Legislative Assembly for the ACT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

# Report on 2003–2004 Annual and Financial Reports

AUGUST 2005

Report 3

## Committee membership

Mr Richard Mulcahy, MLA (Chair)
Dr Deb Foskey, MLA (Deputy Chair)
Ms Karin MacDonald, MLA

## Secretariat support

| | |
|---|---|
| Secretary: | Ms Stephanie Mikac (to 18 April 2005) |
| | Ms Andréa Cullen (from 30 June 2005) |
| Administration: | Ms Linzi Lamont |

## Contact information


| | |
|---|---|
| Telephone: | (02) 6205 0136 |
| Facsimile: | (02) 6205 0432 |
| Email: | committees@parliament.act.gov.au |
| Post: | GPO Box 1020<br>CANBERRA ACT 2601 |
| Website: | www.parliament.act.gov.au/committees |

## Resolution of appointment

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts was appointed by the Legislative Assembly on 7 December 2004 to:

(i) examine:

(A) the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Australian Capital Territory and its authorities; and

(B) all reports of the Auditor-General which have been presented to the Assembly;

(ii) report to the Assembly any items or matters in those accounts, statements and reports, or any circumstances connected with them, to which the Committee is of the opinion that the attention of the Assembly should be directed;

(iii) inquire into any question in connection with the public accounts which is referred to it by the Assembly and to report to the Assembly on that question; and

(iv) examine matters relating to economic and business development, small business, tourism, market and regulatory reform, public sector management, taxation and revenue and sustainability.

## Terms of reference

Inquire into the 2003-2004 annual and financial reports of Government departments and agencies according to the schedule determined by the Legislative Assembly as listed at Appendix A. Following consultation with the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs, the Committee agreed to consider the annual reports of the ACT Cleaning Industry Long Service Leave Board, the ACT Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board, the Office of the Occupational Health and Safety Commissioner and ACT Workcover. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts had considered these reports in previous years. These reports are also listed at Appendix A.

## Conduct of the inquiry

The Committee held public hearings on 22 and 23 February and 23, 30 and 31 March 2005 and heard from Ministers and accompanying departmental and agency officers. Witnesses who appeared before the Committee are listed at Appendix B.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

# INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 7 December 2004, the annual and financial reports of all government agencies were referred to relevant Standing Committees of the Legislative Assembly.

1.2 The below listed annual and financial reports for the 2003-2004 financial year were referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

- ACT Auditor-General
- ACT Gambling and Racing Commission
- ACT Government Procurement Board
- ACT Insurance Agency
- ACT Legislative Assembly Secretariat
- ACTEW Corporation
- ACTTAB Ltd.
- Australian Capital Tourism Corporation
- Australian International Hotel School
- Chief Minister's Department
- Commissioner for Public Administration
- Exhibition Park in Canberra
- Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission
- Stadiums Authority
- Totalcare Industries Ltd.
- Treasury (Department of)

1.3 In addition, on 24 February 2005, the Committee self-referred three additional annual reports to the inquiry. These reports were:

- ACT Cleaning Industry Long Service Leave Board
- ACT Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board
- Office of the Occupational Health and Safety Commissioner and ACT Workcover

1.4 The Legislative Assembly originally referred these reports to the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs for inquiry. The Standing Committee on Legal Affairs resolved not to include the reports in its inquiry into the 2003-2004 annual reports of government agencies, given that in previous years, they had been considered by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

1.5 The Committee examined annual reports in relation to their compliance where applicable with the Chief Minister's Annual Reports' Directions, legislative and other requirements as raised in individual agency reports.

1.6 The Committee sought clarification on a number of issues at public hearings, some of which are expanded upon in the next chapter. The full transcript of public hearings is available on the Assembly website at *http://www.hansard.act.gov.au/hansard/2005*

# 2 PRESENTATION, LAYOUT AND CONTENT OF ANNUAL REPORTS

2.1 Accountability of the Executive to the Legislative Assembly (and to the public) is a key principle of responsible government. For that to be achieved executive agencies must be fully committed to both accountability and disclosure of information in a straightforward way that is meaningful and can be easily understood by the average citizen.

2.2 The provision of meaningful operational and financial information by government to parliament and the public is a fundamental component of the accountability process.[1]

2.3 Annual reports are the principal and most authoritative way in which Chief Executives and Chairpersons account to the Legislative Assembly and other stakeholders, including the public, for the ways in which they have discharged their statutory and other responsibilities and utilised public funds over the preceding twelve months.[2]

2.4 The Committee found broad compliance with the reports as accountability documents for departmental/agency performance and conformance with stated objectives and strategies.

## Compliance with Chief Minister's Annual Reports' Directions

2.5 The Chief Minister's Annual Reports Directions (the Directions) play a crucial and central role in setting minimum standards for the preparation, form and content of annual reports by departmental Chief Executives and the Chairpersons of public authorities.[3]

---

[1] Public Accounts Committee, Legislative Assembly of Queensland, December 2001, report No. 59, *Annual Reporting in the Queensland Public Sector*, p 1.

[2] Auditor-General's Report No 1 of 2003: Effectiveness of Annual Reporting, p 1.

[3] *Ibid*., pp 1-2.

2.6 The Committee found that overall, annual reports generally complied with the Directions. The Committee found a number of formatting errors, which did not detract from the information provided or the general appearance of reports, but which could be improved through better proof reading of draft reports.

2.7 The Committee believes that it is important that annual reports are readable. The Committee found that the use of asterisks or symbols for footnotes as appears in the Chief Minister's Department annual report volume 2, is not reader friendly. The Committee suggests the use of numbers instead of symbols to mark footnotes.

2.8 On the whole, the annual reports examined complied with the annual reports' directions in terms of publication standards. Contrary to annual reports' directions the Committee found that two agencies did not report on Ecological Sustainable Development (ESD).[4]

2.9 Non-compliance with ESD reporting is an issue of concern for the Committee. The Committee would like to see compliance on reporting of ESD matters, as they are part of the reporting framework.

### RECOMMENDATION 1

2.10 **The Committee recommends that Departments and agencies comply with the Chief Minister's Annual Reports' Directions in regard to Ecological Sustainable Development reporting.**

## Performance measures

2.11 The Committee remains concerned that performance measures are not very indicative of actual performance. This is especially the case with performance measures relating to ministerial satisfaction with quality and effectiveness of correspondence, briefs and the like.[5]

2.12 The Chief Minister stated that performance measures do not always take into account legitimate delays. Further, the Chief Minister stated that performance

[4] The ACT Legislative Assembly Secretariat and ACTTAB.

[5] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, pp 2-4 and 23 February 2005, pp 54-55.

measures are continuously reviewed, that the debate about developing adequate performance measures is ongoing and that there are no current alternatives in the interim.[6]

## Auditor-General's comments

2.13 In considering the Auditor-General's Report No 10 of 2004: 2003-4 Financial Audits, the Committee noted the Auditor-General's comments that

> 'Processes to prepare financial statements could be improved…although the Audit office managed to provide the vast majority of audit opinions on time, many financial statements were not provided to the Audit office in accordance with Treasury's reporting timetable. In addition, the Audit office was often required to provide assistance to agencies to bring financial statements to an acceptable standard. This indicates that there is scope for reporting agencies to improve their processes for preparing financial statements[7]'.

### RECOMMENDATION 2

2.14 **The Committee recommends that agencies take up the Auditor-General's finding regarding desirability of improvements to processes for the preparation of financial statements.**

---

[6] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, p 3.

[7] Auditor-General's Report No 10 of 2004: 2003-04 Financial Audits, p 1.

# 3 GENERAL ISSUES ARISING FROM DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY REPORTS

3.1 During discussions over the course of the public hearing program, the Committee was interested in a number of general issues arising from the annual reports.

## Community engagement

3.2 The Committee believes that community engagement is critical in the successful development of acceptable policies and decisions in government. Effective community engagement actively involves the community in the decision-making activities of government, particularly in decisions that impact on how citizens live, exercise, work, study, use services and do business.

3.3 The Committee sought clarification on the components of the Government's Community Engagement Initiative (the Initiative) and its relationship with the Community Consultation Register (the Register).

3.4 An official of the Multicultural and Community Affairs unit stated that the Initiative is an overarching concept that comprises a community engagement manual, service charter, a web site and a training package. The various components of the Initiative have undergone a rigorous community consultation process and are currently in draft form.[8]

3.5 The Multicultural and Community Affairs' official further stated that when the Initiative is released by the end of the financial year it is hoped it will be embraced by both Government agencies and community organisations.[9]

3.6 The Chief Executive of the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services confirmed that the Initiative replaces the former consultation protocol and consultation manual developed previously.[10]

---

[8] Transcript of evidence, 23 February 2005, pp 55-60.

[9] *Ibid.*, p 58.

[10] Transcript of evidence, 23 February 2005, p 57.

3.7 The area of community engagement is of particular interest to the Committee and it will follow progress in this area with interest.

### RECOMMENDATION 3

3.8 **The Committee recommends that the Government ensure its Community Engagement initiative focuses on citizens as active participants in policy making.**

## Sustainability reporting

3.9 The Committee was interested in the Government's position on sustainability and its long term plans in connection with the purpose, substance and implementation of governmental action on sustainability.

3.10 The Committee was particularly interested in the role of the Office of Sustainability in encouraging whole-of-government sustainability. The Chief Minister noted that one of the primary functions of the Office in terms of its administrative responsibilities was the encouragement of whole-of-government sustainability.[11]

3.11 The Committee notes that sustainability reporting seeks to more closely align reporting, underlying management practices and measures of corporate performance with the notion of sustainable development.

3.12 Sustainability reporting aims to extend decision-making and disclosure so that decisions explicitly take into consideration the impacts on natural and human capital, as well as financial capital.

3.13 Whilst the Committee notes the Government is working towards a sustainability reporting policy framework it is concerned that after three years sustainability indicators are still in draft form.[12]

3.14 Furthermore, the Committee is concerned at the lack of a common approach to sustainability reporting.

---

[11] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, p 4.

[12] *Ibid*., p 5.

### RECOMMENDATION 4

3.15 **The Committee recommends that the Office of Sustainability finalise the purpose, substance and effect of the Government's sustainability policy framework and subsequent governmental action.**

## Public sector management

3.16 The Committee believes that a main requirement of an effective government is the development of a workforce that is able to meet the changing needs of the public sector.

3.17 The Committee noted some issues regarding workforce planning, such as redundancies, recruitment and retention.

### RECOMMENDATION 5

3.18 **The Committee recommends that the Government investigate ways in which to build the capacity and capability of current and future employees and maintain the sector as an attractive employer.**

# 4 SPECIFIC ISSUES ARISING FROM DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY REPORTS

## Chief Minister's Department

4.1 Concern was expressed about the services provided and remuneration paid to the Office of the Special Advisor, Council of Australian Governments and Intergovernmental Relations.

4.2 The Committee was concerned that the ACT Government should be funding someone to work on issues such as maritime security, which fall under Commonwealth responsibility.

4.3 The Government commented that it was not unusual for jurisdictions to have public servants working in other jurisdictions on national or multilateral tasks. The Committee was informed that following the officer's expiration of contract in April, that the services being performed would be subsumed by Cabinet's security subcommittee. [13]

### RECOMMENDATION 6

4.4 **The Committee recommends that clear policy and guidelines be developed for secondment arrangements involving chief executives.**

4.5 The Committee expressed an interest as to how InTACT services compare with non-government providers in terms of the provision of its services, taking into account cost and performance. The Chief Minister's Department advised that results of a recent benchmarking exercise have proven that InTACT is competitive in the services it provides.[14]

4.6 The Committee sought clarification relating to the Regional Management Framework (the Framework) and whether the Framework was supported by Government policy.

---

[13] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, pp 10-11.

[14] *Ibid*., p 23.

4.7 The Chief Minister's Department stated the Framework refers to an arrangement being developed between the ACT Government and near neighbours across the border, particularly Queanbeyan. The Framework is an attempt to put in place cooperative approaches to cross border problems.[15]

4.8 Furthermore, the Chief Minister's Department advised that the Framework to deliver better policy development and service delivery outcomes in relation to water, regional settlement patterns, infrastructure, economic development, service delivery and emergency services across the ACT-NSW border was currently in draft form. The Chief Minister advised that the finalisation of the Framework was a priority for the Government and he was happy to keep the Committee informed of its progress.[16]

4.9 The Committee also explored and discussed:

- Additional legal costs associated with the 2003 Bushfires and implementation and review of the Canberra Plan.
- The realisation of the HR Replacement System project for the ACT Public Service. The Government advised that the System would deliver the Service's first pay on the 14 July 2005.[17]
- A process, impact and outcome evaluation of the System since its implementation and whether it may contribute to improved accountability regarding leave management practices in the Service.

## ACTEW Corporation

4.10 The Committee was interested to know the impact the Pricing Commission's determination on a more favourable price path decision had on ACTEW.[18]

4.11 ACTEW maintains that the Pricing Commission had over valued the asset base and the price of water is not necessarily reflective of its true cost. ACTEW has

[15] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, pp 18-19.
[16] *Ibid*., p 18.
[17] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, pp 23-25.
[18] *Ibid*., p 31.

estimated it has foregone $8 to $10 million in revenue, as a consequence of water restrictions, in the 2003-2004 financial year.[19]

4.12 The Committee also discussed water demand and efficiency of water use. Of concern was the relationship between current water restrictions and subsequent impact on ACTEW revenue.[20] The Committee sought clarification as to whether the easing of water restrictions was a Government decision. The Managing Director of ACTEW Corporation stated that under the law it is not a Government decision, but one that resides with the Managing Director of ACTEW. However, he is required to consult Environment ACT and notify the Chief Minister as the responsible minister.[21]

4.13 The Committee remains concerned about the possible conflict between the roles of ACTEW as contracted to manage the Government's water efficiency program and its business enterprise role of revenue making.[22]

## Multicultural and Community Affairs

4.14 The Committee considered issues surrounding the allegations of mismanagement of grants provided to the ACT Multicultural Council Incorporated. The Government stated that the Auditor-General was looking into the matter and would not formally respond in great detail until the report had been released.[23]

4.15 The Committee believes there is an opportunity for the Government to have greater influence through its funding agreements over the constitutional or governance arrangements of councils and community organisations.

4.16 The Committee remains concerned about problems in relation to the effective and efficient functioning of certain councils.

4.17 The Committee was also interested in the provision of extra Government support for the Fringe Festival. During discussions, the Committee heard the

---

[19] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, p 32.

[20] *Ibid*., p 36.

[21] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, p 35.

[22] *Ibid*., pp 34-37.

[23] Transcript of evidence, 22 February 2005, p 63.

inaugural Festival had commenced well, not only in terms of the opportunities provided for people to showcase their talents in a range of artistic endeavour, but also in terms of recognising the many varied contributions the multicultural community makes to the social and commercial fabric of the ACT community.[24]

4.18 The Committee sought clarification as to whether there had been any feedback or consequent development of programs following the release of the *Facing up to Racism* policy paper in 2004.[25]

4.19 An official of the Multicultural and Community Affairs unit stated that the document was both a strategic and operational document. He further advised that the Government plans to issue a consolidated report card every two years, summarising feedback received from agencies in relation to the respective actions and activities they nominated to undertake.[26]

4.20 The Government's progress against the implementation of actions and activities identified in the *Facing up to Racism* policy paper is of particular interest to the Committee, which will examine the first report card.

## Industrial Relations

4.21 The Committee examined the Industrial Relations portfolio in relation to the legal costs associated with the Workers' Compensation Supplementation Fund and corporate governance issues.

4.22 The Committee was interested in the legal costs associated with the Workers' Compensation Supplementation Fund. The Committee noted that the Auditor-General found, among other things, that the processes for the selection of providers of legal services and other services were not in accordance with Government procurement legislation and policy guidelines. Furthermore the provisions of relevant legislation concerning the public availability of information on government contracts were not adhered to. Also, the powers of the fund manager, in managing the relationship with the

---

[24] Transcript of evidence, 23 February 2005, pp 46-49.
[25] *Ibid*., p 49.
[26] Transcript of evidence, 23 February 2005, p 50.

supervising insurer, had apparently not always been exercised in an efficient and effective manner.[27]

4.23 The Committee was reassured that the aforementioned issues have been addressed. The Government stated that the Auditor-General's findings had been taken on board with a view to moving the fund forward.[28]

4.24 In summary the Government stated that the Fund's recent establishment as a stand alone entity would improve its corporate governance arrangements.[29]

4.25 The corporate governance of the Fund is of particular interest to the Committee and it will follow progress in this area with interest.

4.26 In relation to ACT Workcover, the Committee was pleased to hear that a series of workshops presented in each of the four major shopping centres in the ACT to retailers that were the subject of the compliance inspection program were well attended.[30]

## Office for Women

4.27 The Committee was interested in the relationship between the ACT Women's Plan (the Plan) and the implementation of the recommendations from the Select Committee on the Status of Women in the ACT, with a view to seeking clarification on progress regarding implementation of the recommendations.[31]

4.28 The Minister stated that progress against the 52 recommendations is continually updated on the Office's website. Furthermore, the Minister noted a select committee is only established for the duration of an inquiry and given that the Government had reported against its progress in the previous annual report, the Plan now underpins the work of the Office. Consequently, as the Select Committee inquiry fed directly into the Plan, reporting will now be against progress of the Plan.[32]

---

[27] Transcript of evidence, 31 March 2005, p 155.

[28] *Ibid*., p 159.

[29] Transcript of Evidence, 31 March 2005, pp 155-159.

[30] *Ibid*., pp 159-161.

[31] Transcript of evidence, 31 March 2005, p 163.

[32] *Ibid*., p 163.

4.29 The Committee also discussed consultative mechanisms with Indigenous women and grants provided to *Girls on the move*. The Committee believes its areas of concern in relation to these matters will be addressed by the implementation of a consumer engagement framework as identified in Chapter Three of this report.

## ACT Legislative Assembly Secretariat

4.30 The Auditor-General's Report No 10 of 2004: 2003-04 Financial Audits issued an unqualified audit opinion on 27 August 2004 on the accounts of the ACT Legislative Assembly Secretariat. However, the Auditor-General expressed concern about the following:

- significant weaknesses in controls relating to payments, the effect of which was risk of error and irregularities such as fraud;
- a significantly worsened operating result;
- net cost of services exceeded the Legislative Assembly Secretariat's budget; and
- current assets were not sufficient to meet current liabilities.[33]

4.31 The Committee explored the adverse findings of Auditor-General's Report No 10 of 2004, with the Legislative Assembly Secretariat and a Secretariat representative advised[34]:

- the financial unit is small and under resourced;
- measures were being taken to provide additional resources; and
- steps were taken to segregate duties to make the area more risk averse.[35]

4.32 The Committee raised concerns about the personal safety of people working and visiting the building. The Speaker echoed this concern and stated that individuals were not banned from the building without serious consideration to personal safety. The Speaker further advised that, as a result of the heightened global awareness of terrorism, a security review had been

---

33 Auditor-General's Report No 10 of 2004: 2003-04 Financial Audits, p 60.

34 Transcript of evidence, 23 February 2005, pp 68-70.

35 *Ibid*., p 69.

undertaken and the Review had made 74 recommendations. The Clerk expanded by stating that the recommendations were in the process of being implemented with work to take place over the next few years, beginning with the entrances to the building.[36]

4.33 The Committee also explored issues in relation to: ESD reporting and ESD considerations in the building; weatherproof cycle parking; level of support currently offered by the Secretariat; secondment of officers from ACT Government departments; the reintroduction of public service seminars; the availability of parliamentary library services; and the status of computer network security.

## Office of the Auditor-General

4.34 The Committee was pleased to hear that the issue of staff retention in the ACT Audit Office was being addressed through the provision of incentives of improved working conditions, flexible hours, training opportunities for staff and relocation to new premises.[37]

4.35 The Committee also explored issues relating to the:

- Audit Office's three year performance audit plan; and
- relocation of the Audit Office to Moore Street.

## Department of Treasury

4.36 The Committee explored the issue of GST payments to the ACT as part of intergovernmental financial relations with the Commonwealth. Discussion included the subsequent vertical and horizontal fiscal imbalances that might arise and issues surrounding intergovernmental conflict.[38]

4.37 The Committee is concerned about the possible impact revenue shortfalls from the Commonwealth may have on policy decisions and a weakening of the long-term financial position of the Territory.

---

[36] Transcript of evidence, 23 February 2005, p 82.
[37] Transcript of evidence, 23 March 2005, pp 85-88.
[38] Transcript of evidence, 30 March 2005, pp 98-102.

4.38 The Committee sought clarification on whether the Racing Development Fund could be accessed for other needs in the ACT community. The Treasurer advised that the Fund is embodied in legislation which provides for the generation of funds out of the ACTTAB operation to ensure the survival of the industry.[39]

4.39 The Committee was interested in the funding of future infrastructure investment and development and sought clarification as to whether there was a criterion for funding capital works from revenue as opposed to borrowings. The Treasurer stated that as the ACT Government had sufficient funds to finance its own capital works that there was no need to borrow.[40]

4.40 The Treasurer stated

> 'Let's assume that there are other demands for capital that didn't return revenue or necessarily obviate recurrent expenditure. You might look at the jail in future time, depending on how the situation was, and say, there is a business case for borrowing there because the existence of the jail should off-set certain costs elsewhere[41]'.

4.41 The Committee notes the Auditor-General's finding that the management of capital works funding is an area of concern. The Committee further notes that while showing improvement in 2003-04 compared with the previous year, the large amount underspent indicated that the management of capital projects needed to be further improved.[42]

4.42 The Committee also considered the Government's five-year estimated cost of recovering from the January 2003 bushfire disaster. That cost was estimated to be approximately $137 million while to date national disaster relief payments were in the order of $15.2 million.[43] The Committee sought clarification as to whether the Government had made any representations to secure more

---

[39] Transcript of evidence, 30 March 2005, pp 102-103.

[40] *Ibid*., p 105.

[41] Transcript of evidence, 30 March 2005, p 105.

[42] Auditor-General's Report No 10 of 2004: 2003-04 Financial Audits, p 3.

[43] Transcript of evidence, 30 March 2005, p 113.

funding under the national disaster relief arrangement (the NDRA) payments.[44]

4.43 A Treasury official responded that the ACT had taken every approach through NDRA to 'recover all that we can'[45].

4.44 The Committee sought clarification on the scope of coverage provided by the NDRA. Treasury stated that

> 'the NDR arrangements do not cover the full cost of the disaster response. There is a sharing arrangement, which means that the state or territory actually has to tip a certain dollar threshold before it qualifies for funding and even then it is never 100 per cent…the guidelines are quite restrained. They relate to the replacement of non-insured assets to the same standard and to personal distress, but directly related [sic] to the incident and time limited to within a year or so[46]'.

4.45 The Committee noted the absence of the Chief Executive of ACTTAB Ltd. and is concerned that the absence of key people at these annual reports hearings diminishes the ability of the accountability process.[47]

### RECOMMENDATION 7

4.46 **The Committee recommends that, in future, when statutory authorities appear before Assembly committees, their chief executives should be in attendance or, in their absence, a delegate capable of answering operational questions.**

---

[44] Transcript of evidence, 30 March 2005, p 113.

[45] *Ibid.*, p 114.

[46] Transcript of evidence, 30 March 2005, p 114.

[47] *Ibid.*, p 144.

## ACT Insurance Authority

4.47 The Committee expressed concern regarding an increased number of outstanding claims from the Department of Health, which appear to have been overlooked, and the ability of the Government to meet insurance claims.[48]

4.48 The Government stated that in the recent past there was a reluctance to advise the Insurance Authority, 'not so much on the claims themselves but on incidents which are likely to develop into claims'[49]. The Government further stated that it had identified all the possible large claims and was moving to change the situation through education and new legislation.[50]

4.49 The Committee notes the Auditor-General's finding as at 30 June 2004, that the ACT Insurance Authority did not have enough assets to meet its liabilities and its ability to meet long term liabilities and any unexpected losses had deteriorated in recent years.[51] This is an issue of concern that the Committee will monitor.

---

[48] Transcript of evidence, 30 March 2005, pp 123-124.

[49] *Ibid*., p 124.

[50] Transcript of evidence, 30 March 2005, pp 124-126.

[51] Auditor-General's Report No 10 of 2004: 2003-04 Financial Audits, p 3.

# 5 CONCLUSION

5.1 The Committee has made 7 recommendations in relation to the evidence presented to it. The Committee would like to thank Ministers and accompanying departmental and agency staff for their time and cooperation during the course of the inquiry process.

Dr Deb Foskey MLA

Acting Chair

24 August 2005

# APPENDIX A: Annual reports referred to the Committee for inquiry by the Legislative Assembly[52]

ACT Auditor-General

ACT Gambling and Racing Commission

ACT Government Procurement Board

ACT Insurance Agency

ACT Legislative Assembly Secretariat

ACTEW Corporation

ACTTAB Ltd.

Australian Capital Tourism Corporation

Australian International Hotel School

Chief Minister's Department

Commissioner for Public Administration

Exhibition Park in Canberra

Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission

Stadiums Authority

Totalcare Industries Ltd.

Treasury (Department of)

## Annual Reports referred by the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs

Following consultation with the Standing Committee on Legal Affairs, the Committee agreed to consider the following annual reports:

ACT Cleaning Industry Long Service Leave Board

ACT Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board

---

[52] ACT Legislative Assembly, Minutes of Proceedings No 2, Tuesday, 7 December 2004, p 27.

Office of the Occupational Health and Safety Commissioner and ACT Workcover

# APPENDIX B: Witnesses who appeared before the Committee

**22 February 2005**

**Mr Jon Stanhope MLA**

**Chief Minister**

Mr Mike Harris, Chief Executive, Chief Minister's Department (CMD)
Ms Cheryl Vardon, Commissioner for Public Administration
Ms Pam Davoren, Executive Director, Public Sector Management and Industrial Relations, CMD
Ms Lucy Bitmead, Executive Director, Strategic Implementation Group, CMD
Mr George Tomlins, Executive Director, Strategic Implementation Group, CMD
Mr Peter Ottesen, Executive Director, Office of Sustainability, CMD
Ms Susan Killion, Executive Director, Cabinet and Policy, CMD
Dr Maxine Cooper, Executive Director, Arts, Heritage and Environment, CMD
Ms Mandy Hillson, Director, artsACT, CMD
Mr Michael Costello, Managing Director, ACTEW Corporation
Mr Mike Luddy, Chief Finance Executive, ACTEW Corporation
Dr Gary Bickford, Principal Strategic Planner, ACTEW Corporation

**23 February 2005**

**Mr John Hargreaves MLA**

**Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services**

Ms Sandra Lambert, Chief Executive, Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services (DHCS)
Mr Colin Adrian, Executive Coordinator, DHCS
Mr Ian Hubbard, Director, Finance and Budget, DHCS
Ms Bronwen Overton-Clarke, Executive Director, Policy and Organisational Services, DHCS
Mr Nic Manikis, Executive Director, Multicultural and Community Affairs, DHCS
Ms Kathryn Maxwell, Director, Community Engagement Unit, DHCS

**Mr Wayne Berry MLA**

**Speaker**

**ACT Legislative Assembly**

Mr Tom Duncan, Clerk, ACT Legislative Assembly (ACT LA)
Mr Max Kiermaier, Deputy Clerk, ACT LA
Mr Russell Lutton, Manager, Hansard and Communications, ACT LA
Ms Val Szychowska, Information Technology Manager, Hansard and Communications, ACT LA
Mr Ian Duckworth, Manager, Corporate Services, ACT LA
Ms Robina Jaffray, Manager, Committees Office, ACT LA

**23 March 2005**

**Mrs Tu Pham, ACT Auditor-General**

Mr Rod Nicholas, A/g Director, Performance Audits and Corporate Services, ACT Auditor General's Office (AGO)
Mr Malcolm Prentice, A/g Director, Financial Audits, AGO

**30 March 2005**

**Mr Ted Quinlan MLA**

**Treasurer**

Dr Paul Grimes, Chief Executive, Department of Treasury (DT)
Ms Megan Smithies, Executive Director, Finance and Budget Division, DT
Mr John Robertson, Director, ACT Procurement Solutions, DT
Mr Graeme Dowell, Commissioner for ACT Revenue, DT
Mr Roger Broughton, Executive Director, Investment and Economics Division, DT
Mr Peter Matthews, General Manager, ACT Insurance Authority
Mr Glen Gaskill, Director, Corporate Management, CMD
Mr John Walsh, Director and Dean, Australian International Hotel School (AIHS)
Mr Chris de Mamiel, Finance Manager, AIHS
Mr Mike Harris, Chair, Board of Totalcare Industries

**Minister for Economic Development**

Mr Shane Gilbert, Chief Executive, Department of Economic Development (DED)
Mr Geoff Keogh, Director, BusinessACT, DED
Mr Ross MacDiarmid, Chief Executive, Australian Capital Tourism Corporation
Mr Danny Harley, Chief Executive, Stadiums Authority
Mr Simon Wheeler, Chief Financial Officer, ACTTAB

**31 March 2005**

**Ms Katy Gallagher MLA**

**Minister for Industrial Relations**

Mr Mike Harris, Chief Executive, CMD
Ms Pam Davoren, Executive Director, Public Sector Management and Industrial Relations, CMD
Mr Glen Gaskill, Director, Corporate Management, CMD
Mr Erich Janssen, Occupational Health and Safety Commissioner, ACT Workcover

**Minister for Women**

Ms Sue Hall, Director, Community Affairs, CMD