appropriation Bill 2015-2016, the Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015-2016 and any revenue estimates proposed by the Government in the 2015-2016 Budget and prepare a report to the Assembly;

(2) in keeping with Continuing Resolution 8A, the committee be composed of:

(a) two Members to be nominated by the Government; and

(b) two Members to be nominated by the Opposition;

to be notified in writing to the Speaker by 4 pm today;

(3) an Opposition Member shall be elected chair of the committee by the committee;

(4) funds be provided by the Assembly to permit the engagement of external expertise to work with the committee to facilitate the analysis of the Budget and the preparation of the report of the committee;

(5) the committee is to report by Tuesday, 4 August 2015;

(6) if the Assembly is not sitting when the committee has completed its inquiry, the committee may send its report to the Speaker or, in the absence of the Speaker, to the Deputy Speaker, who is authorised to give directions for its printing, publishing and circulation; and

(7) the foregoing provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders.”[[1]](#footnote-2)
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Recommendations

[Recommendation 1](#_Toc426024817)

[1.12 The Committee recommends that all Questions Taken on Notice, not answered within the inquiry period be provided to the Clerk within 30 days from the tabling of this report.](#_Toc426024818)

[Recommendation 2](#_Toc426024819)

[2.9 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider, as part of its ongoing concessions review, the ability for self-funded retirees to access certain concessions.](#_Toc426024820)

[Recommendation 3](#_Toc426024821)

[2.16 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government should consult further with older Canberrans to determine ideal housing types and consider removing barriers within current planning laws that impede construction in established suburbs.](#_Toc426024822)

[Recommendation 4](#_Toc426024823)

[2.23 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government engage with National Seniors Association ACT regarding representation on the Ministerial Council on the Ageing.](#_Toc426024824)

[Recommendation 5](#_Toc426024825)

[2.31 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government make improvements to the funding of arts programs in the ACT and the infrastructure for obtaining private funding support, noting the positive benefits that the arts bring to various sectors of the community.](#_Toc426024826)

[Recommendation 6](#_Toc426024827)

[2.45 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government and the ACT arts community develop a working group to address the issues between these sectors and help develop a more cohesive learning environment.](#_Toc426024828)

[Recommendation 7](#_Toc426024829)

[2.58 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government restore the funding for weeds management to previous levels.](#_Toc426024830)

[Recommendation 8](#_Toc426024831)

[2.66 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government ensure a comprehensive whole-of-government approach, as well as community consultation, to determine the best investment and environmental option for waste to energy initiatives.](#_Toc426024832)

[Recommendation 9](#_Toc426024833)

[2.78 The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider establishing a single nature conservation agency, in line with previous announcements and as recommended by the Select Committee on Estimates 2014‑2015.](#_Toc426024834)

[Recommendation 10](#_Toc426024835)

[2.88 The Committee recommends the ACT Government complete the review of the Emergency Financial and Material Aid program, including community service delivery agencies in the formation of the review, and table the review by the last sitting day in October 2015.](#_Toc426024836)

[Recommendation 11](#_Toc426024837)

[2.109 The Committee recommends the ACT Government report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day of 2015 on how it will better include the youth sector in its consultations, to ensure more collaborative processes and the development of greater trust.](#_Toc426024838)

[Recommendation 12](#_Toc426024839)

[2.113 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government implement a whole-of-government strategy to address issues affecting Canberra’s youth such as employment and mental health support, with a focus on early intervention and prevention.](#_Toc426024840)

[Recommendation 13](#_Toc426024841)

[2.117 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government develop a program of improving and educating young students on the value of positive mental health, as is currently the case with physical health and wellbeing.](#_Toc426024842)

[Recommendation 14](#_Toc426024843)

[2.122 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government examine the social procurement model and its positive outcomes for youth employment, and subsequently increase social procurement in ACT Government contracts.](#_Toc426024844)

[Recommendation 15](#_Toc426024845)

[2.133 The Committee recommends the ACT Government develop a long-term strategy for the delivery of animal welfare services in the ACT, including preventive investment and educational approaches. The strategy should be tabled in the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day of March 2016.](#_Toc426024846)

[Recommendation 16](#_Toc426024847)

[2.140 The Committee recommends the ACT Government legislate for improved animal welfare, including:](#_Toc426024848)

[ a civil bond process for violations of the Animal Welfare Act;](#_Toc426024849)

[ changes to the Animal Welfare Act allow for recovery of costs to be awarded as part of a guilty verdict, at least for medical costs incurred;](#_Toc426024850)

[ limiting the maximum number of animals allowed per residence (including public housing);](#_Toc426024851)

[ amendments to seizure powers;](#_Toc426024852)

[ additional enforcement powers;](#_Toc426024853)

[ minor amendments to current offences and new offences under the Animal Welfare Act;](#_Toc426024854)

[ clarification in relation to ancillary offences; and](#_Toc426024855)

[ penalty reviews.](#_Toc426024856)

[These matters should be progressed by the last sitting day in June 2016.](#_Toc426024857)

[Recommendation 17](#_Toc426024858)

[2.174 The Committee supports the ACT Government’s provision of a primary prevention program in schools to reinforce respectful relationships and counter domestic violence.](#_Toc426024859)

[Recommendation 18](#_Toc426024860)

[2.175 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work with the community sector to determine the level of unmet need with particular regard to housing and homelessness and therapeutic services; in conjunction with work being undertaken by the Domestic Violence Preventative Council, and update the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in June 2016.](#_Toc426024861)

[Recommendation 19](#_Toc426024862)

[2.176 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government explore the option of extending the Land Rent Scheme to Tier 2 and Tier 3 housing providers.](#_Toc426024863)

[Recommendation 20](#_Toc426024864)

[2.202 The Committee recommends that before the Budget is passed, the ACT Government detail to the Legislative Assembly what funding is included in the Budget to address the priorities as outlined in the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement 2015-18.](#_Toc426024865)

[Recommendation 21](#_Toc426024866)

[2.203 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body and other relevant stakeholders to facilitate a process to establish an independent ACT Indigenous Chamber of Business, with a particular emphasis on small and medium business, and report to the Legislative Assembly on its progress on the last sitting day of 2015.](#_Toc426024867)

[Recommendation 22](#_Toc426024868)

[2.204 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review the resources required to enable the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body to effectively carry out its functions as legislated for in *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Act 2008*.](#_Toc426024869)

[Recommendation 23](#_Toc426024870)

[2.205 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider a regional Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children’s’ services agency in conjunction with the NSW Government.](#_Toc426024871)

[Recommendation 24](#_Toc426024872)

[3.23 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review funding to the ACT Auditor‑General to allow for an increase in the number of performance audits over time.](#_Toc426024873)

[Recommendation 25](#_Toc426024874)

[4.15 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government and the Speaker hold further discussions on how to implement the Territory’s Protective Security Policy Framework with particular regard to the Assembly and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426024875)

[Recommendation 26](#_Toc426024876)

[4.16 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government and the Speaker hold further discussions on how to best progress enhanced library services for the Assembly and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426024877)

[Recommendation 27](#_Toc426024878)

[4.22 The Committee recommends that in the event the Treasurer presents in the Legislative Assembly a bill for an Appropriation Act for the appropriation for the Office of the Legislative Assembly relating to a financial year, and the appropriation is less than the “recommended appropriation” given to the Treasurer by the Speaker in accordance with section 20 of the *Financial Management Act 1996*, the Treasurer comply with both the intent and the spirit of section 20AA(2) of that Act.](#_Toc426024879)

[Recommendation 28](#_Toc426024880)

[4.23 The Committee recommends that in the event the Treasurer presents in the Legislative Assembly a bill for an Appropriation Act for the appropriation for an Officer of the Legislative Assembly relating to a financial year, and the appropriation is less than the “recommended appropriation” given to the Treasurer by the Speaker in accordance with section 20AB of the *Financial Management Act 1996*, then the Treasurer comply with both the intent and the spirit of section 20AC(2) of that Act.](#_Toc426024881)

[Recommendation 29](#_Toc426024882)

[4.34 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work with the Speaker to address concerns regarding the funding and administrative arrangements required to support the functions established under the *Officers of the Assembly Legislation Amendment Bill 2013*, including amendments to the *Auditor-General Act 1996*, and report to the Legislative Assembly on progress by the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426024883)

[Recommendation 30](#_Toc426024884)

[4.40 The Committee recommends that the Speaker update the Legislative Assembly at least once each quarter until the end of the 8th Assembly on the progress of the construction works required to accommodate an enlarged 9th Assembly.](#_Toc426024885)

[Recommendation 31](#_Toc426024886)

[4.41 The Committee recommends that the Speaker investigate future accommodation options for the Assembly.](#_Toc426024887)

[Recommendation 32](#_Toc426024888)

[5.20 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government determine and report on how to measure the effectiveness of the 'One Government' reforms by the last sitting day of 2015 and report regularly thereafter.](#_Toc426024889)

[Recommendation 33](#_Toc426024890)

[5.26 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government advise the Legislative Assembly before the ACT Budget 2015-16 is passed, if known, how much funding for responses to family and domestic violence will go to the national campaign and how much to direct service delivery.](#_Toc426024891)

[Recommendation 34](#_Toc426024892)

[5.48 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government should consider developing and launching an updated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment policy for the ACT public service.](#_Toc426024893)

[Recommendation 35](#_Toc426024894)

[5.55 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide further details on how the establishment and implementation of the iConnect platform is progressing.](#_Toc426024895)

[Recommendation 36](#_Toc426024896)

[5.56 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide further details on how the rollout of public Wi-Fi across Canberra is progressing](#_Toc426024897)

[Recommendation 37](#_Toc426024898)

[5.57 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide further details on the use of Wi-Fi for the trial of smart parking in the ACT.](#_Toc426024899)

[Recommendation 38](#_Toc426024900)

[5.85 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government’s budget update on progressive tax reform include detail on whether or not the reforms are revenue neutral.](#_Toc426024901)

[Recommendation 39](#_Toc426024902)

[5.89 The Committee recommends that in the 2016-17 Budget the ACT Government report on the first five-year phase of tax reform and outline its plan for the next five-year phase of tax reform, in particular its commitment to the principle of revenue neutrality and its long term goal of abolishing stamp duty over two decades.](#_Toc426024903)

[Recommendation 40](#_Toc426024904)

[5.94 The Committee recommends that the results of these reviews, or at least those that are complete should be tabled in the Legislative Assembly, as they were funded under previous years’ budgets.](#_Toc426024905)

[Recommendation 41](#_Toc426024906)

[5.98 The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider ways to support and develop the ‘sharing economy’ in the ACT, including how to improve the use of underutilised assets in the household, community, business and government sector.](#_Toc426024907)

[Recommendation 42](#_Toc426024908)

[5.105 The Committee commends the ACT Government for the opening of Winyu House in Gungahlin, acknowledging this is the largest employment base in the Gungahlin Town Centre and will have a positive impact on the local area, especially Town Centre businesses.](#_Toc426024909)

[Recommendation 43](#_Toc426024910)

[5.118 The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider extending the five per cent weighting for local content to all tenders invited by the ACT Government.](#_Toc426024911)

[Recommendation 44](#_Toc426024912)

[5.124 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government include appropriate standard termination/withdrawal clauses in all contracts for the provision of Capital Metro.](#_Toc426024913)

[Recommendation 45](#_Toc426024914)

[5.130 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly with an update by the last sitting day in October 2015, on progress finding suitable alternative sites for the Manuka Occasional Child Care Association (MOCCA) relocation.](#_Toc426024915)

[Recommendation 46](#_Toc426024916)

[5.160 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government update its Tourism 2020 strategy to consider the ten years to 2030 and take into account:](#_Toc426024917)

[i) accommodation;](#_Toc426024918)

[ii) attractions; and](#_Toc426024919)

[iii) events.](#_Toc426024920)

[Recommendation 47](#_Toc426024921)

[5.175 The Committee recommends the ACT Government fund stage two of the Belconnen Arts Centre.](#_Toc426024922)

[Recommendation 48](#_Toc426024923)

[5.176 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider the provision of arts facilities in the Woden/Weston Creek area and Gungahlin.](#_Toc426024924)

[Recommendation 49](#_Toc426024925)

[5.187 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider assisting the arts sector by determining a path to improve the wages paid to the arts community.](#_Toc426024926)

[Recommendation 50](#_Toc426024927)

[5.200 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government, in conjunction with relevant stakeholders, promulgate a vision for Canberra’s CBD.](#_Toc426024928)

[Recommendation 51](#_Toc426024929)

[5.201 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government develop a vision for Canberra as a whole, with a:](#_Toc426024930)

[ long-term plan of 50 years;](#_Toc426024931)

[ medium term plan of 15 years; and](#_Toc426024932)

[ short term plan of 5 years.](#_Toc426024933)

[Recommendation 52](#_Toc426024934)

[5.207 The Committee recommends that the Minister for Urban Renewal and Minister for Housing work as closely as possible on the redevelopment of public housing to ensure that residents are provided with consistent and timely information.](#_Toc426024935)

[Recommendation 53](#_Toc426024936)

[5.211 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government inform the Legislative Assembly of the final cost of delivery of West Basin Stomping Ground on the first sitting day after it is known.](#_Toc426024937)

[Recommendation 54](#_Toc426024938)

[5.250 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly, before the ACT Budget 2015-16 is passed, with an update on the financial status of the loose-fill asbestos buy-back scheme.](#_Toc426024939)

[Recommendation 55](#_Toc426024940)

[5.251 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider how undetected loose-fill asbestos properties will be detected and brought to its attention.](#_Toc426024941)

[Recommendation 56](#_Toc426024942)

[5.253 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide further information to the Legislative Assembly on the status of reported asbestos contamination at the dump site under Nudurr Drive Extension between Crace and Palmerston within 90 days of this report being tabled in the Assembly.](#_Toc426024943)

[Recommendation 57](#_Toc426024944)

[5.274 The Committee recommends the ACT Government closely monitor the first 12 months of Access Canberra and report to the ACT Legislative Assembly in March 2016 on its first 12 months of operation, including community awareness, engagement and satisfaction levels, organisational change and staff issues, and collaboration across ACT Government.](#_Toc426024945)

[Recommendation 58](#_Toc426024946)

[5.278 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government establish performance indicators for the number of Working with Vulnerable People checks to be carried out each year.](#_Toc426024947)

[Recommendation 59](#_Toc426024948)

[5.338 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide details to the Assembly of any changes to the Icon Water dividend policy that may result from the working group’s advice, within five sitting days of its receipt.](#_Toc426024949)

[Recommendation 60](#_Toc426024950)

[5.344 The Committee recommends that the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission, in its next review of water pricing in the ACT, consider a pricing point for community usage to support community owned facilities such as sporting facilities.](#_Toc426024951)

[Recommendation 61](#_Toc426024952)

[5.357 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider sensible and well‑timed divestment of its holdings in fossil fuels.](#_Toc426024953)

[Recommendation 62](#_Toc426024954)

[6.11 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government reconsider the decision to use *Eucalyptus mannifera* as the replacement tree on Northbourne Avenue.](#_Toc426024955)

[Recommendation 63](#_Toc426024956)

[6.12 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government undertake a staged approach to tree replacement on Northbourne Avenue.](#_Toc426024957)

[Recommendation 64](#_Toc426024958)

[6.17 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government release the second review of the full Capital Metro Business Case before the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426024959)

[Recommendation 65](#_Toc426024960)

[7.18 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide reports on the Office for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Community Recovery, Office for Ageing, youth engagement, Office for Women and Office of Multicultural Affairs, including the exact costings of the programs and projects run by each sub-unit, by the last sitting week in October 2015.](#_Toc426024961)

[Recommendation 66](#_Toc426024962)

[7.19 The Committee recommends that in future budget papers the ACT Government amend the Community Services Directorate Output Class 3 so that there be seven sub-Outputs:](#_Toc426024963)

[3.1 Corporate](#_Toc426024964)

[3.2 Women](#_Toc426024965)

[3.3 Multicultural Affairs](#_Toc426024966)

[3.4 Ageing](#_Toc426024967)

[3.5 Community Recovery](#_Toc426024968)

[3.6 Youth Engagement](#_Toc426024969)

[3.7 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs](#_Toc426024970)

[and determine appropriate accountability indicators for each of the seven Outputs.](#_Toc426024971)

[Recommendation 67](#_Toc426024972)

[7.27 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government include in its National Disability Insurance Scheme quarterly reporting to the Legislative Assembly information on the level of staffing in Disability ACT and Therapy ACT during the transition.](#_Toc426024973)

[Recommendation 68](#_Toc426024974)

[7.34 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government continue to work with Tier 2 community service organisations on the NDIS Information, Linkages and Capacity Building to ensure a smooth transition of funding with appropriate notification periods for those organisations.](#_Toc426024975)

[Recommendation 69](#_Toc426024976)

[7.45 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government determine the level of unmet need for early intervention services and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015 on the level of unmet need and how they intend to address that need.](#_Toc426024977)

[Recommendation 70](#_Toc426024978)

[7.50 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide regular updates to the Legislative Assembly on the implementation of the Step Up for Our Kids strategy especially with relation to improving capacity and strengthening of high risk families.](#_Toc426024979)

[Recommendation 71](#_Toc426024980)

[7.57 The Committee recommends the ACT Government continue working to identify and address needs in supporting aged carers.](#_Toc426024981)

[Recommendation 72](#_Toc426024982)

[7.58 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate the need for grandparent playgroups, aimed at grandparents providing care for their own grandchildren, and report back to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day of March 2016.](#_Toc426024983)

[Recommendation 73](#_Toc426024984)

[7.62 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work with the Commonwealth Government to ensure appropriate funding to meet the demand for aged care accommodation in Canberra.](#_Toc426024985)

[Recommendation 74](#_Toc426024986)

[7.69 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government assess the viability of green and garden waste collection throughout the Territory and report back to the Legislative Assembly by the first sitting day in March 2016.](#_Toc426024987)

[Recommendation 75](#_Toc426024988)

[7.70 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate expanding bulky waste collection as part of the ACT concessions program for current and future social housing properties.](#_Toc426024989)

[Recommendation 76](#_Toc426024990)

[7.76 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government develop initiatives that seek to reduce financial abuse of elderly Canberrans.](#_Toc426024991)

[Recommendation 77](#_Toc426024992)

[7.96 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work closely with the community sector on the continuation of the Community Sector Reform Program.](#_Toc426024993)

[Recommendation 78](#_Toc426024994)

[7.97 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly with details of what is planned for the remaining funds already collected under the Community Sector Reform Program levy.](#_Toc426024995)

[Recommendation 79](#_Toc426024996)

[7.98 The Committee recommends that ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly with details of what the continued Community Sector Reform Program levy will be spent on over the next two years including an outline of the cost-benefit ratio by the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426024997)

[Recommendation 80](#_Toc426024998)

[7.104 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government update the Legislative Assembly on the outcomes of actions that are being taken to find suitable alternative accommodation for Gugan Gulwan.](#_Toc426024999)

[Recommendation 81](#_Toc426025000)

[7.112 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government undertake consistent monitoring of key objectives in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement to ensure milestones are being met and report to the Legislative Assembly on a quarterly basis.](#_Toc426025001)

[Recommendation 82](#_Toc426025002)

[7.118 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate a policy of random identifiable drug and alcohol testing for staff and detainees at Bimberi Youth Justice Centre.](#_Toc426025003)

[Recommendation 83](#_Toc426025004)

[7.128 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government write to those public housing tenants affected by the public housing renewal program clearly detailing timeframes for their relocation.](#_Toc426025005)

[Recommendation 84](#_Toc426025006)

[7.129 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government guarantee that tenants in a public housing asset included in the Asset Sales agreement with the Federal Government are able to be relocated into suitable replacement public housing prior to the sale of the asset.](#_Toc426025007)

[Recommendation 85](#_Toc426025008)

[7.136 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government explain to the Legislative Assembly its criteria for selecting the location of new public housing and social housing properties by the last sitting day in October 2015.](#_Toc426025009)

[Recommendation 86](#_Toc426025010)

[7.137 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government identify to the Legislative Assembly the standard costings they use for a public housing property replacement cost by the last sitting day in October 2015.](#_Toc426025011)

[Recommendation 87](#_Toc426025012)

[7.138 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government identify to the Legislative Assembly how many one, two, three or four or other bedroom properties they are planning to build under the public housing renewal program, by the last sitting day in October 2015.](#_Toc426025013)

[Recommendation 88](#_Toc426025014)

[7.139 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government guarantee that the total stock of public housing in the ACT will not fall below the level as at 30 June 2014 of 10,848 dwellings, as per the Asset Sales agreement.](#_Toc426025015)

[Recommendation 89](#_Toc426025016)

[7.147 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government outline how directing the proceeds from the sale of public housing assets towards construction of Capital Metro delivers the best return to the ACT economy.](#_Toc426025017)

[Recommendation 90](#_Toc426025018)

[7.154 The Committee recommends the ACT Government provide quarterly updates to the Legislative Assembly on progress in reducing homelessness in the ACT, based on First Point data, including the number of people waiting for housing assistance and the number of housing placements made in the period under consideration.](#_Toc426025019)

[Recommendation 91](#_Toc426025020)

[8.18 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government detail to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day of 2015 how the Education and Training Directorate will reach its target of two per cent Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander employees.](#_Toc426025021)

[Recommendation 92](#_Toc426025022)

[8.26 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly its assumptions that underpin modelling in any publications or presentations in relation to future school developments and projections by the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426025023)

[Recommendation 93](#_Toc426025024)

[8.52 The Committee recommends the ACT Government consult more closely with the affected parties in the Telopea Park/Manuka Occasional Child Care Association (MOCCA) land swap, to investigate in detail what other options might be available.](#_Toc426025025)

[Recommendation 94](#_Toc426025026)

[8.79 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conclude its inquiry into the inappropriate withdrawal space in an ACT school expeditiously and provide an update to the Legislative Assembly within three sitting days of receipt.](#_Toc426025027)

[Recommendation 95](#_Toc426025028)

[8.80 If the report is not available for the August 2015 sittings, the Committee recommends that the ACT Government update the Assembly on progress to date.](#_Toc426025029)

[Recommendation 96](#_Toc426025030)

[8.120 The Committee recommends that the Canberra Institute of Technology ensure that Auslan Certificate II and III courses are offered to ensure communication access for Deaf people in the ACT by providing a pathway to Interpreting courses.](#_Toc426025031)

[Recommendation 97](#_Toc426025032)

[9.12 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government reconsider DV306 with regard to solar access and report on the review to the Legislative Assembly.](#_Toc426025033)

[Recommendation 98](#_Toc426025034)

[9.20 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government table the Light Rail Master Plan within three sitting days of its completion and receipt.](#_Toc426025035)

[Recommendation 99](#_Toc426025036)

[9.21 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government update the Legislative Assembly on progress regarding design along the light rail corridor.](#_Toc426025037)

[Recommendation 100](#_Toc426025038)

[9.30 The Committee recommends that the ACT Heritage Council ensure that, when advertising Heritage decisions, it is made clear as to what the closing date for comment and/or appeal is.](#_Toc426025039)

[Recommendation 101](#_Toc426025040)

[9.31 The Committee recommends that the ACT Heritage Council review the guidelines for notification periods for heritage listings.](#_Toc426025041)

[Recommendation 102](#_Toc426025042)

[9.38 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government examine the alternative analysis by the Energy Supply Association of Australia of future costs of the ACT’s renewable energy policy and confirm if the Government’s projections are still valid; and report its findings to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in November 2016.](#_Toc426025043)

[Recommendation 103](#_Toc426025044)

[10.13 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider provide the results of the independent review of medical training culture at the Canberra Hospital to the Legislative Assembly within three months of receipt.](#_Toc426025045)

[Recommendation 104](#_Toc426025046)

[10.22 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government continue to work with all First Ministers and the Commonwealth Government to ensure sustainable health funding for State and Territory governments so they can continue to deliver high quality health services to the community.](#_Toc426025047)

[Recommendation 105](#_Toc426025048)

[10.33 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government collect data on why non-elective surgeries get cancelled and report back to the Legislative Assembly on how it will address the issues driving cancellations.](#_Toc426025049)

[Recommendation 106](#_Toc426025050)

[10.43 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government detail to the Legislative Assembly the proposed timetable and funding for the design and construction of the proposed new building 2/3, known as the ‘Tower Block’.](#_Toc426025051)

[Recommendation 107](#_Toc426025052)

[10.44 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government detail to the Legislative Assembly the expenditure of $40 million previously allocated for the proposed new building 2/3 at Canberra Hospital, known as the ‘Tower Block’.](#_Toc426025053)

[Recommendation 108](#_Toc426025054)

[10.51 The Committee recommends that the Health Directorate produce and use a standard table of definitions of ‘bed’ including definitions of acute, subacute, non-acute, and overnight and day beds, in-patient and out-patient beds, bed spaces and traditional and non-traditional beds.](#_Toc426025055)

[Recommendation 109](#_Toc426025056)

[10.58 The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider an improved way of communicating how health services and health outcomes are delivered to the community.](#_Toc426025057)

[Recommendation 110](#_Toc426025058)

[10.64 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide clear definitions for counting staff numbers including head count, fulltime employees, fulltime employees (ACT funded) and fulltime employees (externally funded) and fulltime employees (all funding sources), full time equivalents and agreed abbreviations.](#_Toc426025059)

[Recommendation 111](#_Toc426025060)

[10.65 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide a breakdown of Full Time Equivalents in its annual reports indicating the number of positions externally funded and the number funded by the ACT Government.](#_Toc426025061)

[Recommendation 112](#_Toc426025062)

[10.71 The Committee recommends that any decision-making by the ACT Government around community access to health services be undertaken with proper community consultation.](#_Toc426025063)

[Recommendation 113](#_Toc426025064)

[10.80 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conduct a review into the number of patients admitted to the Adult Mental Health Unit with predominantly drug-related issues rather than mental health issues and that a plan be formulated for managing drug addicted/affected patients.](#_Toc426025065)

[Recommendation 114](#_Toc426025066)

[10.86 The Committee recommends that a whole-of-government inquiry be carried out, and the findings presented to the Legislative Assembly by March 2016, on the inpatient and outpatient services, support programs and care models for adolescents facing mental health issues.](#_Toc426025067)

[Recommendation 115](#_Toc426025068)

[10.91 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government table a copy of the framework for the Adult Mental Health Unit by the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426025069)

[Recommendation 116](#_Toc426025070)

[The Committee recommends the ACT Government should consider addressing the social determinants of obesity through a whole-of-government approach, in conjunction with the obesity clinic.](#_Toc426025071)

[Recommendation 117](#_Toc426025072)

[10.102 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate additional ways to ensure that breast screen services reach women at a level equivalent to at least that of other Australian states.](#_Toc426025073)

[Recommendation 118](#_Toc426025074)

[10.107 The Committee recommends the ACT Government explore opportunities to create a more child and family friendly space at Clare Holland House when they care for paediatric patients. This could include consideration of:](#_Toc426025075)

[ different needs of preschool, primary and secondary aged children;](#_Toc426025076)

[ providing specialist paediatric staff, either temporarily or permanently, when treating paediatric patients and their families; and](#_Toc426025077)

[ providing age appropriate temporary or permanent physical spaces for paediatric patients and their families.](#_Toc426025078)

[Recommendation 119](#_Toc426025079)

[10.116 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider determining the cost of alcohol-related injuries and diseases on the ACT community with regard to:](#_Toc426025080)

[ financial cost;](#_Toc426025081)

[ staff time; and](#_Toc426025082)

[ facilitation,](#_Toc426025083)

[and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426025084)

[Recommendation 120](#_Toc426025085)

[10.117 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider determining the cost of tobacco-related injuries and diseases on the ACT community with regard to:](#_Toc426025086)

[ financial cost;](#_Toc426025087)

[ staff time; and](#_Toc426025088)

[ facilitation,](#_Toc426025089)

[and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015.](#_Toc426025090)

[Recommendation 121](#_Toc426025091)

[11.52 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government appoint a fifth Supreme Court judge.](#_Toc426025092)

[Recommendation 122](#_Toc426025093)

[11.59 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government monitor the effectiveness of the new court listing process and update the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in March 2016.](#_Toc426025094)

[Recommendation 123](#_Toc426025095)

[11.74 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government report to the Legislative Assembly on a quarterly basis on the progress of addressing family violence in the ACT.](#_Toc426025096)

[Recommendation 124](#_Toc426025097)

[11.86 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government present in the Legislative Assembly a statement clarifying the primary intent of the review of rights protection agencies in the ACT, and proposals for their amalgamation, before any major legislative or administrative changes are made for those agencies.](#_Toc426025098)

[Recommendation 125](#_Toc426025099)

[11.96 The Committee, noting the intended use of the London Circuit car park by Capital Metro, recommends that the ACT Government ensure adequate parking is available for the Court precinct and local traders during the Law Court renovations.](#_Toc426025100)

[Recommendation 126](#_Toc426025101)

[11.97 The Committee recommends that during the Law Court renovations the ACT Government assist in court users’ physical safety by ensuring appropriate pathways and adequate lighting.](#_Toc426025102)

[Recommendation 127](#_Toc426025103)

[11.119 The Committee recommends the ACT Government develop a policy to address recruitment issues, such as lateral transfers and advertising of positions, to ensure the most equitable outcomes for applicants and to obtain the best staffing outcomes for the government.](#_Toc426025104)

[Recommendation 128](#_Toc426025105)

[11.131 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly, within three sitting days of receipt of the detail, the full cost of modifying its Hume Air Base hangar to house the Agusta 139 helicopter in 2017.](#_Toc426025106)

[Recommendation 129](#_Toc426025107)

[11.135 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider accountability indicators for both the Rural Fire Service and State Emergency Service under the Response and Recovery heading of the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Budget Statement.](#_Toc426025108)

[Recommendation 130](#_Toc426025109)

[11.139 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conduct a formal evaluation of Community Fire Units and present it to the Legislative Assembly by June 2016.](#_Toc426025110)

[Recommendation 131](#_Toc426025111)

[11.167 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government develop and table a comprehensive approach to addressing drug driving, including community awareness and legal implications.](#_Toc426025112)

[Recommendation 132](#_Toc426025113)

[11.172 The Committee recommends the ACT Government update the Assembly prior to the start of the 2016 school year on its focus on improving road safety, particularly around school zones, as outlined in the 2015-16 Ministerial Direction.](#_Toc426025114)

[Recommendation 133](#_Toc426025115)

[11.193 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate a policy of random identifiable drug and alcohol testing for staff and detainees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre.](#_Toc426025116)

[Recommendation 134](#_Toc426025117)

[12.9 The Committee, noting the treatment of ACTION funding in the 2015-16 Budget papers, recommends that funding for any organisation should only be included in the budget papers in one location.](#_Toc426025118)

[Recommendation 135](#_Toc426025119)

[12.19 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government ensure a timely and well funded road resealing program.](#_Toc426025120)

[Recommendation 136](#_Toc426025121)

[12.26 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government complete the duplication of Ashley Drive from Ellerston Avenue to Johnston Drive as part of the proposal contained in the 2015-16 ACT Budget.](#_Toc426025122)

[Recommendation 137](#_Toc426025123)

[12.31 The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider funding in this financial year to begin the duplication of Horse Park Drive from Majura Parkway to Well Station Drive to align with duplication from Well Station Drive to Anthony Rolfe Avenue.](#_Toc426025124)

[Recommendation 138](#_Toc426025125)

[12.35 The Committee recommends the ACT Government continue to work closely with Burgmann Anglican School to explore new options for improving road and pedestrian safety around Burgmann School.](#_Toc426025126)

[Recommendation 139](#_Toc426025127)

[The Committee recommends that the ACT Government expedite the solution to access issues to the former Pitch ‘n’ Putt site in Woden.](#_Toc426025128)

[Recommendation 140](#_Toc426025129)

[12.46 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government introduce a new ‘NoWaste’ target.](#_Toc426025130)

[Recommendation 141](#_Toc426025131)

[12.51 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government place greater emphasis on the amenity of nearby residents when planning changes at the Mugga and Belconnen tips to ensure the amenity of nearby residents.](#_Toc426025132)

[Recommendation 142](#_Toc426025133)

[12.65 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government engage in detailed consultation with local communities about shopping centre upgrades and place particular weight on what facilities the community would like to see.](#_Toc426025134)

[Recommendation 143](#_Toc426025135)

[12.66 The Committee recommends that in selecting trees for shopping centres the ACT Government take into account staining, litter and safety hazards.](#_Toc426025136)

[Recommendation 144](#_Toc426025137)

[12.72 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide additional information to the community about the locations and timeframes of playground upgrades.](#_Toc426025138)

[Recommendation 145](#_Toc426025139)

[12.73 The Committee recommends the ACT Government engage with the community about playground spaces and consider innovative ways to provide safe and enjoyable play spaces, including through:](#_Toc426025140)

[ encouraging community and local business input, maintenance and potentially funding; and](#_Toc426025141)

[ new models of playspaces such as natural playgrounds.](#_Toc426025142)

[Recommendation 146](#_Toc426025143)

[12.78 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government should consider additional strategies to remove graffiti on private property.](#_Toc426025144)

[Recommendation 147](#_Toc426025145)

[12.94 The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider installing behavioural signposts around Lake Tuggeranong and Emu Inlet, as well as line markings, for the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists.](#_Toc426025146)

[Recommendation 148](#_Toc426025147)

[12.100 The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider introducing a Bus Driver of the Year award.](#_Toc426025148)

* 1. Acronyms and Abbreviations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ABF | Activity Based Funding |
| ACT | Australian Capital Territory |
| ACTAS | ACT Ambulance Service |
| ACTIA | ACT Insurance Authority |
| ACTPS | ACT Public Service |
| AMC | Alexander Maconochie Centre |
| ARACY | Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth |
| ATSIEB | Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body |
| CFC | Cultural Facilities Corporation |
| CFU | Community Fire Unit |
| CIE | Centre for International Economics |
| CIT | Canberra Institute of Technology |
| CMA | Capital Metro Agency |
| CMTEDD | Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate |
| COAG | Council of Australian Governments |
| COTA | Council on the Ageing |
| CPA | Certified Practicing Accountant |
| CPI | Consumer Price Index |
| CSD | Community Services Directorate |
| CTP Regulator | ACT Compulsory Third‑Party Insurance Regulator |
| EBA | Enterprise Bargaining Agreement |
| EBT | Expenses on Behalf of the Territory |
| EFMA | Emergency Financial and Material Aid |
| EPD | Environment and Planning Directorate |
| EPIC | Exhibition Park in Canberra |
| ESA | Emergency Services Agency |
| ETD | Education and Training Directorate |
| FTE | Full Time Equivalent |
| GPO | Government Payment for Outputs |
| HAAS | Healthcare Access At School |
| HR | Human Resources |
| IBA | Indigenous Business Australia |
| ICRC | Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission |
| ICT | Information and Communications Technology |
| ILC | Information, Linkages and Capacity Building |
| JACS | Justice and Community Safety Directorate |
| LDA | Land Development Agency |
| LHN | Local Hospital Network |
| LINCT | Linking into New Communities Taskforce |
| LSN | Local Services Network |
| MLA | Member of the Legislative Assembly |
| MOCCA | Manuka Occasional Child Care Association |
| NDIA | National Disability Insurance Authority |
| NDIS | National Disability Insurance Scheme |
| NERA | National Education Reform Agreement |
| NPA | National Partnership Agreement |
| NSEP | Needle and Syringe Exchange Program |
| OLA | Office of the Legislative Assembly |
| PID | Public Interest Disclosure |
| QON | Question on Notice |
| QTON | Question Taken on Notice |
| RFS | Rural Fire Service |
| RJ | Restorative Justice |
| RSPCA ACT | Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals ACT |
| RTO | Registered Training Organisation |
| SES | Senior Executive Service |
| SES | State Emergency Service |
| SHS | Snowy Hydro SouthCare |
| SPA | Superannuation Provision Account |
| SRS | Sport and Recreation Services |
| STEM | Science, Technology, Engineering, Maths |
| TAMS | Territory and Municipal Services Directorate |
| TBA | Territory Banking Account |
| TES | Tertiary Entrance Statement |
| The Committee | Select Committee on Estimates 2015-2016 |
| TQI | Teacher Quality Institute |
| UC | University of Canberra |
| YWCA Canberra | Young Women’s Christian Association of Canberra |

# Introduction

* 1. Establishment of the Committee

On Thursday, 19 February 2015, the Legislative Assembly for the ACT considered a resolution to create a Select Committee on Estimates 2015-16 (the Committee), moved by Mr Brendan Smyth MLA.[[2]](#footnote-3) Amendments were considered and accepted, and the motion was passed as amended. [[3]](#footnote-4)

On the same day the Speaker of the Assembly announced that Dr Chris Bourke MLA, Ms Meegan Fitzharris MLA, Ms Nicole Lawder MLA and Mr Brendan Smyth MLA had been nominated as members of the Committee, to which they were, by motion, appointed. [[4]](#footnote-5)

* 1. Conduct of the Inquiry

The Committee first met on 26 February 2015. Mr Smyth MLA and Ms Fitzharris MLA were elected as Chair and Deputy Chair respectively.

At successive private meetings the Committee considered and accepted proposals for: community and industry groups to be asked to comment on the ACT Budget 2015-16, and to appear before the Committee during hearings; and a schedule of public hearings during which community groups, government agencies, and statutory office-holders would appear before the Committee as part of its inquiry.

The Committee also agreed to engage a specialist adviser to provide independent economic and financial analysis of the ACT Budget 2015-16, in accordance with Standing Order 238 of the Assembly and as provided for in the Committee’s Resolution of Appointment. The Centre for International Economics (CIE) was selected via a competitive tender process to provide the specialist budget adviser services to the Committee. CIE provided the Committee with a report on the Budget entitled ‘Review of the 2015-16 ACT Budget’.

The Committee held public hearings over 11 days from Friday 12 June 2015 to Friday 26 June 2015 inclusive, hearing evidence across all ministerial portfolios; the officers of all Territory Owned Corporations, all ACT statutory officers and Officers of the Legislative Assembly.

Hansard transcripts of the evidence provided at the hearings are available on the Inquiry webpage. Public hearings can be viewed at the Committees on Demand section of the Assembly website, a portal of audio-visual recordings of committee hearings.

The Committee deliberated on its report over 4 days of private meetings.

In total the Committee met 24 times during the course of the inquiry, including private meetings and public hearings.

A total of 197 questions were taken on notice (QTONs) by Ministers and Officials during the hearings. An additional 56 questions on notice (QONs) were submitted subsequent to the hearings, taking the total number of questions to 254. The Appendices in Volume Two of this Report provide a listing of the question subjects, the Minister to whom the question was addressed, and the date answers for each question were received. This listing was current as at 5.00pm on 29 July 2015. At that time, the answers to 2 QTONs and 1 QON were outstanding. This equates to 251 out of 254 questions or 98.8 per cent answered.

With regard to outstanding questions on notice, the Committee notes that Standing Order 253A of the Legislative Assembly states:

When presenting its report, the Chair of the Select Committee on Estimates will present to the Assembly a schedule listing questions on notice for which answers were not provided during the annual estimates inquiry. Outstanding questions on notice will be provided to the Clerk within 30 days from the tabling of the estimates report. The Speaker will present to the Assembly the answers received after the report has been tabled and a schedule of questions on notice outstanding after the 30-day period.

The Committee recommends that all Questions Taken on Notice, not answered within the inquiry period be provided to the Clerk within 30 days from the tabling of this report.

* 1. Structure of the Report

The structure of this report by the Select Committee on Estimates 2015-16 is as follows.

* + - * 1. Volume One

Volume One contains the Committee’s Report:

* This introduction, Chapter One, outlines the establishment of the Committee, the conduct of the inquiry as well as an outline of the structure of the report.
* Report chapters commence with community groups and Officers of Parliament, then the Treasury and Chief Minister’s portfolio areas. The balance of the chapters follows the sequence of the 2015-16 Budget Statements.
* Each chapter reflects the issues discussed at the Committee’s public hearings in relation to individual Directorates and agencies.
* Within chapters, for each agency, sub-agency, or statutory office-holder considered, information is presented in the following manner:
* Introduction — providing a brief description of the entity; and
* Output Classes or Business Units (as applicable)— for each Output Class/business unit, information is divided into:
* Matters considered — providing a summary of substantive issues discussed in hearings, with citations to the relevant sections of transcripts of hearings; and
* Key issues — providing an expanded coverage of selected issues from ‘Matters considered’ as well as the views of the Committee on the matters they have considered during the inquiry; and the recommendations the Committee has made in relation to those matters.
  + - * 1. Volume Two

Volume Two contains the appendices to the report as follows:

* a list of hearings and witnesses appearing before the Committee;
* a list of exhibits tabled during hearings;
* a list of the community groups that provided written feedback to the Committee;
* a table of Questions Taken on Notice and Questions on Notice asked and answered in the context of the inquiry; and
* the report of the specialist budget adviser.

Exhibits tabled, submissions from community groups, Questions Taken on Notice and Questions on Notice asked and their responses, as well as the report of the specialist budget adviser are published on the Committee’s website.

* 1. Acknowledgements

The Committee thanks everyone who participated in, or otherwise assisted, this Inquiry. These include, among others, representatives of ACT community groups, ACT Government Ministers, Members of the Assembly, Members’ staff, statutory office holders, ACT Government officials, and staff of the Office of the Legislative Assembly.

# Community Groups

On Friday 12 June, the Committee heard from a range of community groups regarding their concerns with the ACT 2015‑16 Budget.

* 1. National Seniors Australia – ACT Policy Advisory Group
     1. Introduction

National Seniors Australia (NSA) is a not-for-profit organisation that gives voice to issues that affect Australians aged 50 years and over, providing member’s views to governments, businesses and the community. It is the largest membership organisation of its type in Australia with more than 200,000 members.[[5]](#footnote-6)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing, the following matters were considered:

* the impact of general rates increases on seniors and self-funded retirees;**[[6]](#footnote-7)**
* the provision of appropriate suburb facilities, housing and downsizing options for seniors and retirees;**[[7]](#footnote-8)**
* the provision of green waste bins;**[[8]](#footnote-9)** and
* representation on the Ministerial Council on the Ageing.**[[9]](#footnote-10)**
  + 1. Key issues
       1. General rates increases

In his opening statement, the NSA ACT Policy Advisory Group Chair (the NSAPAG Chair) expressed concern over general rates increases that impact heavily on people of low and fixed incomes, and who may be asset rich and income poor. The Chair indicated that National Seniors Australia would be in favour of increases to the GST as a way to increase ACT revenue.[[10]](#footnote-11)

The NSAPAG Chair noted that rates have increased due to the value of the land increasing in established Canberra suburbs; a lot of seniors live in these suburbs, and not in newer suburb areas such as Gungahlin. It was acknowledged that rates increases are due to the revaluing of land value, affecting both pensioners and non-pensioners alike.[[11]](#footnote-12)

While it was acknowledged that aged pensioners may receive general rates and stamp duty concessions, self-funded retirees and those still in employment cannot benefit from these and other schemes that are provided to pensioners.[[12]](#footnote-13)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee acknowledges the financial impact that increasing land values and therefore increasing general rates charges may have on pensioners, other seniors and self-funded retirees, especially in conjunction with increases in other regulatory fees such as motor vehicle registration and parking.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider, as part of its ongoing concessions review, the ability for self-funded retirees to access certain concessions.

* + - 1. Appropriate facilities and housing options

The NSAPAG Chair indicated that the current ACT planning system does not result in adequate outcomes for most retirees. Retirees wish to downsize to appropriately sized single storey housing, but residential planning is targeted towards multiunit retirement villages and smaller units which do not adequately cater for seniors who may also be carers for their grandchildren.[[13]](#footnote-14)

In response to a question from the Committee, the NSAPAG Chair provided his view that the issues around property downsizing and the supply of appropriate housing for seniors does vary between suburbs, but the cost of building property suitable for the elderly discourages builders from completing such developments, who tend rather to develop multiunit dwellings inappropriate for seniors.[[14]](#footnote-15)

The NSAPAG Chair noted that older people still require housing of an adequate size, particularly couples. Suitable properties that meet the needs of seniors and would allow seniors to remain close to established social networks, communities and facilities are not being developed in established suburbs. The Chair did acknowledge that development of suitable properties in established suburbs would require community consultation and engagement.[[15]](#footnote-16)

The NSAPAG acknowledged to the Committee that it was aware of the funding in the ACT Budget 2015-16 to retro-fit some suburbs to make them more age friendly, including wheelchair ramps and widening footpaths.[[16]](#footnote-17) The President of the National Seniors Canberra North Branch indicated that such an initiative would have benefitted from further consultation, and needed discussion on how such improvements to the public space related to suitable housing for seniors and private homes and units.[[17]](#footnote-18)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the concerns of the NSAPAG in relation to property planning in the ACT. The Committee is particularly interested in planning options in established inner suburbs that would produce desirable outcomes for the elderly, including the ability to downsize into appropriately constructed housing, within suburbs where seniors have established community networks.[[18]](#footnote-19)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government should consult further with older Canberrans to determine ideal housing types and consider removing barriers within current planning laws that impede construction in established suburbs.

* + - 1. Green waste collection

The Committee heard that while seniors may have downsized they may still have a large area of land for which they are responsible for under ACT Government regulation. Seniors would be limited in the resources and capability in which to maintain this land and on occasion, may be required to engage paid services to address the issues of green waste.[[19]](#footnote-20)

The organisation stated that many other electorates appear to have green waste collection bins, and there is a strong push from seniors in the community for the ACT to adopt the approach of other jurisdictions.[[20]](#footnote-21)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

In response to a question from the Committee, the NSAPAG Chair confirmed that while the National Seniors Association would like to see green waste collection across the whole ACT, such a service would be particularly pertinent to seniors who retire in place or who downsize but still have a garden. Green waste collection would remove the need to hire services to dispose of green waste for those who are unable to do so themselves.[[21]](#footnote-22)

This matter was discussed further with the Minister for Ageing on 18 June 2015 (see Chapter - for an overview of that discussion and associated recommendations).

* + - 1. Representation

The Committee noted the advice from the National Seniors Association that it is distinct from the Council of the Ageing. The NSAPAG advised that the Association does not currently have representation on the ACT Ministerial Council on the Ageing, although steps to attaining representation on this Council are progressing.[[22]](#footnote-23)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government engage with National Seniors Association ACT regarding representation on the Ministerial Council on the Ageing.

* 1. The Childers Group
     1. Introduction

The Childers Group advocates support for the arts to governments at all levels, and engages with the private sector, educators, the media and the broader community about the value of the arts and their role in the cultural sector.[[23]](#footnote-24)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearings, the following matters were considered:

* lack of funding growth for the ACT Arts Fund and other funding issues;**[[24]](#footnote-25)**
* appropriate salaries for those working in the arts;**[[25]](#footnote-26)**
* the arts policy framework and the completion and circulation of an economic impact statement;**[[26]](#footnote-27)**
* the interaction between the arts and education communities;**[[27]](#footnote-28)** and
* the future of the Kingston Foreshore arts precinct.**[[28]](#footnote-29)**
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Arts Funding

In his opening statement, the Childers Group Coordinator (the Coordinator) raised concerns that since 2005, funding for the ACT Arts Fund has not been increased beyond CPI. As this Fund is the main form of government support for the arts in the ACT, any lack of funding growth results in key arts organisations being ‘constrained in their ability to engage with the community and to meet community need.’[[29]](#footnote-30)

In addition to the ACT Arts Fund, the Coordinator noted that the local office of the former Australian Business Arts Foundation (now Creative Partnerships Australia) has been closed, resulting in no local infrastructure for arts organisations to get philanthropic support. While arts organisations benefit from public funding and private sector support, attaining corporate sponsorship is hampered by the excessive time required to secure such sponsorship in organisations with very few resources.[[30]](#footnote-31)

In response to a question from the Committee, the Coordinator confirmed that a more synergistic approach across the ACT’s various arts organisations would be very beneficial and cost effective (for example, a third of the ACT’s arts organisations are located in Ainslie and Gorman Arts Centres, allowing potential sharing of resources). However, in practice this is difficult to implement due to differences in funding sources and the varying types of art produced by organisations.[[31]](#footnote-32)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee agrees that community involvement in the arts creates positive outcomes, including development of the ‘link between artists, creative industries and innovation’.[[32]](#footnote-33) The Committee notes with concern the inadequate funding in place for arts in the ACT, including a lack of infrastructure for obtaining philanthropic support within the local area.[[33]](#footnote-34)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government make improvements to the funding of arts programs in the ACT and the infrastructure for obtaining private funding support, noting the positive benefits that the arts bring to various sectors of the community.

* + - 1. salaries in the arts

The Committee asked for further information regarding The Childers Group statement that ‘the lack of arts funding growth leads to the inability of arts organisations to attract skilled personnel and then retain staff over the long term.’[[34]](#footnote-35)

The Childers Group confirmed that ACT arts employees are competing in a market with a strong public service presence and arts organisations are unable to pay wages similar to those of government, leading to an inability for arts organisations to attract and retain good staff.[[35]](#footnote-36)

The Childers Group indicated that increased funding from government would allow small amounts of money into each arts organisation to increase salaries for CEOs, but acknowledged that while the government has a responsibility to support the arts it is not responsible for determining art organisation salaries.[[36]](#footnote-37)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the concerns regarding the levels of remuneration in the arts sector for executive and other officers.[[37]](#footnote-38)

This issue was raised with the Minister at the hearing of 26 June 2015. (See Chapter - for details of those discussions and the associated recommendation).

* + - 1. Policy Framework and Economic impact statement

The Coordinator noted that the ACT Government had recently undertaken a review of its arts policy framework. However, the Coordinator felt that there had been very minimal consultation throughout this review and he understood that the final draft review policy would not be released for consultation purposes.[[38]](#footnote-39)

It was previously agreed that the ACT Government would complete an economic impact statement, and the Coordinator understands that this has been completed as part of the policy review. However, at the time of the hearing, there was no indication that the statement would be made available by the ACT Government or artsACT. The Coordinator was unsure that the new policy would have any impact if the outcomes of the economic impact statement were unknown, and the minimal and hurried consultation that occurred during development of the new arts policy.[[39]](#footnote-40)

The Childers Group made the point that participation in the arts has clear links to community inclusion, health and innovation. In this light, the economic impact statement is required to clarify the benefits, sector activity and positive economic impact that investment in the arts produces.[[40]](#footnote-41)

This matter was discussed further with the Minister for the Arts on 26 June 2015. See Chapter  - , for details.

* + - 1. Arts and Education

In response to a question from the Committee in relation to whole-of-government integration of the arts across all portfolios, the Coordinator indicated that arts organisations find it very difficult to build relationships with the Education and Training Directorate, leading to a waning of engagements between the arts sector and the education sector.[[41]](#footnote-42)

Following a question from the Committee, it was acknowledged by the Coordinator that the difficulties with education arise in relation to performance art rather than visual art (where an artist is residence program for schools is available, funded by the Commonwealth Government). However, it is a widely held view that it is very difficult for arts organisations to deal with the education sector.[[42]](#footnote-43)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned about the ongoing relationship issues between the arts community and the Education and Training Directorate.[[43]](#footnote-44) These issues will create an ongoing divide between the sectors to the detriment of students and other community members.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government and the ACT arts community develop a working group to address the issues between these sectors and help develop a more cohesive learning environment.

* + - 1. Kingston Foreshore arts precinct

In response to a question from the Committee, the Childers Group identified the Kingston Foreshore as an important national and international arts precinct, and is interested to know how the area might grow in the future. In particular, the Childers Group indicated the importance of investment in capital works maintenance to support established arts precincts and venues, as such investment goes to attracting and retaining artists and performers.[[44]](#footnote-45)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee agrees that the Kingston Foreshore arts precinct plays an important role in the ACT arts community and environment. This precinct requires a clear plan for future development and continuance, to support the cultural importance of the area.

The Committee notes that the Kingston Foreshore Arts Precinct Feasibility Study was released by the Minister on 20 June 2015.

* 1. Conservation Council ACT Region
     1. Introduction

The Conservation Council ACT Region is a non-profit, non-government incorporated group. It aims to achieve the highest quality environment for the Canberra region both now and in the future, through advocacy, campaigning and community engagement.[[45]](#footnote-46)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearings, the following matters were considered:

* underfunding of the weeds management budget;**[[46]](#footnote-47)**
* transparency in biodiversity offsets;**[[47]](#footnote-48)**
* the proposed waste to energy facility and associated business case;**[[48]](#footnote-49)**
* funding of the Environmental Defenders Office;**[[49]](#footnote-50)**
* divestment in fossil fuel projects by the ACT Government;**[[50]](#footnote-51)** and
* funding of a one-stop-shop for environmental approvals on matters of significance.**[[51]](#footnote-52)**
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Weeds Management

The Conservation Council’s Weeds Manager expressed concern over the ACT Budget 2015-16 reduction to the weeds management program, particularly in the absence of any scientific evidence to support this reduction. He indicated that previous funding levels of $2 million per annum has enabled the ACT weeds strategy to be fully and stably implemented. The funding cuts in this Budget will not allow for adequate weeds management in the coming financial years, setting the program back a decade by allowing controlled weeds to regrow and propagate. The Weeds Manager noted that funding into weeds management is important, as insufficient funding will adversely affect biodiversity, agricultural areas and landscapes.[[52]](#footnote-53)

Despite being a member of the ACT Weeds Advisory Group, the Weeds Manager explained that the Group was not consulted about the funding reduction; the Budget documents also did not adequately identify how the reduction would impact on discretionary and overall funding, requiring a number of follow-up enquiries to the relevant directorate.[[53]](#footnote-54)

On notice, the Conservation Council provided the Committee with:

* additional information on potential future invasive weeds in the ACT;
* the title of an additional reference document for information on meeting the objectives of the ACT Weed Strategy; and
* Parks & Conservation Service maps which provide a broad overview of the extent of weed management undertaken in the ACT over the financial years 2013-14, 2014-15 and the draft proposal for 2015-16 given the proposed reduction to the weeds budget.[[54]](#footnote-55)

This matter was discussed further with the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services on 24 June 2015. See Chapter 12 for details.

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee was concerned to hear of the reduced funding for weeds management in the region, especially in the absence of a scientific basis for the reduction, and notes the positive work of recent years may be reversed if funding is inadequate in the future.

The Committee notes that the Conservation Council request that previous funding levels are maintained, and the advice that ‘if you spend money on weeds in a year then you reduce your problem for future years and by underfunding weed management you create a massive issue which a future government will have to deal with.’[[55]](#footnote-56)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government restore the funding for weeds management to previous levels.

* + - 1. Biodiversity Offsets

The Conservation Council noted that there are a number of projects in the ACT where the Commonwealth requires biodiversity offsets; these offsets compensate for the adverse residual impacts of an action (such as residential development) on the environment.[[56]](#footnote-57) In most cases it is the ACT Government that is required to meet the cost of such offsets. However, the Conservation Council expressed concern that development of Offset Management Plans is not subject to public consultation requirements or funding transparency.[[57]](#footnote-58)

The Executive Director expressed concerns regarding biodiversity offsets as listed in the Budget, as they were not sufficiently transparent to show achievement of the required outcome of no net loss of biodiversity. Any biodiversity offsets in the ACT Budget 2015-16 must be in addition to those offsets already in place.[[58]](#footnote-59)

* + - 1. Waste to energy Facility

The ACT Budget 2015-16 allocates funding of $2.8 million to investigate the long‑term options for waste management and treatment in the ACT, including the development of a full business case for a waste to energy facility.[[59]](#footnote-60)

The Conservation Council noted its concern that there had been insufficient public consultation on the various other ways of reducing waste going to landfill. There are a range of options for reducing waste to landfill, and there is a range of policy matters that need to be considered before any one waste to energy option is agreed to.[[60]](#footnote-61)

The Executive Director noted that burning waste still results in residual waste products and gases. Product stewardship (such as banning polystyrene) and composting in proper vessels are alternative examples for reducing products in the waste stream and creating energy. While this Budget has allocated funding to develop a full business case on a waste to energy facility, the Executive Director expressed concern that this indicates the ACT Government is not open to exploring other options, such as composting waste and green waste bins.[[61]](#footnote-62)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee concurs with the Conservation Council that funding for a business case for a waste to energy facility is a significant investment into an important initiative. Therefore, the development of the business case should be subject to broad consultation, and consideration and evaluation of all the viable options.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government ensure a comprehensive whole-of-government approach, as well as community consultation, to determine the best investment and environmental option for waste to energy initiatives.

* + - 1. Divestment

The Executive Director commended the ACT Government for taking steps to combat climate change, but noted that the government should not be investing in fossil fuels which contribute to climate change. The Executive Director encouraged the government to divest of fossil fuel investment, to ‘align its climate change policy with its investment policy.’[[62]](#footnote-63)

The Executive Director also encouraged the ACT Government to have greater transparency in its fossil fuel investments. While the public may be aware of the companies invested in, the quantum of that investment is unknown. The Executive Director noted that ‘it is possible to make divestments based on government policy. We want to know if there is a pathway being mapped for that and if [the government] could declare it.’[[63]](#footnote-64)

Additionally, the Executive Director noted that such investments could become ‘stranded assets’ as they will not be performing if the world takes action on climate change. Divestment can be made on the basis on government policy.[[64]](#footnote-65)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that sensible divestment from fossil fuels is an important step in addressing climate change.

This issue was raised with the Minister at the hearing of 15 June 2015. (See Chapter 5 – Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate for details of those discussions and associated recommendation).

* + - 1. ‘One‑stop Shop’ Environmental Approvals

The Executive Director discussed funding issues regarding a one-stop shop for environmental approvals where matters of National Environmental Significance are involved; the ACT Budget 2015-16 allocated funding over the forward estimates for such arrangements.[[65]](#footnote-66) However, the Conservation Council advised that at a federal level one-stop shop arrangements have not been agreed, and are not supported by the Australian Labor Party or the Greens. The ACT Budget allocation is therefore considered perplexing.[[66]](#footnote-67)

This matter was discussed with the Minister for the Environment at the hearing on 23 June 2015.[[67]](#footnote-68) The Minister advised that:

We have put in place the necessary approvals framework to allow for a one-stop shop here in the ACT. The issue for us is that the Commonwealth parliament has not yet agreed to the necessary legislative changes at a Commonwealth level to allow for the full implementation of one-stop shop arrangements in the states and territories. In the interim we continue to make sure that we have as streamlined a process as possible for approvals under those intergovernmental agreements.[[68]](#footnote-69)

* + - 1. Nature Conservation Agency

The Committee questioned whether there was still a need for a single nature conservation agency in the ACT. The Executive Director confirmed that there was still a definite need for a single agency and supported its implementation, while noting that such an arrangement had already been agreed to between the ACT Greens and ACT Labor.[[69]](#footnote-70)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that the issue of a single nature conservation agency has been ongoing for approximately two years.[[70]](#footnote-71)

The Select Committee on Estimates 2014‑2015 also recommended that the Government establish as a priority the single Nature Conservation Agency in order to achieve better integration of policy, planning, research and management.**[[71]](#footnote-72)**

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider establishing a single nature conservation agency, in line with previous announcements and as recommended by the Select Committee on Estimates 2014‑2015.

* 1. UnitingCare Kippax
     1. Introduction

UnitingCare Kippax is a community service agency that runs a variety of programs funded from a number of sources, to assist the people of the ACT who struggle with issues of low income, housing stress, relationship problems and social disadvantage.[[72]](#footnote-73)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing the following matters were discussed:

* level of funding for the Emergency Financial and Material Aid program;**[[73]](#footnote-74)**
* the practical assistance provided by UnitingCare Kippax to a Service User experiencing financial difficulty;**[[74]](#footnote-75)**
* the continuation of the 0.34 per cent levy for the Community Sector Reform Program;**[[75]](#footnote-76)**
* the funding of the Better Services and Strengthening Families Programs;**[[76]](#footnote-77)** and
* the provision of public housing.**[[77]](#footnote-78)**
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Emergency Financial and Material Aid program

The Executive Minister expressed concern that the Emergency Financial and Material Aid (EFMA) program remains underfunded, with the level of support remaining constant over a number of years despite substantial increases in demand. The EFMA program addresses food, medical and clothing needs, primarily for people who are experiencing financial hardship, and provides a safety net where other services are unable to meet immediate demand.[[78]](#footnote-79)

EFMA funding is provided to UnitingCare Kippax, St Vincent de Paul and the Salvation Army, who work in conjunction with other support streams available in the community, to support the whole of the ACT.[[79]](#footnote-80)

The Executive Minister believes UnitingCare Kippax is underfunded by approximately $100,000 per annum, resulting in decreased staffing levels and longer wait times that exacerbate the problems for people experiencing financial difficulty.[[80]](#footnote-81)

While a review into the EFMA was first mentioned over two years ago, the Executive Minister noted that they are yet to see terms of reference. The organisation remains concerned that the delay of the review into the future of the EFMA program has and will negatively impact on those who are already most vulnerable.[[81]](#footnote-82) There have been recent indications that the review has been amended to a ‘conversation’ to be had over coming years, and the organisation has concerns that ‘demand keeps growing while that review or conversation is ready to take place’, resulting in unchanged funding levels and thus significant funding pressures.[[82]](#footnote-83)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The organisations funded through the EFMA provide valuable and timely support to those in need in the ACT, and are under increasing financial pressure to provide adequate services in the face of growing demand.

The Committee is concerned that the elapsed time and ongoing uncertainty over a review or conversation on the future state of the EFMA is directly resulting in financial pressures for these community organisations, and uncertainty over the future delivery of services. The Committee also notes that the Select Committee on Estimates 2014‑2015 made recommendations in relation to the EFMA concerning these issues, which do not appear to have been addressed.[[83]](#footnote-84)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:[[84]](#footnote-85)

The Committee recommends the ACT Government complete the review of the Emergency Financial and Material Aid program, including community service delivery agencies in the formation of the review, and table the review by the last sitting day in October 2015.

* + - 1. Community Sector Reform Program

The Committee questioned the unexpected continuation for two further years in the ACT Budget 2015-16 of the 0.34 per cent levy on community sector funding, in order to support the Community Sector Reform Program. The Executive Minister confirmed that the organisation was not anticipating its continuation, nor were other similar organisations in the community sector.[[85]](#footnote-86)

UnitingCare Kippax had stated in its submission to the Committee that the continuation was not appropriate, as:

the levy significantly impacts on community sector organisations who are required to absorb increasing costs as funding in the sector is ‘rolled over’ for another year. Along with others in the sector, we do not believe there is evidence that the imposition of this levy has produced results of benefit to the sector.[[86]](#footnote-87)

The Executive Officer confirmed that while some staff had undertaken training funded by the levy, the understanding was that the levy had not been fully expended, raising questions whether the money had been suitably expended for purpose. The Executive Officer confirmed that without the imposition of the levy, further commitments could be made to professional development and collaborative work with similar organisations to ensure that workforce processes are relevant to the needs of the local community.[[87]](#footnote-88)

The Executive Minister noted that by the time the levy amount is removed, indexation will be less than the increase in wage costs, resulting in funds withdrawal from other services to maintain staffing levels.[[88]](#footnote-89)

This matter was discussed further with the Minister on 18 June 2015. (See Chapter 7 – Community Services Directorate for an overview of that discussion and associated recommendations.)

* + - 1. Better Services Program

The Committee asked UnitingCare Kippax if it had any concerns regarding the targeting and effective application of the One Human Services Gateway and Strengthening Families programs, for which funding has been extended in the ACT Budget 2015-16 under the Better Services Program.[[89]](#footnote-90)

The Executive Minister stated that it is important that the funding is properly used in line with the desired outcomes of the Blueprint for Human Services. This can be achieved through continued collaboration and communication across the sector, but it will ‘take a reasonable amount of time to demonstrate the change in the outcomes that are achieved.’[[90]](#footnote-91)

* 1. Youth Coalition of the ACT
     1. Introduction

The Youth Coalition is the peak youth affairs body in the ACT, responsible for representing and promoting the interests and wellbeing of young people aged 12 to 25 years and those who work with them. The Youth Coalition provides information to youth services about policy and program matters.[[91]](#footnote-92)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing, the following matters were considered:

* education;**[[92]](#footnote-93)**
* the relationship between the government and the community sector;**[[93]](#footnote-94)**
* early intervention and prevention strategies;**[[94]](#footnote-95)**
* the promotion of positive mental health;**[[95]](#footnote-96)**
* the Community Sector Reform Program funding levy;**[[96]](#footnote-97)** and
* job creation and employment.**[[97]](#footnote-98)**
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Education

The Director of the Youth Coalition noted the importance of education as a social determinant of health, with poor educational engagement leading to negative outcomes in later life, including housing stress and homelessness. The Director stressed the importance of schools and community services working together to build effective relationships to support young people staying engaged with education.[[98]](#footnote-99)

The Director observed that engaging families within a school community is important. This allows families to connect with the culture of a school, and provides opportunities for a whole family to experience positive change and solutions together, and to properly achieve the ‘schools as communities’ notion.[[99]](#footnote-100)

The Director also discussed the need for children to feel safe in order to learn, stating ‘consistently, young people from diverse cultural backgrounds talk to [the Coalition] about racism in schools being their number one problem’.[[100]](#footnote-101) Young people want to address these issues with friends and family, and need the right community support and surroundings in which to do so.[[101]](#footnote-102)

* + - 1. Community Sector Reform Program

The Youth Coalition expressed similar concerns to UnitingCare Kippax over the continuation of the Community Sector Reform Program levy of 0.34 per cent. The Coalition stated:

The ACT Government did not consult with the community sector about the continuation of the levy and we believe that the surprise announcement of two more years was disrespectful and not in the spirit of community‑government partnership. We will continue to work with our members, ACTCOSS and the ACT Peaks Network to develop a collective community sector position regarding the levy.[[102]](#footnote-103)

This matter was discussed further with the Minister on 18 June 2015. (See Chapter 7 – Community Services Directorate for the relevant discussions and associated recommendations.)

* + - 1. Government and community sector engagement

In her introductory comments, the Director of the Youth Coalition stated that ‘I use the analogy that on we are on a bit of a cliff’s edge around the opportunity to step up the trust and relationship the government and the community sector have with each other.’[[103]](#footnote-104)

The Committee enquired of the Director how the government and community sector can develop a relationship of trust and respect. The Director indicated a need for a review of business models and how the government purchases services from the community sector, with an acknowledgement of the differences between the community and private sectors. Both government and the community sector need to work together to best serve the community.[[104]](#footnote-105)

The Director noted the pressure on the community sector to be more collaborative and efficient, to which the sector has positively responded. The sector has developed practices to increase efficiency in a resource-poor setting, and a more inclusive approach to such practices between government and the sector would be beneficial.[[105]](#footnote-106)

The Director indicated the need to for the government to examine how community engagement and consultation is undertaken. While there are guidelines provided in a community engagement manual, the Youth Coalition has experienced instances where these guidelines are not followed, thus limiting the opportunities to engage people and help them become part of the decisions and solutions impacting their lives.[[106]](#footnote-107)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the concern of the Youth Coalition regarding the interaction of various government agencies with the community sector, and the need for greater levels of trust and cohesiveness between the two parties to achieve the best outcomes for the community and those in need.[[107]](#footnote-108) This issue is highlighted by the lack of consultation with the community sector regarding extension of the Community Sector Reform Program levy for a further two years (discussed further in Chapter 8 of this report).

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day of 2015 on how it will better include the youth sector in its consultations, to ensure more collaborative processes and the development of greater trust.

* + - 1. Early intervention and prevention strategies

The Committee enquired about the need for a dedicated early intervention and prevention strategy. The Director confirmed such a strategy is necessary, with a whole-of-government approach. There have been recent positive efforts with various government agencies investing in single strategies, rather than a fractured approach to services. The Director emphasised the need to discuss the provision of suitable services both at the right time, and for a determined suitable length of time.[[108]](#footnote-109)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee concurs with the Youth Coalition on the need for a dedicated early intervention and prevention strategy for youth issues and across the community sector.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government implement a whole-of-government strategy to address issues affecting Canberra’s youth such as employment and mental health support, with a focus on early intervention and prevention.

* + - 1. Positive mental health

The Policy Officer drew the Committee’s attention to mental health research results that show many young people draw comparisons between the teaching of positive physical health to that of mental health. There is a need for mental health to be discussed in the same way as physical health, moving beyond the negative impacts of mental health issues.[[109]](#footnote-110) The Committee heard that:

From a very young age we are taught to eat healthy and get fit. That happens for all young people no matter what age they are. But we are not talking about mental health in the same positive way. We are talking about illnesses and we might be talking about the kind of negative aspects of mental health issues that we have in our community. We are not talking about what young people can be doing in their lives day to day to make sure that they do not experience those issues and that they learn how to support their peers.[[110]](#footnote-111)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee was interested to hear of the research showing the comparison of the promotion of good physical health while not talking about positive mental health in the same manner and how young people can help themselves and their peers.[[111]](#footnote-112)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government develop a program of improving and educating young students on the value of positive mental health, as is currently the case with physical health and wellbeing.

* + - 1. Job creation and employment

The Committee noted the Youth Coalition’s concern over growing rates of youth unemployment locally and nationally, with an increasing need for the wider community to have a shared responsibility for ensuring young people are supported, to maximise their engagement in education, training and employment. The Youth Coalition acknowledged that capital infrastructure investment is a key way for the ACT Government to create jobs, as is the availability of entry-level employment opportunities.[[112]](#footnote-113)

Infrastructure projects should include a priority for employment of young people who are excluded from other work opportunities, such as the Victorian model of ‘social procurement’, whereby procurement processes and purchasing power is used to generate positive social outcomes in conjunction with delivery of efficient goods, services and works. The Director advised that this model provides targets for procurement, for example ensuring that 10 per cent of employment is from completed apprenticeships.[[113]](#footnote-114)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee was concerned to hear of the increase in youth unemployment, both nationally and in the ACT, and notes the possibilities for youth employment arising from capital infrastructure investment and initiatives such as the Victorian model of social procurement.[[114]](#footnote-115)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government examine the social procurement model and its positive outcomes for youth employment, and subsequently increase social procurement in ACT Government contracts.

* 1. RSPCA (ACT)
     1. Introduction

The RSPCA ACT is a community‑based charity that works to prevent cruelty to animals by actively promoting their care and protection. RSPCA ACT offers a range of services to Canberra, including animal adoption, a lost and found service, an animal cruelty inspectorate, a veterinary clinic and programs to assist vulnerable members of the community.[[115]](#footnote-116)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearings, the following matters were considered:

* the significant increases in incoming animal numbers to the RSPCA;**[[116]](#footnote-117)**
* the financial position of RSPCA ACT in relation to the work performed and services provided;**[[117]](#footnote-118)**
* the activities that RSPCA ACT provides to the community and government outside of its core expected work;**[[118]](#footnote-119)**
* the need for legislative amendments to allow RSPCA officials to undertake their roles more effectively;**[[119]](#footnote-120)** and
* the need for collaborative and preventative investments to help reduce numbers of unwanted and abused animals in future and the associated costs.**[[120]](#footnote-121)**
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Financial position

The Executive Officer noted that RSPCA ACT requested additional funding in the ACT Budget 2015-16 as compensation for some of the outsourced work that RSCPA ACT performs on behalf of the ACT Government. Tasks such as stray animal collection, generally a council responsibility, fall to the RSPCA ACT. Over recent years the RSPCA has been suffering financially due to its role providing resource-intensive services, traditionally animal control and enforcement activities, that fall outside the RSPCA’s core work of prevention of cruelty to animals. RSPCA ACT is now ‘at a financial breaking point as a result’, and in the absence of additional funding the services cannot be provided in future.[[121]](#footnote-122)

Compared with the 2014-15 Budget, the organisation estimates that in the 2015-16 financial year the funding shortfall will be between $150,000 and $250,000. In response to a question from the Committee regarding a proposed relocation of RSPCA ACT to a new premises, the Executive Officer stated:

We have asked the government to put everything on hold for us right now. Our reserves have been depleted so heavily in the last few years that we are at serious financial risk of not even being here next year if we go in the wrong direction just a little bit. ... Right now, we are just trying to cover our basic costs; we cannot move any further.[[122]](#footnote-123)

* + - 1. Collaborative and Preventive Investments

The President noted that RSPCA ACT is developing relationships with local organisations and rescue groups, but there are no comparable organisations in the ACT with the expertise and facilities of the RSPCA. The future delivery of animal care and welfare needs to be considered by all relevant bodies and by the government.[[123]](#footnote-124)

The Executive Officer advised the Committee of the need for collaboration around preventative approaches. In the near future RSPCA ACT aims to conduct targeted preventative and educational programs. Education can assist with informing the public about neglect of animals, thus helping to reduce the number of neglected animals and subsequently the cost of animal care.[[124]](#footnote-125)

In response to a question from the Committee the Executive Officer noted particular concerns around community housing, where RSPCA ACT may be dealing with ACT Housing, mental health teams and the Australian Federal Police on any particular case. There is a necessity for cross-agency communication, assisted by Memoranda of Understanding that would provide the RSPCA with improved access.[[125]](#footnote-126)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee commends the work undertaken by RSPCA ACT on behalf of the ACT Government, including the challenging tasks that fall outside of RSPCA’s core responsibilities.

The Committee also notes the importance of collaboration and education in promoting animal welfare across the Territory, which would assist in animal care and help reduce associated costs.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government develop a long-term strategy for the delivery of animal welfare services in the ACT, including preventive investment and educational approaches. The strategy should be tabled in the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day of March 2016.

* + - 1. Legislative amendments

The Committee heard that there are currently a significant number of prosecutions progressing through the courts in relation to neglect and cruelty of animals. RSPCA ACT is required to hold animals as evidence while court hearings proceed, at times for over a year and at great cost to the organisation.

The Executive Officer recommended a different model as adopted in other jurisdictions that allow matters to proceed though civil law cases ‘that allow some sort of reasonable doubt.’ Animal owners are then required to pay a daily boarding cost, which would subsequently form a bond paid to an organisation such as the RSPCA if the owner ceased to pay for the animal’s board.[[126]](#footnote-127)

The Executive Officer advised the Committee that legislation limiting the number of animals that can be held in a single family home would be very beneficial. Currently, RSPCA ACT cannot act unless there is a welfare issue involved. Legislation limiting animal numbers in households and in public housing in particular, would allow the RSPCA to prevent animal welfare incidents from escalating prior to them becoming serious and out of control welfare issues, and subsequently help to reduce costs.[[127]](#footnote-128)

The Committee sought further information on the proposed legislative changes on notice. The RSPCA ACT provided the Committee with a summary of key areas of proposed reform to the *Animal Welfare Act 1992* and the *Domestic Animals Act 2000*, including:[[128]](#footnote-129)

* a civil bond process for violations of the Animal Welfare Act;
* changes to the Animal Welfare Act allow for recovery of costs to be awarded as part of a guilty verdict, at least for medical costs incurred;[[129]](#footnote-130)
* limiting the number of animals in a residence;
* amendments to seizure powers;
* additional enforcement powers;
* minor amendments to current offences and new offences under the Animal Welfare Act;
* clarification in relation to ancillary offences; and
* penalty reviews.[[130]](#footnote-131)
  + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes RSPCA ACT’s advice regarding current legislative constraints in delivering cost‑effective animal care and animal welfare intervention. The Committee agrees that the legislative issues highlighted by the organisation warrant further investigation and progress.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government legislate for improved animal welfare, including:

a civil bond process for violations of the Animal Welfare Act;

changes to the Animal Welfare Act allow for recovery of costs to be awarded as part of a guilty verdict, at least for medical costs incurred;

limiting the maximum number of animals allowed per residence (including public housing);

amendments to seizure powers;

additional enforcement powers;

minor amendments to current offences and new offences under the Animal Welfare Act;

clarification in relation to ancillary offences; and

penalty reviews.

These matters should be progressed by the last sitting day in June 2016.

* 1. Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) of Canberra
     1. Introduction

The Executive Director and Director, Corporate Relations and Communications, of YWCA Canberra appeared before the Committee in hearings of 12 June 2015.

In her opening statement, the Executive Director of YWCA Canberra described the organisation to the Committee:

YWCA Canberra is a feminist not-for-profit organisation that has been providing community services and representing women’s issues in Canberra since its establishment in 1929.[[131]](#footnote-132)

She went on to tell the Committee that its current operations included provision of:

children’s services, community development services, housing and therapeutic services, youth services, personal and professional training and women’s leadership programs. [[132]](#footnote-133)

* + 1. Matters considered

The following matters were considered in the hearing:

* budgetary provision for responses to domestic violence;[[133]](#footnote-134)
* primary prevention and respectful relationships programs in schools;[[134]](#footnote-135)
* budgetary provision and responses relating to housing affordability and homelessness; [[135]](#footnote-136)
* budgetary provision for therapeutic services for children and young people and gaps between availability and demand for services to support children and young people; [[136]](#footnote-137) and
* gaps between availability and demand for services to support women and families affected by domestic violence. [[137]](#footnote-138)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Respectful relationships programs

In her opening statement the Executive Director told the Committee that:

In April this year a report from Our Watch into youth perceptions of respectful relationships found incredibly concerning data, including that one in three young people do not think that exerting control over someone else is a form of violence. One in four young people do not think it is serious if a guy who is normally gentle sometimes slaps his girlfriend when he is drunk and they are arguing. One in four young people think it is pretty normal for guys to pressure girls into sex. This follows two other evidence-based reports on the attitudes of young people that have similar findings.[[138]](#footnote-139)

She told the Committee that this data ‘clearly demonstrates’ that:

it is vital for the school curriculum to include primary prevention programs that work with young people before these attitudes become entrenched. Further, evidence from school education programs that have been running in the USA has shown positive change in the social norms. We know that primary prevention programs in schools do make an impact, ensuring that children have access to the skills and resources they need to understand and engage in respectful relationships. [[139]](#footnote-140)

She went on to tell the Committee about YWCA Canberra’s involvement in delivering respectful relationships programs:

Over the last few months we have been working with the ACT government Education and Training Directorate and others to explore various models of respectful relationships programs. The YWCA Canberra’s award-winning, evidence-based program, Respect, Communicate, Choose, has been delivered to over 900 students in Canberra and Adelaide. All of our resources are aligned with best practice for primary prevention, reflect the current literature, incorporate information on gender equality and are designed to align with the standards of the national school curriculum. [[140]](#footnote-141)

Moreover, she told the Committee:

recently, at the request of Minister Corbell, we proposed a costed train-the-teacher model for Respect, Communicate, Choose that could be deployed to all public primary schools in the ACT and would empower schools to run the program independently within a 24-hour period. We look forward to again meeting with the Minister for Education and Training to learn more about her plans for this significant financial investment and how we can share what we have learned through developing this best practice evidence-based program. [[141]](#footnote-142)

Later in the hearing the Committee asked questions about respectful relationships programs. In response the Executive Director told the Committee:

* that YWCA Canberra regarded the drivers of domestic violence as ‘the largest area of social change we need to tackle as a community’; [[142]](#footnote-143)
* that ‘if we are actually going to start changing those social norms it needs to start with educating children’; [[143]](#footnote-144) and
* that ‘any program that is put into the schools needs to include evaluation’. [[144]](#footnote-145)
  + - 1. Gaps in services to support women affected by domestic violence

The Executive Director told the Committee of YWCA Canberra’s view on budgetary provision to support women and families affected by domestic violence:

I would like to note that we were very pleased to see the allocation of $250,000 in funding to tertiary service providers featured in the budget. We know that front-line services supporting victims of domestic, family and sexual violence are already stretched beyond their capacity, and this additional funding will ensure fewer women in need will be turned away.[[145]](#footnote-146)

‘However’, she told the Committee:

this funding still will not meet current demands on front-line services. Far more support is still needed. I also note that this additional funding is only for a further 12 months. With the current awareness of domestic, family and sexual violence we will continue to see the demand increase well beyond this 12-month period and therefore we need to ensure the funding continues to be a priority well beyond the 2015-16 budget.[[146]](#footnote-147)

Later in the hearing the Committee asked questions about support of women affected by domestic violence. In response the Executive Director told the Committee:

* that YWCA Canberra crisis accommodation for women and families affected by domestic violence is full to capacity and has an ‘enormous’ waiting list;[[147]](#footnote-148)
* that there was a shortage of housing into which such women and families could move after crisis accommodation, resulting in longer stays in crisis accommodation; [[148]](#footnote-149)
* that there were further difficulties in that women’s refuges did not accept adolescent children and male children; [[149]](#footnote-150) and
* that domestic violence perpetrators often continue to occupy the family home after domestic violence incidents, obliging women and families to seek other accommodation. [[150]](#footnote-151)
  + - 1. Therapeutic services for children and young people

The Executive Director voiced YWCA Canberra’s concern in connection with therapeutic services for children and young people and support for parents.[[151]](#footnote-152)

In particular, she voiced concern at limited access to therapeutic services:

Counselling services to support children and young people are only available as a free and immediate service through the school counselling service, which has limitations. Counselling support is only available during school hours and school terms. Counselling services tend to focus on individual students rather than involving the whole family. [[152]](#footnote-153)

Moreover, she told the Committee:

A significant amount of school counsellor time is devoted to the assessment of students with disabilities. Although this is vital for students with disabilities, it often leaves little time to work with other students, particularly those who require early intervention support. [[153]](#footnote-154)

In addition, the Executive Director told the Committee:

Some children and young people will not access the counselling service for reasons of confidentiality or because they have disengaged from school. And the service has limited capacity to provide longer term counselling support. [[154]](#footnote-155)

The Executive Director informed the Committee that a significant gap exists in the ACT between the availability of therapeutic counselling services for young people and their families and the level of community demand.[[155]](#footnote-156)

This was confirmed, she told the Committee, by the fact that:

ACT school principals regularly identify this as a growing concern in both primary and high school that impacts on student engagement and student attendance.[[156]](#footnote-157)

* + - 1. Housing affordability and homelessness

The Executive Director told the Committee about YWCA Canberra’s views on provision made to respond to problems with housing affordability and homelessness.[[157]](#footnote-158)

She told the Committee that held a positive view of budgetary provision made in this area. ‘However’, she told the Committee:

this investment will not increase the overall number of public housing stock available in Canberra, which will therefore have no real impact on reducing homelessness or increasing access to affordable housing. [[158]](#footnote-159)

This issue, she told the committee, needed ‘long-term planning and investment by the ACT Government with a particular focus on providing adequate services for women escaping family violence’. [[159]](#footnote-160)

‘Currently’, she told the Committee, ‘services are not sufficiently funded to support women and children after the initial crisis period, which is typically three months’. This was of concern because, she told the Committee, research demonstrated that ‘if services are resourced to work with women and children over a longer time, their health and safety and outcomes are improved’. [[160]](#footnote-161)

A further problem, she told the Committee was that ‘women who are engaged in the justice system are not referred to homelessness services’, and these women:

experience poorer outcomes in terms of employment, health, parenting and financial independence, and, as a result, these women often return to violent relationships they were trying to escape and experience secondary homelessness. [[161]](#footnote-162)

The Executive Director went on to tell the Committee that:

While we are pleased to see that the budget’s urban renewal program increases funding to improve the quality and diversity of public housing, this will not address the issue of the lack of affordable and appropriate housing in the ACT. YWCA Canberra would like to see the ACT government make substantial additional investment to increase affordable housing stock and reduce, respond to and prevent recurrence of homelessness. [[162]](#footnote-163)

The Executive Director told the Committee that:

The fact that we have one of the most expensive housing markets in the country, coupled with a lack of affordable options, means we are effectively pushing women and children back into violent households. [[163]](#footnote-164)

In light of this, she told the Committee:

The YWCA Canberra calls on the ACT government to put in place the financial and social supports to ensure that women and children can maintain stable housing and have economic, social and psychological resources to establish a safer life after violence. [[164]](#footnote-165)

Later in the hearing the Committee asked questions about housing affordability and homelessness. In response the Executive Director told the Committee:

* that there should be increased ‘housing market responses to housing needs in the ACT’ including reduction of red tape and development of appropriate smaller unit-style housing options for older women to live independently. expansion of the land rent scheme to Tier 3 providers of community housing; [[165]](#footnote-166) and
* the operation of Lady Heydon House in providing accommodation and as a model for accommodation provision, for women affected by domestic violence, in addition to other models that could be considered. [[166]](#footnote-167)
  + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers the response to domestic violence a very important area of ACT Government policy and action.

The Committee considers that the model of primary prevention as described by YWCA Canberra, involving delivery of a schools-based program to change social norms associated with domestic violence, should form an important part of the overall response to domestic violence.

The Committee notes evidence presented to it — in relation to domestic violence, emergency housing, housing and homelessness, and therapeutic services to children and young people — of significant levels of un-met demand. The Committee considers it important that the ACT Government take specific steps to ascertain the level of un-met demand in each of these important areas, and should then frame policy to ensure equivalency for demand and supply of these services, also involving measures to decrease demand.

The Committee considers that limitations to access to the Land Rent scheme are an inhibiting factor for community sector providers of housing to people who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness.

Homelessness concerns were also discussed on 18 June 2015. (See Chapter 7 – Community Services Directorate for discussion and associated recommendations).

In light of this the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee supports the ACT Government’s provision of a primary prevention program in schools to reinforce respectful relationships and counter domestic violence.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work with the community sector to determine the level of unmet need with particular regard to housing and homelessness and therapeutic services; in conjunction with work being undertaken by the Domestic Violence Preventative Council, and update the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in June 2016.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government explore the option of extending the Land Rent Scheme to Tier 2 and Tier 3 housing providers.

* 1. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body
     1. Introduction

The ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body (ATSIEB) is responsible for representing the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders living in the ACT. It supports the ACT Government to develop policy and provide services that are relevant to the needs of people within the community as well as advocating for accountability, transparency and effectiveness.[[167]](#footnote-168)

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body appeared before the Committee in hearings of 12 June 2015.

* + 1. Matters considered

The following matters were considered in the hearing:

* the Elected Body’s assessment of the ACT Budget 2015-16 on issues affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the ACT, and the degree to which the ACT Government actions were consistent with its whole-of-government agreement with the Elected Body;[[168]](#footnote-169)
* initiatives to promote economic participation by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, including a proposal for an Indigenous Business Chamber of commerce; [[169]](#footnote-170)
* levels of support for Indigenous business initiatives by the Indigenous Business Council (IBA); [[170]](#footnote-171)
* a proposal for an ‘independent Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community controlled child support organisation, which would work in relation to children coming into the foster care and protection environment’, and other business models to service the needs of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community in the ACT; [[171]](#footnote-172) and
* the recognition of cultural rights for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people proposed in the Human Rights Amendment Bill 2015 (ACT).[[172]](#footnote-173)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement

Responding to questions about the Elected Body’s view on the Budget, The Chairperson expressed his disappointment that the ACT Budget 2015-16 did not clearly show any funding that would reflect and advance the recent commitments made by the ACT Government in signing the whole-of-government ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement 2015‑18.[[173]](#footnote-174) He advised:

I think our disappointment was that we could not see a whole lot in the budget. That may be buried within the detail. We saw a couple of things—in particular, the prevention of or decrease in smoking. We think that is just a small portion of the need in the ACT community. It did not basically reflect the commitment by the government to the recent signing of the whole-of-government agreement. That has a whole series of community priorities developed in consultation with community, but it also has some clear alignment with the COAG targets. I guess that I and my colleagues were somewhat disappointed.

There were other things in there. Economic participation was another one that we saw that was not quite clear. We felt that more of the detail should have come to the surface and more of the communication of what the government’s intention is. That would give some confidence in community that this agreement, whole-of-government agreement, is taken seriously.[[174]](#footnote-175)

The Chairperson was asked about priorities set out in the whole-of-government agreement, and how these would be delivered, particularly in terms of funding.[[175]](#footnote-176) Using Step-up-for-Kids as an example, he told the Committee:

We know that that is consistent with one of our priorities. But that is pretty much a mainstream program and we know that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families are targeted in that. We want to be able to see the detail and have some confidence that the issue of families, which is central to the agreement—strengthening families—is addressed. We want some confidence ourselves, but also the community, that those very concerning issues are going to be addressed. [[176]](#footnote-177)

The Chairperson went on to say that:

Our priorities are aligned with our strategic directions, which go through to 2017. The community priorities are directly linked with the whole-of-government agreement. It has the same time line. So we expect that whenever government is thinking about addressing the concerns or needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, that is coming from us. Through consultation, there should be some action that can reflect that it has taken those things into consideration, particularly in the budget process. [[177]](#footnote-178)

* + - 1. Economic Participation

The Chairperson was also asked about attention to economic participation by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and what that might entail.[[178]](#footnote-179)

In response he told the Committee that:

Some of the economic participation stuff was fundamentally about having some roundtables to further discuss how to increase local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander businesses. There was a forum only a few weeks ago on economic participation. One of the things was about the establishment of an ACT Indigenous Business Chamber. We understand that there are some supports that can be obtained from the directorates to help us facilitate a process for that. At the end of the day we do not see that as being a huge cost. It might need some collaboration.[[179]](#footnote-180)

The Chairperson went on to speak about participation by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in a particular area, tourism:

Another economic priority under economic participation and encouragement is the promotion of tourism. Tourism in the ACT involving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people is not significant. [[180]](#footnote-181)

However, he told the Committee, this was an area which had not, apparently, been addressed in the Budget:

It is not prevalent in the current budget. It does not feature as far as we know, unless we drill down into the detail of capital investments like light rail, the city to lake developments or any other developments—the Majura Parkway and those kinds of things. We have not seen anything significant in the budget to give us some confidence that there is going to be some employment and training opportunities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.[[181]](#footnote-182)

In further questioning in this area the Committee considered:

* proposal to form an ACT Indigenous chamber of business; [[182]](#footnote-183)
* training and employment opportunities in construction in connection with proposed projects to provide services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, such as the bush healing farm and an old persons accommodation project;[[183]](#footnote-184)
* potential and limitations of social procurement by the ACT Government as a means to increase economic participation by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people; [[184]](#footnote-185)
* the role of Indigenous Business Australia (IBA) in relation to Indigenous business; [[185]](#footnote-186) and
* a proposal for ‘an independent Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community controlled child support organisation'.[[186]](#footnote-187)
  + - 1. Independent child support organisation

In its submission to the Committee, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body discussed the establishment of an independent Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community-controlled child support organisation, which would also be involved in advocacy work for children entering the foster care and protection environment.[[187]](#footnote-188)

In response to a question from the Committee, the Chairperson noted that this was an ongoing concern for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body, who have raised this issue with government before. However, the elected body does not have capacity to perform its functions under its establishing Act in relation to developing a business case or discussion paper for government on child support.[[188]](#footnote-189)

As a result, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body must draw support from directorates, where the plan for an independent Indigenous child support organisation often conflicts with directorates’ established strategic plans. Now that this initiative priority is in the whole-of-government agreement, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body will pursue the support necessary to develop and design the initiative. This will require long‑term vision and investment, as well as considerable collaboration and partnership work.[[189]](#footnote-190)

For such a child support organisation to be sustainable and effective there must be community-level conversations and drive for the initiative. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body envisages that a business model will be adopted that encompasses a regional approach, with a multi-tenant facility established under the direction of an overall management group.[[190]](#footnote-191)

* + - 1. Proposed recognition of cultural rights for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

The Committee asked the Chairperson about proposed recognition of cultural rights for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people under the Human Rights Amendment Bill 2015.[[191]](#footnote-192)

In relation to the genesis of the Bill, the Chairperson told the Committee:

I think we initiated this when we were first approached because of the Victorian exercise. In that example, Victoria’s human rights act contains recognition of cultural rights. [[192]](#footnote-193)

The Chairperson noted that:

Australia and also the ACT have taken up a commitment to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. With the articles in the UN declaration, there are six for the state of Australia and/or its jurisdictions to implement. We know that the Australian government has committed to that at the UN level, and again last year it reaffirmed its commitment to implementing the declaration. We saw this as an opportunity, and we had some discussions over a long period of time.[[193]](#footnote-194)

The Chairperson told the Committee that there had been extensive discussions between the Elected Body and the ACT Government regarding the proposal, which had begun during the last term of the Elected Body and continued into the new term. [[194]](#footnote-195)

These had included:

* discussion of ‘what the declaration might mean and what sort of commitments or impacts legally or financially it might have on governments’; [[195]](#footnote-196)
* agreement by both parties that the proposal ‘[wasn’t] too bad’; [[196]](#footnote-197)
* that the proposal gave ‘more impetus to the commitment to reconciliation’, ‘taking it a little bit further, and having recognition of fundamental human rights’ and ‘recognition of peoples’ heritage and cultural rights’; [[197]](#footnote-198)
* ‘questions about self-determination’; [[198]](#footnote-199) and
* the experience in Victoria in relation to similar provisions in the *Charter of Rights and Responsibilities (2006).* [[199]](#footnote-200)
  + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is of the view that the priorities and agreements set out in the whole-of-government agreement between the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body and the ACT Government should be reflected in budgetary provision for ACT Government programs.

The Committee supports the establishment of business initiatives that will encourage greater participation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the economy on an ongoing and long‑term basis. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body has already commenced discussions that will help progress the establishment of an appropriate representative body.

The Committee acknowledges that one of the key priorities for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body is the establishment of an independent Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community-controlled child support organisation, which would provide cultural benefits to the children in care.

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body noted to the Committee its ongoing concern that it is unable to develop discussion papers or business plans for any new propositions and initiatives it wishes to progress, such as a new child support organisation. The Elected Body advised does not currently have the capacity to carry out its functions under its enabling legislation to independently present business cases to the government, instead relying on existing government directorates that may have the capacity but differing strategic plans. [[200]](#footnote-201)

In light of the above the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that before the Budget is passed, the ACT Government detail to the Legislative Assembly what funding is included in the Budget to address the priorities as outlined in the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement 2015-18.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body and other relevant stakeholders to facilitate a process to establish an independent ACT Indigenous Chamber of Business, with a particular emphasis on small and medium business, and report to the Legislative Assembly on its progress on the last sitting day of 2015.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review the resources required to enable the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body to effectively carry out its functions as legislated for in *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Act 2008*.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider a regional Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children’s’ services agency in conjunction with the NSW Government.

# Officers of Parliament

* 1. ACT Auditor-General
     1. Introduction

The Auditor-General’s 2013-14 Annual Report states that:

The Auditor-General is a statutory position under the *Auditor-General Act 1996* (AG Act) and is responsible for auditing all ACT Public Service agencies. The Audit Office supports the Auditor-General in carrying out these duties.

The Audit Office provides assurance and independent advice to the community, through the Legislative Assembly, that the ACT Public Service is accountable and managed in an effective and efficient manner.[[201]](#footnote-202)

The Annual Report also notes that the Audit Office consists of three ‘functional areas’:

* Financial Audits;
* Performance Audits; and
* Professional Services.[[202]](#footnote-203)

The Auditor-General and her officers appeared before the Committee in hearings of Friday 19 June 2015.

* + 1. Matters considered

Matters considered by the Committee in relation to the ACT Auditor-General included:

* implications of the Auditor-General being an Officer of Parliament;[[203]](#footnote-204)
* priorities for the Auditor-General’s office for 2015-16 and projects recently completed;[[204]](#footnote-205)
* resourcing and the capacity of the Auditor-General to undertake further performance audits; [[205]](#footnote-206)
* procedure in connection with Public Interest Disclosures (PIDs);[[206]](#footnote-207)
* staff coaching and development in the Auditor-General’s office;[[207]](#footnote-208)
* recruitment and retention of staff;[[208]](#footnote-209)
* strategic reviews of the Auditor-General’s office; [[209]](#footnote-210)
* costs of performing performance audits;[[210]](#footnote-211) and
* the nature of the Auditor-General’s ‘follow-the-money’ powers under Division 3.5, ‘Audit of non-public sector entities’, of the *Auditor-General Act 1996*.[[211]](#footnote-212)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. implications of the Auditor-General being an Officer of Parliament

In her opening statement, the Auditor-General spoke to the implications of the Auditor‑General being made an Officer of Parliament.[[212]](#footnote-213)

She told the Committee that:

Since the last budget the Auditor-General has become an officer of the Legislative Assembly. This occurred in July 2014. Therefore, importantly, this budget is the first one presented under the new process for determining the Audit Office budget.[[213]](#footnote-214)

She went on to tell the Committee that the Speaker of the Assembly had a ‘key role’ in this ‘new process’:

Under section 20AB of the *Financial Management Act*, the Speaker must do two things: advise the Treasurer of the appropriation that the Speaker considers should be made for the Auditor-General for the forthcoming financial year, after consulting with me and the public accounts committee; and the second thing is to present the recommended appropriation to the Assembly.[[214]](#footnote-215)

Section 20AB of the *Financial Management Act 1996* (ACT) reads:

**20AB Recommended appropriation for officers of the Assembly**

Before the beginning of a financial year, the Speaker must for an officer of the Assembly—

(a) after consultation with the officer and the appropriate committee of the Legislative Assembly, advise the Treasurer of the appropriation that the Speaker considers should be made for the officer for the financial year (the recommended appropriation); and

(b) present the recommended appropriation to the Assembly; and

(c) give the Treasurer a draft budget for the officer for the financial year that contains the information mentioned in section 12 that applies to the officer.[[215]](#footnote-216)

The Auditor-General told the Committee that:

The appropriation provided in 2015-16 and the forward years is less than that which was recommended by the Speaker.[[216]](#footnote-217)

Later in her opening statement the Auditor-General went on to provide further detail on budgetary provision to her office in the ACT Budget 2015-16. She told the Committee:

In terms of our budget, the Audit Office total revenue budget for 2015-16 is   
$6.9 million. The total revenue budget consists of financial audit fees of $4 million and appropriation of $2.8 million. The appropriation is around 40 per cent of the revenue budget. The Audit Office expects to spend all of this funding. Consistent with the cost recovery nature of our operations, it is estimated that the Audit Office will incur a small, declining deficit of around $200,000 in 2014-15 to around $17,000 in 2017-18 before returning to a small surplus of around $75,000 in 2018-19. These deficits are very small and can be met from our cash reserve.[[217]](#footnote-218)

She also told the Committee that:

The Audit Office balance sheet shows that we have the capacity to meet our obligations, mainly liabilities for employee entitlements, and any unforseen cost pressures that may occur from time to time. The total revenue budget is expected to remain stable over the forward years, with revenue increasing from an estimated   
$6.8 million in 2014-15 to $7.4 million by 2018-19, an increase of around $583,000 or 2.1 per cent per annum. The revenue budget assumes that the number of performance audits and other activities funded by appropriation will not change.[[218]](#footnote-219)

* + - 1. Capacity to undertake further performance audits

The Auditor-General told the Committee of the implications of the smaller than anticipated appropriation for her office for its performance audit program:

The Speaker, after consulting with the public accounts committee and me, recommended the appropriation be increased to fund additional performance audits. The Speaker recommended that an additional $460,000 be provided in 2015-16 for two additional performance audits, which would mean that in that year, if that funding had been agreed, nine performance audits would be our target. And then in subsequent years, until 2018-19, there would be an additional one performance audit which would mean that by 2018-19 the sweet spot for performance audits would be 12, which would mean the funding for performance audits would roughly equal that which was given for the fees for financial audits.[[219]](#footnote-220)

‘However’, the Auditor‑General told the Committee, ‘given that the additional funding sought was not agreed, we will be targeting our usual seven performance audits’.[[220]](#footnote-221)

Later in hearings the Committee put further questions to the Auditor-General regarding her capacity to perform financial audits. In putting the question the Committee asserted an emerging standard, both nationally and internationally, in which auditors-general would maintain an equivalence between the dollar value of performance and financial audits they would perform, resulting in fifty percent each out of total audits budget for performance and financial audits.[[221]](#footnote-222)

In connection with this, the Committee asked the Auditor-General whether an increase in performance audits by her office, if it were funded, would take the number of performance audits each year to 16, and whether her office would have capacity to increase work volume to this level. [[222]](#footnote-223)

In response the Auditor-General told the Committee that under current conditions a 50/50 split between performance and financial audits would result in 12 performance audits per year, and confirmed that her office’s capacity to increase workload to this level over time:

It would be roughly around 12 performance audits. You probably gear up in a measured way to the next financial year, and then one in subsequent years after that until you had an additional five. [[223]](#footnote-224)

The Committee asked whether an increasing complexity in government operations would justify and provide work for an expanded program of performance audits. The Auditor-General confirmed that this was so and that ‘coupled with that’ was:

the fact that we now have what is commonly referred to as follow the dollar powers. As we outsource more activities, those powers will allow you to look into areas beyond just the government agencies. [[224]](#footnote-225)

In light of this, she told the Committee, she thought there were ‘a crucible of issues coming together that would suggest a broader coverage that could benefit the ACT and the Assembly’. [[225]](#footnote-226)

In subsequent questioning the Committee asked about the cost of performance audits. In response the Auditor-General told the Committee that while larger performance audits could ‘go up to $400,000 or $500,000’, performance audits ‘do range according to the number of criteria that you are looking at and the topic’, and averaged cost was ‘around $230,000, $240,000’.[[226]](#footnote-227)

Later in hearings the Committee asked how these costs compared with other jurisdictions. In response, the Director, Financial Audits, told the Committee that the average cost per performance audit in the ACT ‘over the last three years’ was $230,000, while the average cost per audit was $316,000 for all audit offices in Australian jurisdictions.[[227]](#footnote-228)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the importance of the work of the Auditor-General to government administration and the impact that any reductions in funding may have on audit processes, including the inability to increase the number of audits undertaken each year.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review funding to the ACT Auditor‑General to allow for an increase in the number of performance audits over time.

* + - 1. Strategic review

In her opening statement, the Auditor-General told the Committee that her priorities for the 2015-16 year included a strategic review of her office. Regarding this, she told the Committee that:

Under the *Auditor-General Act*, the strategic review must be performed once in each term of the Legislative Assembly with the timing of that review being at the discretion of the public accounts committee.[[228]](#footnote-229)

Regarding this particular review she told the Committee that it was expected that the strategic review would ‘commence around October’:

As these reviews usually identify areas of improvement, a high priority from our office will be given to those recommendations with which we agree. We will not only implement those recommendations from the strategic review but we will use them to complement the current arrangements that we have from our internal quality assurance reviews and also from our internal audit activities.[[229]](#footnote-230)

When asked how many strategic reviews had been conducted at the Auditor-General’s office, the Auditor-General advised that they took place approximately once every four years. The Director, Financial Audits, told the Committee that:

The one that we expect to occur later this year will be the first under the new legislation. The last performance audit at the office, which is the strategic review by another name, occurred in 2010. There was one before that date but that might have been maybe five or six years under John Parkinson.[[230]](#footnote-231) So we are talking quite a number of years ago. In my time at the office this review will be the third that I am aware of.[[231]](#footnote-232)

When asked whether the review would be analysing the office’s normal operations, the Auditor-General told the Committee that:

They will be analysing us. I would imagine, now having become an OLA, office of the Legislative Assembly, they will be looking at how maybe some of the budget preparation for that is. Are there some areas that an outsider might see and might make the process a bit more efficient? [[232]](#footnote-233)

Later in hearings the Committee asked how the strategic review was funded, and whether there was a specific appropriation for this in the budgetary provision for the office. In response, the Auditor-General told the Committee that:

No, we do not have a specific budget for that review. However, it is likely to be around $100,000, and in our budget we will just have to find it. [[233]](#footnote-234)

* 1. ACT Electoral Commission
     1. Introduction

The ACT Electoral Commission Annual Report 2013-2014 states that the:

ACT Electoral Commission is an independent statutory authority established under the *Electoral Act 1992* comprising a Chairperson, the Electoral Commissioner and a Member, with responsibility for the conduct of elections and referendums for the ACT Legislative Assembly and for the provision of electoral advice and services.[[234]](#footnote-235)

The ACT Electoral Commissioner and his officers appeared before the Committee in hearings of Friday 12 June 2015.

* + 1. Matters considered

The following matters were considered in the hearing:

* a further budget bid by the Commission in next year’s budget in order to cover an increase in the rate of public funding for parties contesting elections as a result of the passage of the *Electoral Amendment Act 2015*; [[235]](#footnote-236)
* a further bid in next year’s budget for funding to cover an increase in administration as a result of the coming increase in the number of Members in the Legislative Assembly;[[236]](#footnote-237)
* funding provided to the Electoral Commission for work preparing for an electoral redistribution in connection with the forthcoming expansion of the Assembly, and the degree to which that work was complete;[[237]](#footnote-238)
* the demographic foundation of calculations for the electoral redistribution; [[238]](#footnote-239)
* progress on Information and Communications Technology (ICT) systems upgrades in anticipation of the 2016 ACT election; [[239]](#footnote-240)
* the Commission’s electoral education program; [[240]](#footnote-241)
* levels of enrolment on the electoral roll and automatic enrolment; [[241]](#footnote-242)
* electronic and pre-poll voting; [[242]](#footnote-243)
* support for voters with disabilities; [[243]](#footnote-244)
* information for voters on new electorates to which they may belong following the impending electoral redistribution; [[244]](#footnote-245)
* conduct of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander elected body election in 2014; [[245]](#footnote-246)
* rates of turnout, formal and informal voting in ACT elections; [[246]](#footnote-247)
* implications of the Electoral Commission becoming an Officer of Parliament, including features of its budget statement; [[247]](#footnote-248)
* the ‘100-metre ban on canvassing at polling places’, its administration and enforcement; [[248]](#footnote-249)
* legislative change regarding campaign finance; [[249]](#footnote-250) and
* results of an investigation into transfer of a sum from the Canberra Labor Club to the 1973 Foundation. [[250]](#footnote-251)

In addition, Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* redistribution of Electoral Boundaries and associated funding;[[251]](#footnote-252)
* reason for decline in Opening Accumulated Fund in the out years, from $731,000 to $165,000;[[252]](#footnote-253) and
* what the negative operating results for the period indicate.[[253]](#footnote-254)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Financial changes associated with the expansion of the Assembly

In his opening statement, the Electoral Commissioner told the Committee that some administrative costs borne by the Commission would increase due to the expansion of the Legislative Assembly from 17 to 25 Members after the 2016 election.[[254]](#footnote-255)

Regarding this, he told the Committee that:

Another impact of the increase in the size of the Assembly from 17 to 25 members is that, because the Assembly has not changed the rate of administrative funding provided to parties per MLA, that means because the size of the Assembly is going up the administrative fund amount will also have to increase as a result of the increase in the size of the Assembly.[[255]](#footnote-256)

The Commissioner told the Committee that the Commission estimated that:

in 2016-17, that being the year of the election, the administrative funding amount will need to go up by approximately $0.119 million in that year, and in 2017-18 and the out years that amount will increase to $0.179 million per annum. That is also indexed by CPI.[[256]](#footnote-257)

An electoral redistribution required as part of preparations for the expansion of the Assembly generated another cost to the Commission. In this case the Commission was provided with additional funds specifically for work preparatory to the redistribution. In relation to this the Commissioner told the Committee that:

we are underspending the amount we were given, and we will be underspent in the year as a result of not spending all the money we were given on the redistribution. We only had one round of objections and we did not have a public hearing, so that saved us some money with respect to the amount we estimated we would need. It was a fairly low cost exercise. We had one notice in the newspaper and we put on our website a redistribution tool. People were able to go and draw their own boundaries and use that to make submissions. That cost a certain amount of money but it was very well received.[[257]](#footnote-258)

Regarding this task, the Commissioner undertook to provide on notice exact details of expenditure on the redistribution. His subsequent response to the Question Taken on Notice advised the Committee that:

During the 2014 Estimates Committee hearing, Elections ACT estimated the 2014-2015 redistribution of electoral boundaries process to cost approximately $41,000. As at 31 May 2015, Elections ACT had expended $49,736.[[258]](#footnote-259)

* + - 1. Implications of the Commission being made an Officer of Parliament

In hearings the Electoral Commissioner was asked to comment on the implications of the Electoral Commission having been made an Officer of Parliament.

In response, the Electoral Commissioner told the Committee that:

The biggest change to the commission on becoming an office of the Assembly has been the financial aspect. We had to do our own budget process. At the end of the financial year we are having to do our own financial reporting.[[259]](#footnote-260)

As a result, he told the Committee:

The Auditor-General will be doing an audit of our finances, working with us, which is a new process. Previously we were part of the JACS portfolio and we reported through JACS, so it is not something we directly interacted with the auditor’s office upon. That is certainly causing us extra work that we have not had to do previously.[[260]](#footnote-261)

‘In terms of our normal day-to-day operations’, the Commissioner told the Committee:

we were always an independent statutory office, so the fact that we are an office of the Assembly has not really changed the independent nature of the commission. We have always been independent and we are still independent. But the new functions under the Financial Management Act have increased our workload.[[261]](#footnote-262)

When asked about whether the new arrangements had placed a greater burden on the Commission without enhancing its independence, the Electoral Commission disagreed. He told the Committee that:

Taking us out from the directorate portfolio and creating us as an office of the Assembly has strengthened the commission’s independence. It has highlighted the fact that we are totally independent not only from the directorate but from government and ministerial control. I am very supportive of the change to create the commission as an office of the Assembly.[[262]](#footnote-263)

* + - 1. Legislative change regarding campaign finance

The Electoral Commissioner was asked to comment on the impact of legislative changes regarding campaign finance.[[263]](#footnote-264)

In response, the Commissioner told the Committee that:

The campaign finance reform changes have bedded down now, and I think everyone has got into a routine with complying with those laws. The changes introduced on 1 July 2012 were quite significant, so there was a learning process with the commission, the parties, the candidates and other participants to get those things up and running. That all seems to be going quite smoothly now.[[264]](#footnote-265)

The Commission also noted more recent amendments to the campaign finance regime in the ACT:

We had amendments passed to the Electoral Act earlier this year that changed some of those campaign finance regulations. For example, we no longer have a ban on how much people can donate. There is no longer a ban on people other than ACT electors being able to donate to political parties for ACT election purposes.[[265]](#footnote-266)

In relation to these more recent changes the Commissioner told the Committee that ‘implementation of those laws seems to have gone quite well’.[[266]](#footnote-267)

At this point the Commissioner was asked for further details of recent changes to the regime.[[267]](#footnote-268)

In response, the Commissioner told the Committee that:

The [2012] law introduced this concept of small anonymous donations where the parties were not able to keep more than $25,000 worth of small anonymous donations in a financial year. If they kept more than $25,000, they would have to pay up any excess over and above $25,000 to the territory. That has not happened. But there was a loophole in that particular provision because the Electoral Act allows people to give anonymous donations up to $1,000 or just under $1,000 and for the parties to be able to retain those moneys. So there was this $750 gap that was not being regulated at all. That got fixed up. That is a change that is, I think, a good change.[[268]](#footnote-269)

He told the Committee that the removal of the caps on donations is now ‘one area of regulation that we do not have to concern ourselves with anymore that we had to concern ourselves with previously’.[[269]](#footnote-270) However, the Electoral Commission noted that the cap on election expenditure from 1 January 2016 will create additional work.[[270]](#footnote-271)

Moreover, he told the Committee:

In February this year we did have quite significant changes passed to the Electoral Act which meant that we have had to update all of our information to all the various political players who have a responsibility for submitting returns to the commission. We are just finalising, as we speak, the manual that we will be giving out to all the political participants who are due to give us annual returns for this current financial year. They will be due by the end of August.[[271]](#footnote-272)

Another change, the Commissioner told the Committee, was to:

give parties and MLAs an extra month in which to get us their annual return. It was the end of July; it is now the end of August. And where the commission had a month in which to publish those returns, we have now given ourselves seven days in which to publish those returns.[[272]](#footnote-273)

There were also changes to the timing of reporting required from political parties, so that parties report gifts of $1,000 or more quarterly rather than within 30 days from the time of donation:

Now, within a month of the end of each quarter, parties have to give us details of all the gifts they have received of $1,000 or more.[[273]](#footnote-274)

In order to support compliance by political parties with these new arrangements, the Electoral Commissioner told the Committee that:

We have been working with parties to give them information where they need to be able to fill in those returns. We have had briefings where we have actually got in all of the financial controllers of the various parties and associated entities where we have sat down and had a roundtable or we have talked through the changes. They have been able to learn from each other about ways in which they could comply with those conditions.[[274]](#footnote-275)

Beyond this, the Commissioner told the Committee:

The biggest change now that we will still need to work on with informing the parties and others is the cap on expenditure that is going to start next financial year on 1 January.[[275]](#footnote-276)

In terms of managing the information stream arising from these legislative requirements material, the Commissioner told the Committee:

One of the things we have been working on has been to streamline the way in which we get information from, particularly, political parties. We are automating that so that we are getting spreadsheets from parties in such a format that we can plug those into our systems and get them up on our website very quickly. That is one of the things that we have done with the additional funding that we were given—automate that process.[[276]](#footnote-277)

As a result, he told the Committee:

Now we think we can receive the annual returns by the end of August and have that up on the website and available for people by 7 September.[[277]](#footnote-278)

* + - 1. Transfer from Canberra Labor Club to 1973 Foundation

The Electoral Commissioner was asked about the Commission’s investigation of a transfer payment from the Canberra Labor Club to the 1973 Foundation.[[278]](#footnote-279)

In response the Commissioner told the Committee that this ‘had been resolved’.[[279]](#footnote-280)

‘With that particular example’, he told the Committee:

my understanding of what occurred was that the Canberra Labor Club transferred a sum to the 1973 Foundation which was disclosed by the 1973 Foundation as a capital injection, so that was disclosed, but the way the law works is that they should not only disclose it as a capital injection but should also disclose it as a receipt. The only mistake that was made was that they disclosed it once when they should have disclosed it twice, but they did actually disclose it so it was not really a case where the amounts were not disclosed; it is just that there was really a technical issue around the way in which it was disclosed. [[280]](#footnote-281)

In connection with this and other investigations, the Commissioner told the Committee that:

One of the recent changes we have made has been to put on our website an ongoing report of outcomes of compliance investigations. We are doing that as an ongoing thing, but we will also be including that information in our annual report. [[281]](#footnote-282)

* 1. Australian Capital Territory Ombudsman
     1. Introduction

The Annual Report 2013-14 of the Australian Capital Territory Ombudsman states that:

Our role is to resolve complaints and monitor the actions of government agencies and the police under the *Ombudsman Act 1989* and a range of other legislation.

Our services are free of charge. We can deal with most complaints involving the administrative actions of agencies and police, including requests made to them under the *Freedom of Information Act 1989* and ‘whistleblower’ disclosures under the *Public Interest Disclosure Act 2012*.

We monitor police use of covert powers through formal inspections of their records under the *Crimes (Controlled Operations) Act 2008*, the *Crimes (Assumed Identities) Act 2009* and the *Crimes (Surveillance Devices) Act 2010*. We also monitor police management of the child sex offenders register established under the *Crimes (Child Sex Offenders) Act 2005*.

We investigate as a last resort. Initially, we encourage people to work through their concerns with agencies or police. We enable this by working with agencies and police to ensure they provide accessible and effective complaint-handling processes to the public.[[282]](#footnote-283)

The Annual Report also notes that:

The ACT Ombudsman role is delivered by the Commonwealth Ombudsman under a Services Agreement between the ACT Government and the Commonwealth Ombudsman. [[283]](#footnote-284)

The Australian Capital Territory Ombudsman appeared before the Committee in hearings of 19 June 2015.

* + 1. Matters considered

Matters considered by the Committee in relation to the Australian Capital Territory Ombudsman included:

* management of public interest disclosures;[[284]](#footnote-285)
* trends in complaints, including in severity of complaints; [[285]](#footnote-286)
* complaints-handling by ACT and Commonwealth government agencies; [[286]](#footnote-287)
* funding for the Ombudsman and ACT Policing oversight functions purchased by the ACT Government from the Commonwealth Ombudsman;[[287]](#footnote-288) and
* the ACT Ombudsman’s role in preventing disputes with government agencies.[[288]](#footnote-289)

In addition Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* Public Interest Disclosure (PID) investigation;[[289]](#footnote-290)
* a University of Canberra (UC) student complaint;[[290]](#footnote-291) and
* the cost of certification programs to become a Certified Practising Accountant (CPA).[[291]](#footnote-292)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Trends in complaints

In his opening statement, the Senior Assistant Ombudsman told the Committee that the subject of a recent conference held by the Ombudsman’s office had focused on ‘unreasonable complainant conduct behaviour’ which, he told the Committee, was ‘an area that has become more topical at both the ACT level and Commonwealth level’.[[292]](#footnote-293)

In connection with this he told the Committee that ‘some behaviour’ by people raising complaints ‘is now becoming more extreme’, and that as a result ‘handling strategies for public servants and public officials [are] becoming more and more important’.[[293]](#footnote-294)

Later in the hearing the Senior Assistant Ombudsman was asked for further detail on this. In response, he told the Committee that:

What we are noticing across the board is that people who might have concerns about an administrative decision by government might not necessarily go back to the agency at first instance to raise that concern.[[294]](#footnote-295)

Rather, he told the Committee:

The rise of social media and other forums means that people sometimes will multi-list, if I could use that term, their concern amongst many forums. The speed at which social media now can operate means that the ability for someone to express a concern at the moment they first discover it, and less temperately than they might otherwise do after some reflection, means that these matters can then move to different levels in agencies.[[295]](#footnote-296)

In addition, he told the Committee, there were:

also perhaps societal trends in terms of the use of particular words, language and expression that might have been considered in previous times to be unacceptable and that are now perhaps becoming more common.[[296]](#footnote-297)

* + - 1. Role of Ombudsman’s office in preventing disputes with agencies

In his opening statement, the Senior Assistant Ombudsman told the Committee that:

When parliaments think of ombudsmen they tend to think of complaints and remedies recovered for wrongs, but in [one] sense that is all past tense. It focuses on the horse that has bolted rather than the one that may be in the stables that is stirring. As much as today is rightly about the things that we have done in the past and what we have done to correct those things that might be wrong, the Ombudsman’s office sees great value in looking at things in a preventive way. [[297]](#footnote-298)

From this perspective, he told the Committee, the role of the Ombudsman’s office was, in addition to dealing with complaints:

about trying to identify, if we can, those areas of foreseeable complaint, to work with agencies to ensure that they have a good strategy in dealing with those things and to ensure that the Ombudsman’s office is involved only when those complaints are unable to be remedied by agencies.[[298]](#footnote-299)

In particular, he told the Committee:

Our value perhaps in the prevention stage would occur at the design of policies and programs and in assisting agencies in terms of their own capability in dealing with complainants in the first instance.[[299]](#footnote-300)

Later in the hearing the Senior Assistant Ombudsman was asked to provide further detail about preventative aspects of the work of the Ombudsman’s office. In response he told the Committee that:

We try and ensure that agencies understand that their role is not to avoid concerns that are expressed to them and that the Ombudsman is not an alternative to them dealing with matters. [[300]](#footnote-301)

He went on to make a number of points about the role of the office in preventing complaints and supporting government agencies in their handling of complaints. [[301]](#footnote-302)

The Senior Assistant Ombudsman informed the Committee that, regarding the complaints that agencies do receive, ‘we attempt, by some of the forums we are holding, to impart best practice’:[[302]](#footnote-303)

That might be dealing with unreasonable complainant behaviour and it might be dealing better with complaints that are raised by social media and other places like that to try and ensure that we have the capability there, that the right people are doing those particular jobs and see them as an important part of that service. [[303]](#footnote-304)

An additional element was that ‘we will try to go to agencies to explain our role better—that the Ombudsman’s office is not there to find fault’: [[304]](#footnote-305)

In many ways, we are actually looking for information to suggest that the agency may well have been doing what it is meant to do but the individual has not received that information, for whatever reason. That gives us an opportunity to say, “Some of the information you are sending back is not clear. People are becoming confused by it. Perhaps if it was expressed in a different way, you might get fewer concerns being raised.” [[305]](#footnote-306)

Another element lay in the ‘area of inviting agencies, if they are designing or potentially initiating a policy or change in a program that might lead to some foreseeable downstream reaction from the public, to let us know at first instance’:[[306]](#footnote-307)

Tell us what the change is. Tell us what you are thinking of doing, what the communication strategy might be. In some cases, we will get people calling just to say, “Are you aware?” They have not necessarily got a complaint, but they are flagging with us that they have read about it. They might have a concern. The fact that the office can say, “We’re briefed. We understand it. We are monitoring it,” is sometimes a source of comfort and assurance to them: “Yes, absent a complaint, there is monitoring and oversight occurring more generally.” [[307]](#footnote-308)

Overall, he told the Committee:

Our job is very much to try and get ahead of the calls that are coming to you, to get ahead of the calls coming to the directorates, and to get ahead of the calls that are coming to us. It is really to try and understand where people are potentially going to raise a concern. By virtue of understanding from past practice that certain ways of doing something—a consultation round or the way you put something together—might lead to more concerns, particularly ones coming to us at first instance, we can make that known to agencies in an attempt to try and help them understand how better to deal with them. [[308]](#footnote-309)



# Office of the Legislative Assembly

* + 1. Introduction

The Office of the Legislative Assembly (OLA) is established by the *Legislative Assembly (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Act 2012* (the Act), which provides a statutory basis for its independence from the Executive.

Under Section 6 of the Act, OLA’s function is to provide impartial advice and support to the Legislative Assembly and committees and members of the Assembly, including by:

* providing advice on parliamentary practice and procedure, and the functions of the Assembly and committees;
* reporting proceedings of the Assembly and meetings of committees;
* maintaining an official record of proceedings of the Assembly;
* providing library and information facilities and services for Members;
* providing staff to enable the Assembly and committees to operate efficiently;
* providing business support functions, including administering the entitlements of members who are not part of the Executive;
* maintaining the Assembly precincts; and
* providing public education about the function of the Assembly and committees.[[309]](#footnote-310)

On 12 June 2015 the Speaker, Mrs Vicki Dunne MLA, and senior officers from OLA appeared before the Committee to discuss the expenditure proposals in the *Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015-2016* and revenue estimates proposed by the Government in the ACT Budget 2015-16.

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing, the following matters were considered:

* appropriation for OLA and unfunded proposals including a senior security officer position and enhanced library services;[[310]](#footnote-311)
* operation of section 20AA of the *Financial Management Act 1996*;[[311]](#footnote-312)
* Speaker’s responsibilities in relation to Officers of the Legislative Assembly including procurement of the strategic review of the Auditor-General’s Office;[[312]](#footnote-313)
* increased OLA staffing requirements resulting from the expanded Assembly;[[313]](#footnote-314)
* outreach opportunities leveraged off the expanded Assembly;[[314]](#footnote-315)
* current outreach programs including education programs, public service seminars, new citizen introductory nights, school debating, constitutional conventions, parliamentary group visits and official delegation visits;[[315]](#footnote-316)
* capital and recurrent expenditure on the expanded Assembly accommodation;[[316]](#footnote-317)
* impacts of the expanded Assembly including possible procedural changes[[317]](#footnote-318) and media accommodation;[[318]](#footnote-319)
* relocation of an MLA to accommodate refurbishment of the Legislative Assembly building;[[319]](#footnote-320)
* Remuneration Tribunal decisions on office support allowances and communication allowances for Members and the resulting shift in administrative workload for some areas of OLA;[[320]](#footnote-321)
* relocation of OLA staff to the North Building and associated changes in management practices;[[321]](#footnote-322)
* electronic voting in the chamber; [[322]](#footnote-323)
* promotion of Assembly business on radio and broadcasting of proceedings;[[323]](#footnote-324)
* cash flow statements;[[324]](#footnote-325)
* audio upgrade project[[325]](#footnote-326) and associated intangible assets;[[326]](#footnote-327)
* Hansard services;[[327]](#footnote-328)
* fluctuations in superannuation expenses;[[328]](#footnote-329)
* increases in supplies and services;[[329]](#footnote-330)
* committee work and the use of electronic media, including Twitter;[[330]](#footnote-331)
* depreciation and amortisation related to the information production system;[[331]](#footnote-332) and
* accumulated funds.[[332]](#footnote-333)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Budget proposals not included in the Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015-2016

The Speaker, Mrs Vicki Dunne MLA, highlighted her concerns to the Committee that two funding proposals included in the proposed appropriation for the Office of the Legislative Assembly, recommended by the Speaker and endorsed by the Standing Committee on Administration and Procedure, were not included in the final appropriation bill. [[333]](#footnote-334)

The Committee discussed with the Speaker and officials the nature of the two proposals, relating to enhanced library services and the creation of a senior security manager position, which were not included in the appropriation.[[334]](#footnote-335)

The request for funding for improved ACT Assembly and ACT Government Library Services resulted from a client information needs review conducted in September 2013 which identified service gaps and demand pressures. The 2014-15 Select Committee on Estimates also recommended enhanced library research facilities. The Standing Committee on Administration and Procedure also supported a proposal to expand the library’s research capabilities.[[335]](#footnote-336)

The library services included recurrent expenditure of $364,000 in the 2015-16 financial year increasing to $536,000 in 2018-19, plus a one-off expenditure of $38,000 in the first year. The funding would enable the library to acquire new information sources and services to keep pace with emerging digital information technologies as well as additional staffing capacity.[[336]](#footnote-337)

The proposal for a senior security manager position aimed to address ‘an identified gap in the management of physical security for the Assembly building’, as raised in an independent review of physical security risks.[[337]](#footnote-338) The security assessment identified an organisational gap between the Director Business Support (Senior Officer Grade A) and the Principal Attendant and Security Controller (Administrative Services Offices Grade 4). The new position would provide middle management support to the Director, Business Support in addition to responsibility for developing, maintaining and evaluating policies, procedures, systems and other control measures to address security risks.[[338]](#footnote-339) The new role would also help to ensure the Assembly’s compliance with the Territory’s Protective Security Policy Framework.[[339]](#footnote-340)

The Speaker told the Committee:

I am particularly concerned that funding was not made available to provide additional staffing capacity in relation to physical security requirements at the Assembly. This proposal was predicated on the findings of a detailed assessment undertaken by a specialist security firm, and it is not the first time this recommendation has been made. I make the simple observation that the Office of the Legislative Assembly’s capacity to effectively manage the risks encountered in the physical security arena is limited by the failure to obtain funding for this proposal.[[340]](#footnote-341)

The Committee heard that the recurrent costs (including on-costs) for the proposed SOG C position would be initially $130,000 in the 2015-16 financial year, increasing to $140,000 in 2018-19.

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes with some concern that the proposed appropriation for a senior security officer was not included in the final appropriation for the Office of the Legislative Assembly, particularly as this was specifically recommended in an independent security assessment and was endorsed by the Standing Committee on Administration and Procedure.

The Committee is equally concerned that the proposed appropriation for enhanced library services was not included in the final appropriation for the Office of the Legislative Assembly, particularly in light of demand pressures and the expansion of the Assembly from October 2016.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government and the Speaker hold further discussions on how to implement the Territory’s Protective Security Policy Framework with particular regard to the Assembly and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government and the Speaker hold further discussions on how to best progress enhanced library services for the Assembly and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015.

* + - 1. Requirements of the Financial Management Act 1996

In relation to the funding proposals not included in the final appropriation for OLA, the Speaker also advised the Committee that the Treasurer was in breach of section 20AA of the *Financial Management Act 1996* as he did not, after presenting the *Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015-2016*, immediately present a statement outlining why the appropriation was less than the recommended appropriation for the financial year.[[341]](#footnote-342)

The Committee heard that the Treasurer tabled a statement two days later ‘in an attempt to meet the spirit of section 20AA’, however that statement did not adequately address the basis of the decision not to fund the proposals.[[342]](#footnote-343) The Speaker advised:

The reason I raise these process issues in relation to the appropriation of the office is that, as Speaker, I am committed to advancing the separation of powers doctrine so far as the interaction between the executive and the legislature is concerned. We have made significant steps in this direction over the years, especially with the passing of the current OLA legislation and the setting up of the separate appropriation.

The intention of sections 20 and 20AA of the Financial Management Act is to establish separate and distinct decision-making and accountability processes for the funding required to support the operations of the legislature, and this is consistent with Latimer House principles, which have been supported by a resolution of this Assembly. To maintain the legitimacy of the separation of powers and to underscore that the government is accountable to the Assembly in these matters, the government of the day must comply with the relevant statutory arrangements.

Further, the spirit of the statute, in my view, requires this compliance to be done in a way that provides sufficient detail for members of the Assembly to evaluate the funding processes and the basis for any decision to deny a funding request. I will be interested in the views of this committee in due course.[[343]](#footnote-344)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the Speaker’s concern about compliance with section 20AA of the *Financial Management Act 1996*.

The Committee also notes that the *Financial Management Act 1996* contains similar provisions in section 20AC with regard to the appropriation for an Officer of the Legislative Assembly.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that in the event the Treasurer presents in the Legislative Assembly a bill for an Appropriation Act for the appropriation for the Office of the Legislative Assembly relating to a financial year, and the appropriation is less than the “recommended appropriation” given to the Treasurer by the Speaker in accordance with section 20 of the *Financial Management Act 1996*, the Treasurer comply with both the intent and the spirit of section 20AA(2) of that Act.

The Committee recommends that in the event the Treasurer presents in the Legislative Assembly a bill for an Appropriation Act for the appropriation for an Officer of the Legislative Assembly relating to a financial year, and the appropriation is less than the “recommended appropriation” given to the Treasurer by the Speaker in accordance with section 20AB of the *Financial Management Act 1996*, then the Treasurer comply with both the intent and the spirit of section 20AC(2) of that Act.

* + - 1. Officers of the Legislative Assembly

With the passing of the *Officers of the Assembly Legislation Amendment Bill (OLA Amendment Bill)* in 2013 the ACT Auditor-General, ACT Electoral Commissioner and ACT Ombudsman are now designated as Officers of the Assembly. The Speaker has ‘particular functions in relation to the Auditor-General and the Electoral Commissioner in their roles as officers of the Legislative Assembly.’[[344]](#footnote-345)

The 2014-15 Select Committee on Estimates had inquired about the implications of this change and the Speaker flagged at that time that, whilst there were no implications for the Office of the Legislative Assembly, there were likely to be implications for the office of the Speaker.[[345]](#footnote-346)

The Speaker advised the Committee that her statutory responsibilities in relation to officers of the Assembly have raised concerns, particularly the operation of section 25(2) of the *Auditor‑General’s Act 1996* which requires that:

If requested by the public accounts committee, the Speaker must, on behalf of the Territory, engage an appropriately qualified person (the strategic reviewer) under a contract to conduct the strategic review.[[346]](#footnote-347)

The Speaker detailed her concerns for the Committee:

One of the concerns I have with this provision is that it appears to require the Speaker to act as an agent of the territory in direct procurement of a service and to enter into a contract on behalf of the territory. This is a most unusual circumstance and I have not observed a similar set-up in any part of the ACT public sector.

...

I am concerned that because there is no official administrative support infrastructure there is a risk that these requirements may not be obvious to future Speakers. It is my view that the processes embodied in section 25(2), which occurs outside the normal administrative remit of any public sector agency including the office of the Legislative Assembly, are not especially transparent and there is a risk of noncompliance with government procurement and government agreement-making requirements.

...

I am also concerned that this provision grants the Speaker a power to commit expenditure of funds on behalf of the territory while the umbrella framework, the Financial Management Act, vests no such power in me. [[347]](#footnote-348)

The Speaker advised the Committee that the source of funding for these functions was also unclear. She noted that discussions with Treasury had led to a view that the funds should not sit with the Auditor-General due to conflict of interest concerns.[[348]](#footnote-349) However, the Speaker told the Committee:

The funds cannot be appropriated directly to the office of Speaker, which is not an appropriation unit, nor should they be appropriated to the Office of the Legislative Assembly, which is not charged with administration of this particular function.[[349]](#footnote-350)

Additionally, the Speaker highlighted similar concerns with her role appointing the Auditor‑General and members of the Electoral Commission, as well as the appointment of an independent auditor to undertake the financial audit of the Audit Office.[[350]](#footnote-351)

The Speaker advised the Committee that she is working through the issues with the statutory office holders and with the Office of the Legislative Assembly.[[351]](#footnote-352) She advised that she also needs to develop a series of procedures for following Speakers regarding these functions so that the responsibilities of the Speaker with regard to the offices of the Legislative Assembly are clear.[[352]](#footnote-353)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that the current funding arrangements for the Speaker to undertake her responsibilities arising from the *Officers of the Assembly Legislation Amendment Bill 2013* are unclear. Additionally, the Speaker appears to have responsibilities for which she has no remit under the *Financial Management Act 1996*.

The Committee notes that the Speaker is actively leading discussions with the statutory office holders and the Office of the Legislative Assembly to determine suitable solutions to the concerns raised.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work with the Speaker to address concerns regarding the funding and administrative arrangements required to support the functions established under the *Officers of the Assembly Legislation Amendment Bill 2013*, including amendments to the *Auditor-General Act 1996*, and report to the Legislative Assembly on progress by the last sitting day in 2015.

* + - 1. Assembly construction works and accommodation changes

The Committee heard about the changes to the Legislative Assembly’s accommodation to cater for the expansion of the Assembly from October 2016 from 17 to 25 members. The least costly option was selected by the Speaker and Chief Minister which includes ‘relocating parts of the Office of the Legislative Assembly to premises across Civic Square in order to make additional space available in the Legislative Assembly for new members and their staff’.[[353]](#footnote-354) The relocation and associated work is funded at $1.497 million.

The refurbishment and remodelling work at the Assembly is budgeted at $5.244 million over two years.[[354]](#footnote-355) The Committee was advised that only one current member would be directly affected by the works and may have to be relocated temporarily.[[355]](#footnote-356)

The Speaker advised the Committee that:

A project control group headed by the Clerk has been established to oversee the project, monitor the costs of the works and ensure they are completed on time so we can start in November 2016 with a fully functioning 25-member Assembly. I have been receiving and I will continue to receive regular updates from the Clerk as the work progresses. The Clerk has undertaken to keep members and Assembly staff informed throughout the project.

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that not all members and staff appear to have the same information regarding the timeframes for the refurbishment and remodelling of the Assembly Building to accommodate the enlarged 9th Assembly, or on the relocation of OLA staff.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the Speaker update the Legislative Assembly at least once each quarter until the end of the 8th Assembly on the progress of the construction works required to accommodate an enlarged 9th Assembly.

The Committee recommends that the Speaker investigate future accommodation options for the Assembly.

# Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development

* + 1. Introduction

The 2015-16 Budget papers provide an overview of the creation of the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate (CMTEDD) as follows:

CMTEDD was formed in July 2014, bringing together the Chief Minister and Treasury Directorate (CMTD), the former Commerce and Works Directorate (CWD)[[356]](#footnote-357) and the former Economic Development Directorate (EDD), along with artsACT, community concessions and community facilities from the Community Services Directorate (CSD) and ACT Property Group from the Territory and Municipal Services Directorate (TAMS).

...

Further changes were made during the year establishing Access Canberra within CMTEDD. Access Canberra brings together shopfronts and regulatory services, including the former Canberra Connect, into a single entity to make it easier for business, community organisations and individuals to work with the ACT Government.

The Urban Renewal portfolio was also created during the year to drive economic activity, improve the liveability of our city, build on the character of our communities and deliver sustainable development. The position of Coordinator-General Urban Renewal was created within CMTEDD to oversee this work across the Service, which will include delivery of the Public Housing Renewal Program.

The Directorate also coordinates the Government’s response to the lasting impacts of loose-fill asbestos in Canberra homes, leading a Taskforce brought together from across the Service.[[357]](#footnote-358)

The Committee heard from the Treasurer on Monday 15 June, Tuesday 16 June and Friday 19 June 2015 to examine the following Output Classes, agency functions, authorities and Territory-owned Corporations:

* Output 2.1: Economic Management;
* Output 2.2: Financial Management;
* Output 3.1: Revenue Management;
* Outputs 4.1, 6.1 and 7.1: Shared Services ICT, Human Resources and Finance;
* ACT Compulsory Third-party Insurance Regulator;
* ACT Insurance Authority;
* ICON Water Limited;
* Independent Competition and regulatory Commission;
* Lifetime Care and Support Fund Commissioner of the ACT;
* Superannuation Provision Account;
* Territory Banking Account;
* ACN 071257504 Limited (formerly ACTTAB Limited [Discontinued Agency]; and
* Home Loan Portfolio [Discontinued Agency].

On the afternoon of 16 June 2015 the Chief Minister and officials appeared before the Committee to discuss:

* Output Class 1: Government Strategy, including:
* Output 1.1: Government Policy and Reform;[[358]](#footnote-359)
* Output 1.2: Public Sector Management; [[359]](#footnote-360) and
* Output 1.4: Coordinated Communications and Community Engagement.[[360]](#footnote-361)
* The following Outputs and matters were also considered at the hearing:
* Output 9.1: Loose-fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication Scheme;
* Output 10.1: Access Canberra; and
* ACT Executive.

The Minister for Economic Development appeared before the Committee on 19 June 2015. The following Output Classes were considered:

* Output Class 5: Procurement and Capital Works, including:
* Output 5.1: Procurement and Capital Works;
* Output Class 8: Economic Development, including:
* Output 8.1: Economic Development Policy, Projects and Legislation;
* Output 8.2: Innovation, Trade and Investment; and
* Output 8.7: Property Services.

The Minister for Tourism and Events appeared before the Committee on 19 June 2015. The following Output Classes were considered:

* Output Class 8: Economic Development, including:
* Output 8.3: VisitCanberra;
* Output 8.5: Venues; and
* Output 8.6: Events.

The Minister for Urban Renewal appeared before the Committee on 19 June 2015. The following Output Classes were considered:

* Output Class 8: Economic Development, including:
* Output 8.9: Urban Renewal; and
* Land Development Agency.

The Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations appeared before the Committee on 26 June 2015. The following Output Classes were considered:

* Output Class 1: Government Strategy, including:
* 1.3 Industrial Relations Policy;[[361]](#footnote-362) and
* ACT Long Service Leave Authority.

The Minister for Racing and Gaming appeared before the Committee on 26 June 2015. The following Output Class was considered:

* ACT Gambling and Racing Commission, including:
* Output Class 1.1 Gambling Regulation and Harm Minimisation.

The Minister for the Arts appeared before the Committee on 26 June 2015. The following Output Classes were considered:

* Output Class 8: Economic Development, including:
* Output 8.8: Arts Engagement; and
* Cultural Facilities Corporation, including
* Output 1: Cultural Facilities Management.

The Minister for Sport and Recreation appeared before the Committee on 26 June 2015. The following Output Class was considered:

* Output Class 8: Economic Development, including:
* Output 8.4: Sport and Recreation.
  1. Government Strategy
     1. Matters considered

Matters considered for Output Class 1: Government Strategy included:

* implementation of the ‘One Government’ model; [[362]](#footnote-363)
* operation of the Strategic Board; [[363]](#footnote-364)
* the role of the Coordinator-General for Domestic Violence and the role of CMTEDD in the context of responses to domestic violence; [[364]](#footnote-365)
* funding for responses to domestic violence in different parts of the ACT public sector; [[365]](#footnote-366)
* reform of the public transport sector in the ACT and levels of staff engaged to progress transport reform; [[366]](#footnote-367)
* the question of whether ACTION would be privatised; [[367]](#footnote-368)
* whether the public operation of Capital Metro was under consideration; [[368]](#footnote-369)
* the regulation regime for taxis in the ACT; [[369]](#footnote-370)
* timelines for the abolition of stamp duty in the ACT; [[370]](#footnote-371)
* budgetary provision and state of implementation for iConnect; [[371]](#footnote-372)
* progress on the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment strategy; [[372]](#footnote-373)
* performance agreements with Directors-General in the ACT public sector; [[373]](#footnote-374)
* progress on employment of people with a disability in the ACT public sector; [[374]](#footnote-375)
* the graduate program in the ACT public sector; [[375]](#footnote-376) and
* budgetary provision for, and coordination of, ACT Government responses to the use of crystal methamphetamine (‘ice’). [[376]](#footnote-377)

In addition, Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* number of people employed in transport reform area;[[377]](#footnote-378)
* breakdown of $6 million change shown on page 15 of CMTEDD Budget Statement;[[378]](#footnote-379)
* actions undertaken to achieve targets for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment in the ACT public service;[[379]](#footnote-380) and
* number of SES officers in ACT public service and number appointed in the 2014-15 financial year.[[380]](#footnote-381)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Operation of the ‘One Government’ model

In hearings of 16 June 2015 the Committee asked about the implementation of the ACT Government’s ‘One Government’ model.[[381]](#footnote-382)

In responding to this question the Head of Service and Director-General, Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, told the Committee that:

Some of the things that we have been doing, for example, include creating coordinators-general. We have now created four different coordinators-general. The idea is that you can leave staff in their own directorates and they can continue to have the benefit of knowledge of the subject area of their directorate and the skills that they get from working with their colleagues in that directorate, but they are more formally linked up across directorates on particular tasks that require a whole-service focus. We have created a parking coordinator-general, an urban renewal coordinator-general, a domestic violence coordinator-general and a roads coordinator-general. That has been one very successful innovation that we have put in place.[[382]](#footnote-383)

In addition, she told the Committee:

We have also … created Access Canberra, which brings together all of the different regulatory and licensing functions of the ACT government, so that we can provide services focused on the customer’s perspective rather than on the individual professional expertise of the staff involved. That has been a significant achievement. I have been very pleased with what we have achieved in just six months and the change that has made. We have a lot further that we can go with that initiative.[[383]](#footnote-384)

The Head of Service told the Committee that a further example was the Asbestos Taskforce, which had brought together ‘staff from across the service to focus on a particular task to be achieved, bringing all of their expertise together’. [[384]](#footnote-385)

The Head of Service went on to tell the Committee that, consistent with this, there had been ‘an increased focus on mobility across the service so that staff understand the different perspectives of the different directorates and the different contexts that the different directorates work in’, and an ‘increased focus on senior executive development’.[[385]](#footnote-386)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes progress on the implementation of the ACT Government’s ‘One Government’ model and notes that the model brings both potential risks and potential opportunities.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government determine and report on how to measure the effectiveness of the 'One Government' reforms by the last sitting day of 2015 and report regularly thereafter.

* + - 1. Funding for responses to domestic violence

During hearings of 16 June 2015 the Committee asked questions regarding funding in the ACT Budget 2015-16 for responses to domestic violence.[[386]](#footnote-387)

Responding to questions, the Deputy Director-General, Policy and Cabinet Division, told the Committee that additional budgetary provision for responses to domestic violence included:

* $615,000 for education programs regarding domestic violence;
* $250,000 to support domestic violence crisis services; and
* $300,000, comprising:
* additional support to the Domestic Violence Prevention Council;
* the development of ‘a domestic violence data framework’; and
* ‘women’s safety grants’.[[387]](#footnote-388)

In addition, the Deputy Director-General told the Committee the Chief Minister of the ACT had ‘indicated to the Commonwealth that we will provide support to the national campaign’, but the Commonwealth was ‘still working out exactly what they will ask of us in relation to that campaign’. [[388]](#footnote-389)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers it important that additional funding for responses to family and domestic violence is allocated to produce best possible outcomes.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government advise the Legislative Assembly before the ACT Budget 2015-16 is passed, if known, how much funding for responses to family and domestic violence will go to the national campaign and how much to direct service delivery.

* + - 1. Timelines for the abolition of stamp duty

In hearings of 16 June 2015 the Committee put questions to the Chief Minister regarding plans to abolish stamp duty in the ACT. [[389]](#footnote-390)

Questions were asked about timelines for the proposed abolition, noting a number of media reports which stated, variously, that the ACT Government would or would not abolish stamp duty within 20 years.[[390]](#footnote-391)

The Chief Minister was asked to clarify the ACT Government’s position, in particular whether stamp duty would be abolished within 20 years or over a longer period.[[391]](#footnote-392)

In responding to questions the Chief Minister told the Committee:

The government is committed to the abolition of stamp duty. I have cut stamp duty in every budget when I have been Treasurer.[[392]](#footnote-393)

In response to further questioning the Chief Minister advised that:

there will continue to be stamp duty collected in this city over three decades – the decade we are currently in, the 2020s and into the 2030s. There are five elections between now and the abolition of stamp duty. In order for stamp duty to be abolished, my government will need to be re‑elected in each of those...[[393]](#footnote-394)

The Chief Minister reiterated that it was the ACT Government’s intention to abolish stamp duty within 16 years from the present, but this could only occur if the Government was   
re-elected.[[394]](#footnote-395)

The Chief Minister was also asked whether revenue foregone from the abolition of stamp duty would be replaced by increases in general rates.[[395]](#footnote-396)

In response to these questions, the Chief Minister told the Committee that rates were ‘a source of revenue replacement’, but not ‘the only source’.[[396]](#footnote-397) He told the Committee that ‘when the government runs a surplus in the future’ it would then ‘attain the capacity to utilise some of that to cut taxes’.[[397]](#footnote-398)

Changes to stamp duty are discussed further under Output Class 2: (see section for the discussion and associated recommendations).

* + - 1. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment strategy

In hearings of 16 June 2015 the Committee asked questions regarding the ACT Government’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Employment Strategy, in particular about progress for the Strategy.[[398]](#footnote-399)

In responding to the question the Head of Service and Director-General, Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, told the Committee:

* that ‘we can always do much better than we are doing, but we are putting a huge effort into doing better’, and that the Strategy was ‘something that is really important and that we can significantly improve our performance on’; [[399]](#footnote-400)
* that she had written to Directors-General ‘at the end of last year’, saying that she was ‘was not happy with what we had been achieving in terms of employment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people’ and setting targets for each Directorate; [[400]](#footnote-401)
* that she regarded the targets set as ‘challenging’ but ‘achievable’ with ‘significant effort’;[[401]](#footnote-402)
* that she had asked for ‘reporting in March from every Director-General about what they were actually doing’, not ‘just how they were going for numbers but concrete steps they were putting in place to make sure they delivered that’; [[402]](#footnote-403)
* that this had resulted in ‘a very good set of initiatives which we shared across the directorates so that people could take up any ideas that might be applicable to their directorate’; [[403]](#footnote-404) and
* that while ‘we can do a lot better’, she was ‘pleased with the step up that we have achieved just in the last six months’, and that she intended ‘to go on pushing that’. [[404]](#footnote-405)

Regarding this, the Head of Service went on to tell the Committee that:

as a whole service we have put in place specific measures to support all directorates in achieving increases in employment. Again it has been a systematised approach to identify what measures would actually make the difference, setting those measures up and then tracking that we are delivering on them.[[405]](#footnote-406)

The Committee asked further questions regarding targets and hiring of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to positions in the Senior Executive Service (SES).

Additionally, it was noted that the original employment target, set in 2010 was ‘407 FTE [Full Time Equivalent] or two percent’, and a question was asked about whether that target had been achieved.[[406]](#footnote-407)

In response, the Head of Service told the Committee that:

We are not at two per cent. When I received the information last year about where we are up to on that, that is why I then started to put these measures in place, because I was quite concerned about that.[[407]](#footnote-408)

The Acting Deputy Director-General, Workforce Capability and Governance Division, and Commissioner for Public Administration also responded to the question. She told the Committee that:

I think we were saying at annual reports last year that we absolutely recognised we were not doing well enough in that area. So the revised targets now look at an increase that will get us to the 407 by 2018-19, with a doubling of the target this year. As Ms Leigh said we have managed to employ 45 more people just in this financial year, which we are very proud of, because that exceeds the target by 15.[[408]](#footnote-409)

Going in to further detail, she told the Committee that:

What we are doing … is putting an increased emphasis on developing specific programs. Both in terms of the graduate program and in terms of developing an Indigenous employment pathway, we expect to be able to offer 18 to 22 placements for the Indigenous employment pathway traineeship scheme within the next month. We are advertising at the moment. That is a specific initiative that we have put in place, recognising, as we did, that we needed to properly review—which we did with Community Services Directorate—the success of that previous Indigenous program.[[409]](#footnote-410)

Furthermore, the Acting Deputy Director-General told the Committee that, working with CSD:

we recognised that the areas of mentoring and support were really crucial to supplement. In terms of both trainees and cadetships and in the graduate program, we are looking to take a number, and that will help us to really develop in terms of the numbers that we want to get to for the renewed targets that we have set.[[410]](#footnote-411)

In response to questions about numbers of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the Senior Executive Service of the ACT Public Service, the Acting Deputy Director-General told the Committee that:

There are no specific initiatives at the moment to increase the numbers of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander executives. What we are doing, as Ms Leigh was explaining, is increasing the number of secondments and mobility arrangements across the service. There are always opportunities there for senior officers to step up, if you like, into executive positions. We have had some of that happening.[[411]](#footnote-412)

Additionally, she told the Committee:

In terms of opportunities to have long-term creation of appointments for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, we now have a much larger proportion in that feeder group, if you like, before the senior executive service. So in terms of both internally across the service and opportunities outside, there is a bigger pool than there used to be.[[412]](#footnote-413)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government should consider developing and launching an updated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment policy for the ACT public service.

* + - 1. ICT and Communications programs

In the context of the Shared Services and Government ICT programs, the Committee had discussions on the current and future approach to a number of ICT and communications programs under Output 1.4.

Of particular interest was the process followed and progress for implementation of communications and community engagement, particularly involving Wi-Fi rollout and implementation in Canberra.

In relation to the iConnect program and its current breakdown and spending,[[413]](#footnote-414) the Committee was advised by the Deputy Director-General, Policy and Cabinet Division, CMTEDD that:

Next year is a key year in that project. We will be spending more money than in any of the other years and we have been appropriated money to support that. So the iConnect project in total goes on for four or five years, but next year is a key year where we will be engaging preferred suppliers and bringing the first wave of services online. Because that is the peak year for spending on that initiative, it is reflected in the budget position for this part of the directorate.[[414]](#footnote-415)

In relation to the iConnect program, the Head of Service and Director-General of CMTEDD told the Committee:

Digital reform, digital transformation, covers a broad range. It covers the things that the government is doing to create a digital economy. The economic development area of CMTEDD have the prime leadership role for that. That looks at things like Wi-Fi and the CBR Innovation Network. Then we have looking at how we can change the delivery of services by government out to the community. Finally we have how we operate within government.

iConnect is some technology that can sit behind those last two categories to enable a joined-up government. It can facilitate things like a citizen not having to provide the same information multiple times to different systems, so that we can have one citizen interface with government. That is a key benefit of the iConnect project.[[415]](#footnote-416)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers that iConnect is a significant program for the future delivery of ACT Government services. The Committee also considers that public Wi-Fi is also important to Canberra’s digital future.

The Committee considers a number of recommendations can be advanced that impact on these issues and expenditure:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide further details on how the establishment and implementation of the iConnect platform is progressing.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide further details on how the rollout of public Wi-Fi across Canberra is progressing

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide further details on the use of Wi-Fi for the trial of smart parking in the ACT.

* 1. Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations

The ACT Government online Functions and Services Directory states that the Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations Division provides a range of services to the ACT Government, community and industry including:

* oversight and management of the ACT private sector Workers' Compensation Scheme (the Scheme) - including policy, legislation and the supervision of the ACT Default Insurance Fund;
* coordinating the management and prevention of workplace injuries in the ACT Public Sector;
* management of the ACT Government accident and incident data repository;
* implementation of the ACTPS workers' compensation and work safety improvement plan including return to work and injury management programs for the ACT Government;
* the provision of health and safety consultancy services and safety system improvement programs to directorates;
* the provision of advice and development of legislation on industrial relations, work safety (including dangerous substances and asbestos), public holidays and daylight savings;
* leading the ACT’s contribution to the national harmonisation of work health and safety and workers’ compensation laws;
* coordination of the Government’s implementation of the recommendations in the Getting Home Safely Report; and
* coordination of the implementation of the whole-of-government Healthy Weight Action Plan.[[416]](#footnote-417)
  + 1. Matters considered

Matters considered at the hearing on 26 June 2015 relating to Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations included:

* a proposed new ACT workers’ compensation scheme; [[417]](#footnote-418)
* the ACT Workers Compensation and Work Safety Improvement Plan;[[418]](#footnote-419)
* the relationship between work safety and drug and alcohol use, and whether there should be drug and alcohol testing for public sector employees;[[419]](#footnote-420) and
* ACT interaction with a federal review of the workplace relations framework.[[420]](#footnote-421)

The Committee also discussed the performance of the ACT Long Service Authority’s investment portfolio (see section of this report for details of that discussion).[[421]](#footnote-422)

* + 1. Key issues
       1. Proposed new ACT workers’ compensation scheme

In hearings of 26 June 2015 the Committee asked the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations questions about a proposed new ACT workers’ compensation scheme.[[422]](#footnote-423)

In responding, the Minister told the Committee that:

We have been working with employee groups across the territory in, I would say, a very active way to get their views on what is the best way forward in a new workers compensation scheme. As you are aware, the government has made a commitment to leave Comcare. We have found that Comcare is not producing the best results for our workers in a view of getting them back to work as early as possible. Also, we do not have any control over the Comcare scheme itself. It is run by the federal government. That decision has been made. We are now working with, as I said, the industry and we hope to have that finalised towards the end of the year.[[423]](#footnote-424)

The Committee asked the Minister when the scheme and accompanying legislation would emerge. The Minister responded by telling the Committee:

It will appear once it is drafted up. There is still the management and, I guess, construction of the scheme. It is important that we take on board the comments and the needs of the employee groups who have indicated that they want to work with us to produce the new scheme. I do not have any fixed dates for you at this time.[[424]](#footnote-425)

The Committee also asked about the ACT’s current contractual relationship with the federal Comcare workers’ compensation scheme, in particular the conditions for the ACT withdrawing from that scheme.[[425]](#footnote-426)

In responding, the Executive Director, Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, told the Committee that:

The territory’s commitment to the Comcare workers compensation scheme is ongoing until such time as the commonwealth minister releases the territory from that scheme. The mechanism for doing that is by way of a revocation of the declaration made under the commonwealth act in 1994. Effectively, it is an ongoing annual commitment. In that respect we expect to be charged a premium for the forthcoming financial year in full and, in the event that the territory wants to exit partway through a financial year, to pursue some sort of pro rata refund from Comcare. In short, it is an ongoing commitment for which we are charged on an annual basis.[[426]](#footnote-427)

The Committee asked for confirmation that under the relevant Commonwealth Act—the *Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988*— the ACT is obliged to remain in the Comcare scheme until released by the Commonwealth. The Executive Director confirmed that this was indeed the case.[[427]](#footnote-428)

The Committee asked whether the ACT had held discussions with the Commonwealth and whether there had been any indication of whether the Commonwealth would release the ACT from the Comcare scheme.[[428]](#footnote-429) In response the Minister told the Committee that although the Commonwealth had not yet provided a ‘formal release’, it had indicated ‘in conversation’ that a release would be provided.[[429]](#footnote-430)

The Committee asked how long it would take, if a release were provided, for the ACT to implement its own workers’ compensation scheme.[[430]](#footnote-431) In responding, the Minister told the Committee that:

The new scheme for the ACT will involve legislation, of course. It will be in the passage of that legislation and the creation of the scheme working with the employee representative groups. So it will take some time. I could not give you a firm figure. Until that scheme is designed, we will not be able to give you a firm time.[[431]](#footnote-432)

The Committee also asked if the ACT Government had held discussions with the ACT private sector about the implications of a new ACT-based scheme.[[432]](#footnote-433) In responding, the Minister told the Committee that:

We have had a number of discussions with representatives of the private sector scheme by way of principally the ACT Workers Compensation and Work Health and Safety Council, which is a tripartite ministerial advisory body with representation from the insurance industry. They have been consulted on two occasions now and there have been separate meetings as part of the government’s consultation process with individual stakeholders, including insurers, unions and the Business Chamber.[[433]](#footnote-434)

The Committee asked further questions about whether the ACT-based scheme would extend beyond the ACT public sector. In responding, the Executive Director told the Committee:

The proposal going forward at the moment is that it would be a scheme for the ACT public sector. That would be for public sector employees that are currently covered in the Comcare workers compensation system.[[434]](#footnote-435)

The Committee noted that private sector companies had contractual arrangements with Comcare.[[435]](#footnote-436) In responding, the Executive Director told the Committee that:

Large employers that were previously commonwealth entities or in competition with commonwealth entities can apply for a self-insurer licence under the Comcare scheme. If such a licence is granted, they underwrite and manage their own claims, albeit subject to the commonwealth legislation. There are some large national private sector companies—quite a few—that do so at the moment.[[436]](#footnote-437)

Later in hearings, the Executive Director told the Committee that in connection with the ACT leaving the Comcare scheme:

another potential benefit comes from addressing the somewhat unusual situation that exists at the moment whereby Comcare is the regulator of the territory in terms of its obligations as an employer under workers compensation law whereas WorkSafe ACT is the regulator of the territory as an employer for its work safety laws.[[437]](#footnote-438)

The Executive Director went on to say that:

The intent of that separation is: in the event that a new scheme is introduced, the responsibility for regulating and compliance enforcement as an employer will transfer to WorkSafe so that we will have a single regulator responsible for both prevention and injury management, which we expect to produce additional synergies above and beyond what the minister has described.[[438]](#footnote-439)

* + - 1. Workers Compensation and Work Safety Improvement Plan

In his opening statement of 26 June 2015 the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations told the Committee that:

During the 2014-15 year the government continued its investment in the public sector workers compensation and work safety improvement plan. Among other things, that investment has allowed the employment of specialist work injury management staff to be continued, upskilling of our return to work case managers and the rollout of a modern online system for the reporting and management of safety incidents.[[439]](#footnote-440)

The Minister went on to say that:

the investment appears to be paying significant dividends. For example, during 2013-14 in the ACT public sector the number of new lost time injuries reduced by 10 per cent to 366. Results for the 2014-15 year to date are also very positive, with the number of lost time injuries falling by a further 15 per cent compared to an equivalent point in time during 2013-14.[[440]](#footnote-441)

Later in hearings the Committee put questions to the Minister about the Workers Compensation and Work Safety Improvement Plan.[[441]](#footnote-442) In response, the Executive Director told the Committee that the Plan:

is executed by the territory in its capacity as an employer. As an employer it has a duty of care to its employees under both safety and workers compensation to prevent work-related injuries and to manage them where they do unfortunately occur. In 2011 the government invested significantly in an enhancement of the resources that are available to the territory to manage its work injuries in its capacity as an employer.[[442]](#footnote-443)

The Executive Director went on to say that key components of the Plan included:

the introduction of an improved case management model based on commercial insurance at best practice; the hiring of additional specialist personal injury staff, including staff with allied health qualifications; and up-skilling of the public service line managers—not case managers but line managers—on matters such as how to assist staff that have sustained a psychological injury or how to assist staff back into the workplace following an injury.[[443]](#footnote-444)

Furthermore, the Executive Director told the Committee there had been ‘a number of early intervention strategies’:

For example, we have recently piloted a physiotherapy initiative whereby workers who are injured but have not yet lodged a workers’ compensation claim can access physiotherapy services with a view to providing earlier treatment and getting them back into the workplace much earlier.[[444]](#footnote-445)

The Executive Director additionally advised:

we have invested in the development and implementation of a whole-of-government online system to identify managing and responding to hazards and injuries as they occur.[[445]](#footnote-446)

* 1. Financial and Economic Management
     1. Matters considered

At the Committee’s hearings on 15 June 2015, the following issues from Output 2.1: Economic Management, and Output 2.2: Financial Management were considered:

* whether tax reforms, including stamp duty provisions forming part of the Government’s revenue raising program, are revenue-neutral;[[446]](#footnote-447)
* variability in projected stamp duty revenue and the volume of transactions in the marketplace;[[447]](#footnote-448)
* government borrowings to fund the Mr Fluffy property purchase program;[[448]](#footnote-449)
* future economic outlook for the ACT and the Government’s related policy settings;[[449]](#footnote-450)
* current value of exports to the ACT economy;[[450]](#footnote-451)
* implementation of tax reform proposals in the ACT in present and future fiscal years;[[451]](#footnote-452)
* residential and commercial stamp duty payments as a proportion of the total current stamp duty receipts;[[452]](#footnote-453)
* projected period of reduction and removal of ACT stamp duty;[[453]](#footnote-454)
* extent of ACT reliance on the Commonwealth Government’s small business and families package to fund growth in the ACT;[[454]](#footnote-455)
* savings and expenses calculations in Budget figures;[[455]](#footnote-456)
* infrastructure spending and how it is dealt with by the Territory Provision Account   
  2015-16;[[456]](#footnote-457)
* ACT involvement in knowledge economy and sharing economic development;[[457]](#footnote-458)
* regulation of the ACT taxi industry, and general regulatory approach by the Government;[[458]](#footnote-459)
* effect of the current asset recycling program on the Budget;[[459]](#footnote-460)
* level of certainty or risk in a return to a budget surplus;[[460]](#footnote-461)
* Grants Commission approach to calculating coverage of the community by private health insurance;[[461]](#footnote-462)
* current and future housing market trends in the ACT;[[462]](#footnote-463)
* effect on the headline net operating balance in the Budget of variations in economic activity in the Budget period;[[463]](#footnote-464)
* reasons for increase in borrowings shown in the Budget;[[464]](#footnote-465)
* payments attributable to Mr Fluffy in borrowings and program for repayment;[[465]](#footnote-466)
* infrastructure borrowing program in the Budget;[[466]](#footnote-467)
* effect and policy responses to health funding payments due to Commonwealth funding arrangements for health services;[[467]](#footnote-468)
* basis for future health services funding;[[468]](#footnote-469)
* quarterly whole-of-government consolidated financial reports and effect on decision making;[[469]](#footnote-470)
* Capital Metro expressions of interest, funding and effect on net debt;[[470]](#footnote-471)
* levels of Lease Variation Charge payments;[[471]](#footnote-472)
* review of the *Financial Management Act* *1996* and other program and expenditure reviews;[[472]](#footnote-473) and
* adaptive re-use of buildings in the CBD and related car-parking issues.[[473]](#footnote-474)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Tax Reform Issues

During the Committee’s examination of the indicators in Output 2, the Committee raised with the Treasurer the question of the extent and progress of the Government’s tax reform agenda and the effect on revenue (and whether changes are revenue-neutral), particularly in relation to stamp duty. The Treasurer advised the Committee that:

The territory has probably lost revenue as a result of tax reform. The question would be whether you are seeking a year by year snapshot or the program to date over a four-year period. We have certainly given up revenue in a number of areas, particularly in relation to payroll tax, for example. So it would be fair to say that given the high level of volatility associated with stamp duty, in particular, that our revenue estimations have had to be written down on a number of occasions over the last four years, particularly in relation to stamp duty.[[474]](#footnote-475)

The Treasurer indicated that information could be made available that provides detail:

in relation to the difference between projected stamp duty revenues and volume of transactions in the marketplace, and the level at which they occur. The other thing when making estimations on revenue from stamp duty is that you have to make an estimation not only on the number of transactions that would occur in any fiscal year but also on the value of those transactions.

...

In fact in some instances, as I said, the Territory has given up revenue in order to stimulate economic activity. So we have either temporarily or permanently cut a number of taxes in order to support the economy through this period. So, yes, we have given up revenue.[[475]](#footnote-476)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee has noted the Treasurer’s advice and answers in relation to this matter and considers that it is important that updated information is provided as to the progress of tax reform as implemented, and if it is revenue neutral as foreshadowed.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government’s budget update on progressive tax reform include detail on whether or not the reforms are revenue neutral.

* + - 1. Reduction in Stamp Duty Rates

An issue which was raised in examination of this Output Class was the question of the timing of stamp duty reduction as part of this tax reform. In answer to a question about how long it would take to put into effect the proposal that stamp duty rates would reduce to zero, the Treasurer provided the Committee with this advice:

A couple of decades at least. The government will have some policy decisions to take around the next phase of reform. As I said, my medium-term objective is to have the lowest stamp duty in the country across all property values. Our first five years have focused very much on the affordable end of the market and a big shift of the large commercial transactions at above the $1½ million level.

At the moment I think ACT stamp duty for properties over $1 million would be higher than New South Wales but still lower than Victoria’s. It is a Labor government. We are always going to want to focus on assisting lower and middle income households. We probably have got some further policy work to do in relation to next year’s budget and to set the next five years path for tax reform but I have two objectives. One is the lowest stamp duty in the country and the second is working, utilising this tax reform, to assist low and middle income households into home ownership. So we will look at future tax reform with those objectives.

There is a policy argument to retain some level of stamp duty over the next couple of decades. We will need to consider at what level but we can certainly announce, associated with next year’s budget, a future path for tax reform. People will want to know where we intend to go over the next five years. We will make some more detailed announcements at the appropriate time but two clear objectives are the lowest stamp duty in the country and assisting housing affordability.[[476]](#footnote-477)

...

I maintain a long-term policy objective that in every budget I am Treasurer I will cut stamp duty. The exact conclusion of that will require future governments. There is, what, 2016, 2020, 2024, 2028. So we have got at least four elections between now and that eventual path for stamp duty elimination. I am not going to quibble over a handful of years. I will focus on the next five but maintain a long-term objective for its abolition.[[477]](#footnote-478)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers that the above statements leave a number of questions on the timing of stamp duty abolition for the future and as a part of taxation reform.[[478]](#footnote-479)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that in the 2016-17 Budget the ACT Government report on the first five-year phase of tax reform and outline its plan for the next five-year phase of tax reform, in particular its commitment to the principle of revenue neutrality and its long term goal of abolishing stamp duty over two decades.

* + - 1. Results of Agency reviews

The Committee discussed a series of reviews which were funded in the 2013-14 and 2014-15 budgets.[[479]](#footnote-480)

These included reviews of:

* the *Financial Management Act 1996*;
* the Emergency Services Agency;
* Parks and Gardens services;
* Concessions program;
* Commonwealth Fire Payment;
* Corrective Services; and
* parking infrastructure.
  + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers the results of these reviews, or at least those that are complete, should be tabled as they were funded under previous years’ budgets.[[480]](#footnote-481)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the results of these reviews, or at least those that are complete should be tabled in the Legislative Assembly, as they were funded under previous years’ budgets.

* + - 1. Sharing Economy

The Committee asked the Minister about opportunities to make better use of underutilised Government assets and was advised that the ACT does have a significant asset infrastructure base that does not get full utilisation.[[481]](#footnote-482)

The Minister stated:

The extent to which those opportunities are driven by innovative entrepreneurs and the community coming forward with, “Hey, we have idea X and we’d love to be able to use asset Y to achieve that,” you want to be open to that noting the obvious constraints are around security and insurance and the like. But it would appear to be a growing movement. Your default position would want to be to make some of this public infrastructure more available if you could.[[482]](#footnote-483)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider ways to support and develop the ‘sharing economy’ in the ACT, including how to improve the use of underutilised assets in the household, community, business and government sector.

* 1. Revenue Management

Revenue Management provides for the administration of the ACT Government’s taxation revenue.[[483]](#footnote-484)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 3: Revenue Management, the Committee considered the following matters at the hearing on 15 June 2015:

* payroll tax court cases;[[484]](#footnote-485)
* revenue from changes to payroll tax for small business (removal of the genuine employer exemption);[[485]](#footnote-486)
* lease variation charge schedules;[[486]](#footnote-487)
* businesses exempt from payroll tax;[[487]](#footnote-488)
* implications of the Commonwealth paying payroll tax;[[488]](#footnote-489)
* progressiveness of rates and revenue collected from each marginal rating;[[489]](#footnote-490)
* assistance provided to taxpayers to meet tax obligations;[[490]](#footnote-491)
* land tax and implications for land tax as a result of emerging sharing economies;[[491]](#footnote-492)
* motor vehicle registration revenue;[[492]](#footnote-493)
* cost of living statements;[[493]](#footnote-494)
* Fire and Emergency Services Levy (FESL);[[494]](#footnote-495)
* new revenue management system (Revenue Collection Transformation Project);[[495]](#footnote-496)
* performance indicators for dealing with tax assessment objections;[[496]](#footnote-497)
* parking fee revenue;[[497]](#footnote-498) and
* home businesses and application of land tax.[[498]](#footnote-499)
  1. Shared Services

The CMTEDD Budget Statement for 2015-16 states that Shared Services provides the Government with services as follows:

* *Shared Services ICT* provides a complete range of ICT services to the Government, including infrastructure, applications support and development and ICT project services (CMTEDD Output 4.1);
* *Shared Services Human Resources* provides tactical and transactional human resource services to directorates and agencies as well as records management services (CMTEDD Output 6.1); and
* *Shared Services Finance* provides tactical and transactional finance services to directorates and agencies as well as publishing services (CMTEDD Output 7.1).
  + 1. Matters considered

The following matters in relation to CMTEDD Shared Services Outputs 4.1, 6.1 and 7.1 were considered during the hearing on 16 June 2015:

* feasibility study on network modernisation;[[499]](#footnote-500)
* Shared Services office move to Winyu House, Gungahlin;[[500]](#footnote-501)
* ICT-related companies in Gungahlin and their relationship to Shared Services;[[501]](#footnote-502)
* Shared Services ICT activities and roles additional to network modernisation;[[502]](#footnote-503)
* data sovereignty issues;[[503]](#footnote-504)
* independent benchmarking for Shared Services ICT;[[504]](#footnote-505)
* introduction of a new budget management system;[[505]](#footnote-506)
* investigation by Shared Services Human Resources (HR) into why an inappropriate withdrawal space was erected to contain a child with autism in an ACT primary school;[[506]](#footnote-507)
* role of Shared Services HR in improving efficiency and morale in the ACT Public Service;[[507]](#footnote-508)
* ACT Government Graduate Program;[[508]](#footnote-509)
* role of Shared Services HR in working with agencies on improving collaboration and innovation in service delivery by agencies;[[509]](#footnote-510)
* the role of Shared Services HR in ACT public service (ACT PS) bullying issues;[[510]](#footnote-511)
* Shared Services HR accountability indicators;[[511]](#footnote-512)
* development and maintenance of the Oracle e-business suite;[[512]](#footnote-513)
* how Shared Services payment systems work for local businesses;[[513]](#footnote-514) and
* Shared Services and the introduction of a new revenue management system (Revenue Collection Transformation Project).[[514]](#footnote-515)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Winyu House

In response to a query from the Committee regarding the recent move of Shared Services to Winyu House in Gungahlin, the Executive Director of Shared Services stated that Winyu House housed 650 employees, and while there was some angst at the move from people who were now required to travel from the south of Canberra to Gungahlin, the Executive Director was overall very positive about the relocation.[[515]](#footnote-516)

The Executive Director went on to advise the Committee that the move was well organised with very little loss of productivity. The staff have productive and inviting new work spaces, have been made welcome into the Gungahlin business district, and anecdotal evidence suggests that the staff are very happy. [[516]](#footnote-517)

The Committee commends the ACT Government for the opening of Winyu House in Gungahlin, acknowledging this is the largest employment base in the Gungahlin Town Centre and will have a positive impact on the local area, especially Town Centre businesses.

* + - 1. Feasibility study on network modernisation

During the Committee hearing on 16 June 2015, the Committee sought advice on matters related to the modernisation of the network. Advice from the Executive Director, Shared Services was that:

The network modernisation program has been an ongoing program. It is a lifecycle program to make sure that our network is always reliable and robust. We have been doing it in the same way for a number of years. We think it is time to approach the market and see if there are more innovative ways to do it—whether we could do it as a managed service or whether in fact the program that we have had should be continued. So the money that has been allocated is just to make sure that we are doing it in the most cost-effective and efficient way possible.[[517]](#footnote-518)

The Committee was told further that the feasibility study process would be outsourced, but that no party had yet been selected. The Executive Director advised that :

We have a number of panels that are available in our IT environment, and I would suggest that we would look at all capable and appropriately qualified people who could do it and choose from within them. So it would probably be a select tender, I would think.[[518]](#footnote-519)

* + - 1. Inappropriate withdrawal space in an ACT primary school

The Committee discussed the progress of the investigation by Shared Services HR into why a cage-like structure was erected to contain a child with autism in an ACT primary school.[[519]](#footnote-520)

The Acting Executive Director advised: ‘that investigation is underway. There have been some delays in it, with people on leave—some of the witnesses et cetera—but we realise the urgency of that, and it is being dealt with.’ [[520]](#footnote-521) He further stated that ‘we are largely in the hands of some of the witnesses that our team needs to interview through this process. People have been on leave. We have also had some involvement from the union. So as the matter stands, it is with the directorate, not with Shared Services at the moment.’ [[521]](#footnote-522)

The Committee later heard from the Under Treasurer:

I just wanted to clarify some of the testimony of Mr Calvin Robinson earlier today in relation to the investigation of details surrounding allegations of the use of an enclosure in relation to a student. I went and reviewed the testimony. Mr Robinson stated that the investigation had been delayed for two reasons—one because of staff leave and the other because of union representation. I think the actual reason for the delay in the investigation has been caused by the complexity of the case, the desire to do a thorough investigation and the request for additional information that we made, to complete the investigation.

I think the request is entirely appropriate. I have, to date, not been involved in the investigation because it has been at arm’s length, but it has delayed the collection of all the necessary evidence and I think the collection of that evidence is required before the investigation can be finalised. Staff had been on leave, but that has not been a contributing factor to the delay in the investigation—whatsoever.

In terms of the time line, just to clarify the time line, Education consulted with us, Shared Services, on 1 April to determine our capability to respond to the matter appropriately. We met on 2 April with Education for an initial briefing. By 10 April the scope of the investigation and the terms of reference were settled and agreed, and at that point the formal investigation began.

During April and May the vast bulk of the evidence has been gathered from relevant sources. We are, as I said, just waiting to finalise a few outstanding matters of evidence before we finalise the investigation.[[522]](#footnote-523)

Shared Services HR considered this matter would be best dealt with in the examination of matters administered by the Education and Training Directorate (ETD). Accordingly, discussion of this issue and associated recommendations can be found in Chapter 8 – Education and Training.

* 1. Procurement and Capital Works
     1. Matters considered

On 19 June 2015 the following matters were considered for Output 5.1: Procurement and Capital Works:

* that capital works has been moved from Output 8.1 into Output Class 5.1;[[523]](#footnote-524)
* a broad overview of the steps in place to manage the percentage of work projects completed on budget and on time;[[524]](#footnote-525)
* the potential for the Majura Parkway to Well Station Drive to be duplicated and how it could be accelerated in time and design terms;[[525]](#footnote-526)
* evaluation of how local contractors are appropriately recognised for the value they add to the community and the Canberra Region Joint Organisation;[[526]](#footnote-527)
* further clarification of a suitable location for the Canberra Services Club and MOCCA and deliberation of lease transfer;[[527]](#footnote-528)
* details regarding termination and/or withdrawal provisions in procurement contracts;[[528]](#footnote-529) and
* local content requirements for tenders and contracts.[[529]](#footnote-530)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Local Content Requirements for tenders and contracts

The Committee sought advice on contract policy and what provisions exist for ACT contractors to be appropriately recognised for the value they may provide to the community and other factors.[[530]](#footnote-531)

Advice from the Chief Minister was that:

There is a weighting within our procurement guidelines to reflect a level of local engagement. That is broader than just the borders of the territory; that includes the Canberra region—what was formerly the southeast region of councils, now the Canberra Region Joint Organisation. That is their new title. There is a weighting within our procurement. [[531]](#footnote-532)

This answer was supplemented by the Executive Director, Procurement and Capital Works, CMTEDD who stated that:

For small to medium enterprises for goods and services contracts, there is generally a five per cent weighting for local contractors. That does not carry across into the infrastructure area, but local contractors have a number of natural advantages there inasmuch as they do not have to pay to set up an office in the city; they do not have to put up their staff in accommodation. They have a number of advantages. They also meet a number of conditions that we put in our contracts. They have to be able to attend a site within a pretty short time. Essentially, we require a lot of local presence. There are a number of structural issues that also support in the construction area. In terms of looking at the quality of their work and rewarding the quality of their work, that is generally taken into account in the assessment of contracts, because their performance on previous projects is weighted and local contractors, who have generally worked for us before, have a good chance of getting reasonable weightings on those issues. [[532]](#footnote-533)

This advice was further supplemented by advice from the Deputy Director-General of CMTEDD, as follows:

Certainly with the local procurement weighting, the biggest beneficiaries are in our service contracts, where it is quite easily demonstrated that a firm is domiciled in the ACT or the Canberra region and that the jobs are based here in the Canberra region. Those are the biggest beneficiaries; they are the ones that most easily get the full weighting of that SME advantage. [[533]](#footnote-534)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers that there is merit and efficiencies in extending the current five per cent weighting factor for local contract content to all tenders invited by the ACT Government and recommends accordingly:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider extending the five per cent weighting for local content to all tenders invited by the ACT Government.

* + - 1. Termination or withdrawal provisions in procurement contracts

The Committee sought details of withdrawal or termination clauses usually in standard contracts for procurement and capital projects in the ACT.[[534]](#footnote-535)

Advice to the Committee from the Executive Director, Procurement and Capital Works was that:

I am not able to be absolutely specific, but we have rights to terminate if the other party has substantially failed in their delivery process. Of course, that can be contested by them. They also have rights if the territory has been unreasonable. We also have a termination of convenience clause. We can terminate any contract. We are generally reluctant to do that because with termination of convenience comes large payments because, essentially, we have caused inconvenience to the other party[[535]](#footnote-536).

The Committee sought further details of how such clauses may work, and was advised that:

Essentially, the principle behind it is that the territory can decide to terminate, but there is a compensation provision. I would have to get you details. They can vary from contract to contract.

...

Essentially, they are contracts that have a clause that relates to the start of the contract. We might go out to tender where there has been general agreement and the project does not commence until budget funding is passed. But that is related to the commencement of the project generally and not to continuation of the project.[[536]](#footnote-537)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee draws attention to this advice and, subject to other considerations regarding procurement contracts, considers that an appropriate, standard termination or withdrawal clause is applicable to procurement contracts for Capital Metro.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government include appropriate standard termination/withdrawal clauses in all contracts for the provision of Capital Metro.

* + - 1. Suitable Location for MOCCA and the Services Club, Manuka

The Committee discussed the location of Manuka Occasional Child Care Association (MOCCA) and the Canberra Services Club with the Minister for Education and Training. See Chapter 8 for the discussion and associated recommendations.

However, the Committee considers that attention should be drawn to the following advice from the Chief Minister in the context of this Output:

There has to be planning for two outcomes ... either continuation of the originally proposed outcome or an alternate. If there is not any work progressed in relation to the originally proposed outcome then we would not be in a position to provide the new facilities to the school. It makes sense to have those new facilities provided over the summer holidays so that they are ready for the new school year in 2016. [[537]](#footnote-538)

In relation to the question of an alternate site to the currently proposed site for a new MOCCA, the Chief Minister advised:

If there is an alternate site found then that would be the preferred course of action.[[538]](#footnote-539)

Since this discussion, the Committee notes that the government announced plans to consider an alternative new site for MOCCA. The government announced that a site near the Griffith shops was being considered.[[539]](#footnote-540)

The Telopea Park Parents and Citizens Association requested that the government halt the planning of the tennis court redevelopment while the Griffith location was under consideration, and the Griffith community has objected to the proposal. However, the Chief Minister indicated that planning for work on the tennis courts at the end of 2015 will continue, stating:

While the government is still working towards the relocation of MOCCA to the tennis court site opposite Telopea Park School – we are willing to consider an alternative site.

The possible site behind the Griffith shops is being considered by the government, and LDA are continuing to consult with the broader community on the viability of an early childhood centre in the area. Issues raised at this stage are being worked through, and will form part of any further decision on whether the site is a better location for MOCCA.[[540]](#footnote-541)

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly with an update by the last sitting day in October 2015, on progress finding suitable alternative sites for the Manuka Occasional Child Care Association (MOCCA) relocation.

* 1. Economic Development
     1. Output 8.1: Economic Development Policy, Projects and Legislation
     2. Matters considered

The following matters were considered on 19 June 2015:

* changes in funding allocations from the 2014‑15 Estimated Outcomes and the 2015‑16 Budget;[[541]](#footnote-542)
* growth, diversification and jobs program; right business environment, innovation and investment;[[542]](#footnote-543)
* the program ‘Confident and business ready: building on our strengths’;[[543]](#footnote-544)
* shift or point of difference between strategy one and strategy two of the Business Growth Diversification Strategy;[[544]](#footnote-545)
* exporter’s network and BusinessPoint programs role in the ACT Government and funding agreements supplemented by the Canberra Business Chamber;[[545]](#footnote-546)
* interplay of ACT-led programs compared with Commonwealth-led programs for start‑up businesses and ensuring ACT funds are allocated to the most appropriate places;[[546]](#footnote-547)
* development of Totalisator Act;[[547]](#footnote-548) and
* housing affordability and the Territory’s role in providing affordable houses with an update on 98 current initiatives and logistics of pursuing a targeted approach.[[548]](#footnote-549)
  + 1. Output 8.2: Innovation, Trade and Investment
    2. Matters considered

The following matter was considered on 19 June 2015:

* dealings with Government owned land.[[549]](#footnote-550)
  + 1. Output 8.3: VisitCanberra
    2. Matters considered

The following matters were considered on 19 June 2015:

* relocation of the Canberra and Region Visitors Centre— Further detail about the Northbourne Avenue Visitors Centre to be moved, after being sold as part of the commonwealth asset recycling scheme;[[550]](#footnote-551)
* approximate timing for the ending of the Visitors Centre lease and refitting the venue as a tourist business centre;
* air stimulus fund - International air services to Canberra—update on progress regarding attracting international flights to the ACT;
* analysis of tourism data reflective of federal government spending reductions;[[551]](#footnote-552)
* review of the Tourism 2020 strategy and the link to varying accommodation needs, including low cost accommodation;[[552]](#footnote-553)
* ‘Christmas in the City’ partnership; funding, renovation and link to charity Christmas lights events;[[553]](#footnote-554) and
* evaluation of progress on the national convention centre, specifically progress on funding for building and renovating.[[554]](#footnote-555)
  + 1. Output 8.4: Sport and Recreation

The online ACT Government Information Portal states that:

Sport and Recreation Services (SRS) manages the sport and recreation policy of the ACT Government, delivers community programs, manages many sporting facilities and provides advice to the minister.[[555]](#footnote-556)

* + 1. Matters considered

The Minister for Sport and Recreation appeared before the Committee in hearings of 26 June 2015.

Matters considered included:

* the outcome, and implications, of investigations into water leakage at Canberra Olympic Pool;[[556]](#footnote-557)
* tenders and management for public pools in the ACT;[[557]](#footnote-558)
* further development of the Lyneham sports precinct;[[558]](#footnote-559)
* funding and maintenance for public sporting grounds and facilities;[[559]](#footnote-560) and
* high levels of demand for sporting facilities in the ACT.[[560]](#footnote-561)

In addition, Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* Canberra Olympic Pool and Tuggeranong Pool; [[561]](#footnote-562)
* sport participation in the ACT;[[562]](#footnote-563)
* sport facilities;[[563]](#footnote-564) and
* oval restoration.[[564]](#footnote-565)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Water leakage at Canberra Olympic Pool

The Committee asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation questions regarding water leakage at Canberra Olympic Pool.[[565]](#footnote-566)

In response, the Minister told the Committee:

As members would be aware, there have been extensive leaks identified at the Civic pool. We got in some leak engineers, essentially, to put it in layman’s terms. They have done a detailed report for us and presented some options. I have formed the view that there are cost-effective repairs that can be made, particularly to the outdoor pools, which will reduce the rate of water leakage. It will not guarantee no water leakage, but it will certainly reduce the rate of leakage.[[566]](#footnote-567)

The Minister told the Committee the implications of this for the availability of the pool complex:

It will mean that we can reopen the outdoor pools. With a sport and recreation perspective on that, that is particularly important, as they are our only diving facility in the region. In thinking about the best way to seek to work with the facility, that has been our key consideration. It will also mean that there will be very minimal, if any, disruption to the use of the 50-metre pool in undertaking those repairs. So the short answer will be that the outdoor pools will reopen as normal on 1 November for the summer season.[[567]](#footnote-568)

Regarding the indoor pool at the complex, the Minister told the Committee that:

The indoor pool will remain open. There may be half a day here or there linked to the other repairs, but essentially the engineer’s report indicates that we can do the outdoor work with no impact on the indoor pool. [[568]](#footnote-569)

Further, he noted that it was the ACT Government’s intent to ‘keep Civic pool as a going operation for what I would describe as the medium term’, and in the long term to ‘build a new aquatic facility in the city region’. In the context of this plan, he told the Committee, it was the Government’s intent that the ‘current Canberra Olympic pool will remain open until a new facility is ready’.[[569]](#footnote-570)

* + - 1. Tenders and management for public pools

The Committee asked the Minister about tenders and management for public pools in the ACT. In particular it asked about tenders for management of the Canberra Olympic Pool and the Lakeside Leisure Centre in Tuggeranong, and interruptions to the tender process.[[570]](#footnote-571)

In responding, the Director, Sport and Recreation Services, told the Committee that:

We commenced a tender process and proceeded to engage new contractors for the Canberra Olympic pool and the Lakeside Leisure Centre. At a point in time in that process, once the tender or the request for proposal had closed, we had one proposal. An assessment of that proposal was undertaken; it was deemed not to be a proposal that offered value for money, so the proponent was advised and that process was concluded. We have started another process for the Lakeside Leisure Centre with the short-term lead time for 1 July.[[571]](#footnote-572)

The Director, Sport and Recreation Services then went on to tell the Committee why interim arrangements had been put in place for management of the Canberra Olympic Pool:

In the circumstances of the leaks with the Canberra Olympic pool, we have sought to put in an interim operator, being YMCA New South Wales, who will come in on 1 July and operate under an interim arrangement until 31 March 2016, which would (a) allow us to continue operations in the short term and (b) also allow the outcome of the leak investigations to be concluded and decisions to be taken—at the time, because the minister has only just made announcements about what will be happening there—in that regard to get some certainty as to what the next steps with the Canberra Olympic pool would be. That is why the interim contracts have been put in place.[[572]](#footnote-573)

With regard to management of the Tuggeranong facility, the Director told the Committee that:

The Tuggeranong procurement process, in terms of the date by which proposals can be received under this new process, will close on 30 June, at which time there will be an assessment of any proposals received as a result of that offering, with a full intention that a new contractor would be engaged by the end of July in time for the opening of Lakeside Leisure Centre again after the current repair works or maintenance works that are happening at that facility are completed. [[573]](#footnote-574)

The Committee asked further questions about interruptions to the tender process for management of the Lakeside Leisure Centre.[[574]](#footnote-575) In response, the Director told the Committee that:

The process was taken through to a conclusion, and the conclusion was that there was not a successful appointment made from those tenders. So there was a full completion of that process. The assessment was undertaken of those tenders by the tender evaluation team; as a result of that process, a recommendation was not able to be made for the appointment of the single proponent for those contracts.[[575]](#footnote-576)

The Committee asked further questions about events leading up to the termination of the management contract with the previous provider at Tuggeranong. In responding, the Director told the Committee that:

We have had ongoing discussions, obviously, with the current incumbent, whose contract will end on 30 June. Throughout the duration of the contract and through the normal course of our contract management discussions, we have had a number of conversations and engagements with them over a number of matters, yes. Late last year they were informed that we were exercising our right under the contract, as the territory is able to do, to end that contract early, which we have done; they were given that full period of notice that we were bringing that contract to an early end.[[576]](#footnote-577)

Later in hearings, in response to further questions, the Minister told the Committee that:

Under the previous arrangement, the Canberra Olympic pool and the Tuggeranong pool were let as a single package. I think it is reasonably well known that the Civic pool runs at a loss. The Tuggeranong pool runs at a profit, for want of a better word. There has been an offsetting between those two contracts. To simply let a contract for the Canberra Olympic pool—inevitably there is a cost to government for that.[[577]](#footnote-578)

The Deputy Director-General, Arts, Business, Events, Sport and Tourism Division, also responded to this line of questioning. In responding, he told the Committee that:

We have been working very closely with the existing operator of the pool, particularly in respect of Canberra Olympic pool, to ensure that they were not unduly out of pocket for things like excessive water losses. Any large swimming pool will have some level of water loss, and the operator allows for that in their basic budget, but we had reached an agreement with the operator that recognised there were excessive losses and we needed to assist there.[[578]](#footnote-579)

The Deputy Director-General, Arts, Business, Events, Sport and Tourism Division went on to say that:

We are satisfied that the arrangements we are now entering do represent better value for money for the territory in aggregate, even when compared to the previous arrangements, from the perspective of both managing risk and uncertainty around the level of water loss. The repairs we are going to undertake we hope will reduce the rolling level of water loss. And comparing the management arrangement that we are letting with YMCA New South Wales for Canberra Olympic pool to the tender we received, there is a substantial price benefit for the taxpayers in the ACT.[[579]](#footnote-580)

* + 1. Output 8.5: Venues
    2. Matters considered

The Committee met with the Minister for Tourism and Events on 19 June 2015 and the following matters were considered:

* current considerations for purpose and use of Exhibition Park in Canberra (EPIC), including future proposals for widening Flemington Road potentially to be used for light rail; [[580]](#footnote-581) and
* potential pathways in which EPIC can be renovated.[[581]](#footnote-582)
  + 1. Output 8.6: Events
    2. Matters considered

The following matters were considered on 19 June 2015:

* international flights to Canberra;[[582]](#footnote-583)
* major exhibitions in Canberra in 2016, including the *Qing Dynasty* exhibition from Beijing;[[583]](#footnote-584)
* management, logistics and delivery of major events—such as Floriade, Floriade NightFest, the Enlighten Festival, Canberra Day celebrations, the Canberra Nara Candle Festival and other events;[[584]](#footnote-585)
* lessons from pervious events which can be used to better future events, such as keeping the event relevant and attractive to the public;[[585]](#footnote-586)
* community response to major events and growth in industry-stakeholder partnerships;[[586]](#footnote-587)
* discussion of the Night Noodle Market including economic impact and sourcing a different location to renew the event and provide a boost to attendance;[[587]](#footnote-588) and
* minimising complaints and problems which arise due to parking processes, potentially partnering with the Commonwealth Government who own car spaces, to progress the smart parking trial.[[588]](#footnote-589)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Accommodation

The Committee discussed the increasing number of hotel rooms in the ACT, attractions provided by Canberra as the National Capital and events which are organised and take place in Canberra, particularly large-scale events.[[589]](#footnote-590)

In this context, the Committee sought details of progress on the proposed Convention Centre concept and the flow-on benefits that would result from the successful establishment of such a facility in Canberra, and particularly major accommodation and a higher likelihood of attracting major events to Canberra.[[590]](#footnote-591)

The Committee sought advice on how an accommodation strategy would leverage from an asset such as a major Convention Centre so as to ensure a maximum return in investment.[[591]](#footnote-592)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers a coordinated strategy is reflected in comments by the Minister for Tourism and Events, which was to the effect that a national Convention Centre on a scale appropriate for the nation requires a contribution from the Commonwealth; a Canberra-oriented convention centre would be on a scale appropriate for the city.[[592]](#footnote-593)

The Committee considers a strategy for accommodation, attractions and events, which is an important part of an events program, should establish a timeline and goals.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government update its Tourism 2020 strategy to consider the ten years to 2030 and take into account:

i) accommodation;

ii) attractions; and

iii) events.

* + 1. Output 8.7: Property Services
    2. Matters considered

The following matters were considered at the hearing on 19 June 2015:

* reasons for the low satisfaction ratings regarding management of community facilities;[[593]](#footnote-594)
* the challenges and opportunities in the property portfolio;[[594]](#footnote-595) and
* evaluation of the property strategy and the accommodation strategy.[[595]](#footnote-596)
  + 1. Output 8.8: Arts Engagement

The 2015-16 Budget Statement B provides that arts engagement will support development of the arts, encourage community participation in and access to the arts through supporting artistic excellence and diversity, strengthen sustainability of the arts, and promote the capacity for the arts to contribute to social and economic outcomes.[[596]](#footnote-597)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 8: Economic Development, the Committee met with the Minister for the Arts and considered the following matters under Output 8.8: Arts Engagement:

* the progress and delivery of the new ACT arts policy framework, including public consultation;[[597]](#footnote-598)
* a study of the economic and social impact of the arts in the ACT;[[598]](#footnote-599)
* the benefits of the arts portfolio moving from the Community Services Directorate to Economic Development;[[599]](#footnote-600)
* the participation of ACT residents in the arts;[[600]](#footnote-601)
* the progress of the stage 2 development to the Belconnen Arts Centre;[[601]](#footnote-602)
* the re-profiled budget allocations for ‑
* stage 2 of the Belconnen Arts Centre;
* City to the Lake – new Canberra Theatre;
* the Gorman House Multi-Art Hub;
* the Kingston Visual Arts Hub; and
* the Public Art Scheme;[[602]](#footnote-603)
* reduction in government total funding and payments for Outputs for arts engagement in the 2015‑16 Budget;[[603]](#footnote-604)
* salaries of ACT arts sector workers;[[604]](#footnote-605)
* progress and funding of the Kingston Foreshore arts precinct; and[[605]](#footnote-606)
* the value, restoration and maintenance of public art.[[606]](#footnote-607)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. ACT arts policy framework

The Committee asked the Minister about the progress of the review of the ACT arts policy framework. The Director of artsACT advised the Committee that the framework was reviewed internally with a public consultation process that resulted in over 300 individual and organisational submissions. These submissions formed part of the considerations of an independent reference group who were appointed by the Minister to review the policy.[[607]](#footnote-608)

The Committee did raise concerns over the non-release of the review, and the short amount of time between closure of the public consultation period on 5 May 2015 and release of the new framework which was then scheduled for release in late June or early July. The Committee further questioned if the review was authored by the appointed reference group or artsACT.[[608]](#footnote-609)

In clarification, the Committee was later advised that:

[t]he consultation period for the review of the ACT Arts Policy Framework was opened on 18 March 2015 and closed on 5 May 2015. artsACT provided the Review material to the ACT Arts Policy Framework Review Reference Group for comment on 7 and 8 May 2015. The first draft of the 2015 ACT Arts Policy and consultation material was forwarded by artsACT to [the Minister’s office] on 18 May 2015. ACT Government agencies were consulted in the period 21‑29 May 2015. The final 2015 ACT Arts Policy was agreed by government on 10 June 2015.[[609]](#footnote-610)

In response to a question from the Committee, the Minister confirmed that a separate study was being conducted to ascertain the economic and social impacts of the arts on the ACT community. The Director of artsACT confirmed that the economic impact report had been completed and was, at the time, being peer-reviewed.[[610]](#footnote-611)

Since the time of the hearings, the 2015 ACT Arts Policy has been released by the Minister. The Policy was released on the 30 June 2015 and was released in conjunction with the report, ‘Economic Overview of the Arts in the ACT’.[[611]](#footnote-612)

* + - 1. Belconnen Arts Centre – Stage two

The Committee asked about the progress of stage two of the Belconnen Arts Centre, which has been subject to delays.[[612]](#footnote-613)

In response, the Director of artsACT told the Committee:

In terms of the development from last year, we have undertaken additional work with refining the design for Belconnen Arts Centre stage 2. That work is not only with the architects who are involved in that within the Shared Services and Procurement areas, but also very close work is taking place with not only the Belconnen Arts Centre but also the Belconnen Community Council. That development work has led to the development application being lodged and approved in January this year; so the project is ready. It is just awaiting funding, but against competing priorities we understand that that project may have to wait a little longer.

...

...the Belconnen area is certainly being looked after, but not Belconnen stage two, which we are all very keen to see progress. In a competing budget we just have to wait our turn. [[613]](#footnote-614)

The Director-General, Economic Development advised the Committee that high level discussions are progressing regarding other opportunities to enhance the Belconnen area, with the Directorate looking at different models to enhance other areas across the ACT.[[614]](#footnote-615)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee was concerned to hear about the lack of funding for stage two of the Belconnen Arts Centre, a project which has now been ongoing for some time. The Committee notes the importance of the Belconnen Arts Centre to the area and to the broader ACT arts community and citizens.

The Committee noted in its discussion that there is no arts centre in the Woden/ Weston Creek area or Gungahlin.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

[The Committee recommends the ACT Government fund stage two of the Belconnen Arts Centre.](#_Toc424204408)

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider the provision of arts facilities in the Woden/Weston Creek area and Gungahlin.

* + - 1. Re‑profiled budget allocations

The Committee questioned why the budget allocation of $25,000 in 2014‑15 for the Belconnen Arts Centre was being re-profiled to 2015‑16. The Director of artsACT noted that this funding will be used to refine and finalise elements of the project with various consultancies and was very confident that this would occur in the 2015‑16 financial year.[[615]](#footnote-616)

The Committee then questioned the re-profiled funding allocation for ‘City to the Lake – New Canberra Theatre (Feasibility)’ from 2014‑15 to 2015‑16. The Chief Executive Officer of the Cultural Facilities Corporation informed the Committee that ‘while we have progressed a number of new theatre studies, not all the money has yet been expended, so it has been rolled into the next year.’[[616]](#footnote-617)

In response to the Committee’s questions regarding the re-profiled funding for the Gorman House Multi-Art Hub from 2014‑15 to 2015‑16, the Director of artsACT stated that there were two elements that needed to be addressed under this funding, being internal works and external landscaping works. While the internal works have now been completed, landscaping and paving works are still progressing into the 2015‑16 financial year.[[617]](#footnote-618)

A further question from the Committee regarding re-profiled funding for ‘Kingston Visual Arts Hub (Feasibility)’ into the 2015‑16 financial year was responded to by the artsACT Director. The Director stated that:

The feasibility study was completed and released last weekend by the minister. There is a balance of money that was not spent in the feasibility study itself, but there is work being done within two of the buildings that will get those buildings prepared for the next part of the rollout of that feasibility study. One of those buildings is the former transport building. We are injecting new life into it, expanding activity beyond the Sunday markets. If you have been to those markets, some of the facilities are less than desirable, so we needed to get them ready for when the rest of the project is rolled out. So it is design work to look at toilets, facilities for storage and facilities for greater use of that space.[[618]](#footnote-619)

The Committee asked about the re-profiled funding of $410,000 into 2015‑16, for the Public Art Scheme. The Director informed the Committee that this funding is for the last of the major public artworks to be installed later this year. A new location for this artwork had to be sourced due to various capital works in the original location, and preparation for installation can now proceed in a new location.[[619]](#footnote-620)

* + - 1. Arts sector salaries

The Committee asked the Minister about salaries for employees in the ACT arts sector, in light of salary increases in the community sector. In response, the Minister agreed that while considerable work had been completed in this area for community sector workers, this had not translated into the arts sector.[[620]](#footnote-621)

The Director of artsACT added to this, stating:

The community sector is covered by an award and by peak bodies that argue on behalf of the people that work in the community sector. There is no such industrial relationship within the arts sector. There is an organisation called NAVA, the National Association for the Visual Arts, that promotes and reflects what they believe to be appropriate salaries for arts workers. There is also the Australia Council for the Arts, which has an indication of the sorts of levels of funding at which individual artists in a project round should be receiving funding, but there is no formal setting of an award rate for arts workers within arts organisations. People are covered, through the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance, by an industrial award.

...

It is not reasonable to compare salaries for either the ACT government or the commonwealth government with arts sector salaries. There are quite different terms and conditions. The level of responsibilities that are undertaken by people in the key arts organisations are reflected in the salaries offered by the boards for those people.[[621]](#footnote-622)

On 12 June 2015, the Committee heard from the Childers Group about salaries in the arts sector (see Chapter 2 for an overview of the discussion).

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned about the often insufficient salary levels in the arts sector, particularly in light of positive changes made to salaries for employees in the community sector and the lack of industrial representation for arts employees.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider assisting the arts sector by determining a path to improve the wages paid to the arts community.

* + - 1. Kingston Foreshore arts precinct

The Committee questioned what funding was in the ACT Budget 2015-16 to progress the Kingston Foreshore arts precinct.[[622]](#footnote-623)

The Director-General of Economic Development advised the Committee that due to competing budget priorities, there was ‘not a lot forthcoming in the budget.’ The Director-General went on to inform the Committee that the Land Development Agency (LDA) has worked closely with the arts and other stakeholders to look at the requirements in the Kingston Foreshore area, and a decision on the final planning outcome is anticipated in early 2016.[[623]](#footnote-624)

The Committee referred to the Kingston Foreshore Arts Precinct Feasibility Study that was released on 20 June 2015, and enquired as to what portion of the land under consideration was for commercial, residential and arts purposes.[[624]](#footnote-625)

In response, the Committee was advised that, based on consultation with arts groups, 7,571m2 of the Kingston Foreshore area would be for arts purposes. If the preferred design option presented in the Feasibility Study was adopted, up to 9,120m2 could be provided for public and arts use space, with potentially up to 53,413m2 for mixed residential and commercial use, and public outdoor space.[[625]](#footnote-626)

On 12 June 2015, the Committee heard from the Childers Group about the importance of the Kingston Foreshore arts precinct (see Chapter 2 for an overview of the discussion).

* + - 1. Public art

Questions were asked and answered regarding the restoration and maintenance work undertaken in the past financial year on ACT public art. This work is undertaken by recurrent funding of $150,000 to maintain the collection of 98 pieces, with priorities for restoration determined by a yearly condition audit on each artwork.[[626]](#footnote-627)

In response to a question from the Committee about the value of the ACT’s public art collection, the Committee was advised that the 98 pieces in the artsACT public art collection are valued at $15.013 million, as at the end of the 2014‑15 financial year. This is a $0.808 million increase on the previous value of $14.205 million in the 2013‑14 financial year.[[627]](#footnote-628)

* + 1. Output 8.9: Urban Renewal
    2. Matters considered

The Committee met with the Minister for Urban Renewal on 19 June 2015 and the following matters were considered:

* time frame for pieces of work looking at the racecourses and EPIC;[[628]](#footnote-629)
* the timing of greater engagement and community involvement in the Tuggeranong area in relation to urban renewal;[[629]](#footnote-630)
* timeframes for the Yarralumla brickworks and the Yarralumla development;[[630]](#footnote-631)
* the City to the Lake project;[[631]](#footnote-632)
* evaluation of how Racing and Gaming policy is addressed as urban renewal;[[632]](#footnote-633)
* urban renewal planning as distinct from the urban development role; and consideration of urban renewal driving planning or planning driving urban renewal;[[633]](#footnote-634)
* evaluation of urban renewal encompassing: asset recycling, the light rail corridor, public housing and progressing City to the Lake;[[634]](#footnote-635)
* City to the Lake project objective of increasing residential population through plans to build high density apartments at Acton;[[635]](#footnote-636)
* public consultation regarding public housing renewal program and the target for 2015-16 of 352 dwellings;[[636]](#footnote-637)
* innovation in building materials, methods of building and the opportunity to partner on some sites, and the role building projects will play in activating local communities;[[637]](#footnote-638)
* quality of what is going to be produced in comparison to the quality of existing dwellings;[[638]](#footnote-639)
* evaluation of the appropriateness of these dwellings for both older people and people with a disability;[[639]](#footnote-640)
* explanation of measures being taken – such as through liaising with the Linking into New Communities Taskforce (LINCT) - to ensure that those who will live in these dwellings will not be further isolated, with further comment given to whether rezoning the supportive housing would be more appropriate; [[640]](#footnote-641)
* what large-scale renewal of ACT housing stock has begun since the completion of McPherson Court, Lachlan Court and, most recently, Burnie Court, with information provided regarding all developments containing over 20 units in the last decade;[[641]](#footnote-642)
* price variations between public housing developments;[[642]](#footnote-643)
* development of multiunit sites in Deakin and the nature of projects in that suburb;[[643]](#footnote-644)
* funding variations from the 2014‑15 Budget to the 2015‑16 Budget for roads projects;[[644]](#footnote-645)
* changes, and associated costs, made to the Stomping Grounds to increase disability access and parking that were not foreseen at the commencement of the contract; [[645]](#footnote-646)
* commencement details, costs and completion estimates for the Stomping Grounds, constructed on behalf of the Government by Stromlo Stomping Grounds, with further comments on the additional impacts of the facility on the commercial market, any costs borne by other agencies, and complications regarding plumbing and emergency exists;[[646]](#footnote-647)
* how the urban renewal Coordinator-General works across government and delivers some of the urban renewal projects which are beyond the city centre;[[647]](#footnote-648) and
* reference to developments and how new and different types of community engagement could be implemented.[[648]](#footnote-649)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. CBD Development Issues

The Committee sought advice regarding proposals for the future of the Canberra CBD having regard to the provision in this Output which emphasises proposed asset recycling, a proposed light rail corridor, public housing elements and the City to the Lake Plan.[[649]](#footnote-650)

The Minister for Urban Renewal told the Committee that:

The city plan was the first phase of that work being undertaken in the planning directorate. There was a range of consultation and a series of priority projects of which city to the lake was one. In the context of the broader CBD, that overarching work is in the sequence of events first within the planning area before it moves into a delivery phase, although there were five priority projects under the city plan 1 of which city to the lake was part. That is the project that this area has responsibility for.[[650]](#footnote-651)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers a better long-term strategy for the development of the CBD can be formulated, allowing for a plan which stresses a holistic approach.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government, in conjunction with relevant stakeholders, promulgate a vision for Canberra’s CBD.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government develop a vision for Canberra as a whole, with a:

long-term plan of 50 years;

medium term plan of 15 years; and

short term plan of 5 years.

* + - 1. Redevelopment of Public Housing

The Committee pursued a number of issues regarding public housing, but highlights the current division of responsibilities between two Ministers: the Minister for Urban Renewal and the Minister for Housing, for housing tenants in the ACT.[[651]](#footnote-652)

This was described as a division whereby the Minister for Housing has responsibility for tenants and the Minister for Urban renewal has responsibilities for building. In particular, the Committee sought advice on how consultations with tenants currently in public housing in the urban renewal context are coordinated with the same consultation process with tenants currently occupying public housing.[[652]](#footnote-653)

The Executive Director of the Public Housing Renewal Taskforce advised the Committee that:

the primary responsibility for tenants is with Housing, but of course that needs to be carefully coordinated with the sites that they are going into. We have got a number of our staff members whose focus is on tenant coordination and relocation. They are working side by side with Housing staff and with the non-government sector, particularly, at this stage, the early stages, with Northside Community Service. They are out there together doing interviews with the tenants, finding out what their aspirations are, what their needs are, what their family compositions are and, from that, what is going to be the most appropriate housing.

...some of those tenants that are being relocated from the redevelopment sites will be moving directly into the new housing that is being constructed, but others will be moving into the public housing portfolio and the portfolio will be augmented by the construction program.[[653]](#footnote-654)

* + - * 1. Committee comment[[654]](#footnote-655)

The Committee notes that both the Housing ACT and Urban Renewal portfolios have responsibilities for public housing. The Committee would encourage the continued interactions of both portfolios to progress the best outcomes for existing and potential public housing tenants and to reduce any administrative issues for tenants that may arise as a result of having multiple government agencies involved in the housing process.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the Minister for Urban Renewal and Minister for Housing work as closely as possible on the redevelopment of public housing to ensure that residents are provided with consistent and timely information.

* + - 1. West Basin stomping ground

In response to questioning the Minister confirmed that the original funding allocation for the West Basin Stomping Ground was $800,000, but that the cost as at the date of the hearing was approximately $933,000 and this was mostly related to the cost of installation of the infrastructure.[[655]](#footnote-656)

The Committee was additionally advised that decisions made subsequent to the commencement of construction meant that additional funding would be required to take the project to completion. This included some additional works around disability access, landscaping and fencing.[[656]](#footnote-657)

* + - * 1. committee comment

Given the changes in the funding required over the course of the West Basin Stomping Ground construction, and the unknown final cost, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government inform the Legislative Assembly of the final cost of delivery of West Basin Stomping Ground on the first sitting day after it is known.

* 1. Loose-fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication Scheme

Appendix B of 2015-16 Budget Paper No. 3 provides details of the Loose-fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication Scheme, as follows:

On 28 October 2014, the Government announced the implementation of a buyback scheme for all ACT houses affected by loose-fill asbestos (Mr Fluffy) insulation. This decision was based on advice from the ACT Asbestos Response Taskforce that eradication of the ongoing risk of asbestos exposure through demolition of all such properties is the only enduring solution to the health risks affected homes pose to current and future residents, visitors and workers, and their associated social, financial and practical effects.

Under the Loose-fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication Scheme (the Scheme), the ACT Government will acquire, demolish and safely dispose of all affected homes, remediate affected blocks and then resell them to defray overall Scheme costs. That Scheme also includes the emergency financial assistance, asbestos assessment and hazard reduction program undertaken by the Asbestos Response Taskforce since it was formed in mid-2014, as well as the ongoing relocation assistance grants payable as affected homes are vacated.[[657]](#footnote-658)

The appendix then goes on to provide further detail on:

* funding arrangements for the Scheme; [[658]](#footnote-659)
* progress on the government purchase of affected properties, known as ‘buy-backs’; [[659]](#footnote-660)
* demolition and remediation; [[660]](#footnote-661)
* land sales; [[661]](#footnote-662)
* a budget update on the Scheme; [[662]](#footnote-663) and
* details on accounting policy for the Scheme. [[663]](#footnote-664)

Previously the Standing Committee on Public Accounts had conducted an inquiry into legislation relevant to the Scheme, the *Appropriation (Loose-fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication) Bill 2014*, completed on 3 December 2014.[[664]](#footnote-665)

* + 1. Matters considered

Matters considered on 16 June 2015 in relation to Output Class 9: Loose-fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication[[665]](#footnote-666) included:

* The so-called ‘go it alone option’, including:
* the ‘go it alone option’ and the process it entails;[[666]](#footnote-667)
* the number of people electing to follow the go it alone option and outcomes of their applications to proceed with this option; [[667]](#footnote-668)
* the buy-back scheme, including:
* administration and progress of the buy-back scheme;[[668]](#footnote-669)
* disputes regarding valuations under the buy-back scheme and their resolution; [[669]](#footnote-670)
* deadlines on participation in the buy-back scheme; [[670]](#footnote-671)
* implications for homeowners of not participating in the buy-back scheme; [[671]](#footnote-672)
* timeframes for vacating properties under the buy-back scheme; [[672]](#footnote-673)
* the impact of the buy-back scheme on the finances of the ACT;[[673]](#footnote-674)
* other aspects of support to homeowners by the taskforce;[[674]](#footnote-675)
* schedule and costing for demolition of affected properties;[[675]](#footnote-676) and
* schedules for release of new residential land in the ACT. [[676]](#footnote-677)

In addition, Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* number engaged in the 'go it alone' option[[677]](#footnote-678)
* copy of letter sent to Mr Fluffy homeowners;[[678]](#footnote-679)
* number of properties eligible for dual occupancy;[[679]](#footnote-680) and
* price of demolitions.[[680]](#footnote-681)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. The ‘go it alone’ option

In hearings of 16 June 2015 questions were asked and answered regarding the so-called ‘go it alone’ option for properties affected by loose-fill asbestos insulation.[[681]](#footnote-682)

The ‘go it alone’ option refers to a process in which owners of properties affected by loose-fill asbestos insulation choose not to participate in the ACT Government’s buy-back scheme but instead undertake demolition of buildings and subsequent rebuilding on their own initiative.[[682]](#footnote-683)

The Committee asked for clarification of this as an option available to owners of affected properties, and also enquired as to how many people were pursuing this option, and what processes were being followed.[[683]](#footnote-684)

In response, the Head, Asbestos Response Taskforce, told the Committee that:

That particular proposal emerged as part of the [Standing Committee on Public Accounts] inquiry into the appropriation bill at the end of November last year. Essentially, while the government’s response to the recommendation noted that while the government had considered supporting the private demolition of affected houses and decided not to do that as part of the scheme, the government’s response left open the prospect of affected owners making a submission to the taskforce. Essentially, I cannot remember the exact form of words. I have got it here. I can get it if we need to but essentially it is that it could be done at a cost that did not add to the taskforce’s costs for demolishing the house.[[684]](#footnote-685)

The Head of the Taskforce went on to say that:

the issue of supporting the private demolition of houses had been considered at length by the government in reaching the position that it reached when it announced the scheme in October. The government’s response makes it clear that this option is not in keeping with its preferred path.[[685]](#footnote-686)

Responding to a question about numbers of property owners seeking to take this option, the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee that there had been ‘seven or eight—I will get my staff to confirm the actual number—people who have particularly raised this issue with the taskforce’.[[686]](#footnote-687)

The Head of the Taskforce also told the Committee that there had been:

two requests made, both of which the taskforce has declined to support, essentially because the way those proposals were constructed was to simply take the overall cost of the scheme, as was tabled in the public accounts committee’s hearing last November, and divide it by 1,021.

While those figures are at an aggregate level an average across a thousand houses, our best estimate at the time was that it is certainly not the case that there is any particular entitlement or allocation against any particular house.[[687]](#footnote-688)

Regarding consideration of these requests the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee that:

As we are moving into the demolition phase now with the activities starting on the pilot, it has been and will continue to be a case by case proposition against each house.[[688]](#footnote-689)

The Head of the Taskforce went on to tell the Committee that:

* the Taskforce had ‘answered a number of letters’,
* that he was ‘conscious that a number of owners have written to the chair of the committee and to members of the opposition recently’; and
* that those letters had ‘now all been answered along the lines of the answers I am giving this afternoon’. [[689]](#footnote-690)

When asked if the Taskforce had made a counter offer in relation to the two requests which had been declined, the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee that:

The response that we gave was to not support the submission as it was made. Nowhere in the scheme is there a negotiation path between officials and the owners. Essentially, the response was, “No, a submission framed in terms of dividing the aggregate cost of the scheme by 1,021 does not satisfy the test that was set out in the government’s response.” So we have then redirected those owners to the remainder of the buyback scheme guidelines.[[690]](#footnote-691)

In response to subsequent questioning the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee that:

the response letters that we have given … have been [to the effect that] “No, we have not supported that request. If you wish to come to us with a specific proposal in relation to a particular house, then we are happy to have another conversation.” [[691]](#footnote-692)

The Head of the Taskforce went on to tell the Committee that:

in the meantime the response in terms of the government’s position, the taskforce’s response has been to return to the broader buyback scheme rules but leave open that opportunity if the owners wish to bring back a more specific and costed proposal rather than one which is simply dividing aggregated average costs by 1,021. [[692]](#footnote-693)

The Committee sought confirmation regarding the final date for people to enter the buy-back scheme reported to be on 30 June 2015.[[693]](#footnote-694)

In response the Head of the Taskforce confirmed to the Committee that, in relation to this date and those looking to enter the ‘go it alone’ option:

The responses that I have sent today in part suggest that if owners wish to continue to have this conversation with us, they also should at least lodge the application for buyback to preserve their options to participate in the buyback scheme in the event that the submission is ultimately declined.[[694]](#footnote-695), [[695]](#footnote-696)

* + - 1. Administration of the buy–back scheme

The Committee asked questions about the administration of the ACT Government’s buy-back scheme. Noting a *Canberra Times* article stating that owners could sign contracts but withdraw before settlement, the Committee asked when this information had been provided to owners of affected properties.[[696]](#footnote-697)

In responding to the question the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee that:

That particular article responded to an interaction that we had had with one home owner. Essentially the scheme, since it was announced, is one in which participation is voluntary. While the deed of surrender, as a normal sales contract, contains provisions for enforcement in the event that there is a delay around the ultimate settlement, essentially the answer that we gave, when pressed by a particular home owner and subsequently by the newspaper that was following that up, was that if at the end of the day the taskforce had got to the scheduled settlement, had issued the notice to complete which is provided for in the deed and the owners had come back and said, “Do you know what? We have changed our mind. We do not want to participate anymore,” the answer we gave was that, at the end of the day, it is a voluntary scheme, and provided we have explained all of the consequences of an owner choosing not to participate, then essentially, if they, having had all that explained, chose not to participate, then yes, they could walk away from the arrangement. And at that point, and this was part of the answer too, there are no funds at risk, inasmuch as there are no deposits paid when agreement is reached to surrender the property. So ultimately, if an owner says at any point that they do not wish to participate in a voluntary scheme, the taskforce will respect those wishes.[[697]](#footnote-698)

The Committee asked if all persons who had signed contracts under the buy-back scheme had been advised that they were able to withdraw from the scheme.[[698]](#footnote-699)

In response, the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee:

Not explicitly … but at the same time more than 840 have accepted and are in the process of moving out. And it has now been covered in the press, and it is being covered in these hearings, and we would give the same answer to anyone else who chose to press that point.[[699]](#footnote-700)

The Committee asked what documentation was necessary to participate in the buy-back scheme.[[700]](#footnote-701)

The Head of the Taskforce responded by telling the Committee that:

The only document that needs to be returned to preserve the option to participate is the request to have a valuation conducted. Beyond that, as each stage of the acquisition process unfolds, essentially how it works is that the request for a valuation comes in, we then provide the details of the property to the Property Institute, the institute appoints valuers with expertise in the particular suburb area, the valuation reports are arranged directly between the appointed valuers and the home owners, and once the reports are finalised they are sent to the home owners and us at the same time, at which point the taskforce makes the formal offer to acquire the property at the average of those two valuations.[[701]](#footnote-702)

The Head of the Taskforce went on to say that this letter ‘sets out the options that exist at that point’: [[702]](#footnote-703)

to accept the offer, to refuse the offer or to pursue the arbitration process through the presidential determination stage if the owner is unhappy with the value. At the point the offer is accepted, we issue instructions to the territory solicitors to actually prepare the deed of surrender based on the agreed sum. And at each of those offer stages, and again at the presentation of the deed, there is a 60 working day period during which they are able to respond. [[703]](#footnote-704)

The Committee also asked questions about valuations, and to what extent property owners had expressed dissatisfaction about valuations.[[704]](#footnote-705)

In response, the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee that:

From the outset, the whole of this process has been one which, while about buildings, stopped being about buildings a long time ago. It has been, as we have acknowledged, an enormously distressing and complicated series of decisions. I would not say that any of the affected owners are happy to be needing to have the conversation. Seven have asked for the arbitration. Of the 840 or something that have accepted the offers, there have been seven arbitrations requested by owners.[[705]](#footnote-706)

The Committee went on to ask further questions about instances where property owners had objected to valuations, in particular whether these had been dealt with by way of ‘presidential determinations’ and what took place after the making of the determination.[[706]](#footnote-707)

According to the ACT Government’s Asbestos Response Taskforce, owners of affected properties who wish to take part in the buy-back scheme should seek two valuations, but may:

reject both valuations and at your choice and cost, request a third and binding valuation from a senior valuer appointed by the President of the API [Australian Property Institute]. This is known as a “Presidential Determination”. You will be bound by this determination, even if it is lower than the average of the first two.[[707]](#footnote-708)

In responding to questions, the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee that in each of the seven cases where valuations were disputed, owners of affected properties had accepted the revised valuation resulting from the Presidential Determination.[[708]](#footnote-709)

* + - 1. Demolitions

The Committee asked witnesses questions about demolitions of properties affected by loose-fill asbestos.[[709]](#footnote-710)

In response to questions about the scheduling of demolitions, the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee that:

The advice we have had from our colleagues in procurement who are actually managing the demolition contract is that around 800 houses that have actually been agreed to be surrendered are about three years work. The taskforce has now largely completed the exercise of the indicative scheduling of those houses into tranches which can then be provided off to contractors. We have provided the first 50 to the two firms who are doing the pilot and then the rest of the first 50; then there will be a rolling series of releases of properties to contractors to actually begin that work.[[710]](#footnote-711)

In relation to questions of cost for demolitions, the Head of the Taskforce told the Committee these were closely related to scheduling:

one of the significant issues that has meant we have been unable to provide that answer [regarding the cost of demolition] is we needed to have a reasonably well-refined conversation with industry about demolition capacity before we could have a serious conversation about time and therefore price. It has always been the case that there is insufficient capacity in the local industry to deliver hundreds of demolitions in the sort of time frame that is contemplated by the scheme.[[711]](#footnote-712)

The Head of the Taskforce also told the Committee that:

The second constraint on that has been that the valuers on whose advice that process relies have been completely occupied, and doing more than they would normally do, to actually deal with the buyback part of the scheme, which comes on top of their ordinary business, in terms of other real estate transactions, bank valuations and so on.[[712]](#footnote-713)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

Given the June 30 2015 deadline to join the ACT Loose-fill Asbestos Eradication Scheme has now passed, and all but six affected properties have chosen to join the buy-back scheme, the ACT Government should be in a position to update the Legislative Assembly on the financial impacts of the scheme.

In relation to the matters considered above, the Committee is mindful of the risks to which the ACT is exposed due to the unique and extraordinary nature of the ACT Loose-fill Asbestos Eradication Scheme on the ACT community.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly, before the ACT Budget 2015-16 is passed, with an update on the financial status of the loose-fill asbestos buy-back scheme.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider how undetected loose-fill asbestos properties will be detected and brought to its attention.

* + - 1. Nudurr Drive

The Committee notes that the Standing Committee on Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services discussed the matter of a $10 million contingency for Nudurr Drive for possible remediation of that site at its public hearings into Annual and Financial Reports 2013‑14[[713]](#footnote-714) and received a map of the contaminated areas in response to a Question Taken on Notice.[[714]](#footnote-715)

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide further information to the Legislative Assembly on the status of reported asbestos contamination at the dump site under Nudurr Drive Extension between Crace and Palmerston within 90 days of this report being tabled in the Assembly.

* 1. Access Canberra

The 2015-16 Budget Paper No. 3[[715]](#footnote-716) describes Access Canberra as:

a new 'one-stop shop' to cut red tape and better connect Canberrans to government services. Access Canberra brings together ACT Government customer services, approvals and regulatory compliance activities. Access Canberra aims to make it easier for business to meet its regulatory requirements by streamlining processes and incrementally moving to a modern, risk-based approach to services and compliance.[[716]](#footnote-717)

Budget Paper No. 3 states that by ‘adopting a customer-focus, Access Canberra will work with businesses to support and promote their ideas, encouraging growth and innovation’. [[717]](#footnote-718) It further describes Access Canberra as ’a key party in delivering on the Government’s red tape reduction agenda’. [[718]](#footnote-719)

Its website notes that Access Canberra results from the amalgamation of the following, previously separate, business units:

* Canberra Connect shopfronts and contact centre;
* the ACT Revenue Office shopfronts;
* the Office of Regulatory Services;
* the Gambling and Racing Commission;
* public health protection and regulation relating to food businesses;
* permits for the use of public unleased land;
* Environment Protection Authority;
* Environment and Planning Directorate Customer Services; and
* Construction Services.[[719]](#footnote-720)
  + 1. Matters considered

Matters considered at the hearing on 16 June 2015 in relation to Output Class 10: Access Canberra included:

* the purpose and composition of Access Canberra; [[720]](#footnote-721)
* examples of the work of Access Canberra;[[721]](#footnote-722) and
* accommodation and staffing for Access Canberra.[[722]](#footnote-723)

In addition, Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* receiving a copy of a presentation on Access Canberra;[[723]](#footnote-724)
* receiving a copy of a chart of all the current arrangements regarding what is in the directorates, what is under the control of the coordinators-general and what now has moved into Access Canberra;[[724]](#footnote-725) and
* number of regulatory officers in the ACT Government.[[725]](#footnote-726)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Purpose and composition of Access Canberra

The Committee asked the Chief Minister about the formation of Access Canberra and what it was intended to do.[[726]](#footnote-727)

In response the Chief Minister told the Committee that:

Access Canberra is a one-stop shop for ACT government regulatory services and the former Canberra Connect is encompassed within the organisation. Its primary objective is to streamline our regulatory service provision within the territory and to provide a no-wrong-door approach. So if people wish to engage with the government, be they residents, businesses or community organisations, they have a single point of contact for engagement.[[727]](#footnote-728)

The Deputy Director-General, Access Canberra, also responded. He told the Committee that:

Access Canberra includes the old Canberra Connect, building, utilities, land and lease regulation, electricity and natural gas, water and sewerage industry technical regulation, environment protection and water regulation, fair trading and registration, inspection and regulatory services, occupational licensing, public health protection and regulation relating to food permits, public unleased land permits relating to events, racing and gambling regulation, road safety regulation and driver and vehicle licensing, WorkSafe ACT and some functions related to the territory Revenue Office shopfront. [[728]](#footnote-729)

When asked about clarity of reporting lines, the Chief Minister told the Committee that it was ‘important to draw a distinction between policy and regulatory functions’: [[729]](#footnote-730)

There is a powerful argument that those who are engaged in the regulatory space have a series of overlapping priorities and interests. From the perspective of a consumer, which is the perspective that I am most interested in, they do not particularly care where in government services are located. Their preference, frankly, is to be able to go to one place rather than to go to many. So if you are seeking to organise an event now in Canberra, rather than having to go and get permits from a number of different areas of government, you go to Access Canberra; it is a one-stop shop.[[730]](#footnote-731)

* + - 1. The work of Access Canberra

The Chief Minister asked the Deputy Director-General to provide the Committee with examples of the operation of Access Canberra.[[731]](#footnote-732)

The Director-General spoke to the Committee about the work of ‘a dedicated events approvals team within Access Canberra’:

This team provides a single entry point to government for event organisers. It is the job of this team to coordinate all the regulatory approvals to get these events happening. In the past it may have been the case that for a particularly complex event, an event organiser would go to different regulatory arms of government and perhaps get three yeses and three noes, and the challenge from there fell to the proponent to figure out how to negotiate the path forward to actually put on the event.

That no longer happens. We have this dedicated team that provides a case management approach. It works with event organisers to essentially understand what it is they are setting out to do, and we do the running around behind the scenes for them. That is not just limited to the regulators that sit within Access Canberra. It is right across the ACT public service, and indeed the Australian government—the National Capital Authority, and [Civil Aviation Safety Authority] in one instance as well.

We provide everything we can to get these events happening. That is not to say that in any way we are watering down public protections. That is all still there, but we are integrating those services and making sure that everything is lined up so that we can run safe events.

Since the time that team has been set up, which is really only a couple of months, a number of approvals have already been provided to recurring events in terms of a weekly park run and also a monthly charity event. The team is also currently assisting with regulatory approvals for over 50 events, including 17 sporting events covering cycling, fun runs, marathons and triathlons, 16 community events covering festivals, markets, concerts and charity days, four major events which includes a concert, the balloon festival, a new year’s eve concert and Summernats, three arts and cultural events, three Christmas events, two commemorative events, two private events, rallies and demonstrations, and the list goes on.[[732]](#footnote-733)

* + - 1. accommodation and staffing for Access Canberra

The Committee asked questions regarding accommodation and staffing for Access Canberra.

In relation to accommodation, the Deputy Director-General told the Committee that there was ‘a range of accommodation considerations that a working group within Access Canberra is currently progressing’:

The government has taken some decisions related to the asset recycling initiative, which looks at the sale of certain properties. Three properties in particular, covering the Dickson motor vehicle registry, Dame Pattie Menzies House and Macarthur House all house considerable numbers of Access Canberra employees. The Dickson motor vehicle registry is one we are moving on particularly quickly, because of the sale time frame. We are looking potentially at other sites where that could be relocated and we will prepare some advice for government.[[733]](#footnote-734)

The Deputy Director-General went on to say that:

Ideally, you would have everyone sitting in the same building, but that is not possible with the accommodation that we currently have. So we look at where it makes sense to co-locate teams, where there would be benefits of inspectors sitting alongside their colleagues, and that will be our priority in the short to medium term.[[734]](#footnote-735)

In response to questions about staffing, the Deputy Director-General told the Committee that there were at present approximately 700 staff in Access Canberra, and that under the new arrangements regulatory officers who had formerly been ‘regulating their particular area’ had opportunities to be ‘cross-trained’ in different regulatory roles.[[735]](#footnote-736)

There were also other questions asked and answered regarding Access Canberra, including:

* which government regulators and inspectorates had been included or not included in Access Canberra;[[736]](#footnote-737)
* accountability indicators and an independent annual survey of users of Access Canberra;[[737]](#footnote-738)
* calculation of numbers and costs of interactions with Access Canberra; [[738]](#footnote-739)
* the degree to which the composition of Access Canberra can be considered complete; [[739]](#footnote-740)
* effects of organisational change on staff; [[740]](#footnote-741)
* impact of Access Canberra on online delivery of services; [[741]](#footnote-742)
* numbers of telephone enquiries fielded by Access Canberra; [[742]](#footnote-743)
* numbers of regulatory officers employed by the ACT Government; [[743]](#footnote-744) and
* numbers of inspections undertaken by regulatory officers, including Working with Vulnerable People compliance checks. [[744]](#footnote-745)
  + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the intent of the ACT Government’s moves to concentrate public sector regulation service delivery.[[745]](#footnote-746)

The Committee notes the ACT Government’s reforms to re-align some policy and regulatory functions, and especially to establish Access Canberra, so that the community and local business access to Governments services, permits and approvals processes is improved.

The Committee commends this reform and welcomes the establishment of Access Canberra. The Committee also acknowledges that such a significant organisational and service delivery reform will present opportunities and risks.

In light of the above the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government closely monitor the first 12 months of Access Canberra and report to the ACT Legislative Assembly in March 2016 on its first 12 months of operation, including community awareness, engagement and satisfaction levels, organisational change and staff issues, and collaboration across ACT Government.

* + - 1. Working with Vulnerable People compliance checks

The Committee noted an increase in compliance visits to premises in relation to with Working with Vulnerable People checks[[746]](#footnote-747) and was advised that:

First of all, the scheme is growing very rapidly. So the compliance effort is reflective of how quickly the scheme is growing. We have a small compliance team. They are, from time to time, supplemented by staff within other areas of the registrations and fair trading branch of Access Canberra.[[747]](#footnote-748)

With regard to reporting and performance indicators, the Committee heard that:

Within the registrations and fair trading branch, we undertake a number of compliance programs throughout the year and we report against those. It is usually 10 or 12 each year. They are carried out over the full 12-month period of the year. Some of them will be done in short bursts. Others will be incrementally, if you like, over the 12-month period.[[748]](#footnote-749)

In light of the above the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government establish performance indicators for the number of Working with Vulnerable People checks to be carried out each year.

* 1. ACT Executive

The ACT Executive consists of the Chief Minister and other Ministers appointed by the Chief Minister. [[749]](#footnote-750) The ACT Executive has powers under the *Australian Capital Territory (Self Government) Act 1988* to govern the Territory and execute and maintain enactments and laws.[[750]](#footnote-751)

* + 1. Matters considered

On 16 June 2015, the following matters considered for the ACT Executive included:

* provision of devices to the ACT Executive (that is, Ministers) by Shared Services, and guidelines regarding personal use of devices, particularly mobile phones; [[751]](#footnote-752) and
* the operation of cross-cutting initiatives under the ACT Executive, including a Cabinet sub-committee on social inclusion. [[752]](#footnote-753)

In addition, Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* breakdown of the $800,000 appropriation for responses to methamphetamine (ice) use;[[753]](#footnote-754) and
* breakdown of the devices provided by Shared Services to Ministers and a breakdown of personal phone use.[[754]](#footnote-755)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Provision of devices to the ACT Executive

In hearings of 16 June 2015 the Committee asked questions regarding the provision of devices to Ministers by Shared Services, including questions about the types of devices provided and sources of funding for their provision.[[755]](#footnote-756)

The Chief Minister in response to these questions told the Committee:

* that there were ‘a number of possible sources of funding for devices used by ministers’; [[756]](#footnote-757)
* that the Remuneration Tribunal had ‘provided a communications allowance to members [of the Assembly], and that includes executive members’; [[757]](#footnote-758)
* that the ‘utilisation of that allowance can include communications devices’; [[758]](#footnote-759)
* that ‘Ministerial offices have an annual budget that would allow for the purchase of devices and their subsequent monthly costs’; [[759]](#footnote-760)
* that funding arrangements for devices varied ‘from Minister to Minister’, with some having ‘a personal phone that they have either bought personally or entered into a contract on personally and would then seek a reimbursement component for business-related calls’, and some funding of mobile phone services through the communications allowance provided to Members of the Legislative Assembly; [[760]](#footnote-761) and
* that there were guidelines for personal use of mobile phones, ‘or all government-issued phones’, which allowed ‘$20 per month of personal related calls’.[[761]](#footnote-762)

In response to further questioning, as to whether the use of devices in such a context was audited, the Chief Minister told the Committee that:

I understand there have been [audits]. There have been audits from time to time in relation to utilisation of allowances. I am not aware of one specifically in relation to personal phone calls on mobile phones.[[762]](#footnote-763)

The Chief Minister also told the Committee that his understanding was that ‘depending on the nature of the contract with the telecommunications provider, would be that there would be itemised information available in terms of billing’, and that ‘the onus is on the user of the phone’ to ensure use within the appropriate guidelines.[[763]](#footnote-764)

* + - 1. Cross-cutting initiatives under the ACT Executive
         1. Cabinet sub-committees

In hearings of 16 June 2015 the Committee asked questions regarding cabinet sub-committees and their role in the ‘one service’ or cross-cutting approach to delivering public sector outcomes.

In response, the Chief Minister told the Committee that:

There are a number of cabinet subcommittees that have been established in my government, with a view to early engagement across ministers, various agencies and interested stakeholders, in relation to a number of priority areas.[[764]](#footnote-765)

Regarding the operation of these sub-committees, the Chief Minister told the Committee that:

Social inclusion and equality are indeed one such area. Work there results, for example, in the most comprehensive social inclusion and equality statement that has ever been provided by a territory government, associated with this year’s budget. We look to continue subcommittee work in areas of transport reform, urban renewal and economic growth, and social inclusion and equality, amongst other government priorities.[[765]](#footnote-766)

The Chief Minister went on to tell the Committee that there was ‘a range of issues that get the opportunity for early consideration before formally moving into the cabinet process’ by being considered by cabinet sub-committees, and told the Committee that these provided:

an opportunity for officials, stakeholders on occasion, and government ministers and staff to consider particular policy issues and priorities and seek further work in certain instances before a formal submission arrives in the cabinet.[[766]](#footnote-767)

* + - * 1. Coordinators-general

Earlier in hearings of the same day the Head of Service had described coordinator-general positions to the Committee:

We have now created four different coordinators-general. The idea is that you can leave staff in their own directorates and they can continue to have the benefit of knowledge of the subject area of their directorate and the skills that they get from working with their colleagues in that directorate, but they are more formally linked up across directorates on particular tasks that require a whole-service focus. We have created a parking coordinator-general, an urban renewal coordinator-general, a domestic violence coordinator-general and a roads coordinator-general.[[767]](#footnote-768)

The Committee asked further questions about the operation of coordinator-general positions, which had been introduced relatively recently, and the effect of such positions on lines of responsibility, including responsibilities under the *Financial Management Act 1996.*[[768]](#footnote-769)

The Head of Service, in responding to the question told the Committee that:

The staff remain in their own directorates, so, from an appropriation point of view, the money is still appropriated to those directorates and the accountabilities in terms of expenditure of money and appropriate supervision of staff remain in the directorates.[[769]](#footnote-770)

The Head of Service went on to tell the Committee that this was:

quite a flexible mechanism because it does not open up any of those issues, but it makes clear to staff that the expectation is that they work across directorates and, indeed, that is what their director-general expects of them when they are in that role—that part of the responsibility of that role is to work across directorates. [[770]](#footnote-771)

When asked about the involvement of other staff in initiatives under the direction of coordinators-general, the Head of Service told the Committee that:

Each coordinator-general has a map that shows the staff from the different directorates and who, under that staff, fits into that structure. Then each has formal governance structures for meetings that are held—adaptive according to the particular task and the particular issues that are arising at that time, but a governance structure of meetings so that we have a formal structure to ensure that the work is being carried forward. [[771]](#footnote-772)

When asked to whom coordinators-general reported, the Head of Service told the Committee that:

They are still accountable directly to their director-general, but I take a particular interest in the issues that have been allocated to coordinators-general because they have been allocated to them because they are of importance, and naturally, in my head of service role, I am paying attention to the issues that are currently of importance across the service. [[772]](#footnote-773)

See (at 5.20) in relation to the ‘One Government’ reforms.

* 1. ACT Compulsory Third-Party Insurance Regulator

The ACT Compulsory Third-Party Insurance Regulator (CTP regulator) is established under section 14 of the *Road Transport (Third-Party Insurance) Act 2008* (CTP Act).[[773]](#footnote-774)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing on 15 June 2015, the following matters were considered:

* reputational risk to the CTP regulator;[[774]](#footnote-775)
* market pressure on premiums;[[775]](#footnote-776)
* expectations of possible new entrants on CTP reform;[[776]](#footnote-777)
* Lifetime Care and Support scheme;[[777]](#footnote-778)
* promoting public awareness of the causes of motor accidents;[[778]](#footnote-779)
* stand-alone personal injury register;[[779]](#footnote-780) and
* policy and procedure enhancement.[[780]](#footnote-781)
  1. ACT Gambling and Racing Commission
     1. Introduction

The Gambling and Racing Commission (the Commission) is an independent statutory authority established under the *Gambling and Racing Control Act 1999*. The Commissioner controls, supervises and regulates gambling and racing activities in the Territory.[[781]](#footnote-782)

* + 1. matters considered

Under Output Class 1: Gambling Regulation and Harm Minimisation, the Committee met with the Minister for Racing and Gaming and the following matters were discussed under Output 1.1: Gambling Regulation and Harm Minimisation:

* the responsibilities of the Commission as a result of reports of live baiting in the greyhound industry;[[782]](#footnote-783)
* the future work of the Commission with regards to the greyhound industry and animal welfare;[[783]](#footnote-784)
* processes, outcomes, costs and lessons learned from the Aquis casino acquisition;[[784]](#footnote-785)
* final outcomes on the sale of ACTTAB and lessons learned from this process;[[785]](#footnote-786)
* implementation of the *Totalisator Act 2014*;[[786]](#footnote-787)
* future government support for the local racing industry;[[787]](#footnote-788)
* the Commission’s workload as a result of the transfer of ACTTAB to Tabcorp;[[788]](#footnote-789)
* animal welfare in relation to horseracing and harness racing, and the role of the Racing Appeals Tribunal;[[789]](#footnote-790)
* the co-location of the three racing codes;[[790]](#footnote-791)
* the effects on Thoroughbred Park and Exhibition Park in Canberra of the Capital Metro project;[[791]](#footnote-792)
* how Thoroughbred Park relates to other New South Wales and Australian tracks, with regards to size, turnover and horse races;[[792]](#footnote-793)
* the process for unclaimed dividends following the sale of ACTTAB;[[793]](#footnote-794)
* problem gambling, and conflict of interest for the Commission between addressing problem gambling and running and promotion of the industry;[[794]](#footnote-795)
* the role of the Commission in regulating online gaming;[[795]](#footnote-796)
* ACT representation on a ministerial council for online gaming in relation to communications;[[796]](#footnote-797)
* the level of cultural and linguistic diversity within the Commission’s employees;[[797]](#footnote-798)
* commencement of disallowable and Notifiable instruments as a result of implementation of the Gaming Machine (Reform) Amendment Act and a trading scheme for poker machines;[[798]](#footnote-799) and
* the number of licensed bookmakers in the ACT and limits on this number.[[799]](#footnote-800)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. live baiting reports in greyhound racing

In response to questions from the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer of the Commission confirmed that, in response to reports of live baiting in greyhound racing, the Commission contacted the Canberra Greyhound Racing Club to establish a listing of all greyhound racers who had raced in the ACT in the previous 10 years. The Commission then consulted with interstate greyhound organisations and regulatory bodies to ‘identify in detail those persons that had either been named or were associated with the live baiting issue.’[[800]](#footnote-801)

The Committee was informed that as a result two people were identified who had raced in the ACT a number of years ago and on a very limited number of occasions. The Commission is continuing to work with the Racing Club on this issue.[[801]](#footnote-802)

The Minister advised the Committee that discussions with the Racing Club have involved matters such as animal cruelty, animal welfare and racing integrity. The Minister is supportive of reviews and amendments to the *Animal Welfare Act 1992* to increase penalties in relation to animal cruelty and has indicated this view to the relevant minister.[[802]](#footnote-803)

To further address animal welfare issues, the Chief Executive Officer informed the Committee that additional security cameras had been installed at the track, particularly for after‑hours and training sessions. The ACT will also take guidance from investigations currently being finalised in Queensland and Victoria, which recommend tightening of integrity and other measures.[[803]](#footnote-804)

While there have been no reports of live baiting in the ACT, the Committee asked whether the Minister and the Commission had met with the RSPCA and the ACT greyhounds support network. The Minister and the Chief Executive Officer confirmed that no meetings have been held with either of these parties.[[804]](#footnote-805)

* + - 1. casino acquisition by aquis

The Committee asked about the processes around the acquisition of the Canberra casino by Aquis. The Chief Executive Officer noted that the proposal for the sale of the Canberra casino was linked with the sale of the Cairns casino in Queensland. Accordingly, as the potential owner could be the same for both jurisdictions, the Commission and the Queensland regulator undertook a joint probity investigation throughout 2014.[[805]](#footnote-806)

The Chief Executive Officer informed the Committee that the investigation was complete by the end of 2014 and a settlement of the sale process occurred on 24 December 2014. It was confirmed to the Committee that there were very significant resource, time and complexity implications throughout this process, with expert advice from external consultants an essential requirement (with the consultants paid for by Aquis).[[806]](#footnote-807)

* + - 1. Totalisator Act and sale of ACTTAB

The Committee asked about whether the Commission had any ongoing role with the sale of ACTTAB. In response, the Committee was advised that, as the sale was completed in October 2014, the Commission’s role is that of normal compliance audits and working with the new business model of Tabcorp, which differs to that of ACTTAB.[[807]](#footnote-808)

The Committee enquired about whether the *Totalisator Act 2014* was fully enacted. The Chief Executive Officer advised that the Act commenced in March 2014, with the Commission implementing the necessary compliance and obligations under that Act with Tabcorp. The Committee was further advised that under the Act the scheduled and random audits program has intensified, especially in light of the new operator, with no significant issues identified to date.[[808]](#footnote-809)

As to resources in the Commission as a result of the transfer from ACTTAB to Tabcorp, the Committee was advised that there is an increased workload with the initial implementation of Tabcorp, but it is expected that later in the year the level of resources required will reduce.[[809]](#footnote-810)

* + - 1. Location of the racing codes

In response to questions from the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer advised that in relation to the co-location of the three racing codes, a review has been completed and the review and report will be tabled. The report resolves that Thoroughbred Park will stay on site, and the greyhounds will stay in the current location. Finding and maintaining appropriate accommodation for harness racing will be considered as part of the broader work around Exhibition Park in Canberra (EPIC), and will aim to make sure its presence is maintained in that area.[[810]](#footnote-811)

The Minister was asked by the Committee whether discussions had been had with Capital Metro, regarding the implications for Thoroughbred Park of the Capital Metro project. The Minister advised that discussions had taken place, and that Thoroughbred Park had indicated it was happy with remaining its current location.[[811]](#footnote-812)

The Committee enquired about the size of Thoroughbred Park in relation to similar venues in other jurisdictions. The Minister confirmed that it is a successful venue in relation to its size, with increasing numbers and well patronised events.[[812]](#footnote-813)

* + - 1. Problem gambling and online gaming

The Committee observed that the Commission may have a conflicting interest, in that it is tasked with addressing problem gambling while at the same time ensuring the efficient running and promotion of the industry. In response, the Chief Executive Officer stated:

I do not really see it as a conflict. We do not have an encouragement or a promotional role in terms of any sort of gambling activity. It is clearly our compliance and regulatory role. We also have, as you indicated, a harm minimisation or a monitoring and minimising of problem gambling role. On the basis that we do not have what I would call a commercial role or a promotional role of those activities, I do not see that as a conflict.[[813]](#footnote-814)

The Commission informed the Committee that a first draft of a report into the prevalence of gambling and problem gambling was due within the next few weeks, with the full report due in September 2015. As the last report on this issue was conducted in 2009, the Committee asked whether changes to legislation and greater awareness of the issue would see a reduction in the prevalence of problem gambling. The Chief Executive Officer replied that the Commission would be hopeful of a slight reduction to reflect the success of programs implemented over the past five years, but did note that there are very broad variables that impact on the data obtained.[[814]](#footnote-815)

The Committee wished to know the role of the Commission and the Minister in regulating online gaming, in which participation is significantly increasing. The Minister advised that she has written to her Federal Government counterpart to raise this issue as it requires a national approach. The Minister later advised that the current Commonwealth Government has moved away from recommendations of previous review in 2012, and has established a new national working group. This working group contains no state or territory representatives or officials.[[815]](#footnote-816)

* + - 1. Gaming Machine (Reform) Amendment Act

The Gaming Machine (Reform) Amendment Act 2015 provided amendments to the *Gaming Machine Act 2004* to enable the implementation of a trading scheme, new licensing framework and new taxation measures, among other things.[[816]](#footnote-817)

The Committee noted that when the *Gaming Machine (Reform) Amendment Act* was implemented, there were a number of disallowable or Notifiable instruments to be executed as a consequence of the Act, but these had yet to be presented.[[817]](#footnote-818)

In response, the Minister stated that the commencement date for the instruments was scheduled for August 2015. The Executive Director of Policy, Projects and Legislation also clarified that:

there is the raft of Notifiable instruments that need to come through in terms of the commencement—the commencement of the tax changes, the commencement of the actual trading scheme itself. There will be an instrument notifying the number of machines for the starting day of phase 1. There is a particular formula in there that has a value called SN that we need to actually notify from the commission.

Some of those things necessarily have to be quite aligned to the actual commencement, because between commencement and what happens now there may be some forfeiture of machines. We cannot guarantee what actually happens at the minute until we have aligned that with that start date.[[818]](#footnote-819)

The Committee requested an update on the three disallowable and five Notifiable instruments as identified by the Executive Director. This information was later provided to the Committee, with clarification of commencement dates of a number of provisions and instruments.[[819]](#footnote-820)

* 1. ACT Insurance Authority
     1. Introduction

The ACT Insurance Authority (the ACTIA) insures assets and services of the ACT by providing risk management and insurance services to ACT client agencies and entities. The ACTIA protects the ACT budget from risk exposure through reinsurance arrangements and the accumulation of a fund reserve to meet the coat of future liabilities and asset losses that may be generated through activities of government.[[820]](#footnote-821)

* + 1. Matters considered

On 16 June 2015 the Committee examined the following matters related to ACTIA:

* implementation of a program of reinsurance to protect the ACT budget based on an appropriate balance between transferred risk and risk retained;[[821]](#footnote-822)
* ACTIA and training across directorates in risk management;[[822]](#footnote-823)
* total value of insurance premiums paid by the ACT each year;[[823]](#footnote-824)
* cost of insurance for ACT sporting facilities;[[824]](#footnote-825) and
* upgrade of ACTIA office accommodation.[[825]](#footnote-826)
  1. Cultural Facilities Corporation
     1. Introduction

The Cultural Facilities Corporation (CFC) aims for Canberra to be a creative capital and sees itself as a creative leader in the Territory. The CFC provides high quality cultural experiences based on the arts and heritage resources that it holds in trust for the people of Canberra. These resources include the Canberra Theatre Centre, the Canberra Museum and Gallery, the ACT Historic Places (Lanyon, Calthorpes’ House and Mugga Mugga) and a number of visual arts and social history collections.[[826]](#footnote-827)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 1: Cultural Facilities Management, the Committee discussed with the Minister for the Arts Output 1.1: Cultural Facilities Corporation and considered the following matters:

* the success of the CFC and the Canberra Theatre throughout the year;[[827]](#footnote-828)
* targets and results of customer satisfaction surveys of CFC services;[[828]](#footnote-829) and
* the educational and community programs provided by the CFC.[[829]](#footnote-830)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Customer satisfaction targets

The Committee enquired whether the customer satisfaction level as stated in the 2015-16 Budget papers as 80 per cent indicated particular facilities where the satisfactions was lower and other where it might be higher.[[830]](#footnote-831)

The Chief Executive Officer indicated that the CFC consistently achieves higher satisfaction rates than those stated, and did not believe that there were ‘any facilities where there are particular indications of any dissatisfaction.’[[831]](#footnote-832)

The Chief Executive Officer went to recall that most facilities would be around 90 per cent satisfaction or higher, and that repeat visitation and usage of programs is a strong indicator of success; the 80 per cent has been retained as the CFC felt this was an appropriate target. The Committee suggested that the target could perhaps be reviewed and increased in light of the consistently higher results.[[832]](#footnote-833)

* + - 1. Educational and community programs

The Chief Executive Officer advised the Committee that across its museums and galleries, this year the CFC has achieved 700 educational and community programs. While these programs have a particular focus on the early childhood sector, programs can also be developed for the secondary school sector (such as the touring exhibition of Chinese ink art).[[833]](#footnote-834)

The Chief Executive Officer also discussed the programs on offer across CFC sites. This includes vocational education training programs in theatre technical skills at the Canberra Theatre Centre and a range of children’s theatre activities. The Chief Executive Officer finalised by stating:

education is really a key priority because we feel that it is a critical part of any child’s education but it is also a way in which we can encourage the arts audiences of the future. I think if we, at a very early age, make them feel comfortable in the gallery space of a theatre then they will keep coming back, they will keep feeling comfortable with that experience, and I think it will be very enriching for them.[[834]](#footnote-835)

* 1. ICON Water Limited
     1. Introduction

Icon Water Limited is a Territory owned corporation which undertakes two primary activities: delivery of water, sewerage and associated services; and managing the investment in the energy business, ActewAGL.[[835]](#footnote-836)

* + 1. Matters considered

The following matters were discussed during the Committee’s hearing with Icon Water on 16 June 2015:

* change of name to Icon Water;[[836]](#footnote-837)
* industry Panel Review of water and sewerage pricing determination;[[837]](#footnote-838)
* discussions with ActewAGL on ongoing finance and capital issues, including dividend policy;[[838]](#footnote-839)
* Icon Water debt forecasts and related issues;[[839]](#footnote-840)
* final cost of the new Cotter Dam and related matters;[[840]](#footnote-841)
* community responses to rebranding as Icon Water;[[841]](#footnote-842)
* Icon Water efficiency measures and comparison with other utilities;[[842]](#footnote-843)
* customer satisfaction surveys – Icon Water approach;[[843]](#footnote-844)
* increase in charges and reasons for variation from previous years;[[844]](#footnote-845)
* Icon Water organisational restructures and results;[[845]](#footnote-846)
* effect of decrease in retail electricity prices in 2015-16;[[846]](#footnote-847)
* breakdown of consumption numbers into categories such as residential, commercial and community usage;[[847]](#footnote-848)
* ACT clubs’ usage of water, including golf clubs;[[848]](#footnote-849)
* industry Panel Review - Icon Water reaction to suggestions made by the Panel including five year pricing determination;[[849]](#footnote-850)
* cost of water to the ACT consumer over the last decade;[[850]](#footnote-851)
* water pricing and water charging for single dwelling residential compared with multi-unit developments;[[851]](#footnote-852)
* consumption monitoring and ‘smart’ metering;[[852]](#footnote-853)
* external environment issues for Icon Water and potential effect and response to resulting changes;[[853]](#footnote-854)
* identification of Icon Water core competencies;[[854]](#footnote-855)
* treatment of staff redundancies;[[855]](#footnote-856)
* reduction in dividend payment;[[856]](#footnote-857)
* Icon Water’s community service obligations;[[857]](#footnote-858)
* Icon Water’s approach to balancing economic and environmental considerations;[[858]](#footnote-859)
* lower Molonglo upgrade investment plans;[[859]](#footnote-860)
* directions to Icon Water pursuant to legislation;[[860]](#footnote-861)
* possibility of future sale of electricity ‘poles and wires’ assets;[[861]](#footnote-862) and
* the decrease in cash holdings shown in accounts.[[862]](#footnote-863)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Working group on Icon Water Debt and Dividend

The Committee sought advice from Icon Water officials and the Minister on concluding financial arrangements to do with Icon Water and ActewAGL debt. The Committee was advised by Icon Water’s Managing Director that this process was under way, and described the several issues relevant to future decisions :

The first one was that we came across a complexity that needs a bit more consideration. It is quite complex and technical but it refers to equitable charges over assets. That is something that we will need to get back on to and push through.

The second point, though, is that the energy investment over the last 12 months has been through quite a ride with regard to the [Australian Energy Regulator]’s determination. That pretty much superseded the issue of the debt program. We are very focused on making sure that the business could resize itself, intending it to operate safely moving forward. We have made some progress on it but there is still some way to go. That is on the debt program, the ActewAGL debt program.[[863]](#footnote-864)

The Committee was interested to ascertain the timetable for the finalisation of this process and how it would be finalised. The Committee was advised by the Managing Director of Icon Water that:

We have formed a working group with the Treasury team. We have had a couple of meetings. That covers a number of things relating to financial and debt strategies. I anticipate really that the main game is talking about the long-term financial position of Icon Water and what we can do to reduce the gearing levels that we are at the moment, which is just under 60 per cent.[[864]](#footnote-865)

The Committee sought advice from the Minister during the hearing on the question of how a long-term sustainable dividend policy for Icon Water could and would be developed. The Minister told the Committee that:

the statistics I have are that the current base value of borrowings, the $1.6 billion, is a gearing level of 58.1 per cent as at 31 May 2015. With the borrowings forecast over the forwards, the gearing level would reach 63.6 per cent for 2018-19. We would look to work with Icon Water on operating within that 55 per cent to 65 per cent band and we are well within that for the foreseeable future. So the question of the change of dividend policy is one that is on the agenda for this working group but not one that will be in this parliamentary term but could well be in the next parliamentary term.[[865]](#footnote-866)

In this regard the Committee notes the Minister advised that, whilst there will be no change in the Government's dividend policy for Icon Water in the 2016 budget, that there may well be some change thereafter.[[866]](#footnote-867)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that the processes followed by the working group described by the Icon Water Managing Director should ensure a timely report to the Assembly through the Minister.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide details to the Assembly of any changes to the Icon Water dividend policy that may result from the working group’s advice, within five sitting days of its receipt.

* 1. Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission

The Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has responsibility for a broad range of regulatory and utility administrative matters. The Commission has responsibility under the *Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission Act 1997* (ICRC Act) for regulating and advising government about pricing and other matters for monopoly, near-monopoly and ministerially declared regulated industries, providing advice on competitive neutrality complaints and government-regulated activities, and arbitrating infrastructure access disputes under the ICRC Act. The objectives of the Commission are set out in section 7 of the ICRC Act and section 3 of the *Utilities Act 2000* (Utilities Act).[[867]](#footnote-868)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing on 15 June 2015, the following matters were considered:

* methodology for water and waste services price determination; [[868]](#footnote-869)
* encouragement of long term investment in utilities infrastructure;[[869]](#footnote-870)
* effect of development of home storage battery devices on electricity prices;[[870]](#footnote-871)
* cost of a large feed in tariff scheme for consumers;[[871]](#footnote-872)
* comparison with costs of other jurisdictions;[[872]](#footnote-873)and
* water pricing for community facilities.[[873]](#footnote-874)
  + - 1. Water pricing for community facilities

In New South Wales there is special water pricing for community groups running community facilities such as golf clubs and bowling greens. The Minister noted that clubs in the ACT are eligible for concession pricing.[[874]](#footnote-875)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the benefits of the concession program to clubs but considers that the approach of New South Wales is worth examining. The upcoming review of the water tariff structure by the ICRC provides an opportunity to see whether community pricing should be part of the regulatory process.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission, in its next review of water pricing in the ACT, consider a pricing point for community usage to support community owned facilities such as sporting facilities.

* 1. Land Development Agency

The Land Development Agency (LDA) is a Territory authority established under the *Planning and Development Act 2007*. Its mission is to contribute positively towards economic, social and sustainable outcomes through its greenfield and urban renewal projects in development of residential, commercial, industrial and community land.[[875]](#footnote-876)

* + 1. Matters considered

The Committee discussed matters relating to the LDA with the Minister for Urban Renewal on 19 June 2015 in conjunction with CMTEDD Output Class 8.9 Urban Renewal. See section for those discussions.

* 1. The Lifetime Care and Support Commission

The Lifetime Care and Support Fund (the Fund) was established under the *Lifetime Care and Support (Catastrophic Injuries) Act 2014*. The Fund is effective from 1 July 2014 and reflects the financial operations of the Lifetime Care and Support Scheme (the Scheme).[[876]](#footnote-877)

The Scheme provides ongoing treatment and care to people who have been catastrophically injured, on or after 1 July 2014, as a result of a motor vehicle crash in the ACT on a no-fault basis. The Scheme is funded by a levy on Compulsory Third Party insurance policies that commence on or after 1 July 2014.[[877]](#footnote-878)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing on 15 June 2015, the following matters were considered:

* intergovernmental agreement with NSW;[[878]](#footnote-879)
* number of participants;[[879]](#footnote-880)
* levies;[[880]](#footnote-881)
* benefits of the scheme;[[881]](#footnote-882) and
* mechanism to collect feedback from participants.[[882]](#footnote-883)

The Committee was advised that there are currently five interim members participating in the Scheme. These members will remain as interim participants for a two‑year period, at which point they will be reassessed before becoming lifetime members. This method allows members to get immediate assistance but also recognises that injuries can take time to develop.[[883]](#footnote-884)

* 1. Superannuation Provision Account

The Superannuation Provision Account (SPA) is established to recognise the investment assets and defined benefit employer superannuation liabilities of the Territory which includes ACT employees who are members of the Australian Government’s Commonwealth Superannuation Scheme (CSS) and Public Sector Superannuation Scheme (PSS) and Members of the Legislative Assembly.[[884]](#footnote-885)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing on 15 June 2015, the following matters were considered:

* responsible investment framework;[[885]](#footnote-886)
* fossil fuel investment;[[886]](#footnote-887)
* 2030 target for superannuation provision;[[887]](#footnote-888) and
* annual and triennial reviews.[[888]](#footnote-889)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Investment in Fossil Fuel Industries

Investments by the ACT Government in the Superannuation Provision Account are governed by the responsible investment policy and the investment plan, two publicly available documents.[[889]](#footnote-890) In response to questions about the account’s exposure to fossil fuel industries officials noted that the account had about 18 per cent less exposure than the standard market average in the energy sector. Seven percent of the total portfolio is currently invested in the energy sector.[[890]](#footnote-891)

The Chief Minister noted that many energy businesses have very diverse sources of energy provision including fossil fuels and renewables. The ACT Government’s single largest shareholding is the joint shareholding in ActewAGL. No dramatic divestment policy was planned. The government is gradually phasing out investment in certain areas, such as those subject to possible stranded assets, to reduce risk.

The Conservation Council also raised Government investment in fossil fuels as a concern at the hearing of 12 June 2015. (See Chapter 2 for this Discussion).

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider sensible and well‑timed divestment of its holdings in fossil fuels.

* 1. Territory Banking Account

The general Government’s investment assets and debt liabilities are recognised and managed by CMTEDD through the Territory Banking Account (TBA). Revenues on behalf of the Territory are also transferred to the TBA and appropriation disbursements are made to government agencies from the Account on a fortnightly basis.[[891]](#footnote-892)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing on 15 June 2015, the following matters were considered:

* Bloomberg Ausbond Bank Bill index;[[892]](#footnote-893)
* borrowing program;[[893]](#footnote-894)
* triple A credit rating;[[894]](#footnote-895) and
* cash flow statement.[[895]](#footnote-896)
  1. Home Loan Portfolio [Discontinued Agency]

The Home Loan Portfolio is responsible for the administration of home loans, which were granted by the Commissioner for ACT Housing to assist low‑income households in achieving home ownership. All ACT Government home buyer lending ceased in 1996. From 1 July 2015 the activities of the Portfolio will be reflected in the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate (CMTEDD) and the Territory Banking Account.[[896]](#footnote-897)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing on 15 June 2015, the following matters were considered:

* split of the balance sheet between CMTEDD and the Territory Bank Account;[[897]](#footnote-898)
* timeline for the program wind-up;[[898]](#footnote-899)
* financial benefits to government;[[899]](#footnote-900) and
* administration costs.[[900]](#footnote-901)
  1. ACN 071257504 Limited (formerly ACTTAB Limited) [Discontinued Agency]

ACTTAB Limited’s name changed to ACN 071 257 504 Limited on 17 November 2014 following the sale of ACTTAB’s business undertakings to Tabcorp on 14 October 2014. The company formerly provided wagering services including pari-mutuel and fixed odds betting. The remaining company shell will be wound up as soon as the residual assets and liabilities have been resolved. The ACT 2015-16 Budget Statement B notes that it is expected the wind up of the company was to be completed in 2014‑15.[[901]](#footnote-902)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing on 15 June 2015, the following matters were considered:

* job losses and job protection;[[902]](#footnote-903)
* winding-up;[[903]](#footnote-904)
* naming;[[904]](#footnote-905)
* commitments by Tabcorp in sale contract;[[905]](#footnote-906) and
* unclaimed dividends.[[906]](#footnote-907)
  1. ACT Long Service Leave Authority
     1. Introduction

The ACT Long Service Leave Authority (the Authority) currently administers portable long service leave schemes for the construction, cleaning, security and community sector industries, under ACT Government legislation. The schemes allow workers (including self-employed workers) to move from employer to employer without losing credit for time worked in the covered industry.[[907]](#footnote-908)

* + 1. Matters considered

On 26 June 2015 the Committee met with the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relation in relation to the Long Service Leave Authority.

Matters considered included:

* the performance of the ACT Long Service Leave Authority’s investment portfolio and its investment strategy;[[908]](#footnote-909) and
* how office accommodation forms part of the Authority’s investment strategy.[[909]](#footnote-910)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Office Accommodation

The Committee enquired about one of the Authority’s initiatives in its Statement of Intent to seek suitable new office accommodation and divest the existing office space, and how this related to the prior year’s priority of selling its Manning Clark offices.[[910]](#footnote-911)

The Chief Operations Officer informed the Committee that ‘the Manning Clark offices were part of our investment portfolio. They were sitting in our non-current assets, so the board decided to divest itself of those offices’, and the properties were sold for approximately $25 million.[[911]](#footnote-912)

The Authority advised the Committee that the money from the sale of the Manning Clark offices was invested with its investment manager, Vanguard. The Authority is now in the initial phase of looking for new accommodation that better suits the needs of its stakeholders.[[912]](#footnote-913)

The Chief Operations Officer responded to questions about the investment strategy of the Authority, and confirmed that it is currently looking at a return on investment of around 14 per cent, which is higher than average. The Chief Operations Officer noted that investments help to ensure that money is there for the Authority to fulfil its liabilities.[[913]](#footnote-914)

The Committee questioned the drop in gains from investment for the coming financial year. The Chief Financial Officer responded that the drop in gains is a result of higher than expected returns this year, at 14 per cent. The average gain from investment is 7.5 per cent and this amount has been applied over the forward estimates.[[914]](#footnote-915)

# Capital Metro Agency

* + 1. Introduction

The 2015-16 Budget Statements state that:

The principal objective of the Capital Metro Agency (CMA) is to manage all aspects of the ongoing planning, design and delivery of the Capital Metro project, being the first stage of a light rail network in the Territory (the Project). CMA is to achieve its principal objective in a manner which ensures comprehensive coordination and integration of transport, land use and development, social, economic and environmental outcomes.[[915]](#footnote-916)

* 1. Capital Metro Project and Governance
     1. Matters considered

The Committee met with the Minister for Capital Metro on 24 June 2015 and considered the following matters in relation to Output Class 1: Capital Metro Project and Governance:

* removal and replacement of trees on Northbourne Avenue;[[916]](#footnote-917)
* chances of project abandonment;[[917]](#footnote-918)
* Russell extension;[[918]](#footnote-919)
* consultation with bidding consortia and industry;[[919]](#footnote-920)
* expenditure on Capital Metro Agency;[[920]](#footnote-921)
* Project timetable;[[921]](#footnote-922)
* design;[[922]](#footnote-923)
* history of light rail proposals in Canberra;[[923]](#footnote-924)
* comparison of light rail and bus services;[[924]](#footnote-925)
* asset recycling funds;[[925]](#footnote-926)
* depreciation for Capital Metro project work in progress;[[926]](#footnote-927)
* additional trams for Russell extension;[[927]](#footnote-928)
* operating hours for light rail;[[928]](#footnote-929)
* changes to ACTION routes due to light rail;[[929]](#footnote-930)
* environmental Impact Statement consultation;[[930]](#footnote-931)
* light rail projects in other cities;[[931]](#footnote-932)
* CMA’s probity plan and the special advisers panel;[[932]](#footnote-933)
* release of second review of the business case;[[933]](#footnote-934) and
* employment and training opportunities.[[934]](#footnote-935)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Northbourne avenue Trees

The Committee inquired about the choice of trees to replace trees to be removed along Nortbourne Avenue and Flemington Road as part of light rail construction works. The Minister noted that *Eucalyptus rossii*, or scribbly gum, had initially been selected. Further analysis, including of soil conditions, determined that would not be a suitable choice.[[935]](#footnote-936)

The Minister stated:

After consultation with the National Capital Authority, the Australian National Botanic Gardens, independent expert arborists and a range of other stakeholders, the recommendation to government was that *Eucalyptus mannifera* be chosen, which is known as brittle gum. The reason for that is, first of all, it is a well-established and well-known street tree in the ACT. There are already over 100,000 brittle gum trees planted in the urban forest across the ACT, including on some very high profile and iconic avenues—for example, Captain Cook Crescent in the inner south of Canberra. It is also a tree which is indigenous to the local climate; therefore it is well suited to the Canberra climate.[[936]](#footnote-937)

Responding to questions about the tendency of *Eucalyptus mannifera* to shed limbs without warning, the Minister noted that all eucalypts can shed limbs unexpectedly but that the:

advice to the government is that the risk is no greater or no worse than for any other eucalyptus species.[[937]](#footnote-938)

The Minister explained that it was a requirement of the National Capital Authority that tree plantings along the Northbourne corridor be of a native species.[[938]](#footnote-939)

The Minister stated that the trees along the Northbourne corridor required renewal in any event and that it was sensible to approach the issue in conjunction with the light rail project. A 2014 survey showed that the total number of trees in the median from Alinga Street to Flemington road had dropped from 802 in the 2010 survey to 484, and only 59 per cent of those were in good health.[[939]](#footnote-940)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the community concern about the removal of trees along the Northbourne corridor and urges the government to examine ways in which the replacement can be staged in order to minimise concerns about appearance.

The Committee notes community concerns about the type of replacement tree chosen for Northbourne Avenue. The Committee heard reports that the *Eucalyptus mannifera* is known as the ‘widow maker’ or ‘brittle gum’, as it is known for dropping branches without warning even in calm conditions. The Minister informed the Committee that this species can shed limbs unexpectedly, as with all other eucalyptus species, but advice to Government has been that the risk is no greater or worse than for any other eucalyptus species.[[940]](#footnote-941)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government reconsider the decision to use *Eucalyptus mannifera* as the replacement tree on Northbourne Avenue.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government undertake a staged approach to tree replacement on Northbourne Avenue.

* + - 1. Release of Second review of full Capital Metro Business Case

The Committee inquired about the contents of the second review of the Capital Metro full business case. The Minister replied:

The second review confirms the findings of the first review that has been made public. The territory has commissioned that second review for its own assurance as much as for any possible public debate. That is the status of that document at the moment.[[941]](#footnote-942)

When asked about the release of the report the Minister stated:

The government may very well release it, but we will release it at a time of our choosing.[[942]](#footnote-943)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that there has been considerable political and community debate about various aspects of the full Capital Metro business case, including the modelling assumptions and the cost benefit analysis. If the second review of the full business case can add to that debate then it should be released.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government release the second review of the full Capital Metro Business Case before the last sitting day in 2015.

# Community Services

* + 1. Introduction

The Community Services Directorate *Budget Statement* for 2015-16 states that the Directorate helps all Canberrans to fulfil their potential, take advantage of the social and economic opportunities on offer, and make a valued contribution to our community. It outlines the nature of its services as follows:

Community services are targeted towards people with a disability, children and young people, families, carers, women, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, people from a culturally and linguistically diverse background and who are ageing. The Directorate’s primary service domains can be described as access information, (i.e., assessment and referral), early intervention, intensive support and child and young people statutory protection services. The non-government sector is a crucial partner of the Directorate in the delivery of these services. As this sector assumes more responsibility for the delivery of services the Directorate is strengthening its regulatory functions.[[943]](#footnote-944)

The Directorate provides services through the following Output Classes:

* Output Class 1: Disability and Therapy Services comprises the following Outputs:
* Output 1.1: Disability and Therapy Services
* Output Class 2: Early Intervention Services comprises the following Output:
* Output 2.1: Early Intervention Services
* Output Class 3: Community Participation comprises the following Outputs:
* Output 3.1: Community Participation
* Output Class 4: Child and Youth Protection Services comprises the following Outputs:
* Output 4.1: Child and Youth Protection Services.[[944]](#footnote-945)

The Committee also considered the budget statement for Housing ACT under Output Class 1.1 Social Housing Services.[[945]](#footnote-946)

* + - 1. Changes to Output Classes

The 2014-15 Outputs of Youth Services (Output 4.1) and Care and Protection services (Output 4.2) have been combined into Output 4.1 Child and Youth Protection Services as these services areas have been integrated.

Disability Services and Therapy Services (formerly Outputs 1.1 and 1.2) have also been combined into a single Output in the ACT Budget 2015-16 (Output 1.1: Disability and Therapy Services).

Arts Engagement, formerly Output 3.2 in 2014-15, now falls within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development portfolio.

* + - 1. Ministerial responsibility

Ministerial responsibility for the work of the Directorate is divided across three Ministers.

On Thursday 18 June 2015, the Committee met with Mr Mick Gentleman MLA, Minister for Children and Young People and Minister for Ageing. The Committee also met with Ms Yvette Berry MLA, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Women, Minister for Community Services and Minister for Housing.

On Friday 26 June 2015, the Committee met with the Minister for Disability, Ms Joy Burch MLA to discuss matters relating to Output 1.1 Disability and Therapy Services.

* 1. General

During the course of hearings in relation to the Community Services Directorate, there were some issues raised in relation to more than one Output Class or in relation to the overall structure of the Output Classes. Those matters, which are relevant to the Directorate as a whole, or to more than one Output, are discussed below.

* + 1. Matters considered
* government payment for Outputs, Treasurer’s advance and workers compensation premiums;[[946]](#footnote-947)
* structure of Output 3.1 Community Participation;[[947]](#footnote-948) and
* Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment targets and numbers across CSD.[[948]](#footnote-949)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Changes to appropriation

The Committee discussed changes to government payment for outputs (GPO) across a number of the Output Classes and the apparent decrease in funding for some areas. [[949]](#footnote-950)

The Committee was advised about the reasons for large changes in the estimated outcomes, particularly apportioning additional payment across all the Output Classes:

The reason why there was a big jump in the estimated outcome is—if you look at the approp table, we received a Treasurer’s advance of $11 million. When we have allocated the Treasurer’s advance, that proportion of the Treasurer’s advance goes into that estimated outcome of where we are going to land the total budget at the end of this financial year.

... It is composed of an increase in our workers compensation premium for CSD overall. You have probably heard all the stories about quite dramatic increases in Comcare. The commonwealth decided not to cross-subsidise that entity in the commonwealth anymore, so the cost of Comcare has really come back to the clients, in this case the client being the ACT government. Our share of that was almost $6 million, which was after budget day last year. That was a bit of a surprise in our budget going forward. We have had to accommodate that into the budget, because you need to pay that bill.

... We were also required, I think in 2013-14, to make a late payment to the commonwealth for a program which was to do with young people in older persons’ accommodation, YIPRAC. So we needed to defer some bills at the end of last financial year. Those deferrals of bills were then spread across the different outputs.

...We also had to cover some costs which we did not factor into the budget at the start of the year for the royal commission into child sex abuse. That was $300,000 worth.

... There were other impacts, of course ...

In the following year, in the budget year 2015-16, of course, we will not have that funding, the TA funding, going forward in the GPO. That is why you get the drop.[[950]](#footnote-951)

* + - 1. Disaggregation of Output Class 3.1

The Committee heard that the Budget does not provide a breakdown across Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander affairs, multicultural affairs, women’s issues, and the community services sub-units which are all captured by Output 3.1 Community Participation.

The Senior Director, Finance and Budget advised that the community participation group includes Community Recovery, youth engagement, Office for Ageing, Office for Women and Office of Multicultural Affairs. The Office of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs has been separated out from that group.[[951]](#footnote-952) He told the Committee:

We do not actually provide a salary break-up between the Office for Ageing, Office for Women, Office of Multicultural Affairs or the Office of Youth Engagement because, as you are probably aware, the staff work across those areas on a needs basis.

...

To give you an idea of the total amount that is covered by that group, on the staffing and admin side it is, for 2014-15, $6.2 million, for 2015-16, $6.5 million and to get the total of the tape you would need to add in the Office of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, which for 2014-15 was $2.2 million and for 2015-16 was $2.43 million. Then, of course, there is the grants line in that output, which covers a variety of grants schemes...[[952]](#footnote-953)

The Committee was advised that, by not separating out offices in the community participation group, it improves the productivity of that area.[[953]](#footnote-954)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee appreciates that Directorate staff work across the different sub-units within Output 3.1 as needed and that this provides a level of flexibility, however it notes that it is difficult to establish how much of the budget is going towards different programs within Output 3.1 without a more detailed breakdown across the sub-units.

It is also difficult to identify budget increases (or decreases) for any particular function.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide reports on the Office for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Community Recovery, Office for Ageing, youth engagement, Office for Women and Office of Multicultural Affairs, including the exact costings of the programs and projects run by each sub-unit, by the last sitting week in October 2015.

The Committee recommends that in future budget papers the ACT Government amend the Community Services Directorate Output Class 3 so that there be seven sub-Outputs:

3.1 Corporate

3.2 Women

3.3 Multicultural Affairs

3.4 Ageing

3.5 Community Recovery

3.6 Youth Engagement

3.7 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs

and determine appropriate accountability indicators for each of the seven Outputs.

* 1. Disability and Therapy Services
     + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.1 Disability and Therapy Services , the Committee considered the following matters:

* progress of transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS);[[954]](#footnote-955)
* reimbursement for service providers if cash flow issues arising between the cessation of block funding and client transitioning, including budgeted contingency, length of wait for reimbursement and timeframes for verification of submissions for reimbursement;[[955]](#footnote-956)
* number of young people with a disability in nursing homes and other housing options;[[956]](#footnote-957)
* community and private enterprise uncertainty about the transition to the market-based approach for service delivery;[[957]](#footnote-958)
* changes to the number of service providers and types of services in the ACT with the transition to NDIS;[[958]](#footnote-959)
* changes to funding for peak body organisations and their feedback;[[959]](#footnote-960)
* case-by-case approach to carrying over funding for service providers from one year to another and retaining unspent funds;[[960]](#footnote-961)
* new respite property for teens from 13 to 18 years in partnership with the Ricky Stuart Foundation, capacity and demand, service provider selection;[[961]](#footnote-962)
* changes in the average cost per hour of therapy services, reporting error, additional staffing expenditure and decrease in government payments for outputs;[[962]](#footnote-963)
* changes to staffing numbers and payments with the cessation of therapy services;[[963]](#footnote-964)
* participation of young people with a disability in sport and recreational community groups;[[964]](#footnote-965) and
* Connect and Participate Expo, assessment and evaluation, attendance, cost and future recurrence.[[965]](#footnote-966)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Staffing and NDIS Transition

In response to the Committee’s enquiries about changes to staffing numbers with the transition to NDIS, the Minister and official advised that staff numbers in Disability ACT were changing month to month with some staff looking for new employment opportunities and taking advantage of training and transition support. Other staff are looking to retire or leave active service.[[966]](#footnote-967) All staff are being supported to determine their future career and are able to exercise options under the enterprise agreement for redundancy or redeployment within the ACT Government.[[967]](#footnote-968) The Committee was advised that 40 per cent of staff are looking, or will be looking, for jobs in the community sector.[[968]](#footnote-969)

As of May 2015, Disability ACT had 315 staff and Therapy ACT had 119, including permanent, temporary and casual staff. [[969]](#footnote-970) Of this, around 61 FTE permanent staff are still employed within Therapy ACT.[[970]](#footnote-971)

The Committee was advised that , moving into the future, a new child development unit will be established within Therapy ACT so there will be a continuing Therapy ACT workforce of around 30 FTE.[[971]](#footnote-972) Disability ACT will retain its policy function, which will consist of around 10 or 11 staff.[[972]](#footnote-973)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee understands that staff numbers within Therapy ACT and Disability ACT are shifting steadily with the transition of a large percentage of the workforce to the community sector, or through redeployment or redundancy.

Given the number of staff affected by the transition to NDIS, the Committee believes it is important to keep the Assembly informed about the progress of this transition on a regular basis.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government include in its National Disability Insurance Scheme quarterly reporting to the Legislative Assembly information on the level of staffing in Disability ACT and Therapy ACT during the transition.

* + - 1. Linkages and Capacity Building

The Committee enquired about changes to funding of peak organisations which fall under Tier 2 of the NDIS (now being referred to as Information, Linkages and Capacity Building or ILC). The Committee was advised that all service organisations that have been funded by the ACT Government have service funding agreements or contracts in place until 30 June 2016 which is aligned with the end of the trial period.[[973]](#footnote-974)

The Committee was also advised that:

at the national level there has been a policy decision by the Disability Reform Council in April this year when the national framework for ILC was agreed. That policy framework is about to be made public... [[974]](#footnote-975)

The ACT is working with the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) to put in place arrangements for those ILC organisations and aims to ensure that the new service framework is consistent with the ACT’s existing service frameworks including the Better Services Initiative and Human Services Blueprint.[[975]](#footnote-976)

Officials anticipated being in a position to tell organisations by the end of 2015 what the new funding arrangements from mid 2016 might look like.[[976]](#footnote-977)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

In order to give community service organisations some certainty in terms of staffing and continuation of services, the Committee believes that it is important the Directorate continue to work with Tier 2 providers in the Information, Linkages and Capacity Building area to ensure a smooth transition of funding with appropriate notification periods for those organisation.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government continue to work with Tier 2 community service organisations on the NDIS Information, Linkages and Capacity Building to ensure a smooth transition of funding with appropriate notification periods for those organisations.

* 1. Early Intervention Services
     + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 2.1: Early Intervention Services, the Committee considered the following matters:

* lack of growth in accountability indicators and changes to government payment for outputs (GPO);[[977]](#footnote-978)
* national early development census;[[978]](#footnote-979)
* integration of data across Directorates, postcode level analysis and local area planning;[[979]](#footnote-980) and
* assessment of unmet need for early intervention services. [[980]](#footnote-981)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Unmet need in early intervention services

The Committee sought information about unmet need in early intervention services.[[981]](#footnote-982) Directorate officials advised the Committee that with the redesign of child and family centres, through better service integration with the Better Services program and the Human Services Gateway, the Directorate aimed to ensure everyone who presents with a need is assessed and referred to an appropriate program.[[982]](#footnote-983) The Committee was advised by the Director, Early Intervention and Prevention Services that:

There are a number of drivers for that redesign, including alignment with the human services blueprint and alignment with a step up for our kids. What we have done in that process is develop a suite of programs. Parents as teachers is one of the core programs that are delivered out of child and family centres.

Intensive home visiting may not be appropriate for everyone but we have other complementary programs. One of those programs that we have commenced this year is circle of security. It is a group program operating out of each of the three centres where parents can come. It really targets assisting parents to develop their relationship and attachment with their child, particularly where there are concerns emerging. We also have maternal and child health nurses in the centres. As part of their job they would do home visiting.

When people present at the centres we make an assessment and we direct them to an appropriate program. It might be a program run by child and family centre staff but it might be a program run by health staff, Smith Family staff, Medicare Local staff. [[983]](#footnote-984)

Following questions from the Committee,[[984]](#footnote-985) the Committee was advised by the Director of Early Intervention and Prevention Services that there are not waiting lists for the Parents as Teachers program and there is an increased capacity for parents to access that program with three additional full-time equivalent staff in last year’s budget.[[985]](#footnote-986) However, the Director-General advised that there are waiting lists, although families will access the right service at a point in time and in the meantime will be supported with other resources available through the child and family centres.[[986]](#footnote-987)

The Committee also enquired about any assessment done by the ACT Government into unmet need.[[987]](#footnote-988) It heard from the Director-General that:

there will always be a need for a range of initiatives around early intervention prevention. What we are attempting to do, as we explained earlier, is to build our understanding, both from a quantitative and qualitative point of view of the needs of particular communities at a localised level and then be able to mobilise the resources available to meet that need, and identify a gap if that is the case.

The redesign work around better services is giving us our first and best opportunity to really assess the full impact of what is available for communities, what they consider to be the most important issues to resolve for their community, and then be able to draw from that in relation to any gaps in the service system. [[988]](#footnote-989)

The Committee was further advised that the Directorate is about six months into that consultation and data gathering process and does not believe at this point ‘that there is a mismatch between what is available and what the community sees as a priority’. [[989]](#footnote-990)

In response to a Question Taken on Notice, the Committee was advised that:

The Local Services Network (LSN) is being independently evaluated with the final results to be reported in mid 2016. This evaluation will inform improvements to the LSN and its expansion to other areas in the ACT.[[990]](#footnote-991)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that it received conflicting information from the Director-General and the Director of Early Intervention and Prevention Services regarding demand for the Parents as Teachers program.

Noting that families are provided with other services whilst they wait for appropriate programs, the Committee believes that the Directorate should provide further information on demand for early intervention programs such as Parents as Teachers.

The Committee believes that the evaluation of the Local Services Network should be made publicly available and that a clearer understanding of unmet need for early intervention services in the ACT is established.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government determine the level of unmet need for early intervention services and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015 on the level of unmet need and how they intend to address that need.

* + - 1. A Step Up for Our Kids

The Committee heard about the integration of youth justice services and care and protection services, which will be known from 1 July 2015 as the new Child and Youth Protection Service. This is anticipated to provide a better service response that focuses on diversion, protection, restoration, transition, permanency and trauma-informed care, for children, young people, carers and their families.[[991]](#footnote-992)

The Government is committed to the implementation of a new five-year out of home care strategy ‘A Step Up for Our Kids –one step can make a lifetime of difference’, to provide a suite of new programs to support high risk families and the creation of a continuum of care for children in out of home care, and the creation of a therapeutic assessment system.[[992]](#footnote-993)

There are specific measures aimed at Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people in out of home care.[[993]](#footnote-994)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the upcoming rollout of the new strategy and its place in the delivery of out of home care services regionally.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide regular updates to the Legislative Assembly on the implementation of the Step Up for Our Kids strategy especially with relation to improving capacity and strengthening of high risk families.

* 1. Ageing
     + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 3.1 Community Participation (Ageing), the Committee considered the following matters:

* breakdown of the funding for community participation across Ageing, Multicultural Affairs, Women and Community Services functions;[[994]](#footnote-995)
* consultation by the ACT Government with Council on the Ageing and National Seniors Association ACT;[[995]](#footnote-996)
* one-stop-shop for seniors concept;[[996]](#footnote-997)
* community flexible bus transport system; part of ACTION fleet, funding being transferred from the Community Services Directorate to Territory and Municipal Services;[[997]](#footnote-998)
* community flexible bus transport system fleet size, hours of operation, and community feedback;[[998]](#footnote-999)
* support for grandparents with caring responsibilities for grandchildren;[[999]](#footnote-1000)
* unmet need for nursing homes and other aged accommodation due to Commonwealth funding arrangements;[[1000]](#footnote-1001)
* promotion of age-friendly city concept, including upgrade to selected suburbs;[[1001]](#footnote-1002)
* actions to support Canberra’s ageing population into the future;[[1002]](#footnote-1003)
* services to assist independent living for the elderly;[[1003]](#footnote-1004)
* community capacity building projects;[[1004]](#footnote-1005) and
* visits to community services organisations for management of contracts and service funding agreements.[[1005]](#footnote-1006)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Aged Carers

Having heard from National Seniors Australia that a majority of their members were almost full-time grandparent carers of their grandchildren,[[1006]](#footnote-1007) the Committee enquired about support for grandparents with daytime caring responsibilities for grandchildren.

The Committee was informed by the Director, Community Participation group that no specific program has been set to assist grandparents although various playgroups are funded through the community language program.[[1007]](#footnote-1008) The Minister also advised that child and family centres provide opportunity for playgroups for all ages of carer to become involved.[[1008]](#footnote-1009)

The Committee also heard from National Seniors Australia at the hearing on 12 June about appropriate housing options to support aged carers. This issue was discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 of this report.

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee believes that, given the significant role grandparents play in providing care for grandchildren, further investigation is warranted around services that could assist them in that role, such as grandparent-specific playgroups.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government continue working to identify and address needs in supporting aged carers.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate the need for grandparent playgroups, aimed at grandparents providing care for their own grandchildren, and report back to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day of March 2016.

* + - 1. Transitional Accommodation

In response to a question on notice, the Committee was advised that transitional accommodation services in the ACT, including retirement villages and nursing homes fall under the responsibility of the Federal Department of Social Security.[[1009]](#footnote-1010)

The Committee heard that the ACT assists where it can, including the provision of land but the allocation of, and bidding for, beds is the Commonwealth’s responsibility for which the ACT can only help in a limited capacity:

certainly on aged care you are seeing different groups that are coming into the territory and are doing battle with the commonwealth—and it is a lengthy battle and it is a complex battle—to actually get aged care and retirement facilities, nursing homes, on the ground. It is very difficult and we have tried to assist some of the locals to do that.

...

But I am looking around and, from what I am hearing as well from some of the providers, I am pretty optimistic that we are well served and we will be well served going into the future.[[1010]](#footnote-1011)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work with the Commonwealth Government to ensure appropriate funding to meet the demand for aged care accommodation in Canberra.

* + - 1. Bulky and Garden Waste Collection Services

The Committee was told about the Bulky Waste Collection Service which provides a collection service to remove large, bulky waste for pensioners and concession cardholders who have limited capacity and financial ability to remove the waste themselves.[[1011]](#footnote-1012)

In response to a question taken on notice, the Committee was also advised that the Bulky Waste Collection Service does not include the collection of garden waste.[[1012]](#footnote-1013)

Concerns about garden waste collection were raised with the Committee on 12 June 2015 and advice on this issue was heard from National Seniors Australia – ACT Policy Advisory Group. See Chapter 2 for further details. The Committee also discussed resource recovery and waste to energy with the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services on 24 June 2015. See Section for details.

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that some Canberrans would have difficulty removing garden waste from their properties, particularly if they may reside on blocks which have significant garden maintenance and mowing requirements resulting in garden waste.

Similarly, whilst the bulky waste collection service would be available to public housing tenants that are concession cardholders, the Committee notes that service does not apply to garden or green waste. This service is particularly important where a community garden has been established in order to ensure residents can make best use of the community garden.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government assess the viability of green and garden waste collection throughout the Territory and report back to the Legislative Assembly by the first sitting day in March 2016.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate expanding bulky waste collection as part of the ACT concessions program for current and future social housing properties.

* + - 1. financial abuse of elderly

In response to a question taken on notice, the Committee was advised that it is difficult to measure the percentage of people over 65 experiencing elder abuse in the form of financial abuse or other means because there are multiple data sources in the ACT which report elder abuse. Similarly, there is no centralised elder abuse data collation in the ACT so it is not possible to compare against other state and territories.[[1013]](#footnote-1014)

The Committee was advised that:

Significant work is being undertaken by the ACT Government and organisations across the ACT with the aim of reducing elder abuse, including financial abuse, in Canberra. Initiatives employed to raise awareness of Elder Abuse Prevention available in the ACT include:

Community Education - In collaboration with community partners including the ACT Ministerial Advisory Council on Ageing, the Elder Abuse Prevention Working Group and the Council on the Ageing (COTA ACT) and the ACT Government have developed strategies and awareness programs that serve to prevent and reduce the prevalence of elder abuse and other forms of abuse in our community.

These include awareness raising initiatives and strategies.[[1014]](#footnote-1015)

Other initiatives include:

* distribution of relevant information throughout the Community such as the *Respecting Our Elders - Abuse Prevention and Referral Line {APRIL}* publication, supported by the Elder Abuse Prevention Working Group;
* a suite of factsheets for workers and the community, one of which will be focused on financial abuse, currently being developed by Care Inc; and
* an Elder Abuse Prevention Forum on 17 June 2015, hosted by COTA ACT, which identified gaps in services in the ACT and how services can work better to address the issue.[[1015]](#footnote-1016)
  + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee believes that more work could be done to create initiatives that seek to reduce financial abuse of elderly Canberrans.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government develop initiatives that seek to reduce financial abuse of elderly Canberrans.

* 1. Multicultural Affairs
     + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 3.1 Community Participation (Multicultural Affairs), the Committee considered the following matters:

* balance of community and corporate participants in the Multicultural Festival and pricing structure;[[1016]](#footnote-1017)
* electricity supply to Multicultural Festival stallholders and outages;[[1017]](#footnote-1018)
* physical limits on expansion of Multicultural Festival and improving community participation;[[1018]](#footnote-1019)
* participation of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds in community activities including national days and Refugee Week, participation in multicultural grants;[[1019]](#footnote-1020) and
* ACT declared a refugee welcome zone, number of refugees welcomed.[[1020]](#footnote-1021)
  1. Office for Women
     + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 3.1: Community Participation (Women), the Committee considered the following matters:

* Women’s Information and Referral Centre (WIRC) services and change to service model, number of interactions, future service opportunities;[[1021]](#footnote-1022)
* Canberra Men’s Centre role working with men around domestic violence;[[1022]](#footnote-1023)
* national domestic violence awareness and prevention campaign;[[1023]](#footnote-1024)
* funding for the Domestic Violence Crisis Service, the Canberra Rape Crisis Centre and the Canberra Men’s Centre;[[1024]](#footnote-1025)
* fact sheet on initiatives countering violence against women and children;[[1025]](#footnote-1026)
* ACT participation in national campaigns including Australia’s National Research Organisation for Women’s’ Safety (ANROWS); [[1026]](#footnote-1027)
* women’s safety grants, criteria for funding and funding amount; [[1027]](#footnote-1028) and
* budget for the Office for Women.[[1028]](#footnote-1029)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Domestic Violence prevention

On 12 June 2015 the committee heard from the YWCA on a number of issues in relation to domestic violence prevention. (See Chapter 2 for the discussion and associated recommendations).

* 1. Community Services
     + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 3.1: Community Participation (Community Service), the Committee considered the following matters:

* community services 0.34 per cent levy and the Community Sector Reform Program;[[1029]](#footnote-1030)
* amount collected from the levy;[[1030]](#footnote-1031)
* value-add to community organisations;[[1031]](#footnote-1032)
* indexation and levies interstate;[[1032]](#footnote-1033)
* response from the community sector;[[1033]](#footnote-1034)
* empirical evidence of Community Sector Reform Program benefits;[[1034]](#footnote-1035) and
* Strengthening Families program, effectiveness, community worker training and role of a lead worker.[[1035]](#footnote-1036)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Community Sector Reform Program Levy

The Community Sector Reform Program was launched in March 2014 and developed ‘in conjunction with the sector’. It is described as follows:

The program comprises five modules: Governance and Financial Management; Sustainability and Strategic Risk; Collaboration and Strategic Alliances; Tendering and Procurement; and Working with Government.[[1036]](#footnote-1037)

At its hearing on Friday 12 June 2015 the Committee heard a number of concerns from community groups in relation to continuation of the 0.34 per cent Community Sector Reform Program levy, discussed in Chapter 2 of this report.[[1037]](#footnote-1038) The Committee sought further information about the levy from the Minister and officials.

The Committee was advised that the reform program and the services it funds are continuing and therefore the levy has been extended for a further two years. The Director, Community Sector Reform Project, stated that ‘when it was originally agreed it was for three years with the potential for an additional two years. Essentially, this represents the additional two years.’[[1038]](#footnote-1039)

The levy applies to organisations that receive over $150,000 funding from CSD[[1039]](#footnote-1040) and raises under half a million dollars each year for the reform program.[[1040]](#footnote-1041)

The Committee was further told that the first phase of the program had returned some significant benefits to the non-government sector both financially and in terms of capabilities that will help position themselves to be responsive providers of quality services to the community.[[1041]](#footnote-1042) The Minister advised that in the last three years of the program, the sector had been saved $2.4 million.[[1042]](#footnote-1043)

Other jurisdictions do not apply a similar levy although the Committee was told that the ACT has traditionally had the highest rate of indexation payments.[[1043]](#footnote-1044)

In response to the Committee’s discussion on the concerns raised by UnitingCare Kippax and the Youth Coalition of the ACT, the Director-General noted that ‘we do understand that the sector has not received this measure favourably.’[[1044]](#footnote-1045) The Deputy Director-General said:

Although the sector may believe that it is unfair...the reality is that there is a lot of benefit that individual organisations by themselves would not achieve because they simply could not afford it. Small organisations would find it very difficult to hire a financial adviser worth $23,000 to look at their structure, their governance, their accounting rules. Those packages actually help those organisations do that, exactly as the minister said, to ensure that they are sustainable into the future with all of the changes that are occurring.[[1045]](#footnote-1046)

The Committee sought empirical evidence of the achievements of the levy and heard that the oversight group of the first 0.34 levy program work was provided with a reconciliation of the levy including the benefits realised and savings generated for the community sector. The reconciliation was provided to the Committee[[1046]](#footnote-1047)and the Committee was advised that:

The benefit from July 2012 to June 2015 from the community sector reform program has been assessed at approximately $3,298,000. The remaining funds that have not been spent on initiatives and will be rolled over into 2015-16 are $157,212.[[1047]](#footnote-1048)

The Deputy Director-General further advised that the funds remaining from the initial levy would be spent on an electronic compliance tool to reduce compliance costs for community organisations. The Committee heard that by pooling funds a good deal was secured which ‘will deliver a benefit of between $2,000 and $5,000 per organisation’, depending on their size.[[1048]](#footnote-1049)

The remaining funds will also fund scoping for the industry development plan. The Director-General advised that ACTCOSS has committed its membership to the development of an industry development plan which will be the framework for the next phase of the program.[[1049]](#footnote-1050)

ACTCOSS advised in its analysis of the ACT Budget 2015-16 that remaining funds should be used to complete agreed learning and development projects and for the industry development plan, however ACTCOSS is ‘opposed to funding through a continuation of the tax on the sector.’[[1050]](#footnote-1051)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the concerns of community sector representatives regarding the extension of the Community Sector Reform Program levy of 0.34 per cent in the ACT Budget 2015-16, despite previous indications that the levy would cease.

The Committee is also concerned that the community sector does not appear to have been made aware of the possibility of two-year extension of the levy, nor consulted before the extension was applied.

There also appears to be a lack of transparency over how the levy has been expended to date.[[1051]](#footnote-1052)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government work closely with the community sector on the continuation of the Community Sector Reform Program.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly with details of what is planned for the remaining funds already collected under the Community Sector Reform Program levy.

The Committee recommends that ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly with details of what the continued Community Sector Reform Program levy will be spent on over the next two years including an outline of the cost-benefit ratio by the last sitting day in 2015.

* + - 1. Gugan Gulwan Accommodation

The Committee discussed accommodation for Gugan Gulwan Aboriginal Corporation and was advised that their current premises, now managed by ACT Property Group in the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, has undergone some significant refurbishment. The Executive Director, Service Strategy and Community Building told the Committee that:

We did quite an amount of refurbishment to the building, including upgrading of kitchens and meeting areas, and additional space, particularly as Gugan Gulwan has received additional funding from both the commonwealth and the ACT government over the years; they have needed extra space in their building. We have been able to do some additions and refurbishments there.[[1052]](#footnote-1053)

With regard to new premises, the Committee was advised that the Directorate has worked with Gugan Gulwan in the past to look at existing ACT facilities that could be repurposed but in the end were not able to find another suitable building they could move into. [[1053]](#footnote-1054)

Looking at their future needs, the Committee heard that Gugan Gulwan is interested in providing more outreach services, rather than requiring members of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community to travel to their Wanniassa premises. Gugan Gulwan already conducts some outreach services through Billabong in Holt and the West Belconnen Child and Family Centre. The Directorate is working with Gugan Gulwan to determine what the best accommodation will be into the future to suit the types of services they wish to deliver.[[1054]](#footnote-1055)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that Gugan Gulwan has been in need of new premises for some time.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government update the Legislative Assembly on the outcomes of actions that are being taken to find suitable alternative accommodation for Gugan Gulwan.

* 1. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs
     1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 3.1 Community Participation (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs), the Committee considered the following matters:

* programs and support to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community;[[1055]](#footnote-1056)
* Growing Healthy Families initiative;[[1056]](#footnote-1057)
* connections between the Gungahlin Child and Family Centre and children at the Ngunnawal School;[[1057]](#footnote-1058)
* Tracks for Reconciliation;[[1058]](#footnote-1059)
* changes to service delivery from the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement, gaps between the agreement and programs, implementation plan, measurement of key goals;[[1059]](#footnote-1060)
* Gugan Gulwan Aboriginal corporation premises and outreach services;[[1060]](#footnote-1061)
* suicide rate and drug use amongst young Indigenous people and assisting families in crisis;[[1061]](#footnote-1062)
* Indigenous Business Chamber;[[1062]](#footnote-1063)
* closing the gap data and lack of progress against some indicators, 2015 report and data collection processes;[[1063]](#footnote-1064)
* Indigenous expenditure report;[[1064]](#footnote-1065) and
* Budget information provided to the Indigenous community.[[1065]](#footnote-1066)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement

The Committee sought information on how the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement would be measured over the coming years to ensure key goals are achieved. It was advised that that Government is still working through the details with the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body and would be establishing a clear evaluation plan as part of the implementation process which is currently in development.[[1066]](#footnote-1067)

The Committee heard that milestones would be set for each of the key areas of focus in the Agreement as well as establishing a suite of outcomes that will be measured over a longer period of time. The sub-committee of the Strategic Board is in the process of identifying appropriate data sets to inform the evaluation plan and which can be reported on a regular basis.[[1067]](#footnote-1068)

The Minister advised that the agreement was a ‘living document’ which can be adapted to suit changing needs identified by the Government or the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body.[[1068]](#footnote-1069)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee acknowledges the ongoing work identifying suitable data sets and finalising details of the implementation plan for the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement. However, the Committee is concerned that some of the quality-of-life outcomes are difficult to practically measure.

Further discussion about the implementation of the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement, as well as other concerns of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body took place at the hearing on 12 June 2015. (See Chapter 2 for the discussion and associated recommendations.)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government undertake consistent monitoring of key objectives in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement to ensure milestones are being met and report to the Legislative Assembly on a quarterly basis.

* 1. Child and Youth Protection Services
     1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 4.1: Child and Youth Protection Services, the Committee considered the following matters:

* reductions in re-substantiation rates for children in care, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children;[[1069]](#footnote-1070)
* stay-at-home visiting services in early intervention, related procurement process, and opportunities for an Indigenous service provider;[[1070]](#footnote-1071)
* general savings and changes to appropriation;[[1071]](#footnote-1072)
* Step Up For our Kids program, parents as teachers program and child and family centre redesign;[[1072]](#footnote-1073)
* external investigation into allegations of drug supply and use in Bimberi, AFP involvement, stand down of staff alleged to be involved;[[1073]](#footnote-1074)
* seizure of contraband items in Bimberi;[[1074]](#footnote-1075)
* drug testing procedures for detainees, visitors and staff;[[1075]](#footnote-1076)
* increases in targets for children in out of home care;[[1076]](#footnote-1077)
* enduring parental responsibility and adoption arrangements;[[1077]](#footnote-1078)
* number of residents in Bimberi, Bendora care system, youth justice blueprint;[[1078]](#footnote-1079)
* decrease in the youth offending rate and number of young people in the justice system;[[1079]](#footnote-1080)
* capacity of Bimberi in terms of infrastructure, support and utilisation;[[1080]](#footnote-1081)
* assaults at Bimberi on residents or staff;[[1081]](#footnote-1082)
* capacity for young women in Bimberi and shift in gender make-up of residents;[[1082]](#footnote-1083)
* measuring the impact of early intervention and support across all government services;[[1083]](#footnote-1084)
* Karinya House placements, mother-baby unit, new facility and outreach services;[[1084]](#footnote-1085)
* trauma informed therapeutic services, continuum of care;[[1085]](#footnote-1086)
* Children And Young Persons System (CHYPS) upgrade and replacement of CHYPS and Youth Justice System (YJS), paper and electronic record keeping, and associated change management;[[1086]](#footnote-1087)
* Bendora through-care unit and funding for staffing, staff numbers;[[1087]](#footnote-1088) and
* Narrabundah House capacity and occupancy.[[1088]](#footnote-1089)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Drug testing at Bimberi

In response to the Committee enquiries about the drug testing procedures at Bimberi for the young people, visitors and staff, it was advised that young people coming into the centre may be required to have a urine analysis. Additionally there is a regime of random urine analysis testing for young people in the centre and those on longer term remands.[[1089]](#footnote-1090)

The Minister advised that drug testing of staff at Bimberi is not currently conducted. He advised that it is possible to test staff under the current legal system; however the Directorate is conducting a risk analysis across Bimberi to determine whether it is appropriate to do so at the centre. The Minister further advised that there had been no evidence of staff involvement with drugs at Bimberi.[[1090]](#footnote-1091)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee believes it is important to ensure that Bimberi remains a drug-free centre and supports investigation of random drug testing of detainees and staff.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate a policy of random identifiable drug and alcohol testing for staff and detainees at Bimberi Youth Justice Centre.

* + - 1. Changes to investment in Output 4.1.

In response to a question taken on notice regarding the reconciliation in relation to Output Class 4.1 and youth protection services, the Minister advised:

The 2014-15 Budget Statements showed the GPO budget for Output 4.1 in 2014-15 to be $80,652,000 and the estimated budget for 2015-16 to be $69,510,000. This drop of $11,142,000 is the result of technical adjustments to indexation and savings, and initiatives that would cease at the end of the 2014-15 financial year...

...

In the 2015-16 Budget Statements the GPO budget for Output 4.1 in 2015-16 would be $81,356,000. The increase from the estimated budget of $69,510,000 is the result of technical adjustments to indexation and savings and the funding of additional initiatives valued at $11,846,000. These changes are detailed in the table below. The reduction in funds from ceasing initiatives in 2014-15, has been offset by new initiatives in the 2015-16 years showing an increase in GPO of $704,000 across the two budget years.

...

Importantly, the $16 million investment for 'A Step Up for our Kids' is distributed over the next three budget years, being 2015-16 $6,495,000, 2016-17 $6,260,000 and   
2017-18 $3,044,000.[[1091]](#footnote-1092)

* 1. Housing ACT
     + 1. Matters considered

Under Output Class 1.1: Social Housing Services, the Committee considered the following matters:

* housing waiting lists: housing register and transfer register;[[1092]](#footnote-1093)
* out of turn transfers;[[1093]](#footnote-1094)
* timeframe for relocation of Owen Flats residents;[[1094]](#footnote-1095)
* matching tenants and properties;[[1095]](#footnote-1096)
* new developments at Monash, Nicholls and Chisholm;[[1096]](#footnote-1097)
* split between ministerial responsibilities of Housing and the Chief Minister’s Urban Renewal portfolio;[[1097]](#footnote-1098)
* tenant housing preferences in the public housing renewal program, including tenant consultation;[[1098]](#footnote-1099)
* Linking into New Communities Taskforce (LINCT);[[1099]](#footnote-1100)
* Dickson Flats, learnings and follow-up with tenants;[[1100]](#footnote-1101)
* salt-n-pepper approach to public housing, managing community resistance;[[1101]](#footnote-1102)
* community housing providers;[[1102]](#footnote-1103)
* partnerships with philanthropic organisations for social or supported housing and the Common Ground project;[[1103]](#footnote-1104)
* homelessness accommodation, First Point data and public housing waiting times;[[1104]](#footnote-1105)
* Spotless key performance indicators, locking systems, central access point, client satisfaction surveys, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment;[[1105]](#footnote-1106)
* National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness, Commonwealth funding and paper on housing issues;[[1106]](#footnote-1107)
* payment plans for tenants in arrears;[[1107]](#footnote-1108)
* new tenancy model;[[1108]](#footnote-1109)
* wrap-around services;[[1109]](#footnote-1110)
* tenancy management approach;[[1110]](#footnote-1111) and
* condition audits by Spotless.[[1111]](#footnote-1112)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Tenant transfers and waiting lists

The Committee sought information about how the ACT Government was prioritising public housing needs, given the waiting list and the need to relocate existing tenants, for the housing renewal program. The Executive Director, Housing and Community Services ACT advised that:

Technically, we actually have two waiting lists. We have a housing register and a transfer register. Essentially, people in current housing that will be relocated under the public housing renewal program will be on the transfer register. In terms of the actual priorities around allocation, our commitment is first and foremost to our current tenants, to relocate them under the public housing renewal commitment. The minister and the government have made that commitment very strongly and very publicly.[[1112]](#footnote-1113)

The Committee heard that each individual tenant will be consulted to find a suitable housing solution which could be in existing housing stock or in the new housing. As properties become available, the Directorate looks for the best match between an individual applicant and a property.[[1113]](#footnote-1114)

Tenants being moved as part of the public housing renewal program, such as those in Owen Flats, are considered as out of turn or management-initiated transfers and do not appear on the priority waiting lists.[[1114]](#footnote-1115)

The Committee also discussed the timeframes for relocation of tenants for the public housing renewal program, noting that there was conflicting public information.[[1115]](#footnote-1116) The Committee was advised that relocation will occur on an as-needs basis, based on individual tenant circumstances and preferences. Whilst Owen Flats residents, for example are due to be relocated in the 2015-16 financial year, some tenants are already looking to move.[[1116]](#footnote-1117) Influencing the timeframes is the construction process and the Minister noted ‘It is unlikely that the new housing, which is part of the program for renewal of our public housing stock, will be completed until early 2016 at the earliest...’[[1117]](#footnote-1118)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that there remains uncertainty for some public housing tenants being relocated as part of the public housing renewal program about the likely timing of their move, particularly in light of the Asset Sales agreement.

The Committee notes the complexity of managing public housing waiting lists and the impact on current tenants.[[1118]](#footnote-1119)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government write to those public housing tenants affected by the public housing renewal program clearly detailing timeframes for their relocation.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government guarantee that tenants in a public housing asset included in the Asset Sales agreement with the Federal Government are able to be relocated into suitable replacement public housing prior to the sale of the asset.

* + - 1. New housing provision

In response to the Committee’s questions about the nature of new public housing being developed under the public housing renewal program, the Committee was advised that the first three construction sites are in Monash, Nicholls and Chisholm and will respectively comprise 25, 14 and 20 new units. The Committee heard that the developments will all be accessible accommodation, contributing to almost 60 new accessible houses to be available by the end of this current financial year.[[1119]](#footnote-1120)

The Executive Director, Housing and Community Services ACT also advised that:

the government’s commitment under public housing renewal is for no net loss of accommodation. So 1,288 units will be removed during the renewal program and 1,288 will be replaced. That, over time, will be neutral to the waiting list. What it will do is improve the form of that housing and its accessibility and adaptability to a range of different people.[[1120]](#footnote-1121)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee believes the ACT Government needs to release its criteria for selecting the location of new public housing and social housing properties in order to establish whether proximity to services such as bus routes was taken into account.

Further information should also be made available on the cost of replacement and on the types of accommodation being developed.

The Committee also believes that the total number of properties in the public housing stock should not fall below the level as at 30 June 2014 of 10,848 dwellings as per the Asset Sales agreement.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government explain to the Legislative Assembly its criteria for selecting the location of new public housing and social housing properties by the last sitting day in October 2015.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government identify to the Legislative Assembly the standard costings they use for a public housing property replacement cost by the last sitting day in October 2015.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government identify to the Legislative Assembly how many one, two, three or four or other bedroom properties they are planning to build under the public housing renewal program, by the last sitting day in October 2015.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government guarantee that the total stock of public housing in the ACT will not fall below the level as at 30 June 2014 of 10,848 dwellings, as per the Asset Sales agreement.

* + - 1. Public housing and proceeds from the sale of public housing assets

The Committee notes that Mr Andrew Barr MLA, Minister for Urban Renewal and Ms Yvette Berry MLA released a joint media statement on 20 June 2015 calling for expressions of interest to provide new public housing homes through construction and purchase. The media release states that ‘the expression of interest forms part of a wider program to replace 1,288 ageing public housing dwellings across Canberra’. [[1121]](#footnote-1122)

It further states that ‘eligible properties need to comply with design and liveability criteria, and be available for occupation no later than 31 December 2018.’[[1122]](#footnote-1123)

* + - 1. Allocation of proceeds from the asset recycling program

On 24 June 2015, the Committee met with the Minister for Capital Metro, Mr Simon Corbell MLA, and discussed the allocation of proceeds from the asset recycling program to the Capital Metro project.

The Asset Recycling program is described by the Federal Government as an initiative that: ‘will help unlock funding for new public infrastructure projects through reinvestment of the sale proceeds from existing government-owned assets.’[[1123]](#footnote-1124)

The Minister confirmed that:

The agreement between the federal and the ACT governments is that the bonus payment, as well as the revenue received from the asset sales themselves, will be directed towards the Capital Metro project.[[1124]](#footnote-1125)

The Minister further advised that:

The total amounts are that the ACTTAB sale contributes $106 million; land sales associated with the public housing estate 287 million—that is not just the public housing estate; there are other government sites in that—and the commonwealth incentive payment $59 million.[[1125]](#footnote-1126)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government outline how directing the proceeds from the sale of public housing assets towards construction of Capital Metro delivers the best return to the ACT economy.

* + - 1. Homelessness

The Committee noted the number of people experiencing homelessness in the ACT, according to First Point data, appear to be growing and questioned how the public housing renewal program and out of turn transfers would affect these numbers.[[1126]](#footnote-1127)

The Executive Director, Housing and Community Services ACT, advised that:

With the First Point data that you mentioned, First Point has a system where they categorise need into A, B, C and D levels of priority need. The number you raise is for all of those groups. Not all of those people require accommodation; some of those people require support or referral to other service providers.[[1127]](#footnote-1128)

The Committee was also advised, as highlighted above, that the intention of the public housing renewal program is for no net loss in accommodation. The Committee heard that:

During the course of the program there will be some temporary fluctuations in the waiting list as people are relocated and as we move people into their new accommodation. That, for some people, might mean a quicker allocation. For example, if you are on a waiting list in Chisholm—the example that was used before—and that is the most suitable location for you and you require accessible, adaptable accommodation, those people may indeed get accommodation sooner than they would have otherwise if the public housing renewal program did not exist. You are right; that also might cause some delays to some individuals as well, as we work through that process for individuals.[[1128]](#footnote-1129)

At its hearing on 12 June 2015, the Committee heard about issues of homelessness and housing affordability. (See Chapter 2 for the discussion and associated recommendations).

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that the number of people experiencing homelessness in the ACT will continue to rise.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government provide quarterly updates to the Legislative Assembly on progress in reducing homelessness in the ACT, based on First Point data, including the number of people waiting for housing assistance and the number of housing placements made in the period under consideration.

# education and training

* + 1. Introduction

The 2015‑16 Budget Statement for the Education and Training Directorate (ETD) states that the Directorate works with students, parents and the community to ensure that all ACT citizens benefit from high quality and accessible education, childcare and training systems.[[1129]](#footnote-1130)

Services of ETD include:

* the provision of public school education;
* regulation of education and care services;
* registration of non-government schools and home education; and
* the planning and coordination of vocational education and training.[[1130]](#footnote-1131)

The Committee discussed the following Output Classes within ETD, as presented in the Education and Training 2015-16 Budget Statement:

* Output Class 1: Public School Education
* Output 1.1: Public Primary School Education
* Output 1.2: Public High School Education
* Output 1.3: Public Secondary College Education
* Output 1.4: Disability Education in Public Schools
* Output Class 2: Non Government Education
* Output 2.1: Non Government School Education
* Output Class 3: Vocational Education and Training
* Output 3.1: Planning and Coordination of Vocational Education and Training Services.[[1131]](#footnote-1132)

The Committee heard from the Minister for Education and Training, Ms Joy Burch MLA, on 22 June 2015 to discuss the Output Classes within ETD and matters relevant to other bodies for which the Minister is responsible, namely CIT, CIT Solutions Pty Ltd and the ACT Building and Construction Industry Training Fund Authority. These matters are all discussed below.

* 1. Education and Training Directorate - General
     1. Matters considered

The Committee considered the following general matters:

* capacity issues in north Canberra schools and the future of schooling in north Gungahlin and Molonglo;[[1132]](#footnote-1133)
* budget allocations for the planning and construction of new schools in north Gungahlin and Molonglo, up to 2018‑19;[[1133]](#footnote-1134)
* whether there will be any school closures between now and 2020;[[1134]](#footnote-1135)
* management of enrolment and capacity pressures, with particular reference to south Canberra;[[1135]](#footnote-1136)
* population growth in Canberra’s inner north and the impact on school populations;[[1136]](#footnote-1137)
* Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment levels in ETD and activities undertaken to attract and retain Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees;[[1137]](#footnote-1138)
* land per student per school in the ACT;[[1138]](#footnote-1139)
* the progress of the enterprise bargaining agreement for teachers;[[1139]](#footnote-1140)
* New South Wales children entering ACT schools, and development of a primary school at Murrumbateman;[[1140]](#footnote-1141)
* details of the modelling used for future school enrolments and how projections are developed;[[1141]](#footnote-1142)
* the de-radicalisation of students around the issue of faith;[[1142]](#footnote-1143)
* cessation of Commonwealth funding for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Consultative Group and the Group’s relationship with the Directorate;[[1143]](#footnote-1144)
* the work of the ACT Teacher Quality Institute in maintaining and enhancing professional teaching standards;[[1144]](#footnote-1145)
* timing and budget allocation for the development of a specialist learning centre at Caroline Chisholm School, covering science, technology, engineering and maths programs;[[1145]](#footnote-1146)
* delivery of quality education within the physical school environment and building design;[[1146]](#footnote-1147)
* the continuing investment in quality digital technology in ACT schools;[[1147]](#footnote-1148) and
* development and support of a digital technologies curriculum, including teaching of coding across all ages.[[1148]](#footnote-1149)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Capacity and enrolment pressures

In response to a question from the Committee, the Minister confirmed that north Gungahlin and Molonglo were growth areas for school enrolments. Questions were asked and answered regarding funding and development of schools in these areas between now and 2018‑19.[[1149]](#footnote-1150)

The Director of Planning and Performance stated:

We do have sufficient capacity in Gungahlin at the moment to cater for enrolments and for growing enrolments. But we do see that those enrolments will continue to grow into the future. Therefore we have proposed new school facilities in the Gungahlin area to cope with those enrolments in the outyears. Certainly, our planning at the moment shows that we have sufficient capacity to cope with enrolments until the new school in north Gungahlin comes online.[[1150]](#footnote-1151)

The Committee enquired about whether Canberra’s south was experiencing similar enrolment pressures to north Canberra. The Director identified growth in enrolments for some primary schools and colleges in south Canberra, but noted growing enrolments and demand for places across the sector.[[1151]](#footnote-1152)

The Director-General advised the Committee that:

Looking at enrolment pressures, we look at our policies and particularly our priority enrolment to make sure that students within their priority enrolment area can still be accommodated in their local school. That is the guarantee. In the local enrolment area, you have priority enrolment in your local school. We then need to manage pressures with enrolment.[[1152]](#footnote-1153)

Later in the hearings, the Committee asked about the priority schools for the suburb of Lawson. The Director of Planning and Performance stated that students in Lawson would have priority access to Kaleen schools, but the Directorate would seek to accommodate families who wished to attend different schools in the area. ETD is also monitoring projections for developments in the Belconnen town centre to ensure local schools have capacity in line with development.[[1153]](#footnote-1154)

In response to a question from the Committee regarding Ainslie Primary School, Campbell High School and Dickson College, the Director confirmed that currently the Directorate is ‘fairly relaxed with our capacity and projected capacity moving forward in the inner city area.’[[1154]](#footnote-1155)

The Committee was informed by the Minister that there will be no school closures between now and 2020, and reiterated that such closures require a two‑year consultative process under the relevant education legislation.[[1155]](#footnote-1156)

* + - 1. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment

The Committee enquired about ETD’s target for the employment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The Director of People and Performance indicated that ETD is aiming for two per cent of its workforce to consist of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees. ETD has a ‘very targeted and sustained suite of activity to get that cumulative growth and continue to attract and retain Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees.’[[1156]](#footnote-1157)

The Director advised the Committee that there are a range of activities undertaken by ETD to attract and retain Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees, including:

* an employment action plan with 35 initiatives to attract, retain and develop Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees;
* a cultural integrity framework for change;
* cultural integrity training; and
* full engagement with the whole-of-government employment pathways programs.[[1157]](#footnote-1158)

The Director stated that the June target for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders staff was 72 and this target was achieved. The Committee enquired how this figure of 72 staff accords with the two per cent target, as ETD has a staff number of approximately 5,000. The two per cent target would therefore be closer to 100 staff. The Committee asked how the extra 30 positions will be obtained.[[1158]](#footnote-1159)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee commends the Directorate for its clear frameworks regarding the attraction and retention of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees. However, the target of two per cent remains unmet in a workforce of considerable size.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government detail to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day of 2015 how the Education and Training Directorate will reach its target of two per cent Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander employees.

* + - 1. Enterprise Bargaining Agreement (EBA)

The Committee asked the Minister on the current status of the EBA for ACT teachers. The Minister advised that she had recently met with the Chief Minister and Australian Education Union, provided information to the Committee on the issue of back-pay and noted that a third offer was currently under discussion.[[1159]](#footnote-1160)

Following the hearings, it was announced that on 2 July 2015 the third offer, which included back-pay, had been given in-principle acceptance by the ACT branch Council of the Australian Education Union.[[1160]](#footnote-1161)

* + - 1. Modelling for future school enrolments

The Director-General provided advice to the Committee regarding modelling used in planning future school infrastructure needs, stating:

We undertake student enrolment projection modelling, using information from land release sales data, birth data, occupation and dwelling forecasts, school census and schools capacity data. This planning is used to help cast potential enrolment for up to 30 years. The directorate also works closely across government to plan for new schooling and facilities across the territory.[[1161]](#footnote-1162)

In providing the Committee with details on the how projections are developed regarding apartment living versus single dwelling housing, the Director of Planning and Performance advised:

The projections model is quite complex. We actually receive data through our colleagues in other directorates as to the types of dwellings that they see being built, whether it is [an] infill type of development or greenfields. We have different assumptions about the number of children living in the areas based on different types of dwellings. Our model takes into account, and we review it fairly regularly, the type of dwelling and assumptions around the number of children that we would expect in that type of dwelling.[[1162]](#footnote-1163)

The Committee was additionally advised that data from the Commonwealth’s population census is used to look at dwelling type, family structures and types of families living in those dwellings, the details of which are then applied in a local ACT context.[[1163]](#footnote-1164)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee was interested to hear the various factors taken into account when developing projections for future school enrolments in both new and established suburbs. The Committee sees this work as particularly relevant at this time with a number of ACT schools heading towards capacity, and new schools proposed for development in new suburbs. The broader community would benefit from being advised about how projections have been determined.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly its assumptions that underpin modelling in any publications or presentations in relation to future school developments and projections by the last sitting day in 2015.

* + - 1. ACT Teacher Quality Institute

The Committee enquired about the importance of teacher quality. The Chief Executive Officer of the ACT Teacher Quality Institute (TQI) provided the Committee with details of the work undertaken by the TQI, such as regulation, accreditation of teaching programs, workshops, training, ongoing development and encouragement of professional practice.[[1164]](#footnote-1165)

The Chief Executive Officer was asked about the cost to the individual of maintaining, through training, professional standards for relief teachers and teachers nearing the end of their careers. In response, the CEO indicated that the TQI has a number of programs to provide professional learning opportunities to these individuals, with very high success rates.[[1165]](#footnote-1166)

Later in the hearing, there was discussion concerning education programs that are available to all students and teachers across the ACT, irrespective of the sector. This included commentary on the role of the TQI in bringing together school leadership teams for professional learning and supporting cross-sectorial development.[[1166]](#footnote-1167)

* + - 1. Caroline Chisholm School

The Committee asked the Minister about the budget allocation of $6.5 million to develop a centre for innovation and learning at the Caroline Chisholm School, which would run science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM) programs for students across Tuggeranong.[[1167]](#footnote-1168)

The Committee was advised by the Director of Infrastructure and Capital Works that planning for the project will commence later this calendar year, with construction to commence mid to late 2016. It is anticipated that the centre will be ready for use at commencement of the 2018 school year.[[1168]](#footnote-1169)

The Committee noted that the development of this centre was a 2012 election commitment, then costed at $8.7 million with completion due in 2015‑16. The Director stated that the use of architects and quantity surveyors had ensured a design concept that could be delivered at lower cost, and the Directorate was confident that all the originally anticipated elements could be delivered at the lower budget allocation.[[1169]](#footnote-1170)

* + - 1. Digital technology in ACT schools

The Chief Information Officer provided the Committee with an overview of the information and communication technologies both current and intended in ACT schools. The Chief Information Officer indentified that the 2015‑16 Budget allocation and funding over the forward estimates will continue investment in the Sustaining Smart Schools program, which will deliver (or has delivered):

* over 2,500 wireless access points into high schools and secondary schools;
* new cloud services for schools through Google Apps For Education and Microsoft Office 365 for Education (with over 11,000 students enrolled for the Google service since the start of 2015); and
* $2 million for the delivery of enhanced wireless services into primary schools over the next 12 to 24 months.[[1170]](#footnote-1171)

In response to a question from the Committee, the Chief Information Officer noted that the network has been established to cater for two devices per student to be connected at any one time. This has resulted in the speed of the network being ‘three times faster than the average Australian household [and] more than 10 times faster than any jurisdiction counterpart.’[[1171]](#footnote-1172)

The Director of Learning and Teaching responded to the Committee’s questions about digital technology curriculum, noting that this curriculum has two strands: digital and design. Primary school students engage more in visual programming language and robotics, with secondary and upper secondary students progressing to more purposeful programming language for more specific purposes.[[1172]](#footnote-1173)

* 1. Public Primary School Education
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.1: Public Primary School Education, the Committee considered the following matters:

* the parental engagement program in the ACT, undertaken by the Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth (ARACY);[[1173]](#footnote-1174)
* the movement of the Manuka Occasional Child Care Association (MOCCA) from its current site and associated discussions with Telopea Park School;[[1174]](#footnote-1175)
* the proposed removal of the Telopea Park School tennis courts and development of a new master plan;[[1175]](#footnote-1176)
* the design and construction of a new P‑6 school opening in Taylor in 2019;[[1176]](#footnote-1177)
* the success of the ACT model for early childhood schools and the transition process from grade two to grade three;[[1177]](#footnote-1178)
* concerns regarding Commonwealth improvement targets and ongoing funding for the Universal Access program for early childhood education;[[1178]](#footnote-1179)
* the impact of the Universal Access program on teacher qualifications and requirements;[[1179]](#footnote-1180) and
* the allocation of funding under the yearly capital investment program in non-government preschools.[[1180]](#footnote-1181)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Parental Engagement Program

The Committee enquired about the progress of the parental engagement program being undertaken by the Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth (ARACY). The Director of Learning and Teaching advised that the first phase of the project was completed by ARACY in February 2015 by defining parental engagement in the ACT (as opposed to parental involvement).[[1181]](#footnote-1182)

The Director informed the Committee that phase two of the project is nearing completion and will provide a set of information and fact sheets for parents and schools around various parental engagement strategies that ETD wishes to see embedded in ACT schools. Phase three is also in progress, which aims to develop a survey instrument that will measure, for the first time, the level of parental engagement in schools.[[1182]](#footnote-1183)

The Director of Learning and Teaching noted that the ACT work around parental engagement has been distributed to all jurisdictions. While the project is currently primarily focused on primary schools, ARACY has been engaged to develop supplementary and targeted strategies for secondary schools.[[1183]](#footnote-1184)

* + - 1. MOCCA and Telopea Park School

The Committee enquired about the role of ETD the proposed removal of the Manuka Occasional Child Care Association (MOCCA) from its current site, possibly to a site on Montgomery Oval. While the Minister advised that the Directorate has been working with MOCCA on potential options for new sites, the land arrangements are primarily a matter for the Land Development Agency (LDA).[[1184]](#footnote-1185)

The Committee drew the Directorate’s attention to MOCCA’s previous statements that it is not in a financial position to build or run a new childcare facility on another site, and asked ETD to confirm for MOCCA clients that services will remain affordable to them. The Director of Planning and Performance stated that the LDA is responsible for future options for the centre.[[1185]](#footnote-1186)

The Directorate was asked about its role regarding Telopea Park School releasing the Montgomery Oval to make way for a new childcare centre. The Director of Planning and Performance stated, in relation to ETD’s involvement, that:

On the actual transfer of land, the actual transfer was agreed a short time before the conversations with the school community were held, but the school community was advised of arrangements, including the fact that the school would be in receipt of new sporting facilities to improve outcomes for the students. Those conversations were held with the school community in February, including [the] arrangements for new sporting facilities at Telopea Park School.[[1186]](#footnote-1187)

The Committee enquired why the land was removed from Telopea Park School when in 2009 the then education Minister specified the land was specifically for educational purposes which could include childcare.[[1187]](#footnote-1188)

The Chief Minister was questioned about the transfer of the lease of the Montgomery Oval site from ETD to the LDA, given that in 2009 in his role as Education Minister, the Minister specified the land would only be used for education purposes. The Chief Minister advised the Committee that ‘when the circumstances change... I retain the capacity to change my mind.’[[1188]](#footnote-1189)

In a later hearing, Minister Burch was also asked about the land being allocated for only educational purposes in 2009, and in response informed the Committee that:

the Chief Minister has responded to this, and it is very much on the public record, around the discussions and the decisions that were made on that land. One could argue that if an early education facility is built on the tennis courts there, it is indeed in keeping with the principles of an education facility.[[1189]](#footnote-1190)

In response to a further question from the Committee regarding why Telopea Park School was not consulted as part of this land release process, the Deputy Director-General of Organisational Integrity told the Committee:

The land is territory land that is currently used by the school for the tennis courts, but ultimately the land is owned by the territory for territory purposes. In order to achieve that broader territory outcome and the Manuka Oval broader precinct development, that land was released [from ETD]. The benefit for the school community is that they get significant investment in sporting and recreational facilities at the school that they would not have otherwise had.[[1190]](#footnote-1191)

Regarding the Committee’s concerns that the school may need to expand at a later date but now does not have the land in which to do so, the Director of Planning and Performance noted that Telopea Park School has sufficient land per student to manage their educational program, and current projections indicate no need for additional buildings on the Telopea Park School site. The Directorate feels that the addition of new sporting facilities enhances the current use of the land and facilities for students.[[1191]](#footnote-1192)

The Minister was asked about plans to demolish by December the tennis courts at Telopea Park School, currently on the land transferred to the LDA, despite the absence of a clear plan for the future of the site. The Minister advised that the best time to complete these works was through school holiday periods, to ensure they were ready for the next term.[[1192]](#footnote-1193)

The Director of Infrastructure and Capital Works stated that the Directorate is currently in a consultation phase with the school, enabling the school to contribute information towards a landscaping master plan. The school executive and board will then decide on a particular landscaping master plan option and preferred first stage works, with anticipated completion of the new facilities in place for commencement of the 2016 school year.[[1193]](#footnote-1194)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee was very concerned to hear about the lack of consultation regarding the transfer of Telopea Park School land to the LDA, and the subsequent lack of consultation regarding alternative sites for MOCCA. The Committee is also concerned about the lack of certainty for MOCCA regarding a new location and the financial impost this will have on both MOCCA and its clients.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government consult more closely with the affected parties in the Telopea Park/Manuka Occasional Child Care Association (MOCCA) land swap, to investigate in detail what other options might be available.

* + - 1. Universal Access program

Following an enquiry from the Committee, the Director of Learning and Teaching confirmed that whilst the Federal Government did extend funding for the Universal Access program until 2017, the offer has not yet been formalised by the Commonwealth.[[1194]](#footnote-1195)

The Minister informed the Committee that, should the national partnership not be continued, it could result in funding decrease of approximately $6 million.[[1195]](#footnote-1196)

The Director went on to state that under the existing funding agreement, targets were set for improvement under a staged rollout that would ensure every child receives 600 hours of care over the school year, delivered by a degree qualified early childhood teacher. However, there are fundamental issues and concerns that have been identified across jurisdictions with the data quality used by the Commonwealth to determine the various targets. With regards to the funding impact on Universal Access, the Director stated:

In the 2015 agreement the Australian government put in place that 40 per cent of funding would be withheld from states and territories that did not meet any one of the six targets that are part of the national partnership. It was a take it or leave it offer to states and territories. The ACT entered into the agreement knowing that there was a degree of risk that some of those targets were potentially unattainable because of the dataset being used and that there was some risk particularly around line of sight for teacher qualifications.

...

There is widespread concern that in some jurisdictions departments are not disbursing all the funding because they are fairly well assured that they are not going to receive all the funding. This is the disincentive that the Australian government is now addressing. We look forward to them addressing it through [the] negotiation process.[[1196]](#footnote-1197)

* 1. Public High School Education
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.2: Public High School Education, the Committee considered the following matters:

* feasibility studies regarding a secondary school component to the proposed P‑6 school in Taylor;[[1197]](#footnote-1198)
* target rates of year 12 students receiving a Tertiary Entrance Statement, including targets for year 12 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students;[[1198]](#footnote-1199)
* increased school participation and completion rates for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, supported by targeted programs and scholarships;[[1199]](#footnote-1200)
* targets and indicators for high school completion and acknowledgement of the variable pathways available to students after year 12 completion;[[1200]](#footnote-1201)
* expected timeframes and funding requirements for completion of Belconnen High School upgrades;[[1201]](#footnote-1202) and
* the capability of Wi-Fi in high schools and colleges where multiple devices are operated by students.[[1202]](#footnote-1203)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Target rates for Tertiary Entrance Statements

Questions were asked and answered regarding the target percentages for year 12 students who receive a Tertiary Entrance Statement (TES). The Committee questioned why the target percentages appeared to be relatively low. In response, the Director of the Office of the Board of Senior Secondary Studies noted that there are now multiple pathways available for students after school, such as further tertiary study, later entrance to tertiary study without a TES, apprenticeships, vocational courses or entering the workforce.[[1203]](#footnote-1204)

The Director-General later advised the Committee that:

[the targets are] acknowledging the value of a variety of pathways. With students who complete year 12, not all of them apply for the tertiary entrance statement. Our first policy lever is to make sure we have year 12 completion, acknowledging the variety and breadth of pathways. ... It is then looking at what are the pathways beyond year 12 so that we are increasing the qualification levels of our community.[[1204]](#footnote-1205)

In relation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students obtaining a TES, the Director of the Office of Board of Senior Secondary Studies explained to the Committee that the lower achieved and target rates reflect a significant increase in the number of such students enrolled in school but with no corresponding change in the rates of students completing year 12 and obtaining a TES.[[1205]](#footnote-1206)

The Deputy Director-General, Education Strategy informed the Committee of the various programs in place to support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students into tertiary education, for example the Aspirations Program and the Senior Secondary Scholarships Program.[[1206]](#footnote-1207)

* + - 1. Belconnen High School upgrades

The Minister was asked about the reasons for a change to the anticipated budget allocation for upgrades to Belconnen High School. An election commitment in 2012 stipulated that $28 million would be allocated for this project, but the 2015‑16 Budget provides $17.6 million.[[1207]](#footnote-1208)

The Minister responded that now the final details of the project have been determined, it can be delivered at the lower cost while still meeting the election commitment. The Director of Infrastructure and Capital Works stated that the funding will remove a disused building, modernise the music and arts areas, build a new administration block and a total refurbishment of the main building.[[1208]](#footnote-1209)

The Committee notes that funding of $2,000,000 for Stage 1 of the Belconnen High School modernisation was included in the 2013‑14 Budget. The 2014-15 Budget showed that $1,500,000 of this funding was re-profiled into 2014‑15, in addition to a one-off allocation of $250,000 for investment in improvements in the school and to build on the master planning work initiated in the 2013-14 Budget. The 2014‑15 Budget provided that the Stage 1 funding would provide for ‘building demolition, facilities upgrades and completion of the master planning in consultation with south Belconnen public school communities.’[[1209]](#footnote-1210)

* 1. Disability Education in Public Schools
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.4: Disability Education in Public Schools, the Committee considered the following matters:

* progress of the inquiry into the construction of an inappropriate withdrawal space in an ACT primary school, and the communication strategy for this issue;[[1210]](#footnote-1211)
* outcomes of the Healthcare Access At School (HAAS) program and identification of the participating schools;[[1211]](#footnote-1212)
* the assessment of a student’s medical needs to determine educational and assistance requirements;[[1212]](#footnote-1213)
* a review of the HAAS program implementation and the impact on nurses, teachers and learning support assistants of administering the HAAS program in schools;[[1213]](#footnote-1214)
* participation of students with disability in both specialist and mainstream schools, through the ACT’s Student-Centered Appraisal of Need (SCAN) model and the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS);[[1214]](#footnote-1215)
* interaction of the NDIS and other concurrent schemes in providing specialised transport for students with disability;[[1215]](#footnote-1216)
* the extension of special needs transport to non-government schools under the NDIS criteria;[[1216]](#footnote-1217)
* the reasons for increased funding for disability education in schools in 2015‑16;[[1217]](#footnote-1218)
* the assessment of the most suitable school setting for a student with disability, including investment in capital improvements to make reasonable adjustments to established schools (such as lifts or ramps);[[1218]](#footnote-1219) and
* the facilities and spaces available in schools to most appropriately address the learning or behavioural needs of students.[[1219]](#footnote-1220)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Use of an inappropriate withdrawal space

The Committee asked representatives of the Directorate what communication strategy had been adopted since the incident of a child being placed in an inappropriate withdrawal space, including what communication had occurred with the parents at the school involved. In response, the Director-General stated:

The communication strategy really is based on the privacy and welfare of individuals concerned, primarily the student and the family, but also staff members concerned. There is an HR investigation currently underway, and we need to have regard for the rigour of that process as well. In informing parents, we used the primary objective of making sure of the welfare of the students family and the staff involved.[[1220]](#footnote-1221)

The Director-General also advised the Committee that the school board, P&C president and executive, the specific student and family and members of the specific class grouping and their parents had been regularly advised of progress all throughout the inquiry. In addition, the Committee was advised by the Director-General that since the incident, the following actions and initiatives had been taken and implemented:

* establishing an inquiry into the use of an inappropriate withdrawal space;
* establishment of a telephone hotline and email address accessible by the whole ACT community;
* the encouragement by ACT school principals for direct questions from school communities on withdrawal spaces; and
* the establishment of an expert panel to look more broadly at how schools manage complex and challenging behaviours with students, including use of withdrawal spaces and the decision‑making process in such situations.[[1221]](#footnote-1222)

Later in the hearing, the Director-General provided further information to the Committee on the facilities and processes available in schools in relation to student separation options. The Director-General advised that options could vary from smaller groups, to an individual needing a separate space, an outdoor area or time with a learning support assistant, but did note that:

The priority for any teacher is to make sure, particularly around the more difficult students, if they are in a challenging circumstance, that they are always supervised and in line of sight and that there is assistance and support for that individual student at all times.[[1222]](#footnote-1223)

* + - * 1. The Inquiry

The Minister was asked to provide an explanation for the various delays of the investigation into construction of an inappropriate withdrawal space at an ACT primary school, the existence of which was first made public in April 2015.[[1223]](#footnote-1224)

The Minister advised the Committee that the inquiry was active and proceeding ‘with the same level of urgency with which it was initiated.’ The Minister went on to state that while she was personally frustrated with the length of time the inquiry was taking, it was important to take the necessary time to make sure the inquiry was completed properly and respectfully.[[1224]](#footnote-1225)

The Minister was asked to tender the terms of reference for the inquiry to the Committee. As the terms of reference form part of an active investigation, the Minister stated that the terms could not be released. This position was reiterated by the Director of People and Performance, who noted that the terms of reference were quite specific in this matter, and that:

we have a high reporting culture in the directorate and we build that culture by assuring participants of their welfare and their privacy. The terms of reference in HR investigations are not a matter for the public domain. We must maintain the welfare and the privacy of participants in this matter.

...

The assurance of privacy is a critical element of participation in matters such as this. Individuals are very unlikely to be involved in the process such as this if they are aware that their information will be in the public domain. So, no, we will not be releasing the terms of reference of this investigation or other HR investigations.[[1225]](#footnote-1226)

In response to a question about whether the findings of the inquiry will be publicly released, the Minister advised the Committee that as it was predominantly a HR review, some findings will be unable to be released to the public, but what can be made public will be.[[1226]](#footnote-1227)

* + - * 1. Delays to the inquiry

The Committee questioned why testimony given in relation to the inquiry on 16 June 2015 by the Acting Executive Director, Finance and HR Services, Shared Services was corrected later that day by the Under Treasurer.[[1227]](#footnote-1228) The Acting Executive Director had commented that the inquiry had, in part, been delayed due to staff leave and absences and involvement from the union.[[1228]](#footnote-1229)

The Under Treasurer clarified that the actual cause of the delay in the investigation ‘has been caused by the complexity of the case, the desire to do a thorough investigation and the request for additional information that we made, to complete the investigation.’[[1229]](#footnote-1230)

The Director of People and Performance further clarified that school holidays did not impact on the inquiry timeframes, and could not comment on why the Acting Executive Director of Finance and HR Services was under that impression. The Director noted that a small amount of information is still to be collected, but the Directorate is ‘doing everything we can to resolve the matter as quickly as possible.’[[1230]](#footnote-1231)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee acknowledges that this incident has caused considerable angst within the ACT community and particularly for families of children with disability.

The Committee is encouraged to hear of the options now available regarding communication channels available to the public.

The Committee is concerned with the delay of the ACT Government inquiry into the use of an inappropriate withdrawal space in an ACT school. [[1231]](#footnote-1232)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conclude its inquiry into the inappropriate withdrawal space in an ACT school expeditiously and provide an update to the Legislative Assembly within three sitting days of receipt.

If the report is not available for the August 2015 sittings, the Committee recommends that the ACT Government update the Assembly on progress to date.

* + - 1. Healthcare Access At School (HAAS)

The Minister and Directorate representatives clarified for the Committee the schools participating in the HAAS program, being a combination of specialist and mainstream schools, and detailed how HAAS was operating in ACT schools. The Minister also provided an explanation as to why ETD did not attend a briefing with Health regarding HAAS.[[1232]](#footnote-1233)

The Deputy Director-General of Education Strategy responded to claims that nurses and teachers had raised concerns and were troubled by having to deliver assistance to students outside of their duty statements. The Deputy Director-General was not aware of any reports or records indicating staff felt this way, and clarified that the duty statement for a learning assistance officer does include providing healthcare assistance if required, which would be based on a healthcare plan from a doctor or other healthcare professional.[[1233]](#footnote-1234)

The Committee was informed by the Deputy Director-General that a review was being conducted into the needs of children in special schools, that this will engage teachers, nurses and the relevant unions and will address concerns around the implementation of HAAS.[[1234]](#footnote-1235)

HAAS was discussed further with the Minister for Health on 17 June 2015. See Chapter 10 for relevant discussions.

* + - 1. transport for students with disability

In response to a question from the Committee, the Chief Finance Officer detailed the interaction of the ACT Government’s provision of special needs transport with the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS). The NDIS will extend special needs transport to all schools (government and non-government), and will differ from the current system as it will be based on need, rather than setting.[[1235]](#footnote-1236)

The Director-General noted to the Committee that as the transition is made to NDIS and the pilot program ends, the ACT needs to ensure it negotiates ‘a model that would allow us to look at economies of scale, efficiencies and effectiveness of that for our families.’[[1236]](#footnote-1237)

* 1. Non-Government School Education
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 2.1: Non-Government School Education, the Committee considered the following matters:

* percentage of the budget allocated to non-government schools through payment of grants and under the National Education Reform Agreement (NERA);[[1237]](#footnote-1238)
* the impact on the non-government schools sector of Commonwealth changes to the Gonski funding program and School Resourcing Standard;[[1238]](#footnote-1239)
* government programs that are accessible by both non-government and government students and teachers across the ACT;[[1239]](#footnote-1240)
* the prevalence of home schooling in the ACT and the associated regulatory framework;[[1240]](#footnote-1241)
* interactions between ETD, the former Non-Government Schools Education Council and other representatives of the non-government schools sector;[[1241]](#footnote-1242) and
* non-government school involvement in safe schools frameworks.[[1242]](#footnote-1243)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Funding to non‑government schools

The Committee asked what percentage of the total budget for non-government schools relates to grants, and whether the government was considering increasing this percentage. The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that, as with prior years, the percentage remains around 18 per cent.[[1243]](#footnote-1244)

The Minister and the Chief Finance Officer explained the breakdown of this funding, and confirmed that there were no plans to change the current funding arrangement or percentage. It was also noted that funding is supported in part by the needs-based National Education Reform Agreement (NERA), to which the Commonwealth Government has only committed to until the end of 2018.[[1244]](#footnote-1245)

In response to a question from the Committee regarding Commonwealth changes to the Gonski funding in the outyears for non-government schools, the Chief Finance Officer advised that the estimated loss per annum to the ACT Catholic system is approximately $4 million, with a $1 million loss to ACT independent schools and $2 million to ACT public schools.[[1245]](#footnote-1246)

Further discussion followed regarding the impact of these funding changes and how the Commonwealth funding programs will be calculated and applied over the forward estimates.[[1246]](#footnote-1247)

* + - 1. Non-Government Schools Education Council

The Minister responded to questions regarding the frequency of meetings between the now ceased Non-Government Schools Education Council and ETD. The Minister detailed that discussions with the Council included, among other things, issues around the Australian curriculum, needs-based funding and undergraduate teacher training.[[1247]](#footnote-1248)

The Minister further detailed the other opportunities available for formal engagement between the non-government schools sector and ETD, including regular meetings attended by the Director-General with the Catholic Education Office, Independent Schools ACT, Australian Education Union and Independent Education Union.[[1248]](#footnote-1249)

The Minister responded to questions about the closure of both the Government Schools Education Council and the Non-Government Schools Education Council, providing advice to the Committee regarding future opportunites:

An announcement has been made that the next advisory council will have a focus on digital citizenship. ... There will be a very small committee and there will be a reference group or advisory group wrapped around that. That will involve teachers, principals, parents, business and experts in the field. That is the structure I am looking at for this upcoming ministerial advisory group.

... there are also broader opportunities for this group or for me to lead and initiate more public forums on particular topics.[[1249]](#footnote-1250)

The Minister stated her position that the previous Council structures were artificially divided, while the preferred approach is cohesive and cross-sectorial, ensuring that ‘parents, families and teachers come together for student outcomes.’[[1250]](#footnote-1251), [[1251]](#footnote-1252)

* 1. Vocational Education and Training
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 3.1: Planning and Coordination of Vocational Education and Training Services, the Committee considered the following matters:

* the existence, enrolment levels and funding of vocational education programs in ACT public schools and colleges;[[1252]](#footnote-1253)
* evaluation of vocational education and training outcomes;[[1253]](#footnote-1254)
* interaction of vocational education students, industry and the community to address future training needs and requests;[[1254]](#footnote-1255)
* the cost of vocational education and training;[[1255]](#footnote-1256)
* delivery and administration of skill development programs and the Adult and Community Education Program;[[1256]](#footnote-1257)
* changes in Commonwealth funding for vocational education and training and the impact of these changes to ACT programs;[[1257]](#footnote-1258)
* the ACT presence and regulation of Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) and how these operate with interstate providers;[[1258]](#footnote-1259) and
* accountability indicators and the impact on yearly targets of external factors such as employer and consumer confidence and Commonwealth policy changes.[[1259]](#footnote-1260)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Vocational Education and Training system

The Committee enquired about the interaction of students, industry and the community in determining future vocational training needs and requests.[[1260]](#footnote-1261)

In response, the Director‑General advised the Committee that:

The Education and Training Directorate supports the minister in policy advice around vocational education and training. We have recently, in the last 12 months, released different discussion papers on vocational education and training in the ACT including our Skilled Capital initiatives as part of [the] $21 million that we put towards our Skilled Capital initiatives. The money goes towards supporting training. Money is also passed on to CIT to support training in the ACT.

...

We have a regular, quarterly RTO forum each term, each quarter, where we bring all the RTO stakeholders together to talk about what is happening in national reform directions and what is happening in the ACT.[[1261]](#footnote-1262)

The Director of Training and Tertiary Education also provided commentary to the Committee on this issue including: how VET qualifications are delivered to address industry needs and through industry consultation; the administration of the Australian Apprenticeships program, and how modelling can assist with highlighting the skill needs within the ACT.[[1262]](#footnote-1263)

The Committee engaged in further discussion with Directorate representatives regarding the presence and activities of registered training organisations in the ACT, covering interjurisdictional issues, funding agreements and regulation.[[1263]](#footnote-1264)

* + - 1. Funding issues

The Committee enquired about the impact and pressures of Commonwealth funding changes on ACT vocational training and education systems.[[1264]](#footnote-1265)

The Director of Training and Tertiary Education advised the Committee that Commonwealth funding supports direct incentives to employers, provides trade loans to apprentices and supports the Australian Apprenticeship Support Network. The Director noted that funding was currently provided until 2017 and the sector was keen to ensure that the Commonwealth has no intention to change the current commitments and ‘would be very concerned that any further changes that the Commonwealth was seeking to make would potentially change or have them pulling back from the commitment under that current agreement.’[[1265]](#footnote-1266)

* 1. Canberra Institute of Technology
     1. Introduction

The Canberra Institute of Technology (CIT) and its wholly owned subsidiary CIT Solutions Pty Ltd provide vocational education and training through a distinct Output Class and Output – Output Class 1: Canberra Institute of Technology; Output 1.1: Provision of Vocational Education and Training Services.[[1266]](#footnote-1267)

* + 1. Matters considered

The Committee considered the following matters in relation to the Canberra Institute of Technology (CIT):

* use of Commonwealth and ACT funding for the new Foundation Skills Training Package qualifications;[[1267]](#footnote-1268)
* economic activity generated by CIT through education, appeal to international students and job creation;[[1268]](#footnote-1269)
* work to establish CIT’s Bruce campus as a centre for excellence regarding renewable energy industries;[[1269]](#footnote-1270)
* the timeframe for the appointment of a new CIT Chief Executive Officer;[[1270]](#footnote-1271)
* the development of a new CIT campus in Tuggeranong, including staffing and student capacity;[[1271]](#footnote-1272)
* modernisation strategies for CIT campuses across the ACT;[[1272]](#footnote-1273)
* the impact of CIT campus modernisation strategies on CIT Woden teaching staff;[[1273]](#footnote-1274)
* expenditure of budget allocations for CIT Bruce campus upgrades;[[1274]](#footnote-1275)
* Auslan certification course uptake, promotion, participation targets and nominal hours;[[1275]](#footnote-1276)
* delivery of the electrotechnology course, including rectification of any training issues and the process of appointment of a new head of electrotechnology;[[1276]](#footnote-1277)
* cases of alleged bullying or workplace harassment over the past 18 months;[[1277]](#footnote-1278) and
* acknowledgment of the work of previous CIT Chief Executive Officer, Mr Adrian Marron.[[1278]](#footnote-1279)

The Committee considered the following matters in relation to CIT Solutions Pty Ltd:

* short courses offered and utilised by the Canberra community each year;[[1279]](#footnote-1280) and
* the benefits of partnerships with CIT Solutions and large ACT employers such as the Department of Defence.[[1280]](#footnote-1281)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Modernisation strategy

In response to questions from the Committee about the plans for CIT campuses across the ACT, the Chief Operating Officer of Corporate Services advised:

The campus modernisation strategy is about a long-term vision for CIT’s assets. It is about producing fit-for-purpose, contemporary, modern facilities for our students and our clients. We all know that the majority of our campuses, especially Woden, are very old and dated. They cost a considerable amount of money to maintain. Our focus in modernising our assets is on getting rid of the old ones that are costing us a lot of money to maintain and building new ones that are fit for purpose and really suitable for our students moving forward.

They will also be a lot cheaper to run, which releases recurrent money that we can put back into teaching or resources for teaching rather than wasting it on facilities. The strategy is all about moving off so many large campuses to more non-estate-based campuses—more building-type arrangements rather than spread-out campuses which cost a lot of money to maintain.[[1281]](#footnote-1282)

In addition to this, the Acting Chief Executive answered questions from the Committee regarding the $1.7 million budget allocation for refurbishments to the Bruce CIT campus. The Committee was informed that Bruce is being considered for refurbishment in health sciences and children’s education and care departments, but that the final specifications are still to be determined.[[1282]](#footnote-1283)

* + - 1. New campus: CIT Tuggeranong

The Committee asked CIT representatives about further details concerning the announcement of a new CIT campus at Tuggeranong, which is currently forecast for opening in 2016.[[1283]](#footnote-1284)

The Executive Director of People and Organisational Governance provided detail to the Committee about the new campus, stating:

We are looking to achieve two outcomes with the expansion of CIT in Tuggeranong. Firstly, we are looking to offer CIT services to the people that are living in that locality. We are also looking to attract activity into the Tuggeranong area to support businesses that are located in that area so that they can be more sustainable.

...

CIT Tuggeranong will have a focus on business and innovation, aligned with the general government direction. We are looking to work with the CBR Innovation Network to deliver programs, be they new programs that we will develop for that purpose or existing qualifications to support other entrepreneurs and start-ups.[[1284]](#footnote-1285)

The Executive Director advised the Committee that with a 12 month lead‑in time until the campus opens, there should be an instant volume of students from the first enrolments. At any one time, up to 330 students will be able to attend the new campus, in addition to the courses run by CIT Solutions, some of which are held after hours. There will be approximately six core teaching staff with some support services, and a total floor space of 1,665m2.[[1285]](#footnote-1286)

* + - 1. Woden campus

Concerns were raised regarding the remaining staff levels at the Woden campus following the opening of Tuggeranong, and in light of plans to modernise and relocate the Woden campus as it is no longer considered fit for purpose.[[1286]](#footnote-1287)

The Executive Director stated that:

[W]e are really committed to maintaining a presence at Woden, and there will be a staged transition from Woden campus that will take place during 2016. We are looking to construct that with minimal disruption to students. Some of that timing will depend on when we can find suitable alternative accommodation for the program areas.

Whilst we might aim for some time during 2016, it will depend on a number of factors. Ultimately, we are looking to have that presence at Woden located in the town centre, so that there is improved accessibility for students. At this point there has been nowhere that has been identified as suitable. But that is the ultimate vision.[[1287]](#footnote-1288)

* + - 1. Auslan courses

The Committee asked a number of questions regarding the target hours for Certificate II in Auslan, which in 2014 had a budget target of 1,000 nominal hours yet zero hours in 2015.[[1288]](#footnote-1289)

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that until very recently, CIT understood that the course wouldn’t be available to new students due to lapse in accreditation, however this accreditation has now been extended across all Auslan courses for a further 12 months. Accordingly, no target has been set for 2016.[[1289]](#footnote-1290)

The Committee also questioned why the Certificate III in Auslan had 1,000 nominal hours in 2014, but was increased tenfold to 10,000 in 2015.[[1290]](#footnote-1291) The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the hours reflect the rollover from those completing the Certificate II. However, the enrolments in these two courses were unknown.[[1291]](#footnote-1292)

The Deputy Chief Executive explained to the Committee that discussions were currently taking place regarding what programs would be run in 2016. The decision to run both the Certificate II and Certificate III in Auslan in 2016 will need to be made before the CIT open day as this will determine what courses are advertised.[[1292]](#footnote-1293)

Following the hearings, CIT provided the Committee with extensive information on the Auslan courses run by CIT, including accreditation, cost and expenses and hours of interpreting.[[1293]](#footnote-1294)

The Committee questioned the availability of Auslan courses at other providers, and how this correlates to the courses on offer at CIT. The Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that CIT Solutions does provide Certificate I courses, and that the Deaf Society of New South Wales is a registered training organisation for the delivery of Certificates II, III, IV and the diploma.[[1294]](#footnote-1295)

* + - * 1. Committee Comment:

The Committee highlights the importance of providing Auslan courses at both CIT Solutions level (Auslan I and Auslan II) as well as CIT certificate level II and III, especially in light of the NDIS. This would ensure a pathway within the ACT for people interested in progressing to Interpreter level courses.

The Committee recommends that the Canberra Institute of Technology ensure that Auslan Certificate II and III courses are offered to ensure communication access for Deaf people in the ACT by providing a pathway to Interpreting courses.

* + - 1. Electrotechnology course

The Deputy Chief Executive of CIT responded to questions regarding the delivery of the electrotechnology course, confirming that CIT staff are trained to the appropriate standards for both the national regulator and for the industry regulator requirements. The Deputy Chief Executive also stated that the course does deliver the full complement of training that is required under current laws.[[1295]](#footnote-1296)

Under further questioning, the Minister informed the Committee that:

CIT electrical trades teaching staff are skilled and qualified in meeting the requirements of the training package, ACT industry regulation and the ACT public service CIT teaching staff enterprise agreement.[[1296]](#footnote-1297)

Questions were asked and answered regarding the appointment process for the new head of electotechnology at CIT. CIT later confirmed that this position was advertised through normal ACT Government channels, and detailed how many applications were received, shortlisted and proceeded to interview. A merit‑selection process was undertaken through a Joint Selection Committee consisting of five panel members.[[1297]](#footnote-1298)

* + - 1. Bullying and workplace harassment

The Minister responded to enquiries regarding incidences of workplace bullying and harassment at CIT over the previous 18 month period. The Minister stated:

As a result of complaints raised with the Commissioner for Public Administration in 2012, CIT was required to take no further action. There are currently no investigations in progress relating to inappropriate workplace behaviour of CIT employees. Since January of 2013, five staff complaints or issues have resulted in one preliminary assessment and investigation procedures within the enterprise agreement. As a result of these processes, I think three staff have been counselled in relation to inappropriate behaviour.[[1298]](#footnote-1299)

CIT later provided information that since 22 December 2013, CIT has addressed three claims of bullying. Of these, two required no further action under the Enterprise Agreement and one claim remains outstanding and procedures are in progress.[[1299]](#footnote-1300)

* 1. ACT Building and Construction Industry Training Fund Authority
     1. Introduction

The ACT Building and Construction Industry Training Fund Authority (BCITFA) administers the Building and Construction Industry Training Fund. This fund is financed by a levy on the building and construction industry, and BCITFA makes payments from this fund to provide training to eligible workers.[[1300]](#footnote-1301)

* + 1. Matters considered

On 22 June 2015 the Committee considered the following matters relating to the ACT Building and Construction Industry Training Fund Authority (BCITFA):

* the ongoing funding and participation of trainees in the asbestos awareness training program;[[1301]](#footnote-1302)
* the impact of asbestos training on various aspects of the fund, including audit requirements, time restraints and increased costs;[[1302]](#footnote-1303)
* programs and initiatives for the participation of women in the building and construction industry;[[1303]](#footnote-1304)
* the completion of registered training organisation audits to ensure compliance with the eligibility criteria for funding and the quality of the training delivery;[[1304]](#footnote-1305)
* the historically consistent level of available funds ($2.850 million) for the BCITFA, with an expected increased requirement to approximately $4.2 million this year as a result of the asbestos awareness program;[[1305]](#footnote-1306)
* the shift in the industry to shorter, refresher‑style training, resulting in shorter courses but with higher participation numbers and less anticipated cost;[[1306]](#footnote-1307)
* the funding by BCITFA to implement initiatives as a result of the *Getting Home Safely* report, with recent significant focus on cultural change training and development of a onsite supervision program;[[1307]](#footnote-1308)
* the level of staff in BCITFA and the current redevelopment and upgrade of the fund’s website and content management system;[[1308]](#footnote-1309) and
* how the fund enables small and medium‑sized businesses to invest in training at a time that is most suitable for the business.[[1309]](#footnote-1310)

# Environment and Planning

* + 1. Introduction

The Environment and Planning Directorate (the Directorate) promotes sustainable living and resource use, strengthens the Territory’s response to climate change and provides an integrated planning and land use system that contributes to the sustainable development and future of the ACT.[[1310]](#footnote-1311)

The Directorate’s aim is to lead the Territory in developing and implementing targeted policies and programs that address environment protection and sustainability, nature conservation, heritage, water and energy security, building safety, sustainable urban design, and sustainable and integrated transport and spatial planning, policy and delivery.[[1311]](#footnote-1312)

The Committee considered the following Outputs and Output Classes:

* Output Class 1: Planning:
* Output 1.2: Planning Delivery;
* Output 1.3: Strategic Planning;
* Output 1.4: Heritage;
* Output Class 2 Environment:
* Output 2.1: Environment;
* Output 2.2: Strategic Planning;
* Output 2.3: Sustainability and Climate Change; and
* Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment.

The Committee met with the Minister for Planning, the Minister for the Environment and the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment on 23 June 2015.

* 1. Planning Delivery and Strategic Planning
     1. 1.2 Planning Delivery

Planning Delivery facilitates and manages growth and change within the ACT through development assessment and leasehold management, with the overarching objective of promoting and facilitating economically productive, sustainable, attractive, safe and well designed urban and rural environments in the ACT.[[1312]](#footnote-1313)

* + 1. 1.3 Strategic Planning

Strategic planning is responsible for the provision of high quality professional services in strategic and land planning, sustainable transport planning (including *Building an Integrated Transport Network*) and planning for land release that encourages high quality urban design.[[1313]](#footnote-1314)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.2 and 1.3: Planning, the Committee considered the following matters:

* solar access provisions;[[1314]](#footnote-1315)
* planning facilitating “ageing in place”;[[1315]](#footnote-1316)
* review of the Territory Plan;[[1316]](#footnote-1317)
* establishment of Access Canberra and resulting numbers of staff transferred from EPD;[[1317]](#footnote-1318)
* on-line lodgement of Development Applications;[[1318]](#footnote-1319)
* development Application disputes and appeals;[[1319]](#footnote-1320)
* westside Acton Park;[[1320]](#footnote-1321)
* Yarralumla Brickworks redevelopment;[[1321]](#footnote-1322)
* Throsby, the associated roles for both EPD and the LDA and pre‑consultation on government development proposals;[[1322]](#footnote-1323)
* DOMA project in Dickson;[[1323]](#footnote-1324)
* Woden pitch ‘n’ putt course;[[1324]](#footnote-1325)
* Woden master plan and amount of retail space in the Territory per capita;[[1325]](#footnote-1326)
* redevelopment of section 63 site and the payment of commence and complete fees;[[1326]](#footnote-1327)
* progress on extension of the Canberra Centre;[[1327]](#footnote-1328)
* urban design in Capital Metro corridor in Gungahlin and Northbourne, and EPD’s involvement through various projects;[[1328]](#footnote-1329)
* the Belconnen Master Plan;[[1329]](#footnote-1330)
* seeking works approval for Capital Metro;[[1330]](#footnote-1331) and
* heritage listings and the National Trust, and the cost to government of court proceedings.[[1331]](#footnote-1332)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Solar Access Provisions

Draft Variation to the Territory Plan 306 (DV306) went into effect in 2013 and introduced policy changes to all forms of development in residential zones and subdivision of land. One of the changes was the introduction of solar access provisions. Officials told the Committee that, following monitoring and review of how the provisions were operating, EPD would be making recommendations to the Minister on whether there are different ways of achieving the desired policy outcomes.[[1332]](#footnote-1333)

Officials noted that, in response to industry feedback, they were looking at simplifying development codes to make it easy for industry to work with. Officials were also reviewing the height and depth of the solar fence provisions to see whether they are appropriate.[[1333]](#footnote-1334)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the strong concern from industry groups about the impact of solar access provisions. The Committee is concerned about other poor outcomes that can arise including design flaws and increased cost. While acknowledging the environmental and energy efficiency benefits from construction that accounts for solar access, the Committee is concerned about the significant costs that may be involved in meeting the current requirements. Increased construction and development costs can negatively impact upon housing affordability in the Territory.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government reconsider DV306 with regard to solar access and report on the review to the Legislative Assembly.

* + - 1. Urban Design along Capital Metro Stage 1 corridor

The Minister and officials outlined some of the urban design work along the light rail corridor. In certain sections, and particularly around the Gungahlin Town Centre, there will be an emphasis on increased ‘pedestrianisation’. This may involve fully ‘pedestrianising’ parts of streets or a shareway model similar to that in Bunda Street.[[1334]](#footnote-1335)

Northbourne Avenue is currently ill‑suited for pedestrians with long blocks with poor access and poor lighting. EPD is looking at ways of encouraging pedestrians to the area. The Executive Director of Strategic Planning informed the Committee that:

There is about a kilometre on each side of Northbourne and we are looking at the potential intensification of the corridor.

It is a long way across the road itself, and up the corridor. We have done a number of targeted consultations currently, and we will go out later this year for more formal consultations, looking at some east-west villages that would be built at the human scale—very walkable, and joining up the west and east sides of Northbourne.

One of the issues along Northbourne is that some of those blocks are a couple of kilometres long, so to actually get around it and onto the corridor can mean maybe a 15 or 20-minute walk. A recommendation, as the government looks to redevelop those sites, will be that you have dedicated walkways and pedestrian wings so that you can get from, say, Dickson onto the corridor.

That work will also include Civic—the city. Part of the implementation of the city plan is to look at the pedestrianisation, the pedestrian links, around the city. We have had a special study done of what it takes to encourage people to walk. Currently, if you are walking from Civic to the ANU, you are spending as much time waiting at traffic lights as it takes to walk. So it might be a 20-minute walk but you are standing still for maybe 10 to 12 minutes of that time. We are looking at ways to minimise the wait times, to have a more pedestrian feel, to encourage people to walk across what currently is a bit of a divide down the city, which is Northbourne.

That work will also talk about building bulk and what the opportunity is for development down the corridor, so that we can phase the development of the corridor in a sensible way to complement development we are doing in other parts of the city, and how it might connect to the west basin proposal.[[1335]](#footnote-1336)

The Committee was advised that EPD will talk with the National Capital Authority about rules which encourage interesting urban design and diverse housing opportunities. Much of the planning work along Northbourne Avenue would need to happen regardless of the light rail project, due to already occurring intensification in the area.[[1336]](#footnote-1337)

* + - 1. Light Rail Master Plan

The Committee questioned the progress of the Light Rail Master Plan. The Committee heard that the light rail master plan, which will scope the whole of the ACT for light rail in the future, is ‘almost at fruition’.[[1337]](#footnote-1338)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the level of public interest in the proposed changes to the urban design along Northbourne Avenue.

The Committee also notes the level of public interest in the proposed Light Rail Master Plan.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government table the Light Rail Master Plan within three sitting days of its completion and receipt.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government update the Legislative Assembly on progress regarding design along the light rail corridor.

* + - 1. Ageing in Place

On 12 June 2015, the Committee heard from the National Seniors Australia’s ACT Policy Advisory Group about the need for appropriate housing facilities and options for ageing Canberrans. (See Chapter 2 for an overview of those concerns and associated recommendations).

* 1. Heritage
     1. 1.4 Heritage

Heritage has a responsibility to administer the heritage provisions of the *Heritage Act 2004* and provide assist to the conservation of the ACT’s heritage assets. The area provides administrative and operational support to the ACT Heritage Council and its projects, and administers the annual funding of the ACT Heritage Grants Program. [[1338]](#footnote-1339)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.4 Heritage, the Committee considered the following matters:

* Heritage role in Northbourne Avenue Urban Renewal developments;[[1339]](#footnote-1340)
* National Trust challenge to Heritage decision on Dickson flats;[[1340]](#footnote-1341)
* scarred tree in Namadji National Park;[[1341]](#footnote-1342)
* budget for Heritage and signage around heritage sites;[[1342]](#footnote-1343)
* heritage listed Mr Fluffy affected properties;[[1343]](#footnote-1344)
* Heritage advice to LDA regarding Yarralumla Brickworks;[[1344]](#footnote-1345)
* heritage trail in Tuggeranong;[[1345]](#footnote-1346)
* outstanding heritage registration proposals;[[1346]](#footnote-1347)
* Hill Station in Hume;[[1347]](#footnote-1348)
* Rose Cottage.[[1348]](#footnote-1349)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Dickson Flats

The ACT Heritage Council is an independent statutory body. In February 2015 the Heritage Council decided to list the Northbourne housing precinct and register it as a heritage precinct. The registration covered five buildings within the precinct and included samples of each of the five types of housing in the precinct. The National Trust, a private interest group, preferred that the entire precinct be listed and sought to challenge the Council’s decision in ACAT.

Following a heritage listing there is a 28 day period in which to make a submission challenging it. Due to an administrative error, ACT Heritage Council advertised a closing date for submissions two days after the end of the 28 day period. The National Trust made its submission within the advertised time frame but outside the statutory period and ACAT ruled that they were therefore not an interested party able to challenge the heritage registration.[[1349]](#footnote-1350)

In a separate but related matter, The National Trust is challenging the development application to demolish a number of buildings in the precinct. This is a third party appeal to ACAT and the National Trust’s ability to pursue that is not affected by the decision on its standing to challenge the heritage registration.[[1350]](#footnote-1351)

* + - 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that the ability of the National Trust to make its case on the heritage registration has been restricted. The Committee believes that that ACT Heritage Council should review the 28 day notification period to avoid the confusion that National Trust had when the advertising period was held up for two days.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Heritage Council ensure that, when advertising Heritage decisions, it is made clear as to what the closing date for comment and/or appeal is.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Heritage Council review the guidelines for notification periods for heritage listings.

* 1. Environment
     1. 2.1 Environment

The *Environment and Planning Directorate Budget Statements 2015-16* states that this Output helps protect the ACT’s natural environment through:

* the implementation of programs responding to natural resource management as part of the Commonwealth’s *National Landcare Program*;
* manage, review and implementation of legislation/action plans to help protect native land and species;
* sustainable use of water, including *Striking the Balance*, the ACT’s Water Strategy;
* establish an ACT catchment management governance framework;
* administer the annual funding of the ACT Environment Grants Program;
* policy development of regulatory activities to protect and enhance the natural and built environment; and
* promotion and education of the community regarding the ACT’s natural environment. [[1351]](#footnote-1352)
  + 1. 2.3 Sustainability and Climate Change (Including Conservator of Flora and Fauna)

The *Environment and Planning Directorate Budget Statements 2015-16* states that this Output develops policy, provides advice and delivers programs in relation to:

* ACT Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan – AP2;
* investments in renewable energy through a Feed-in-Tariff;
* energy efficiency measures, including administration of the Actsmart and Outreach programs; and
* administration of the ACT’s Carbon Neutral ACT and Energy Efficiency (Cost of Living) Improvement Scheme. [[1352]](#footnote-1353)
  + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 2.1 Environment and 2.3 Sustainability and Climate Change, the Committee considered the following matters:

* changes and decreases to funding;[[1353]](#footnote-1354)
* renewable energy and employment in that sector;[[1354]](#footnote-1355)
* changes to Commonwealth environment programs;[[1355]](#footnote-1356)
* staff changes within EPD;[[1356]](#footnote-1357)
* kangaroo fertility management trial;[[1357]](#footnote-1358)
* volunteer organisations including Waterwatch and Frogwatch programs;[[1358]](#footnote-1359)
* catchment Management;[[1359]](#footnote-1360)
* environmental offsets in new developments;[[1360]](#footnote-1361)
* ACTSmart accreditation;[[1361]](#footnote-1362)
* Environment and Planning Directorate’s role in asbestos contamination issues;[[1362]](#footnote-1363)
* household solar panels;[[1363]](#footnote-1364)
* policy development of regulatory activities in cooperation with Access Canberra;[[1364]](#footnote-1365)
* energy efficiency measures;[[1365]](#footnote-1366)
* residential battery storage developments;[[1366]](#footnote-1367)
* outreach program for low income households;[[1367]](#footnote-1368)
* Energy Efficiency Improvement Scheme;[[1368]](#footnote-1369)
* Threatened Species Action plans and investigations undertaken in the past 12 months;[[1369]](#footnote-1370)
* cost of reaching 90 per cent renewable target;[[1370]](#footnote-1371)
* one stop shop for environmental approvals;[[1371]](#footnote-1372)
* threats to ACT flora and fauna;[[1372]](#footnote-1373)
* climate change impacts on the ACT;[[1373]](#footnote-1374) and
* cat containment.[[1374]](#footnote-1375)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Renewable Energy

The Minister outlined developments in renewable energy in the ACT. Expressions of interest for the next generation solar project close in July 2015. It is estimated the project will generate an additional 50 megawatts of renewable energy and will contribute to the 90 percent renewable energy target by 2020 the renewable energy industry development strategy which intends to encourage further research and innovation in the ACT through existing businesses, new start-ups and tertiary institutions. There are opportunities for the ACT in the field of hands-on training for renewable energy technologies.[[1375]](#footnote-1376)

The Committee asked the Minister about recently released figures from the Energy Supply Association of Australia regarding the total cost per household of the ACT reaching 90 per cent renewable energy use. The cost determined by the Association reflected different figures to those forecast by the government.[[1376]](#footnote-1377) The Minister responded that:

the government’s projections to date have been confirmed by the pass-through costs that have been conferred by the electricity price regulators. For example, in relation to the estimated cost of the first round of the large-scale solar auction, we made estimates around that at the time based on the prices received by the winning bidders. Those costs have subsequently been passed through to consumers through a decision of the price regulator, and the government’s assumptions and calculations were proven to be accurate.

I think we have a good track record of being able to identify what the potential price impacts are. Those have been confirmed by the regulator when it has come to previous pass-through decisions. That indicates to me that we have a robust methodology for estimating these cost price pass-throughs.[[1377]](#footnote-1378)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government examine the alternative analysis by the Energy Supply Association of Australia of future costs of the ACT’s renewable energy policy and confirm if the Government’s projections are still valid; and report its findings to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in November 2016.

* 1. Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment

The Commissioner is an independent statutory position established by the *Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment Act 1993*.[[1378]](#footnote-1379)

* + 1. Matters considered
* complaint about use of unleased public land;[[1379]](#footnote-1380)
* budget;[[1380]](#footnote-1381) and
* self-referral of complaints.[[1381]](#footnote-1382)

The Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment provided information to the Committee on, among other things, the progress of complaint settlement and new complaints received, the State of the Environment Report, and whether the Commissioner would self‑refer an investigation into the removal of trees from the Northbourne Avenue Corridor for the construction of light rail.[[1382]](#footnote-1383)

In light of the Commissioner’s then imminent retirement, the Committee provided the Commissioner with the opportunity to provide advice for his successors to follow. In response, the Commissioner said:

My dearest wish would be to see a genuine optimisation of environmental, social and economic outcomes in decisions that the Assembly makes on behalf of the community.[[1383]](#footnote-1384)

# Health

* + 1. Introduction

The *ACT Budget Statement C 2015-16* states that the Health Directorate ‘partners with the community and consumers for better health outcomes’ by:

* delivering patient and family centred care;
* strengthening partnerships;
* promoting good health and wellbeing;
* improving access to appropriate healthcare; and
* having robust safety and quality systems.[[1384]](#footnote-1385)

The Directorate provides health services under Output Class 1: Health and Community Care, at a budgeted total cost for the 2015-16 financial year of $1.253 billion, of which government payment for Outputs makes up $264 million.

The ACT Local Hospital Network (LHN) was established under the *Health Act 1993*, and is administered by the Director-General of the Health Directorate and supported by staff from the Health Directorate.[[1385]](#footnote-1386)

The ACT LHN receives Activity Based Funding (ABF) from both the Commonwealth and the ACT Governments, and block funding for teaching, training and research. It purchases public hospital services from four ACT public hospital providers:

* Canberra Hospital;
* Calvary Public Hospital;
* Clare Holland House; and
* Queen Elizabeth II Family Centre. [[1386]](#footnote-1387)

The ACT Local Hospital Network Council is also established under the *Health Act 1993* and provides advice to the Director-General of the Health Directorate on the clinical and corporate governance framework needed to improve standards of patient care and services provided through the LHN, and on ways to support, encourage and facilitate community and clinician involvement in the planning of health services within the LHN.[[1387]](#footnote-1388)

The Committee met with the Minister for Health, Mr Simon Corbell MLA and Health officials on Wednesday 17 June 2015.

* 1. General
     1. Matters considered

The Committee considered the following general matters:

* Health staffing and intensive review of training culture in the Canberra Hospital;[[1388]](#footnote-1389)
* Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment targets and current employment levels within the Health Directorate, including recruitment approach;[[1389]](#footnote-1390)
* impact on ACT Health service delivery and overall budget from the shift to a population-based funding model including NSW-ACT cross-border agreements;[[1390]](#footnote-1391) and
* total Commonwealth funding from 2013-14 to 2016-17.[[1391]](#footnote-1392)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Review of Training Culture in the Canberra Hospital

The Committee sought information on training culture in ACT hospitals and was advised by the Minister that:

It is the case, as we know, that there have been a number of issues raised nationally when it comes to the training of junior medical specialists. Junior medical specialists undertake training in our hospitals to become consultant specialists in their own right. We have seen, for example, the recent reporting from Four Corners about poor behaviour on the part of certain specialists in hospitals interstate when it comes to the training environment they provide for junior medical officers.

We have seen similar concerns raised here in the ACT. The maternity services concerns are a good example of that where there was significant discord and what I would characterise as not healthy relationships at that time between trainees and the senior medical staff involved in the training.

I believe it is absolutely critical that we ensure that we have a positive and respectful training environment for our future medical specialists. The issues in the maternity services area are an example of where that environment can go wrong. So today I am announcing, Ms Fitzharris, that I have instructed my director-general to commence an immediate review of the training culture inside the Canberra Hospital to make sure that respectful and professional relationships are being sustained and maintained, and that our existing policies and programs are being effectively implemented—and, if they are not, to look at what we can do to make sure that they are.[[1392]](#footnote-1393)

The Committee further heard from the Director-General that the review of training culture would be started immediately and would be an independent external review.[[1393]](#footnote-1394) The review is to be conducted over three or four weeks and will be ‘fast, deep and responsive’,[[1394]](#footnote-1395) with recommendations to be made ‘to ensure that the training culture remains a positive one, productive and develops the clinical and professional skills that we need to see in our future clinical leaders.’[[1395]](#footnote-1396)

The Minister advised that he had no problem with publicly releasing the document, subject to seeing what is in it and what conclusions it draws.[[1396]](#footnote-1397)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is pleased that the ACT Government has taken steps to review the medical training culture at the Canberra Hospital and awaits the outcomes of the review.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider provide the results of the independent review of medical training culture at the Canberra Hospital to the Legislative Assembly within three months of receipt.

* + - 1. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment

In response to the Committee’s questions about the level of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment in ACT Health, the Minister advised that:

as of March this year there are 85 employees in ACT Health who self-identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander. That is an increase from the previous figure of 78. We have a target of two per cent for people in the ACT public service as a whole who are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent, and at the moment our workforce is at 1.1 per cent.[[1397]](#footnote-1398)

The Committee heard that the Directorate employs an inclusion manager to manage this issue and the employment of people with a disability, and has strategies for employment at all classification levels. [[1398]](#footnote-1399) The Committee was advised that recruitment is decentralised and the People and Strategy Services branch provides an advisory role, particularly through the inclusion manager, to ensure the business units are aware of the targets.[[1399]](#footnote-1400)

On notice, the Minister further advised that the target set by Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate for June 2015 is 81 employees, so the Health target has been exceeded by five staff with 86 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees as at April 2015 which is 1.06 per cent of total staff.[[1400]](#footnote-1401) The Directorate additionally employed three Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Australian School Based Apprentices on a contract basis.[[1401]](#footnote-1402)

* + - 1. Impacts from changes to Commonwealth funding

The Committee enquired about the impact on health services resulting from the changes to Commonwealth funding arrangements and was advised by the Minister that:

It is worth highlighting that at the end of the 2016-17 financial year, there is considerable uncertainty around our capacity to continue to deliver a range of services at the existing level. The reason for that is the very significant reduction in funding from the commonwealth. That takes particular effect in 2016-17 when current funding agreements come to an end...[[1402]](#footnote-1403)

... in the current budget over the next three years, the budget estimates account for $228 million less in funding received from the commonwealth than would have otherwise been received under the national health reform agreement arrangements.[[1403]](#footnote-1404)

...

Unless the commonwealth adjusts its funding formula to recognise growth in the health sector properly, then there will be real impacts on access to a whole range of services. [[1404]](#footnote-1405)

...

We cannot sustain growth to the level we need to sustain it in elective surgery, in access to emergency departments, in a whole range of other activity unless there is a fundamental re-think on the part of the federal government when it comes to the health budget...[[1405]](#footnote-1406)

...

We will be working very hard over the next 12 to 18 months in particular to secure a better deal from the commonwealth to properly fund our hospitals and health systems.[[1406]](#footnote-1407)

The Chief Financial Officer for the Health Directorate explained the history and changes to funding under the National Health Reform Agreement:

The national health reform agreement was signed with the explicit intention of the federal government of the day to increase its contribution for its public hospital costs. The first live year of that was to be 2014-15. With the change of federal government it was announced in that year that those agreements would not be honoured.

The first part of the agreements that were not being honoured was the guarantees that were provided that no jurisdiction be worse off by moving from the old SBP funding to ABF funding. They had $16.4 billion built in to be spent through to 2020 to do with growth and guarantees. They have abandoned those guarantees.

Then they announced—at the same time they announced—that they will therefore cease moving from 45 per cent of the cost of public hospitals as a contribution by the federal government to 50 per cent, which was a plan from 2017-18. That has gone. And from 2017-18 they move back to a specific purpose payment based on population, which is raw population rather than allowing for the demographic factors as well. [[1407]](#footnote-1408)

The Committee heard that one of the main problems with a move away from activity-based funding to population-based is ‘it has no regard for the level of acuity in the community’ or how sick people are.[[1408]](#footnote-1409) Activity-based funding is the most equitable model as it accounts for the fact that if you have to conduct more expensive procedures ‘you will be appropriately compensated for that from the federal budget.’[[1409]](#footnote-1410)

The shift to population-based funding also raises problems with cross border patients, particularly in the ACT where ‘a quarter or more’ of patients come from across the border.[[1410]](#footnote-1411) The NSW Government is likely to compensate the ACT Government on a population basis if that is how all funding by the Commonwealth is structured.[[1411]](#footnote-1412) This has further implications for the ACT because of the demographic difference between NSW and ACT patients as explained by the Deputy-Director-General, Canberra Hospital and Health Services:

We are the tertiary referral centre for the surrounding area of New South Wales, so the people that come here are the people who need a level of care that is not available in the surrounding region. Accordingly, on the whole, they come for more serious and complex procedures than the bulk of the health care that is provided by the southern area local hospital district.[[1412]](#footnote-1413)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government continue to work with all First Ministers and the Commonwealth Government to ensure sustainable health funding for State and Territory governments so they can continue to deliver high quality health services to the community.

* 1. Acute Services and ACT Local Hospital Network
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.1: Acute Service and ACT Local Hospital Network , the Committee considered the following matters:

* impact of increases in general, intensive care and neonatal intensive care hospital beds;[[1413]](#footnote-1414)
* additional acute beds at Calvary;[[1414]](#footnote-1415)
* hospital acquired infections and increased bed days;[[1415]](#footnote-1416)
* revisions to strategic and accountability indicators;[[1416]](#footnote-1417)
* expected surgery numbers in 2015-16 and uncertainty from the significant reduction in Commonwealth funding after 2016-17, impact on waiting times;[[1417]](#footnote-1418)
* University of Canberra Hospital, balance between overnight and day beds;[[1418]](#footnote-1419)
* impact of the University of Canberra Hospital on the health system as a whole;[[1419]](#footnote-1420)
* car parking spaces to be provided at the University of Canberra Hospital, staff parking, location of surface car parks;[[1420]](#footnote-1421)
* timing of the design and construction of the University of Canberra Hospital ;[[1421]](#footnote-1422)
* anticipated gross floor area of the University of Canberra Hospital ;[[1422]](#footnote-1423)
* anticipated staffing at the University of Canberra Hospital;[[1423]](#footnote-1424)
* cost of subacute beds and acute beds to construct and operate;[[1424]](#footnote-1425)
* full cost and payment regime for the University of Canberra Hospital;[[1425]](#footnote-1426)
* progress of the Canberra Hospital emergency department expansion including paediatrics area, funding;[[1426]](#footnote-1427)
* building 2/3 (known as the Tower Block) development funding and timing;[[1427]](#footnote-1428)
* funding for Emergency specialists;[[1428]](#footnote-1429)
* re-profiling of funds for the Calvary Public Hospital car park;[[1429]](#footnote-1430)
* procurement and construction timeframes for the Calvary Public Hospital car park;[[1430]](#footnote-1431)
* revised funding profile for the health infrastructure program, including the secure mental health unit;[[1431]](#footnote-1432)
* adjustments to strategic objectives and accountability indicators, including targets for occupancy rates of overnight hospital beds;[[1432]](#footnote-1433)
* patient choice to attend the Canberra Hospital or Calvary emergency departments, maternity services;[[1433]](#footnote-1434)
* timeliness targets and delays for non-elective surgery;[[1434]](#footnote-1435)
* national weighted activity unit;[[1435]](#footnote-1436)
* changes to targets for contacting people with mental health issues who have been discharged;[[1436]](#footnote-1437)
* mental health services provided at the Canberra Hospital precinct and Calvary Hospital campus, inpatient transfers and discharge practices;[[1437]](#footnote-1438) and
* patient care at the Canberra Hospital, accreditation of the hospital, pressures on nursing resources, and update on the pay dispute with doctors.[[1438]](#footnote-1439)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Cancellation of non-elective surgery

The Committee discussed concerns raised by community members around the cancellation of non-elective surgeries, particularly where people had turned up and been prepped for surgery and then sent home, in some cases multiple times. The Committee noted that there is no information available publicly that indicates targets and achievements for the timeliness of non-elective surgery and the number of people waiting.[[1439]](#footnote-1440)

The Minister advised that he recognises this is an area for improvement and a program of reforms is being implemented ‘to provide for a dedicated capability, separate from the elective surgery capability, so that we would see fewer interruptions for non-elective surgery.’[[1440]](#footnote-1441)

The Deputy Director-General, Canberra Hospital and Health Services advised:

To start off, leading on from what the minister was talking about, we have got two primary changes that we have put in place in Canberra Hospital for managing emergency surgery. One is an acute surgical unit which has dedicated operating time every day and a dedicated roster of surgeons to enable them to review patients more quickly and to get the surgery undertaken more quickly. We also have what we term an “anaesthetist of the day”, who is a senior medical specialist who is able to manage the workflow through the theatres to ensure that we are getting optimal use of the theatre capacity and that we are keeping track of the urgency of cases and whether people are being delayed.

In terms of performance indicators, we have not got them finalised. We are working through it with the data area, identifying theatre information and standardised reports that we can use to monitor the effectiveness of this, but that remains a work in progress. [[1441]](#footnote-1442)

The Committee heard that the Deputy Director-General receives reports twice-daily on anyone who has had their surgery cancelled, including how often they have been cancelled.[[1442]](#footnote-1443) Those reports do not include a reason for cancellation, which the Committee was advised is usually substitution for more urgent cases or if demand exceeds operating capacity.[[1443]](#footnote-1444)

The Minister advised that:

There will be a body of work undertaken over the coming months to look at what our options are to further improve access and, in particular, to improve our performance when it comes to the target times. I think that is very important. But in terms of emergency surgery, we are implementing change. Previously there has not been a clearly delineated separate stream between elective and emergency. Now there is. Dedicated resources are going into that, and certainly there is scope to allow the Assembly to have greater visibility around that performance as we implement those reforms.[[1444]](#footnote-1445)

The Committee was provided with further information on non-elective surgery postponements for patients who have experienced this on multiple occasions, in response to a Question Taken on Notice:

Postponements generally occur when more urgent, and at times life saving surgery, takes precedence over less urgent cases.

Decisions to postpone surgery are made in consultation with the treating specialists and are based on the clinical need and clinical urgency of the patient, relative to other patients requiring surgery, and the impact of a delay on the clinical outcomes of the patient.

The demand for emergency surgery is continuously assessed by the operating rooms’ multidisciplinary management team as the demand is fluid. The goal is to utilise all available emergency operating time to meet emergency demand.[[1445]](#footnote-1446)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that patients may experience cancellation of their surgery more than once.

The Committee is equally as concerned that essential information on cancellations and waiting times for non-elective surgery is not already publicly available and believes the reforms designed to record and report data on waiting times and cancellations of non-elective surgeries needs to be expedited.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government collect data on why non-elective surgeries get cancelled and report back to the Legislative Assembly on how it will address the issues driving cancellations.

* + - 1. The Canberra Hospital Tower Block (Building 2/3)

At its hearing on 17 June 2015, the Committee asked about the $40 million funding previously appropriated for the redesign of the Canberra Hospital (TCH), specifically for building 2/3 known as the ‘Tower Block’, and how it has been reallocated.[[1446]](#footnote-1447)

The Minister advised that:

The funding that I am referring to was originally provided for the development of a proof of concept report and delivery of a preliminary sketch plan for the redevelopment of building 2/3. The government took the decision that further work was required before we could proceed with some of that work. So the funding was redirected to allow the expansion of the emergency department.[[1447]](#footnote-1448)

The Minister further advised that:

The issues with redevelopment of building 2/3 are the most complex of all the capital works decisions we have had to make in ACT Health. We are talking about the development of an entire new tower block structure at the Canberra Hospital. It will be a fundamental and very disruptive change when it occurs that will have to be managed very carefully and it will have long-term implications in terms of how service delivery operates at the Canberra Hospital for many decades to come.

The government is not going to rush into the redevelopment of building 2/3 until we are absolutely confident that we have the right model and that we understand fully the spaces and places required and how they should be delivered and financed. We are going to take the time to get that right. So I am not going to commit to a project that may ultimately cost our health system and our budget, I would anticipate, over $1 billion until we have done the appropriate scoping and analysis...[[1448]](#footnote-1449)

The Committee also sought more information on where the planning and project design for the Tower Block have progressed to and what timeframes are being considered for commencement and completion of the project.[[1449]](#footnote-1450)

The Minister informed the Committee that ‘ongoing analysis and assessment of options is being undertaken by the government in relation to what should be the scope and scale of that work.’[[1450]](#footnote-1451)

The Minister advised that:

The cabinet has determined that there will be joint work undertaken between ACT Health and the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, through a dedicated taskforce in relation to this project to provide further advice and options to government on how to ensure that we are building a piece of infrastructure which meets demand and which takes account of changes in models of care, takes account of changes in methods of service delivery, changes in technology and opportunities to improve patient flows.[[1451]](#footnote-1452)

The Committee heard that there is funding already appropriated for the analysis and options work[[1452]](#footnote-1453) for the Canberra Hospital and the Minister anticipated the government would be in a position to make a substantive decision heading into the 2016-17 budget.[[1453]](#footnote-1454)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned that it is unclear where the original $40 million appropriation for the Tower Block has been reallocated.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government detail to the Legislative Assembly the proposed timetable and funding for the design and construction of the proposed new building 2/3, known as the ‘Tower Block’.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government detail to the Legislative Assembly the expenditure of $40 million previously allocated for the proposed new building 2/3 at Canberra Hospital, known as the ‘Tower Block’.

* + - 1. Hospital Beds and the University of Canberra Hospital

The Committee questioned the number of beds planned for the University of Canberra hospital and the balance between overnight beds and day beds.[[1454]](#footnote-1455)

A media release issued by ACT Health on 14 May 2015 advised that:

ACT Health Director General Dr Peggy Brown today clarified that there has been no reduction in either bed or place numbers at the University of Canberra Public Hospital (UCPH).

"Under the service delivery model that has been in place since the beginning of 2014 the UCPH will have the capacity to treat 215 patients each day through 140 overnight inpatient beds and 75 day spaces, more than would have been the case if it had consisted of only 200 overnight inpatient beds," Dr Brown said.

"Service delivery model refinements between the original options paper in 2011 and the public release of the proposed service delivery model in June 2014 adjusted the mix of overnight beds and day spaces, however the overall capacity to treat patients has not been reduced.

"By adjusting these numbers we will be able to treat more patients each day. It is not simply about places or beds. It is providing the care that people need when and where they need it.

"We have adjusted the arrangements at the UCPH based on the expert analysis. The readjusted distribution of numbers at the hospital itself were announced in early 2014 which was then followed by public consultation in June 2014 on the Service Delivery Plan," Dr Brown said.

The statement made to the ABC last night confirmed that the mix of overnight inpatient beds and day places had been adjusted prior to 2014 to reflect expert recommendations on contemporary models of care, it did not say overall capacity at UCPH had been reduced.

Across the ACT, after UCPH opens there will be approximately 250 sub acute inpatient beds across the ACT health system, broadly distributed as:

•140 in-patient beds at UCPH;

•20 mental health in-patient beds for older people at Calvary Hospital;

•45 aged care and rehabilitation in-patient beds at Canberra Hospital;

•15 aged care and rehabilitation in-patient beds at Calvary

•19 palliative care beds at Clare Holland House; and

•15 rehabilitation beds at the new Secure Mental Health Unit.

"In addition, we will have 75 day places at the UCPH, allowing us to treat a minimum of 75 people each day.

"These numbers and this model have been derived from in depth planning and independent expert analysis. It is appropriate for the needs of Canberrans in years to come. It shows we are delivering a contemporary model of care that is about people and patients," Dr Brown said. It should be noted that people coming to a Day Service will be formally "admitted" to a place at the hospital as a day patient but won't occupy a traditional hospital bed. Their program of treatment and therapy might be conducted in a gym, the hydrotherapy pool or consultation rooms, or a combination of these spaces. [[1455]](#footnote-1456)

The Minister advised that the intention was:

the total overnight bed capacity would be up to 200—that is overnight bed capacity—but the exact mix between day beds or day spaces and overnight beds was to be determined following finalisation of the model of care.[[1456]](#footnote-1457)

...

Our position is that we want a flexible University of Canberra public hospital and, because we have day patients, who are admitted for less than a day, we can see more people than if there were just 200 admitted. Once you are admitted in an overnight bed, you are staying for at least a day, so that is only 200 a day.[[1457]](#footnote-1458)

The Minister further noted that a model that included a mix of overnight and day beds or day spaces, as appropriate, was supported by expert advice received by ACT Health.[[1458]](#footnote-1459)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

Whilst the Committee appreciates that provision of day beds provides flexibility and may improve throughput, there continues to be a lack of clarity around what a day bed or space actually encompasses, as well confusion from references to ‘bed equivalents’.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:[[1459]](#footnote-1460)

The Committee recommends that the Health Directorate produce and use a standard table of definitions of ‘bed’ including definitions of acute, subacute, non-acute, and overnight and day beds, in-patient and out-patient beds, bed spaces and traditional and non-traditional beds.

The Committee also notes the discussion around ‘beds’ relating to the delivery of health outcomes for the ACT community. The Committee recognises the complexity that is involved in delivering a high quality health system, as well as the challenges in communicating this complexity.

The Committee agrees that use of the term ‘beds’, while having relevance to health professionals may not be the most effective way of communicating with the community about health services and health outcomes. The Committee agrees that discussion of ‘beds’ in the context of delivery of health services is not the same as, for example, an actual ‘bed’ in a home.

The Committee further acknowledges that the UCPH, as a sub acute facility has a specialised role within the health system, especially as it is distinct from, but essential to easing pressure on our tertiary and acute hospitals. The Committee notes that in some cases a literal ‘bed’ will not be the best clinical option for a number of patients.

The Committee notes that the Minister has said the UCPH will have the capacity to treat 215 patients each day through 140 overnight inpatient beds and 75 day spaces.

The Committee notes that discussion about how to deliver health services may be better served by focusing discussion on the outcomes that will be delivered to the community.

In light of the above discussion, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider an improved way of communicating how health services and health outcomes are delivered to the community.

* + - 1. Measure of Full-Time equivalent staff

The Committee questioned some discrepancy between the budget papers and annual report regarding fulltime equivalent (FTE) health staffing, noting that ‘the budget papers have the FTE for 2013-14 at 5,873. The annual report for 2013-14 had the FTE at 5,979.’[[1460]](#footnote-1461)

The Minister advised:

The variance between the two is 106 FTE. The variance is due to externally funded FTE which is available for some health-related positions—that is, commonwealth funding, McGrath breastscreen nurses, research positions and so on. The budget papers show the number of FTEs appropriated by the ACT budget, which is 5,873. The larger figure, 5,979 FTE, included in the annual report includes all staff regardless of how the position is funded. As a comparison, currently there are 163.96 FTE externally funded positions in the ACT.

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that the two different approaches to reporting on FTE numbers creates some confusion. The Committee believes that a clear definition of FTE is needed.

Additionally, annual reports should provide a breakdown of FTE by ACT and externally funded positions, in addition to the total FTE. This should apply to all Directorates and Agencies where externally funded FTE and ACT funded positions exist.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide clear definitions for counting staff numbers including head count, fulltime employees, fulltime employees (ACT funded) and fulltime employees (externally funded) and fulltime employees (all funding sources), full time equivalents and agreed abbreviations.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide a breakdown of Full Time Equivalents in its annual reports indicating the number of positions externally funded and the number funded by the ACT Government.

* + - 1. Choice of hospital

The Committee discussed the variance between the number of people presenting at Calvary and Canberra Hospital Emergency Departments and heard from the Deputy Director-General, Canberra Hospital and Health Services that:

We are working with Medicare Local to try and get a better sense of that and work out what the patterns are and what, if anything, can be done with them. But, of course, it is individual choice there and if people have confidence in Canberra Hospital and prefer to present there rather than Calvary hospital, then that is their choice.[[1461]](#footnote-1462)

Additionally, the Committee followed up concerns about the possible use of postcodes to determine where patients would be allowed to access maternity and other health services.[[1462]](#footnote-1463) The Minister advised that:

These issues warrant consideration but no decision has been made in relation to them and nor would it be without engagement, discussion and consultation with the broader community. There is no determined proposal at this stage to look at that matter, to proceed with that approach. However, there is no doubt that our maternity services are under considerable pressure. There is a very significant number of births occurring at the Canberra Hospital. We have some excellent facilities at the Canberra Hospital in that respect. But we do have to have a look at the capacity of both of our public hospitals, both of which provide very high quality care when it comes to maternity services, and make sure that they are being utilised effectively.

At this point in time I have asked for further work to be done on understanding the best possible approaches to manage demand when it comes to maternity services but no decision has been taken on that matter and nor would it without a proper engagement and discussion with the community about it.[[1463]](#footnote-1464)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that, whilst the ACT Government has not decided to implement a postcode-based approach to hospital choice, it has not ruled it out.[[1464]](#footnote-1465)

The Committee also agrees that the ACT Government should ensure all its health services are being utilised effectively.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that any decision-making by the ACT Government around community access to health services be undertaken with proper community consultation.

* + - 1. Emergency Department service delivery

The Committee notes that the ACT’s emergency department timeliness is still not meeting the national average in some categories.[[1465]](#footnote-1466)

This issue was raised by the Standing Committee on Health, Ageing and Community and Social Services in its inquiry into the 2013-2014 Health Directorate Annual Report, which recommended that the ACT Government consider annual benchmarking for emergency department timeliness against peer group hospitals to provide a better indication of how the ACT is performing compared to similar hospitals.[[1466]](#footnote-1467), [[1467]](#footnote-1468)

* 1. Mental Health, Justice Health and Alcohol and Drug Services
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.2: Mental Health, Justice Health and Alcohol and Drug Services, the Committee considered the following matters:

* enhanced mental health services and community services initiatives;[[1468]](#footnote-1469)
* staffing numbers at the Gungahlin Community Health Centre;[[1469]](#footnote-1470)
* supporting Common Ground staff;[[1470]](#footnote-1471)
* nature of the work of mental health teams based in community health facilities, interaction with child and family centre clients and management of walk-ins;[[1471]](#footnote-1472)
* community based drug treatment and support and focus of the funding;[[1472]](#footnote-1473)
* naloxone overdose management program;[[1473]](#footnote-1474)
* accountability indicators including child and adolescent community contacts, and Bimberi health assessments and alcohol and drug services community contacts;[[1474]](#footnote-1475)
* recruitment and retention of mental health staff including nurses, the Secure Mental Health Unit and workforce planning;[[1475]](#footnote-1476)
* assaults on mental health staff;[[1476]](#footnote-1477)
* update on the construction of the bush healing farm including timing and cost;[[1477]](#footnote-1478)
* ACT Health consultation on the Human Services Blueprint trial at West Belconnen;[[1478]](#footnote-1479)
* Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander smoking cessation strategies, evaluation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander tobacco control strategy;[[1479]](#footnote-1480)
* smoke free policy at the Canberra Hospital;[[1480]](#footnote-1481)
* e-cigarettes and a government preferred response, Therapeutic Goods Administration regulation and a national approach;[[1481]](#footnote-1482)
* reducing seclusion and restraint in mental health inpatient settings;[[1482]](#footnote-1483) and
* funding to community mental health organisations, objectives and monitoring, administration of grants.[[1483]](#footnote-1484)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Adult Mental Health Unit

In response to the Committee’s questions about alcohol and drug-related mental illness, the Committee heard that:

There are two aspects to the budget for alcohol and drug services. One is an appropriation for, I believe it is, $800,000 that relates to funding for the community sector...

There is also some funding within the big mental health component, which is around some community-based enhanced services—specialist services. They relate to our addiction specialists and nurse practitioners providing specialist care in the community health centres.[[1484]](#footnote-1485)

The Committee was advised that the community sector funding was primarily for six community-based organisations to increase their capacity to provide specialist drug treatment and support as well as providing funding to the Canberra Alliance for Harm Minimisation and Advocacy (CAHMA) to conduct its program on naloxone overdose management.[[1485]](#footnote-1486)

Further, in relation to the enhanced mental health services and community services initiatives, the Minister provided an overview of a range of services in relation to mental health care, including advice that:[[1486]](#footnote-1487)

There will be an expansion of alcohol and drug services at the Canberra Hospital to a seven-day-a-week service—a number of other improvements there and also in the justice health sector. [[1487]](#footnote-1488)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is conscious that mental health issues and drug-related issues can often be interrelated, however the Committee considers that it is worth exploring ways to manage those patients with primarily drug-related issues separately from the Adult Mental Health Unit.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conduct a review into the number of patients admitted to the Adult Mental Health Unit with predominantly drug-related issues rather than mental health issues and that a plan be formulated for managing drug addicted/affected patients.

* + - 1. Adolescent mental health

At the hearing on 17 June 2015, the Committee was advised that as part of the increased funding towards enhanced mental health services and community services:

There will be an expansion to the child and adolescent mental health services—an additional two staff there—to assist with early identification and treatment of children presenting with emerging mental illness.[[1488]](#footnote-1489)

The Committee was also advised that the child and adolescent mental health teams work very closely with the child and family centres.[[1489]](#footnote-1490)

In response to the Committee’s questions regarding the failure to meet child and adolescent community contact indicators, the Committee was told:

That was underachieved by 2,000, which was, by our calculation, about a two per cent underachievement. We had some vacancies in our service in the third quarter of this reporting period. That does directly impact on our performance. We have recruited to those positions and we are now fully staffed in CAMHS [Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services]. So our month-on-month achievement that is not reported in that detail in the budget papers is now achieving—delivering—a monthly target.[[1490]](#footnote-1491)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that in addition to the work of the child and adolescent mental health teams, there are services available to youth through community mental health organisations.

The Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that a whole-of-government inquiry be carried out, and the findings presented to the Legislative Assembly by March 2016, on the inpatient and outpatient services, support programs and care models for adolescents facing mental health issues.

* + - 1. Staff safety at the Adult and Secure Mental Health Units

The Committee was advised that the head contractor for the new Secure Mental Health Unit is Richard Crookes Constructions, who was contracted on 30 September 2014.[[1491]](#footnote-1492) The Committee also heard that some of the funding for the enhanced mental health services and community services initiative includes funding to commission the Secure Mental Health Unit, in relation to coordinating recruitment of staff for the facility.[[1492]](#footnote-1493)

With regard to the safety of mental health staff in light of past assaults at the Adult Mental Health Unit the Committee was told:

Unfortunately from time to time behaviours in a mental health unit do result in assaults on staff. We try very hard to reduce that and the best way of reducing assaults on staff is good clinical care to reduce the psychological distress that people have when they are in the mental health unit. Since the provisional improvement notice last year we have been very active in that unit. Our clinical director has taken on a lead role in the management of aggression and violence in our unit and we are developing a divisional-wide framework for management of aggression and violence which will not only be relevant for the adult mental health unit and the mental health assessment unit in the emergency department but will be the background framework for managing aggression and violence in our secure mental health unit as well.[[1493]](#footnote-1494)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee acknowledges the difficult environment in which mental health staff at the Adult Mental Health Unit work and wants the ACT Government to ensure that it is taking all appropriate steps to manage the safety of medical and administrative staff in both the Adult Mental Health Unit and the new Secure Mental Health Unit.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government table a copy of the framework for the Adult Mental Health Unit by the last sitting day in 2015.

* 1. Public Health Services
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.3: Public Health Services, the Committee considered the following matters:

* healthy weight initiatives and health promotion, including obesity prevention; [[1494]](#footnote-1495)
* sale of less healthy food choices, Heart Foundation survey on community attitudes and consultation with young people;[[1495]](#footnote-1496)
* waiting times for the obesity clinic and recruitment for additional senior medical staff;[[1496]](#footnote-1497)
* bariatric surgery, number of expected surgeries this year based on population and screening processes;[[1497]](#footnote-1498)
* evaluation of the healthy weight initiative including data collection, web-based platforms and measures of success. Kindy Screen, year 6 surveys, ABS and AIHW data;[[1498]](#footnote-1499)
* treatment modalities offered in the obesity clinic;[[1499]](#footnote-1500)
* evaluation of bariatric surgery safety and outcomes;[[1500]](#footnote-1501)
* whole-of-government approach to the social determinants of health and their impact on obesity;[[1501]](#footnote-1502) and
* future population health risks including obesity, smoking in certain groups, injury, mental health and preparedness for infectious diseases.[[1502]](#footnote-1503)
  + - 1. Obesity Clinic

The Committee asked about the treatment options available at the obesity clinic (the Obesity Management Service). The Acting Executive Director of the Division of Medicine, Canberra Hospital and Health Services advised the Committee that:

[The clinic] is about getting the patients to reach a healthy weight or at least attempt to reach a healthy weight. We are talking about people who have BMIs of greater than 40—very large and overweight persons—people who sometimes do not have any comorbidities but who often do have very complex medical histories.

Therefore, the service provides input into patients who are complex, who are frequently readmitted to hospital and, therefore, who do not necessarily get access to allied health. And the value-add comes from allied health. There is a group of people who have very few comorbidities and who require a pathway into bariatric surgery. Those people are a very select group and have to be carefully chosen. [[1503]](#footnote-1504)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee recognises the importance of healthy weight initiatives in the ACT health system and the increasing need to address obesity through prevention and the promotion of healthy weight initiatives.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government should consider addressing the social determinants of obesity through a whole-of-government approach, in conjunction with the obesity clinic.

* 1. Cancer Services
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.4: Cancer Services, the Committee considered the following matters:

* breast screening targets, encouraging take-up of the service, improving accessibility and evidence of the effectiveness of screening;[[1504]](#footnote-1505)
* Canberra region cancer centre operations;[[1505]](#footnote-1506)
* new mammography machine at Belconnen Health Centre, hours of operation, staffing requirements, funding and cost;[[1506]](#footnote-1507)
* health website usability, central cancer services intake;[[1507]](#footnote-1508)
* Paediatric oncology services, visiting services, referrals to Sydney and support for families with travel assistance and the Eden Monaro cancer support service;[[1508]](#footnote-1509)
* adult referral to Sydney for treatment of rarer cancers;[[1509]](#footnote-1510)
* radiotherapy staffing;[[1510]](#footnote-1511)
* preventative approach to cancer;[[1511]](#footnote-1512) and
* early detection.[[1512]](#footnote-1513)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Breast Screen services

The Committee enquired about the additional funding in 2015-16 to assist Health meet its targets for breast screening and early detection. The Deputy Director-General, Canberra Hospital and Health Services advised the following:

There are two aspects to the issue of achieving the targets. The first is that the activity of breast screening is dependent on the take-up and we have had difficulties in the past attracting women, particularly in the eligible age group, to sign up for the breast screening. Towards the end of last year we had access to the electoral roll and we are now sending out routine letters to all women within the age group to remind them of their eligibility and the desirability of them attending for breast screening. We are seeking to increase the take-up that way. To date over 5,000 letters have gone out and we will continue that strategy.

We are also sending letters directly to lapsed attendees, people who have had screens in the past but have not attended for their routine follow-up, as well as trying to contact women directly by phone. That is one aspect of the issue in terms of meeting the demand.

The other aspect is looking at access and with the new Belconnen health centre we have the opportunity to set up another breast screening location there. Through the funding that is particularly being provided by the commonwealth to expand the target age group to include 70 to 74-year-old women we have been able to purchase an additional mammography machine and set up a space at the Belconnen community health centre to enable screening to be undertaken there. We think that will be attractive to women who live in the local area, as well as anyone who is concerned about getting into Civic and the logistics of that. Those are the two approaches that we are looking at to try to improve the screening rates.[[1513]](#footnote-1514)

The Committee heard that these strategies are also directed at women in the 50-69 age group and that the ACT follows the National Breast Screening Guidelines.[[1514]](#footnote-1515)

* + - * 1. committee comment

The Committee notes that the target for Total Screens for 2015-16 takes into account the Project Agreement for the expansion of the BreastScreen Australia Program signed in May 2014 between the States and the Commonwealth. That agreement adds women aged 70-74 to the target age group for screening and provides performance benchmarks for the number of additional women aged 70-74 years to be screened by the ACT.[[1515]](#footnote-1516)

The Committee believes there is scope for improvement in the ACT’s outcomes for the relevant indicators.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate additional ways to ensure that breast screen services reach women at a level equivalent to at least that of other Australian states.

* + - 1. respite care for children and youth

The Committee discussed paediatric oncology issues with the Minister who provided further detail on notice on paediatric respite care.[[1516]](#footnote-1517)

The Committee was advised that Clare Holland House does not have a specific paediatric room. However, families, parents and carers of paediatric patients are encouraged to amend the room and make it as comfortable and homely as they wish. Additionally, while the medical staff do not have specific paediatric qualifications, they do have training in the management of paediatric palliative care.[[1517]](#footnote-1518)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the opportunity to create a more child and family friendly space at Clare Holland House.

In light of the above the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government explore opportunities to create a more child and family friendly space at Clare Holland House when they care for paediatric patients. This could include consideration of:

different needs of preschool, primary and secondary aged children;

providing specialist paediatric staff, either temporarily or permanently, when treating paediatric patients and their families; and

providing age appropriate temporary or permanent physical spaces for paediatric patients and their families.

* 1. Rehabilitation, Aged and Community Care
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.5: Rehabilitation, Aged and Community Care, the Committee considered the following matters:

* hospital in the home funding, demand, formula for nursing staff to beds, increases in medical staffing, number of occasions of service;[[1518]](#footnote-1519)
* reduction in decayed, missing and filled teeth (DMFT) for children at ages 6 and 12, ACT dental health program;[[1519]](#footnote-1520)
* access to emergency dental health services and days of operation;[[1520]](#footnote-1521)
* changes to measurements for the aged care assessment team service;[[1521]](#footnote-1522)
* healthcare access at schools pilot program (HAAS), timeframes, changes to the previous arrangements, maintaining staff numbers, interstate experiences;[[1522]](#footnote-1523)
* nurse led walk-in centres, increases in number of patients presenting, referral to other health services, patient demographics, intention to reduce presentations at emergency departments, role of nurse practitioners, referrals from Healthdirect;[[1523]](#footnote-1524)
* aged care services; provision of residential aged care and demand, patient transfers from aged care to hospitals;[[1524]](#footnote-1525)
* unplanned readmissions;[[1525]](#footnote-1526) and
* strategic objectives.[[1526]](#footnote-1527)
  1. Early Intervention and Prevention
     1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.6: Early Intervention and Prevention, the Committee considered the following matters:

* number of general practitioners and training in the ACT region;[[1527]](#footnote-1528)
* immunisation rates and impact of national changes;[[1528]](#footnote-1529)
* newborn hearing screening tests;[[1529]](#footnote-1530)
* food hygiene practices at community events;[[1530]](#footnote-1531)
* measuring success of prevention strategies and data sharing;[[1531]](#footnote-1532) and
* costs of alcohol-related injury or disease to the ACT health budget.[[1532]](#footnote-1533)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. cost of alcohol-related and tobacco-related injury and disease

In hearings of 17 June 2015 the Committee asked about the cost of alcohol-related and tobacco-related injury or disease on the ACT health budget, including dollars, staff time and facilitates allocated to treating the patients.[[1533]](#footnote-1534)

In responding to this question on alcohol-related injury or disease, the Minister told the Committee that:

I do not think we have ever been able to quantify that directly. Since the passage of the changes to the liquor licensing laws back in 2010-11, there is now an improved reporting framework, including in our emergency departments, that allows us to identify occasions of service, if you like, occasions of treatment, where alcohol is a factor. And it is the same in the ambulance service. Previously we did not have a coherent and regular framework for reporting, if someone was cared for by ambulance and transported, whether it was due to alcohol in part or in whole. We are now strengthening that. There is more work to be done on that, but the changes to the legislation in 2010 have supported our capacity to improve that reporting.

But no, I do not think we have ever been able to quantify that. Of course, there has been some national assessment done of that, but I think if you were to speak to our ED physicians, they would certainly indicate that presentations where alcohol is a factor are not insignificant.[[1534]](#footnote-1535)

The Minister provided further information on notice, advising that:

According to the Australian Institute of Criminology the societal costs of alcohol outweigh the revenue generated from alcohol taxation by a ratio of 2:1.

In 2010 it was estimated that the total alcohol-related costs to society were $14,352 billion. Of these costs:

42.1 per cent were to Australian productivity, 25.5 per cent to traffic accidents, 20.6 per cent of these costs are attributable to the criminal justice system and 11.7 per cent to the health system, and

$1.68 billion were to the Australian health system (hospital costs, nursing home costs, pharmaceutical expenses and ambulance costs).[[1535]](#footnote-1536)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that the cost of alcohol-related and tobacco-related injury and disease on the ACT health budget is significant.

Noting the improved reporting framework identified by the Minister, the Committee believes the ACT Government should determine the cost of alcohol-related and tobacco-related injury and disease on the ACT budget.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider determining the cost of alcohol-related injuries and diseases on the ACT community with regard to:

financial cost;

staff time; and

facilitation,

and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015.

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider determining the cost of tobacco-related injuries and diseases on the ACT community with regard to:

financial cost;

staff time; and

facilitation,

and report to the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in 2015.

# Justice and Community Safety

* + 1. Introduction

The Justice and Community Safety Directorate’s Annual Report 2013-2014 states that the Directorate ‘seeks to maintain a fair, safe and peaceful community in the ACT where people’s rights and interests are respected and protected’, and that it does this by:

* maintaining the rule of law and the Westminster style of democratic Government;
* promoting the protection of human rights in the Territory;
* providing effective offender management and opportunities in relation to rehabilitation;
* protecting and preserving life, property and the environment;
* providing for effective and cohesive emergency response and management; and
* implementing and enforcing legislation covering regulatory functions of Government.[[1536]](#footnote-1537)

The Annual Report also notes that the Directorate’s performance is measured against strategic objectives as follows:

* accessible justice system;
* safe community;
* safe community – emergency services;
* effective regulation and enforcement; and
* promotion and protection of rights and interests.[[1537]](#footnote-1538)

Ministers with responsibilities for functions of the Directorate appeared before the Committee with their officers in hearings of 25 June 2015.

Ministers who appeared included the Attorney-General, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services and the Minister for Justice.

The following Output Classes and Outputs were considered:

* Output Class 1: Justice Services, including:
* Output 1.1: Policy Advice and Justice Programs;[[1538]](#footnote-1539)
* Output 1.2: Legal Services to Government;[[1539]](#footnote-1540)
* Output 1.3: Legislative Drafting and Publishing Services;[[1540]](#footnote-1541)
* Output 1.4: Public Prosecutions;[[1541]](#footnote-1542)
* Output 1.5: Protection of Rights;[[1542]](#footnote-1543)
* Public Trustee for the ACT & Statement of Intent;[[1543]](#footnote-1544)
* Justice and Community Safety Output Class 3: Courts and Tribunal, including:
* Output 3.1: Courts and Tribunals;[[1544]](#footnote-1545)
* Legal Aid Commission (ACT) & Statement of Intent,[[1545]](#footnote-1546) including:
* Output 1.1: Legal Aid Services Provided to the Community;[[1546]](#footnote-1547)
* Emergency Services — Output Class 4: Emergency Services, including:
* Output 4.1: Emergency Services;[[1547]](#footnote-1548)
* ACT Policing, including:
* Output EBT [expensed on behalf of the Territory] 1: ACT Policing;[[1548]](#footnote-1549)
* Justice and Community Safety Output Class 2: Corrective services, including:
* Output 2.1: Corrective Services;[[1549]](#footnote-1550)
* responsibilities of the Minister for Justice listed on p.290 of 2015-16 Budget Paper 3; and
* some aspects of the service and operational aspects of Access Canberra.
  1. Justice and Community Safety Directorate
     1. Matters considered

The following matters were considered:

* funding for and a transition to ‘an administratively based victims of crime financial assistance scheme’;[[1550]](#footnote-1551)
* further funding for:
* the High Density Safety And Security Program;[[1551]](#footnote-1552)
* the Street Law Early Intervention Outreach Service;[[1552]](#footnote-1553)
* funding for and operation of the ACT Legal Aid Commission;[[1553]](#footnote-1554)
* an expansion of the ACT’s restorative justice scheme to adults and more serious offences for both youth and adult offenders, and further funding to support this;[[1554]](#footnote-1555)
* funding and planning for the redevelopment of the ACT courts complex; [[1555]](#footnote-1556)
* funding and administrative changes to support the appointment of a fifth resident judge in the ACT Supreme Court;[[1556]](#footnote-1557)
* delays in matters heard by the Magistrates Court;[[1557]](#footnote-1558)
* developments in the Justice Reform Strategy, including investigation of ‘a longer term ambition of a justice reinvestment approach for our justice system’; [[1558]](#footnote-1559)
* developments in the response to domestic violence, including the appointment of a coordinator-general for domestic and family violence responses; [[1559]](#footnote-1560)
* proposals to restructure protection of rights agencies and statutory office holders;[[1560]](#footnote-1561)
* proposals for legislative change to combat organised crime groups, including outlaw motorcycle gangs;[[1561]](#footnote-1562)
* movement of a number of regulatory functions from the Justice and Community Safety Directorate to Access Canberra, administered by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate;[[1562]](#footnote-1563)
* an update on an instance of fraud in the Office of the Public Trustee;[[1563]](#footnote-1564)
* operation and efficiency of the ACT Magistrates Court;[[1564]](#footnote-1565) and
* availability of parking at the ACT Courts precinct during the courts redevelopment and Capital Metro projects.[[1565]](#footnote-1566)

In addition, a Question Taken on Notice was asked and answered regarding:

* the number of clients that Legal Aid ACT has supported over the last few years.[[1566]](#footnote-1567)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. An administratively based victims of crime financial assistance scheme

When the Attorney-General appeared before the Committee in hearings of 25 June 2015 he told the Committee, in his opening statement, that the 2015-16 ACT Budget included ‘$1.6 million over four years to move to an administratively based victims of crime financial assistance scheme’.[[1567]](#footnote-1568)

The Attorney-General told the Committee that:

The new improved scheme moves away from the adversarial court-based approach to financial assistance to victims of crime to a more supportive arrangement that is available in relation to a much wider range of victims. Of note, for the first time it opens the scheme to victims of domestic violence on a much broader basis. [[1568]](#footnote-1569)

Later in the hearing the Committee asked the Attorney-General for further detail on this. In response the Attorney-General told the Committee that:

At the moment to receive an award for recompense for the harm you have suffered, beyond a relatively modest immediate grant for emergency assistance such as clean-up following a crime and so on—if, for example, you have sustained injuries as a result of a crime being committed against you and you need ongoing medical care, as long as you fall into the categories of eligibility you can get an award of a grant, an award of assistance, but it has to go to court and it has to be adjudicated upon by a magistrate and the amount determined.[[1569]](#footnote-1570)

The Attorney-General told the Committee that this was ‘a very lengthy, complicated, costly business for everybody and unfair to the victim’:[[1570]](#footnote-1571)

The victim should not have to go to court to get assistance in this way, given that they are already, perhaps, going to court to give evidence against the offender and all the other trauma associated with that.[[1571]](#footnote-1572)

In view of this, he told the Committee, the government had formed an intention to reform compensation for victims of crime, which it had announced ‘about 18 months ago, two years ago now’. [[1572]](#footnote-1573)

The Attorney-General told the Committee that:

We have since that time worked through what the legislative change needs to be to reform the victims of crime assistance scheme.

There has been very detailed consultation over the last 12 months in particular with all of the interested stakeholders. I feel very confident that we have reached a pretty good consensus position on what the new system should look like. I expect to introduce legislation in the spring session that provides for the new scheme’s operation. [[1573]](#footnote-1574)

The new scheme would, he told the Committee:

mean that no longer do you go to the Magistrates Court as a matter of course to get an award amount determined. Instead, that will be done administratively by an official based on an agreed process and administered by the Victims of Crime Commissioner. His office will be responsible for the administration of the scheme. [[1574]](#footnote-1575)

Regarding the design of the new scheme, the Attorney-General told the Committee that it would represent ‘a fairer approach in that more victims of crime become more eligible but in many respects the amounts that are available will be more modest’. [[1575]](#footnote-1576)

A problem with the present scheme, he told the Committee, was that it:

only provides support to a very small number of victims for only the most serious of crimes and the awards are quite high. That means all the other victims of crime miss out. That includes victims of violence. That includes victims of domestic violence. They miss out on getting assistance under the scheme in many instances.[[1576]](#footnote-1577)

In contrast, he told the Committee the intention for the new scheme was to:

spread the awards scheme across a greater number of victims, a greater category of crimes, and to do so where it is determined administratively rather than through a judicial process. [[1577]](#footnote-1578)

As a result, he told the Committee, the new scheme would:

increase support to victims of domestic violence, people who witness a homicide, victims whose injuries are extremely serious but not permanent. [[1578]](#footnote-1579)

This contrasted with the present scheme, he told the Committee, in that:

At the moment all of those victims do not get any ongoing awards for the harm they have suffered other than perhaps a very small grant for emergency assistance. [[1579]](#footnote-1580)

* + - 1. Expansion of the ACT’s restorative justice scheme

In his opening statement, the Attorney-General told the Committee that:

Particularly important is the budget’s investment of $2.1 million over four years to allow adults to participate in the restorative justice process, both as an alternative to and in conjunction with imprisonment. This will expand restorative justice to capture serious offences for young people who have previously only been able to undertake restorative justice for minor offences. [[1580]](#footnote-1581)

The Attorney-General told the Committee that with expansion of the scheme, offences and offenders ‘that fall within restorative justice in the ACT’s victim-centric system means that more victims will have the opportunity to receive the proven benefits provided to them by the restorative justice process’, and that this extension followed ‘the 10-year anniversary of the scheme in its first phase, which was marked earlier this year’.[[1581]](#footnote-1582)

Later in hearings the Attorney-General was asked to provide further detail on the expansion of the scheme.

In response he told the Committee that restorative justice had been introduced in 2004-05 and had, to this point, been in use in relation to

minors, young people—not adult offenders—and only for relatively minor crimes. Its focus was on restoration for victims, so that victims could achieve closure, and offenders could understand the impact of their wrongdoing on their victims and make restorations for that wrongdoing.[[1582]](#footnote-1583)

Regarding the scheme to date, the Attorney-General told the Committee that it had been ‘a highly effective program’:[[1583]](#footnote-1584)

The independent reviews of the program have highlighted that victims feel that there is a greater sense of closure, conclusion and finality around the offending and significant reconciliation between the offenders and their victims though the restorative justice process compared to the outcomes that are otherwise achieved through a traditional criminal trial and sentencing process.[[1584]](#footnote-1585)

The new scheme, he told the Committee, would:

extend restorative justice to allow adult offenders to participate in restorative justice as an alternative to and in some cases in conjunction with more traditional sentencing through the courts, and it will also include for the first time referrals for more serious crime, including crimes of violence both amongst juvenile offenders and adults.[[1585]](#footnote-1586)

Commenting on this, he told the Committee that this was ‘a nation-leading program’, and that:

Restorative justice has been demonstrated to be a more cost-effective and more engaging way to resolve the wrongs done by offenders than can often be done through the traditional court process. [[1586]](#footnote-1587)

The Attorney-General told the Committee that restorative justice was ‘particularly beneficial for victims’ because:

it allows victims of crime to move on with the rest of their lives and gives some greater sense that the matter has been dealt with and that they can leave that behind them and lead more productive lives. We know that the ongoing legacy of being a victim of crime can be debilitating for a large part of the victim’s life beyond the period of offending unless there is restoration and closure, and that is what this scheme delivers.[[1587]](#footnote-1588)

* + - * 1. Implementation

Regarding the implementation of the expanded scheme, the Attorney-General told the Committee that the program could be extended ‘without legislative reform because the act already provides for a phase 2 for adult offenders’,[[1588]](#footnote-1589) and that:

We will be looking at how this is rolled out in a staged matter. I am looking forward to discussions with my directorate about the detail of that in the coming months as we finalise these arrangements, but it will see people accused and/or convicted of serious crimes, including violent crimes, being captured in this program and their victims and the offenders going through the very intensive restorative justice process.[[1589]](#footnote-1590)

The Attorney-General provided the Committee with detail about further staffing for the restorative justice program funded in the 2015-16 ACT Budget, which included ‘an additional senior convenor, two more junior convenors and a court liaison and business support officer’.[[1590]](#footnote-1591)

* + - * 1. Restorative justice in practice

The Manager of the Restorative Justice Unit also spoke to the Committee about the implementation of the expanded scheme. She told the Committee that:

Phase 2 [[1591]](#footnote-1592) will be rolled out in two stages. There will be an amendment that allows us to do that. That means that from March 2016 we will be able to roll out phase 2 for adults and young people for serious as well as less serious offences, allowing for diversions and referral at all points along the criminal justice system. [[1592]](#footnote-1593)

Staging the implementation, she told the Committee, would allow the Restorative Justice Unit to develop staff so that the Unit would be ready for a greater caseload:

We are hoping to recruit and train and raise the capacity of all conveners to manage the complex matters of domestic violence and sexual offending about 18 months to 24 months after that enactment. I think that will allow us to ensure that we are managing those very complex matters in ways that are safe and in ways that engage other agencies that are working in that area and to bring everybody up to speed at that time.[[1593]](#footnote-1594)

When asked how many cases the Unit was expecting to field each year, the Manager told the Committee that:

We expect adult domestic violence matters not to be—they are serious matters—diverted. They will be referred after a plea of guilty has been entered or found. We estimate that there is a rising amount of adolescent domestic violence and that restorative justice might play quite a prominent role in managing those matters in meeting the needs of families who are victims in those circumstances.[[1594]](#footnote-1595)

The Manager, Restorative Justice Unit, was asked for further detail about restorative justice and domestic violence offenders. The Manager told the Committee that:

We are looking at young adolescents as offenders in that domestic violence context—so early intervention, looking for opportunities to bring support into families and to manage those matters in ways that lead to safer outcomes and, hopefully, prevent those young people from offending … once they are adults and in other relationships and having their own families. [[1595]](#footnote-1596)

Speaking more broadly, the Manager told the Committee that:

In general terms, restorative justice has a focus on meeting the unmet needs of victims of crime, but it also has, happily, a lot of evidence to show that it has a more profound effect on offenders. We see it as possibly a critical link between an offender understanding and taking stronger responsibility and then linking into other offender rehabilitation dedicated programs and completing those. [[1596]](#footnote-1597)

When asked about the kinds and scope of restoration performed under the scheme, the Manager told the Committee that:

We are a point of referral. If there are any other risks or needs around the young person and the family, we are able to refer them out to relevant agencies. For instance, Relationships Australia runs something called the non-violent resistance program. That is for parents of young people who are exhibiting very challenging, aggressive behaviours. That helps them to regain their parental presence and authority in the home and find ways and strategies to deescalate and to manage situations in the home. [[1597]](#footnote-1598)

In addition, she told the Committee:

We work with lots of other community agencies and areas to hopefully provide those added benefits. As a one-off, one restorative justice event alone, we would not expect that to have a big impact on recidivism, but connected to other dedicated offender rehabilitation-oriented programs and community agencies, we think that it will have an added effect.[[1598]](#footnote-1599)

* + - * 1. Consent and restorative justice

In response to questions, the Attorney-General advised the Committee about the consent of both the offender and victim that is required before engaging in restorative justice.[[1599]](#footnote-1600)

He told the Committee that:

[Restorative Justice] requires the consent of both the offender and their victim or victims to work. One of the options that is being explored is how that sits alongside a more traditional sentencing process within the court and whether the court says to an offender who has been found guilty, “We believe there is significant merit in your engaging in RJ as part of this process around sentencing.” It would still require their consent. However, I think there are ways where the court can add its persuasive power to the importance of participating. That is something that the guidelines around referral will deal with.[[1600]](#footnote-1601)

The Committee asked for further information about rates at which both victim and offender agree to participate in the restorative justice process.[[1601]](#footnote-1602)

In response, the Manager of the Restorative Justice Unit told the Committee that:

Amongst young offenders over the last 10 years, about 60 to 70 per cent of young people are taking up the opportunity. For victims it is around 50 per cent.[[1602]](#footnote-1603)

When asked if there were a difference in victims’ willingness to participate depending on their gender, the Manager told the Committee:

There is in that women are much more likely to be interested in dialogue-related intervention. Sometimes male victims of crime are a little less ready to explore the impacts on them and to articulate those in an emotional context. For personal crime we find that women may be a bit more likely to participate in and benefit from those processes. However, we have found that men who do participate as victims in the process find really positive benefits and outcomes too.[[1603]](#footnote-1604)

* + - 1. Plans to appoint a fifth resident judge in the ACT Supreme Court

In his opening statement the Attorney-General told the Committee that the ACT Government had, in the Budget, ‘provided $3.1 million over three years to appoint a fifth resident judge from 1 July 2016, to address the increase in matters before the ACT Supreme Court’.[[1604]](#footnote-1605)

The Attorney-General told the Committee that this had:

now been justified by modelling undertaken by the government and the courts which demonstrates that a new judge will be needed from the beginning of the 2016-17 financial year.[[1605]](#footnote-1606)

Later in hearings the Attorney-General was asked for further detail on the proposed appointment. In responding, he told the Committee that:

Obviously, calls for a fifth resident judge have been a fairly constant element of debate about judicial resourcing in the territory for quite a number of years.[[1606]](#footnote-1607)

In relation to this, he told the Committee:

The government’s position has been quite clear, which is that first and foremost we have to make sure that our existing judicial officers’ time is being well used and that the processes of the court are efficient in terms of listing practice and in terms of the administration of hearings, so that the resources of the court are properly and efficiently utilised. For that reason we focused first and foremost on reforms to listing practice in our courts. We focused on a range of measures to change the way hearings are conducted to provide for more timely determination and conclusion of matters. [[1607]](#footnote-1608)

The Attorney-General went on to describe modelling done, in conjunction with the ACT Courts, on the number of judicial officers required in relation to the anticipated caseload of the courts.[[1608]](#footnote-1609)

The Attorney-General then went on to say that:

the modelling now indicates that based on the lodgement rates we will see the full-time equivalent requirement for judicial officers sitting at approximately five—it is actually just under five—by the time we reach the 2016-17 financial year. That is the reason for the government’s decision in this year’s budget.[[1609]](#footnote-1610)

When asked what was responsible for upward pressure on lodgement rates, the   
Attorney-General told the Committee that:

The number of matters is growing based on population. It is largely driven by population growth but it is not beyond that which you would expect for a city of our size in terms of our population, if I remember correctly.[[1610]](#footnote-1611)

At this point in hearings there were questions and discussion about the best time for the appointment of a fifth judge for the ACT Supreme Court and, in particular, whether the timeline proposed by the Attorney-General for the appointment of a fifth Supreme Court judge entailed a ‘delay’.[[1611]](#footnote-1612)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the long-standing debate in the ACT over the appointment of a fifth judge to the Supreme Court, a debate which has frequently cited delays in court cases as a significant concern for both civil and criminal matters.

In light of the importance which the Committee attaches to timely resolution of court matters, it makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government appoint a fifth Supreme Court judge.

* + - 1. Delays in matters heard by the Magistrates Court

In hearings of 25 June 2015 questions were put to the Attorney-General about delays in the ACT Magistrates Court, particularly in connection with civil matters.[[1612]](#footnote-1613)

In responding to questions, the Attorney-General told the Committee that he was ‘aware that there are some issues of concern that have been raised by a number of stakeholders in relation to the business of the Magistrates Court’.[[1613]](#footnote-1614)

In relation to this he told the Committee that:

The first important point to make, of course, is that the way the court manages its business is a matter for the court and the Chief Magistrate. The Chief Magistrate has implemented a new listing system and I understand that that has led to some concerns from other stakeholders. But these are decisions of the Chief Magistrate. The court is independent in these matters. We will continue to monitor these issues closely and they will be matters that if necessary I will discuss with the Chief Magistrate in due course.[[1614]](#footnote-1615)

When asked if he had discussed this with the Chief Magistrate, the Attorney-General told the Committee that he had had ‘an initial conversation with the Chief Magistrate’, and that his ‘conclusion at this point’ was:

that it is still early days in terms of the new listing initiative, and certainly that is the advice I have from the Chief Magistrate. It is appropriate to determine after a period how effectively the new court listing process is operating.[[1615]](#footnote-1616)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee views with concern reports that matters, particularly civil matters, are often delayed in the ACT Magistrates Court. It notes that related questions have frequently been raised since the advent of self-government, and that the consequences of delayed justice can be profound.

In light of this the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government monitor the effectiveness of the new court listing process and update the Legislative Assembly by the last sitting day in March 2016.

* + - 1. Responses to domestic violence

In his opening statement of 25 June 2015 the Attorney-General told the Committee that:

In line with the government’s strong and ongoing commitment to ending and tackling the problem of domestic and family violence, including sexual assault in our community, we are working to build stronger foundations to strengthen our response to this problem. So far this year across Australia 45 women have been killed in the context of domestic violence. It is a crime and a breach of basic human rights.[[1616]](#footnote-1617)

The Attorney-General told the Committee that:

A key element of the government’s focus for the coming year is on progressing the second implementation plan for the ACT prevention of violence against women and children strategy. This will build on the work undertaken and informed by the extraordinary meeting of the Domestic Violence Prevention Council, which a range of members here attended earlier this year, in April.[[1617]](#footnote-1618)

The Attorney-General noted that ‘funding and initiatives announced as part of the budget’ represented ‘key elements of the government’s response to domestic and family violence’.[[1618]](#footnote-1619)

As part of these efforts, he told the Committee:

On 30 May this year I announced with my colleague Minister Berry the appointment of Ms Parker, Deputy Director-General of Justice and Community Safety, as the coordinator-general for domestic and family violence responses. The coordinator-general is responsible for overseeing and supporting all domestic and family violence prevention and response-related work across the ACT administration.[[1619]](#footnote-1620)

In subsequent questioning, the Committee asked how the Justice and Community Safety Directorate would coordinate the government response to family and domestic violence. In responding to the question the Attorney-General told the Committee that this would be coordinated:

First and foremost through the work of Ms Parker, as the coordinator-general. One of the issues arising from the extraordinary meeting of the Domestic Violence Prevention Council in April was the identification of the need to provide more effective coordination across government.[[1620]](#footnote-1621)

The Attorney-General also noted that:

Domestic violence and family violence responses are not solely a justice sector response; they are also a community sector response, in terms of the Community Services Directorate; they are a health sector response, in terms of the Health Directorate; and in a range of other sectors—multicultural affairs as well, for example.[[1621]](#footnote-1622)

During the recent extraordinary meeting of the ACT Domestic Violence Prevention Council in April 2015, he told the Committee, it was recognised that there was a ‘need to pull together and make sure that we do not have any gaps in the way the government is supporting the community sector’, and ‘the justice system more broadly’. He noted that that the government’s response to these concerns was the appointment of the   
Coordinator-General.[[1622]](#footnote-1623)

The Attorney-General noted, however, that there would:

also continue to be the responsibilities of the Justice and Community Safety Directorate to advise the government on our response to the ACT implementation plan in relation to tackling domestic and family violence, and also our contribution to the national plan and the work around that. That is all work that fundamentally is driven from within my directorate, but with collaboration across other directorates such as, for example, Community Services, and the women’s portfolio as well under Minister Berry.[[1623]](#footnote-1624)

The Committee asked for further detail about the functions of the coordinator-general. In responding, the Attorney-General told the Committee that:

The relative responsibilities of different parts of government are set out in the ACT plan. The ACT plan sets out which parts of government have responsibility for which functions. It is important, though, that we make sure everyone is pulling together and that they are coordinating their efforts, not just doing their bit but recognising the broader picture. That is fundamentally what the coordinator-general’s position is there to achieve.[[1624]](#footnote-1625)

When asked about contributions to cultural change to reduce domestic violence, the Attorney-General told the Committee:

I think Rosie Batty got this right in her comments that she made in a speech here in Canberra when she said that the most immediate response must be about saving lives, and the long-term agenda is to change attitudes and perceptions of the relationships between men and women, and build more respectful understandings of those relationships and the importance of them. [[1625]](#footnote-1626)

The Attorney-General went on to tell the Committee that:

In this budget there is funding of approximately $600,000, if I recall correctly, for the Education and Training Directorate. That funding is to support the development of a respectful relationships framework that can be delivered in schools in an enduring and ongoing way. Obviously kids move through the school system pretty rapidly. You can have a one-off program that might reach a particular cohort for a particular period of time, but we are keen to see it built into the ongoing curriculum of what is provided in schools by teachers, as part of the broader school community, and that is what that funding is there to achieve. [[1626]](#footnote-1627)

On 12 June 2015 the Committee heard from the YWCA of Canberra about respectful relationship programs in ACT schools. (See Chapter 2 for this discussion and associated recommendations).

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers the response to family and domestic violence to be an important part of the role of government.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government report to the Legislative Assembly on a quarterly basis on the progress of addressing family violence in the ACT.

Additional recommendations concerning domestic violence prevention can be found at sections , 2.175 and 5.26.

* + - 1. Proposals to restructure protection of rights agencies and statutory office holders

In hearings the Committee noted the Government’s proposal to restructure rights agencies and statutory office-holders, and asked the Attorney-General to outline the government’s concerns and objectives.[[1627]](#footnote-1628)

In response, the Attorney-General told the Committee that:

The government signalled last year, I think probably in the budget process last year, that we were looking at restructuring of our rights protection framework to make sure that more resources were able to be devoted to front-line human rights protection and promotion.[[1628]](#footnote-1629)

In particular, he told the Committee, the government’s concerns related to the fact that:

The ACT is a small jurisdiction but it has a very large number of statutory office-holders in the human rights protection area. Indeed, we probably have more statutory office-holders than any other jurisdiction when it comes to rights protection. That does lead to a significant level of overhead costs. My concern, particularly in the context of budget restraint, is the need to make sure that front-line human rights protection services are being maximised and that overhead costs are being managed appropriately.[[1629]](#footnote-1630)

In light of these concerns, the Attorney-General told the Committee:

the government has set out a reform proposal to stakeholders for discussion. I did that earlier this year. We are currently considering submissions from that proposal document. We have received 41 submissions from a broad range of stakeholders, including the statutory office-holders themselves in the Human Rights Commission and elsewhere, as well as community sector groups and private individuals. I am expecting to receive advice shortly from my directorate on the outcomes of that public comment process and options for the government to pursue as the next step.[[1630]](#footnote-1631)

When asked whether proposals for change may lead to confusion for the clients of rights protection agencies, the Attorney-General told the Committee that this was ‘clearly an issue that we will need to work through’, but that ‘the government’s objective [was] very clear’: [[1631]](#footnote-1632)

First of all, we believe there should be one statutory appointment that has authority for the administration of the Human Rights Commission. At the moment it is a shared governance model where responsibility is collective across the three commissioners. I do not think that is a desirable governance model; I think there needs to be someone who is ultimately in charge and accountable for the operation of the commission.[[1632]](#footnote-1633)

The Attorney-General went on to tell the Committee that:

The government proposes that there should be a president who is responsible for the administration and operation of the [Human Rights] commission, and then a number of other commissioners who serve a number of important advocacy and complaints-handling roles in a structure which is fit for purpose in terms of our size and making sure that different stakeholders know where they can go to make complaints about service delivery and have them investigated, make complaints about breaches of rights and have them investigated, or raise issues around broader systemic advocacy and reform. That is the intention of the model. [[1633]](#footnote-1634)

Moreover, he told the Committee:

We are proposing that the office of Public Advocate no longer exist in its current form and that … the guardianship functions of the Public Advocate … go to the Public Trustee, because the Public Trustee already performs the financial guardianship function at the moment, and we see a lot of synergy in having the financial guardianship aligned with the broader wellbeing guardianship of those individuals who are very vulnerable and having them administered by the same office. So it is proposed that those functions go there. The broader advocacy functions would be considered by a reformed human rights commission body. So there are some real opportunities there. [[1634]](#footnote-1635)

The Attorney-General told the Committee that this model had been ‘recommended by our outgoing Public Advocate’, who said ‘she saw no need to continue the office in it is current form and that it would be better to align them in a slightly different way’, and that the government had ‘built on that advice’ in formulating its proposal. [[1635]](#footnote-1636)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee considers that the best possible administrative structure and arrangements are critical to the protection of rights in the ACT. It also considers it important that the intent of proposals to review and amalgamate rights protection agencies be explicitly stated, and that the outcome of any review process would represent true value for money in that it would deliver rational and effective structures for rights protection in the context of an effective use of resources.

In light of this the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government present in the Legislative Assembly a statement clarifying the primary intent of the review of rights protection agencies in the ACT, and proposals for their amalgamation, before any major legislative or administrative changes are made for those agencies.

* + - 1. Legislative change to combat outlaw motorcycle gangs

In hearings of 25 June 2015 the Committee noted that laws to combat organised criminal groups, including outlaw motorcycle gangs, had been flagged as one of the government’s priorities for 2015-16, and asked for further detail on this.[[1636]](#footnote-1637)

In responding, the Attorney-General told the Committee that:

Yes. It is important that the ACT remains proactive in understanding the impact of organised crime in our community and making sure that it is kept in check and making sure that the police have the necessary and appropriately framed powers to deal with those matters. I am very pleased to say that the police have significantly resourced their response in the area of organised crime, particularly motorcycle gang-based crime. Taskforce Nemesis is an ongoing ACT policing operation, a dedicated taskforce to disrupt and dismantle criminal motorcycle gang activity here in the ACT.

The government continues to look at a number of legislative responses in the area of dealing with these organised crime groups and in particular is looking at issues around association and is looking at issues around managing large group events which we sometimes see these criminal motorcycle gangs involved in.[[1637]](#footnote-1638)

The Attorney-General also told the Committee that, regarding the particular approach proposed, that the ACT Government:

does not support the approach adopted in other jurisdictions but we still remain committed to a proactive and strong response to dealing with organised criminal groups in a proportionate manner. The response that we are looking at is one that is based on the evidence.[[1638]](#footnote-1639)

The Committee asked the Attorney-General if the government’s intention to proceed was due to a change of circumstances. In response, the Attorney-General told the Committee that:

The fact is that there has been a change in circumstances in the criminal scene in the ACT and the police have been very clear about that. Four or five years ago there was only one established motorcycle gang in the ACT. Their presence was relatively low profile and relatively benign compared with the activities of that group in other jurisdictions. That has now changed. What we have seen is the arrival of a second motorcycle group based here in the ACT. We have seen an increase in rivalry between those two groups, patching over of members from one group to another, and criminality associated with that. That is what has changed. As circumstances change, the government’s response changes accordingly to meet those new circumstances.[[1639]](#footnote-1640)

* + - 1. Pop-up Facilities During Court Redevelopment

The Minister explained that two shortlisted consortia are in the final stages of bidding for a project to redevelop and expand the existing courts precinct to provide for an integrated courts complex that will link the Magistrates Court with the Supreme Court.[[1640]](#footnote-1641) The courts must continue to operate during the period of the redevelopment and there is provision in the budget for the construction of a temporary facility should it be required.

The temporary facility, should it proceed, would be built on the site adjacent to the Magistrates Court and the entry of Northbourne Avenue onto Vernon Circle. This is vacant land, distinct from the London Circuit carpark.[[1641]](#footnote-1642) The Minister noted that, depending on the outcome of bids, the permanent facility was expected to be operational in the first quarter of 2018.[[1642]](#footnote-1643)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that Capital Metro Environmental Impact Statement indicates the London Circuit car park space may be used during the construction of light rail. The Committee notes the Minister’s assurances that there will be sufficient car parking in the area to service users of the courts during the court redevelopment and light rail construction.[[1643]](#footnote-1644)

The Committee acknowledges that this is an area that engages many different parts of Government: JACS regarding safety for court users, TAMS for parking provision, Capital Metro for its construction responsibilities and CMTEDD with a coordinating role. The Committee notes the importance of ensuring the safety and security of courts users during the period of redevelopment.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee, noting the intended use of the London Circuit car park by Capital Metro, recommends that the ACT Government ensure adequate parking is available for the Court precinct and local traders during the Law Court renovations.

The Committee recommends that during the Law Court renovations the ACT Government assist in court users’ physical safety by ensuring appropriate pathways and adequate lighting.

* 1. Emergency Services Agency
     1. Matters considered

During the hearings, the following matters were considered in relation to the ESA:

* the Emergency Services Agency (ESA) Strategic Reform Agenda and the ACT Ambulance Service (ACTAS) Blueprint for Change;[[1644]](#footnote-1645)
* the Pathway to a Diverse and Inclusive Workforce, including Step One, Women in Emergency Services Strategy;[[1645]](#footnote-1646)
* processes employed to select a new Chief Officer for the ACT SES;[[1646]](#footnote-1647)
* response times for ACT Ambulance Service;[[1647]](#footnote-1648)
* new structure for senior staffing arrangements in the ESA;[[1648]](#footnote-1649)
* writing-off of money owed for ambulance attendance;[[1649]](#footnote-1650)
* a forthcoming recruitment for the ACT Fire & Rescue College;[[1650]](#footnote-1651)
* volunteers, staffing and training within ESA;[[1651]](#footnote-1652)
* the transition to a new provider and airframe for the Snowy SouthCare helicopter service;[[1652]](#footnote-1653)
* indicators for the State Emergency Service (SES) and Rural Fire Service (RFS);[[1653]](#footnote-1654) and
* performance of Community Fire Units (CFUs).[[1654]](#footnote-1655)

In addition, Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* the replacement of the Chief Officer for the ACT SES using a lateral transfer process within the organisation, and how often this has occurred in the past; [[1655]](#footnote-1656)
* the occurrence of any external reviews into the ESA in the last financial year and any planned for the new financial year;[[1656]](#footnote-1657)
* the waiving of unpaid debts for ambulance trips and the breakdown of these debts between ACT residents and interstate residents; [[1657]](#footnote-1658)
* the billing of ambulance trips for age pensioners in emergencies and non-emergencies; [[1658]](#footnote-1659)
* the comparison of unpaid debt between the ACT and other jurisdictions, particularly as compared to New South Wales; [[1659]](#footnote-1660)
* the numbers of volunteer staff in the CFU, RFS and SES for 2014‑15 and 2015‑16; [[1660]](#footnote-1661)
* the number of level one, two and three fire controllers across the relevant ACT agencies; [[1661]](#footnote-1662) and
* the reviews undertaken within ESA and whether these reviews can be released to the Committee. [[1662]](#footnote-1663)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. ESA ‘Strategic Reform Agenda’ and ACTAS ‘Blueprint for Change’

In her opening statement of 25 June 2015 the Minister for Police and Emergency Services told the Committee about the Emergency Services Agency’s Strategic Reform Agenda:

As a new minister my focus has been on the future and to continue the support to enhance the ESA. As part of this future focus the ESA is now moving towards implementing the strategic reform agenda which was announced by the commissioner earlier this year. The strategic reform agenda provides the opportunity to strengthen the capabilities and effectiveness of our emergency services through operational, fiscal and cultural reform, and builds upon the outcomes of a number of reviews that have been undertaken.

The strategic reform agenda is about providing cohesive operations, a collaborative management team and a unified executive within the ESA.[[1663]](#footnote-1664)

The Minister also spoke about the ACT Ambulance Service (ACTAS) Blueprint for Change:

Following the launch of the ACTAS blueprint for change in March this year I am pleased to see that ACTAS is positively progressing, with a series of measures to enhance the service. I recently received the first quarterly report for the ESA for the blueprint for change which shows ACTAS staff are positively engaged in this organisation. I am absolutely committed to seeing this initiative being successfully implemented. I am proposing to make a ministerial statement to the chamber in September this year.[[1664]](#footnote-1665)

Later in hearings the Minister was asked for further detail on the Strategic Reform Agenda. In responding, she told the Committee that it was:

a way of moving the ESA towards a very strong, unified and collaborative approach. It has been some work that the commissioner has been focused on for some time.[[1665]](#footnote-1666)

At this point the Minister asked the Commissioner of the ESA to provide further detail. He told the Committee that:

The strategic reform agenda is about setting the scene for the Emergency Services Agency for the next five years. For me, it is a very important agenda that we are setting for ourselves in relation to a whole host of things which I will go into more detail about in a minute. Just by way of background, I think there are two key elements that I take as important in relation to the future of emergency services and how we best serve our community and ensure our firefighters, paramedics and volunteers are able to serve the people on the ground.

One is at the broader national level in relation to the position that ACT government has agreed to in relation to the national strategy for disaster resilience, which recognises the importance of investment in planning and community resilience through education and promotion of the hazards that jurisdictions like the ACT face. [[1666]](#footnote-1667)

The Commissioner went on to say that the strategic reform agenda would ‘focus a lot on that’, and that this was:

backed up very much by the recent Productivity Commission findings in relation to disaster resilience undertaken at the national level, which clearly demonstrates that investment in prevention and protection is much better than trying to spend that money later on in response to recovery. For me, within ESA, we are going to take a significant focus on that over the next five years.[[1667]](#footnote-1668)

Speaking in further detail, the Commissioner told the Committee that the Strategic Reform Agenda was:

itself … broken into five separate parts—structure, strategy, people, performance and accountability. In terms of structure, we are going through some significant reforms and we are working very closely with our ESA executive about that. Some of that relates to one of the previous questions. We are creating new executive positions within the ESA to allow us to meet those future challenges. Whilst we continue to have our full operational services and the chief officers of those, we are creating two other executive positions. One is in relation to our logistics and support area, which is a continuation of the previous director’s support services role, which is about ensuring we have cohesive operations of our logistics, finance and administration.[[1668]](#footnote-1669)

In addition, he told the Committee, the ESA was:

creating a new people and culture position, which is all about ensuring that we recognise how valuable our people are to us not only in terms of our day-to-day operations but also our continued workforce planning. Again, it is not only for our staff; it is to ensure that we continue to have a sustainable volunteer workforce into the future as well. We are also creating a risk and planning area, which is about those things that I have identified that are very much on the national agenda. The data clearly shows how much better we could invest in prevention and planning into the future to make sure that we meet those future challenges.[[1669]](#footnote-1670)

Furthermore, he told the Committee, the ESA was:

developing a new strategic plan to make sure we pick up on government commitments on infrastructure upgrades in terms of the station upgrades and relocation program and the important rollout of the $15 million program to upgrade the territory radio network, as well as the other communication systems that we continue to provide. We have got, obviously, the DTS to deliver and we continue with our fleet and rollover of our fleet program. All of those things are key to our strategy, as well as other key important programs such as our women in emergency services program, which the minister has already talked about, which is phase 1 of our pathway to a diverse and inclusive workforce. [[1670]](#footnote-1671)

The Commissioner also spoke specifically about the ACTAS Blueprint for Change:

We are already focusing, through the ACTAS blueprint for change, on significant leadership programs that consist of communications to our staff to ensure that we have good feedback and consultative mechanisms, particularly in relation to the recent re-establishment of things like workplace consultative and local consultative committees with staff. Of course, there is our ongoing commitment to volunteer consultation, which is recognised in the volunteer charter which the ACT government signed off on with our own volunteers. We will continue to work very closely on the people aspect of the agenda.[[1671]](#footnote-1672)

* + - 1. Pathway to a Diverse and Inclusive Workforce

In her opening statement of 25 June 2015, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services told the Committee that:

I am very pleased to be the first female minister in the ACT for emergency services and police. I will have a focus on promoting women across our services. In the coming weeks I will be launching the pathway to a diverse and inclusive workforce—step one, women in emergency services strategy. This pathway is a key document and outlines a series of targeted actions that will take the ESA on a journey to improve the attraction, development and retention of women across our services.[[1672]](#footnote-1673)

Later in the hearing the Commissioner for the ESA was asked for further detail on this policy and related matters. In response, he told the Committee that:

I think the key is when the minister releases step 1 of the pathway to a diverse and inclusive workforce it very much will send a much stronger message than we have in the past. Like in a lot of male-dominated organisations—this is my personal view—we think we are doing all right in this space until we actually step back and say, “How do we really compare?” When I started to compare our numbers with traditional male-dominated roles such as banking, investment companies, engineering, manufacturing, the defence forces and mining we are not keeping up. Therefore, we are seeing significant increases in women within those areas but not within our traditional emergency services roles.[[1673]](#footnote-1674)

Further, he told the Committee:

We have probably got to do a little more work to raise the awareness of why it is important, and it is a bit hard for people to understand that at first. But when I go back and look at the data, when I look at the research and when I look at the capability we see in the women we have already got in our organisation, it just says to me, “We are never going to get to a fifty-fifty balance or anything like that.” Hopefully we will make sure that we have an opportunity for as many women that want to be a part of the organisation, particularly volunteers—we are not just talking about paid here, of course—to see it as not only a career but obviously a very important way that they can support the community.[[1674]](#footnote-1675)

* + - 1. Selection of a new Chief Officer for the ACT SES

In hearings of 25 June 2015 the Committee asked the Commissioner of the ESA questions regarding the selection of a new Chief Officer for ACT State Emergency Service (SES), as the incumbent Chief Officer had given notice of his intention to retire.[[1675]](#footnote-1676)

In response to questions the Commissioner told the Committee:

* he had ‘made a recommendation to the Directorate in relation to a replacement’, and this was ‘going up through the appropriate process to the Head of Service’;**[[1676]](#footnote-1677)**
* that the position had not been advertised;**[[1677]](#footnote-1678)**
* that the ESA had ‘decided to go through a process to appoint internally through lateral transfer’; **[[1678]](#footnote-1679)**
* that the candidate had been considered in the course of ‘a recent a selection process’ for another position, and in that process had been identified ‘as someone capable of taking on that role, or a similar role, within the ACT senior executive service’; **[[1679]](#footnote-1680)**
* that this was ‘part of a full and open employment process’; **[[1680]](#footnote-1681)** and
* that ‘as the employer, we have a number of different options … that allow us to laterally transfer positions and put people with the appropriate qualification into those roles’.**[[1681]](#footnote-1682)**

The Commissioner was asked a further question about how many positions within the ESA had been filled in this way, and the Committee was later advised that there have been no specific transfers of this nature in the ESA.[[1682]](#footnote-1683)

The Committee notes the comments of the Head of Service on 16 June 2015 in detailing the progress on the ‘one government’ approach within the service, where:

We have also had an increased focus on mobility across the service so that staff understand the different perspectives of the different directorates and the different contexts that the different directorates work in. We have had an increased focus on senior executive development.[[1683]](#footnote-1684)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that the ESA Strategic Reform Agenda and ACTAS Blueprint for Change respond to matters raised in the context of other inquiries by relevant committees of the Legislative Assembly.[[1684]](#footnote-1685)

The Committee notes the potential advantages of lateral transfers in filing vacant positions, but also recognises the desire for a full and open recruitment process. The Committee feels that recruitment processes should afford all interested and qualified parties the opportunity to apply for any vacancies in the applicant’s relevant field of experience.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government develop a policy to address recruitment issues, such as lateral transfers and advertising of positions, to ensure the most equitable outcomes for applicants and to obtain the best staffing outcomes for the government.

* + - 1. New provider and airframe for Snowy SouthCare helicopter

In hearings of 25 June 2015 the Committee asked questions regarding a re-tender for helicopters for the Snowy Hydro SouthCare Service.[[1685]](#footnote-1686)

The Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2013-2014 states that:

The Snowy Hydro SouthCare (SHS) helicopter aero-medical service is a joint venture funded by the ACT and NSW Governments which provides aero-medical retrieval and rescue services to the ACT and surrounding region of south-east NSW.

Medical staffing for the service is drawn from Intensive Care Flight Paramedics employed by the ACTAS and Flight Physicians from the Capital Region Retrieval Service at [the Canberra Hospital]. Pilots, aircrew and engineering support is provided by CHC Helicopters (Aust).[[1686]](#footnote-1687)

In responding to questions, the Chief Officer, ACT Ambulance Service and the Secretary of the operating company for the service told the Committee that:

Yes, we signed contracts with Toll helicopter group in December last year. Under the agreed contract implementation Toll are due to commence here in the ACT in April 2017. As part of that contract Toll will also be providing airframes to greater Sydney region. There will be two aircraft stationed in Sydney, Wollongong, Canberra, Orange and Lismore. The second part of the contract, which is a state-wide contract for New South Wales, was awarded to Hunter region, who will also be using the same airframe, which will be the Agusta 139 aircraft.[[1687]](#footnote-1688)

In relation to this new aircraft, the Chief Officer told the Committee that:

The Agusta 139 machine that will be coming online is brand new; it is coming out of the factory. That was part of the contractual requirements. The machine gives us far greater range. It meets the category A performance. It will give us night-vision capability that we do not currently have on the machine here in Canberra, and it is essentially a newer, much more powerful machine.[[1688]](#footnote-1689)

He also told the Committee that the new provider would commence operations on 1 April 2017.[[1689]](#footnote-1690)

The Committee asked whether the new aircraft was bigger than the one it replaced, and whether it was able to fit into the existing hangar at the Snowy SouthCare base at Hume.[[1690]](#footnote-1691)

In response, the Chief Officer told the Committee that:

I can assure you, Mr Smyth, that it does right now, but unfortunately the tail rotor clearance on the 139 leaves us with about 25 millimetres to spare going into the hangar. We have already commenced discussions with Toll about undertaking modifications to the gantry of the hangar. Once we are inside it is not a problem at all; we have plenty of clearance. It is about the initial entry point for the tail rotor on the 139. Over the next couple of years we will be undertaking works at the hangar doors to fix that.[[1691]](#footnote-1692)

The Chief Officer told the Committee that the 25 millimetre clearance available at present was insufficient to ensure safe operation and storage of the helicopter:

If you get a heavy pilot in the front and the tail rotor dips upwards, because it does come in on the undercarriage, we would prefer not to have the occasion of the tail rotor striking the top of the hangar.[[1692]](#footnote-1693)

The Chief Officer was not able to advise the Committee about the cost of works required to modify the hangar.[[1693]](#footnote-1694)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that correct storage of advanced equipment such as aircraft is essential to the safe and effective work of Snowy Hydro SouthCare service. Due diligence by the ESA would anticipate, and prepare for, any modifications necessary due to the advent of new equipment, including resultant costs.

In light of this the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide the Legislative Assembly, within three sitting days of receipt of the detail, the full cost of modifying its Hume Air Base hangar to house the Agusta 139 helicopter in 2017.

* + - 1. Indicators for SES and RFS

In hearings of 25 June 2015 the Committee asked questions about accountability indicators for the State Emergency Service (SES) and Rural Fire Service (RFS).[[1694]](#footnote-1695)

In particular the Committee noted that there were no indicators for the SES or RFS in the Budget papers under the heading ‘Response and Recovery’.[[1695]](#footnote-1696)

In light of this the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider accountability indicators for both the Rural Fire Service and State Emergency Service under the Response and Recovery heading of the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Budget Statement.

* + - 1. Performance of Community Fire Units

In hearings of 25 June 2015 the Committee asked the ESA Commissioner whether there had been any formal evaluation of Community Fire Units (CFUs) in the ten years of their operation in the ACT.[[1696]](#footnote-1697)

In response the Commissioner told the Committee that he was ‘not aware of any specific evaluation as such to judge their work’.[[1697]](#footnote-1698)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

In light of the absence of formal evaluation of ACT CFUs, and given that ten years has elapsed since they were introduced in the ACT, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conduct a formal evaluation of Community Fire Units and present it to the Legislative Assembly by June 2016.

* 1. ACT Policing
     1. Matters considered

At hearings of 25 June 2015, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services discussed the following matters with the Committee:

* application of an efficiency dividend to the budget of ACT Policing;[[1698]](#footnote-1699)
* referrals of matters by other ACT Government agencies to ACT Policing; [[1699]](#footnote-1700)
* support provided by ACT Policing to other agencies and institutions in preventing crime, including through advice based on the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design;[[1700]](#footnote-1701)
* downward trends for certain crimes in the ACT;[[1701]](#footnote-1702)
* the role of ‘enabling services’, that is: services provided to ACT Policing by the Australian Federal Police (AFP), such as ‘forensic services, information and communication technology [and] high tech crime’; [[1702]](#footnote-1703)
* geographical distribution of ACT Policing resources and focus;[[1703]](#footnote-1704)
* ACT Policing and outlaw motorcycle gangs; [[1704]](#footnote-1705)
* random roadside alcohol and drug testing of vehicle drivers;[[1705]](#footnote-1706) and
* road safety around schools.[[1706]](#footnote-1707)

In addition a Question Taken on Notice was asked and answered regarding:

* the number of times children have been present in vehicles that are booked for traffic infringements in or near school zones. [[1707]](#footnote-1708)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Application of an efficiency dividend to ACT Policing

In hearings of 25 June 2015 the Committee asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services questions about reductions in funding in 2013, quoted as amounting to $15.3 million, a small amount of which had been reinvested in ACT Policing, leaving a $12 million shortfall.[[1708]](#footnote-1709)

The Minister responded by saying:

I think you are referring … to the general saving measures that have been applied to ACT Policing, as they have been applied to a number of government agencies and, indeed, as I understand it, the Australian Federal Police itself. There is tranche of a four-year saving. The Chief Police Officer has said a couple of times that he can realise those savings; there is an absolute commitment to front-line on-the-ground services.[[1709]](#footnote-1710)

In addition, she told the Committee:

I have confidence that with smart modelling, smart response and how [ACT Policing] configure their teams, our community will continue to have the safety that they currently enjoy.[[1710]](#footnote-1711)

At this point the Minister asked the Deputy Chief Officer of ACT Policing to provide further detail to the Committee. The Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee that ACT Policing had:

very clearly considered internally what is the best way that we can structure our resources—whether it is a centralised or decentralised view—minimising the management structures inside to give and protect the numbers on the front line, the officers on the front line.[[1711]](#footnote-1712)

He went on to say that ACT Policing had ‘achieved that in this last year’, and was ‘going to undertake now a new focus towards what is the best way we can be as lean and mean as possible within a management group’:[[1712]](#footnote-1713)

There are some positions we have had that may well have come from history, that were there because they were always there. ACT Policing has been fairly stable on that ground, and we do not want to be stable on that ground; we want to look to the future for opportunity and we want to provide the policing group now with a structure that fits the challenges as they stand, as different problems have emerged.[[1713]](#footnote-1714)

At this point the Committee asked how many positions would be lost within ACT Policing as a result of the funding reduction and organisational restructure. In response the Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee that:

For the 2015-16 year, we think that will be around 13 positions, but it depends on what level those positions are, the different pay grades. We certainly have a thrust in ACT police to refresh our workforce. There is natural attrition. The people who leave during that natural attrition are generally much higher paid, at the top of the pay bands, and we are a pathway in for recruits. So that may well be less than that in reality.[[1714]](#footnote-1715)

In response to further questions, the Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee that no other positions had been lost to date, and that the reductions in staffing would be realised through the proposed restructure occurring in the 2015-16 financial year.[[1715]](#footnote-1716)

In response to further questions, the Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee that there had not been a $15 million reduction in funding ‘to this point’, as ACT Policing had been able to ‘achieve efficiencies through non-front-line initiatives in the last two financial years’, and that savings would be achieved without reductions in front-line policing.[[1716]](#footnote-1717), [[1717]](#footnote-1718)

* + - 1. Random roadside alcohol and drug testing

In hearings of 25 June 2015 the Committee asked questions about random roadside alcohol and drug testing.[[1718]](#footnote-1719)

In response the Deputy Chief Officer outlined recent statistics in relation to random breath testing and random roadside drug testing for the Committee.[[1719]](#footnote-1720) He provided further clarification in correspondence to the Committee, advising that:

For the 2013-14 financial year ACT Policing conducted 148,295 random breath tests of which 1,348 drivers/driver trainers were identified as being the prescribed concentration of alcohol. That is a ratio of approximately one in 110 drivers/driver trainers returning a positive test for alcohol by breath.

For the 2013-14 financial year ACT Policing conducted 2,542 random roadside drug tests of which 268 drivers/driver trainers returned a positive reading for the presence of a prescribed drug. This is a ratio is approximately one in 9.5 drivers/driver trainers.

In the first three quarters of the 2014-15 financial year ACT Policing conducted 110,180 random breath tests of which 873 drivers/driver trainers were identified as being the prescribed concentration of alcohol. That is a ratio of approximately one per 126 drivers/driver trainers

In the first three quarters of 2014-15 financial year ACT Policing conducted 1986 random roadside drug tests of which 276 drivers/driver trainers returned a positive reading for the presence of a prescribed drug. This is a ratio of approximately one in 7 drivers/driver trainers.[[1720]](#footnote-1721)

The Deputy Chief Officer noted that ‘our statistics, although the team works hard at that, are still based on a relatively low population. If you multiply that on a high level of population it is alarming.’[[1721]](#footnote-1722)

The Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee:

Trends across this country are indicating that as we do more tests on more and more people we are getting more return on the positive drug results and more and more of the tests are revealing that there is a methamphetamine component, not just cannabis.[[1722]](#footnote-1723)

Regarding drug drivers, the Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee that:

These people have a level of effect and a level of danger on the road which is not traditionally captured. They are not the traditional person who staggers out of a licensed premises or a home, a person who can barely stand and barely talk. These are people who may well have consumed this drug within the last 12 hours, 24 hours or 48 hours and we will still get some responses.[[1723]](#footnote-1724)

The Deputy Chief Officer also identified a difficulty in connection with drug testing, in that:

the test says only that it is positive to drugs. It does not have the technology or that ability to tell you how much of the drug, so how impaired they are like traditional drink testing shows. [[1724]](#footnote-1725)

Moreover, he told the Committee, there were new patterns of drug use that presented a particular challenge to formerly accepted ways to approach driver testing:

With the new technology, they are becoming more and more skilled about who may be likely random targets. It is not through the traditional method of a car that is unroadworthy, not looking very good and being driven all over the place. These are people who are in all stations of life and in all levels of motor vehicle, which challenges the traditional police targeting and identification of people who may have an impaired capacity on the road and who are sharing the road with others.[[1725]](#footnote-1726)

The Committee asked the Deputy Chief Officer about wider responses to the emerging pattern of drug use he identified. In response he told the Committee that:

If this is a societal-community issue, we need to attack it from every angle. We will not arrest our way out of people taking these drugs and driving their cars. We need to educate them from the ground up, through the schools, of the dangers. We need to continue education of people looking after their friends and their mates from a young age. We also need to look at where the supply is from. It is also where the drugs are coming from. How is the supply available? So this is a multi-layered approach.[[1726]](#footnote-1727)

Underscoring that emerging patterns represented new challenges, the Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee that:

This is a new phenomenon. As sad as it is, I do not think enough members of the community have realised the level and the number of people who are taking drugs, which is not evident, and that they are driving. I think an awakening will occur as we move into this drug space—more and more people’s behaviours when they are affected by different drugs. As we detect more, I think we will have buy-in from a state and a federal level towards that education and it will become more of a national conversation. This is not acceptable.[[1727]](#footnote-1728)

The Deputy Chief Officer also noted that conventional approaches were not adequate and that there needed to be further developments in the response to drug driving:

The penalties—I would not say the penalties are fine. I think the penalties are consistently applied by the courts in relation to drug or alcohol driving. The disqualifications are consistently applied in general but it is not stopping that. So how do we stop the people that have taken that drug 24 hours before? First of all, we educate them to know that it is still in their system. That is a common reaction, “We didn’t know it would last so long because alcohol doesn’t.” How do we educate them in that space? [[1728]](#footnote-1729)

In addition, he told the Committee, there were technical and cost limitations for roadside drug testing:

One of the challenges we have is that this is quite a technical process. We cannot do it on the side of the road quickly—count to 10, there is the positive and do quite a quick process. There is a technical aspect. People are specifically trained. We have a specific group who does that testing. The kits must be maintained at a certain temperature. The samples must be maintained at a certain temperature. There is a continuity of evidence aspect which is significant in relation to prosecution. It takes quite a lot longer. It may take up to 20 or 25 minutes. It may be five to 10 minutes on the roadside just to see an indication. It may well take 20 to 30 minutes actually just to capture enough saliva on the physical test in the station where we are doing it because the effects of the drug dries them out. We need the saliva. It is a longer process. It is not as quick; so it slows down the number. There is an increased cost associated with those tests rather than with the RBT. It does not define how many we do.[[1729]](#footnote-1730)

When asked further questions about the cost of roadside drug testing compared with roadside blood-alcohol testing, the Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee that the cost of random breath testing for alcohol was ‘[v]irtually a number of cents for the old tubes’ with follow‑up formal breath analysis for random alcohol testing costing less than $100. Conversely, positive roadside drug tests had to be confirmed in a laboratory. While the initial random drug test costs approximately $38, the subsequent formalised testing is more costly at several hundred dollars per test and, depending on jurisdiction, can vary from $300 to $500 per test.[[1730]](#footnote-1731)

The Deputy Chief Officer told the Committee that ACT Policing intended to increase numbers of tests, and noted special requirements in connection with drug testing:

We are trying to get more people cross-trained as we roll out—we also have to make sure the infrastructure is there to protect the continuity of the testing, as I am saying, because there is a temperature aspect to that. We have to make sure that we have the fridges or the containers in the right place to make sure the sample, as a piece of evidence, is not contaminated in any way so that we will have a successful prosecution. We have got to get it to the lab first and get it tested. That is critical. It is an extra few layers but for us it is worth every investment in doing that and our plan is to try and increase those numbers.[[1731]](#footnote-1732)

In connection with this line of questioning, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, speaking to cross-government cooperation of this issue, told the Committee that:

Certainly at the COAG level, in respect of just the drug ice there is the Ice Taskforce. There are discussions around the country on that. There will certainly be some activity, I have no doubt, that will come out through that process as well. But as we refresh the ACT road safety policy as well, that will be the framework on which we can embark on this across-agency education, community education awareness raising, because a lot of people just do not understand the consequences and the ripple effect of what they are putting in their system and how long it stays in there for.[[1732]](#footnote-1733)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee views emerging patterns of drug use and drug driving with great concern. From evidence tendered to the Committee it is clear that there are distinctly new patterns and prevalence in this area, including more widespread use of ice and other forms of methamphetamine in drivers, and that this increases risks from drug driving as this drug has profound effects and persists in a physical sense for longer periods.

In considering evidence provided to it, the Committee wishes to highlight pressing needs to:

* increase community awareness about the effects of drugs, including crystal methamphetamines (‘ice’) on driving capacity, and the physical persistence of drugs in the human body;
* consider the implications of the persistence of drugs in the human body for definitions of driver impairment and the way offences are defined in statute; and
* take active steps to reduce the cost per test of drug driving tests, and support ACT Policing in providing continuity of evidence in relation to random roadside drug tests, so as to support prosecutions and thus have drug driving offences operate effectively to deter drug driving.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government develop and table a comprehensive approach to addressing drug driving, including community awareness and legal implications.

* + - 1. ACT Policing and School Safety Zones

The Committee heard that the Minister has included two new priorities in the most recent ACT Policing Ministerial Directions, domestic violence and school safety zones.[[1733]](#footnote-1734)

In regard to school safety zones the Committee heard that they are seeing infringements for:

A combination of driving behaviour, parking, where you want to park, mobile phones, seatbelts—a lot of inattention things: “It’s only a short run to school. We’ll drop them off quick and get back in and we don’t have to go far.” Our road safety calendar drives a lot of activity; I have been impressed by the document, having seen it for the first time four months ago.

We are restructuring that, as Ms Playford said, in partnership with JACS, to say, “Okay, we will target particularly the pre-holiday and post-holiday periods we see as when the worst behaviours happen.” The children have been having a great time too; they want to go on holidays and not pay any attention. They had a great holiday and are not paying attention coming back. We will build the higher levels of specific activity around the schools, being at crossings in those periods, than we had last year. We actively respond and provide support for any complaints that come in from schools and/or people in streets or suburbs or places. We have been doing that. But we will have more of a dedicated built-in focus around those for next year. As to the exact details and number, we are still creating that, as it is a new initiative, but it will be part of the calendar when it gets released.[[1734]](#footnote-1735)

The Minister advised that there would be a stronger ACT Policing presence around school zones including patrolling and speed cameras.[[1735]](#footnote-1736)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government update the Assembly prior to the start of the 2016 school year on its focus on improving road safety, particularly around school zones, as outlined in the 2015-16 Ministerial Direction.

* 1. Corrective Services
     1. Matters considered

The following matters were considered.

* increasing numbers of inmates at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC);[[1736]](#footnote-1737)
* plans for a Needle and Syringe Exchange Program at the AMC;[[1737]](#footnote-1738)
* an update on works to expand the capacity of the AMC;[[1738]](#footnote-1739)
* use of the Periodic Detention Centre in Symonston for inmates who cannot easily be accommodated due to high numbers of inmates at the AMC;[[1739]](#footnote-1740)
* the Throughcare program and its effects on recidivism;[[1740]](#footnote-1741)
* an expansion in community corrections to replace Periodic Detention, and the anticipated advent of intensive community corrections orders as a sentencing option in the ACT;[[1741]](#footnote-1742)
* drugs and other contraband at the AMC;[[1742]](#footnote-1743)
* characteristics of inmates on admission, with regard to: low levels of educational achievement; a history of low levels of participation in the workforce; mental health problems; problem with drug and alcohol use; problems with housing and homelessness;[[1743]](#footnote-1744)
* whether the Throughcare program seeks to modify domestic violence offending behaviour;[[1744]](#footnote-1745) and
* prison industries and other forms of employment for AMC inmates.[[1745]](#footnote-1746)

In addition, Questions Taken on Notice were asked and answered regarding:

* the number of intercepts of contraband entering the AMC over the last 12 months; [[1746]](#footnote-1747)
* reported incidences of problems with alcohol, drug dependencies, educational problems, mental health problems, poor employment histories and issues with housing among AMC detainees; [[1747]](#footnote-1748) and
* the training preparedness or support an employer or a prospective employer is given prior to taking on a detainee or an individual that is going through the transitional release program. [[1748]](#footnote-1749)
  + 1. KEY ISSUES
       1. Plans for a Needle and Syringe Exchange Program at the AMC

In hearings of 25 June 2015 the Minister for Justice, in his opening statement, told the Committee that:

We have also held true to the government’s policy intent to move forward on a needle and syringe exchange program in prison by working closely with the CPSU and other stakeholders to reset the debate and find a positive place in which to continue that discussion and develop a model for future consideration. I know this is a controversial health initiative, but it is also a very important health initiative and I believe it is one that will ultimately save lives and realise significant health benefits in our corrections system. Our through-care program continues to go from strength to strength, and it is currently preparing for a full evaluation.[[1749]](#footnote-1750)

Later in the hearing further questions were put to the Minister regarding the Needle and Syringe Exchange Program (NSEP).[[1750]](#footnote-1751)

The Committee asked the Minister for an update on negotiations with staff regarding the program. In responding, he told the Committee that:

Through the process of the discussion on the enterprise agreement we have now established a process in partnership with the Community and Public Sector Union whereby we have agreed to essentially reset the discussions, in some ways start afresh, and we will basically put together a panel, a working group, comprised of staff from corrections and other parts of the ACT government and then representatives of corrections officers and the union as they choose. They will work together to design a model that could work at the AMC, and then the intent is for staff to vote on that within 12 months of the date of the start of the enterprise agreement.[[1751]](#footnote-1752)

In response to further questions the Minister told the Committee that:

* all staff covered by the relevant Enterprise Agreement would be included in any future ballot regarding the implementation of the NSEP; [[1752]](#footnote-1753) and
* that, regarding timeframes for the NSEP, the ‘first step really [was] to start the discussions, to design a model that is agreeable to be put to a vote, and then the time frame will depend on the outcome of that vote’. [[1753]](#footnote-1754), [[1754]](#footnote-1755)
  + - 1. Works to expand the capacity of the AMC

The Minister was asked questions regarding works to expand to the capacity of the AMC. [[1755]](#footnote-1756)

In responding to questions, the Minister told the Committee that the project was ‘running on time and on budget’:

It is really being delivered in two phases. We expect the special care unit to be available in September for full use. There will be a series of commissioning works and testing phases prior to that. That is a 30-bed facility. The larger accommodation unit is on schedule to be ready in the middle of next year.[[1756]](#footnote-1757)

When asked about the implications of the expansion for management of the AMC, the Minister told the Committee that:

Both units—they are a bit different—in the broad have been designed to offer a greater capacity for segregation in light of the operational lessons that have been learnt since the AMC has opened and particularly the higher separation rate than was forecast at the time the AMC was designed. In both cases each of the buildings has a range of wings that offer high levels of segregation. It means people can operate program spaces and the like and it minimises the need for people to perhaps be moved across the prison for programs, health treatments and the like. So there are two issues. One is providing more separated spaces to separate out cohorts and the other is less need for movement of people across the prison, which again enhances safety and obviously provides some efficiencies as well.[[1757]](#footnote-1758)

Further questions noted the high number of inmates at present, and asked whether there was an expected timeframe after which further works would be needed to create further capacity at the AMC. In responding the Minister told the Committee that:

As you know, we have had John Walker come in and provide us with updated forecasting. It is quite simple to match those numbers up against Mr Walker’s forecast. My personal view is that I would like this to be the last expansion of the AMC, and that is why the government has simultaneously invested in work on our justice reform and justice reinvestment strategies to make sure that we minimise the number of people that need to go to jail or to focus on making sure that the people who go to jail are the people who have to go to jail, and that people who might be better served through other means that can address their offending behaviour can get that more appropriate treatment, support and rehabilitation in the community.[[1758]](#footnote-1759)

* + - 1. Drugs, drug testing and contraband at the AMC

With regard to drugs and contraband at the AMC, questions were put to the Minister about:

* how inmates reported as having used drugs were detected;[[1759]](#footnote-1760)
* whether any matters were referred to police as a result of detected drug use;[[1760]](#footnote-1761)
* whether random drug testing at the AMC resulted in an identification of inmates who had yielded a positive test; [[1761]](#footnote-1762)
* whether it were possible to test corrections officers for drug use;[[1762]](#footnote-1763) and
* in what way drugs and other contraband entered the AMC, and the number of instances in which contraband had been intercepted.[[1763]](#footnote-1764)

In responding to questions about the detection of drug use at the AMC, the General Manager, Custodial Operations, told the Committee that:

There are three ways of detecting drug use in the centre. We have random urinalysis, we have target urinalysis and we have admissions urinalysis. The target testing is based on our intelligence that we have established that some persons may be undertaking drug use. As you know, our random system brings out a random number per month, and all those statistics are kept, so it could be any one of those three ways. The target and random testing at the current status does not carry with it sanctions; they are a data collection analysis only. The target testing which is generated through our intelligence certainly carries sanctions; they range from restricted regimes to restricted visiting privileges—by restricted visiting privileges, I am talking about contact or non-contact visits—and the capability of referral to drug and alcohol support programs.[[1764]](#footnote-1765)

In responding to questions about whether inmates yielding a positive test were referred to police, the General Manager told the Committee that:

From urinalysis we do not refer those to the police. The persons that are detected using drugs in the centre are not referred to police at all; they are dealt with internally. If we have a contraband find, absolutely, but not drug use.[[1765]](#footnote-1766)

The Executive Director, ACT Corrective Services, also responded to this line of questioning, advising the Committee:

It is a reasonable question, but unless you actually find the drugs on the person, it is my experience in New South Wales and Victoria that there is no point in referring to police. If you do a physical search and you find it in someone’s room or in their pocket or something and they admit ownership, it is much easier. Quite often you might find the contraband hidden in a common area or in a room that is shared by two people, so it is hard to prove ownership. Once someone has actually administered the drug, however they have done that, and it is only showing in their urine, it is really hard to prove. I do not know any jurisdiction that would do charges at that point. The most appropriate response is normally, as we do, in terms of restricting contact visits and a referral to a program, if it is appropriate and the person is indicating they would be responsive to that.[[1766]](#footnote-1767)

In response to questions about circumstances under which inmates were identified in connection with positive tests for drug use, the General Manager, Custodial Operations, told the Committee that positive tests for drug use on admission to the AMC resulted in identification, but not the random drug testing conducted as a matter of course within the AMC prisoner population.[[1767]](#footnote-1768)

In response to questions about testing of corrections staff for drug use, the Minister for Justice told the Committee that although this was possible under the *Corrections Management Act 2007*, this had not been the practice in the ACT.[[1768]](#footnote-1769)

In response to questions about ways in which drugs and other contraband enter the AMC, the Minister told the Committee that there were:

a range of ways that contraband enters the jail, as I think is probably a matter of public knowledge. Some of it is thrown over the fence; some of it is smuggled in by visitors; and presumably there is a range of other mechanisms. Corrections, of course, has a response to each of those, which I am happy to go into some detail on if you wish. We have both physical and intelligence-led responses in trying to prevent that contraband coming into the jail, as all jails do across the country.[[1769]](#footnote-1770)

A question about the number of incidents in which contraband was intercepted was taken as a Question Taken on Notice. The Minister subsequently provided the following advice to the Committee:

'interceptions' would constitute interception at visits, on an individual in the visits car park or in an individual's vehicle in the visits car park, also where ACT Corrective Services staff intercept persons approaching the perimeter fence with the intention to

introduce contraband over the fence. This is as opposed to contraband located in other areas of the prison, either within individual cells, cottages and common areas; contraband located in these areas is the result of a search rather than an interception. Therefore the number of interceptions in the 2014-15 financial year is 21. [[1770]](#footnote-1771)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee is concerned at the continued movement of drugs and other contraband into the AMC.

In light of this the Committee makes the following recommendation:[[1771]](#footnote-1772)

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate a policy of random identifiable drug and alcohol testing for staff and detainees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre.

# Territory and Municipal Services

* + 1. Introduction

The 2015‑16 Budget Statement for the Territory and Municipal Services (TAMS) Directorate states that:

TAMS plays a key role in building and maintaining Canberra’s environment, social, cultural and economic capital.

The Directorate delivers a range of services to the Canberra community including public transport, libraries, waste and recycling services, infrastructure maintenance and management of territory assets including recreational facilities.

The Directorate also is invested in the planning, building and maintenance of many of the Government’s infrastructure assets such as roads, bridges, cycling and community paths and the streetlight network.[[1772]](#footnote-1773)

The Committee discussed the following output classes within TAMS, as presented in the Territory and Municipal Services 2015‑16 Budget Statement:

* Output Class 1: Territory and Municipal Services
* Output 1.1: Information Services (Libraries)
* Output 1.2: Roads and Sustainable Transport
* Output 1.3: Waste and Recycling
* Output 1.4: Land Management (including Yarralumla Nursery and Arboretum)
* Output 1.5: Regulatory Services
* Output 1.6: Capital Linen Service.[[1773]](#footnote-1774)

The Committee heard from the Minister for Roads and Parking, Mr Mick Gentleman MLA, on 23 June 2015 in relation to Output 1.2: Roads and Sustainable Transport.

The Committee also heard from the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA, on 24 June 2015 to discuss the remaining Output Classes within TAMS and matters relevant to other bodies for which the Minister is responsible, being the ACT Public Cemeteries Authority and ACTION.

* 1. General
     1. Matters considered

The Committee considered the following general matters:

* budget changes for the Directorate between 2014‑15 and 2015‑16;[[1774]](#footnote-1775)
* Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment targets in the Directorate;[[1775]](#footnote-1776) and
* the treatment of ACTION funding in budget statements.[[1776]](#footnote-1777)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Budget treatment of ACTION

The 2015-16 Budget Statements state that TAMS *Output 1.2: Roads and Sustainable Transport* includes the provision of ACTION bus services.[[1777]](#footnote-1778) There is also a single Output Class under ACTION: *Output 1.1: Public Transport* which also has provision for bus services.[[1778]](#footnote-1779) Officials explained that $96 million in funding for ACTION is appropriated to TAMS. That money is then passed to ACTION as a grant. Both Outputs mentioned above contain the same money.[[1779]](#footnote-1780)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee observes that this appears to be the only time in the Budget papers that money appropriated once is ‘delivered’ twice in the budget papers. The Committee believes that, for the purposes of clarity, the ACT Government should rethink the way in which this funding is handled in the budget papers.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee, noting the treatment of ACTION funding in the 2015-16 Budget papers, recommends that funding for any organisation should only be included in the budget papers in one location.

* 1. Information Services

This Output provides library services to the community through the Libraries ACT branches, Home Library Service, the ACT Virtual Library and the Heritage Library.[[1780]](#footnote-1781)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.1: Information Services (Libraries), the Committee considered the following matters:

* Home Library Service;[[1781]](#footnote-1782)
* distance to nearest libraries for citizens;[[1782]](#footnote-1783)
* usage of Belconnen and Kippax libraries;[[1783]](#footnote-1784)
* the prevalence of pop-up libraries;[[1784]](#footnote-1785)
* upgrades to the Gungahlin Library;[[1785]](#footnote-1786)
* e-book collection;[[1786]](#footnote-1787) and
* Canberra Connect to Access Canberra transition.[[1787]](#footnote-1788)
  1. Roads

This Output provides management of the ACT’s road and associated assets, stormwater infrastructure, community paths, bridges, traffic signals, streetlights and car parks. This Output also includes the provision of ACTION bus services which is discussed later in this chapter.[[1788]](#footnote-1789)

Roads related issues are the responsibility of the Minister for Roads and Parking, who the Committee heard from on 23 June 2015.

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.2: Roads and Sustainable Transport, the Committee considered the following matters:

* split in Output 1.2 between roads and ACTION bus, and changes in spending;[[1789]](#footnote-1790)
* road resealing processes and budgets;[[1790]](#footnote-1791)
* considerations of the whole‑of‑life costs and management for chip seal versus asphalt in road reseals;[[1791]](#footnote-1792)
* Horse Park Drive duplication and Gungahlin intersections;[[1792]](#footnote-1793)
* the timing, location and works being undertaken for a pedestrian crossing outside Winyu House, Gungahlin;[[1793]](#footnote-1794)
* new traffic lights in Ginninderra;[[1794]](#footnote-1795)
* long term plans for Kingsford Smith Drive;[[1795]](#footnote-1796)
* roads in Tuggeranong, particularly the duplication of Ashley Drive;[[1796]](#footnote-1797)
* stormwater management along Northbourne Avenue;[[1797]](#footnote-1798)
* urban renewal in Erindale;[[1798]](#footnote-1799) and
* Calwell car park line markings.[[1799]](#footnote-1800)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Road Resealing

The Committee was advised that TAMS has a target of resealing five per cent of the Territory’s roads annually. In 2014-15 the outcome was 3.2 per cent. The Minister explained that the community was requesting a different surface on their roads. In response to this TAMs was using more asphalt, which was more expensive than chip seal, and was therefore resurfacing a smaller area. Officials noted that there are other pressures on the roads budget such as street lighting, electricity and drainage. Wet weather can increase maintenance costs and reduce the amount of resurfacing completed. The road resealing budget for the ACT in 2014-15 was $11 million and will be around $12 million in 2015-16.[[1800]](#footnote-1801)

In response to questions about road resealing decision, the Committee was advised that chip seal costs around $10-$15 per square metre and last for approximately 15 years. With additional work to reduce noise issues the cost rises to $30-$40 per square metre. Asphalt costs from $50-$100 per square metre and lasts for 20 to 25 years. Over the last 10 to 15 years chip seal has represented about 90 per cent of resurfacing in the Territory.[[1801]](#footnote-1802)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee acknowledges the pressure on the road resealing budget but notes that under current funding arrangements the target of five per cent resurfacing in 2015-16 may not be reached.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government ensure a timely and well funded road resealing program.

* + - 1. Duplication of Ashley Drive

The Committee noted that the 2015-16 ACT Budget has an allocation of $24.7 million for the duplication of Ashley Drive. The section of Ashley Drive north of Erindale Avenue was duplicated last year. The funding in this year’s budget is for duplication south to Ellerston Avenue. The Minister advised the Committee that the area from Ellerston Avenue to Johnston Drive is not being duplicated at this time as it is ‘not yet at capacity’ and funding for this section of the road will be considered in future budgets. [[1802]](#footnote-1803)

The Committee was later advised of the projected traffic volumes on Gungahlin roads for various times between 2016 and 2031.[[1803]](#footnote-1804)

Officials stated at the hearing that the section of Ashley Drive north of Ellerston Avenue to Isabella Drive carried between 10,000 to 15,000 vehicles per day, while Ashley Drive south of Ellerston Ave to Johnston Drive carried fewer than 10,000 vehicles per day.[[1804]](#footnote-1805)

The Committee was later advised that the roads in question carried the following vehicles:

* 11,000 vehicles a day in the section between Johnson Drive and Ellerston Avenue;
* 16,500 vehicles a day in the section between Ellerston Avenue and Clift Crescent; and
* 18,000 vehicles a day in the section between Clift Crescent and Isabella Drive.**[[1805]](#footnote-1806)**
  + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee welcomes the continued duplication of Ashley Drive for its potential to reduce congestion and improve safety. The Committee considers that the duplication should be extended to cover the short distance required to encompass all of Ashley Drive.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government complete the duplication of Ashley Drive from Ellerston Avenue to Johnston Drive as part of the proposal contained in the 2015-16 ACT Budget.

* + - 1. Roads Projects

The Committee discussed roads projects relating to land release and heard from the Director-General, Economic Development that capital works and procurement processes were becoming more integrated across the ACT Government.

He advised that ‘better integration and cost savings have been exhibited’:

We saw that in particular in the last financial year, where we were able to accelerate some other projects with some of the savings that were yielded in Molonglo in particular.[[1806]](#footnote-1807)

The discussion also included reference to the savings made on previous school construction projects as well on land release related projects in Molonglo and potential for future land release projects in suburbs such as Throsby.

In light of the above the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider funding in this financial year to begin the duplication of Horse Park Drive from Majura Parkway to Well Station Drive to align with duplication from Well Station Drive to Anthony Rolfe Avenue.

* + - 1. Burgmann Anglican School traffic

The Committee discussed issues relating to traffic and pedestrian safety issues at Burgmann Anglican School and heard that TAMS is ‘aware that there are some ongoing concerns’ and is working with the school to find outcomes that work for the site and take into account other considerations.[[1807]](#footnote-1808)

The Minister advised that:

Safety is paramount for school children especially, and that location has shown that we needed to put in a signalised pedestrian crossing there. In some other areas across Canberra we are looking at particular changes to intersections to provide safer access for pedestrians. That may mean changes to traffic flows to ensure that safety is paramount.[[1808]](#footnote-1809)

In light of the above the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends the ACT Government continue to work closely with Burgmann Anglican School to explore new options for improving road and pedestrian safety around Burgmann School.

* + - 1. Facilities During Court Redevelopment

On 25 June 2015, the Committee discussed court facilities during the redevelopment of the courts precinct, including the provision of parking. (See Chapter 11 for an overview of those concerns and associated recommendations).

* + - 1. Light rail alignment

The Committee asked the Minister about the Woden master plan and the impact of a proposed light rail transport corridor, both of which would remove access to the Woden Pitch ‘n’ Putt site. The Committee wished to know what assistance was being given to that business to arrive at a solution.[[1809]](#footnote-1810)

The Executive Director of Strategic Planning advised that the Directorate was aware of the access issues, and was engaging with the community and stakeholders to find a solution. The Executive Director went on to state that:

There is the potential rail alignment that we are looking at through there. We are just looking at access issues from other arterial roads and what the potential access arrangements can be. So it is still a work in progress.

...

Obviously we are looking right across Canberra with the light rail master plan, so we are looking at what potential alignments might be right across Canberra.[[1810]](#footnote-1811)

* + - * 1. Committee Comment

The Committee notes that the Woden master plan and progress of light rail alignment in the Woden area are both still in development and not yet nearing completion. This is particularly true of light rail alignment through Woden. It will therefore be some time until the Pitch ‘n’ Putt facility will have a clear outcome to its access issues.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government expedite the solution to access issues to the former Pitch ‘n’ Putt site in Woden.

* 1. Waste and Recycling

This Output is for the provision of domestic waste and recyclables collection services, operation of resource management and recycling centres, and implementation and evaluation of waste management programs, including household garbage and recycling.[[1811]](#footnote-1812)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.3: Waste and Recycling, the Committee considered the following matters:

* capacity and review of Mugga landfill;**[[1812]](#footnote-1813)**
* disposal of Mr Fluffy related asbestos waste;**[[1813]](#footnote-1814)**
* odour issues at Mugga Lane;**[[1814]](#footnote-1815)** and
* resource recovery and waste to energy.**[[1815]](#footnote-1816)**
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Resource Recovery and Waste to Energy

In response to questions from the Committee, the Minister advised that funds in the 2015-16 ACT Budget will allow TAMS to do a full analysis of the next steps in waste management in the ACT. The project will look at improved resource recovery and recycling facilities and then whether residual waste should go to a waste to energy facility. The Minister said that no decision had been taken to have a waste to energy facility and that possible energy benefits would need to be balanced against emissions and the possibility of being locked in to producing a certain level of waste to feed the facility.[[1816]](#footnote-1817)

In hearings on 12 June 2015, the Committee heard from the Conservation Council ACT Region about their concerns around a waste to energy facility. (See Chapter 2 for the discussion and recommendations on this issue.)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government introduce a new ‘NoWaste’ target.

* + - 1. Odour Issues at Mugga Lane

The Committee advised the Minister that residents in areas near the Mugga Lane tip, particularly Fadden and Macarthur, raised concerns about the odour coming from the tip during works conducted in late 2014 and early 2015. Officials explained that old waste was exposed to allow it to be ‘re-profiled’ to create extra space. This work allowed the diversion of waste to Belconnen to finish earlier, thereby saving money.[[1817]](#footnote-1818)

The Director of ACT NoWaste advised the Committee that the operation ceased from Christmas Eve for a period of three weeks, and recommenced after that. This was to try and avoid any inconvenience to residents in relation to odour.[[1818]](#footnote-1819) The Minister advised that:

At the tip a series of odour control measures were put in place, but, as has been evident to all of us, some people still experienced odour problems. We regret that, and I have certainly apologised to people who were affected by it. It was unfortunate. All best efforts were made to avoid those consequences, but there were still some consequences.[[1819]](#footnote-1820)

* + - * 1. Committee Comment

The Committee notes that concerns about the handling of communications with residents near the Mugga Lane tip were raised by the Standing Committee on Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services.[[1820]](#footnote-1821)

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government place greater emphasis on the amenity of nearby residents when planning changes at the Mugga and Belconnen tips to ensure the amenity of nearby residents.

* 1. Land Management

Land Management, under Output 1.4, provides planning and management of the ACT’s parks, reserves, open space system and plantations, including associated community infrastructure.[[1821]](#footnote-1822)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.4: Land Management (including Yarralumla Nursery and the Arboretum), the Committee considered the following matters:

* mowing program, budget and contract;[[1822]](#footnote-1823)
* widening of Arboretum gates;[[1823]](#footnote-1824)
* graffiti removal;[[1824]](#footnote-1825)
* weeds management;[[1825]](#footnote-1826)
* Harcourt Hill and its treatment as a nature reserve;[[1826]](#footnote-1827)
* local shopping centre upgrades;[[1827]](#footnote-1828)
* playgrounds;[[1828]](#footnote-1829)
* urban trees study and tree maintenance;[[1829]](#footnote-1830) and
* implementation of community gardens and orchards.[[1830]](#footnote-1831)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Mowing program

The Minister acknowledged that over the last summer TAMS had received an increased level of feedback indicating frustration at the mowing program. A wet January increased growth at a time when grass would usually be dying off and also made it difficult to mow. This created a backlog that lasted some months.[[1831]](#footnote-1832)

The Government’s response to this feedback has been to add an ‘extra mow’ into the program through funding of additional resources. Mowing is primarily done in-house by TAMS; however contractors are engaged to mow along arterial motorways.[[1832]](#footnote-1833)

Following questions from the Committee, the Minister later advised the cost of contracting the mowing for arterial roads, and noted that there are provisions in the contract for supplementary mowing to be undertaken by in‑house resources or another contractor.[[1833]](#footnote-1834)

* + - 1. Weeds Management

The Committee asked the Minister and the Director of Parks and Conservation about budget cuts to the ACT weed management program. The Minister provided advice to the Committee about the weeds program, and later provided a breakdown of funding for invasive weed control for each of the last five financial years.[[1834]](#footnote-1835)

The Minister also provided a breakdown of funding for the Lower Cotter catchment area, with regards to fire mitigation works, weed and pest control and erosion and sediment control.[[1835]](#footnote-1836)

On 12 June 2015, the Committee heard from the Conservation Council ACT Region about the underfunding of the weeds management budget. (See Chapter 2 for an overview of those concerns and associated recommendations).

* + - 1. Shopping Centre Upgrades

Officials noted the difference between a group centre upgrade, which mainly come about through the master planning process, and the local centre upgrade program which looks to refresh public spaces. Major upgrades involve matters such as changing the circulation pattern and addressing major accessibility issues. Minor upgrades look to improve lighting, paving and the general aesthetics of the public areas.[[1836]](#footnote-1837)

The Committee asked the Minister about plans for upgrades to the Kambah shops, and where responsibility lies for the public seating areas and courtyards around Kambah and Erindale.[[1837]](#footnote-1838)

Questions were also asked about the schedule for upgrades to the Cook shops, including car parking and landscaping improvements.[[1838]](#footnote-1839)

The Committee was later advised that the design phase for the Cook shops will continue through to August 2015, with construction expected to commence in late 2015. The Committee was also informed about the timeline and scope for upgrades to the Florey and Evatt shops, which are scheduled for commencement in early 2016 and completion by mid 2016.[[1839]](#footnote-1840)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee highlighted some areas of concern regarding the maintenance of public space at some local shops and makes the following recommendations:[[1840]](#footnote-1841)

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government engage in detailed consultation with local communities about shopping centre upgrades and place particular weight on what facilities the community would like to see.

The Committee recommends that in selecting trees for shopping centres the ACT Government take into account staining, litter and safety hazards.

* + - 1. Playgrounds

The Minister explained that the extra $200,000 allocated in the budget for playgrounds was for safety upgrades. It comes on top of the usual maintenance budget and is focused on relatively minor works that can make ageing playgrounds safe for ongoing use. All the playgrounds in the ACT have recently been mapped in terms of location and equipment. This data is being used in the creation of a playgrounds strategy.[[1841]](#footnote-1842)

The Committee was advised that there are three tiers of playgrounds in the Territory. Local playgrounds are intended for use by small children and have a few pieces of small equipment. They are often accessed by walking from your house. Neighbourhood playgrounds have equipment for use by three year olds up to eight or nine year olds. District playgrounds are aimed at the broadest age groups and cater for people with mobility and accessibility issues.[[1842]](#footnote-1843)

In response to questions from the Committee regarding the development and success of natural play spaces, the Minister advised that:

We installed one in Oxley during this past year. I think the feedback on that so far has been fine. Certainly in recent weeks I have, interestingly, had a number of people talking to me about their desire to see more natural play spaces. They are essentially just the provision of rocks and logs in an interesting formation that children can just play on. I am very attracted to that because I think it both creates a great play space and is potentially quite a cost-effective way to roll out more spaces that kids enjoy as well.[[1843]](#footnote-1844)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the work outlined by the Minister and officials on development of a playground strategy. The Committee notes the value that local communities place on playgrounds and their desire to be consulted on changes and upgrades.

In light of the above, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government provide additional information to the community about the locations and timeframes of playground upgrades.

The Committee recommends the ACT Government engage with the community about playground spaces and consider innovative ways to provide safe and enjoyable play spaces, including through:

encouraging community and local business input, maintenance and potentially funding; and

new models of playspaces such as natural playgrounds.

* + - 1. Graffiti removal

The Committee asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services about extra resources for graffiti removal and prevention, noting public complaints about graffiti on private property that faces public land, particularly fences.[[1844]](#footnote-1845)

The Minister confirmed to the Committee that:

additional resources that are provided in the budget will see the employment of a graffiti coordinator within TAMS. Having that position is about actually working with the street art community to provide legal spaces and manage that in a more productive way. We have had a couple of instances recently where there has been some miscommunication and people have been unhappy with the outcome. Part of that is trying to make sure that we channel some of the energy into the legal locations. There will also be additional resources for the removal of graffiti from public assets.[[1845]](#footnote-1846)

After further questioning, the Minister confirmed that fences that face onto public land are considered private assets, and while TAMS may make representations to the landowners and provide advice on how the graffiti can be removed, the legal responsibility to maintain a fence rests with landowner.[[1846]](#footnote-1847)

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government should consider additional strategies to remove graffiti on private property.

* 1. Regulatory Services

The Regulatory Services Output provides administration of regulatory activities to protect and enhance the natural and built environment. It provides advice, education and compliance services to the Government and community in relation to municipal ranger functions, domestic animal management, plant and animal licensing and tree protection.[[1847]](#footnote-1848)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.5: Regulatory Services, the Committee considered the following matters:

* dangerous dogs and how many seized dogs are euthanised;[[1848]](#footnote-1849)
* assistance to RSPCA;[[1849]](#footnote-1850)
* urban trees;[[1850]](#footnote-1851)
* community orchards;[[1851]](#footnote-1852)
* abandoned vehicles and associated fines;[[1852]](#footnote-1853) and
* response to development applications referred from the Environment and Planning Directorate.[[1853]](#footnote-1854)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Assistance to the RSPCA

The Committee asked the Minister about RSPCA funding levels, relocation issues and development of longer‑term arrangements.[[1854]](#footnote-1855)

On 12 June 2015, the Committee heard from the RSPCA about their financial position and proposed legislative amendments. (see Chapter 2 for the related discussion and associated recommendations).

* 1. Capital Linen Service

The Capital Linen Service provides a managed linen service to a range of customers including public and private hospitals, health and aged care providers, hotels, restaurants, major tourist attractions, educational institutions and emergency services.[[1855]](#footnote-1856)

* + 1. Matters considered

Under Output 1.6: Capital Linen Service, the Committee considered the following matters:

* recent growth due to an increase in contracts in the accommodation sector;[[1856]](#footnote-1857) and
* Investigations into the capacity of the service and potential growth opportunities [[1857]](#footnote-1858)
  1. ACT Cemeteries Authority

The ACT Public Cemeteries Authority (the Authority) is an independent statutory authority established under the *Cemeteries and Crematoria Act 2003*, to effectively and efficiently manage public cemeteries and crematoria in the ACT.[[1858]](#footnote-1859)

* + 1. Matters considered

The Committee considered the following matters in relation to the ACT Cemeteries Authority:

* whether the Authority had met with Trident Corporate Services;[[1859]](#footnote-1860)
* percentage of Canberrans interred at Canberra’s cemeteries;[[1860]](#footnote-1861)
* progress on the southern memorial park and crematorium;[[1861]](#footnote-1862) and
* implementation of natural burial options in the ACT.[[1862]](#footnote-1863)
  1. Sustainable Transport

Output 1.2: Roads and Sustainable Transport concerns the management of ACT roads and associated assets, stormwater infrastructure, community paths, bridges, traffic signals, streetlights and car parks. This Output also includes the provision of ACTION bus services.[[1863]](#footnote-1864)

* + 1. Matters considered

The Committee discussed the following sustainable transport matters with the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services on 24 June 2015:

* feasibility study for foot and cycle paths around the Belconnen and other town centres;[[1864]](#footnote-1865)
* targets for shifting trips to public transport;[[1865]](#footnote-1866) and
* shared path etiquette and the interaction between cyclists and pedestrians.[[1866]](#footnote-1867)
  + - 1. Shared Paths

The Committee asked about shared paths and how to best accommodate the needs of cyclists and pedestrians, such as wider paths.

The Minister advised that:

When it comes to the interaction between cyclists and pedestrians, I think this is much more a cultural issue than an infrastructure issue at this point in time. The vulnerable road users inquiry last year, which I recall you were on, certainly identified the need for further work in this space. Work is being done both to prepare a code of conduct, which can be used, and to roll that out as part of our ongoing education programs.[[1867]](#footnote-1868)

The Committee also enquired about line markings and signage on bicycle paths and the courteous behaviour of pedestrians and cyclists and was informed that this work was part of the regular maintenance work of the Directorate. Lake Tuggeranong and Emu Inlet in Belconnen were just two examples given where additional signage and markings could be beneficial. [[1868]](#footnote-1869)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes the potential benefits of behavioural signposts and line marking on pedestrian /cycle paths, for example, around Lake Tuggeranong and Emu Inlet.

In light of this, the Committee makes the following recommendation:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government consider installing behavioural signposts around Lake Tuggeranong and Emu Inlet, as well as line markings, for the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists.

* 1. ACTION

ACTION’s principal objective is to provide public transport services to the ACT community consisting of scheduled route bus services, school bus services, community and special needs transport and management of the ACT rural school bus contract.[[1869]](#footnote-1870)

* + 1. Matters considered

At the hearing on 24 June 2015, the Committee considered the following matters in relation to ACTION:

* measures to increase patronage on Canberra buses;[[1870]](#footnote-1871)
* review of ACTION and release of the final report;[[1871]](#footnote-1872)
* Transport Reform Strategy and associated cost;[[1872]](#footnote-1873)
* new seats for bus drivers;[[1873]](#footnote-1874)
* update on the community transport coordination initiative – Flexibus;[[1874]](#footnote-1875)
* accountability indicators;[[1875]](#footnote-1876)
* worker compensation and its impact as a primary cost driver;[[1876]](#footnote-1877)
* number of unique passenger boardings and number of passengers who do not swipe off;[[1877]](#footnote-1878)
* change in Director of Public Transport position;[[1878]](#footnote-1879)
* staffing changes and number of redundancies;[[1879]](#footnote-1880)
* financial statements;[[1880]](#footnote-1881)
* cost recovery through fares and analysis of fares with other jurisdictions;[[1881]](#footnote-1882)
* user data analysis;[[1882]](#footnote-1883)
* fleet emissions and fuel usage;[[1883]](#footnote-1884)
* replacement of ACTION’s underground storage tanks and funding rollover;[[1884]](#footnote-1885)
* Erindale bus station upgrade and funding rollover;[[1885]](#footnote-1886)
* real time information displays and funding rollover;[[1886]](#footnote-1887)
* costs and benefits of the AdBlue fuel additive;[[1887]](#footnote-1888)
* costs and incentives for bus advertising;[[1888]](#footnote-1889)
* further explanation of the current liabilities of ACTION;[[1889]](#footnote-1890)
* investment in active travel initiatives in conjunction with planning new suburbs;[[1890]](#footnote-1891) and
* late night services and patronage of last bus and parliamentary triangle services.[[1891]](#footnote-1892)
  + 1. Key issues
       1. Bus Advertising

Members asked about the management of advertising on ACTION buses. Officials informed the Committee that advertising is contracted out through the company GoTransit. ACTION’s remuneration is set during contract negotiation and the price that GoTransit seeks from advertisers at any particular time is up to the company.[[1892]](#footnote-1893)

Members inquired about whether there had been any change to ACTION’s policy of not accepting political advertising on buses, noting that Animals Australia currently have authorised advertisements on ACTION buses. The Minister said that he was not aware of any change in policy.[[1893]](#footnote-1894)

* + - * 1. Committee comment

The Committee notes that, if ACTION is to continue its policy of not accepting political advertisements, it is important that ACTION ensures that no political advertisements, regardless of source, are placed on ACTION buses.

The Committee recommends the ACT Government consider introducing a Bus Driver of the Year award.

Mr Brendan Smyth MLA

Chair
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