



**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL
TERRITORY**

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES 2015-2016

(Reference: [Appropriation Bill 2015-2016 and Appropriation
\(Office of the Legislative Assembly\) Bill 2015-2016](#))

Members:

MR B SMYTH (Chair)
MS M FITZHARRIS (Deputy Chair)
DR C BOURKE
MS N LAWDER

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE

CANBERRA

FRIDAY, 26 JUNE 2015

Secretary to the committee:
Mrs N Kosseck (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

ACT Long Service Leave Authority	1171
Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate	1109,
	1171, 1188
Community Services Directorate	1109
Cultural Facilities Corporation	1109

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 9.32 am.

Appearances:

Burch, Ms Joy, Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Disability, Minister for Racing and Gaming and Minister for the Arts

Community Services Directorate

Howson, Ms Natalie, Director-General

Sheehan, Ms Maureen, Executive Director, Service Strategy and Community Building

Whitten, Ms Meredith, Executive Director, Disability ACT

Gehrig, Ms Therese, Director, ACT NDIS Taskforce

Power, Ms Leanne, Director, Policy Planning and Business Support, Disability ACT

Hubbard, Mr Ian, Senior Director, Finance and Budget

Evans, Ms Jacinta, Senior Manager, Therapy ACT

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate

Dawes, Mr David, Director-General, Economic Development

Rake, Mr Gary, Deputy Director-General, Arts, Business, Events, Sport and Tourism Division

Whitney, Mr David, Director, artsACT

Ogden, Mr Paul, Chief Finance Officer

Gilding, Ms Louise, Executive Director, Policy, Projects and Legislation

Jones, Mr Greg, Chief Executive Officer, ACT Gambling and Racing Commission

Cultural Facilities Corporation

Elvin, Ms Harriet, Chief Executive Officer

THE CHAIR: Good morning all, and welcome to the last day of estimates. Who would have thought it would have crept up on us so quickly? Today we are looking at a range of different output classes—disability and therapy services, the arts, gaming and racing, industrial relations and sport and recreation.

Please be aware that everything said today will be recorded and transcribed by Hansard and will be published, and the proceedings are also being broadcast and webstreamed. I would ask all those sitting at the table and all those that come to the table to look at the privilege card and to confirm for the committee that you have read the privilege card and that you understand the implications of privilege. All so acknowledged; thanks very much.

Before we proceed to questions, minister, would you like to make an opening statement?

Ms Burch: Yes, thank you, chair. Before we go to questions it is a good opportunity to make some comments. Canberra is a city full of brilliant possibilities and

opportunities. However, sadly, people with disability are not always able to access the full potential of this city. The 2015-16 ACT budget continues our commitment to provide all Canberrans with an opportunity to realise their potential and to be all that they choose to be.

We continue to lead the country in rolling out the national disability insurance scheme and we will be the first jurisdiction to accept all eligible residents into the scheme by mid-2016. The latest data is encouraging, with the NDIS quarterly report showing that there were 911 approved plans and 999 access requests in the ACT in the first nine months of the trial. This is good progress and it is 91 per cent of our bilateral targets compared with 85 per cent nationally.

The NDIS promised an expansion of services and this is happening, with more than 160 organisations now registered with the NDIA to provide services. The joint investment into the scheme in the ACT by 2019-20 is expected to be \$342 million. Total ACT funding associated with the NDIS will rise from approximately \$120 million in 2013-14 to \$167 million. This is effectively a doubling of the investment in disability services in the ACT in real terms.

Commencing in 2014-15 the ACT government provided an additional \$5.03 million over the three years of the NDIS trial. This contribution is made up of \$1.6 million for the therapy assistants in schools program, \$2.8 million for emergency support for people with a disability and over \$500,000 in cash that will be transferred to the NDIS for the delivery of support packages under the scheme.

We are also supporting the sector in transition. This includes \$12.5 million that the commonwealth has allocated from the national sector development fund for Canberra. We have allocated \$800,000 to facilitate workshops that build the capacity of people with a disability to engage with the NDIS and to plan a good life. ACT NDIS business investment packages will be offered twice this year, with grants from \$1,000 through to \$50,000 available. An NDIS task force awareness program has been designed for ACT workers organisations and offers plain English advice about the NDIS and how it will impact on their work and clients.

The NDIS has resulted in changes to services for children with early intervention needs. The government is redesigning intake and assessment services to ensure families receive the support and advice they need. The ACT child development service, worth more than \$3.3 million, will be operational from January next year. The service will provide assessment, intake and referral for children aged zero to six years at risk of developmental delay and will support clients not eligible for the NDIS to access appropriate services.

The ACT, along with other states and territories, remains committed to implementing the national disability strategy, a unifying national approach to improving the lives of people with a disability and creating inclusive communities. Last week I had the pleasure of launching the Canberra disability commitment, Involve. The commitment will give visibility to disability issues and promote equality and inclusion for people with a disability by addressing barriers to inclusion and by coordinating activities and engagement across government and the community alike.

In the 2015-16 year our focus will be on promoting the economic security of people with a disability through employment and housing opportunities. Next year's will have a focus on justice and access.

I would like to finish by thanking the officials here at the table and also workers at all levels across Disability ACT and Therapy ACT for the grand work they do for the community. I also acknowledge and put thanks on the record to our non-government organisations that have been great partners in the transition to the NDIS.

THE CHAIR: Thanks for that. I might throw my first question to Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Thank you, chair. Minister, could you give us a brief overview of where the transition is currently up to, whether we are tracking on time and whether the funding envelope has been there?

Ms Burch: We will go to the details of the funding envelope, but as I mentioned in my opening statement I think we are sitting at 91 per cent of our bilateral target. We have 911 approved plans and 999 access requests. So this is good progress. Ideally, we should be sitting at 100 per cent but we are ahead of the national average. I think it is doing incredibly well. The sector partnership has been really critical in making sure that our transition plan, by the end of this year, will see all of our school children through. At the end of this calendar year it is up to 55; adults from 55 and above will be transitioned as well. So it is doing great work. I will go to Ms Sheehan on the NDIA.

Ms Sheehan: Thank you for the question, Mr Wall. The way in which we have phased has really assisted the success of the phasing to date. We understand that the new arrangement in New South Wales which has just been announced, which is not called a trial but it is part of the start to phase their whole community, has actually been taking a leaf out of the ACT book because they are phasing 2,000 young people based on that "ages and stages" approach.

As the minister was saying, taking that approach, particularly by going with children and an arrangement for children based on school, has been particularly successful. It is about moving older people in first so that they could benefit from the NDIS, before people make a choice at 65 about whether they move into the aged-care system. Then, of course, it will be about moving in people with particularly high needs who are in supported accommodation, with the opportunity for them to see the other people in their group and their home and decide how they would like their arrangements to go into the future.

As the minister said in her opening statement, not only are we at 91 per cent of our target for the third quarter but we are ahead of the rest of the country in terms of the percentage of phasing people against target.

Ms Burch: More broadly, Ms Whitten might want to add some comments, because this is a serious change and it is an opportunity for the committee to hear about the transition.

Ms Whitten: In relation to the phasing of people with disability who are currently

clients of Disability ACT, we have been planning with individuals as per each of the households that are due to phase in at a particular time. During 2014-15 we anticipated or planned for 14 households to phase in to the national disability insurance scheme. We are up to about 10 of those households, but the end of the quarter occurs next week, and I am sure all of those households will be phased in by then. We have been working with the individuals in each of those households to plan for their conversations with the national disability insurance scheme, so that they are supported in terms of what they need to be able to tell the planners in the National Disability Insurance Agency about what their needs are.

As part of that conversation, individuals in each household have their conversation with the planners in the National Disability Insurance Agency. Once a plan is approved, then we start working with each of the households about making their choices around who is going to be their new service provider into the future. To date we have had about two households move from Disability ACT into the non-government sector. We know that around 50 per cent of our households at the moment are thinking about who their new service provider will be. So we are about on track.

Overall it takes about nine months. We are estimating about nine months for the pre-planning conversations to occur with individuals in households, then the planning conversation with the National Disability Insurance Agency, and then time is taken to work with households, and individuals in households, to move to their new service provider.

MR WALL: There was a communique that Disability ACT put out in November last year notifying service providers that if there was a cash flow risk that arose during the transition between when their block funding ceased and their clients transitioned, there would be the opportunity for reimbursement. How many service providers so far have received a reimbursement and what has been the value of the reimbursements?

Ms Whitten: At the moment we have about four service providers who have received reimbursement and another six or so have applied for a reimbursement and we are just working through the methodology. In terms of the value, the actual number at the moment is about \$157,000 for those people who have been paid their reimbursement and there is about another \$176,000 for those organisations that are seeking reimbursement.

MR WALL: This is likely to be an ongoing issue that will arise during transition. What has been budgeted as a contingency for this?

Ms Whitten: The reason why we put out that communique, which was signed by me and my colleague in ACT Health, was to anticipate that there are possibly going to be some delays in participants phasing in to the scheme, and that has arisen. So we have not necessarily budgeted for an amount for the next years because we are trying to seek that reimbursement through the National Disability Insurance Agency. The National Disability Insurance Agency, as you can appreciate, in the first year of the trial, are working through their own processes. They have a commitment to try and move from 91 per cent approval of plans to closer to 100 per cent. So that financial impact will be lessened over the years.

Ms Burch: The reality is that \$120-odd thousand in the scheme involving Disability ACT is really quite minimal. As we move through the transition the reimbursement costs will become less and less because most of the clients will be settled.

Ms Howson: We are very conscious of and we will maintain some vigilance over this issue so that we can support the sector to make this transition. Working on this issue at the other end, of course, is the National Disability Insurance Agency, to improve their capacity to achieve the phasing schedule. We have been able to see a significant improvement in that over time. There are further measures being put in place by the NDIA that give us confidence that the phasing schedule will come to fruition. So we are working on that side of the equation as well.

THE CHAIR: Mr Wall.

MR WALL: For the service providers that have requested a reimbursement, how long has it taken from when they have applied or submitted their request to it being approved?

Ms Whitten: I do not have that exact detail here but certainly we put out the communique last year and we then met regularly all of this year. With regard to the actual submission of invoices, between the date we actually receive it and the payment date it is less than a month at the moment.

MR WALL: For all of them?

Ms Burch: It is again worth noting, as I meet with peak bodies and key organisations, that this is their day-to-day reality. They are very supportive of the diligence which Disability ACT is applying to this. Yes, it is a matter, but there is a process in place, there is an agreement and understanding in place, and it seems to be working.

Ms Whitten: It is less than 16 days. That is the longest one in terms of payment.

MR WALL: So we need 16 days turnaround at the moment?

Ms Whitten: At the moment, but just in terms of some clarity, some invoices have been submitted and we really need to work with those organisations to make sure that what is being requested in terms of the payment details can be verified. That might take a little bit of toing and froing before the finalising.

MR WALL: The 16 days is starting from when that has been verified?

Ms Whitten: Absolutely.

MR WALL: The process from when they make their initial submission through to having that verification—what sort of time frame are organisations looking to go through for that stage?

Ms Whitten: I think Ms Gehrig is coming to the table.

Ms Howson: I think Ms Power is going to come to the table, but I might just say that

some of that is somewhat determined by the fact that we are positioning ourselves to be very responsive. Some of that is determined by the capacity of the organisation to provide the information necessary to do the verification.

Over the last couple of weeks I have actually met with a couple of organisations that have been engaged through this process and they were very positive about, again, our responsiveness, the fact that we had arranged this step-down model, and in terms of assisting them to manage their business risks they were actually acknowledging that this was one of the most significant things that we have done to work us through the transition.

MR WALL: And I am focusing on it because it is a very significant issue insofar as these organisations are generally not for profit, and run on very tight budgets and very tight cash flows, and having a gap between the block funding and the NDIA payments could potentially jeopardise the viability of that organisation and—

Ms Burch: Which is why we have been so diligent in this. Before we go to Ms Power, we are a facilitator in this but I would imagine that if incomplete information is provided at the first go, we have to keep on going back and checking it with the provider and also validating that back into the NDIA as well. We are a facilitator. We do not control all the moving bits, though.

Ms Power: In the service funding agreements that we have with our providers, they are paid up-front for the quarter. So their cash flow is ensured for the quarter. They are paid for the whole quarter that a participant may phase in, so they do get a full three months payment under their service funding agreement. If in that quarter the participant is delayed in terms of their expected phasing, the arrangement that we have with the service provider is that they are letting us know. They have been letting us know quite regularly so that we can work with them to anticipate if there are cash flow implications for them.

As Ms Whitten talked about in regard to the group of providers that we have worked with so far, from the time that it has taken them to let us know that there is a delay in a participant's phasing to the time that they have received a payment, within that time we work to verify with them when the participant's plan actually was signed, which is the day that they can bill the National Disability Insurance Agency from. We work with them to identify and verify all of that information. It is usually taking between 10 and 16 days, by the time they have notified us to the time that we have paid. The time frame for the cash payment for them is about that.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder has a supplementary. Perhaps Mr Wall could finish and then we will move on to Dr Bourke.

MR WALL: I am happy to finish there.

MS LAWDER: Thank you. Earlier, Ms Sheehan, you mentioned young people. I just want to ask: at present what is the ACT status of young people in nursing homes?

Ms Howson: Your question is best directed to Ms Whitten.

Ms Whitten: Just in terms of the question, there are about 64 younger people in nursing homes at the moment in the ACT. I missed the gist of your question.

MS LAWDER: Do you have plans to move them out of nursing homes?

Ms Whitten: In terms of those people who are eligible for the national disability insurance scheme, there is a choice and control that will operate for those people as well. It is really a conversation that those individuals and their families will be having with the National Disability Insurance Agency.

Ms Burch: There was an initiative a number of years ago around young people in aged care facilities. We built a property in Narrabundah, as I understand. Again we approached a number of the young folk or under-65s that were in a nursing home. Some of them chose to stay. They might have been in their late 50s or 60s and it was what they knew: they were comfortable; they were happy with the environment.

MS LAWDER: There is something of an Australia-wide movement. I am thinking more specifically of quite young people.

Ms Burch: That is right, younger, yes.

Ms Howson: As a general position on this, we are keen to see that younger people have a range of housing options. This is again a national issue that has been progressed to ensure that there are appropriate housing types for people that are suitable for their age and their circumstances and that fit entirely with the concept of the National Disability Insurance Agency.

MS LAWDER: Thanks.

Ms Burch: And as I understand, everyone under the age of 65 is being written to. I have just been given a note that there are none under 50 in nursing homes at the moment.

MS LAWDER: Thanks.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke, a new question.

DR BOURKE: Thank you, chair. Last year, this committee heard that there was community uncertainty about the transition to the market-based system for service delivery, and we have talked a little about it already this morning. Has it eased?

Ms Burch: Some tension moving into the market—

DR BOURKE: Community uncertainty, anxiety.

Ms Burch: There are two, and I will go to Ms Sheehan and Ms Whitten to go to it. The fact that there are now 160 organisations registered on the NDIA website I think has given the community absolute assurance that not only is there a known market, continuing to stay strong, but there are new and innovative providers that are moving into town. The early intervention for the pre-preschoolers was a case in point in

relation to the timing of that decision. We negotiated with the NDIA to put out some block funding arrangements. We have two years of block funding arrangements and that has assured the community that that market is there and to give it time so that quite unique piece of the market can develop over time. I am not quite sure if one of the officials wants to add to that.

Ms Sheehan: The issue of how a group of providers operating under a block funding arrangement would transition to a market arrangement and then how the market could be grown because of the doubling of resources that the minister referred to in her opening statement was very much alive in the minds of the ACT government and the commonwealth government. That is why the commonwealth and the ACT governments have jointly invested \$12.5 million in sector development, or will over the course of the trial.

At this stage the type of investment that we have been able to make available to providers—and I will talk about how we have supported people with a disability a little later—has been at many levels. We have offered—and the minister has spoken about this as well—essentially business development packages to providers where they have been able to, first of all, nominate a consultant to come in and look at their business and then have a look at how that business needs to adapt in order to move to the market environment. For example, what is the governance structure of the organisation? Does it have a business plan? Can it do unit costing? Does it understand the cost of its current operations and so on so that it could make that move into a market environment?

There were those initial assessment packages. In addition, the National Disability Services, which is the peak for disability across Australia, had already developed a tool to enable disability organisations to do a desktop assessment of their business capacity. Before offering that really quite substantial level of investment, which is packages of between \$20,000 and \$50,000, each organisation is required to have undertaken that desktop assessment. There was a level of analysis after which the more intensive work could be done with consultants. That best positions current providers, where they are already providing services—of course, we need to make sure they continue on—to continue those services, and then we need to expand the market as well.

I also wanted to emphasise that we did make those offers and packages to existing providers, but we were mindful of the need to really grow the market. Because of all of that extra resourcing, we did offer to organisations and individuals who were not currently providing the service but were interested in providing the service. An example of that would be allied health professionals in Therapy ACT who are interested in establishing their own business. They have been able to take advantage of those sorts of packages. Again, that shows how we grow the market, particularly a market that can enable and accommodate a transition from government service provision to non-service provision.

Ms Whitten will be able to talk about this. Disability ACT, combined with Health, have quarterly forums of providers where providers are able to bring up the issues that they are finding in transition. There was a forum just yesterday where Ms Gehrig, who is the director of the NDIS task force, talked about the next round of investment

that will be available to providers, both existing and potential providers, to grow their business and expand the market. She spoke also about the next lot of work that we will be doing, particularly on workforce, which is so important. We potentially have the availability of another \$1.8 million from the sector development fund, which is part of that \$12.5 million which will specifically go to the issues of how we grow the disability workforce.

DR BOURKE: Good. I think we have already heard how the non-government providers have responded to the challenge of this transition. What about private enterprise? How has that figured in the ACT market?

Ms Sheehan: As the minister was saying, we have a great increase in the number of providers in the ACT, including from the private sector. When it comes to organisations that were in the old block funding system, funded by government, we had 64 organisations. Now we have 161 providers registered with the National Disability Insurance Agency to operate as a disability provider, and that includes a number of private sector organisations.

The other thing that I wanted to emphasise is that there is really substantial work around the quality and safeguards for people with a disability to make sure that for the organisations that are registered and that essentially put up a shingle for business that we may never have seen before in the ACT there is an assessment process done by the human services registrar in the Community Services Directorate to make sure that those organisations meet the national standards right across the board—disability standards, mental health standards, educational standards and so on.

DR BOURKE: You have said there are 161 registered providers now. What does that represent in the increase of organisations within the ACT over the last couple of years? Where have we come from and where are we going?

Ms Sheehan: I would need to take that question on notice because some of the extra people who are registered might have been providing other services—for example, a homelessness service—and had not received block funding for disability. We could certainly do that assessment and let you know.

DR BOURKE: Thank you.

Ms Burch: I think it is worth looking at the absolute new providers and the expanded provisions. For example, for each child it is an absolute new provider in town. There are a number of new players coming through.

DR BOURKE: What percentage of private enterprise organisations has joined the market?

Ms Sheehan: I can take that on notice too, Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Can you give us any examples of new and different services which were not previously available in the ACT that have come about from this transition to a more market system?

Ms Sheehan: I think the best example would be around early intervention services to support children. With the Education and Training Directorate services moving across to the non-government sector, we saw the move from classroom-based school services to assist children to get ready for school as an early intervention service, expanding right across into every aspect of that child's life. That could actually be provided by a support provider that we had not seen in the ACT before. The minister was talking about new providers that came into the ACT. She has reported to the Assembly on a number of occasions regarding those extra providers that came into the ACT.

What is important about that is that in the old system—and let's never forget that this is a new, improved system with lots more choices for people with a disability, including children and their families—we had a very siloed, segmented approach. So there was a group of services that helped children get ready for school and another group of services that would be around allied health professional support, and so on. In the new world, it is not about siloed service types; it is about the individual person who can make a plan for how they would like their life to be and then what services will assist that person, that child, to have the life that they want.

You move right away from a particular service type to all of the services that work together to make your life the sort of life that you want it to be. We often think about the parents who have a child that is born today or next week with a disability. What sort of life do they see for that child? What are the possibilities that that child has compared to a 60-year-old person with a disability now who was born at Canberra Hospital 60 years ago? What life did the parents of that child 60 years ago think that that child might have? What were the siloed services that were or were not even available for a child then? What was the limitation in the life experience that that child could have who was born 60 years ago, and then what are the infinite possibilities for a child born today with a disability? If you think about it in that way, you can really see what a wonderful thing the national disability insurance scheme is, and really the breadth of approach that new providers are taking and the sorts of choices that people will have.

DR BOURKE: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder, a new question.

MS LAWDER: I had a supplementary first.

THE CHAIR: A supplementary first and then a new question.

MS LAWDER: With other tiers of funding, have there been changes to funding—I know I have asked this several times over the years—to peak-type bodies such as Arthritis ACT, Epilepsy ACT and the Deafness Resource Centre, and what feedback have you had from those types of organisations?

Ms Whitten: Thank you for the question, Ms Lawder. In terms of all of the service organisations that we have been funding, they all have service funding agreements or contracts in place until 30 June next year. That is aligned with, essentially, when the trial will be ceasing. They have that funding from the ACT government in place until then.

In relation to some organisations such as those peak organisations which may be covered under tier 2, or what is now being called information, linkages and capacity building—or ILC for short—at the national level there has been a policy decision by the Disability Reform Council in April this year when the national framework for ILC was agreed. That policy framework is about to be made public towards the end of this month. I am just checking that we are up to date on that.

In terms of the ACT, because our trial ends earlier as a whole-of-jurisdiction trial, ending next year, we are working with the National Disability Insurance Agency to put in place an arrangement for those types of services to have some idea about what ILC will look like in the ACT.

For the ACT, what is really important is that, whatever service framework operates in the ACT next year, it is consistent with our other service frameworks, like the better services initiative and the human services blueprint that we already have in place and are implementing. We are working with the National Disability Insurance Agency on how we can provide this new service framework in conjunction with our existing arrangements. That is going to take a bit of time. What we did say at the quarterly forum yesterday was that we hope to be able to tell organisations by the end of this year what—

MS LAWDER: This calendar year?

Ms Whitten: This calendar year—what the funding arrangements might look like from the middle of next year. We have still got a lot of mapping of what the current services offer and how we can adjust the service framework so that people with a disability know where they can go.

Ms Burch: And that adjustment will be based on the nationally agreed frameworks of ILCs.

MS LAWDER: Thanks. For my substantive question, I am happy to pass to Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Minister, what is the government's approach to carrying over funding from one financial year to another by service providers? Are they entitled to retain any unspent funds, or are they required to be returned back to the department?

Ms Burch: Ms Power.

Ms Power: We negotiate that on a case-by-case basis. The approach that we are having with all of the service providers during the transition is quite flexible. A number of service providers are asking us about whether they can trial different services, for example, and use some funding that they may have unspent. It is not usually large amounts of funding, though, that people have. A number of services that people provide are through individual service packages, so the clients go through and use that money up. But they might also have some things that they might want to purchase in the new year. We typically do all that on a case-by-case basis.

MR WALL: What amounts would we normally be talking about or what approaches

have service providers made as far as new ideas that they are looking to retain that funding for?

Ms Power: I can give a specific example, if you like. One of the organisations that are providing services for carers, for example, has indicated that they have got some funding that they would like to spend in the new year on a new program. We have worked with them and agreed that they can pilot, if you like, a new program that they would like to test for carers in providing some different outcomes for them. So they will use that money next year to deliver a new service.

MR WALL: So there is no standing arrangement as far as any unspent funds being retained. What is the normal process if an organisation, for example, received \$100,000 for a program in this financial year and only spent \$80,000 of it? What happens to the balance of that?

Ms Howson: It is really a case-by-case scenario, Mr Wall, in the context of the output class and the objectives of government in the intention of providing that funding. We are always open and flexible to proposals that come in from organisations. If they align with those output classes and the objectives of government then we are generally very positive about encouraging the application of that funding to innovation for better services for clients. There is no hard and fast rule on this, except that the principles around accountability need to be firmly in place.

Ms Burch: And the reasons behind them. Some of these will clearly change, though, once the funding is predominantly out of block funding and into NDIS spending.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke, a new question.

DR BOURKE: Thank you. Minister, if we turn to page 116 of budget paper 3, there is an item “Support for people with disability—new respite property”. Could you tell us about this \$1.4 million over four years?

Ms Burch: This is a new respite property in partnership with the Ricky Stuart Foundation. I am very pleased with how that partnership is going. It builds on the respite property that we are building currently at Chifley; there is a great property being built at Chifley. The providers are being determined through Marymead; that partnership is really progressing well. This allocation of budget will see a similar thing, with a focus on Teen House. This will be a respite arrangement for, I think, 13 to 18-year-olds, again with Ricky Stuart Foundation. I met with Ricky Stuart just recently and he is very excited. I think we are very close to getting, if we have not already got, a selection of land. I know they would have been in the back seat of the car looking at land from day one of the announcement. They are very keen. I am very pleased with this. They have significant fundraising capacity; they have drawn immense in-kind support and cash support across the community. I think it is just a great outcome. Do you want to add anything to that?

Ms Howson: No.

Ms Burch: Okay.

DR BOURKE: How many young people at a time would be able to be provided with respite in this facility?

Ms Burch: I think similar arrangements to the one at Chifley. As I understand, it is around 40 families with about six bedrooms. The built form will accommodate about six bedrooms and a mix between shorter term and longer term arrangements. Also, the discussion with John Mackay and Ricky Stuart just recently was about how you create an asset and whether it can be used for almost occasional care or after school care. Some of our existing places, Kese and Teen, do have little ones coming, perhaps after school, to spend some time at regular points through the week, and through the year as well. So we are looking at about 40 families. This, whilst it is a built form respite, will also build into the broader flexible community respite that is being offered through various community organisations. That is currently in place.

DR BOURKE: So you are providing some capital, I presume, and the foundation is going to provide the staff?

Ms Burch: We are providing the land and the moneys as identified in the budget paper. We will have some capital injection; we will provide the land. We will retain ownership of the property, but it is definitely and absolutely promoted and marketed as a partnership approach. As the foundation has said, once the young people move in to the new children respite centre, there will be towels in the bathrooms and knives and forks in the drawers. They will not be wanting for anything.

DR BOURKE: You mentioned short or long term as well as occasional care. What does short or long term mean?

Ms Burch: I will go to Ms Power; she can talk you through that.

Ms Power: Some families require just overnight respite. It may be that there is something the family needs to do or where the young person needs some overnight respite. As the minister indicated, there is longer term weekend respite; the young person might come in on a Friday night and go home on a Sunday. There might be a longer term stay, over a school holiday period, for example. There might also be some situations—where the carer might need to attend hospital, for example—and the young person will attend respite for that period of time.

DR BOURKE: I presume the occasional care or after school care would also provide an opportunity for relationships to be built with staff of the facility?

Ms Burch: It is. What we have seen in the existing properties is that families ask about when other families are in respite, because the young folk do build up relationships and they get on. It just enhances their time there. They have a holiday because they catch up with friends.

DR BOURKE: What is the difference between this and the Marymead facility at Chifley?

Ms Burch: The one at Chifley is for children up to the age of 12. Yes? I am getting the nod; that is right. This will be for teens, so from 13 to 18 years. The principles will

be that we will seek a community provider at the moment.

Ms Power: The Disability Trust currently provides the respite at Teen.

Ms Burch: We assume that they will continue to provide Teen respite services.

DR BOURKE: The Marymead facility, as you say, is about the same size as the proposed Ricky Stuart facility, so that would be looking after about 40 families as well?

Ms Burch: That is what we are looking at at the minute. All of that will be determined by the final selection of the land, the built form and that. But it is pretty much in that ballpark.

DR BOURKE: How many families with children with disability need this kind of facility in the ACT, minister?

Ms Burch: At the moment there is an existing facility that I think is running at about 80 per cent capacity, so there is availability. This will just be a new purpose-built facility. Then we will make decisions about the existing property once the other one is set up and we get a sense that it is established and it is well utilised. Then we will make decisions about the built form and what we do with the existing property. If we are running at the mid-80 per cent and if that meets the need for the market, the property could well be returned to housing and decisions made about that and investments in disability elsewhere or investments into social housing elsewhere.

DR BOURKE: In effect, you have a facility for children and a facility for young teens which you are confident will meet the needs of the ACT population?

Ms Burch: On the figures that are being utilised at the moment, yes.

DR BOURKE: So we only have about 40 families with children with disability who are going to need it?

Ms Burch: Natalie Howson can add something there.

Ms Howson: I think the other thing to put into context in this discussion is that the national disability insurance scheme's intent is to ensure that, through choice and control, individuals that are seeking some alternative arrangements do not always have to go to a residential setting for respite care. Through the national disability insurance scheme, there is now the possibility for a whole range of different options, probably more so for young people and adults, who, for whatever reason, need to have some time away from their family or their residential setting—to do that in a way that best meets their needs and to be involved in the things that they want to be involved in.

Residential respite care is not for everybody. What we are now seeing is that people are able to, for example, arrange a holiday and be able to afford to have a support worker go with them to enable them to enjoy that holiday. It is these types of options. Or it is being able to participate in the things that all young people participate in, for example through school holidays, through their NDIS package actually having some

support arrangements that enable them to be a part of the normal school holiday programs, for example, or to participate in camps with Outward Bound or whatever that might be, rather than only having the option of a residential respite centre. I think we will start to see the respite services become much more flexible and broad in their offerings.

So at this stage, I think we are confident that the residential form, the built form, will meet the needs of the Canberra community as they start to explore all these other options.

DR BOURKE: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Mr Wall had a supplementary; then a new question from Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Just on the Teen House—who did you say the current service provider was?

Ms Burch: Disability Trust.

MR WALL: And they are likely to take over or they have been going to take over the new facility when it is built?

Ms Burch: Certainly the conversations are going along that way. They are the existing provider; they are under contract. There is an expectation that this will be replaced—an old built form to a fabulous new built form—so they will follow the contract into there.

MR WALL: I would imagine or anticipate, given that it is a change of premise and a change of the scope of service being offered, that the service agreement would be renegotiated?

Ms Whitten: We do have a service agreement with them at the moment. Certainly when we informed them that this is the government's decision to build a new respite property, they were very excited about that because they have had such a longstanding service provider for respite in other parts of the ACT. In terms of the agreement, we just need to look at how that would occur in terms of a service funding relationship and who that relationship would be with.

MR WALL: Why wouldn't the service agreement for the management of the new teen property be put to tender again?

Ms Burch: They have an existing provider. This could simply be looked at as a new location.

MR WALL: Yes, but it is—

Ms Burch: It is not a change of service. We are looking at it as a new location and improved facility.

MR WALL: I understand that the service is still going to be the same, but the terms

of the service that are being delivered are going to probably change given that the premises have changed. There are additional beds and there are more people that this new facility is going to be able to accommodate.

Ms Howson: We would probably consider that only a variation in terms of the outputs and the financial implications of that, which we would treat within the current contract arrangements. We have the same issue with Marymead, who are gearing now to move into the new facility for children. The minister is correct in saying that this is essentially a shift in location, but the support service that is offered through that location is the one defined under the current service agreement.

MR WALL: It just seems that—when the request for tender was put out to provide respite services, that was about 18 months ago—the goalposts are now moved as far as the scope of the service being delivered is concerned. Would it not be fair to—

Ms Burch: Not significantly enough, Mr Wall, and I would say, in support of community providers, that just because you upgrade their digs you should not end their contract. I do not think that is due respect to community providers either.

MR WALL: Okay.

THE CHAIR: A new question?

MR WALL: I refer to page 11 of statement G, which shows the accountability indicators for disability and therapy services. In respect of point h, the average cost per hour of therapy services to an individual or a group, the target for the current financial year is \$185.05 per hour, but the estimated outcome is near \$250 per hour. What has been the reason for the jump?

Ms Burch: Ian Hubbard will respond to that. I alert the committee to the fact that once we deal with the questions on this we have a statement to make about indicator n. I alert the committee to an error there. We will go to the detail of that.

Mr Hubbard: That is the average cost per hour of therapy service to an individual or group. That is that one. The way that is calculated, obviously, is by using the hours in point g as the denominator and the budget for that area as a numerator. I will just give you the numbers there. For the 2014-15 target, we have \$12,675,925 as the target budget. That is divided by the number of hours provided, which is 68,500. That gives you the \$185.05.

In respect of the estimated outcome for 2014-15, that budget has increased to \$13,561,000 and the number of hours has reduced, as shown in the estimated outcome, to 54,800. So that is what gives you the actual \$247.46. There was another reason why the budget has gone up slightly and the hours have gone down slightly as well, but I might get Jacinta to outline that. She is in charge of Therapy. Those are the calculations.

Ms Evans: Yes, there is a change in the number of hours provided in 2014-15. That is substantially around the transition to the NDIS and changes that we have made in terms of how we support families to transition across from what was previously a very

defined service into a range of choice and control situations. Families are actually now seeking a lot of advice and support from Therapy ACT, which is the established provider that they have known for a long time. Rather than us in some cases providing direct therapy service for families, we have actually been engaged in a range of support and advocacy services that are not actually registered in this figure.

I think that the other change is again around the transition to the NDIS and the way in which we negotiated a memorandum of understanding to support our staff across into new sector employment. We have different duties that staff are doing, including supporting the sector through moving across to secondments in non-government organisations and also a range of training opportunities for staff. So it has been a very different 12 months for Therapy ACT staff and for our clients. That is reflected somewhat in the number of hours that have been provided that can be captured as direct clinical services.

MR WALL: What then is the explanation for, I guess, the additional spend? If 68,500 hours of respite was anticipated at \$185 as an average per hour, that equates to about \$12.6 million. At \$247 for 54,800 hours, it is \$13.5 million. In an actual sense the indicators are saying that you spent \$884,000 more but provided 13,700 less hours.

Mr Hubbard: That is right and the difference—

Ms Howson: I might come in for a moment in terms of the context. It is really the commitment to make sure that we walk beside our clients as we move into the transition to the NDIS. The first figures, the 2014-15 targets, were really established on the basis of the service not changing that much from previous years, whereas the actual experience is that clients are choosing to use their NDIS packages to go to other providers, which is a good thing. But we have not been able to reduce our staff as rapidly as that adjustment in their expenditure on clinical hours by other providers because we have made a commitment, as Ms Evans said, to support our clients through that transition. While we cannot count the time spent with clients as clinical hours, we are spending time with clients in relation to supporting them to prepare for their phasing and to actually make decisions about where they then seek support.

The other issue is the commitment to the changes for our staff as we step down. While we are funding staff on our books, they are actually working in seconded environments to support the transition to the non-government sector. That is the general theme for that. In terms of the actual dollars, did you want to say something, Ian?

Mr Hubbard: You have covered most of it, I think, Ms Howson. I think there are also some other issues, as I canvassed earlier in the estimates process. We have also distributed to some of the areas some additional costs to do with the increase in the Comcare premium and some things like that. Probably half of the increase in that \$800,000 is just those additional costs that we got through that process.

MR WALL: Sorry, Mr Hubbard; half of it is attributed to workers comp?

Mr Hubbard: Yes, to our increase in workers comp. As an organisation we got about a \$6 million increase in the one year post-budget. So we had to distribute that to the

different areas. It was mostly distributed on a risk profile. That was Therapy's share. As part of the transition, staff go off and do training. To support them going forward into different roles in the future, they go off and do training. They need to be backfilled; so there is a cost for training, for some financial advice and for backfilling. Those associated costs are also built into that amount as well.

Ms Burch: While you are there, Mr Hubbard, should we notify the committee of a correction on indicator n? In preparing for this we actually noticed that we need to make a correction. We will make a formal addendum through the appropriate process. Mr Hubbard, can you go to indicator n?

Mr Hubbard: Thank you, minister, and chair. We have made a mistake regarding the population number for indicator n, which has changed those numbers going across there. As you would appreciate, the first number in 2014-15, the target there, instead of being \$252 should have been \$280.7. That is made up of the total cost of \$110,784,000 divided by the population for 2014-15, which was 394,700. That was the population number that we used in that period.

The next one, estimated outcome 2014-15, obviously is based on the total cost shown in the budget papers of \$117,485,000, again divided by the same 2014-15 population number, which was 394,700. That gave a number there for the estimated outcome of \$297. That increase from \$280 to \$297 again reflected some of the costs that I alluded to earlier in the estimates process about the TA that we got that covered the Comcare increase and the deferred payments et cetera.

In relation to the target going forward, that number there is 269. The total cost expected of that output in 2015-16 is \$12,980,000 and the population number for 2015-16 is 399,900. I apologise for the wrong population numbers there.

Ms Burch: We will get that addendum in to the committee as soon as we can.

THE CHAIR: Sorry, the 2015-16 total becomes 269?

Mr Hubbard: 269.

THE CHAIR: And the population of 394,000—where did you get that number from?

Mr Hubbard: That is a number that we are given through the budget processes as the number to use for the population. It is consistent across all directorates to have that population number. We just used the one from the previous year.

Ms Burch: In the spirit of corrections, also, in my opening, I said that access requests were 999. Indeed, 999 was the bilateral target for approved plans, but the access requests, in fact, have been 1,543. So more people are actually going in than our target. That is my read of that correction. Again, I apologise to the committee for that.

THE CHAIR: While Mr Hubbard is at the table, on page 24 of budget paper G there is an eight per cent drop in the GPO. Why is that?

Mr Hubbard: What I would like to do is give you the comparison between—firstly, I

will just give you the reason why it went from \$108 million up to \$114 million. That is a similar discussion that we had when we were looking at the care and protection output. It is the disability distribution for that TA that we got. The actual number that went in that took it from 108 to 114 was in the order of \$6 million. That \$6 million broken up is the Comcare premium distribution for both Disability and Therapy of \$3,461,000 plus some deferred payments from the prior year at \$1.317 million and also \$1 million that we got through the TA process for emergency clients coming to Disability ACT prior to being able to transition into the NDIS. So that gave the movement from 108 to 114.

The comparison change is really between the 108 and the 104 moving from one budget year to the next, which is a movement of about \$3.4 million. That \$3.4 million is made up largely of \$2.6 million for indexation on the contracts on the NGO's payments. So their base amount that they get funded per year indexed up to the next year. That is the largest part of it.

Then we have virtually got a drop in the community sector indexation. That is calculated using the WCI. As indexes go down for CPI and WCI—that index—we need to adjust that technically down. We also have some savings of about \$328,000. Then there are some movements in the commonwealth funding after transition, which was mainly received in the year prior. Some of that comes off and there is some increase in the NDIS ACT component going up. That gives you the total difference of \$3.8 million.

THE CHAIR: In the 2016-17 year, Disability ACT will cease as a provider, as will Therapy ACT. What does that do to the staff numbers and the payments? The payments jump, and then in 2017-18 they jump another \$30 million. Why is that?

Mr Hubbard: Again, that is as we transition into the NDIA, the full scheme. What we have captured here is essentially most of the flows coming through that agreement in CSD. What we need to determine in the future, which we have started but will really get into in 2015-16, is how the funding relates to health, education and CSD. The lion's share for 2014-15 and 2015-16 is CSD in the arrangements, but there will also be significant impacts as we move into the full scheme for health and education. We have a pretty strong governance process between CSD, health, education and the budget branch at Treasury.

As we go forward, these numbers will change quite dramatically about whether the GPO actually comes into CSD or stays with Treasury and the payment comes into Treasury and then goes back to the commonwealth. We are just determining how those flows work. One thing you can say is that it will look quite different by the end of next year as we determine exactly how those flows are going to work and whether it still comes into CSD or whether the payments stop with Treasury and are funded out. We pay the payments to the NDIA and NDIS on behalf of the whole of government at the moment. CSD is doing that function.

THE CHAIR: How many staff in Disability ACT at the moment?

Ms Howson: While Ms Whitten is getting that information, can I just correct a contextual comment that you made, Mr Smyth. We are ceasing to provide therapy

services through Therapy ACT at the end of the calendar year ending December 2016, but we are not withdrawing from provision of specialist accommodation services until the end of June 2017.

THE CHAIR: So 2017.

Ms Whitten: In relation to the Disability ACT staff at the moment, at May 2015, we have, in terms of the headcount in Disability ACT, 315 staff, representing permanent staff, temporary staff and casual staff. In Therapy we have a headcount of 119.

THE CHAIR: When those services delivered cease at 31 December and 30 June, what happens to those 430 people?

Ms Burch: At the moment our disability support staff are moving. The figures would be different a month ago; they will be different in three months time. A number of staff are taking advantage of the training and transition support and indeed are looking to change employment opportunities and take those opportunities. Some that consider themselves at the end of their working commitment are taking the opportunity in this change to actually retire and to leave active service.

With Therapy ACT, as I mentioned in our opening statements, we will be developing a child development unit, and we will continue to have a workforce within that space.

Between Ms Whitten and Ms Evans, we can go to some of those transitions and changes across staff.

THE CHAIR: Of the 434 staff, how many positions will there be after 30 June 2017?

Ms Whitten: As part of the government's exit from government service delivery, the government negotiated with the unions how we would support staff to find their future careers. As part of that, it gives everyone who is a permanent staff member the opportunity to exercise options under the redeployment and redundancy provisions of the enterprise agreement. So that is what we are working with staff on at the moment.

We have been engaging with 90 per cent of our staff to determine what their future career will be over the next 18 months. In terms of our total staff, in terms of Disability ACT we will still retain our policy function, because we still have that responsibility, and that is important in terms of our obligations for the national disability strategy, which the Involve campaign is part of. So there is a very small team, probably in the order of around 10 or 11 staff. The rest of the staff will be looking for jobs in this sector. We know that at least 40 per cent of our staff are looking for jobs in the sector or will be looking for jobs in the sector over the next few years. Other people will be redeployed within the government if that is what they wish to do and they are suitable for other jobs within the ACT government. Other people will retire, as the minister has said. That is in terms of Disability ACT.

In terms of Therapy ACT, obviously the health professionals there are still able to access redeployment within the ACT government. Perhaps the Health Directorate is an obvious area. But there are also some residual parts of Therapy ACT that will remain. Ms Evans will talk about the child development service.

Ms Evans: In terms of therapy—

THE CHAIR: Before we go to that, what are the numbers? How many from Disability will remain?

Ms Whitten: Because most of our staff are direct service delivery staff, their future career is primarily in the non-government sector.

THE CHAIR: So the policy unit will be how many?

Ms Whitten: In terms of our policy function, around—

Ms Howson: Can I just formally say that at this stage we are working that through, Mr Smyth, so to be precise would be unfair on our staff, to be clear about that. We are just working our way through—

THE CHAIR: Sure. I am happy for an approximate number.

Ms Howson: Ms Whitten has already given you that—around probably 10 to 11. It will be a small unit.

THE CHAIR: And how many in Therapy?

Ms Howson: That is what we would like to now talk about, the child development service, because there is a significant residual role that we will be playing.

THE CHAIR: That is okay, but what will be the number?

Ms Burch: We will go through that.

Ms Evans: I will speak to that, Mr Smyth. The child development service is actually a redesign of current government services. The positions available in that will be available in the first instance to the staff of Therapy ACT. That is why it is important to explain it in this context. At this stage we have designed a service which will employ around 30 FTE from Therapy ACT staffing. That will include mainly clinical staff, but some administrative staff and some allied health assistants in that number.

To give you a bit of a context around that, at the moment we have about 61 FTE permanent staff still employed within Therapy ACT; about 30 of those will have an opportunity to look at the child development service if that is what they are interested in. I should say that that is not necessarily what all of them are interested in, because they are allied health professionals with disability specialist skills, so a whole range of staff are looking to be employed in the non-government sector, which is more their area of expertise.

Ms Burch: To date, just from July through to May, as I understand it, a headcount of voluntary redundancies has been 52. I think that is within the normal parameters, and there has been a number of people redeployed within Disability.

THE CHAIR: So approximately 40 to 50 jobs will remain across the two, and there will be approximately 280 or 290 jobs that will transition. If that is the case, why in the 2017-18 and 2018-19 outyears do you still show full employee expenses of \$36 million and \$37 million? And you still show the government payment for outputs; in fact in 2017-18 it jumps \$30 million.

Mr Hubbard: Thanks for that question, Mr Smyth. You are right. At the moment what we are doing is—this is a really exciting and interesting budgeting process for this output, because the transition is so extreme and involves so many players, with the sources of funds coming from so many different places. What we have tried to do, just to get to 2015-16, is to really model the phasing and really address where we believe, based on the assumptions in our modelling, the funding should be placed.

Once we go out beyond that, the assumptions get a bit less firm. As I think you appreciate, we are really going through the discussions of basically what would be left up. That large increase going in in the future is really an indication of the funding that is coming through to the ACT government from the commonwealth based on the levy that has been in place to attract funds into the NDIS scheme.

I might pass to Therese Gehrig, because she has a really good explanation of how that flow, which is the largest, works. Just before we finish on that, if you look at the costs in that on page 24, which you were at before, obviously we have really just slowly maintained the level of employee expenses. That is going to be very different as a result of—

THE CHAIR: Clearly that will drop to probably \$6 million at most.

Mr Hubbard: Yes, and you are right. There is no doubt about it. That will change quite dramatically. We just do not know at the moment how to do that and basically when that is going to happen. By the end of this year, going into the next budget year, I will have a much tighter view on where those numbers are going to go in the future. They will be adjusted downwards, clearly.

The other line where there is big movement is in the grants and purchased services. That is really that interface between the block funding that we currently now have and the quite large funding that will come in from both the ACT government and the commonwealth government. We have reflected that in that line. Again, by the time we get to 2017-18, whether those GPO funds actually come to CSD as basically the distributor of those funds or not has not been decided yet. My belief is that actually that will be a function within Treasury and it will be basically handled from a Treasury perspective directly.

THE CHAIR: All right.

Ms Burch: We might just get that explanation from Ms Gehrig.

THE CHAIR: Yes, why it goes up 30 and then drops 20 in the course of a year.

Ms Gehrig: If I could ask you to move to page 15, the first line and figures in the outyears relate to the commonwealth grant of assistance to states for DisabilityCare

Australia. Under the former federal government, the NDIS had a name change to DisabilityCare Australia. For all Australians who pay the Medicare levy, that Medicare levy went up half a per cent, and that half a per cent was quarantined into the DisabilityCare Australia fund.

The ACT's share of that fund as it will flow through the outyears would be around \$14 million now, growing to \$15 million, as you see, in 2018-19. What we are seeing here are the figures that have been published within the commonwealth federal budget. They relate to the drawdown and the timing of payments to states. Until a state has 50 per cent of its clients in the NDIS, the maximum it can draw down is 10 per cent. So the 1.4 represents 10 per cent of the \$14 million. Once we get to 50 per cent of people in the trial, we could access 50 per cent of that cash flow; when we have 60 per cent, 60 per cent of the cash flow. So what you are seeing is the maximum drawdown of 10 per cent in 2015-16. Based on our bilateral targets, we would be up to 85 per cent of our expected population in 2016-17. And then this payment, this huge jump of the \$30 million, is essentially retrospectively paying back the 2014-15. So it is just a bubble in the cash flow at the moment.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke, a new question.

DR BOURKE: Thank you. Minister, in tandem with the Human Rights Act, the Mental Health (Treatment and Care) Amendment Act has reaffirmed the ACT's commitment to equal treatment and support for young people or people who suffer mental illness or disability. How do we ensure young people who suffer disability can participate in sport and recreational community groups?

Ms Burch: There are a number of ways of doing that. It is working with those community groups on an education level to inform them how to remove the barriers and to have different champions. There are certainly groups around the ACT that are very active in that space. Imagine More is a small community group looking to break down those barriers. But I might go to Ms Whitten about the active work or Ms Evans about what that looks like as far as Disability or Therapy ACT is concerned.

Ms Whitten: I think that is particularly relevant to the work that we want to undertake through the Involve campaign. It is to garner support from across the community—from government, the business sector and the community sector—about how children with a disability or developmental delay can participate in the sporting area. The minister talked about the Involve campaign and our priorities for 2015-16 being around housing, employment and NDIS participation. In the next financial year we are actually looking at accessible communities as well. That will be one of our priorities in that 2016-17 period.

In addition to that, the ACT government participates in the ACT Inclusion Council, which includes people from the community sector and from the business sector. Most recently, we have had a new member from the Australian Institute of Sport join the Inclusion Council. One of the areas of focus for the ACT Inclusion Council, which sponsors the ACT Chief Minister's inclusion awards, which people have attended—we had our 11th year in August last year—is the inclusion of children in the sporting arena as well. That is something that we are going to focus on not this financial year but certainly soon after. Imagine More's Jan Kruger is a member of the ACT

Inclusion Council and she is very passionate about how children can participate in soccer, netball and any of those sports that every other child participates in.

Ms Burch: In relation to Therapy ACT?

Ms Evans: In relation to Therapy ACT the focus for the child development service starting from 1 January next year is not just around developmental delay but also around the emotional wellbeing of children. The service actually integrates services from Health and from the Education and Training Directorate into one location and will allow families to access services that will actually check in on their child's health and wellbeing, including their mental health, through that service.

The other thing that would really be relevant is around the better services initiatives and the human services blueprint. The approach that all of our services in the Community Services Directorate are taking is to say, "What is the whole need for this child around all the aspects of their life, whether that is sport, whether that is around their mental wellbeing, whether it is around their physical development?" Those initiatives also are supporting wraparound the child and are looking at what in the community can support that child to have the best life they can have.

DR BOURKE: Speaking of inclusiveness, could I hear some more about your involvement in the Connect and Participate Expo back in March?

Ms Burch: This is about just making sure that people are connected, community members and service providers alike. We have got good organisations, good service providers, out there but oftentimes it is about making people aware of it and actually giving a bit of an introduction, so to speak, to this range of services. There were significant numbers of providers and participants, were there?

Ms Whitten: There were 146 providers this year. This is the second time we have had an expo. Last year was the first time, at the Kingston Foreshore. It was a very exciting day where a range of organisations came together to show the ACT community, not specifically people with disabilities but the entire community, what are the various sporting groups and community groups that exist within the ACT. It is a pretty unique opportunity for members of the community to drop in and spend some time. The people we have talked to and who have attended have been very enthusiastic about attending the expo. They want to know what is going to happen next year. It is an opportunity to see anything from doll groups through to the *Star Wars* groups—there is such a range of people—the gym classes, the dancing classes. It is a good expo that all members of the community really enjoy participating in. One gentleman I spoke with had spent the entire day at the expo, it was that important to him.

DR BOURKE: And is this going to become a permanent event in the calendar, minister?

Ms Burch: I think it has been successful and, as we go to people having choice of control over their lives, many in the community understand that it is not only the larger service providers and the well-known ones but often these smaller connections, whether you are a fan of *Star Wars* or whether you are a fan of dancing, that are the types of events that make those connections. I am very keen to see if we can look at

having it on once a year.

DR BOURKE: The directorate hosted it?

Ms Whitten: Yes, a group from the community development group. A very small team had the idea and initiated it with our community partners and it has been really popular. Even one group that had not actually booked in turned up anyway; we were able to accommodate them and they were really thrilled. It is a really important event in the calendar and we just need to work out how we can continue it.

Ms Burch: Yes, it is. Organising something like this is a logistic task within its own right but the success is really pivotal to having the community engagement and those different organisations that turn up. People are still talking about the success of it. It is now about how we turn it into a reality ongoing.

DR BOURKE: Have you undertaken any formal assessment or evaluation?

Ms Whitten: What we do on the day is actually ask the stallholders to give us an assessment of those people who participated in their stall and how many people have left their names so that we have got that level of detail. Plus we also undertake surveys of the people who attend. We collate all that information and then that gives us the basis to determine how successful the event has been.

DR BOURKE: And what was the result of that evaluation and analysis?

Ms Burch: Big ticks all around, I think, in short.

DR BOURKE: And how many people attended the expo?

Ms Whitten: I know I have got that figure somewhere—8,000. Sometimes we can determine that by knowing who are the stallholders who are actually providing the food and the coffee. They can tell us how many people actually purchased coffee, lunch. I know in the first year that it was certainly the coffee provider that said we had done really well. It was great.

DR BOURKE: And of course this is budget estimates, minister. So how much did it cost?

Ms Burch: It was worth every penny.

Ms Gehrig: It is actually very cost effective. I think, in terms of hiring the tables and the banners, the equipment—we have a lot of sound equipment, we have bands and dancing and there is a lot of that kind of cost—it was less than \$50,000.

Ms Burch: As I said, worth every cent.

Ms Gehrig: If I could just confirm, the cost this year was around \$47,000.

DR BOURKE: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR: Thank you for that. Our time for disability services has come to a close. Minister, I thank you and your officials for attending today and for your answers. Some questions were taken on notice. If answers could be provided within five working days of the receipt of the transcript, that would be appreciated. The transcript when it is available will be forwarded to you for correction or additions if you feel the need. With that we will suspend until 11.15, when we will resume with the Minister for the Arts.

Sitting suspended from 11.01 to 11.15 am.

THE CHAIR: Good morning all, and welcome to this session of the Select Committee on Estimates 2015-2016. We will be looking at the arts, output class 8, economic development, 8.8, arts engagement, and the Cultural Facilities Corporation statement of intent, output class 1.1.

Please be aware that the proceedings are being recorded and transcribed, and will be published as well as being broadcast and webstreamed. In front of you on the table is the privilege statement. Could those at the table please confirm that they have read and understand the implications of privilege?

Mr Whitney: Yes.

THE CHAIR: So noted; thank you very much. Could those who come to the table make sure you are familiar with the privilege statement. Minister, would you like to make an opening statement?

Ms Burch: Thank you, chair. The 2014-15 financial year saw the government undertake significant community consultation on the ACT arts policy framework which has led to a new arts policy being developed. The new whole-of-government policy, which will be released next week or shortly, sets the government's vision for the arts in the coming years and aligns with the government's strategic priorities, economic growth and diversification, enhancing livability and social inclusion, suburban renewal and better transport and health and education investment.

The last few years have seen a focus on arts hubs, with investment in Ainslie and Gorman House arts centres, Tuggeranong Arts Centre, the Street Theatre, Watson and Strathnairn art centres and the move of Megalo Access Arts to the Kingston Arts Precinct. This work has enabled these arts centres to focus their work and to enhance our artistic vibrancy and profile.

Overall ACT key arts program funded organisations report that over 425,000 people attended art events or participated in programs in 2014, and the important work of these organisations was supported by community volunteers, with an estimated 34,000 volunteer hours. This is indeed a fantastic indication not only of the depth of community engagement in the arts but also of the importance of arts organisations and facilities in the livability and vibrancy of our city.

The 2015-16 budget sees support for strategic asset management of our arts facilities, with \$496,000 over two years for high priority safety upgrades across the portfolio. The safety improvements mark the start of the implementation of the strategic asset

management plan completed for the arts portfolio last year.

The Kingston Arts Precinct is a strategic priority for the ACT government and will become a major arts hub. A feasibility study completed by Stewart Architecture was launched last weekend at the Canberra Glassworks and explores the development of Kingston as a dynamic and energetic arts precinct. Through this budget the government will invest just over \$4 million over the next three years in upgrading the Canberra Theatre Centre. This major capital project will support the centre in its role as the region's premier performing arts venue.

The government will also provide \$99,000 through this budget for the capital project at Lanyon heritage centre at the former Nolan gallery building. The funding is to be used for upgrades to the stormwater systems at the centre. This funding builds on the previous two years of capital projects, where the government invested \$400,000 in upgrading the roads at Lanyon. Lanyon is a very special place for me. Both previous budgets and this new funding support the role of Lanyon as the ACT's premier historic site. Each year it attracts over 50,000 visitors, and rightly so, and provides hundreds of education and community programs.

This is in addition to the \$8.3 million in recurrent funding to the Cultural Facilities Corporation for its programs.

This government continues to be committed to the arts through the new arts policy and the investment that we have seen in this budget. Before we go to questions, I would like to thank David Whitney, the Director of artsACT, and indeed all of the artsACT team, the directorate in policy support, the CEO and the chair of CFC, Ms Elvin and John Hindmarsh, for the work they do in this community. I also acknowledge that this is Mr Whitney's last estimates hearing, unless he comes back in another guise once he sees that retirement could be a bit dull. I want to put on record my thanks for his support and guidance during my tenure as arts minister.

THE CHAIR: Thanks for that, minister. The committee acknowledges the presence of the Chair of the Cultural Facilities Corporation, Mr Hindmarsh, in the gallery. Minister, where is the review of the arts framework?

Ms Burch: Mr Whitney can talk about the detail of how that was progressed. As I indicated in my opening statement, that will be released publicly next week or shortly, and I will send a copy through to you, Mr Smyth.

THE CHAIR: Sorry, the review or the new arts framework will be released?

Ms Burch: The review is an internal document that was used as the mechanism for reviewing the arts policy. Mr Whitney, do you want to talk to that?

Mr Whitney: The arts policy framework was reviewed internally and there was also a public consultation process, with over 300 individuals and organisations involved in that consultative process. The result of that process was monitored by an independent reference group who were nominated by the minister to provide an overview of that policy and the discussion around that. The intention is that the policy is to be released in the near future by the minister.

THE CHAIR: Is a copy of the review available for the committee?

Ms Burch: We will take some advice. It was an internal working document for use regarding what will be released next week. We will take some advice, chair.

THE CHAIR: How was the public consultation conducted and over what period?

Mr Whitney: The consultation period began on 18 March this year and closed on 5 May. There were a variety of mechanisms that were used for that consultation. A lot of them involved direct work through the reference group, who were the independent group looking at that: there was an online survey that was undertaken; we received written submissions; there was one major community forum; and there were specific targeted workshops that were held with key parts of the arts community—a visual arts targeted workshop, music, arts facilities, dance, circus and also theatre. There was a Facebook group of young and emerging artists that were involved. We specifically met with the Cultural Facilities Corporation executives and their board and we also had a variety of meetings with other ACT government stakeholders in that process.

THE CHAIR: If the public consultation finished on 5 May, how is it that we are able to produce the new arts framework in the last week of June or first week of July? Has there been ample consideration of what the consultation revealed, and when did you receive the final consultation report?

Mr Whitney: The consultation work was undertaken within artsACT. We received information from all of those consultation processes throughout that time frame and then we fed that back through to the reference group throughout the process. At the end of the exercise, when we reworked the policy, we had discussions about the policy with the reference committee and also with government organisations and stakeholders.

THE CHAIR: So did the reference committee write the review document or did artsACT write the review document?

Mr Whitney: It was prepared within artsACT but the reference group were involved as advisers to that process.

THE CHAIR: On what date was the review document finalised?

Ms Burch: We had an end date for public consultation, but as Mr Whitney has indicated this was ongoing. There was not a vacuum of activity and review, and finessing of the policy in that time.

THE CHAIR: That is okay, but when was the final review document completed?

Mr Whitney: I will have to get back to you on the exact date. We reviewed the document, we prepared the information and we provided advice to the minister, but I cannot recall the date.

THE CHAIR: That is okay; take it on notice. So we will get the new arts framework

sometime soon?

Ms Burch: Yes, next week or the week after, but my plan is next week, all things being equal.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Dr Bourke?

DR BOURKE: Thank you, chair. I have a supplementary to that question to start with. Did that study undertake an economic impact of the arts, including social impacts, or was it a different study you were talking about there?

Ms Burch: That has been a different study but again an important piece of work. It is always questioned when you are putting up different budget bids. How do you validate the worth and the economic input from the arts community and arts investment? So we have undertaken that work. It is being QA-ed by experts from KPMG who did that work in Victoria as well. I will go to Mr Whitney for the detail.

Mr Whitney: Yes, we have undertaken an economic impact report. ArtsACT is part of a network of jurisdictional officials. We have a relationship with the Australian Bureau of Statistics. There is a group called the statistics working group that are within that. So we are well aware of the ABS data that is collected about arts and cultural activity. We have used that information and also the skeleton of a report that, as the minister was just saying, was undertaken by the Victorian government to look at the value of the arts and culture to the economics of Victoria.

We have used that but had our colleagues in the policy area within our own directorate have a look at that economic study and take the data from the ABS to translate that into an ACT experience. We have also used data that we have collected from the Cultural Facilities Corporation, principally around audiences, volunteer servicing and activities that they do, and also from our own programs and our own arts organisations, so it has got very much a local flavour.

The major difference, I think, between the two reports is that we have a municipal role here as well as a state role. The Victorian report was much grander in its ambition because of the nature of Melbourne and Victoria, and the state government's responsibility is purely that. Ours is also looking at the municipal role. So principally it is about the engagement of people in both arts practice and also as an arts audience. That work has been undertaken. The findings and recommendations are, as the minister was saying, currently being peer-reviewed in order to give validation to the work that has been undertaken. The anticipation is that that work will be very much completed by early next week. That economic study should be available to be released as early as next week.

THE CHAIR: And it will be released in full?

Mr Whitney: Yes.

DR BOURKE: Are there any preliminary findings you can share with us, minister?

Ms Burch: Mr Whitney, are there any?

Mr Rake: It would be inappropriate for us to release them just yet in that they have not been QA-ed.

Ms Burch: It would be premature.

DR BOURKE: Even preliminary?

Ms Burch: Yes.

Mr Rake: We would fill the hearts of arts enthusiasts with optimism and we would just like to get it checked first. The preliminary findings are very interesting and are very positive. They are a very positive reflection on the strength of our sector.

DR BOURKE: I noticed that this arts portfolio has moved into a different directorate. Is this economic review a reflection of its new home in EDD?

Ms Burch: No, but it is being facilitated by the move into EDD. It has been something that various arts sectors, and certainly the CFC, have been interested in—a better understanding about the economic impact across our arts centre. So when arts moved from CSD into EDD, there was a synergy there and the work was undertaken internally. But it was very important to consider how we would test the assumptions and the framework on which the analysis is done. Hence we have brought in KPMG. I understand that the fellow who is doing the QA was the same consultant who did the work in Victoria. Is that right?

Mr Rake: Yes, the same person. It is an opportunity for us to join in with the other functions of EDD. What we recognise is that our arts sector is an integral part of our visitor economy and the tourism attraction efforts that we undertake in VisitCanberra. It is also very relevant to our business development strategy, broadening the economy, and looking to assist those who wish to turn their arts practice into their main source of income, to help them understand the business opportunities, whether that is a sideline to another form of employment or whether it is their primary form of income earning so that we are able to join programs such as the CBR Innovation Network, our tourism programs and our arts programs together and make sure that we are optimising the full range of benefits that we can get out of our arts sector.

DR BOURKE: Will it also assess the social impact and outcomes of that activity?

Mr Rake: The economic report looks at that lightly, but it is a lot harder to put a direct economic value on that flow through to, say, mental health and wellbeing. A lower call on the health budget is a lot harder to quantify, but they are still valuable elements of all forms of leisure, whether they be in arts or whether they be in sport.

Mr Whitney: To come to you particularly, Dr Bourke, the ABS figures are remarkably positive about how people in the ACT accept and adapt to arts practice. We consistently have the highest attendance at exhibitions and galleries. We also have the highest attendance at film and screen activity. The consumption of books in the ACT is higher than the national average and the individual per capita spend is greater than the rest of the country. So the arts are an important part of our local economy.

The measures that we looked at are about employment, the output and the value directly added by the arts and cultural sector, as well as other measures. Those other measures include our consumption of arts and culture, the creative industry businesses, which is what Gary was talking about, and how culture interacts with other parts of the economy such as innovation and the urban environment. So we are trying to quantify those elements of the arts activity.

We certainly looked very carefully in the report at traditional art forms such as dance, theatre, literature and the visual arts, and have expanded it to also pick up much broader cultural activities such as media, design, screen and other elements of the creative sector.

DR BOURKE: I have a follow-up on that. Minister, where are we up to with Belconnen Arts Centre stage 2—

Ms Burch: Well—

DR BOURKE: in my electorate?

Ms Burch: In your electorate, yes. I am unsurprised that you would ask that question. It is a sound project. It is just that in a budget that has the constraints on it that this budget has, things needed to be prioritised. Good work has been done on that. I might go to David Whitney, but I know that the board and the director up at Belconnen regularly remind me of the benefit it would bring to the community. I am a supporter of the project. It is just about prioritising limited capital, limited expenditure. But I would expect you to keep on reminding me of that, Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: And perhaps now that you are off—

Mr Whitney: In terms of the development from last year, we have undertaken additional work with refining the design for Belconnen Arts Centre stage 2. That work is not only with the architects who are involved in that within the Shared Services and Procurement areas, but also very close work is taking place with not only the Belconnen Arts Centre but also the Belconnen Community Council. That development work has led to the development application being lodged and approved in January this year; so the project is ready. It is just awaiting funding, but against competing priorities we understand that that project may have to wait a little longer.

One of the interesting developments that has come from Belconnen stage 2 is a direct link with the Strathnairn Arts Centre. Those two organisations now work very closely together. We are working with Strathnairn and Riverview. We are developing a greater west Belconnen suburban area. That is another focus for capital injection into your area of Belconnen. Part of the Riverview development will be the staging and building of a sales office for that development that will transfer across to artsACT as part of additional studios and workshop spaces at Strathnairn. So the Belconnen area is certainly being looked after, but not Belconnen stage 2, which we are all very keen to see progress. In a competing budget we just have to wait our turn.

DR BOURKE: It is a long view for Strathnairn, though, but it is good. Perhaps the

location, minister, into a different directorate might assist Belconnen stage 2, given the opportunities for development around Emu Bank. There is some work that needs to be done on the inlet there. Does that all fit together within the economic development directorate?

Mr Dawes: It does. There is some discussion going on at a very high level. Nothing has been formally presented at all at this point in time, but we are looking at some opportunities there in Belconnen to see how we can enhance that particular area. If, for example, something did stack up that might be able to advance that stage 2 sooner rather than later—it is very early and I have not even presented anything to the LDA board at this point in time. But there has been some discussion to look at how we might be able to deliver some particular projects in some particular areas.

Obviously, as you are aware, urban renewal is very important for the government. They are looking at how we can actually ensure that we can deliver some of the community assets within some of our urban development. Hence the minister last Saturday launched the arts hub at Kingston, and we are looking at how we can actually incorporate some of the arts into some of the future development of that Kingston area, that arts hub, and how we could actually have some of that delivered as part of that urban renewal program. So we are looking at a number of different models and just testing some of those models—how we can actually enhance other areas across the ACT.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder, a new question?

Mr Whitney: If I may, chair, could I just add two comments in addition to David's comments. The lakefront, of course, is controlled and managed by TAMS, and we are continually working with them to look at extending the development that they have done on Emu Bank. Certainly, as Benjamin Way came down, they did a lot of work on that at the inlet there. They are very keen to have the cycle path and the pedestrian path following around the lake. We will allow for that development to occur as part of the extension of Belconnen stage 2.

We are also having discussions with colleagues in Treasury to work with the commonwealth government's infrastructure grant program to see if we can find a way of getting some assistance to look at Belconnen stage 2. All the work that has been funded to date has put us in a very strong position to be able to argue to people in the commonwealth to get a major capital upgrade and injection of funds from the Australian government which then could ease the pressure a little on the territory budget to progress stage 2. That is way into the future, but that is our plan to move into that area.

DR BOURKE: So is there going to be some capacity in the future for some significant piece of public art on the foreshore that says to everybody looking across the lake, "Here is an arts centre," rather than people just seeing another building?

Ms Burch: We will take that into consideration as we go through the plan.

DR BOURKE: Because having seen the designs for the arts centre, one would say that I am sure it is going to be very well functioning and look good on the inside, but

on the outside you would have to say it was—

Ms Burch: It needs a bit of pizzazz? Is that what you are saying?

DR BOURKE: Lacking in zap.

Ms Burch: Okay.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder?

Ms Burch: For consideration, Dr Bourke.

MS LAWDER: I just had a few questions about table H.1, in budget paper 3. It is about re-profiling and technical adjustments of capital works.

Ms Burch: What page are you on, sorry?

MS LAWDER: It is 337, budget paper 3.

Mr Ogden: Sorry, Ms Lawder, could you refer me to a particular point?

MS LAWDER: Sure. I have not asked a question yet. On page 337 of budget paper 3, I just had a couple of items. I wanted to ask about the reasons why they were re-profiled and moved from one year to the other. The first one is about the third or fourth item down, “Belconnen Arts Centre, stage 2 (Feasibility and forward design)”. We have already spoken about the Belconnen Arts Centre, but why are we moving the money from one year to the other?

Mr Whitney: It is a modest amount of money and there are still elements of the project that we are needing to refine with some consultants. We have just, this week, received the theatre consultant’s report about the specifications to go within the actual performing centre itself. So there is \$25,000 that will continue into the new year to finish off those small sub-consultancies that we need to have finished and resolved.

MS LAWDER: You are quite confident it will be completed in that coming financial year?

Mr Whitney: Absolutely, yes.

MS LAWDER: The next one, a couple further down, is “City to the lake—new Canberra Theatre (Feasibility)”.

Ms Burch: We might ask Ms Elvin to come and talk to that.

MS LAWDER: I want to reassure you that we read every single page!

Ms Elvin: The CFC does not directly control this money; it is allocated to the urban renewal area of the directorate. But I think it is simply reflecting that, while we have progressed a number of new theatre studies, not all the money has yet been expended, so it has been rolled into the next year.

Mr Dawes: One of the key things that we look at as we go throughout the year is that I think it is important that when we are looking at our capital works program I do move things around in our capital works program from time to time as well, first to ensure that we have the right brief to make sure that when we go out to the market we are getting what we want. As well, there are a number of pieces of work, as we discussed last week, on city to the lake; that is part and parcel of what is happening and ongoing. We do move it around. It is the same with even capital works and the delivery of capital works. Depending on the timing when contracts are let, we do sometimes smooth things out just in case we hit some issues or problems with a particular project, to make sure that we get the right profile and our expenditure is appropriate.

MS LAWDER: Taking on board what you have said about the urban renewal part, was more money allocated to that particular task? I note that \$100,000 is only a small part of what has been transferred to next year.

Mr Dawes: Yes; that is a small component of that city to the lake fund.

MS LAWDER: I want to go a bit further down the page, “Gorman House multi-art hub”. The reasons why that \$300,000—

Mr Whitney: There are two principal reasons for that. There are two elements of the Gorman House work; one is the internal works and the other is landscape external works. There is a timing question around the best time to do those external landscape works. You will note that if you drive past Gorman House at the moment it is a building site. The courtyards are being developed at the moment and the plantings that will go in are winter plantings in order for the trees to establish and be ready for spring. So it is the second part. The first part of the project, which was the work internal to the building, has now been completed. This is the second part of that project; the contractors are on site and are anticipated to finish by the end of the first quarter of the new financial year.

MS LAWDER: Was it just landscaping or was it paving and landscaping?

Mr Whitney: It is paving and landscaping. It is along Batman Street, where there are major entrances to the Canberra Youth Theatre, also to Sage restaurant and a dance space that is used quite a lot, the Hatchery. It is trying to manage around keeping those businesses open, those activities operating, which has to be managed in a way that there is not an interruption to their business but that allows the work to continue.

MS LAWDER: What was the tender process for that? \$300,000 is quite a bit for landscaping.

Mr Whitney: It was part of a greater tender process for the works that were done at Gorman. That was an open tender process managed through Shared Services Procurement. FM Projects are the company that was successful with the major tender, which were substantially ahead of that, but they were involved. They sub-tendered that work out or subcontracted that work out.

MS LAWDER: I will look forward to seeing it when it is completed. Just over the page, the third one down, “Kingston visual arts hub (Feasibility)”—

Mr Whitney: The feasibility study was completed and released last weekend by the minister. There is a balance of money that was not spent in the feasibility study itself, but there is work being done within two of the buildings that will get those buildings prepared for the next part of the rollout of that feasibility study. One of those buildings is the former transport building. We are injecting new life into it, expanding activity beyond the Sunday markets. If you have been to those markets, some of the facilities are less than desirable, so we needed to get them ready for when the rest of the project is rolled out. So it is design work to look at toilets, facilities for storage and facilities for greater use of that space.

MS LAWDER: Finally, about halfway down the page, “Public art scheme”, \$410,000.

Mr Whitney: This is the last of the major public artworks to be installed later this year. The original location was Morshead Drive where the work is being done at the moment for the Majura Parkway extension, so a new location had to be found. A new location was identified at the arboretum. They have just completed some work of installing a new dam. That is not far from the location where our artwork is to go. To avoid double dislocation, if you like, we had to wait for that work on the dam to be completed. That work is now completed and we can begin the preparation and the rollout of the installation of this artwork.

MS LAWDER: So it is the one piece of artwork that is going to go into the arboretum?

Ms Whitney: It is one artwork, but there are two elements to the one artwork.

MS LAWDER: Is that the dam that I would see if I am driving down the Tuggeranong Parkway?

Mr Whitney: Yes.

MS LAWDER: You mentioned the Majura Parkway. There will be no new artwork around there?

Mr Whitney: No; that is correct. At this stage there is no funding for new artwork to be installed down there. The location for the artworks that will now be at the arboretum was near the Sylvia Curley bridge, but now there is the major overpass going there and the works would be completely disrupted from a visual aspect. The works are kinetic works, movable works; they pick up the migrating birds from Japan into the Jerrabomberra wetlands. The birds also now follow the lake around and go to the arboretum. And there are two forests that have Japanese-related trees. That is why we were able to find that location that provides a connection and a relationship of those artworks to the arboretum.

MS LAWDER: I have a quick follow-up, kind of unrelated. Talking about public art, I just wanted to ask the minister this: the “little men” statue artwork has been moved; is it a more successful location now?

Ms Burch: It will move into the courtyard of Gorman House, so I think it will be better protected from many enthusiasts late at night.

MS LAWDER: Good.

Ms Burch: And that will be installed as part of the courtyard.

MS LAWDER: Excellent.

THE CHAIR: If we go back to page 25 of BP B, table 25, which has the funding for arts engagement, what is the cause of the \$239,000 reduction in GPO and the \$200,000 in the total costs for arts?

Mr Whitney: That is principally driven by and connected to the earlier question about the Kingston Arts Precinct. The study was funded in previous years and that money has been expended. That is principally the drop in that GPO.

THE CHAIR: So nothing has been cut?

Mr Whitney: There is no cut to the arts funding.

THE CHAIR: A new question, Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Minister, the ACT and other jurisdictions have participated in a scheme to boost salaries of community sector workers. Have those increases flowed on to ACT arts sector workers, and what is happening there?

Ms Burch: There has been considerable work done around community sector workers. It has not been translated into the arts sector; that would be the short reply. Funding to key arts organisations and to arts programs have a CPI or an increase built in. You cannot replicate function for function from the community services sector into the arts sector, but Mr Whitney may talk more to that.

Mr Whitney: The community sector is covered by an award and by peak bodies that argue on behalf of the people that work in the community sector. There is no such industrial relationship within the arts sector. There is an organisation called NAVA, the National Association for the Visual Arts, that promotes and reflects what they believe to be appropriate salaries for arts workers. There is also the Australia Council for the Arts, which has an indication of the sorts of levels of funding at which individual artists in a project round should be receiving funding, but there is no formal setting of an award rate for arts workers within arts organisations. People are covered, through the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance, by an industrial award. They are people, for example, who are working in the Canberra Theatre Centre.

What has happened in the last two years, since we have been really developing the notion of arts hubs, consolidating activity and providing support to those arts hubs, is that the boards themselves who determine the level of salary have become more competitive in finding the appropriate and best people they can for those jobs. Those key arts organisations that manage arts hubs have in fact recruited to fill positions,

often attracting people from interstate to come and work in those positions. That probably is an indicator for us that those salary levels are competitive and are, within the arts sector, appropriate.

It is not reasonable to compare salaries for either the ACT government or the commonwealth government with arts sector salaries. There are quite different terms and conditions. The level of responsibilities that are undertaken by people in the key arts organisations are reflected in the salaries offered by the boards for those people.

DR BOURKE: Given that you have described some pressure within organisations to increase salaries to remain competitive, how is that going to be reflected in funding in the future?

Mr Whitney: The process of funding our key arts organisations is competitive. They need to apply on a five-year cycle. The applications have to contain within them a business plan and also an artistic plan. They are measured by an external peer review process. You may have noticed over the last few years that some key arts organisations are no longer successful in their funding application and those that are very strong and positive are in fact more successful in their process of application.

In the last few years you may have noticed that the Jigsaw Theatre Company, for example, was not delivering against the criteria that were set in our key performance indicators for key arts organisations. With that organisation no longer being funded it meant that we could redirect funding to other organisations. I mentioned Strathnairn before. Strathnairn and the Watson Arts Centre we saw as important cultural facilities and important parts of the landscape. We have provided additional funding for those organisations very specifically to engage people who are there as general managers or chief executive officers.

DR BOURKE: Is it possible to quantify the number of people working in the not-for-profit arts sector and the private enterprise arts sector in the ACT? Do you have numbers of people working in those areas?

Mr Whitney: No. I am a bit interested in the second part of your question.

DR BOURKE: The private enterprise arts sector.

Mr Whitney: I guess you are talking about—

DR BOURKE: Not for profit and private enterprise.

Mr Whitney: Yes; I am just trying to think who would be in that private sector. The only commercial gallery is Beaver Galleries and then in the screen sector there is the Academy of Interactive Entertainment. Outside that it would be interesting to see who would be in the for-profit sector. Certainly, in the not-for-profit sector we could ask our arts organisations to give a scan of the numbers of staff that they have and the salary levels that they provide. That would be determined by those boards, as to the number of people they have working in those organisations.

Ms Burch: They may report that routinely in their own reporting requirements, such

as annual reports. We would have to go out and directly ask to get that sort of feedback.

Mr Whitney: It certainly would not be dissected down; we would have a lump sum for salaries that they pay. We do not keep tabs on individual payments. I mentioned earlier the equivalent interstate. I am aware of a couple of our large organisations that have recruited recently, and I know the level of salary that they are paying there, and their general managers. But I would not be able to tell you across the arts organisations what the individual salaries are.

Ms Burch: Often a question raised by arts advocates is around salaries and conditions in the arts sector. We are not unique in our response. I think this government is very supportive of arts organisations and arts practice through funding to key arts organisations. They use their global moneys as they can, to get the best result internally. Through our grants program we facilitate financial support to individual artists. It is always something that would be of interest to arts practice. Indeed just last night, the news in regard to decisions by George Brandis around the \$105 million out of the Australian Council is causing some angst across the arts community. I think there is apprehension about that disadvantaging the emerging and new artists and the alternative art stream. So funding to arts is always complex, Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Thank you very much. Finally, I noticed mention of a touring exhibition from CMAG that boosted audiences. Maybe you can tell me more about that exhibition.

Ms Elvin: I think this is a reference to our forthcoming exhibition. Is that the one you are referring to, Dr Bourke?

DR BOURKE: I think it is indicated in a table.

Ms Burch: CFC and the Canberra Theatre have had a very successful year. They have had a couple of great productions. *Sweet Charity* was very successful.

Ms Elvin: Dr Bourke, are you referring to an exhibition or a theatre production?

DR BOURKE: There was a reference to a travelling exhibition. I do not have the note in front of me. I will come back to it.

Ms Elvin: I think that may be on page 127. Perhaps while you are finding it, I will talk about it. This is a major exhibition of contemporary Chinese ink art that the Chief Minister will be opening next week. It is contemporary ink art from mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong. It is really a reinterpretation of what is a very classical Chinese art form. The ink in this case is sometimes Coca-Cola, for example. It will be a major exhibition that will have a national tour after it finishes its run at CMAG. It will go to Brisbane, Sydney and Bendigo.

There is a lot of interest, of course, in the regions it covers. There is a huge number of Chinese-speaking people in Canberra. There is a big Chinese community, as we know. I think Mandarin is the second most frequently spoken language in Canberra. So there is huge interest in this exhibition. There are a number of visiting artists coming out

from Taiwan to participate in the exhibition and in associated activities. So it is really our big exhibition for the forthcoming financial year.

DR BOURKE: Table 3 on page 131 is the one I was looking for, which has the reference to that touring exhibition. When does that open?

Ms Elvin: That opens next Wednesday.

DR BOURKE: How long will it be open for?

Ms Elvin: It is on for a number of months in Canberra and then, as I say, it goes on a national tour.

THE CHAIR: I have a couple of questions about Kingston Foreshore. Apart from the \$90,000 that was rolled over this year, what funding is in the budget to progress the Kingston Foreshore arts precinct?

Mr Dawes: One of the key focuses that I mentioned earlier is urban renewal. Again we go through the budget processes, and there was not a lot forthcoming in the budget because it came back to priorities. The LDA has undertaken to work very closely with arts and other stakeholders to look at what the requirements are, and we have a very good handle on what the requirements are.

We had a very brief discussion on this at the LDA board meeting yesterday. There will be a formal presentation to the board. So I cannot go into too much about commercial confidentiality, but I will say we are looking at taking some of that land, a little additional land in and around that precinct, potentially as an englobo sale to the market, and specifying some of the requirements that we need, which will be some of the arts facilities and some arts spaces. We will go out with an expression of interest. It will be a fairly long process but we feel that in that way we can get some innovation also from the private sector, and some of those assets handed back to the territory.

We are in the early stages but that is a key focus, to ensure that we bring that arts precinct to fruition and to have it being planned. We have worked closely with arts. Colin Stewart has done some of that work. Chris Purdon, before she retired from Purdon Associates, had done quite a bit of work on that. We have taken all of that into account, and we will be presenting that to the LDA board as an option at the very next board meeting. Hopefully, after that, we will be able to get that out to the market, depending on the board decision.

THE CHAIR: When would the EOI go out and when would we expect construction to begin?

Mr Dawes: With the timing for it, we are advanced on a number of the different options. We would envisage an expression of interest going out in and around the last quarter of this calendar year. So we are looking at around October to go out, leaving a bit of time for innovation, to make sure that we get the best planning outcome, to ensure that we have the right assets that will be returned back to the territory and that they are going to be fit for purpose. We will be making a decision sometime in early 2016, or very near to that.

THE CHAIR: From the plans that were unveiled last week, what percentage of the space is given over to commercial, what percentage is given over to residential and what percentage is given over to the arts?

Mr Dawes: I will have to take some of that on notice. We have tried to ensure that what has gone out, from an arts perspective—

Ms Burch: 7½ thousand square metres was the figure I was interested in on the weekend. That is what was in the paper.

THE CHAIR: For what?

Ms Burch: For arts.

Mr Dawes: For the arts facilities.

Ms Burch: And the others we can take on notice and provide.

Mr Dawes: We are doing a bit of market sounding, too, Mr Smyth. One of the key parts of our doing this is to look at what, from a commercial space and residential perspective, is required. That is again how we will take that to the market and allow the private sector to innovate as well. As the minister has pointed out, the important thing is the 7½ thousand square metres which will come back to the territory.

Ms Burch: David can go through the detail of what that will look like.

Mr Whitney: With respect to that 7½ thousand the consultation process was with all of the arts organisations we are looking at moving onto the site there. So it will be studio and workshop space, gallery exhibition and retail space, education and training space, meeting rooms, service areas, storage, accommodation for visiting artists and also shared office accommodation and administration space. That is the intent for that 7½ thousand square metres.

There is also, in terms of open public ground, a proposal in the Stewart report of about a 5,000-square-metre plaza area, loosely bordered by the Glassworks, the Fitters' Workshop and the former transport building. This will become an area for activation for the public domain area. But it is not a built form as such; it is activating the open space that is there.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke, a new question.

DR BOURKE: I want to ask some questions about the restoration and maintenance of public art. We have heard already about the restoration and relocation of "little men". What other work was undertaken in the past financial year, minister?

Ms Burch: The much-loved *Other Side of Midnight* is getting some minor maintenance work. It is the delightful images down near the Canberra Centre. It was designed to attract families and little ones, and it certainly has done that. Mr Whitney may have some detail about some maintenance. It is very minor and I think it reflects

how well loved it is. It is a bit like the “little men”. Regularly the metal is polished and it is developing a wonderful patina from being handled by the public as well.

Mr Whitney: I cannot answer the question about every single piece of work that has had some maintenance and repair on it. I could provide that for you but I have not got it right here.

DR BOURKE: I do not think that is necessary.

Mr Whitney: Thank you. What I would like to say, though, is that we have recurrent funding of \$150,000 to maintain the collection. There are over 100 artworks in the collection, and the vast majority of the work that we do is in fact completely standard cleaning and maintenance of the artwork. Regrettably there was a flurry of vandalism for a while but that seems to have fallen away. I think that probably the opposition to public art has ameliorated and people have become respectful of the artwork.

The minister just mentioned the *Other Side of Midnight*, which is probably the most-repaired or most-cleaned artwork that we have. Mainly it is the scuffing of children’s shoes as they sit on the horses and have their photographs taken and play with that.

We need to do some work on a piece in the city, in City Walk. It is quite an interesting piece. It is quite a convoluted series of tube work that has been in the ground now for about 15 years and needs to get repainted. Of course, you have to cover the whole thing to protect it while it is being stripped back and painted. We are also doing some work on the *Toku* artwork down at Canberra Nara Peace Park. The exposure to the lake means that we have to go and repair and fix up that artwork.

There is a routine maintenance program where all the works have to be washed and cleaned and maintained every year and there is also a schedule in place where works are identified now for the more substantial repair work that is undertaken and that has to be completed. But we do have an allocation, as I said, of \$150,000 for us to undertake that work to be completed. For the first two years of the percent for public art scheme, there was one per cent that was allocated for maintenance of the artwork which continues to roll out for the various works that were funded during that program.

DR BOURKE: How do you decide on priorities for restoration and maintenance?

Mr Whitney: Each year the collection is valued for insurance purposes and also there is a condition audit that is undertaken for each of the artworks. Then that informs the nature of the work that is needed to maintain them. For some of the more robust bronze works, it is simply a question of a wash and a wax. For some of the other works, it might require a more complex approach to repair and maintain those.

Also, sometimes works are identified that are at the end of their particular life. There was a work called *LaserWrap* that was projected as a laser work onto the old health building, and the lasers were ageing and the cost to keep replacing them was becoming quite disproportionate to the value of the artwork, as opposed to the cost of maintaining. We in fact, in consultation with the artists, decommissioned that artwork because the lasers were 25 years old and they were not working. That came through as

part of that process of the condition report and the asset valuations that are undertaken each year.

Ms Burch: And of course with *On the Staircase*, we just had to find another location for it. We do not have the ongoing cost of damage and repair for that. That conversation also was had with the artist. It is not only about repair but where it would end up.

DR BOURKE: What is the value of our public art collection?

Mr Whitney: I will need to take that question on notice. I think it is immeasurable. I think it is fantastic. But that is not the answer that you need today. So I will take that question on notice and we will come back to you with that.

DR BOURKE: And maybe some tracking over time as to whether it is increasing in value or—

Mr Whitney: There is absolutely no question that the public art collection has increased in value substantially—not necessarily just the works that we inherited from the previous National Capital Development Commission and works that have been in the TAMS collection for some time but works that have been installed through that percent for arts scheme have now, according to their annual valuation, increased quite substantially. We could certainly provide that information.

Ms Burch: Would that include the gifts that we get from different embassies and—

Mr Whitney: The gifts tend to be measured more in TAMS. They receive those cultural gifts. We would not have access to that information. But certainly we do have one gift which is from the greater Chinese community, the statue of Confucius, which is at Dickson. I am trying to think. There is a work in Glebe Park which is a gift from the Indian community, a statue of Gandhi. There is also a work—and I will need to be very careful; I am about to say “Latvian”; I just want to be clear it might be Latvian or Hungarian; and I apologise to both communities if I have got it wrong—which one of those communities has donated. It is a piece in Glebe Park. These are works that are a part of our collection.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder.

MS LAWDER: On page 131 of budget paper B there are the accountability indicators for output classes 1 and 1.1. I was surprised at the customer satisfaction level of around 80 per cent. I thought it might have been higher. Are there particular facilities where the satisfaction is lower and some where it is higher?

Ms Elvin: Those are targets. Our aim, I guess, is to do better than that and we consistently do. We do undertake customer satisfaction surveying at all our venues throughout the year and those rates are consistently higher than that. I cannot think of any facilities where there are particular indications of any dissatisfaction.

MS LAWDER: Are there any particular facilities where it is much higher?

Ms Elvin: My recollection is that in all our facilities the rates would be up in the 90s, 90 per cent, and there is no—

Ms Burch: Just look at the sheer numbers and reflect that it is across visitations and the education programs in CMAG. You have 700 education programs.

Ms Elvin: Across some museums and galleries we this year are providing nearly 700 programs and a lot of those are repeat visits. I feel that that repeat visitation and repeat usage of our programs is another very powerful indicator that what we are doing is right. For example this year we are having a terrific year in theatre. The minister mentioned some of our really big productions like *Sweet Charity* and *Le Noir*. Between them they achieved 18,000 patrons. I think we are putting on things that people want to see and that people keep on coming back to have further experiences with, which I think again consolidates those customer satisfaction figures.

MS LAWDER: How long has the target been at 80 per cent?

Ms Elvin: We have kept it at that level for some years. We feel it is a good target. I think 80 per cent is a good satisfaction level but, as I say, we always do try to surpass that and indeed we succeed in doing so.

MS LAWDER: If you are achieving in the high 90s it might be time to review the target.

Ms Elvin: Put the target up?

Ms Burch: Stretch it.

Ms Elvin: We will certainly look at that. It is a good point, thank you.

THE CHAIR: There is time for one last question. Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Minister, can you tell me about the number of educational and community programs provided by the CTC referred to in the accountability indicators in table 3?

Ms Burch: Ms Elvin can go to that. I think she has just mentioned that across the museum facilities they are looking at 700 education programs. I had the pleasure of dropping in to CMAG a week or so ago with a little preschool group that were in there. It is just fabulous to see these wee little ones being introduced to art and culture and enjoying their participation in that.

Ms Elvin: Certainly, as I mentioned, across our museums and galleries we have achieved 700 educational and community programs this year. That includes everything, as the minister said, from programs for the early childhood sector, which is a sector which we particularly specialise in, to this year we have been talking about the touring exhibition of Chinese ink art. That will give us an opportunity to develop programs for the secondary school sector. We think that will be a particularly good one to engage that older age group with.

But we do programs across our sites. We do a range of educational programs at the Canberra Theatre Centre, for example. Vocational education and training is something that we specialise in there, in theatre technical skills. We have hosted the Bell Shakespeare schools festival this year, the inaugural festival, and we hope to continue that in further years. We provide a range of children's theatre activities.

I would say across all our sites education is really a key priority because we feel that it is a critical part of any child's education but it is also a way in which we can encourage the arts audiences of the future. I think if we, at a very early age, make them feel comfortable in the gallery space of a theatre then they will keep coming back, they will keep feeling comfortable with that experience, and I think it will be very enriching for them.

DR BOURKE: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Time is up, and we will finish there. Minister, I thank you and your officials for your attendance today. A number of questions have been taken on notice. If answers could be provided within five working days, that would be appreciated. A transcript will be provided when it is available, for correction or alteration or additional information as you see fit. With that, members, we will now finish and resume at 2 o'clock this afternoon with gaming and racing, followed by industrial relations, followed by sport and recreation.

Sitting suspended from 12.16 to 2 pm.

THE CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to this, the last afternoon of estimates for 2015-16. We have done well. All we have to do is gaming and racing, industrial relations and sport and recreation. Welcome, minister, to you and your officials.

Please be aware that the proceedings today are being recorded and will be transcribed by Hansard and then published, and that the proceedings are also being broadcast and webstreamed. On the table in front of you is the pink privilege statement. Could you please confirm for the committee that you have read the card and understand the implications of privilege?

Mr Jones: I have.

THE CHAIR: So noted. Minister, would you like to make an opening statement before we proceed to questions?

Ms Burch: Thank you, chair. Before we go to questions, I will just make a few comments. The ACT government stands committed to ensuring the continued viability and vibrancy of our local racing industry and community club sector. The ACT government has continued to partner with the racing industry to progress strategic policy commitments contained in the memorandum of understanding signed by the government and the three racing codes in December 2013.

The key deliverables include completing the investigation of co-location opportunities with the three codes—and we completed that earlier this year—continuing to

recognise the ongoing financial and social contribution of the industry to territorians by confirming existing financial support for next year and the outyears, as provided in the budget, and undertaking preliminary work on developing long-term contractual arrangements, including the establishment of key performance indicators—and work on this is set to increase and continue over the coming months.

The ACT government continues to work with the clubs industry to progress commitments in the memorandum of understanding with ClubsACT. Progress report 2, issued to all clubs earlier this month, details the significant progress made to date. Following work across government and the industry, legislation passed the Assembly earlier this month to commence stage 2 of the gaming machine reform package.

The legislation establishes a trading scheme for class C gaming machine authorisations and a phased reduction in the total number of machines operating in the territory. Hotels and taverns will be given the opportunity to divest themselves of outdated gaming machines by selling the authorisation, should they like, to community clubs, but they will not be allowed to operate class C machines.

Tax changes are being made that will benefit the clubs. The gaming reform package complements existing mechanisms put in place by this government, including the community clubs task force, to support clubs to explore every opportunity for diversifying revenue away from gaming machines. The ACT government recognises the importance of providing the right support to ensure the industries within this portfolio can continue to contribute to the economic and social wellbeing of the Canberra community today and for generations to come.

Before we go to questions, I would like to take the opportunity to thank Greg Jones, as commissioner, and his team over at the commission of gaming and racing and also the staff of EDD for their policy support. I particularly recognise Louise Gilding, if I may, for her work on the gaming reform bill. I know Mark Kalleske is also in the room. They were ably assisted by many across EDD, but it was a significant piece of work, and I just wanted to put on record my formal recognition and thanks.

THE CHAIR: Minister, what responsibilities did the commission have when reports of live baiting in the greyhound industry were aired, and what was the outcome of any investigations?

Ms Burch: The commission did work with greyhounds ACT on this, and certainly worked with them to investigate incidents in relation to any people that were connected to that. I will let Mr Jones go to the detail, but then I might make some closing comments about what we are proposing to do next with this.

Mr Jones: The first thing, when the *Four Corners* program came out, was the commission contacted the Canberra Greyhound Racing Club to work with them to do, effectively, a stocktake of everyone that had raced in Canberra over the last 10 years to see whether they had been identified in the *Four Corners* program. In the subsequent weeks to that *Four Corners* program, the greyhound club and the commission worked with interstate greyhound organisations, as well as the regulatory bodies interstate, to identify in detail those persons that had either been named or were associated with the live baiting issue.

It turned out soon after that that there were only two persons that were identified in a very extensive list across the east coast of Australia that had ever raced in the ACT, and they were both two or three years ago. One had a couple of entries on, I think, one weekend and the other one had, I think, only one entry into ACT racing. Since then, we have been working with our interstate colleagues as well as the local club to monitor any updated trainers or persons of interest that have been identified interstate that may or may not have visited here. So far there have been no further persons identified other than those two.

The commission continues to liaise with the club on activity in that area. More recently there was a meeting between the club chair and secretary of the commission and the minister to get an update on what is happening, particularly interstate. There are some consequences from part of that discussion which the minister may elaborate on.

Ms Burch: As part of that discussion there was a keen interest to look at what was happening in Queensland, but we were also aware of the report and those integrity matters being considered in New South Wales. Part of the discussion with Mr Collier from Canberra greyhounds involved the measures in actions in relation to animal cruelty, animal welfare and racing integrity. Just this week I wrote to the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services and said that I would be supportive of a review of the Animal Welfare Act 1992 with a view to increasing those penalties.

The message to our community is that we recognise greyhound racing has a place amongst our three racing codes, but there will be absolutely no tolerance of animal cruelty. This was a way to reinforce our very good record to date, and to send a clear message. I would like to provide to the committee a copy of those letters.

THE CHAIR: All right. Will there be a review of the Animal Welfare Act?

Ms Burch: I have written this week to the responsible minister saying I am supportive of it, and I will follow that up with conversations. I think it is appropriate to review it. The progress of that is in the hands of the outcomes of the review process, but it has not been reviewed for some time. Given everything around greyhound racing, it is appropriate for us as a jurisdiction, and certainly as a government, to consider it.

THE CHAIR: Beyond that is the government considering any other new measures to ensure that it does not occur in the ACT?

Ms Burch: I think it is the strong integrity that we expect out of the industry here, and recognising ACT greyhounds' report under greyhounds Australia or greyhounds New South Wales. They are going through a report at the moment. I know, from talking with the greyhound industry—Mr Jones can go to more detail—that they have increased their surveillance and other activities, as well as their camera positioning out at the track.

Mr Jones: To further expand on what the minister is saying, additional security cameras have been installed out at the track, particularly for after-hours and training sessions. In addition, in terms of the integrity points, we are watching very carefully

the investigations that are being conducted by our interstate colleagues. Victoria and Queensland have already produced their preliminary reports on activity in the greyhound racing industry in their jurisdictions. Amongst an extensive range of recommendations, some tightening of integrity and separation of operational matters from the steward's investigations and that sort of thing has been recommended. The New South Wales investigation is not due till September. We are obviously keenly waiting on the outcomes of those to see what impacts and implications that may have for the ACT operations.

THE CHAIR: Are there any reports of live baiting, or cruelty to greyhounds in the ACT?

Mr Jones: Not that we are aware of; not that we have received. We liaise extensively with the TAMS officials that look after the Animal Welfare Act. They have done their own investigations as well and they have no reports that have been substantiated on live baiting in the ACT.

THE CHAIR: Have you met with the RSPCA or the ACT greyhounds support network?

Mr Jones: The commission has not, given our regulatory role on greyhound racing, but we understand that Minister Rattenbury has met certainly RSPCA—I am not sure about the other body—and has obviously taken submissions from them on that. I think that is a matter for the TAMS area.

THE CHAIR: Minister, have you met with the RSPCA—

Ms Burch: No, I have not, and they—

THE CHAIR: or the ACT greyhounds support network?

Ms Burch: I am answering your question, Mr Smyth.

THE CHAIR: I had not finished the question.

Ms Burch: No, I have not. RSPCA have not made direct contact with me or provided any reports or suggestion of information that they would have about live baiting. If they did, we would pursue it vigorously. But they have not put to us any question. I think our response to date has been very clear. We are not taking these matters lightly and we will not tolerate any such behaviour.

THE CHAIR: And the ACT greyhounds support network?

Ms Burch: No.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke, a new question.

DR BOURKE: Thank you, chair. Minister, given that you do not handle casino sales every week, could you detail for me how you managed the extra work involved in the Aquis casino acquisition? What was learned about the refining of that process?

Ms Burch: No, you do not go through the sale process of a casino every day. The commission certainly had a very active role in the integrity of that process, of making sure that probity issues were addressed. I might let the commissioner go to the detail on that.

Mr Jones: Thank you, minister. The original proposal for the sale of the Canberra casino was linked with the sale of the Cairns casino in Queensland. An unsolicited bid from the Aquis group was made initially to Casinos Austria, the owner of the Cairns casino. As part of their commercial negotiations, Casinos Austria linked the conditions of sale to the purchase of the Canberra casino as well. In other words, it was a package deal.

On that basis, the commission and the Queensland regulator did a joint probity investigation which was undertaken for the majority of last year, 2014. It was mostly driven by the Queensland regulator, given the relative risk in terms of the purchase of the Cairns casino versus the ACT—just the size. Just to put that into perspective, the total package deal for the Cairns casino, which included a hotel, was valued at something like \$360 million, whereas the package for the ACT casino, the Canberra casino, was valued in the order of \$10 million to \$12 million. In terms of size, and I guess risk, they were sort of chalk and cheese. Nevertheless, given the purchaser and the potential owner was the same, we conducted a joint investigation.

One of the conditions due to the complexities of the ownership arrangements of the Cairns casino, which was owned through a trust arrangement, was that the deal in Queensland had to be finalised in November last year due to a whole range of circumstances, mostly particular to Queensland. They did not meet that time frame. So right towards the end of last year when I guess the offer for the Cairns casino was withdrawn because it did not meet that time frame, further negotiations continued with Aquis and Casinos Austria. A separation of the two properties was made and the sale process continued for the Canberra casino in isolation from Cairns.

Given that we had just about completed our probity investigations conducted jointly with Queensland, we were in a position to give an undertaking to the Aquis group that we could complete our probity investigations by the end of 2014 calendar year, which we did. We had settlement of the sale process on Christmas Eve, late last year. That was the process and how it evolved.

In terms of resource implications, yes, that was significant. It was a huge undertaking given the complexities of the Aquis group. Through the Queensland regulator, we had two significant consultants employed at Aquis's cost which advised on financial arrangements, particularly on the source of funds and also on the legal arrangements, their structure and how that was going to work. So we had expert advice from two consultants put on by Queensland, paid for by Aquis. That helped inform us through the probity process. I missed the last part of your question.

DR BOURKE: What did you learn—possibly to make sure that there is a sale going through in another state at the same time?

Ms Burch: That was a lot of hard work.

Mr Jones: It is extremely time consuming. It is very complex. Having consultants on is absolutely essential to get that expert advice. Doing probity on overseas-based companies is extremely difficult, very time consuming and very resource intensive. Yes, there were a lot of learnings coming out of that. I would not be looking forward to another process like that in the near future, given the resource implications.

DR BOURKE: Given that you did a mostly shared investigation with your counterparts in Queensland—their sale was worth \$360 million and yours was worth \$10 million—was there an appropriate split of the resources use provided by each commission or did you do more than your fair share?

Mr Jones: Roughly, in terms of discussions of strategies and who we investigated, who we interviewed, that sort of thing, that was done equally because we were both stakeholders in the deal. I guess that if either regulatory body was not satisfied then the deal would not have gone ahead. That was part of the arrangements. Other than internal staffing costs, given all the external costs were met by the Aquis group, there was not any need, I guess, to pro rata the significant costs. Each organisation just met its own internal costs.

DR BOURKE: So Aquis met the costs of the consultants?

Mr Jones: Correct, yes.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder, a new question.

MS LAWDER: Minister, could you give your views on the final outcome of the sale of ACTTAB and what lessons the government may have learned?

Ms Burch: The sale of ACTTAB sits with the Treasurer. It does not sit with me as Minister for Racing and Gaming. I think what was learned from that is that we have an investment of over \$100 million in the Canberra community.

MS LAWDER: Does the commission have any ongoing role in the sale of ACTTAB?

Mr Jones: Given that the sale was completed in October, our ongoing role is our normal compliance audit role with Tabcorp as the new owner. That is continuing. Our role is relatively busy with Tabcorp, given the number of changes that they are proposing. They have a bit of a different business model to the previous ACTTAB operations. At the moment we are just going through a number of significant proposals from Tabcorp to migrate their IT systems to their Melbourne mainframe. So there is significant involvement from us in that in terms of our approvals of those systems.

MS LAWDER: So that change—the implementation and regulation of the Totalisator Act 2014—is fully up and running? Are there any further changes planned to the act?

Mr Jones: The tote act was commenced I think earlier last year—

MS LAWDER: I note how you cleverly avoided the use of the word.

Ms Burch: I nearly had it. We call it just the tote.

Mr Jones: Yes. That is much simpler, especially on a Friday afternoon! The tote act, for simplicity, commenced in about March last year. We are going through all the implementations of that in terms of the probity required—sorry, the compliance requirements and things like that, the obligations under that act with Tabcorp. So that is an ongoing process under that act.

MS LAWDER: Have there been any audits of tote activities?

Mr Jones: Yes, definitely. Virtually from day one, we have intensified our audit program, given they are a new operator. Although reputable obviously, they are a new operator in town. So we have intensified our audit program on that and have been working with Tabcorp to make various changes to their operating procedures and their models, especially as this relates to their systems which, as I said earlier, are due to be migrated by the end of August to their interstate existing IT framework.

MS LAWDER: Are they scheduled audits, random audits or a combination?

Mr Jones: Our usual compliance program is a combination of both. Some are completely unannounced random audits. We do have what we call keyhole access, which is a desk audit to their systems where we can plug into their systems on a read-only basis and look at their activity. That gives us real-time exact confirmation, for example, of their activity reports or their tax returns in terms of their sports bookmaking, for example.

MS LAWDER: Were there any issues identified in those audits?

Mr Jones: Nothing of significance; you would expect, especially with a new business coming to town, that there would be one or two minor ones, which we have found. They are not of significance. In fact, Tabcorp I think on one of them discovered it before we did, between audits, and immediately notified us. We worked through that. That was a relatively minor legacy which has continued on from ACTTAB operations.

MS LAWDER: In this deal with Tabcorp, there was the 50-year licence at zero tax on tote earnings and less than one per cent on the sports bookmaking licence; is that correct?

Mr Jones: Yes.

MS LAWDER: Has the government seen any benefits from this deal at present?

Mr Jones: As the regulator, we do not have a comment on the sale process. That would be a matter for Treasury and their negotiations.

MS LAWDER: Thank you.

Ms Burch: And I understand that the Tabcorp board was before the committee a number of days ago.

THE CHAIR: Just as a supp to that, what is the future support now for the racing industry in the ACT, the local racing industry?

Mr Jones: Economic Development might like to comment on this, but basically budget appropriations give ongoing or a committed support to the racing industry in the order of approximately \$8 million, but I could be corrected on that.

Mr Dawes: As per the budget papers, again the government is committed to the four-year funding there, which is just under \$42 million over the four years for the various codes. Just over \$8 million was provided in 2014-15, in 2015-16 it goes up to \$8.26 million and then in the final year of this period, in 2018-19, \$8.636 million as well. So there is just under \$42 million.

THE CHAIR: What certainty does the racing industry have long term that the government will continue to support it?

Ms Burch: As I said in my opening statement, we will progress some work on longer contractual arrangements, but you can see in the budget in the outyears that they are now built in as a regular activity. They were given that assurance at the time of sale. They have continued to have that assurance from me, but I understand their desire to have longer term arrangements. We will work through the MOU process to provide that certainty for them.

Mr Dawes: Yes, just to add to that—

THE CHAIR: What table was that you were quoting from?

Mr Dawes: That is in the budget papers as well. I have not got the page here in front of me, but there is a table in the budget where we talk about what funding we are providing. It is on page 76 of the Chief Minister and Treasury paper, BP B. That outlines what we are providing. It is in as a lump sum, chair, but I am more than happy to provide you with a per annum break-up to make it easier.

THE CHAIR: All right; yes, that would be fine. Dr Bourke, a new question?

DR BOURKE: I might go back to that previous topic. I presume that there are not any savings to the commission in terms of workload as a result of the transfer from ACTTAB to Tabcorp, from that particular operation? In fact, it sounds as though you have actually got more work to do; is that right?

Mr Jones: Certainly in the initial stages there is more work. Partly that is because it is a new operator in town and therefore, under our risk profile, that risk goes up. No doubt as they settle in and we become comfortable with their operations, that risk profile will be adjusted accordingly. I guess that in the short term there are resource implications for the migration of their IT networks, particularly to Victoria, in terms of approvals. They are quite complex and quite detailed. But once that is done, I would imagine that later on in the year, after all that migration has occurred and we are comfortable with those operations, our risk profile will reflect probably a lower level of resources.

DR BOURKE: Coming back to the topic of animal welfare, which we were discussing previously, do you have any role in horseracing with regard to animal welfare in horseracing or harness racing?

Mr Jones: Do we have an active role? No, we do not. No concerns have come to us about either cruelty or mistreatment of horses or horseracing. There is a debate within the horseracing industry about the use of whips and things like that. Obviously, doping in terms of horses is a concern of all regulatory bodies, particularly within the racing industry itself. The thoroughbred racing industry has a very extensive network of integrity and monitoring of its own activity, much more extensive than the greyhound industry, and they tend to be a lot more self-regulated in terms of how that is conducted. It is really just the size of operation and resource allocation. I do not recall having any complaints about the treatment of horses—or ill-treatment of horses, as the case may be.

DR BOURKE: What sort of matters does the Racing Appeals Tribunal handle?

Mr Jones: The Racing Appeals Tribunal is an opportunity for registered operators such as a trainer or perhaps a jockey within the industry who has had disciplinary action taken against them by the relevant racing club. Again, the first point of integrity and compliance in terms of racing activity is with each racing code or each racing body. As an independent appeals mechanism, the Racing Appeals Tribunal will hear appeals based on a decision. For example, if a trainer was suspended for a period of time, they could appeal to the Racing Appeals Tribunal against either the length of that suspension or the fact that there was a suspension at all.

DR BOURKE: That does not cover owners or, should I say, other identities?

Ms Burch: Other identities?

Mr Jones: No; it is only registered persons who are approved by the racing code. To be honest, I am not sure whether it covers owners or not. It certainly does trainers and jockeys that are actively involved in the conduct of the racing.

DR BOURKE: Yes, because they can be suspended. But people can be warned off, too, can't they?

Mr Jones: They certainly can, yes. That is all under the auspices of the racing club, or the racing body as the case may be, in each state.

DR BOURKE: So they would have an opportunity to appeal to the tribunal about that, or is that just the—

Mr Jones: Given that they can be warned off, I think that would be right and they would have an appeal or access to the Racing Appeals Tribunal to have their disciplinary action, as it were, independently heard.

DR BOURKE: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Minister, the co-location of the three racing codes—we have had the review. What is happening now?

Ms Burch: The review and the report are being tabled. The report, I think, resolves or recognises that Thoroughbred Park will stay on site. Now it has certainty so we can continue to develop there. The greyhounds effectively will stay where they are. The work for harness, to find or maintain appropriate accommodation for them, will be considered within the broader work that will be happening around that precinct of EPIC.

Mr Dawes: Just to add to that, I think we entered part of this last week when we appeared under urban renewal. I just want to reinforce what was said there. Obviously, as the minister has already pointed out, we are looking at providing certainty to the three codes. We are working now with harness racing to look at how that can remain and be incorporated at EPIC. But we are looking at the broader opportunities with EPIC as discussed last week. It is some 80 hectares. We are looking at what has been done in other jurisdictions—there has been some very good work done in other jurisdictions, for example in Brisbane, in particular—and how we can ensure that we get better facilities and enhance the facilities at EPIC as well as looking at how some of the costs and upgrades there can be offset.

THE CHAIR: Minister, as the racing minister, have you had any discussions with Capital Metro on the effects of Thoroughbred Park not moving on the capital metro project?

Ms Burch: I think Thoroughbred Park are quite pleased that they are staying where they are. As a member of this government, there are broad discussions with Capital Metro around the various development areas that will be involved in that corridor between Civic and Gungahlin.

THE CHAIR: But in your capacity as racing minister, have you had discussions with Capital Metro?

Ms Burch: I have answered you. Yes, and it goes to the answer I have just given you.

THE CHAIR: What was discussed?

Ms Burch: The location of Thoroughbred Park, the impact of the co-location study and that Thoroughbred Park is very keen and very pleased that they have certainty so they can get on now and invest in their precinct there.

THE CHAIR: Was it the government's preference for it to stay there or were they happy to see them move?

Ms Burch: The co-location study, Mr Smyth—I am quite happy to refer you to the link; I am sure it is available online—resolves that. To consider a greenfield investment involved an extraordinary amount of money which was not sensible or a priority, or really for government to have a great appetite to continue. But there was merit to stay and continue to invest on their precinct where they are. Hence we did the work. It was the right thing to do the work. There was a level of interest at different

points across the three codes. We went in and did the work, looked at a greenfield site, looked at co-locating the three disciplines on one site. Each had merits and disadvantages, and the resolution is as it is.

THE CHAIR: What assistance will now be given to harness racing in the ACT?

Ms Burch: We will continue to support and make sure that they have a presence here as we go through. Mr Dawes can go back and talk about the precinct at EPIC.

Mr Dawes: As I have stated, when you look at capital metro, they had the showground, or EPIC, remain there, and you have the racing facilities there. That is on the transit corridor for the light rail. So it works for passenger movements very well there. One of the key things, coming back to your broader question about the harness racing, is that we will be working with harness racing and EPIC to make sure that their presence is maintained there and see how that can be incorporated in any future redevelopment.

I do not envisage seeing the whole site—as I said, it is 85 hectares of land there; I do not think there is any need to be doing major shifts away from where they are currently. It will be just a matter of how we can enhance some of those facilities. As you are aware, some of those buildings are quite old and ageing; they need a refresh. Perhaps with some of the redevelopment as we go through there and look at what we can do there, that will all need to be sorted as we further do some of the master planning.

Ms Burch: And also in the feasibility study. Whilst we are talking around harness at EPIC, that would be considered. But it is also to further explore those other opportunities, whether arrangements and agreements can be made that enhance harness and Thoroughbred Park. These are matters that we will still work through. The co-location study is resolved, and it has resolved to keep greyhounds and thoroughbreds where they are. It has also resolved that harness has a place in this city; it is now just working through where their new home is.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke, a new question.

DR BOURKE: Thank you. Minister, in terms of turnover and the number of horses raced at Thoroughbred Park, how does it rank in size with other tracks in New South Wales or even in Australia?

Ms Burch: It is successful for the size of the product that it puts out. It is a regional track. There is a grade, and I must admit that it is not coming readily to mind, but in the racing code there is a tiered system, with the Melbourne Cup and the Sydney races at one end moving around through to country races. It does hold its own. The shift over the last couple of years to have the Canberra Cup and the Black Opal on one day in March has been very successful; their numbers continue to increase. I have been out there to the last couple of Black Opal and Canberra Cup days, and they are well patronised. It is a successful day of racing in Canberra. The regular meets are increasingly getting good numbers as well.

DR BOURKE: What sort of numbers are we talking about, minister?

Ms Burch: I do not have it in front of me, but I am quite happy to provide it. I have no doubt that Peter Stubbs and his crew would be more than happy to give us that information.

DR BOURKE: How busy is that compared with the other tracks in the same tier that you talked about before?

Ms Burch: It holds its own. It definitely holds its own. In fact, I think it might hit the proverbial punch above its weight as far as a regional piece of activity is concerned. And they are diversifying. Whilst their focus will always be on thoroughbreds, we had the Horsefest there last year, and they are expanding into hospitality and being a venue for other functions and activities.

Mr Dawes: If I could just add something, I think they have taken on a new caterer there and they are looking at how they can enhance that part of their business to cater more broadly for the economic part of the city that are looking for small venues to hold events or whatever the case may be. They have certainly got a niche market there; it is quite a nice venue overlooking the track and that sort of thing. It has some natural advantages for it, and they are hoping to be able to expand that business.

Ms Burch: Just on the numbers, it is my understanding that there were 10,000 at the last Black Opal, in that vicinity. If you look to other major sporting events, and consider it a sporting event, across Canberra, that is a good turnout: to have 10,000 turn up for a day's racing there is a good outcome.

DR BOURKE: Just going back to that minor question that Mr Smyth was pursuing before, how much land does Thoroughbred Park actually have?

Mr Dawes: It is around 85 hectares.

THE CHAIR: So it is the same as EPIC?

Mr Dawes: It is about the same, yes.

DR BOURKE: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder, a new question?

MS LAWDER: I will pass my question to you, Mr Smyth.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. With the change to the TAB, the unclaimed dividends, can you quickly go through that process?

Mr Jones: I would need to check the arrangements under the legislation. They are specified in the legislation. My understanding is that they are kept by Tabcorp, by the operator, for a period of approximately 12 months, but I am not exactly sure of the period, and then under the arrangements they have an opportunity to effectively recycle those dividends back through their operations.

THE CHAIR: What is your role? My understanding is that Tabcorp will keep them for a period of time, until October, and honour any tickets that are presented, but what is the role of the commission in making sure that unclaimed bets are there to be claimed?

Mr Jones: That would be part of our audit program. Our audit program not only covers what is in the legislation, but also—under the sale deed and the sale agreements, there are some obligations there. We also, on behalf of the government, monitor those to make sure that Tabcorp meet those obligations. That is payments for certain things, refurbishments of their agency outlets and things like that. We have taken on that role to ensure that some sort of monitoring does in fact occur.

THE CHAIR: The commission seems to have some sort of conflicting interests, in that on one hand you have to deal with problem gambling but on the other hand you have to be efficient about the running and promotion of the industry as a whole. How do you balance that activity?

Mr Jones: I do not really see it as a conflict. We do not have an encouragement or a promotional role in terms of any sort of gambling activity. It is clearly our compliance and regulatory role. We also have, as you indicated, a harm minimisation or a monitoring and minimising of problem gambling role. On the basis that we do not have what I would call a commercial role or a promotional role of those activities, I do not see that as a conflict.

THE CHAIR: You talk about the work that you do with problem gambling. There is a study being done currently. When is that due?

Mr Jones: Is that the prevalence study of gambling and problem gambling?

THE CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Jones: We are expecting the first draft or the first cut of the data being put together by ANU in the next few weeks. With agreement from ANU, we are proposing to have a select amount of agreed and confirmed data released to this committee under its inquiry for the club industry sometime in July. At this stage we are aiming for mid-July. The full report is not due until about September. We are sure we will be able to have a high level summary of some significant data available in mid-July.

THE CHAIR: The last study was in 2010?

Mr Jones: 2009, released in 2010, yes.

THE CHAIR: In the five years since then, given the work the commission has done, the changes to legislation and greater awareness, are you hoping for a reduction in the prevalence of problem gambling?

Mr Jones: We certainly would be hoping for that. Given that the influences on gambling and problem gambling are extensive and very broad, to isolate the cause and the effect in that area is very difficult. But if we are just looking at the absolute levels

of problem gambling, yes, we would be looking at perhaps a slight reduction as a reflection of some sort of measure of success of some of the programs that we have been implementing over the last five years.

THE CHAIR: Given all that has happened in the last five years, is only a slight reduction an indication that the reforms have not worked, if that is your expectation?

Mr Jones: Given the size of the variables that are in this space, and some of the variables are economic variables or commercial variables which clearly we have no influence over, it is a matter of working on a balance of what the outcomes are and perhaps what we can gain from the data as indicators of what has been influencing those outcomes. But it may be that there is a bunch of interesting outcomes produced by this data which we will need to conduct further research on to explore what the actual impacts were, or drill down further in the data. That is what we did in 2009-10; that actually fed into about another two or three years of research, to flesh out some of the intricacies and detail of what the stats actually tell us.

To assist with that, we have increased the sample size from 5½ thousand in the 2009 study to a bit over 7,000 in this study. That will, in theory, increase the actual numbers of those measuring high on the problem gambling scales that we use as part of that survey. With an increased sample size in those areas, that will enable us to drill down with more detail into the specifics of those particular persons.

THE CHAIR: This is perhaps a question for the minister, although I would be interested in the commission's role. There is clearly a significant move to online gaming of many sorts. What is the role of the commission in regulating or keeping a watching brief on it in the ACT? I guess the question for the minister is: what activity has there been federally?

Ms Burch: Online gambling is problematic. It is absolutely a growing and insidious form of gambling. I have written to my federal counterpart. I might ask Louise Gilding to explain the very disappointing response we have got from our federal counterparts. Under the communications act, I think Mr Turnbull needs to take action on this. I had it on the agenda for the last proposed meeting for ministers for gaming and racing. That meeting was cancelled at the last moment, unfortunately. But when we do meet, I will raise it again because it is something that needs to be considered and addressed. Ms Gilding, do you want to make any comment about our approaches to date?

Ms Gilding: There is not much more to report than what I said at a previous hearing a couple of weeks back. We are still waiting for a response from the federal government in terms of the composition of the working group that they are proposing to set up. At the moment my understanding is that it is actually an industry working group. We are advocating that the states and territories should also have a seat at the table in terms of that particular consideration of policy issues. Given the nature of online gambling, it needs a national approach.

THE CHAIR: When is the next meeting of racing ministers?

Ms Burch: A new date is yet to come through. It was scheduled for the end of May

and it was cancelled at the last minute. So that was disappointing. Following the meeting, rest assured, I will keep pursuing this because it does need to be filtered through. Whilst the federal government seems to have an industry-based council, this is something that is, or ought to be, of concern to all governments.

Mr Jones: If I could add to that, I think they are looking at scheduling it for later this calendar year, mostly to consider all of the states' outcomes of the live baiting with greyhounds racing issue. Given that New South Wales's does not come out until September, my guess is we are probably looking at October-November for a rescheduled meeting.

THE CHAIR: Who looks after it in terms of communications? Is it the Attorney-General, for the ACT—or would you attend a communications ministers meeting?

Ms Burch: I do not attend communications ministers meetings. This is one of the frustrating things about it, because it seems to be in communications, but it is a problem that affects gaming ministers. I turn up as gaming minister but the avenue is through communications. So I think it is frustrating.

THE CHAIR: Who is the ACT rep on that ministerial council?

Ms Burch: For gaming and racing, it is me.

THE CHAIR: No, for communications?

Ms Burch: It is not me. I do not know if there is a ministers meeting for communications.

THE CHAIR: Does anybody know?

Mr Dawes: I am not sure. We will have to take that on notice.

THE CHAIR: All right; that is fine.

Mr Dawes: It may be the Chief Minister but I do not want to say that until we clarify it.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Dawes. Dr Bourke, a new question.

DR BOURKE: On page 13 of the statement of intent, I notice that you have 29 staff and that three more are due to come on next year, which indicates that you are a small agency but growing by 10 per cent. In the 2014 ACT public service state of service report, on the snapshot on page 43, which looks at cultural and linguistic diversity by directorate, I notice that you have 0.0 per cent cultural and linguistic diversity. Are you going to be able to make some efforts to shift those statistics in the future?

Mr Jones: Firstly, your comment that we are a small agency is absolutely correct. Our staffing numbers hover, with a number of part timers, in terms of FTEs, between 29 and 32 or 33. In terms of the culturally and linguistically diverse nature, it is also a matter of those individuals declaring themselves to be recognised as that. There may

be some within the commission who have decided not to declare that. But clearly, in terms of our recruitment strategies, equity and diversity are always part of our activities in that area, and we would certainly encourage those that have the right skills to join us.

DR BOURKE: I just contrast it with the Long Service Leave Authority, which is coming on shortly. I notice they have only got 11 staff but they manage 36.4 per cent, which is impressive. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Going to poker machines, the trading scheme and the legislation we passed recently, there were something like eight notifiable or disallowable instruments contained in that or as a consequence of that. The trading scheme is likely to start when? And when will see the notifiable or disallowable instruments?

Ms Burch: We have August as a commencement date. I will go to Ms Gilding, who has been instrumental in drafting it. Given that you have raised it, I found most unfortunate the ridicule that you had in your statements around the drafting and the composition of the legislation, given the good work that the officials, for all the right reasons, have been working diligently behind the scenes on.

THE CHAIR: Officials only do what they are told. If the directions were poor, minister, that is your responsibility.

Ms Burch: The direction was to implement a robust and rigorous trading scheme with all the requirements that it involves. If you want to continue playing that game and not taking responsibility for your own words, which were quite disrespectful—

THE CHAIR: You raised it, minister; I did not raise it.

Ms Burch: You raised it in the Assembly under privilege.

THE CHAIR: And you raised it here.

Ms Burch: Yes, and I am just letting you know that I thought it was disrespectful then and I think it is disrespectful now. I am just reminding you.

THE CHAIR: The only commentary that I have from the clubs is that it is not their preferred path for the legislation. This is based on talking to the industry, minister. They would have hoped for a totally different approach.

Ms Burch: No. You had very derisive comments around officials, and I just—

THE CHAIR: No; I did not say anything about the officials.

Ms Burch: You did, Mr Smyth, and I will drag out *Hansard* and remind you of them.

THE CHAIR: You drag that out, minister. You go for your life.

Ms Burch: I will.

THE CHAIR: Go on. Good. Go and get it.

Ms Burch: I will.

DR BOURKE: Are you two going to have a conversation or are you going to ask some questions, chair?

THE CHAIR: I have asked the question. I am just waiting for an answer.

Ms Gilding: In terms of following the passage of the Gaming Machine (Reform) Amendment Act, which, as you said, was on 4 June, in association with the passage of that bill there are some housekeeping amendments that need to be made to the regulations so that the provisions actually align with the changes in terms of section numbering and in terms of terminology, so there is a range of parts and sections that will be updated. In terms of going to the heart of any policy changes, I guess you would say this is more housekeeping.

There is one key regulation that will be coming through which is going to be included as part of the transitional regulation that I will point out to the committee. That is about preserving the existing in-principle approval granted to the Eastlake Football Club for a new venue in the Gungahlin town centre. The provisions in the old legislation allowed for in-principle approval, and approval was given; we are just ensuring that that still is valid in the new act and new regime. That is probably the most interesting regulation apart from changing section numbers and terminology.

Then there is the raft of notifiable instruments that need to come through in terms of the commencement—the commencement of the tax changes, the commencement of the actual trading scheme itself. There will be an instrument notifying the number of machines for the starting day of phase 1. There is a particular formula in there that has a value called SN that we need to actually notify from the commission.

Some of those things necessarily have to be quite aligned to the actual commencement, because between commencement and what happens now there may be some forfeiture of machines. We cannot guarantee what actually happens at the minute until we have aligned that with that start date.

THE CHAIR: So the tax rates start on 1 July?

Ms Gilding: Yes, that is right.

THE CHAIR: The other thing—if you have to take it on notice, that would be fine—is that I think there were three disallowable and five notifiable instruments in that list you provided. Could we have an update on where they are at and what their likely dates are?

Ms Gilding: Yes, certainly. I have a list here; I will just check with colleagues and see whether I can table that at the moment. I will provide that in terms of all the notifiable instruments and the sections that will be changed under the regulation.

THE CHAIR: All right, thank you. The final question, the last two minutes.

DR BOURKE: Thank you, chair. I notice that one sports bookmaker has ceased trading and is surrendering its licence. Is that correct, minister? How many licensed sports bookmakers do we have, and is there a limit on the numbers?

Mr Jones: There is ability to declare a maximum number, which has never been set. So there is no upper limit, and we are down to one, which was Tabcorp.

DR BOURKE: Why would you have an upper limit?

Mr Jones: Why would you have one?

DR BOURKE: What would be the policy reason for having an upper limit?

Mr Jones: I cannot think of one, which is perhaps why we have never utilised that.

DR BOURKE: Yes.

Mr Jones: It sounds like reducing competition to me, but no, we have never set a maximum number, so I am not aware of what the policy implications or the policy reasoning behind setting a maximum number would be.

DR BOURKE: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: All right. Our time is—

Mr Dawes: Mr Chair, could I just add that we will take that previous question on notice; we will table that and provide that information for you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr Dawes.

Mr Dawes: The amendments that are necessary. And there is just one other thing that I wanted to make clear: when I talked about \$42 million for the funding for the racing codes, that includes the current financial year, so it is five years.

THE CHAIR: It is actually five years, yes.

Mr Dawes: I just wanted to make sure that I made that clear.

THE CHAIR: I look forward to the breakdown.

Mr Dawes: No worries.

THE CHAIR: That is the end of our time with the Minister for Racing and Gaming. A number of questions have been taken on notice; we would appreciate answers as quickly as possible, within five days of the receipt of the *Hansard*. The *Hansard* will be provided as soon as it is available for proofreading; if there are any suggestions or corrections you would like to make, the secretariat would be happy to receive those.

With that, members, we will say thank you. We will reconvene at 3.15 with the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations and then the Minister for Sport and Recreation.

Sitting suspended from 3.01 to 3.16 pm.

Appearances:

Gentleman, Mr Mick, Minister for Planning, Minister for Roads and Parking, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, Minister for Children and Young People and Minister for Ageing

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate
Nicol, Mr David, Under Treasurer
Young, Mr Michael, Executive Director, Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations
McCabe, Mr Mark, Executive Director, Construction and Workplace Protection, and ACT Work Safety Commissioner

ACT Long Service Leave Authority
Josipovic, Mr Goran, Chief Operations Officer
Shih, Ms Catherine, Chief Financial Officer

THE CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the final session of estimates for the 1915—sorry, 2015; it seems like it has been 1915—for the 2015-16 budget. In this last couple of hours we are going to look at workplace safety and industrial relations, and then sport and recreation.

Again, as we have new faces here, please be aware that proceedings today are being recorded and transcribed by Hansard and will be published. The proceedings are also being broadcast as well as webstreamed. On the table, as always, is the privilege statement. Could those at the table please confirm that they have read the privilege statement and understand the implications of privilege?

Mr Gentleman: Yes, thank you, Mr Chair.

THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. I ask those coming to the table also to read the card. Minister, would you like to make an opening statement before we proceed to questions?

Mr Gentleman: Yes, thank you, Mr Chairman, and thank you, committee members. As the committee is aware, the government is committed to ensuring healthy, safe, fair and equitable workplaces in the ACT. The workplace safety and industrial relations portfolios cover two budget output classes, 1.2 and 1.3. This includes work health and safety, dangerous substances, public and private sector workers compensation, workplace injury management and industrial relations. 2014-15 has been a significant year and I wish to highlight some of the key achievements and initiatives during this period.

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

I am pleased to advise that the investment appears to be paying significant dividends. For example, during 2013-14 in the ACT public sector the number of new lost time injuries reduced by 10 per cent to 366. Results for the 2014-15 year to date are also very positive, with the number of lost time injuries falling by a further 15 per cent compared to an equivalent point in time during 2013-14.

In another example of the improvement plan paying dividends, specialised staff employed under the plan devised, developed and led the territory's successful appeal against the commonwealth workers compensation pricing model in 2014-15. The finding in favour of the territory resulted in a refund of around \$2 million for 2014-15 and will reduce the territory's future workers compensation premium by around \$2 million per annum. Independent actuarial analysis commissioned by Comcare indicates that were it not for the improvements in the territory's performance, our premium costs for 2015-16 would have been around \$8 million higher.

Also in the field of work health and safety, the government has put in place a number of initiatives designed to assist the ACT construction industry to improve its work health and safety performance. This has included providing for the employment of additional work health and safety inspectors within WorkSafe ACT and the creation of the new compliance powers for inspectors.

A recent actuarial review commissioned by the government has shown that in the first year since we accepted the recommendations of the getting home safely construction safety inquiry, lost time injuries in the construction industry have reduced by about a third. In the private sector more generally, 2013-14 saw the number of new cost incurred claims reduced by five per cent and the number of new lost time claims reduced by eight per cent, driven primarily by improvements in the construction industry.

In addition to making changes to improve work safety, the government is changing workers compensation laws to make it easier and less expensive for employers to obtain workers compensation insurance. For example, this year we introduced legislation designed to avoid any need for employers who operate in the ACT and New South Wales to take out insurance for the same workers in more than one jurisdiction. Furthermore, in 2015-16 we intend to introduce legislation that will reduce the number of times employers must provide detailed wage and salary data to their workers compensation insurer.

The government has also introduced legislation to address the legacy of asbestos contamination, including loose-fill asbestos. Mandatory asbestos awareness training for workers who may be exposed to asbestos has been in place since October 2014. Since this requirement commenced, more than 70,000 people have undertaken the course.

While asbestos safety remains a priority of government, I am pleased that work has also commenced to address broader industrial relations issues. One such issue is portable long service leave. Prior to the last ACT election, ACT Labor committed to extending the community sector scheme to aged care workers and the contract cleaning scheme to waste workers. Work is now well underway to extend the schemes to these two new sectors. In keeping with this theme, the passage of the Holidays

Amendment Bill 2014 in August last year has ensured that Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Day are now public holidays. I am now also considering the treatment of Easter Sunday and have sought industry views on that subject.

In summation, I am pleased with the work that has been undertaken in the workplace safety and industrial relations sphere during 2014-15. I am eager to continue ongoing initiatives and to build upon the progress that we have made in the new fiscal year. Thank you, Mr Chairman. We look forward to an opportunity to answer your questions.

THE CHAIR: I am sure; you always do, minister. Minister, on page 2 of budget paper B in the priorities for 2015-16 it looks like dot point 6 is the priorities that relate to this part of the portfolio. In particular it talks about the implementation of the new workers compensation scheme. Can you update us on where that is at and when it is likely to commence, if it is likely to go ahead?

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

THE CHAIR: The scheme and legislation would appear when?

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

THE CHAIR: When does our contract with Comcare run out, or is it just an annual premium so we choose not to renew the premium?

Mr Gentleman: Yes; I will ask Michael to answer for you.

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

THE CHAIR: Because of the act, we are tied to the feds unless they give us a release?

Mr Young: That is right.

THE CHAIR: And have you met with Senator Abetz over this?

Mr Gentleman: We have had some correspondence with Senator Abetz. My office has been in consultation with his office but we are yet to have a formal meeting on it.

THE CHAIR: And have the commonwealth offered an initial opinion as to the likelihood of the release?

Mr Gentleman: No, not at this stage.

THE CHAIR: So how much is the workers—

Mr Gentleman: Sorry; I should say that in the conversations that we have had, there has been an indication that they would release, yes.

THE CHAIR: They have indicated that they would release?

Mr Gentleman: Yes, in conversation, but no formal release yet.

THE CHAIR: Should the release be obtained, not taking into account the existing cases, how long will it take you to set up and start your own system?

Mr Gentleman: The new scheme for the ACT will involve legislation, of course. It will be in the passage of that legislation and the creation of the scheme working with the employee representative groups. So it will take some time. I could not give you a firm figure. Until that scheme is designed, we will not be able to give you a firm time.

THE CHAIR: Is the legislation being drafted?

Mr Gentleman: There are some forms of work that have been done, but it has not been finalised at this point, no.

THE CHAIR: What conversations have you had with the ACT's private sector about such a scheme, the impact on them and possibly their joining your scheme?

Mr Gentleman: Mr Young.

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

THE CHAIR: Is there consideration of extending it into being not just an ACT public sector scheme but an ACT-wide workers compensation scheme?

Mr Gentleman: Mr Young.

Mr Young: The proposal going forward at the moment is that it would be a scheme for the ACT public sector. That would be for public sector employees that are currently covered in the Comcare workers compensation system.

Mr Gentleman: Can I say—

THE CHAIR: Comcare, of course, can and does take on private sector companies.

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

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke has a supplementary.

DR BOURKE: Thank you. Minister, how does this work articulate with the ACT public service work safety implementation plan, which I understand you will be implementing, according to the budget paper at page 16?

Mr Gentleman: It is quite important, of course, that we have the correct plan for our territory public servants. The workers compensation scheme is quite different from the safety plan but there are some crossovers, I guess, in ensuring that we have the best health outcomes for our workers. I know Mr McCabe has been working hard with both the ACT public sector and the private sector in some of the preparation for safety schemes across the territory. I might ask Mr Young to give some more details on the safety scheme.

Mr Young: Are you familiar with the workers compensation and work safety improvement plan?

DR BOURKE: Yes.

Mr Young: That plan is executed by the territory in its capacity as an employer. As an employer it has a duty of care to its employees under both safety and workers compensation to prevent work-related injuries and to manage them where they do unfortunately occur. In 2011 the government invested significantly in an enhancement of the resources that are available to the territory to manage its work injuries in its capacity as an employer.

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

There have been a number of early intervention strategies. For example, we have recently piloted a physiotherapy initiative whereby workers who are injured but have not yet lodged a workers compensation claim can access physiotherapy services with a view to providing earlier treatment and getting them back into the workplace much earlier. As the minister mentioned previously, we have invested in the development and implementation of a whole-of-government online system to identify managing and responding to hazards and injuries as they occur.

In October 2014 part of the ACT government's rehabilitation case management team was co-located with Comcare claims officers in order to better integrate the employer and claims management functions of injury management, and that has provided a number of positive outcomes on what were previously intractable long-term claims. That was an initiative that was put in place in response to feedback from unions, in particular, that found, often, a disconnect between the Comcare claims managers and ACT government employees who are performing return to work co-ordinations. By co-locating we have been able to go some way towards ensuring an integrated and cooperative approach to entry management.

These are all significant initiatives that have been coming online incrementally since 2011 and are tied up in that output class that you referred to.

Mr Gentleman: I can add a little to that too in regard to some of the work that has been done by ACTION in their injury management performance. Similar to much of the work that the ACT public service has done, ACTION's injury management performance has improved following the introduction of the improvement plan initiatives. Compared to the year prior to the commencement of the improvement plan, ACTION's 2014-15 year to date results show a 90 per cent reduction in the number of lost time injuries. That compares favourably with the equivalent whole-of-government result, which improved around 10 per cent. Whilst ACTION does continue to pay a relatively high premium rate for workers compensation, we see that this improvement in the management performance will reduce those costs, with any luck, per capita.

DR BOURKE: Minister, if the ACT public service has this plan in place and you are also running your own compensation scheme, do you see that there are greater opportunities for better service delivery and better outcomes for workers?

Mr Gentleman: Indeed, and I think that was really part of the decision-making process in that we wanted to see much better outcomes for our employees and a return to work at the earliest possible time. Support for return to work at the earliest possible time means that you get better results; people actually have better health and socially better outcomes as well by being able to return to work and then continue on a full career. We see that with Comcare there is, if you like, less emphasis on the early return to work, a longer tail in the workers compensation scheme and therefore not the best outcomes for employees. Whilst we want to be able to control our scheme as well, we also want the best outcomes for employees.

Mr Young: And if I might add—sorry to interrupt—another potential benefit comes from addressing the somewhat unusual situation that exists at the moment whereby Comcare is the regulator of the territory in terms of its obligations as an employer under workers compensation law whereas WorkSafe ACT is the regulator of the

territory as an employer for its work safety laws. The intent of that separation is: in the event that a new scheme is introduced, the responsibility for regulating and compliance enforcement as an employer will transfer to WorkSafe so that we will have a single regulator responsible for both prevention and injury management, which we expect to produce additional synergies above and beyond what the minister has described.

DR BOURKE: And what are the implications of that for WorkSafe resourcing?

Mr Young: We expect that there will be additional resourcing for WorkSafe to undertake that compliance enforcement activity. That being said, WorkSafe is already the regulator of the private sector employers in terms of workers compensation and therefore it already has a capacity which can be expanded.

Mr Gentleman: This is a very good time to bring that question up while we have the Under Treasurer with us ready for the next budget bid.

DR BOURKE: I was looking for it in the budget outyears but I could not find it. You mentioned before—

THE CHAIR: What, no answer, Under Treasurer?

Mr Nicol: I see this as an integrated solution so that the question of what is going to happen to our premium—investment was made in our own return to work capacity and assistance—is very much holistically about skilling up our line managers but also giving them a centralised resource that helps that early intervention. Not allowing workers to be away from work or not be contacted by someone from the ACT government to find out what their injury is and how they are responding to their injury aids in returning to work.

If the scheme is introduced and we move to a private sector model we will expect our private sector insurers to also be interested in returning workers to work. They are going to be adding resources and skills to that question. I expect that those providers will have skills from other jurisdictions because they will provide similar services in other jurisdictions and their aim is going to be returning workers to work.

Comcare, I think, is more, as the minister said, a compensation scheme, an income replacement scheme, and there has been less emphasis on that return to work. I think the most important outcome for workers for their long-term economic and social health is to get back into the workforce.

We will also expect to provide additional resources in terms of both regulation and monitoring management of the scheme. That job will fall to us, into our core system. We have allowed for resources in that area as well. How those resources ultimately play out will depend on the make-up of the scheme, the structure of the scheme, the tender process that we ultimately go through to seek the bids from the private sector to set premiums et cetera and what services they are willing to offer.

We will be going through that process, hopefully in the next 12 months, and in the next budget I expect we will see much more fine detail on that allocation of those

costs.

Mr Gentleman: Can I reassure committee members and also staff that may now have compensation claims through Comcare that anybody that is with Comcare at the moment will stay with Comcare and their Comcare payments will continue through that process. There will be still a relationship with us and Comcare in regard to those people that are on claims at the moment.

DR BOURKE: Minister, both Mr Nicol and Mr Young mentioned up-skilling line managers. Can I get some more detail about what that actually means, please?

Mr Gentleman: Indeed. I might ask Mr McCabe to come up and tell us some of the work that has been occurring in providing training and information to line managers. Mr Young, you might begin the process.

Mr Young: The specific actions I referred to, albeit briefly, a little while ago involved commissioning a leading clinical psychologist to develop and deliver training to line managers in a number of areas, which have included better management of workers with an injury and better management of workers with a psychological injury, which is focused on not just the return process but having managers better identify and respond to at-risk people who may be working for them.

In addition, the public sector management group, which is sitting under Chief Minister, output 1.2, has been working very closely with my division on the development of a manager's tool kit which crosses over a whole range of human resource management areas but which includes up-skilling in terms of performance management and addressing a positive workplace culture, which, particularly in the area of psychological injury, is integral to building staff resilience and preventing hazards, psychological risks, from occurring.

Mr McCabe: Really the only thing I would add to that would be that one of the primary responsibilities for an employer under a workers comp scheme is to address return to work and recovery from injury for their employees. As Mr Young said, there has been a fair bit of up-skilling already beginning to happen with ACT public sector line managers in that space. It is really about line managers understanding the importance of that recovery process and, in particular, being mindful of the importance of providing alternative duties for workers when they are in that recovery phase. That can be a quite critical factor in reducing the costs of workers compensation but the primary cost to workers compensation comes from time off work. That is why there is the importance of return to work.

Mr Nicol: And I might add, from a strategic leadership point of view of the service, it is a topic that has occupied some time and strategic thought. The importance of that is recognising knowledge by directors-general, and I expect those people to be flowing that down to their subordinates in the director reports. I certainly do so to mine—that this is an important part of our responsibilities. Beyond the responsibilities of the staff that we have, in general we have legal responsibilities in terms of their health and wellbeing. It goes to matters of personal responsibility for us and I take it very seriously.

We also have reporting to cabinet for particular directorates that have significant workers compensation issues, and that happens on a regular basis. I think it goes a long way to focus the mind of managers that this is a pretty important issue. As Mr Young, Mr McCabe and the minister have pointed out, preventing injury in the first place and then identifying and getting the right support in getting people back to work quickly is the best way to address this problem.

Mr Young: And, if I might add, further work is currently occurring above and beyond what has been described previously to build on established policies and focus on specific aspects of employee engagement. This has included the development of a positive work attendance policy, a staying in touch policy that sets out principles for keeping workers connected to their workplace when they are on extended leave or unable to attend the workplace due to illness, and a reasonable adjustment policy which is around making changes to the workplace to support an earlier and sustained return to work following injury or illness, be that compensable or non-compensable. Also work is commencing on a redeployment policy to modify the way the directorates find alternative duties for workers who may be unable to return to their pre-injury role.

Mr Nicol: Again I just emphasise that is another matter that has taken the particular attention of directors-general—that the old perception, the myth, that if you have a psychological injury, you are off work and the work environment might have been a contributing factor, getting alternative meaningful redeployment is so important to both the worker and the employer. That is something that, I think, is more myth than reality, but it is a myth that we have to tackle and we have to tackle pretty hard.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder, a new question.

MS LAWDER: Minister, I was wondering whether the government have any recorded instances of accidents due to workers on the job being under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.

Mr Gentleman: That is a good question. I am not aware of any, but I will ask Mr Young to go into some detail.

Mr Young: Our system would certainly record incidents of that nature. I am not aware of any. I would have to take the question on notice.

MS LAWDER: Thank you. So how many there are, if any?

Mr Nicol: None have been brought to my attention.

MS LAWDER: Is the government considering introducing on-site drug or alcohol testing of workers at the point of an accident or otherwise?

Mr Gentleman: This goes back to a discussion we had the other day about Bimberi, where there was an allegation of drug supply. Of course, that has been investigated and it has been found there was no evidence to support that. We have had some discussion about areas where perhaps there is a greater risk and whether or not we should have some testing. If there is no evidence that alcohol or drugs are an influence

and cause accidents, I am not in a position to start some sort of project on testing. But I am certainly taking advice on it.

Mr Young: If I might add: there is a whole-of-government policy which contemplates the prevention of risks arising from the use of alcohol and other drugs in the workplace. It does not set a single policy for testing. However, it does encourage individual directorates, particularly those that might have occupations engaged in higher risk work, to make a risk assessment, consult with staff and potentially introduce it, but that would be on a directorate-by-directorate basis.

Mr Nicol: I can add, from anecdotal evidence, that in TAMS, which is a workplace where obviously they are driving buses et cetera, this is an issue on which Mr Byles has quite a strict anti-alcohol policy for his workforce. I have a policy that we do not consume alcohol during the working day, but if you are working back during the budget process you might have a glass of wine with a meal.

Mr Gentleman: Or after estimates you may have a scotch, Mr Smyth.

Mr Nicol: It is something I monitor. I have not seen any evidence in my experience in the public service. Of course, this is something that you can sometimes miss, but I have not seen any significant evidence of this being a problem. As Mr Young said, we will take it on notice.

THE CHAIR: But if we are not recording it or checking it, how would we know?

Mr Nicol: Personal observation. But you are right; you cannot always pick it up.

THE CHAIR: The Acting Chief Police Officer said yesterday that their random drug testing showed one in eight Canberrans are driving under the influence of drugs. Perhaps Mr McCabe would remember the incident of a grader being driven by someone under the influence down Northbourne Avenue and Adelaide Avenue.

Mr McCabe: If I could just add something in relation to this, I support what the minister said about it needing to be evidence based. I understand the issue that you are raising, which is that we commonly do not—even when there is an accident—go out and test for drugs in the participants. In the construction industry recently there has been a bit of a shift in thinking that they do need to do drug testing in particular. I think that has been a shift from the employee representatives as much as from the employers.

There are some manufacturing industries where they are dealing with highly dangerous equipment, and clearly there is quite a risk associated with it if there is drug taking going on. The construction industry is characterised by young male workers, so there is a belief that there is potentially an issue there and they should be doing testing. But, as a general rule, an industry would not really adopt that unless there was some basis for that belief.

Like I said, that tends to be more an assessment of what could be happening rather than what is happening, because there is very little data to tell us how many accidents are attributable to alcohol or drugs. There may be parts in the government where it

might be appropriate. We would need to do that thinking, but I would be quite surprised if there was a decision to do it right across the public sector. It would be rare for a white collar industry, for example, to introduce that.

Mr Nicol: I would agree that risk and consequence should be judged in this instance as in any other.

THE CHAIR: There is that famous management axiom “if you don’t measure it, you can’t fix it”. We are clearly not measuring it. We all think that it is perhaps not a problem, except, as Mr McCabe has said, in some sectors, but the reality is we do not know.

Mr Gentleman: I think the evidence-based argument is a strong one, that if there is evidence that perhaps accidents or those sorts of things are occurring because of drug-affected participants or alcohol-affected people then you would see a need, if the evidence presents itself.

Mr Nicol: And consequence as well. If you are dealing with heavy equipment or interfacing with the public where serious injury is more likely to occur through accidents then I think the grounds for it would be greater. I agree, Mr Chair, that if you do not measure it, you do not know, but there are a lot of things we could measure and they all have cost resource implications. So we have to make risk-based assessments. Perhaps it is a question I will ask and then have a look at, but I have not seen a spate of accidents that are unexplainable or that might need that further investigation. I will endeavour to make some inquiries.

Mr McCabe: There is also some difficulty associated with testing. With alcohol it is pretty obvious. If there is alcohol in the system there are some tried and proven techniques for assessing how that might affect your competence to do the activity you are doing. With drug testing, that can remain in the bloodstream for quite some time. It does not necessarily mean the person is still impaired. It might indicate this person is a drug taker, but it is not proof of impairment to do the activity they are doing. So there are some issues associated with that as well that have to be worked through.

THE CHAIR: Which I suspect have largely been addressed through the drug driving program the AFP is now implementing. I apologise to Ms Lawder; I have sort of taken over. Back to you.

MS LAWDER: Thank you. You said you are not necessarily progressing it, but you may think about it.

Mr Gentleman: I am taking some advice, Ms Lawder, and that came off the back of that inquiry at Bimberi. I will see what the advice is before we look at anything else.

MS LAWDER: Because there could be some particular industries like bus driving maybe where the risk and consequence may be greater if an employee is at work under the influence of alcohol or other drug. Have you had any approaches, either for or against drug or alcohol testing in the workplace, from any interested stakeholders?

Mr Gentleman: Not that I can recall.

Mr Young: If I might add: the whole-of-government policy that I referred to earlier was put through quite a rigorous process of internal consultation with internal staff—employees, HR and safety professionals—and all views were canvassed. If it gives some assurance, that includes advice for managers on actions that should be taken if they observe a staff member who appears to be intoxicated and guidance on how to respond, which should encourage reporting of the nature that I described earlier. There were views from all possible perspectives put in and they did come up for and against.

Mr Gentleman: I can say that we have a strong move for reporting. We encourage people to report. Harking back again to the Bimberi inquiry, we encourage people to report where they have some suspicion that something has occurred. That is what occurred in that situation and, therefore, sparked the inquiry.

MS LAWDER: In your considerations perhaps you would think about whether at the point of an accident or an incident that kind of testing might be appropriate too. That is it from me. Thank you.

Mr Gentleman: Certainly. But harking back, again, to that evidence-based approach, if it appeared on the evidence that in an accident there could be intoxication then it would be worthwhile looking at it.

MS LAWDER: It is not always just intoxication, though, is it? There is just a threshold level without being intoxicated.

Mr Gentleman: I am not an expert, Ms Lawder.

Mr Nicol: In any accident of any seriousness a proper investigation should cover all potential causes and contributory factors. Certainly, if there are illicit substances involved, legal matters would come to the fore as well.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke, a new question.

DR BOURKE: Minister, the recent Productivity Commission workplace relations framework inquiry which was initiated by the federal government is, I presume, due to come down soon. Did you have any involvement in that inquiry?

Mr Gentleman: No, not particularly. The government has particular policies that the inquiry would have looked at as well. Mr Young, is there any update on that?

Mr Young: There are a number of COAG-initiated inquiries ongoing around both the workplace relations and the WHS framework, which we are involved with via a senior officials committee which meets quarterly. I am not certain we are talking about the same inquiry.

DR BOURKE: No; the Productivity Commission released a series of working papers about their current inquiry into the workplace relations framework in Australia. I was wondering whether the minister or the government had made any submissions or was involved in any way through the workplace ministerial council, or had some other

involvement in that inquiry.

Mr Gentleman: Yes, we did meet last year with the ministerial council in Melbourne, in regard to some of the amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act. There were a couple of amendments that were put forward by the federal government that the ACT did not support. One was in regard to 24 hours notice for a provisional improvement notice to be put forward. We felt as a government that we could not support that. At the moment if a provisional improvement notice is put forward the workplace needs to attend to that notice before any work takes place. The intention was to amend that so that whoever was putting forward the provisional improvement notice would have to give 24 hours notice, and we could not support that. What was the other matter dealt with, Mr Young?

Mr Young: If you do not mind, I might take on notice the question about those specific inquiries. I have officials that are engaged at multiple levels. I am just not convinced I am responding to your exact question.

DR BOURKE: Okay. One of the discussion papers looks at unfair dismissal in some detail, minister, and contemplates a change to the current unfair dismissal arrangements, which may mean a return to the previous regime, whereby firms with 100 or less employees may be exempt from federal unfair dismissal legislation. Do you have any views about what the ACT's role might be? Of course, we are hypothesising upon my hypothesis here; nevertheless do you have any view about what the ACT should or could be doing in that space, if there was a federal withdrawal from worker protections in that way?

Mr Gentleman: Certainly. I suppose my history in looking after the workforce and looking after employment practices would precede a statement saying that I would view very carefully any changes to unfair dismissal laws. There is a certain set of criteria under the Fair Work Act that set out a precedent for ensuring that you do not unfairly dismiss someone. That means you have to go through a number of processes before a termination can be lawful. So I would be very cautious about amending those regulations. I think it is important that people feel that they have a safe and strong workplace to go to and to project a future career with. If there is a diminution of conditions that mean you no longer feel it is a place where you can safely continue a career for many years, I think that would affect confidence across the ACT.

Mr Young: From my perspective I understand that the final report of that Productivity Commission review is expected in November this year. Obviously we will be watching it very closely.

DR BOURKE: The draft is due soon.

Mr Young: Early next month, I believe.

DR BOURKE: If you look at the writing on the wall and you read the way the questions are framed, you might construe that that is the way the commission is interested in travelling. Unfair dismissal law changes seem to be something that they are particularly interested in, as a result of that inquiry.

Mr Gentleman: Yes, indeed. I understand—

DR BOURKE: Not that I am suggesting people would write their recommendations before they have heard all the evidence.

Mr Gentleman: That review will involve a thorough analysis of the workplace relations system and its impact on the economy and productivity of jobs. The commission released five issues papers covering a range of matters. It is seeking feedback which is intended to assist parties in making submissions as well. Those submissions closed on Friday, 13 March this year, and that draft report, as you say, is due.

DR BOURKE: What other changes have been happening in the national workplace relations system, minister, that you would be able to tell us about?

Mr Gentleman: There has been some work federally in regard to conditions of entry for work safety inspectors—those people that have permission to enter a work site to look at workplace safety. Mr Young, can you give us some more information on that?

Mr Young: Sure. The principal forum that we are working through is the senior officials group that I described previously. That group met in February, June and October 2014 and March and May 2015. In that period issues that were examined included work safety matters, including refinements to model WHS laws and the development of a national strategic plan for asbestos management and awareness. That plan has recently been launched.

The expansion of the Comcare workers compensation scheme is a piece of work initiated by the commonwealth to look at possible mechanisms by which the Comcare scheme could be expanded to additional classes of employers. With respect to proposed changes to the Fair Work Act, there have been several other broad categories of activity where we have been consulting with the commonwealth and with other jurisdictions in the national industrial relations area.

THE CHAIR: Ms Lawder, a new question.

MS LAWDER: Can I ask a question about the Long Service Leave Authority. One of your initiatives from the statement of intent for the coming financial year was to seek suitable new office accommodation for the authority and divest the existing office space. Is that the same as last year's priority, to sell the Manning Clark offices?

Mr Josipovic: We have hired a consultant to look at our existing accommodation, and we will be looking for suitable accommodation in the ACT. The Manning Clark offices were part of our investment portfolio. They were sitting in our non-current assets, so the board decided to divest itself of those offices.

MS LAWDER: Have they been sold?

Mr Josipovic: They have been sold.

MS LAWDER: You were waiting for a consultant's report, or have you already

decided how much space you need?

Mr Josipovic: We are in the initial phase of looking for office accommodation. We would be looking at a similar size. We have had an offer or some interest from people in the building to purchase our office space. Being on Constitution Avenue, there is some potential for opportunities for the other existing tenants within the building.

MS LAWDER: How much did you get from the sale of the Manning Clark offices?

Mr Josipovic: Around \$25 million.

DR BOURKE: What is the rationale for moving out of your current office space on Constitution Avenue?

Mr Josipovic: One of the main reasons for moving is that we have the ASIO building across the road. For our stakeholders there is very little parking available. Quite often we have people come to our offices in their trucks and utes, and there are only two visitor car spots. For our stakeholders we think it is a good opportunity to divest ourselves out of the CBD or out of the city.

MS LAWDER: Do you have any properties in mind or are you waiting for the consultant's report?

Mr Josipovic: We have some properties in mind but we are waiting for the consultant. We will look for a position where hopefully we can better meet the needs of our stakeholders.

DR BOURKE: Let us go to the investment plan that you have, Mr Josipovic. You have sold Manning Clark for \$25 million; you did not go and buy another building, I presume?

Mr Josipovic: No, we did not. We invested it with Vanguard, our investment manager.

DR BOURKE: Why did you use that particular investment manager?

Mr Josipovic: We had to review our investment plan and we have changed from a 50-50 split to a 65-35 split. We have piggybacked on the back of the whole-of-government process for the investment. We have options also to go with other investment managers, but the board found that it was appropriate investment management.

DR BOURKE: Are there any constraints placed on your investment strategy?

Mr Josipovic: No, not really.

DR BOURKE: So you can buy anything that is available on the stock market, if you want?

Mr Josipovic: If we wanted to. However, we would seek advice from the Under

Treasurer as well.

Mr Nicol: One of the things we have been doing in the last couple of years is looking at the various authorities and agencies that have investment portfolios, for legitimate reasons, obviously. This is to pay out long service leave, to meet long service leave obligations in certain industries. We are seeking to move them to a consistent framework for managing their portfolios, so it is subject to audit and professional advice as to the appropriate risk weighting for a particular portfolio, given the liabilities and the needs of that particular agency.

In the case of the Long Service Leave Authority—I am going from memory, but I think the advice was that moving to a professionally managed fund manager was appropriate for its entire portfolio, rather than essentially trying to manage different asset classes within the authority itself. Its expertise is not necessarily in that area. So that is part of the move on behalf of the whole ACT government to make our investments consistently managed, to base them on sound prudential financial advice, to have appropriate risk weighting and management of the portfolio that we hold.

DR BOURKE: With the return on your investments over the last couple of years, Mr Josipovic, how does that compare with, say, commercially available funds on the market?

Mr Josipovic: Currently we are looking at a return on investment of around 14 per cent. If you benchmark that with most of the benchmarks, we would be on a par there. The authority invests money to make sure that we fulfil our liabilities, and that is the view that the authority takes.

THE CHAIR: You talked about investments. On page 22 the construction industry long service leave scheme gains from investments dropped 40 per cent this year. What is the reason for that?

Mr Josipovic: I might take that on notice. This is in regard to the construction—

THE CHAIR: In your operating statement, on page 22 the gains from investments expected were \$2.6 million. You got \$7.9 million, but you are expecting a 40 per cent drop, to \$4.7 million for the coming year. And it is the same for all of them. For the cleaning industry, on page 26, you are expecting 42 per cent less in the coming year. For the ACT community sector, you are expecting 41 per cent less and for the security industry you are expecting 29 per cent less.

Mr Josipovic: I might refer that question to our CFO, Catherine Shih.

Ms Shih: Thank you for the question. The drop in gains flowing back from this financial year to next year is mainly because, as the acting CEO was mentioning, this year we are expecting around 14 per cent return on investments. For the outyears we are assuming that we will be achieving 7.5 per cent, which is our long-term rate of return. The investment portfolio has a 65-35 split regarding growth in the defensive asset portfolio. That is the main reason why there is a decrease in the gains for investment.

THE CHAIR: So what is the long-term gain?

Ms Shih: Long-term rate of return—

THE CHAIR: Long-term average.

Ms Shih: for our investment portfolio, with a 65-35 split, is 7.5 per cent.

THE CHAIR: So this is just returning to a normal expectation?

Ms Shih: That is correct, yes.

THE CHAIR: I thought you just said that the standard was about 14 per cent and you are on par with the other super funds?

Mr Josipovic: That is for the current year.

THE CHAIR: Just for the current year?

Mr Josipovic: That is for the current year.

THE CHAIR: So long term, if you get 7½ per cent, you will be happy?

Ms Shih: That is our long-term expectation of the portfolio, with our current asset allocation specified in the investment plan. If our investment plan changed the asset allocation split then we would have to adjust our expectation accordingly.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, minister, for your last appearance at the 2015-16 estimates. If you have taken any questions on notice, if we could have an answer within five working days, that would be appreciated. The transcript will be provided when it is ready. With that we will suspend for a moment. The Minister for Sport and Recreation will appear at quarter past four.

Mr Gentleman: Thank you, Mr Chairman; thank you, members.

Short suspension.

Appearances:

Rattenbury, Mr Shane, Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, Minister for Justice, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Transport Reform

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate

Rake, Mr Gary, Deputy Director-General, Arts, Business, Events, Sport and Tourism Division

Priest, Ms Jenny, Director, Sport and Recreation Services

THE CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the last session of the 2015-16 public hearings of the Select Committee on Estimates. I ask that all those at the table acknowledge that they have seen the privilege statement and understand the implications of privilege. It is so acknowledged. The proceedings today are being recorded as well as broadcast and webstreamed. The minister has indicated that he has no opening statement so we will go straight to questions. Minister, could you tell us about what is happening with the Olympic pool?

Mr Rattenbury: Yes. I did provide an update yesterday. As members would be aware, there have been extensive leaks identified at the Civic pool. We got in some leak engineers, essentially, to put it in layman's terms. They have done a detailed report for us and presented some options. I have formed the view that there are cost-effective repairs that can be made, particularly to the outdoor pools, which will reduce the rate of water leakage. It will not guarantee no water leakage, but it will certainly reduce the rate of leakage. It will mean that we can reopen the outdoor pools. With a sport and recreation perspective on that, that is particularly important, as they are our only diving facility in the region. In thinking about the best way to seek to work with the facility, that has been our key consideration. It will also mean that there will be very minimal, if any, disruption to the use of the 50-metre pool in undertaking those repairs. So the short answer will be that the outdoor pools will reopen as normal on 1 November for the summer season.

THE CHAIR: And the indoor pool?

Mr Rattenbury: The indoor pool will remain open. There may be half a day here or there linked to the other repairs, but essentially the engineer's report indicates that we can do the outdoor work with no impact on the indoor pool. I guess the next answer to that, Mr Smyth, is that the intent is to keep Civic pool as a going operation for what I would describe as the medium term. It is the government's intent to build a new aquatic facility in the city region. Our intent is that the current Canberra Olympic pool will remain open until a new facility is ready.

THE CHAIR: On BP B, page 39, table 43, output class 8.4, measure d, satisfaction with the management of aquatic centres, the target was 93 per cent and the estimated outcome is 88 per cent. Is the closure of the pools driving that or are there other things that have led to that target not being reached?

Mr Rattenbury: It would be fair to say that my sense, from all the patrons I talk to

and people I know, and it is a few of them, is that the uncertainty around the pools has been a bit of an issue, including the two-month closure at Tuggeranong. I have had people contact me and say, “I hear Tuggeranong pool is being permanently closed.” We have never said anything like it, but the rumours have grown in the telling a bit. Obviously with the Tuggeranong pool, the reason we are closing it for two months is to upgrade the facilities. Again, in talking to people, they are saying, “Well, the two months is inconvenient, but the change rooms really do need the work.” There is probably a bit of a sense that the pools are a bit run down. And we have had some concerns expressed to us about the existing management contract, so that is a factor as well.

THE CHAIR: Did the complaints about the management contract lead to the previous manager being removed?

Mr Rattenbury: It was certainly one of the considerations that sport and rec took into account.

THE CHAIR: The tender process was started, then stopped, then restarted. Why was that?

Mr Rattenbury: I will ask Ms Priest to go into a bit more of the detail of that.

Ms Priest: We commenced a tender process and proceeded to engage new contractors for the Canberra Olympic pool and the Lakeside Leisure Centre. At a point in time in that process, once the tender or the request for proposal had closed, we had one proposal. An assessment of that proposal was undertaken; it was deemed not to be a proposal that offered value for money, so the proponent was advised and that process was concluded. We have started another process for the Lakeside Leisure Centre. With the short-term lead time for 1 July and in the circumstances of the leaks with the Canberra Olympic pool, we have sought to put in an interim operator, being YMCA New South Wales, who will come in on 1 July and operate under an interim arrangement until 31 March 2016, which would (a) allow us to continue operations in the short term and (b) also allow the outcome of the leak investigations to be concluded and decisions to be taken—at the time, because the minister has only just made announcements about what will be happening there—in that regard to get some certainty as to what the next steps with the Canberra Olympic pool would be. That is why the interim contract has been put in place.

THE CHAIR: So New South Wales Y is running Tuggeranong?

Ms Priest: No, the Canberra Olympic pool.

THE CHAIR: Canberra? Who has got Tuggeranong?

Ms Priest: The Tuggeranong procurement process, in terms of the date by which proposals can be received under this new process, will close on 30 June, at which time there will be an assessment of any proposals received as a result of that offering, with a full intention that a new contractor would be engaged by the end of July in time for the opening of Lakeside Leisure Centre again after the current repair works or maintenance works that are happening at that facility are completed.

THE CHAIR: What other pools does the government run? Gungahlin?

Ms Priest: Gungahlin Leisure Centre.

THE CHAIR: Who is the contractor there?

Ms Priest: The contractor there is the YMCA. We have also got the Dickson—

THE CHAIR: New South Wales?

Ms Priest: Yes. We have also got the Dickson pool and the Manuka pool.

THE CHAIR: Who runs those?

Ms Priest: Big Island Sports run Manuka. The Dickson pool—sorry, the name has just escaped me, but it is another well known—

Mr Rattenbury: It is a well-known local family. They have had it for the last 20 years.

Ms Priest: Shae and Chris are the operators.

Mr Rattenbury: There is also the Erindale facility, but that is formally owned by the Education and Training Directorate and has a slightly different arrangement.

THE CHAIR: A supplementary, Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: Thank you, Mr Smyth. Ms Priest, just a couple of questions. You opened a tender for the Tuggeranong pool, as you did for the Olympic one, and both of these were then not carried through. Is that normal tendering practice—that you throw it to tender, invite tenderers, and if only one tenderer comes in, you do not accept that tender?

Ms Priest: Not at all. The process was taken through to a conclusion, and the conclusion was that there was not a successful appointment made from those tenders. So there was a full completion of that process. The assessment was undertaken of those tenders by the tender evaluation team; as a result of that process, a recommendation was not able to be made for the appointment of the single proponent for those contracts.

MR DOSZPOT: The previous tenderer, as I understand, also managed in the previous contract period. Were they notified that their services were not acceptable, and is that why the contract was cancelled?

Ms Priest: We have had ongoing discussions, obviously, with the current incumbent, whose contract will end on 30 June. Throughout the duration of the contract and through the normal course of our contract management discussions, we have had a number of conversations and engagements with them over a number of matters, yes. Late last year they were informed that we were exercising our right under the contract,

as the territory is able to do, to end that contract early, which we have done; they were given that full period of notice that we were bringing that contract to an early end. Obviously, part of the consideration of doing that has been the evolving situation with the Civic pool and the leaks which we discovered.

And just coming back to the accountability indicator question, I think one of the reasons for the lowering of the satisfaction rate with the pool—sorry, I do not want to digress, but I think it is important to note—is that we undertook a number of repairs through 2014, and as a result of that there was disruption to the services at the pool. I just wanted to add that detail.

MR DOSZPOT: Sure; I appreciate that. I guess my question cuts across both pools. Okay?

Ms Priest: Sure.

MR DOSZPOT: There is some concern amongst the potential contractors that they put in a tender in good faith which seemed to be rejected in a very short time frame. One of them was not even announced—the fact that there was only one tenderer. There seems to be some concern about the way both tenders were handled. I will ask a couple more questions on the actual management contract that you are talking about now, but very briefly do you have a comment on that first part?

Mr Rake: When we assess a tender there are broadly three things that we need to look at. The first one is whether we have a complying tender—that is, that it meets the basic requirements to even be accepted. In this case both met the basic compliance. We then assess the suitability of the tender that we have received. That goes to everything from the operator's capacity to undertake the work, in this case manage pools, through to the financial sustainability and organisational capability. We were not able to satisfy ourselves entirely in that regard. Then the third thing that we have to think about, our primary obligation in procurement, is to get value for money. The prices that were put to us in those we did not believe represented appropriate value for money for the territory, and we could not satisfy ourselves that it was the best use of taxpayer money that we could come up with.

MR DOSZPOT: Talking about value for money, what was the annual revenue that was realised from the previous contractor on each of these pools?

Mr Rake: We would need to take that on notice. Civic pool was a loss-making exercise, though.

MR DOSZPOT: Could you also take on notice to let the committee know about the cost of the new management contract that has been awarded. In other words, the government will be paying for the running of the pool rather than receiving revenue from it. How is that value for money for the territory, to be in that position now where you are paying for someone to do—

Mr Rattenbury: You are comparing apples and oranges, Mr Doszpot. Under the previous arrangement, the Canberra Olympic pool and the Tuggeranong pool were let as a single package. I think it is reasonably well known that the Civic pool runs at a

loss. The Tuggeranong pool runs at a profit, for want of a better word. There has been an offsetting between those two contracts. To simply let a contract for the Canberra Olympic pool—inevitably there is a cost to government for that. So I am not sure that your description of the situation is quite accurate in that sense.

MR DOSZPOT: We should be paying due attention to the businesses that operate in Canberra and giving them every opportunity to continue the businesses that they were involved in. You are saying that it was a loss-making exercise for the government, but it was also a loss-making exercise for the contractors. So at the point that you discover—

Mr Rattenbury: The government will not be disclosing the contractor's finances, but if you are happy to, that is okay.

MR DOSZPOT: Sorry? I beg your pardon?

Mr Rattenbury: It is not the government's position to disclose the finances of any contractor. It is up to the contractor—or you, if you see fit.

MR DOSZPOT: I am not asking you to do that either. The question I am asking you is: are you being fair to the business community by trying to determine what the problem is and, once you discover what that problem is, taking the opportunity for them to refute any of the losses that they made over the last few years?

Mr Rake: We have been working very closely with the existing operator of the pool, particularly in respect of Canberra Olympic pool, to ensure that they were not unduly out of pocket for things like excessive water losses. Any large swimming pool will have some level of water loss, and the operator allows for that in their basic budget, but we had reached an agreement with the operator that recognised there were excessive losses and we needed to assist there. We are satisfied that the arrangements we are now entering do represent better value for money for the territory in aggregate, even when compared to the previous arrangements, from the perspective of both managing risk and uncertainty around the level of water loss. The repairs we are going to undertake we hope will reduce the rolling level of water loss. And comparing the management arrangement that we are letting with YMCA New South Wales for Canberra Olympic pool to the tender we received, there is a substantial price benefit for the taxpayers in the ACT.

MR DOSZPOT: You have taken questions on board; you will answer both of those. I will be comfortable if you get those answers back.

THE CHAIR: A new question, Dr Bourke.

Mr Rattenbury: We might be able to save one question on notice. If I understood your question, Mr Doszpot, you asked about the contract with YMCA New South Wales. That will be up to \$274,859.59. That is not an absolute figure. That includes a range of contingencies depending on factors that have been built into the contract.

MR DOSZPOT: That is for what period?

Mr Rattenbury: That is for the nine months to 31 March.

MR DOSZPOT: Were other potential contractors given the opportunity to put a bid in for that?

Mr Rattenbury: No, that was conducted as a single select given the short time frame available to us, after the completion of the previous tendering process.

Ms Priest: And noting that the YMCA has a proven track record and experience in coming in and undertaking interim management arrangements, and doing so at short notice.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Minister, I am interested in the Lyneham sports precinct as a major asset serving sports across north Canberra, including Belconnen. Can you talk about the role as a regional hub and also recent developments such as the Canberra Tennis Centre development and Hockey ACT's plans to rationalise their facilities, including apparently the number of bars, and perhaps introducing a childcare centre? What happened to the beach volleyball courts? They were supposed to be opened this year. And are there any plans for a new road entrance to the precinct at the Northbourne-Swinden Street intersection? How would that road affect the netball courts and feed into the network in the precinct?

Mr Rattenbury: That is quite a set of questions, Dr Bourke. In terms of Lyneham, obviously there has been a very substantial level of redevelopment. All stage 2 works in the Lyneham precinct are now complete and the precinct has been fully returned to community use and for full access and hire. The final sportsground in the precinct was made available in October last year.

The fields are now being intensively used. If you take, for example, some weeks late in June we had 130 hours of formal bookings across all of the fields, including 82 hours under lights. So the precinct is back into full usage. The car parks have all been completed. The roads have been resurfaced. All the pieces of work that were planned under stage 2 are now done.

In terms of the tennis centre, the redevelopment is now completed there as well. The ACT government provided \$7.15 million towards the new tennis facilities, which includes the four-court indoor tennis facility, refurbishment of the 12 clay courts to international standard, junior development courts and broadcast quality lighting for the centre court. So we have seen a very substantial upgrade attached to that. Tennis ACT have entered into a partnership with Next Gen health and leisure club. That has just opened as well. You cannot have missed the advertising for that one. That is a private development. The government did not fund that at all. But through that partnership with Tennis ACT, Tennis ACT have generated an ongoing source of revenue to assist them to continue to be viable as a local sporting organisation.

Certainly Tennis ACT sees that as a real positive. Obviously the Next Gen investment, which has been very substantial, in the order of \$20 million in their development, has brought a significant new facility to the north side and it will also employ up to 65

people. So that is a substantial new development on the north side.

You asked about the hockey centre. Hockey ACT have approached the government at a preliminary level in recent times. There was a story in the paper on the weekend. They are proposing to look particularly at the development of a childcare centre and also some refurbishment of their on-site buildings. You touched on the possibility of a revamped bar or eating facility. As a government, it cuts across a number of directorates, including planning and the like. I have contacted my ministerial colleagues, having been approached by Hockey, to canvass their views on this. At this stage there is not a formal government position but we are certainly looking to work with Hockey ACT. I think they have seen across the road that Tennis ACT has been able to come up with a partnership that has provided them with some financial stability, and Hockey ACT are looking at the same opportunities.

Finally, in terms of the beach volleyball facility, that is a little behind schedule but the ACT government is continuing to work with Volleyball ACT. They got higher than expected quotes for their original proposal. So sport and rec have worked with them to help to think about the scope of the project. They went out to a further tender in late May 2015 with a new scope of works. They are currently assessing those tenders with the assistance of sport and rec services. They expect to make a decision in the coming weeks. They have a major tournament in November this year, the Good Neighbour Tournament. They are working to a time frame to have works completed in time for that tournament in November.

DR BOURKE: What about the road at Northbourne and Swinden Street?

Mr Rattenbury: Yes, that is more caught up with light rail. It is not a particular road proposal in itself, but clearly with the development of light rail through that area, the Swinden Street intersection is one that will require some works. I cannot remember where it is up to. There was certainly discussion of whether there would be a stop in that area as well, because of the benefit to the Lyneham sporting precinct of having a stop there.

DR BOURKE: I have previously asked whether golf buggies would be allowed on the light rail; I was told not. I presume tennis racquets and netballs will?

Mr Rattenbury: Yes, of course. There is a bit of work to do there in terms of access to the Yowani golf club as well, in terms of intersection work. I do not have the full details of that to hand but there is certainly work being thought about in terms of the access to Swinden Street, Yowani golf club and the Lyneham sporting precinct. I do not recall the details at present.

DR BOURKE: What was the nature of the re-scoping works required for the beach volleyball?

Ms Priest: It was value management, effectively. As with any of the capital works projects, when you go out to market often you will get a response that is potentially above what a budget is. It was about working through a process of value managing, and paring back on-costs, which was done with the superintendent, Cardno, who have been engaged by Volleyball ACT as their superintendent, to have a look at costs.

THE CHAIR: A supplementary on this from Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: With the choice of land for the volleyball project, what was the process for picking the land and on what basis did beach volleyball have that land given to them?

Ms Priest: They have not had the land given to them at this stage. We are certainly looking at a sublease arrangement that they would have in terms of operating that facility. It could best be described as opportunistic and something that fitted within the strategic needs of Volleyball ACT. Also, in terms of there being some leftover land within the Lyneham sports precinct, this opportunity has come up, and it is one that we were prepared and willing to work on with Volleyball and explore, to help that sport and the growth of the sport.

MR DOSZPOT: Is it common practice to have a potential tenant build quite an extensive project on land that is not theirs?

Ms Priest: There are certainly a number of partnership arrangements with co-investment and co-contribution between sports and the ACT government around the place, including the recently announced Phillip oval redevelopment. We will be working with AFL NSW-ACT and Cricket ACT to redevelop Phillip oval. So it does happen, yes, and there are a number of examples where sports do invest with government for the benefit of the greater community and the sport.

MR DOSZPOT: I understand that the beach volleyball project we are talking about is a co-funding exercise which the sport has to put significant money into. I understand that they had to borrow that money. How can they borrow that sort of money against land that is not theirs?

Ms Priest: I am not sure that they are borrowing money against land that is not theirs. They will have a sublease. It will be a short-term sublease with some options.

MR DOSZPOT: But they would not have any equity in it.

Ms Priest: I am not sure.

Mr Rake: That is correct. They would not be taking a mortgage over the land. Similarly, it means that the government remains a partner in the management of that land. We vary the management arrangements case by case. Most of these result in the party that has the sublease taking on the management obligation. But you are correct; they would not be able to take a mortgage over it. So to the extent that they were borrowing, they would have to borrow either with other security or on an unsecured basis.

MR DOSZPOT: Does the ACT government act as guarantor in any way?

Mr Rake: No.

MR DOSZPOT: What is the specific use of the land at the moment? What can it be

used for?

Ms Priest: It is dictated by the zoning, which is recreation use.

MR DOSZPOT: I am looking at a document that we got under FOI, and it does not indicate the area now known as 48 59 for any specific use. What does that mean in terms of deciding what use can be given to it? Do you have to ask for exemptions? What is the process?

Mr Rake: Could you read that again? Did you say it is not zoned for any particular use?

MR DOSZPOT: That is what it says. “Master plan approved under DA 200915725, section 59, 63 and 64 does not indicate the area now known as 48 59 for any specific use.” I am asking what the process is to determine what use it is going to be put to. Does that have to go through a DA?

Ms Priest: There has been a DA, and there is an approved DA for the facility. It is assessed against—

MR DOSZPOT: When was that approved?

Mr Rattenbury: It was approved in May 2014. The DA was submitted in March 2014 and approved in May 2014.

THE CHAIR: We might have to move on.

MR DOSZPOT: Yes, that is fine.

THE CHAIR: A new question, Ms Lawder.

MS LAWDER: Thank you. Minister, I want to ask some local sports facilities questions. In budget paper 3 it outlines \$400,000 towards asset repair and maintenance for local sporting clubs. It says it will assist a range of community sporting organisations to keep their facilities in good working order by supporting certain repair and maintenance projects. Can you expand on what—

Mr Rattenbury: Give some examples? Yes, of course. Under the 2015 asset repair and maintenance scheme, some examples would be that the Canberra City Gymnastics Club was funded \$26,000 to have a replacement floor at their facility; Pegasus Riding for the Disabled got \$88,000, just over, to upgrade facilities; and the Pines Tennis Club was given just over \$12,000 for a lighting upgrade. The nature of these grants is to assist organisations to essentially do some capital works that they just do not have the capital for.

MS LAWDER: Would it be under that item or another one where you do things like repair of long jump pits at Little Athletics ovals?

Mr Rattenbury: Yes.

MS LAWDER: Is that under that item as well?

Ms Priest: The asset repair and maintenance fund is for more substantive, costly works. There is capacity through the sport and rec grants program to apply for support for minor upgrades and facilities like long jump.

MS LAWDER: Do you do those during the off season—those kinds of long jump repair things? I have had complaints about Kambah and Lanyon, for example, where the sand comes out and builds up a real hump all around it.

Ms Priest: Is it just a case of sand moving?

MS LAWDER: It is now grassed over.

Ms Priest: It really would depend on what was required to fix the particular issue, how much it costs and whether or not the sporting organisation has approached us through the sport and recreation grants program—or, indeed, approached us at all. If there is an issue, we would be happy to talk to whoever it is and look at what might be the best vehicle and funding mechanism to assist them. We have also got a facilities improvement program where, with small or minor things, we might be able to fit them within existing operational costs. If we can be made aware of what a particular issue is, we are more than happy to talk to the sporting organisation about either how they can apply for funding or how we might be able to assist them in other ways, depending on if it is a minor cost issue.

MS LAWDER: On page 76, there is an outline to provide an additional \$871,000 for mowing and irrigation. Is that anything specific or is it just across the board?

Mr Rattenbury: That is across the 160-odd sites where we have sporting fields in the ACT. It is to assist with our water bills and to have enough staff to continue to do the basic horticultural work of maintaining those ovals.

MS LAWDER: It is said it is reviewed on an annual basis, based on anticipated demand. Can you give a bit of an outline of how you work out anticipated demand? Is it partly weather related? Is it new clubs being registered? What sort of criteria do you look at?

Ms Priest: There are a range of factors. The papers talk about a base of funding that we have. As you indicated, things like the weather, whether or not we get a decent rainfall or not, do have a significant impact on our capacity to fund water bills. Obviously we ensure we water, to keep our fields safe and fit for the purpose. It is a bit of a moving feast, and something that we wish we were able to predict with greater certainty every year, but we cannot, for particularly that reason.

MS LAWDER: On my understanding, there may have been a number that had their irrigation switched off last year—17 sportsgrounds perhaps. Has that been restored in this additional funding.

Ms Priest: Not last year. We did turn off a number of sportsgrounds during the years of drought. There has been a systematic approach, and a prioritisation where need has

been demonstrated, to switch a number of ovals back on over the last few years. There has—

MS LAWDER: Have any of those that were turned off during the drought been switched back?

Ms Priest: Yes.

MS LAWDER: Have they all been switched back?

Ms Priest: No, not all of them; and it is possible that not all of them will be. We have also, since the years of the drought, done a number of other things, including broadening the drought-tolerant couch grass varieties, replacing natural turf with synthetic turfs and doing a whole range of other things to try and reduce our water consumption.

We have recently installed a new Rain Bird system which helps to better regulate watering across the city. We can actually water in one part of the city reliably when we are not watering in another. We may have had rain north and not south, for example. So there are a number of things that we have undertaken since the ovals were turned off and since the drought years to actually improve our water consumption where we can.

We have also introduced a new sportsground provision model for the newer suburbs, the community recreation irrigated park, and implemented a number of those at Crace and Franklin. We are just about to formally open the Franklin CRIP, as we call them—community recreation irrigated park—which is a modified sportsground unit. In consultation with sports, the old neighbourhood oval model is not necessarily the most effective model anymore and not the best approach to be taken in all circumstances of turning ovals back on. So we have actually sought to look at a different model of sportsground provision as well.

In answer to your question on those ovals that were turned off in the drought years, some have been turned back on but not all of them necessarily will be.

MS LAWDER: How many were turned off during the drought?

Ms Priest: The exact number I would have to check, but—

MS LAWDER: Can you tell me how many of those have still not been turned back on and which ovals they were?

Ms Priest: I can get you an exact number. We will take that on notice.

MS LAWDER: Yes, and the names of those. Thank you. There have been recent reports of rapid growth in junior soccer participation. Have you been looking at any new facilities to keep up with the demand for local sports like soccer?

Mr Rattenbury: Yes. Certainly soccer is one of our sports that is going very well in the ACT. We are in constant conversation with Capital Football about their needs. We

have just brought the Woden field back onstream, although, as Mr Doszpot would know, we are having a few issues with the turf there. But the Woden facility has come onstream. We have just announced in this budget the funding of the Melrose synthetic pitch. There is also great demand for indoor soccer, or futsal; that is something we are looking at closely at the moment. We are also talking with Capital Football about the best way to utilise the sports. One of the issues we have is that a lot of football is played on Saturday—a lot of junior football—but not so much on Sunday. We have more fields available on a Sunday. So it is also about having the conversations about the best utilisation of the pitches.

MS LAWDER: Do you have reports of running out of space for training as well? How is that going?

Ms Priest: Not specifically. As you have said, we certainly have had representations by and are in discussions with Capital Football about how we might help to provide additional facilities for them. They are currently going through a process of reviewing their strategic facilities plan, which we have spoken to them about. They have agreed what they will do to help prioritise where they see the need for additional facilities at this stage. We have already, as you said, got the Melrose project that is going ahead now and Woden park, which has recently come back online. We have also been talking to Capital Football about a south Curtin site that they can get greater use of as an option. It was just this season that we started discussions with them about that.

You would be aware that as a result of the Asian football cup there is funding coming back to the territory; there is a commitment to reinvest funding coming back from the Asian football cup into grassroots football. So in terms of Capital Football revising and re-prioritising where they see they need facilities, understanding that some additional funding will be coming back, we are looking forward to being able to work with them to look at the further provision of facilities.

Mr Rattenbury: They have almost completed that strategic facilities plan. We do not have it yet, but that is obviously a key part of waiting to hear what they have identified as their important priorities.

MS LAWDER: Greenway oval had a new clubhouse built. It looks as though it is pretty much finished. Will it be completely finished in this financial year that we are just finishing up or are there any outstanding works?

Mr Rattenbury: No; I understand it has finished. I was actually in it this morning; it is looking great. We are due to have an official opening, in partnership with the clubs that operate there, in a couple of weeks time.

MS LAWDER: I will look forward to my invitation.

Mr Rattenbury: I will make sure you get one, Ms Lawder. You are very welcome to join us.

MS LAWDER: Finally, to go to basketball, I understand that they delayed an expansion at the Belconnen basketball stadium. Will a government contribution to Basketball ACT still be available to them?

Mr Rattenbury: Yes. We have been quite clear with basketball. It is not unlike the volleyball conversation. We are very keen to support the sport. The initial ideas around the project perhaps have not turned out as everybody had expected, but we have been having back and forths with Basketball, indicating we want to help them, letting them think about what they want to do and putting ideas on the table ourselves. That is an ongoing conversation at this point. There is no intention of withdrawing the support for basketball. It is another of our popular and growing sports; we are keen to make sure that they do progress and take advantage of the profile of basketball, particularly at the moment.

MS LAWDER: Have you had any representations from members of the public about the move of the Tuesday night's women's basketball comp from Tuggeranong to Belconnen?

Mr Rattenbury: I have not.

Ms Priest: No, I have not.

MS LAWDER: Apparently there is no women's basketball in Tuggeranong any longer, which is quite disturbing.

Mr Rattenbury: Do you know why that happened?

MS LAWDER: I believe it was a cost issue for Basketball ACT. They have to hire the courts in Tuggeranong. They moved the women's comp and replaced it with a men's comp with fewer teams so that they did not have to hire as many courts in Tuggeranong. But my understanding is that a number of the participants from Tuggeranong then decided not to shift, because not only was it moved to Belconnen but it was on a different night, which does not always suit everyone.

Mr Rattenbury: No; I can understand—

MS LAWDER: I am just disappointed that there is no longer women's basketball in Tuggeranong.

Mr Rattenbury: Sure. It is an example of the very serious pressure we are facing on indoor sports facilities generally. I know, for example, that netball is really struggling and indoor football is really struggling. That is why we have the audit of indoor sports facilities happening at the moment. That is due to be completed in the next few weeks, and we will be using that as a basis to plan for new indoor facilities.

MS LAWDER: That would be great.

THE CHAIR: Mr Doszpot has a supplementary. We are running out of time, so you will need to be quick. Then we will have a new question from Dr Bourke, and then back to Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: So I do not get to ask my first question?

THE CHAIR: You may or may not; you have had very long supplementaries.

MR DOSZPOT: I will get back to the previous issue, looking at volleyball. When is construction due to start?

Mr Rattenbury: I do not have an exact date at this time. We do have a target date for completion, as I said earlier, which is October this year, in time for their November Good Neighbour Tournament.

MR DOSZPOT: Originally it was budgeted for \$250,000 in 2014 and \$250,000 this year. What is happening there? Has any money been advanced to Volleyball ACT—beach volleyball?

Mr Rattenbury: There has been some minor expenditure to date, which has gone to feasibility studies, engineering, concept and site investigation reports, site surveys and detailed design and approvals.

MR DOSZPOT: What was the amount given for that?

Mr Rattenbury: So far \$161,000 has been spent, of which the territory's contribution is \$119,000.

Ms Priest: Minister, can I clarify that? There is \$161,000, some of which has not been drawn down. The total expenditure to date has been \$119,000.

MR DOSZPOT: What is causing the delays?

Ms Priest: Our latest discussions with Volleyball ACT have been over the course of the last week or so. Their board has asked them to go back and do a final due diligence, in terms of their assessment of the latest tenders. They have an approved loan facility, which I think I have referred to previously. Their board has asked for Volleyball ACT to go back and do a final due diligence, given the passage of time.

MR DOSZPOT: The initial cost that we were told about was around \$750,000. There is also a summary of costs that I am looking at that is for \$1,055,000. Can you explain the difference?

Mr Rattenbury: Which summary of costs is that, Mr Doszpot?

MR DOSZPOT: I am looking at “beach volleyball schedule 3 documents”. It is a summary of the Lyneham beach volleyball facility.

Mr Rattenbury: Is that a government document?

MR DOSZPOT: It is from Cardno.

Ms Priest: The original estimate was for \$750,000, as you say. When they went out and did the first procurement process the costs came in greater than that, which is why there is a differentiation. There have been a number of processes of value management undertaken since that original tender process last year.

MR DOSZPOT: So what is the total cost now?

Ms Priest: I do not yet have a final cost.

Mr Rake: We are still working through a process to see if Volleyball can come up with a viable project to go ahead with.

MR DOSZPOT: I think there is a bit of a missing piece of the jigsaw puzzle here. You originally agreed to \$250,000, \$250,000 and \$250,000 co-contribution. If it has blown out to a million dollars, will ACT Volleyball, beach volleyball, be able to sustain the increase in what it is going to cost?

Mr Rattenbury: That is the way that it is being done at the moment, and that is why we are not able to give you a final answer, because those negotiations and fitting that final piece of the puzzle are work that is still in progress.

THE CHAIR: We are going to have to finish and go to Dr Bourke.

MR DOSZPOT: One final question. What was the reason, from the ACT's point of view, that it has taken two whole fiscal years and the projected \$250,000 was not paid? That was not all beach volleyball, surely?

Mr Rattenbury: For the same reasons we have already outlined. There has not been a final agreed design and cost that everybody has been happy with. So that work has continued.

THE CHAIR: Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Minister, in Belconnen we have a number of ovals that are regularly used for sport, and have toilets and change rooms that were probably built in the 60s and 70s. Do you have regular maintenance schedules for those toilets and change rooms? Where there are lighting towers, do they have a mandated level of brightness that you aim for in the centre of the ovals? What charges do you apply for unlocking toilets and change rooms, for training at night? I presume that is something you can answer wearing your other ministerial hat. With the vehicle barriers around ovals, how well are they maintained?

Mr Rattenbury: Which barriers?

DR BOURKE: The vehicle barriers around ovals: how well are they maintained to prevent hoons from damaging the pitch?

Mr Rattenbury: Let me start at the bottom of that list. It is one of those multidirectorate things. The vehicle barriers are generally provided by TAMS and they are maintained very quickly. If we find out either through the rangers seeing it or the public reporting it, they are replaced as quickly as possible, for the exact reason you identified, which is trying to prevent vehicles from getting onto the ovals, because they can do a lot of damage. In terms of charges for opening, with the public toilets around town, TAMS operate some of them and sport and rec operate some of the

others. As for the actual opening costs, I will need to take that on notice. I do not know if there are any.

Ms Priest: There are no opening costs as such. We have a sportsground booking fee, which is published in our fees and charges. As part of that it would cover the ranger coming out and opening the facilities, and then locking them at the conclusion of the booking.

Mr Rattenbury: In terms of lighting towers, I think your question was about the brightness of those. It depends on the nature of the facility. If it is just a training facility then the lux is lower, but if it is a competition facility then the standard goes up. So there is a variety across the city and they are being upgraded over time. For example, we have just done, in your area, the Belconnen Netball Association courts at Charnwood. They, for example, as part of an upgrade, now have competition quality lighting. In doing the upgrade, the cost means the technology gets better. So those have been upgraded to that standard. Did I forget anything?

DR BOURKE: There was the regular maintenance schedule.

Mr Rattenbury: There is certainly a regular cleaning schedule for those facilities.

Ms Priest: There is a facilities improvement program. I think I have spoken about this on previous occasions as well. It is like painting the Harbour Bridge. We do the very best we can to maintain all of our facilities over a reasonable period of time, and we program it according to the greatest need.

DR BOURKE: Does that happen on an as needed basis or is there a scheduled basis? Do you rely upon users to call you up or do you check?

Ms Priest: No, we are working to get a lot more strategic in regard to that. We are constantly auditing the condition of our facilities and prioritising what is required above other works. Certainly, where matters are brought to our attention, we look to prioritise those as well.

DR BOURKE: Finally, could you give me an update on the work at Weetangera oval and when is it due for completion?

Ms Priest: We were delayed in completing the pavilion there. We had an ACAT appeal which has now been resolved. The expected completion date for the pavilion is September.

THE CHAIR: Mr Doszpot, you have 23 seconds, as long as the minister agrees.

MR DOSZPOT: Minister, can you give us an indication of why, in the Woden facility, which blew out to about \$7 million, the spectator seating was cut by around 50 per cent and there was no sunshade or scoreboard provided for the oval?

Mr Rattenbury: As we went through in the Assembly just a couple of weeks ago, Mr Doszpot, in terms of the seating, the seating is all movable. ACT Sport and Rec Services owns a range of movable seating, and that seating is moved around from

time to time. It is certainly available for use at Woden if the—

MR DOSZPOT: Minister, with all due respect, the seating was there at Woden oval beforehand and it is no longer there.

Mr Rattenbury: That is because Woden was closed while it was redeveloped, so it was utilised somewhere else.

MR DOSZPOT: The football has been going on for a whole season at the moment. We are partway through, and the seating has been cut by 50 per cent.

Mr Rattenbury: There has been no indication of a request for additional seating at this point in time, I understand.

MR DOSZPOT: What about the sunshade?

Mr Rattenbury: Yes, the sun shading is being worked on at the moment.

Ms Priest: We have got quotes and we are looking to press ahead with four banks of 50 seats, so an additional 200 seats for Woden park.

MR DOSZPOT: Where are they going to go?

Ms Priest: I will have to confirm exactly where they are going to go, but we are certainly working—

MR DOSZPOT: There are now buildings where the seats used to be.

Mr Rattenbury: Mr Doszpot, come on!

THE CHAIR: We are running out of time. Could we just get the answer?

Ms Priest: There will be an additional 200 covered seating arrangement, and we are trying to get that sorted out in time for the end of the year.

MR DOSZPOT: I will look forward to seeing it.

THE CHAIR: We might call it a day there. Thank you, minister; thank you, officials. I think you have undertaken to get back to us with a couple of answers. If they could be provided within the five days, we would appreciate that. The transcript, when it is available, will be provided for correction and proofreading. If there is anything you would like to suggest, we would love to hear from you.

Members, that is the final session of the public hearings of the 2015-16 estimates committee. We will now go into the deliberation phase, which will be just as exciting, I am sure. Thank you.

The committee adjourned at 5.03 pm.