



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE
AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON ECONOMY AND GENDER
AND ECONOMIC EQUALITY**

(Reference: [Inquiry into Annual and Financial Reports 2022 - 2023](#))

Members:

**MS L CASTLEY (Chair)
MS S ORR (Deputy Chair)**

PROOF TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

WEDNESDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 2023

This is a **PROOF TRANSCRIPT** that is subject to suggested corrections by members and witnesses. The **FINAL TRANSCRIPT** will replace this transcript within 20 working days from the hearing date, subject to the receipt of corrections from members and witnesses.

**Secretary to the committee:
Ms S Milne (Ph: 620 50435)**

By authority of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory

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

APPEARANCES

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate[104](#), [125](#)

Privilege statement

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

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

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

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

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

Amended 20 May 2013

The committee met at 1.00 pm.

Steel, Mr Chris, Minister for Skills, Minister for Transport and City Services and Special Minister of State

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate

Hocking PSM, Mr Stuart, Under Treasurer, Treasury

Holmes, Ms Lisa, MAI Commissioner, Insurance, Economic and Financial Group

Mirzabegian, Ms Sanaz, Executive Group Manager, Procurement ACT, Treasury

Konti, Ms Bettina, Deputy Director General and Chief Digital Officer, Digital, Data and Technology Solutions,

Valtas, Mr Julian, ACT Government Chief Information Security Officer

Rynehart, Mr Josh, Executive Group Manager, Property, Insourcing and Secure Local Jobs Group, Office of Industrial Relations and Workplace Safety

Bailey, Mr Daniel, Executive Group Manager, Operations

THE CHAIR: Good afternoon and welcome to the public hearings of the Standing Committee on Economy and Gender and Economic Equality for its inquiry into the annual and financial reports 2022-23. The committee will today hear from the Special Minister of State and the Assistant Minister for Economic Development.

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

The proceedings today are being recorded and transcribed by Hansard and will be published. The proceedings are also being broadcast and webstreamed live. When taking a question on notice it would be useful if the witnesses would use these words: "I will take that question on notice." This will help the committee and witnesses to confirm questions taken on notice from the transcript.

We welcome Mr Chris Steel MLA, Special Minister of State, and officials. I want to remind you of the protections and obligations afforded by parliamentary privilege and draw your attention to the privilege statement. Witnesses must tell the truth. Giving false or misleading evidence will be treated as a serious matter and may be considered contempt of the Assembly. Please confirm that you understand the implications of the statement and that you agree to comply with it.

Mr Hocking: I have read and understood the privilege statement.

Ms Mirzabegian: I have read and understand the privilege statement.

Ms Konti: I too have read and understand the privilege statement.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. We do not have any opening statements today, so I will kick off. I would like to ask about the Government Procurement Board—just a couple of questions. Since, I believe, at least July of this year there have been multiple spots

vacant on the nine-person board—ministerial appointments. Currently, half of the non-public employee member spots are not filled. Even considering future legislation proposed in your response to recommendation 11 of the Auditor-General's report, I am wondering why the board positions are only partially filled?

Mr Steel: We have been going through a process to advertise those positions and fill those vacancies.

Ms Mirzabegian: Thank you for the question. I confirm the minister's statement that we have, indeed, been recruiting for those processes. As you would appreciate, we do take these appointments very seriously, and we have conducted a full merit process. There needs to be other due processes, including agreement by cabinet and so forth, in relation to these appointments, so they do take time; however, we have made sure that in the meantime the board has the necessary quorum it requires to conduct its functions.

THE CHAIR: Board vacancies spanning multiple months would mean that valuable advice might be being missed on proposals. How have the vacancies affected the workload and the effectiveness of the board?

Ms Mirzabegian: The vacancies have not affected the deadlines of the board. The board, you would appreciate, operates such that most members have got a broad range of experience, and therefore they can provide the benefit of their experience. We do not have specialist members on the board that would have only the ability or the capability to provide their views in relation to one matter.

MR CAIN: Will the number of board members be expanded in light of the new powers proposed in the proposed reform?

Ms Mirzabegian: Thank you for that question, Mr Cain. The total number of board members remains the same.

MR CAIN: And what will be the ratio of non-public members to public members?

Ms Mirzabegian: In the future, the ratio would be five non-public employee members to four public employee members.

MR CAIN: Which existing public employee members of the board will be removed or not offered a new tenure to make room for the new members?

Ms Mirzabegian: I do not think that will be necessary, because of the current end dates of the relevant members.

MR CAIN: So are you simply waiting for the end dates to occur before you fill vacancies?

Ms Mirzabegian: We generally commence the recruitment process before the end of that period.

MR CAIN: Are you able to provide the end dates for each of those public officials?

Ms Mirzabegian: I will take that on notice.

MR CAIN: Thank you.

MS ORR: On a slightly different topic, how is work progressing to improve the ACT government's capability to respond to cyber incidents?

Mr Steel: Thank you. There has been a lot of work that has been going on for some time to strengthen our capability to respond to and manage cybersecurity and to uplift cybersecurity capability across ACT government. Among other things, we have established the ACT cybersecurity centre, which has enabled us to have a single point within ACT government that is supporting that capability.

We have been working closely with the commonwealth government. I note they have released their cybersecurity strategy today, which provides, I think, a national framework. We are working collaboratively with the Australian Cyber Security Centre, and when particular incidents have occurred—and we had more significant incident in relation to the Barracuda system—then, of course, we have been working closely with the commonwealth and responding to them, and also looking at what opportunities there are to improve our response to those types of incidents. The commonwealth are—after engaging with that particular matter, and, indeed, in response to many other cybersecurity incidents that are incurring costs to the economy, including to private business—developing a playbook which will basically set out a best practice approach to responding to these incidents in the future, drawing on the best examples of government responses and also those of the private sector.

We know that there is going to be an increase in incidents over time, so it is not a question of if, but when, and we will continue to need to develop our response and capability to manage these incidents going forward. I will hand over to Julian Valtas and Bettina Konti to talk a little bit about this work.

Mr Valtas: Thank you. I have read and acknowledge the privilege statement. Everything that the Special Minister of State articulated is very much on point. There has been continued investment within the ACT government for cybersecurity. It is not only development of the cybersecurity centre; it is also our security operations centre. We have got a new technology stack that is supporting us being able to detect and respond to cyber incidents at a much faster rate and that is more effective in having visibility about all the threats on our network.

Another major program that we have had developed over the last 18 months is a whole-of-government cyber awareness program. The cyber awareness program has included learning management modules that are targeted at all staff, the executive and our privileged users—so, we are looking at different cohorts of staff that have different threats pertinent to their role. We are also looking at other forms through which we can reach the audience, so I have been given the right to send a monthly message, and that is something I have been doing. We are targeting themes that are meaningful. We are looking at behaviours in personal cybersecurity that translate well into the workplace security practices as well—so, even things like online shopping. If people can respond more effectively in how they protect their own identity and their

own security at home, they have better workplace behaviours, so that is something that we have been working towards.

One of the things that the government has committed to is starting the foundations of compliance towards the Essential Eight. The Essential Eight are the Australian Cyber Security Centre national compliance strategies that look at resilience and how we can be the less attractive target for cyberthreat actors. That is something that the government has committed to in the last budget, and we have started work on that. We are currently working with the Australian Cyber Security Centre to get that footprint so that we understand what our current positions are and where we focus our energies towards building our resilience.

A couple of other initiatives over the last year that I would draw your attention to are the two major cyber exercises that we have had. They were testing our incident response and our emergency response to incidents. They have been coordinated with the commonwealth, so we have had Home Affairs. One of the scenarios tested the new security of critical infrastructure legislation and some of the security obligations that go with that legislation. We have got lessons learnt coming out of both those exercises and the Barracuda incident that will form part of revisions to our incident response and emergency management plans moving forward.

MS ORR: What is the time line for developing those responses, and when might we start to see some recommended next actions?

Mr Valtas: Sure. That is currently underway, so we have had the lessons learnt, we have had the actual exercises and we have seen the responses, and the commonwealth helped us develop some of the reviews about the exercises. The target is that the plans will be completed in the first half of next year, noting that we want to do another test of the plan before making it live. Any of the updates will be actually tested to ensure that they are fit for purpose.

MS ORR: Okay. Once these processes, which are responding to incidents but also these changes from the federal government, are done, what regular monitoring for best practice will you be implementing?

Mr Valtas: Part of the Essential Eight program will be to have high visibility so that we understand our vulnerabilities; we understand if we have got an issue with patching. We know that that can often be the weakest link, and when we look at the disasters of many of the big data breaches over the last year as an example, patching is one of the most critical things. It is really about creating that visibility where we will have the early indication of what we need to patch, what we need to maintain and where we need to put in controls to protect ourselves from some of the known threats that we are seeing in concert with working with our commonwealth security agencies and their advice.

MS ORR: In working with the others, that is leading to knowledge sharing so you can gather information from them and not necessarily have to wait for something to happen—you can proactively manage it. Is that correct?

Mr Valtas: That is correct. I sit on the National Cyber Security Committee, which is

the lead security body for Australia that has membership of my peers in the states and territories, the government chief information security officers, plus the commonwealth security agencies. We look at the Cyber Incident Management Arrangements for Australia. We look at the national threat level for Australia, and we think about the things like the sharing of threat information. There are certainly services out there that we have subscribed to that help us understand the threat information. We can actively support each other and ensure we are focusing our energies on the right thing and prioritising. One of the recent ones that has come out is in relation to the DP World incident that has been in the media. There was some sharing of threat information that came with that that made both the government and other sectors look at, “What is the exposure for our networks?” In our case, there was none.

MS ORR: Okay.

Ms Konti: Do you mind if I add a little bit to that?

THE CHAIR: Sure.

Ms Konti: I wanted to mention that we do already have intrusion detection and monitoring capabilities in place now, and Julian’s team is set to do that on most days. We have also implemented a cabinet agreed, best practice, design and delivery guidance, which includes the regular assessment of threats to directorates’ systems and processes as part of that too.

THE CHAIR: Mr Cain?

MR CAIN: I have got some question about the MAI Commission benefits. Minister, is it true that over \$800 million worth of premiums have been collected in revenue since the scheme’s commencement?

Mr Steel: I will hand over to Lisa Holmes to provide some more information about that. I am not sure exactly what date-data we have for the premiums collected at this point in time.

Ms Holmes: I have read and understood the privilege statement. Mr Cain, would you mind repeating your question?

MR CAIN: What dollar value is there on premiums collected in revenue since the scheme’s commencement?

Ms Holmes: I do not have those figures with me. Can I take that on notice, please? But can you tell me: is it a particular financial year that you are wanting?

MR CAIN: Since the scheme’s commencement, and perhaps broken down by financial year. Are you aware of roughly how much of that is distributed—even a rough percentage—to insurers?

Ms Holmes: Everything that is collected as part of the registration process—the MAI premiums—is provided in full through to the insurers. We are collecting it on their behalf. It is not a government tax.

MR CAIN: Of the total premiums collected, how much is being paid in benefits to claimants? I think it is about \$40 million—\$39.9 something—but I will just get you to confirm that.

Ms Holmes: As at the end of September the figure is just shy of \$40 million.

MR CAIN: For several financial years there has been a grave disparity between the amount collected and how much is paid out. In July's estimates, Minister, you advised that this was due to the novelty of the act; so, according to your modelling, when will this ratio balance itself?

Ms Holmes: If I may, Mr Cain. Can I explain how the premiums work? What is collected in an accident year is to cover all expenses associated with the accidents which occur in that year. For people who have an injury which has occurred in, say, the current financial year 2023-24, they are entitled to treatment and care up to five years; then for people who are more seriously injured and meet the threshold, it can go through to common law. Particularly for common law, you might not see all of those settlements come through until seven, perhaps 10, years down the track. What is collected in premiums for 2023-24 actually covers expenses for, potentially, up to 10 years, possibly past that. What you cannot do is look at what is collected in a single year and then compare what the payments were in that year. You need to look at accident years: so, the premiums for that year and then what is paid out in all of the expenses associated with the accidents for that year.

MR CAIN: Would you say that is all very readily explained in the annual report? Because it does sound extremely complicated.

MS ORR: Chair, I would seek your advice on whether that is an opinion.

MR CAIN: I have got another question. I note in your annual report, the financial reports do not cover the collection of premiums paid out to insurers and how much is collected from taxpayers. Why is this data obscured?

Ms Holmes: It is not obscured. As a regulator, we are focusing on what it is that the scheme is providing and what our activities are as the regulator.

MR CAIN: You are confident that the explanation of how these premiums are collected and how they are distributed is pretty easy to understand from your annual report?

MS ORR: I think that is bordering on opinion.

MR CAIN: That is a question.

Ms Holmes: I would question whether or not it is the purpose of the annual report, every single year, to actually go into that level of detail. Certainly, the three-year review, which is coming up, and which we are in the process of doing at the moment, will go into all of that detail as to exactly how it is that premiums are calculated and the basis for the length of time of expenses that they need to cover.

MR CAIN: I suggest, in the interests of transparency, you make the explanation a lot more amenable to public scrutiny. Thank you, Chair.

THE CHAIR: I will move on. I have further questions on service provider oversight with regard to insurance. Minister, does the MAI Commission provide oversight of a general practitioner in the development of a recovery plan?

Mr Steel: Do you want to take that one, Ms Holmes?

Ms Holmes: The MAI Commission does not. We regulate the insurer as part of the scheme and what is required under the legislation. For someone who is off work or injured and has not recovered within about 28 days, there is a requirement for an insurer to put a recovery plan in place for that injured person. The recovery plan is put in place in consultation with the injured person and the treating team of that injured person.

THE CHAIR: Okay, just so I am clear: can you explain why, in the case of the McLuckie family, despite the lodging of medical benefit forms, the insurer did not develop a recovery plan for any of the family—Tom, Sarah or Amanda McLuckie, who is Matthew’s mother?

In the recovery plan fact sheet it states that, once a MAI medical report is submitted, “The insurer must tailor each version of a Plan to your circumstances and your specific treatment and care needs.” It is clearly stated in the recovery plan fact sheet from the MAI website. Is it possible that, without any governance, insurers, including the nominal defendant, are being prescriptive in who should receive a recovery plan or are not pursuing the development of one unless the claimant requests one?

MS ORR: Are we allowed? Because—these are some personal details.

MR CAIN: They have been volunteered by the McLuckie family.

Ms Holmes: An injured person does not need to request a recovery plan. We have certainly been working with the insurers, since the scheme has started, to remind them of their obligations. We have been monitoring and reminding them of their obligation in relation to recovery plans and the need to put recovery plans in place.

THE CHAIR: Do you have a supplementary, Mr Cain?

MR CAIN: In the case of the McLuckie family, do you think it is acceptable that, 18 months after their son’s death, with the trauma and grief they have experienced, a recovery plan has never been put forward by the initial insurer, the nominal defendant or the new insurer to whom their claims were transferred? That is, the NRMA.

MS ORR: I am sorry, Chair, but I am really uncomfortable with this line of questioning, given that this is about an individual case, whether the details have been provided or not. It is not necessarily responsive to the annual report and we are asking an official to comment on an individual case. I do not think that is quite a good fit.

THE CHAIR: I think a lot of what we talk about here is individual cases, whether it is about a tree in Gungahlin or something else. If we remove the names—

MS ORR: Yes, but we would not be identifying—

THE CHAIR: Okay, well, let's remove the name.

MS ORR: No. We would not be identifying it to this point.

MR CAIN: I would like to hear what the minister or his official has to say.

MS ORR: They have no requirement to answer an out-of-order question.

MR CAIN: That is not out of order.

THE CHAIR: I do not think it is out of order. Does the minister have any comments? If there is a family that is struggling and still waiting, this is the insurance scheme and this is the Special Minister of State.

Mr Steel: I am not going to comment on the individual matter specifically, but Ms Holmes might be able to comment on the general policy in relation to these matters.

Ms Holmes: Yes. I certainly, for privacy reasons, cannot disclose any information about individuals. As I said, the legislation is clear about the requirements. People do need to be requesting treatment and care of the insurer. If it has been requested—and I am talking generally—and it is declined, there are processes in place by which the individual can ask for an internal review. If they are not satisfied with an internal review, they have the ability to go through to ACAT for an external review.

THE CHAIR: I am sure that is tough when you are grieving.

MR CAIN: What measures has the MAI Commissioner put in place to ensure consistency in the support arrangements afforded to persons dealing with insurers? I am reliably informed that one family had an occupational therapist appointed by the insurer who coordinated services, worked with the GP and developed a recovery and return to work plan, when other persons, after 18 months of dealing with the system, have not received adequate support.

Ms Holmes: As I said, Mr Cain, I cannot comment on the individual circumstances, for privacy reasons. As I said, there are processes which are in place. I encourage anyone to continue to work with their insurer. We also have the Defined Benefit Information Service, which is available for injured people, which is a free service that we fund to provide information to injured people as to what they are entitled to, if they have questions about the process.

MR CAIN: Minister, will you undertake to ensure there is consistency of service?

Mr Steel: What we are doing is undertaking a review of the scheme. There will be an opportunity for the community to raise any issues that they have with the scheme, as

part of that process, and they will be considered. If that issue of consistency is one that people raise, that will be considered.

MS ORR: If there are concerns with the meaning of “serviceable agreements”, for lack of a better way to put it, through the scheme, what is the appropriate way to raise those?

Ms Holmes: As I said, there are processes in place for individuals. If they have requested treatment and, for whatever reason, that treatment has been declined, there are processes in place by which they can ask the insurer to review their decision, which is an internal review. If they do not like the outcome of that, they have the external review avenue as well, which is through ACAT.

They also have the ability to make complaints to the MAI Commission. If we have a complaint, we cannot overturn a decision of an insurer but we can certainly check to see whether or not the insurer is following the processes required under the legislation and the guidelines. Certainly, we have followed up in a number of instances. We meet with the insurers quarterly. We go through stats with the insurers quarterly. Things such as recovery plans being put in place, we discuss with the insurers every quarter. We give them numbers of particular ones which might not have a recovery plan in place yet, to follow up as to what are the circumstances and why one has not been put in place. The commission is certainly very active in this space.

THE CHAIR: Does it happen often that a recovery plan is not put in place?

Ms Holmes: There can be multiple reasons why that might be the case. It could be that they are waiting for further information from the injured people. It could be that they are waiting on information back from treating professionals as well. Just because a treatment plan is not in place does not mean that they are not still receiving treatment and care. It could be on a more ad hoc or temporary basis, whilst that recovery plan is being put in place.

Mr Steel: It is worth reflecting that it is quite a significant change from the previous CTP scheme, where a common-law claim might take years to settle to be able to provide some of that support. The scheme is designed to make sure that people do get that treatment and care in a timely way, compared to the old scheme. There are certainly improvements that can be made to the scheme, which will be considered as part of the review, but it is a significant improvement on what was there previously under the CTP scheme.

Ms Holmes: In response to the transparency question that we had before, we publish stats in relation to the scheme every quarter. That is on our website. We provide information as to the number of applications we receive and the number which are accepted. We provide details as to the overall payments being made, the length of time for the first treatment and care payments, and the length of time for income replacement payments. If we look at treatment and care, on a median basis it is 13 days to the first treatment and care payment being provided, which, as the minister said, is considerably faster than the number of years which used to be the case generally under common law.

THE CHAIR: And what about complaints? Do you get many complaints?

Ms Holmes: We actually have only had four complaints in the 2022-23 financial year. We also publish statistics each quarter on the internal reviews which people have requested. There have been 137 completed to date. That is over a three-year period. Seven are in progress. When you consider all of the decisions which are made on all those individual points about treatment and care, income replacement and other things that the scheme provides, that is actually an incredibly low number.

THE CHAIR: So it is 137 in three years and we have had six in this current financial year—

Ms Holmes: It is 137 internal reviews. We have had four complaints in the calendar year.

THE CHAIR: Great.

MS ORR: In the budget there was some funding for community facility upgrades and improvements to ACT government buildings. Can I get an update on how the work on that is progressing? Ms Holmes might get to have a bit of a break.

Mr Steel: I will ask Josh Rynehart from ACT Property Group to provide some information about those upgrades.

Mr Rynehart: I have read and acknowledge the privilege statement. Sorry, Ms Orr; you were asking about community facility upgrades?

MS ORR: Yes: the community facility upgrades and improvements to ACT government buildings that funding was allocated for in the last budget.

Mr Rynehart: We have a program underway. We are currently undertaking activity related to the Woden and Belconnen community facilities work. We are looking to investigate what the long-term options are relating to those. We will need to have a further conversation with the community around what those outcomes are, but that work is underway this year.

Effectively, what we are looking to do is to take some activity with some of the community facilities, as examples of how we can move forward, and look at the utilisation of the assets in the best way that we can. Over the longer term, as the community need moves and as the demographics shift across the city, we want to ensure that we have the best properties in place in the best locations. We are working through that process, as I said, to look at the feasibility of upgrades in some locations, as examples of how we move forward in the longer term.

Mr Steel: The specific budget measure goes to a number of other properties where basic maintenance is required, and the work that is continuing in relation to replacing some of the energy systems with more efficient electrical systems. We might provide, on notice, a list of those properties that are being upgraded under that specific measure.

MS ORR: Good. Thank you.

MR CAIN: Regarding the Motor Accident Injuries Commission, can you report, Minister, the detail of the 1,350 lodgements? How many people raised a treatment or care claim?

Mr Steel: I will ask Lisa Holmes to provide some information, if she can. Otherwise, we will take that one on notice.

Ms Holmes: Sorry, Mr Cain. Can you repeat that for me?

MR CAIN: Of the 1,350 lodgements, how many people raised a treatment or care claim?

Ms Holmes: I am going to have to take that one on notice, Mr Cain.

MR CAIN: Okay. Thank you. How many of these lodgements were done under the mechanism of a recovery plan?

Ms Holmes: People put in an application to the scheme. Once they apply to the scheme, they can then request treatment and care assistance or income replacement assistance. The scheme does not quite work in the way that you have just indicated with your question.

MR CAIN: While under a recovery plan, are they able to make a treatment or care claim? Can you clarify that or not?

Ms Holmes: Once someone applies to the scheme and it is accepted, whilst they are waiting for their application to be accepted there are certain allowances available for treatment and care during that period. Once it is accepted then they can request treatment and care at any point in time. The purpose of a recovery plan is to be a forward-looking plan which is in place for generally up to three months and then it gets reassessed on an ongoing basis.

A treatment and care plan is not the only mechanism. You can still have ad hoc treatment and care happening at the same time. The treatment and care plan is around trying to formalise and provide some certainty, going forward, but anyone can request, at any point in time, something which might not be in a recovery plan.

MR CAIN: How many of the 1,350 claimants sought a treatment or care plan but did not receive one?

Ms Holmes: I will have to take that on notice. I repeat that not having a treatment and care plan—a recovery plan is the terminology under the legislation—does not mean that they have not received treatment and care.

MR CAIN: Does the MAIC measure how many recovery plans have been developed by the insurers, working with the applicants' doctors?

Ms Holmes: We collect stats from the insurers. One of the stats that we do collect from the insurers is in relation to recovery plans.

MR CAIN: And whether they have worked with the applicants' doctors?

Ms Holmes: The requirement is that when a recovery plan is put in place the individual injured person has the ability to respond to a draft recovery plan. Their treating physician or their treating team also has the ability to provide input into their recovery plan before it is finalised.

MR CAIN: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: I will keep going. I have some questions about appeals to ACAT. What are the powers of ACAT in response to disputes?

Ms Holmes: ACAT can make a number of different decisions in relation to a dispute. They can dismiss a dispute. The different categories are in our quarterly report. They can affirm a decision, they can set aside a decision and they can dismiss a decision. They will sometimes remit it back to the insurer to look at the decision that they have made.

THE CHAIR: Where ACAT reports that the insurer failed in a duty—for example, the insurer inappropriately advising a claimant of the claims process—can you explain why they cannot overrule a benefit calculation when this lack of advice has directly impacted a claimant and their ability to be compensated for income?

Ms Holmes: At the end of the day, what ACAT has to look at is what is in the legislation and the guidelines as to how an income replacement payment has to be calculated.

THE CHAIR: And that is why they cannot overturn or overrule?

Ms Holmes: They can only overrule if the decision which is being made is inconsistent with the requirements in the legislation and the guidelines.

THE CHAIR: Right. Where an insurer has not met its obligations in appropriate advisement, do you think that a penalty should be enforced on the insurer and any subsequent loss of income replacement or benefit due to the insurer's lack of engagement should be compensated to the claimant?

MS ORR: Chair; I am sorry. That is asking for an opinion. You said, "Do you think," and that is very subjective.

MR CAIN: I think the witness can answer.

MS ORR: Peter, you can think a lot of things but it is not helpful, mate. I am sorry, Chair, but no.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Are you aware of any of the recent findings from ACAT in such a matter regarding an appeal by Mr Thomas McLuckie?

Ms Holmes: Yes, I am.

THE CHAIR: I think that will do for me for the moment. I will read through these and reword them.

MR CAIN: Are you engaged with the McLuckie family in helping them to navigate the complexities of the scheme as they have encountered it? How are you engaging with that family?

MS ORR: Chair, I am really sorry, but we have already had this discussion on how, for privacy reasons, officials cannot comment on individual cases.

THE CHAIR: Can you answer how you engage with people who have questions and help them walk through? Forget the McLuckies. What is the process?

Ms Holmes: The Defined Benefit Information Service has been put in place to provide free information to injured people and their families in relation to the scheme, what is provided by the scheme and the processes in the scheme. We do sometimes get people contacting us directly and we will advise them of the Defined Benefit Information Service.

MR CAIN: Chair, a point of order. I believe the secretariat has some assistance where matters of confidentiality or privacy arise.

THE CHAIR: All right. Not talking about a specific incident, could you tell me what the harm would be to the public interest if this person has come to us and said they are happy for their name to be mentioned? Would you like me to read it word for word?

MS ORR: Yes. It might just help everyone.

THE CHAIR: Minister, your official has made a claim of confidentiality. Parliamentary privilege overrides this claim. To manage these situations, the Assembly has passed continuing resolution 8B that uses a public interest test. Minister, is it your view that it is in the public interest to withhold this information?

Mr Steel: No, and I do not think we have withheld any information that I am aware of. I think we have answered the question, but in general terms, so we have addressed your question.

MR CAIN: But no, not with respect to the McLuckie family.

THE CHAIR: The McLuckies, on this last question.

MR CAIN: And obviously, Ms Orr, that is the advice that was brought to my attention earlier as well.

Mr Steel: If you could repeat the question that you would like information on then we might be able to consider it.

MR CAIN: Given that the McLuckie family, 18 months since the trauma of the loss of a son, has gone through intricacies and frustrations with the scheme, what assistance, Minister, are you giving to that family to help them navigate a scheme over which you have oversight?

Mr Steel: I met with them and heard from them directly in a meeting about some of the issues that they have with the scheme, and the MAI Commissioner was there at the time.

MR CAIN: How recently was that?

Mr Steel: I believe that was last year.

MR CAIN: Last year?

Mr Steel: I can take that on notice and come back to you on the timing of that. There will be opportunities for them to make representations in relation to the legislative review that is being undertaken, three years after the introduction of the scheme. The commission—

MR CAIN: Minister, it does seem—

Mr Steel: I have not finished my answer, Mr Cain. The commission may have some further information that they can provide.

Ms Holmes: We have had correspondence with Mr McLuckie, and we have responded to him. I believe we have also spoken to him a number of times as well.

MR CAIN: How recently was this?

Ms Holmes: I would have to take that on notice.

MR CAIN: Minister, given that the MAI scheme is meant to support victims and the families of victims, what we are hearing in this case is that the scheme is frustrating the recovery of a family from a traumatic event. You met with them, what, last year? I am pretty staggered that they have gone through so many trials in dealing with the scheme, following this traumatic incident. Surely, this scheme should be implemented benevolently. That is the policy driver. Why are you just sitting back behind the rules and saying that they are getting treated appropriately? Will you review the treatment of this family and reach out to them, for their direct assistance?

Mr Steel: I think the commission has been in touch with them and understands the issues that they have been raising. There is a legislative review of the scheme as well, which will provide further opportunity for these systemic issues to be considered, not just the individual ones—

MR CAIN: I am not sure whether there is comfort for them by telling them, “Do not worry; we are reviewing the scheme.”

THE CHAIR: That is not a question, Mr Cain.

MS ORR: I think that is a comment.

THE CHAIR: Yes.

MR CAIN: It certainly is a comment.

THE CHAIR: Ms Orr, would you like to have a substantive?

MS ORR: No. I am sorry. I am going to ask Mr Cain to leave, because I find his methods quite disruptive. I have the power under the standing orders to do that. I think it is fair to say, Ms Castley, that you have very similar questions, so I do not think we will be stopping the scrutiny.

MR CAIN: Chair?

THE CHAIR: On what grounds do you want him to go?

MS ORR: Admission of visitors; 236.

THE CHAIR: But on what grounds?

MS ORR: Disruption, and he has been rude to me throughout this committee. He was rude last week too. It is enough. We do not have much left, and I would like to be able to go on with the rest of the hearing.

THE CHAIR: I think we are moving on to your question now.

MS ORR: Any member can ask him to leave. I have asked him to leave.

THE CHAIR: Am I being forced to ask him to leave? The advice I have is that if any member of the committee asks somebody to leave, they have to leave. I have to ask you to leave, Mr Cain.

MR CAIN: This is pretty ridiculous. Shame on you!

MS ORR: That is exactly why I have asked you to leave, Peter.

Mr Cain withdrew from the hearing.

THE CHAIR: Over to you, Ms Orr.

MS ORR: We recently saw the construction of a new BMX facility at UC Stromlo, which is very popular with the BMX community. How is Stromlo working to not only make sure that it remains a premier mountain-biking facility, but also attracts new visitors to the park, like BMXers, equestrians and road cyclists?

Mr Steel: We have been delighted to partner with Freestyle ACT BMX Club to support them in the development of a new BMX facility at Stromlo Forest Park. It is consistent with the master plan to have that type of facility available. It has also

helped them to stage a major event, with the ACT Jam that was held just a couple of weekends ago, and which drew hundreds of people into Stromlo Forest Park to see some of Australia's top BMX bikers, as well as international BMX bikers, compete at UC Stromlo, which is the new branding.

This is a really great facility, and it is a tribute to the volunteers involved. They had a lot of support from some local businesses in helping to construct the track. We have got a huge amount out of the investment that the ACT government has made, which I understand is just over \$70,000, which provides access to a range of different lines—which is the terminology used to describe different sections of the track—for beginners and intermediate riders and the jumps for the more advanced riders. I think there will be opportunities to expand that offering at Stromlo. The additional facilities that we are building, including a new car park, will also assist visitors to access that facility and other facilities around Stromlo. It has been a great collaboration. I will hand over to Daniel Bailey to talk a little bit about that work.

Mr Bailey: I acknowledge the privilege statement. The minister has outlined it pretty well in terms of the event. There were just over 3,000 participants at that BMX event the other day. At Stromlo we are also doing a master plan that is looking at a number of different things that we will do there. BMXing is a big part of that, as well as satisfying all of the other cycling groups. It was also a good test the other day of the car park. The car park works are just about complete, but they were complete enough that we were able to open it up and give it a bit of a test for that event. That went well.

MS ORR: What have been the learnings from staging such a big event, and where is the facility up to? It is still a reasonably new facility, in the whole scheme of things.

Mr Steel: I would say maintenance is the thing that is at the top of my mind in terms of the facility. It is a compacted dirt facility. There is the potential for erosion. We did see some rain in the lead-up to the event. We are very mindful, even though there has been an initial up-front investment in building the track, that we need to continue to make sure that it is in a safe condition to be able to support not only riders to train, but also those major events.

That is one of the reasons why we are looking at opportunities for insourcing at Stromlo Forest Park, to make sure that we have the staff available that can do that maintenance and make sure it is in a safe condition for riders. Daniel might have some further thoughts on that.

Mr Bailey: We have had a number of learnings with Stromlo. Some of the challenges include the one-way-in, one-way-out access there, and parking. We have addressed that now, with the new car parks that we have done there. We hold a number of other events—running events and things like that—that bring in large numbers of people, so we have become quite good at traffic management. That is usually a bit of a challenge at Stromlo, but I think we have that sorted now. Even while the car parks were out, we were able to host some major running events there, by using other areas of the park. It is quite flexible in that regard. It seems to be interacting really well with Stromlo pool, which is right next to it. We have learnt quite a lot, and Stromlo is going quite well.

MS ORR: Is this the appropriate session in which to ask about visitor numbers to the

park?

Mr Steel: Yes.

Mr Bailey: We will have to take that on notice; I am sorry.

MS ORR: That is okay. There has been a lot of work done in the park. I believe there were some announcements not too long ago about some further works that we are looking to do. What future plans and time lines do you have in place for improvements to the park?

Mr Steel: I understand that the car park will be completed around the end of the year, weather permitting. There will be an opportunity to be able to host more events there, when we have that formalised parking in place—more parking, and more accessible parking for the community to use.

Of course, the master plan will inform future projects going forward. The car park has made room for the village green, which I understand is being seeded with grass, and it will provide an opportunity to provide a staging point, as a hub of activity for those events in the future.

Other projects that have been conceived of in the future, which the user groups have put forward to us as priorities, include a new north-south access road from Cotter Road through to the centre and the central village of Mount Stromlo. That is important from a safety and accessibility point of view, as well as staging events using the road and providing access for those who are accessing the park. That is a particular one that has been prioritised, but there are some other projects that they would like to see as well, and Daniel can talk to that.

Mr Bailey: On top of that, we have recently extended the criterium track. That enables safer exit from the park for biking events going out onto the road, as well as a larger track internally, and for triathlons integrating with the pool as well. That has been implemented recently.

We are currently doing a tracks and trails master plan for the site. There was a Your Say consultation on that. We have taken that feedback and consultants are gathering all of that together and compiling it, in order to look at taking Stromlo into the future, and making sure that it is still a good product. Mountain biking is a competitive market. Pretty much anywhere that has a hill in a local country town will have mountain biking. Stromlo was one of the leaders, and we want to keep it at that level. It is about making sure we can target that investment in the tracks, and look at what people want, and want to see and use. That work is wrapping up as we speak. Hopefully, we will have something early in 2024 to look at there.

With the BMX track, whilst we have done stage 1, as the minister mentioned, there are future stages that we can do. I think that pretty much covers it.

Mr Steel: I have some further information on an earlier question, if that is okay.

MS ORR: Is it on the visitor numbers?

Mr Steel: No, sorry; it is the Procurement Board.

Ms Mirzabegian: It was in relation to the terms of the current members. I will enumerate them. No 1, Bettina Konti, Chair: term ends on 11 May 2024; No 2, Geoffrey Rutledge, Deputy Chair: term ends 8 July 2024; No 3, Dave Gilbert, Public Employee Member: term ends 25 September 2026; No 4, Sally Druhan, Public Employee Member: term ends 25 October 2026; No 5, Ian Turnbull, Public Employee Member: term ends 25 October 2026; No 6, Coretta Bessi, Non-Public Employee Member: term ends 16 May 2025; No 7, Mathew Baldwin, Non-Public Employee Member: term ends 8 September 2025; No 8, Katherine McDermott, Non-Public Employee Member: term ends 16 May 2025; and No 9, Sommer Roles, Non-Public Employee Member: term ends 8 June 2026.

THE CHAIR: I have questions about CIT. The Integrity Commissioner has now circulated his interim report into the CIT contracts. Did you receive a copy of this report?

Mr Steel: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Will you table a copy of the interim report?

Mr Steel: No. As you are very much aware, and as the Integrity Commissioner has outlined, I understand, in these annual report hearings, those are matters which are questions for the Integrity Commission to answer. I understand that this is a matter that is confidential, and I cannot disclose that. If you have a question about that, I suggest you go and ask the Integrity Commissioner.

THE CHAIR: I will keep going with the questions, and we will see whether I am in the right spot or not. Is Ms Leanne Cover still in her role as CEO of CIT?

Mr Steel: I believe she is. I remind you that we have a whole hearing in relation to my portfolio as Minister for Skills, which is later in the week. If you are going to ask questions about CIT, I am not sure that that fits into this portfolio today.

THE CHAIR: I have questions for you as Minister for Skills and Special Minister of State. Will you provide a response to the commissioner's report, in your role as the Minister for Skills and Special Minister of State?

Mr Steel: Obviously, that is a matter that is currently the subject of the investigation. I cannot comment.

THE CHAIR: Do you anticipate that there will be resignations following the report, including both CIT CEO Leanne Cover and other colleagues?

Mr Steel: I cannot comment on the matter that is under investigation. If you have questions for CIT or the Integrity Commission, I suggest you ask those people at the right opportunity, and there will be opportunities, I believe, later this week. I can confirm the exact date of that, if you like. I understand that the hearing will be occurring on Friday at 11.15 am.

THE CHAIR: Have you heard of a familial or personal relationship between Ms Cover and the CEO of Think Garden, Patrick Hollingworth, at the time the contracts were entered into?

Mr Steel: I am not commenting on matters under investigation.

THE CHAIR: Are you refusing to answer the question?

MS ORR: Chair, the minister has already said that it would be more appropriate to be asked in a different session, which also reports to this committee, and we will be sitting on Friday.

THE CHAIR: He is here today in his capacity as Special Minister of State, and that is a question I have chosen to ask—

MS ORR: Yes, but you are asking him questions about skills, so it is not within this area.

THE CHAIR: No, I am asking questions about relationships within his directorate and things that are going on within an area of his responsibility.

MS ORR: But not as Special Minister of State, though.

Mr Steel: CIT is not in this hearing, either.

MS ORR: It is not in this portfolio.

THE CHAIR: Okay. We will move on.

Mr Steel: Matters for the Integrity Commission need to be asked of the Integrity Commissioner. You would have had that opportunity already, because that hearing apparently has already occurred. I am sure there will be opportunities for you to ask questions on notice to the Integrity Commissioner, if you would like, through a different committee. Indeed, in your general role as a member of the Assembly, you might be able to ask him questions through the normal process of questions on notice, if you would like.

THE CHAIR: Just not in annual reports. That is okay. Minister, you have had a difficult time articulating in dollar terms the role that the unions play in procurement. In one answer, you advised that there are roughly 1,300 union-affiliated businesses to validate in sorting through the contracts register and via manual processes. For clarity, what is your definition of a union-affiliated business?

Mr Steel: I think that is not quite correct, in the sense that I think there was an assumption that there could be up to that many businesses, but we do not actually know, and that is the whole point. We do not know how many businesses there could be in that category. That is one of the reasons why the advice that came to me was that it would be an unnecessary and unreasonable use of government resources to go through and find out that information. What I did was to provide information—I think

it was in answer to a question on notice—about the direct contracts that are with unions.

THE CHAIR: You do not have any oversight of the union-affiliated businesses and the contracts that they are awarded? You do not have oversight of that?

Mr Steel: I do not quite understand what you are asking, Ms Castley. We have provided—

THE CHAIR: If businesses are getting contracts with the ACT government, are you saying that you do not have any idea whether they are affiliated with a union or not?

Mr Steel: No, we have not done that level of data. That would be a considerable effort to go through, and we may not even have the information necessary to understand whether a business is affiliated with a union or not.

THE CHAIR: You would not know the value of contracts?

Mr Steel: That would be difficult to obtain, but Ms Mirzabegian might have some information about that.

Ms Mirzabegian: I can only elaborate on what the minister has said. I think the question on notice was asked in the context of whether we could provide that data on whether there were any contracts with bodies that were considered to be affiliated to unions. There are, on our search, around 1,300 such bodies across Australia. We do not have any markers where we ask, for example, in a tender process, “Please identify whether you are union affiliated or whether you are a union body.” We do not collect that information; hence we do not have that. It is also not part of our notifiable contracts register requirements to mark that as an identifier.

THE CHAIR: The Deputy Chief Minister is under investigation right now by the Integrity Commission for the role of her office in interfering on a contract, so it is a highly relevant issue. Minister, will you improve your reporting metrics for contracts awarded to unions?

Mr Steel: I am not going to comment on that specific matter.

THE CHAIR: Do you agree that tracking contracts awarded to union-affiliated businesses is important? Yes or no?

Mr Steel: If there are issues raised then of course we will consider them, but at this stage—

THE CHAIR: You will not track them?

Mr Steel: I am not sure what the potential benefit of that might be. You might be able to elaborate on that.

THE CHAIR: Just to ensure whether money is going to union-affiliated businesses or not. Is it not something that you would think appropriate to track?

Mr Steel: It is not something that we have thought was appropriate to track. Obviously, we have work underway at the moment to improve ICT systems around our procurements. We might be able to talk about some of those improvements, but they require quite significant investment. We have some work underway to try and better track each individual procurement.

We have general policies in place which deal with who it is appropriate to contract with. We have a set of procurement values that must be followed. We have a range of different policies like the secure local jobs code and the ethical treatment of workers evaluation. There are a range of different policies across our procurement system that must be followed.

We track some of those things but we will not be able to track the nature of every single provider. At the moment we are focusing particularly on where there is a concern about secure local jobs. That is certainly a concern for us. The ethical treatment of workers is a particular focus for us. We are doing further work around—

THE CHAIR: Our time is up. If you have taken any questions on notice—there have been plenty of them—please provide your answers to the committee secretary within five business days of receiving the uncorrected proof *Hansard*. We will now suspend the proceedings and reconvene at 3 pm.

Hearing suspended from 2.01 to 3.05 pm.

Appearances:

Cheyne, Ms Tara, Assistant Minister for Economic Development, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Business and Better Regulation, Minister for Human Rights and Minister for Multicultural Affairs

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate

Arthy, Ms Kareena, Deputy Director-General, Economic Development

Starick, Ms Kate, Executive Group Manager, Policy and Strategy, Economic Development

Triffitt, Mr Ross, Executive Branch Manager, Events ACT

Cubin, Ms Derise, Commissioner for Fair Trading, Controlled Sport Registrar and Registrar for Cooperatives, Access Canberra

Chesworth, Ms Fiona, Executive Branch Manager, Better Regulation Taskforce

Engle, Mr Sam, Coordinator-General, Office for Climate Action and Better Regulation Taskforce

THE CHAIR: Welcome back to the public hearing of the economy and gender and economic equality committee inquiry into annual and financial reports for 2022-23.

The proceedings today are being recorded and transcribed by Hansard and will be published. The proceedings are also being broadcast and webstreamed live. When taking a question on notice, it would be useful if witnesses used these words, “I will take that question on notice.” This will help the committee and witnesses to confirm questions taken on notice from the transcript.

We welcome Ms Tara Cheyne, the Assistant Minister for Economic Development, and officials who are appearing today. Could all witnesses acknowledge that they have read and understand the privilege statement?

Mr Triffitt: I have read and understand the privilege statement.

Mr Engle: I acknowledge the privilege statement.

Ms Arthy: I have read and understand the privilege statement.

Ms Starick: I have read and understand the privilege statement.

THE CHAIR: Excellent. There are no opening statements today?

Ms Cheyne: No.

THE CHAIR: Let us go to questions. I have one about the Screen Investment Fund. Page 181 of volume 1 of the latest CMTEDD annual report mentions that there was a review into the Screen Investment Fund, which was a requirement of the funding agreement. It goes on to say that “CMTEDD will work with Screen Canberra through 2023 to address areas for improvement, identified by the review”. I want to confirm whether this review has been made public.

Ms Cheyne: No, I do not believe so, Chair. It has been an internal review, as part of

the agreement, to determine that it was meeting its aims and how it has been operating in these past few years, given that it is a sizable amount of money. Also, a good deal of it has now been spent.

THE CHAIR: The review was conducted by CMTEDD, as a requirement of the funding agreement?

Ms Cheyne: Was it a requirement? That is my understanding.

Ms Starick: Yes, and it was conducted internally within CMTEDD.

THE CHAIR: Why internally? Why not externally, or by an independent reviewer?

Ms Starick: It was conducted independently of economic development. The acronym is “STO”; it is part of—

Ms Cheyne: The Strategy and Transformation Office.

Ms Starick: Thank you very much. It was conducted independently under the Strategy and Transformation Office, which is an office set up to work with different parts of government and undertake reviews of these types.

THE CHAIR: You mentioned a few reasons why it is not public, but it is \$5 million of taxpayers’ money. Has any consideration been given to letting that be public?

Ms Starick: Ms Castley, part of the reason why it is not out there is that, as you might be aware, there has been a change of leadership at Screen Canberra. The review findings came out around that time. We have only just started working with the new CEO on the outcomes. That is part of the reason why it has not been released any further, because we are still working through it with Screen Canberra.

This is the turn - EGEE-22Nov23-10.docx

THE CHAIR: Is it something that you would consider once all of that is settled?

Ms Cheyne: I think we need to determine how much of it is commercial in confidence, because the amounts that Screen Canberra provides to different productions is not generally publicly available.

THE CHAIR: I am pretty good at reading redacted material these days. I am happy to take anything redacted if that is an option.

Ms Cheyne: We will consider that as we work through.

THE CHAIR: Sure. Did the review look at matters of integrity, misconduct and corruption linked with the investment fund?

Ms Arthy: The review was mainly around the administration and purely around whether there were areas of improvement that could be made to make it a bit more

streamlined. That was the main focus. I will just check with my colleague whether there is anything else of note. No.

THE CHAIR: Have there been any complaints about mishandling to you, Minister, or the directorate about the fund or its integrity?

Ms Arthy: I am not aware of any issues relating to integrity, no. The review, as I mentioned, was mainly around the administration, which is all very boring processes, procedures and such things. I am not aware of issues that have been raised around integrity and none of my colleagues are as well.

Ms Cheyne: The Screen grants used to be with Screen Canberra and now that funding bucket has been rolled into the Arts Activities Fund. This is different to the Screen Investment Fund.

THE CHAIR: Right. So the funding grants are not part of this?

Ms Cheyne: Smaller grants that people would apply for through Screen Canberra are slightly different. The Screen Investment Fund is about some bigger productions that Screen Canberra kind of has more of an association with; whereas, the Screen Canberra grants program was more about helping a production get off the ground or to do some further work there. So you could imagine that there may have been some people who have been disappointed that they did not receive a grant. The bucket, when it was with Screen Canberra, was about \$100,000.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

MS ORR: Where are the night-time economy reforms up to and what is the purpose of providing case studies around the Liquor Act and permits and licences?

Ms Cheyne: Thanks, Ms Orr. I will hand to Mr Engele to talk you through both of those. But, as an overview, significant progress has been made this year—and, indeed, since we last spoke about it in estimates—in that a range of consultations have been held as well as with some thought leaders in the night-time economy space to really help guide us on what is going to make a difference for business, for economic impact but also for the vibrancy of the city and making Canberra's night time more impactful and more attractive.

One of the consultations that we did outside of industry was a YourSay consultation. It probably will not come as a surprise, but we heard that the biggest challenge for the night-time economy is streaming services, which make it very easy to give you access to a whole lot of things to keep you on the couch. So we have to work on making sure that we have a great proposition. This is an issue for cities everywhere—for people to come out and to engage in night life and socialise and things like that.

We have also done a range of workshops with stakeholders and local businesses, and that has really driven our thinking. We took a pause to have a look at the night-time economy reforms announced just recently in New South Wales, to see the applicability of their reforms or if there were any good ideas they come up with that we could borrow. What we learnt is that much of the outcomes of the New South

Wales liquor reforms deliver what our Liquor Act largely does—not in all cases but in quite a few.

We really saw that as a great opportunity to share better with the public and with the business community what opportunities are actually available under our Liquor Act, because it is quite flexible. That is why we have started to publish some scenarios on our Access Canberra website to help businesses see that there are opportunities for them. For example, there are a range of businesses that are exempt from having a liquor permit, like a hairdresser. So they are welcome to provide alcohol on their premises for someone who is getting pampered in any way. Another example is that a business that is having a private function of fewer than 30 people does not need a liquor permit to sell alcohol at that function. I do not think that is necessarily well known. Making sure that we not only publish that but also write directly to businesses is something that we are engaging in at the moment.

Mr Engele: Thank you, Minister. I can expand on the work that the task force has been doing on the night-time economy. You would recall that the night-time economy was elected as it was an area that had been heavily impacted by COVID. The BRT started work on the reviews initially early this year. The first piece of analysis and work that we did was to bring down some key experts from other entertainment precincts in Queensland and also some key experts in relation to harm minimisation. They presented at a MusicACT function that the ACT government sponsored. At that function, the minister presented a draft vision for the night-time economy. We also then utilised those experts while they were in town for an internal sort of workshop with all ACT government regulators and policymakers in that area.

Post that, we then went into a series of more detailed pieces of analysis and then a series of key workshops with all the stakeholders from industry and also some community members. The workshops spanned a number of areas. They are broader than just regulation. The BRT is coordinating them and we have also set up a departmental committee. As you can imagine, there is noise regulation, there is safety, there is liquor and a whole range of different regulators involved, including economic development. So as part of that, we ran these three workshops as I mentioned. A focus of that was on some draft sets of reforms around liquor, times and licensing fees and also in relation to how regulatory actions occur. We also had a session on safety and then one specifically focused on the city centre entertainment precinct and noise levels in there.

The reforms are across all of Canberra, and we are also doing a key focus piece on the city centre entertainment precinct. Specifically to that precinct, the new Territory Plan released a broad zone for where the city centre entertainment precinct will be. Within that, we are looking at what noise standards are appropriate for different parts of the city and examining whether some of those noise levels should go up, so that it allows for businesses to go and operate at a higher level. A big consideration is the proximity to existing residences. Obviously, we do not want to set higher noise levels where they are right up against existing residences. So that work has been occurring.

We have pretty much packaged up a range of things. As the minister mentioned, we paused while we were looking at the New South Wales reforms that just came out two weeks ago. That package has now being provided to government.

THE CHAIR: I have some more questions about the night-time economy. They might be related, but I doubt it. Volume 1 of the CMTEDD annual report, on page 145, recorded that you facilitated some workshops. That might have been what you were just chatting about.

Mr Engele: Yes.

THE CHAIR: They were to uncover regulatory barriers facing the night-time economy and entertainment sectors. The report added that the challenges facing this sector were not new and have been known for several years and stakeholders wanted to see action. The 2021-22 annual report noted that you made changes to the night-time economy that were COVID-related. This annual report says that the directorate “began the development of a night-time economy regulatory quality framework approach by reviewing existing policy and legislative, regulatory and process requirements for this sector”. Minister, I am wondering if you can point me to one action that has been implemented that was not COVID-related since the workshops have gone on?

Ms Cheyne: Ms Castley, what page was that?

THE CHAIR: Page 145, CMTEDD, volume 1.

Mr Engele: I am sorry, Ms Castley; this is volume 1 of this year’s annual report?

THE CHAIR: Yes, I believe so. That is what—

Ms Cheyne: Or maybe 145 of the pdf.

THE CHAIR: Sorry; this was last year’s report. It talked about—

Ms Cheyne: Last year’s. Volume 1 last year.

THE CHAIR: That is right. It talked about changes that you made due to COVID, so I am just wondering if now you can point me to the changes you have made not related to COVID.

Ms Cheyne: Yes; definitely. The first of those is the responsible service of alcohol training. If you were from New South Wales and you had your RSA certificate from there and then you moved to the ACT and your certificate expired, you previously had to do the entire course again, rather than having to do a refresher course. That was more time out of your day, at a greater cost. What we have done now is recognise that the training is largely similar. So if you do move to the ACT and it expires, you just need to do a refresher course. That was very positively received. I appreciate that it is a small saving for people, but at the moment any saving is very welcome, I think.

The outdoor dining reforms that we announced the other day will make a difference for our businesses as well, in terms of giving them more confidence in being able to expand. We have been really focusing on our communications with people who hold liquor licences. As I mentioned, we will be writing to businesses soon, directly, in

addition to the upgrade that we have got on our website about what is available.

On top of that, a very useful mapping exercise has been done with our hospitality businesses. We worked with a group of them to uncover what are the easy parts of their application process when they are looking to start or change a business or apply for a particular licence or adjust the business in some way, or close it. Working through that, we have seen what is easy, what is not easy, what are the pain points, and we have been able to share that with our colleagues in Access Canberra. We have used it to inform information that is on the business hub website and the Access Canberra website for businesses that are looking to do these things. We are improving information, making it easier where we can.

On top of that, this year we announced the creation of the events and business coordination assist team, or the business assist team for short, in Access Canberra. This is a direct line that people can call if they want to start a business, adjust it, whatever, hold an event. They do not have to call 132281; it is a direct line to this group of people who can help guide a business. So far I think 57 businesses have been engaged, with 47 helped, and that help is complete, and there are 10 where Access Canberra is still assisting them.

THE CHAIR: When did you say that opened?

Ms Cheyne: I believe it came into force around May. If that is wrong, I will correct it.

THE CHAIR: Six months ago.

Ms Cheyne: Yes.

THE CHAIR: They have had 57 businesses wanting help in six months. Great. How many people are on that team?

Ms Cheyne: I would have to take that on notice.

Mr Engele: On automatic mutual recognition for security guards, we have had 352 notifications of interstate licences that are intending to work in the ACT.

THE CHAIR: The workshop was held in April 2021; is that right?

Mr Engele: Sorry?

THE CHAIR: The first workshop. There have been a few?

Mr Engele: As part of the discovery report, when we were trying to work out what would be the priorities for the Better Regulation Taskforce, we had a workshop and one of the suggestions was to explore whether there were opportunities in the night-time economy area. That was a very early scoping one. These have been more detailed, where we had draft proposals for changes to legislation that we were working through with businesses. This is more of a deeper consultation process.

THE CHAIR: So the kick-off was 2021 and only now, this year, as of six months ago,

the business helpline kicked off. Really, most of the practical changes for business have occurred just recently, so business has been waiting since 2021. I have got a quote here from *Hansard* that you have known for several years what some of the issues were. It has taken all of these years to make the changes.

Ms Cheyne: I would not characterise it that way at all, Ms Castley, to be honest. Many of the COVID supports continued right into 2022, including fee reductions for businesses. That was incredibly important for us. Access Canberra waived fees in that time as well. When was the right time to do that deep dive work with businesses and actually identify those pain points—right in the middle of the pandemic? Probably not. I think you would agree. What we have heard so far is really good engagement, good progress. Like I said, a package is now before government with a range of options for us to progress. I am looking to do that as soon as we can, depending on my colleagues' support.

THE CHAIR: Was the security guard automatic mutual recognition a federal initiative?

Mr Engle: Yes. That was an intergovernmental one. The way it works is that they set some key legislation at a federal level and then we had to run a process to work through what the scope would be and whether there were significant risks to bringing different occupations in. That was quite a significant piece of work. I think it went to about 40 pieces of GSO advice in relation to all of the different occupations. You are correct that it was a federal initiative. It took up quite a lot of the task force's time to get that implemented.

THE CHAIR: What is next on the agenda, of the issues that you have known about for a while? Of the recent workshops that you have been having, what policies, legislation and regulatory processes require fixing that you are looking at?

Ms Cheyne: We are in a funny position at the moment, Ms Castley, because this is now subject to cabinet. I would like to tell you exactly, but I am probably walking a fine line.

MS ORR: You cannot announce policy.

THE CHAIR: There have been workshops. What have business been telling you that they want?

Mr Engle: The key areas that were consulted on were flexibility in liquor licences and where they provide flexibility for businesses. It was things like: can businesses utilise their liquor licences to do a range of different things that are not your standard approach? What we found when we looked at New South Wales was that the ACT has far fewer restrictions and there is more ability to innovate for those businesses. That is why some of the examples in answer to Ms Orr's question were about telling businesses that you can actually already do these things with your liquor licences.

Times were another area of consultation—the times for liquor licences and, in particular, what the standard times were. We were asking, “Are we artificially restricting businesses who would, every once in a while, open later for a special event

but they have these set liquor licence times?” For low risk venues, does it matter what their times are? We consulted on that.

We also looked at what are some of the other key events that businesses are working on and do we have the right settings in place to allow businesses to do that? A good example is when we had the Matildas in the final. Obviously, the games were early in the morning or late in the evening, so how do we enable businesses to participate in the fan support, and are there government initiatives? We looked at those areas as well.

Outside of the regulatory requirements, the key things for businesses and community groups were around safety. We looked at whether there are areas, particularly in the city, that are unsafe or there is a perception of safety. As part of that, we have commissioned a safety audit to get people to walk through and have a look at whether there are parts of the city that can have urban improvements.

Another area that we consulted on was in relation to governance. This is an area where there was not a key outcome, which is how do you set the governance? Some cities in New South Wales have a night mayor. Yes, it is a funny title.

Ms Cheyne: It is so weird, but it is well accepted.

THE CHAIR: Who wants that job?

Ms Cheyne: Yes.

Mr Engle: Their job is to advocate and try to coordinate things. In the ACT I do not think there was strong support for that. We also looked at advocacy groups where different businesses could come together, and how to fit that into the work that the City Renewal Authority does in relation to activations. There are a whole set of different views about it. Is it just about getting more programs of activations in the city or is it about overcoming challenges? They were the key themes that I think came out of those consultations. The noise levels that should be in the city was another area that we consulted on, and whether there are particular zones that would be better for higher levels of noise than others.

THE CHAIR: Ms Orr was talking about the liquor licensing. I know we discussed the other day this extension that you can get—approval to trade outside with tables and chairs, but the liquor licence for outside has to be extended. Can you just unpack that for me? It is the same business. I know we talked about it. I was chatting to people about it afterwards and I—

Ms Cheyne: This is exactly why we have Ms Cubin here. She can certainly talk you through it. In expanding liquor licences there is a degree of risk. Ms Cubin can talk you thought that.

Ms Cubin: Thanks, Minister. I have read and acknowledge the privilege statement. It might get a little bit technical because we have different options. As we talked about the other day, the fast-track outdoor dining is extending out into the public unleased land area for tables and chairs only.

A liquor licence has an occupancy loading that the fire brigade approves in that space. There are also other controls around when we issue a licence. We have to do public consultation, based on the application. When we start to change a licence there are a few triggers in place where we need to either implement that public consultation or have a broader look at the occupancy loading of the venue.

There is a scenario where, if a venue wanted to extend into the outdoor area, on the fast-track permit, with tables and chairs, and they did not want to increase their occupancy loading, we could facilitate that much faster because they would still have the same number of people and utilise the same number of toilet facilities. We are not increasing the loading anywhere.

But if they wanted to take their nominal premise and then add the extra space, with extra people, that is called an amendment under the act, because we are amending the overall people capacity. Then we have to do a public consultation process. There are more times hard-wired into the legislation. That is why it is a bit tricky.

THE CHAIR: Right. So it is not just about the one business with their same old liquor licence. It is about enough toilets for extra people and all that sort of stuff—

Ms Cheyne: Yes.

Ms Cubin: Yes.

Ms Cheyne: If they are expanding the number of people they want on their site by going outside, which in most cases they would—not all—then that triggers a requirement for it to be consulted on.

THE CHAIR: Right. Thank you.

Ms Cheyne: I appreciate you asking.

MS ORR: The Hoodoo Gurus are playing with the Canberra Symphony Orchestra at Symphony in the Park. I believe the ACT government has commissioned their work. How significant is this for the arts and for the ACT community, and how did it come about?

Ms Cheyne: Thank you, Ms Orr. I will get Mr Triffitt to talk you through most of it, given that he and the CSO did the heavy lifting. The story of it is quite interesting and a bit of a boon for the ACT, as well as reflecting how important our statement of ambition for the arts is and speaking as a confident city. Bear with me; I will try to keep this brief.

In September last year the National Museum opened its major new exhibition space, called Great Southern Land. To mark that opening, Icehouse played. Usually when there is an exhibition opening the director invites special guests to a dinner, which I and plenty of other people attended. I ended up being sat across from Keith Welsh, who is the manager of Icehouse. We had a very wide-ranging discussion, which focused on how great the ACT is, how our arts community punches way above its weight and how fantastic the Canberra Symphony Orchestra is. I said that Symphony

in the Park is a real highlight for the community and a free event and that if Mr Welsh ever saw any opportunities for collaboration in any way, through any of his contacts, we would welcome that.

I did not expect anything to come of that. But the Monday afterwards he wrote to me and said that he had really enjoyed the conversation and wanted to more genuinely explore what opportunities there could be. I wrote back and said, “Better check in with the directorate that this is even a possibility.” He talked to the senior leaders in the directorate, who did say yes, depending on what the CSO’s appetite for it was. From there we connected Keith with Ross. That is the point where I will hand the story over to Ross to talk about what happened next.

Mr Triffitt: Thank you, Minister. From that point on, Keith and I had discussions around the potential involvement of his artists, in particular in Symphony in the Park. That did not pan out. We continued discussions about other possible collaborations. But he did provide me with the contact details for the Hoodoo Gurus’ manager, who he knew quite closely. That led to a conversation between me and Michael McMartin about the opportunity.

He then checked in with Dave Faulkner from Hoodoo Gurus and came back to me and said that there was a level of interest in the project—in fact, they were quite excited about the concept. Following that, I briefed the minister, to check the government’s level of interest in pursuing the matter further, and then had discussions with the Canberra Symphony Orchestra, which were very positively met.

It is a challenge to commission a new piece of work. It is a significant amount of work, and it does rely on having the right kind of composer to work with the artists. I facilitated conversations between Michael McMartin and Andy Baird, from the Canberra Symphony Orchestra. They went very well, and within a matter of weeks we were talking about having a live project. We scoped out the costs associated with it, to ensure that they fell within an acceptable budget level, which they did, thankfully. That led to the collaboration where the Canberra Symphony Orchestra brought together a composer and Dave Faulkner. There was an agreement in place and then we entered into an arrangement for them to perform at Symphony in the Park on 10 March.

We launched that on 9 November. We were able to commission a piece specifically for the launch, which was *My Girl*, which was arranged by Alex Turley. Alex Turley, the composer, has also worked on previous projects with Electric Fields and other great national artists. We are very privileged to have him involved in the project. The launch was very successful. We have had a lot of media interest. The fact that the ACT government is commissioning the work means that there will be recognition for the ACT government when that work is played in other concert scenarios. It will premiere at Symphony in the Park—

Ms Cheyne: A world premiere.

Mr Triffitt: Yes. It will be a world premiere. We are very excited that it has been able to come together.

Ms Cheyne: To answer your question about what this means for the ACT, I think it provides a level of recognition about our willingness, and our arts sector's willingness, to engage in new and innovative things. To underline what Ross said, commissioning this work and having the work orchestrated is a big challenge. We are so lucky to have Alex Turley, who is very, very experienced in this, given that it is a rock band. Dave Faulkner also said that this is a dream come true for him. I think that is very powerful. That is something that is going to be echoed in how people talk about the ACT—the confidence that we have in ourselves—and hopefully drive some further opportunities as well.

I did send a message back to Keith a few weeks ago to say, “This all started with you,” and he was very excited for us as well. I think this is a valuable lesson in speaking confidently about the ACT and what the opportunities are here for collaboration. It also speaks to the calibre of the CSO and their willingness to collaborate and to get that sort of recognition. You cannot really put a price on that. Already we have seen people right across social media saying, “Road trip to Canberra.” Enlighten already attracts many people over that period, but we may see a further bump because of that concert.

MS ORR: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: I have a few questions on BRT. What is the size of the team now? Is it still four full-time staff or did I pluck that out of the air?

Mr Engele: Yes; you are right. That was the original funding envelope. We have a few other staff from within PCD that have been assisting, because we have had the night-time economy reforms and we are trying to complete a few other key reform areas. I think there are another three staff. One additional FTE was also funded for commonwealth work. I will get Ms Chesworth to provide the specifics.

Ms Chesworth: I have read and acknowledge the privilege statement. Can I just clarify: was the question about staff?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Ms Chesworth: We have four funded positions at the moment. In addition to that, in the most recent budget we received funding for a SOGC at 0.8 for this financial year, and then one FTE SOGC for next financial year as well. That resource at the moment has been dedicated to assisting us with the night-time economy review in the first instance. Next year we will move on to finishing the remainder of our agenda and progressing the night-time economy reform implementation.

THE CHAIR: That is four plus those two. Six now.

Mr Engele: The funded positions are four plus one.

Ms Chesworth: That is funded; yes.

Mr Engele: Then we have an additional three FTE that are nominally policy and cabinet, which is essentially the area that we work in, who have been assisting as part

of the task force's work.

THE CHAIR: Minister, you alluded to these changes occurring now and that you would rather do this now than when we were in the peak of COVID. Have you heard from any businesses about their frustration that we could have done a few of these things earlier in order to get things cracking straight after COVID, like the liquor licensing or giving them the extra space or one-day approvals—

Ms Cheyne: We did do those things during COVID.

THE CHAIR: They stopped, didn't they? It was not a permanent thing.

Ms Cheyne: There was a natural end point for those, but what it did spark was an opportunity for us to look at, "Are those settings right, going forward?" given that many businesses took advantage of the outdoor dining situation that we had. Obviously, they welcomed fee reductions as well. That only ceased relatively recently, and we did provide further supports. We did provide further grant programs. We have kept business up to date along the way about what we are doing. I do not think I have had feedback that we should have done this sooner. They have been very engaged with us about the pace at which we are working. Where we do have things to announce that would help, we are doing it. I did not wait on the outdoor dining permits. I said, "We can do that now, so let's do it now." Where we can do that, we are.

THE CHAIR: I suppose my concern, if I put my business hat on, is that they had something through COVID that was working and it stopped and came to an end; then, all of a sudden, we can do it again now. That sort of excess process is what business talk about as the overburden of red tape. That is exactly what you guys exist to reduce. I am just wondering why, with a team of four people and extra people coming on under a funding envelope, some of these things could not have continued, or why we could not be further along in that process of reducing the red tape they talk about quite often.

Ms Cheyne: I see what you are getting at. We are at different points in time. I think there are some businesses who would welcome the Business Support Grant program continuing.

THE CHAIR: No, I am not—that is not feasible.

Ms Cheyne: No, I know that. For some of the other things that we were doing, as well, it was not necessarily feasible to continue either, but what it has resulted in is us looking at it and asking, "Are the settings right?" We are not talking about a package that necessarily replicates the COVID package, and having to chop and change and go back and forth. What we are talking about is: "What are the settings that we can change that will support businesses going into the future in the environment that we have from here going forward?" That is what we have been looking at. That is what we have heard. We have been able to take the lessons from COVID, and what businesses liked about that and where there might be further opportunity, but all of those COVID measures were intended to be short-term—for COVID. We did not know what the tail of COVID would be. We are into year 4 of COVID, and we are in

our eighth wave—whatever it is—and so we are still learning about what its impacts are.

I see what you are saying in terms of us having one setting, and then we have another setting and then we have another setting, but I think, the entire way, Access Canberra has done an extraordinary job in communicating with businesses and in engaging with them about what the settings are and how to achieve those. We do have that dedicated support team, and the taskforce, all along, has been keeping business updated. You might recall that my responsibilities for the night-time economy only came in in January this year, so within my powers I think that we have done a lot.

THE CHAIR: I understand. I just know the BRT was set up to sort this stuff out, and it does seem like—stop, start, stop, start, hopefully never stop. With a largish team, and a growing team, I would hope to see changes more quickly for business, when this is exactly what you exist to achieve: to reduce regulation.

Ms Cheyne: I think, Ms Castley, that is perhaps just a slight mischaracterisation of the BRT, because it does not have responsibility for a lot of the policy areas where it is making recommendations. It is doing the work. It is doing the heavy lifting for those teams who are doing the day-to-day work. It is doing the thinking. It is doing the engagement. It is making the recommendations. But when it makes the recommendations, it needs to engage across government to say, “We think that this would work. Business has told us they want this. Is this actually feasible?” That is where some of that time is built into it. BRT cannot just say, “We’ve got a good idea; let’s make it happen,” as much as we would wish we could.

THE CHAIR: As would business, I think, because they do understand the process, but they move quickly. Are you sick of talking about this, Ms Orr?

MS ORR: I would not say “sick” of talking about it! I have got one more question, and we are running out of time.

THE CHAIR: I have one more for the rest of the day. It is related, and then I will move on.

MS ORR: Yes, we might as well finish off this line of questioning.

THE CHAIR: I am just wondering if, as part of your review, anything has come up in regard to finding out how many businesses may have closed due to COVID, and the impact that has had on business. Are you looking into any of those figures?

Mr Engele: In the night-time economy sector? We do not have the business numbers, but I do know the GDP print came through as quite a strong increase in the hospitality-accommodation sector. I think that was one of the fastest growing areas in the ACT over the last financial year. In that regard, it would seem like, after COVID, those businesses came back quite strongly.

Obviously, we do hear now that with interest rates increasing that that has impacted on people’s spending patterns, so I think whilst it was great to see that GDP print, it is a little bit dated. The reason why we are continuing to engage in the NTE sector is

because we know that, from what we hear from businesses, even if they are going out for meals, people are not spending as much. It is a tough environment for those businesses, and whatever we can do to remove those regulatory barriers is what we are aiming to achieve.

THE CHAIR: Just a comment: some businesses have said it is almost more difficult now than during COVID, because they knew to expect reduced crowds and things like that, and now they just never know on any given pay week how things are going to be.

Ms Cheyne: I would reflect that I have heard not quite the same but similar feedback in that the patterns of people's behaviour are no longer as predictable as they used to be. It is not that Friday, Saturday, Sunday are the big days; sometimes it is that Wednesday night is like the massive day, and that is hard in terms of staffing and other costs.

THE CHAIR: Over to you, Ms Orr.

MS ORR: Just how big a deal is *AUSTIN*—all in capital letters—to Canberra and to our film community?

Ms Cheyne: *AUSTIN* is a massive deal, I think I can say without exaggerating, for the ACT for recognition of our screen community and for the reputational impacts that it is going to have for our community as a place to do screen business. *AUSTIN* is here for several reasons: one is the Screen Investment Fund, and it has also been a recipient of the Screen Attraction Fund. The Screen Attraction Fund was an election commitment where we had a particular amount of money that we have released that a production company can apply for. They must meet specific criteria. Importantly, to receive it, they have to have a minimum spend in our jurisdiction, and the production must budget for and engage local crew and/or cast. So you can see why a fund like that is very attractive for us, and very attractive for production companies.

The outcome of *AUSTIN* has been that they are filming here for, I think, three weeks, and then it is one week in London. We have international actors here who are very well recognised. It is a quite extraordinary production in that there is an autistic person playing an autistic person, in Michael Theo, who is well loved from *Love on the Spectrum* and already has his own very strong following. In addition to that, we have got some big-name Australian stars like Gia Carides from *Strictly Ballroom*. And in addition to that, these people are staying here in accommodation in Canberra; they are spending money here; they are in our restaurants; they are shopping at our local businesses.

I did have the opportunity to visit the set last week, and the director and the actors were all telling me how much they are enjoying being in Canberra. They are having great fun with the shoot. The shoot, as well, is at so many different, interesting locations in the ACT that are not Parliament House. As much as Parliament House is fantastic, and I think we all enjoyed seeing it in *Total Control* and others, this is a real opportunity to showcase the Canberra that we know and love, not just the Canberra bubble, and I think that is something really special.

The character of Austin works in a well-known Canberra workplace. There are plenty

of restaurants and cafes that are going to get some exposure out of this as well. Some streets you are going to recognise. In addition to that, the fact that they have employed local crew is giving our sector here in the ACT experience with a production of this size and of this calibre, and, hopefully, it will result in more opportunities for us as well.

Visiting the set was a very nice thing to do and a great perk of the job, but the most important thing for me was hearing them say how much they are enjoying it and the director showing me his lookbook of all the locations. I said, “Oh, my gosh, Canberra is going to be the star!” That is very special for us.

Ultimately, I would expect, we will not just get a greater reputation as being a place that is easy to do screenwork, especially given how we have collapsed layers of government; but, also, our local crews will be more prepared and better skilled for the next opportunity. That will only, I hope, result in the growth of the sector. We are very excited that it is here and that it is going so well, and I think, if social media is anything to go by, the Canberra community is getting a bit of a thrill out of it as well.

MS ORR: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Great. I have nothing further. Anything further from you Ms Orr?

MS ORR: No, that was my last question.

THE CHAIR: Anything that you would like to add, Minister?

Ms Cheyne: No, I do not think I need to correct the record on anything, and if I do, I will let you know.

MS ORR: You know where to find us.

THE CHAIR: Thank you to all.

Ms Cheyne: No—wait. I do have an answer to a question taken on notice. The event coordination business assist team is funded for eight FTE, with seven currently filled. Three of those are dedicated to business support. It is important to note that it is not just the FTE in the team; they are a concierge element, so they facilitate support across government and connect to the different areas of government that need to be engaged.

MS ORR: So arguably the FTEs limit them—

Ms Cheyne: Pardon?

MS ORR: Largely limit them—

THE CHAIR: These FTEs—businesses are able to get their phone number and have contact with them?

Ms Cheyne: Yes.

MS ORR: For the concierge? For the team?

Ms Cheyne: Yes, for the business assist team, and then they will help guide them through the process or whatever questions they have.

THE CHAIR: And if they get sent to another department, or whatever, and they are not getting any love there, they can go back to this team and say, “This is who I am”—

Ms Cheyne: Yes, and ideally the team stays in touch with them as they work through the process and ensures they have got that concierge support the whole way through.

THE CHAIR: Awesome, thank you. On behalf of the committee, thank you all for coming today. There have been more questions taken on notice, so please provide your answers to the secretary within five business days of receiving the uncorrected proof of *Hansard*. Again, thank you to the witnesses who have assisted the committee through their experience and knowledge. We also thank our broadcasting and Hansard team for their support. If a member wishes to ask questions on notice, please upload them to the portal as soon as practicable and no later than five business days after the hearing. This meeting is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 3.57 pm.