



# Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

**NINTH ASSEMBLY**

**2 AUGUST 2018**

[www.hansard.act.gov.au](http://www.hansard.act.gov.au)

## Thursday, 2 August 2018

Betting Operations Tax Bill 2018 .....	2585
Courts and Other Justice Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 (No 2) .....	2586
Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018 .....	2588
Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018 .....	2592
End of Life Choices in the ACT—Select Committee .....	2594
Executive members' business—precedence .....	2598
National Energy Guarantee .....	2598
Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018 .....	2610
Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee .....	2611
Senior Practitioner Bill 2018 .....	2615
Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee .....	2626
Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018 .....	2626
Ministerial arrangements .....	2627
Questions without notice:	
Australian Labor Party—preselection .....	2628
Planning—development applications .....	2628
Australian Labor Party—preselection .....	2629
Land—rural property acquisition .....	2629
Public housing—renewal program .....	2630
Land—Molonglo stage 3 .....	2632
Floriade—financial management .....	2632
Youth—social participation .....	2633
Building—code compliance .....	2635
Health—adult mental health unit .....	2636
Housing—housing choices .....	2637
Building—code compliance .....	2639
Office for LGBTIQ Affairs—outcomes .....	2640
Crime—motorcycle gangs .....	2641
Crime—motorcycle gangs .....	2644
Domestic and family violence—family safety hub .....	2645
Supplementary answers to questions without notice:	
Land—rural property acquisition .....	2647
Land—Molonglo stage 3 .....	2647
Crime—motorcycle gangs .....	2647
Land—rural property acquisition .....	2647
Papers .....	2648
Call-in powers—block 6 section 79, Giralang .....	2648
Paper .....	2649
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body—report .....	2650
Choice in education (Matter of public importance) .....	2651
Visitor .....	2660
Choice in education (Matter of public importance) .....	2660
Animal Diseases Amendment Bill 2018 .....	2664
Stock Amendment Bill 2018 .....	2672
Adjournment:	
Schools—visits .....	2677
Federal government—territory rights .....	2678

Canberra Institute of Technology—heart health program.....	2679
Federal government—territory rights .....	2680
Environment—climate change .....	2680
Federal government—territory rights .....	2681
Plastic Free July.....	2681
ACTION bus service—network .....	2682
Federal government—territory rights .....	2684
Environment—plastic bag ban .....	2684
Federal government—territory rights .....	2685
Federal government—territory rights .....	2686
Schedule of amendments:	
Schedule 1: Senior Practitioner Bill 2018 .....	2687
Answers to questions:	
ACT Policing—Firearms Consultative Committee (Question No 1052).....	2689
Government—vehicle fleet (Question No 1325).....	2690
Government—carers strategy (Question No 1327) .....	2694
Government—concession programs (Question No 1340).....	2697
Government—payments (Question No 1341) .....	2698
Government—payments (Question No 1342) .....	2699
Government—concession programs (Question No 1344).....	2699
Government—revenue collection transformation program (Question No 1345) .....	2700
Land—tax (Question No 1346) .....	2701
Land—tax (Question No 1347) .....	2711
Land—tax (Question No 1348) .....	2711
Land—tax (Question No 1349) .....	2721
Land—tax (Question No 1350) .....	2721
Land—tax (Question No 1351) .....	2725
Land—tax (Question No 1352) .....	2725
Land—tax (Question No 1353) .....	2726
Land—rent scheme (Question No 1354).....	2727
Housing—first home owners (Question No 1355).....	2728
Government—notifiable invoices (Question No 1356).....	2728
Education Directorate—staff (Question No 1358).....	2732
Health—multicultural health policy unit (Question No 1359) .....	2734
ACT Health—staffing (Question No 1360) .....	2736
Government—vehicle fleet (Question No 1362).....	2737
ACT Ambulance Service—crews (Question No 1363—revised answer)....	2740
Bushfires—controlled burns (Question No 1376).....	2741
Planning—light rail (Question No 1378) .....	2742
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1381).....	2743
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1382).....	2744
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1383).....	2744
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1384).....	2745
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1385).....	2746
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1386).....	2746
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1387).....	2746
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1388).....	2747
Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1389).....	2747

[illegible]

Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1439) .....	2776
Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1440) .....	2778
Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1441) .....	2779
Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1442) .....	2779
Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1443) .....	2779
Alexander Maconochie Centre—review (Question No 1444) .....	2781
Planning—Moncrieff (Question No 1445) .....	2785
Alexander Maconochie Centre—Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees (Question No 1446) .....	2786
Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders—Boomanulla Oval (Question No 1448) .....	2788
Sport—fencing (Question No 1450) .....	2789
Sport—ground maintenance (Question No 1451) .....	2790
Transport—parking (Question No 1452) .....	2791
Questions without notice taken on notice:	
Roads—Ashley Drive .....	2792
Planning—land use .....	2792
Rural fire services—Molonglo .....	2793
Cabinet—meetings .....	2793
Planning—Territory Plan .....	2794
Hospitals—waiting times .....	2794
Land—Dickson land swap .....	2795
Budget—Canberra Institute of Technology .....	2795
Budget—Canberra Institute of Technology .....	2795
Courts—building works .....	2795
Budget—health funding .....	2796
Budget—infrastructure .....	2796
Greyhound racing—transition package .....	2796
Land—sales .....	2797

**Thursday, 2 August 2018**

**MADAM SPEAKER** (Ms J Burch) took the chair at 10 am, made a formal recognition that the Assembly was meeting on the lands of the traditional custodians, and asked members to stand in silence and pray or reflect on their responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

## **Betting Operations Tax Bill 2018**

**Mr Barr**, pursuant to notice, presented the bill, its explanatory statement and a Human Rights Act compatibility statement.

Title read by Clerk.

**MR BARR** (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (10.01): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I present to the Assembly the Betting Operations Tax Bill 2018. This bill establishes the legislative framework for the implementation of a new point of consumption betting tax in the ACT. The bill provides for a new act to tax gambling occurring in the ACT from 1 January 2019.

Under existing arrangements, betting taxes are levied at the point of supply, such as where the betting operator is located. However, shifts in technology and tastes have led to growth in the market for online betting. Suppliers who offer online services to customers in other jurisdictions are not captured by traditional point of supply legislation.

This means that online gambling suppliers based in low or no-tax jurisdictions are currently avoiding tax payments on a large number of betting transactions. Jurisdictions are unable to use this tax revenue to support gambling harm reduction where it occurs. This also puts traditional betting operators, who are taxed at the point of supply, at a competitive disadvantage.

A majority of Australia's states and territories have agreed to address this through implementing a point of consumption tax with a harmonised base and collection framework across jurisdictions. From January 2019, six of the eight Australian jurisdictions will have implemented point of consumption gambling taxes. The tax will be levied where the bet is placed; that is, at the place of consumption. This model better aligns taxation with the location where the social costs of gambling occur.

South Australia and Queensland have already implemented point of consumption taxes. Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales have announced plans to introduce similar legislation to commence from 1 January 2019. Jurisdictions have taken this shared approach because it will create a more level playing field between online and in-person betting operators when it comes to the tax that they pay.

The ACT bill is based largely on South Australian and Queensland legislation. It establishes that the new tax will be payable by betting operators that accept bets from, or provide services to, people located in the ACT, regardless of where the operator may be based.

The tax is calculated at an initial rate of 15 per cent on the net wagering revenue of an operator for a financial year in excess of a tax-free threshold. The wagering revenue means the value of bets placed in the ACT, less the operator's payouts to customers. Smaller operators, such as on-course bookmakers at territory racing events, are not expected to be liable for the tax because of the operation of the tax-free threshold of \$150,000.

Betting operators who are liable for the tax must register with the ACT revenue office and lodge monthly and annual returns. The bill also amends the Taxation Administration Act 1999 so that general tax administration and enforcement provisions of that act will apply.

This bill introduces legislation in keeping with the approach taken by other jurisdictions. It taxes betting operators that are not already caught by the current gaming and racing legislation, and it brings back within the ACT stronger capacities to meet the social costs of gambling that are incurred here in Canberra. I commend this bill to the Assembly.

Debate (on motion by **Mr Parton**) adjourned to the next sitting.

## **Courts and Other Justice Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 (No 2)**

**Mr Ramsay**, pursuant to notice, presented the bill, its explanatory statement and a Human Rights Act compatibility statement.

Title read by Clerk.

**MR RAMSAY** (Ginninderra—Attorney-General, Minister for Regulatory Services, Minister for the Arts and Community Events and Minister for Veterans and Seniors) (10.06): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I am pleased to present the Courts and Other Justice Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 (No 2) to the Legislative Assembly. This bill reflects the government's program of continuous improvement, and a holistic approach to the justice system. It is also a demonstration of the value that this government places on older Canberrans in the workforce. This bill will adjust the retirement ages for key justice system officers, it will provide for flexible working arrangements in the courts, and it will improve the legislative foundation for the administration of the courts. The legislative changes in this bill are straightforward and simple, but that does not take away from their importance.

The primary set of amendments in this bill will increase the retirement age of magistrates, the ACAT President and the Director of Public Prosecutions from the age of 65 to 70. Supreme Court judges currently are eligible to sit until the age of 70. While magistrates, the DPP and the President of the ACAT play very different functional roles in the justice system to judges, the differing ages of retirement that apply to them are now clearly historical. This change will bring the ACT into line with most other Australian jurisdictions.

The increased age of retirement means that sitting magistrates, directors and tribunal presidents will not be required to leave the bench at age 65. In addition to recognising the importance of these roles in the justice system, this change also recognises the value that we place on older Canberrans in the workforce. All of our workplaces benefit from their experience and participation, and the justice system is certainly no exception.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank Mr Hanson for raising the issue of the retirement age of magistrates with his bill of May 2018. There is no difference of principle between our bills, and the government has been engaged with the courts over the course of this term. The government's bill is the result of that engagement. It brings together a broad series of improvements that have been identified cooperatively with the courts.

The second set of amendments in this bill also proceed from a recognition that the courts are a workplace. The bill will allow magistrates to work on a part-time basis. Previously there has been no provision for magistrates to work part-time in the ACT, although this is allowed in similar courts interstate.

The introduction of this provision will create increased flexibility in the working arrangements of magistrates. It will help to support magistrates to manage family or carer responsibilities, or to transition towards retirement. The part-time work arrangements will be negotiated between the magistrate and the Chief Magistrate, but will be required to be approved by the Attorney-General.

These amendments do not disturb the overarching responsibility of the Chief Magistrate for ensuring the orderly and prompt discharge of the business of the court. They simply provide the Chief Magistrate with more flexibility in discharging this function, while also providing government with the ability to have oversight over the resourcing arrangements of the court.

The third set of amendments in this bill deal with improvements to court legislation. Amendments to the Court Procedures Act 2004 will clarify the governance arrangements for the statutory office of the Principal Registrar. The Principal Registrar is a key office that manages the administration of our courts and tribunals. These provisions are modelled on similar provisions applying to the Director of Public Prosecutions and Solicitor-General, and deal with the responsibilities of the office and its powers to manage staff.

Importantly, this bill aligns the conditions under which the executive can make decisions about the Principal Registrar's appointment with legislation about the



Solicitor-General and the Director of Public Prosecutions. New section 11C contains a range of criteria to consider that could allow the executive to end the Principal Registrar's appointment. Examples include on grounds of misbehaviour or incapacity to perform the functions of the office. These are rarely used, but they are important provisions to facilitate transparency and good governance.

The bill also makes amendments to the statutory framework applying to the associate judge of the Supreme Court. The role of the associate judge is one that has evolved from the role of master. Historically, the role of master on a court was confined to a limited set of civil matters. This differing role meant that, unlike a judge, the master's term of appointment could be for a seven-year term.

As the name change implies, the associate judge performs many of the same functions as resident judges, and her jurisdiction has recently been extended to cover some criminal matters. Under the existing legislation the government has the option to appoint the current associate judge for either a seven-year term or until the age of 70. The government chose to make its most recent appointment until retirement age. This bill recognises the evolution of the role by removing the legislative option to appoint for a term of seven years. This will mean that, as with the current appointment, all future appointments to the role will be until the age of 70.

I am pleased to present the Courts and Other Justice Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 (No. 2). This bill demonstrates the government's focus on recognising the importance of workplaces, and the role of older Canberrans in the workplace. It also shows that our ongoing engagement with the justice system is continuing to yield tangible improvements. These improvements will support our justice system to keep on offering first-rate services to this community. I commend this bill to the Assembly.

Debate (on motion by **Mr Coe**) adjourned to the next sitting.

## **Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018**

**Ms Stephen-Smith**, pursuant to notice, presented the bill, its explanatory statement and a Human Rights Act compatibility statement.

Title read by Clerk.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations) (10.13): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

Today, I am pleased to present the Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018, which makes amendments to the Government Procurement Act 2001. The reforms that will be initiated by this bill deliver on the government's

commitment to deliver a secure local jobs package to deliver better outcomes for workers in businesses and organisations that do work for the territory.

The bill and code set out the government's expectations that businesses tendering for territory-funded work abide by the highest ethical and labour standards. This is not just the government's expectation; this is the community's expectation. Too often over recent years, we have seen evidence, both locally and nationally, of employers entering into sham contracting arrangements, exploiting visa workers, and avoiding their industrial, workers compensation and taxation obligations.

In 2017, the Fair Work Ombudsman paid a return visit to 80 ACT businesses that had previously been found to be non-compliant with their obligations. On this return visit, 40 per cent, 32 businesses, were still non-compliant. In January this year, the ombudsman announced that more than \$27,000 had been recovered from southern Canberra businesses on behalf of employees after an audit prompted by a high proportion of requests for assistance from young workers.

This government and our community believe in fairness. We believe that the key to building a better Canberra is to provide opportunities to the people and businesses that do their part to make this city a better place to live. As the Chief Minister said earlier this week, workers deserve fair pay and secure entitlements. They have the right to organise and be represented by their union.

This is not just what we believe, Madam Speaker; it is the law. In crafting this bill and the subordinate instrument of the secure local jobs code, the government has been mindful of the limits of our authority as a territory. We do not have the capacity to make operable industrial relations law, except in specific areas such as work health and safety.

The ACT government cannot change the rules, Madam Speaker; it will take a federal Labor government to do that. The ACT government cannot restore penalty rates; it will take a federal Labor government to do that. The ACT government cannot abolish the anti-union Australian Building and Construction Commission and the code for the tendering and performance of building work; it will take a federal Labor government to do that.

But the ACT Labor government will always stand up for workers where it is in our power to do so, ensuring as far as possible that they can go to work and be treated with respect, be paid fairly and go home safely to their families at the end of each day. One of the ways we will achieve this is by using the government's purchasing power to demonstrate the standards we expect to see across the economy.

While this approach supports and protects workers on government projects, it is important to emphasise that it also rewards businesses that do the right thing by their workers. Creating a transparent, well-governed pre-qualification regime provides ethical employers with the opportunity to undertake territory-funded work over dishonest and unscrupulous businesses. We will make our expectations clear and will provide support for territory entities—directorates and agencies—and for businesses and organisations to understand the process and comply with it.

Rightly, the community expects the government to be a model purchaser. Quite simply, governments should not be giving their businesses to employers who sidestep or ignore their obligations and, in doing so, undercut their rule-abiding competitors. This bill will legislate a pre-qualification audit regime, to be known as the secure local jobs code certificate; new tender evaluation and contract oversight requirements; a ministerial advisory council; and internal governance and supporting infrastructure, including establishment of the statutory role of registrar for the secure local jobs code.

This bill will help ensure a level playing field for those seeking government work. It will also encourage employers across the territory to lift their standards and do better by their workers so that no-one gets left behind.

The secure local jobs package as a whole will also simplify the sometimes complex processes businesses must undertake in order to tender for work. A number of existing requirements and policies will be streamlined and clarified as a result of these new arrangements.

Guidance on how agencies are expected to comply with the requirement for ensuring “probity and ethical behaviour” under section 22A of the act already requires the completion of an ethical suppliers declaration for relevant projects and compliance with the industrial relations and employment obligations strategy, as well as outlining specific requirements for contract provisions and contract management.

More than 1,500 companies currently hold certificates under the existing industrial relations and employment certification regime for building and construction contracts. Code certification will replace this process for the building and construction sector.

There is already an ethical suppliers declaration that tenderers are required to complete for prescribed works and services worth \$25,000 or more, which will be folded into this process. Individual agencies have different tender requirements and contract terms to endeavour to meet the objective of contracting only with service providers that meet their ethical and labour relations obligations.

As we all know, there is currently an MOU with UnionsACT that is given effect through various parts of the procurement process. The MOU will be phased out as the code takes effect: first in the construction, cleaning, security and traffic management sectors; and then for all procurements when the second tranche of the territory-funded work is established under schedule 1 to the bill.

These current mechanisms are fragmented and difficult for territory entities to understand and comply with consistently, in part because they are established through a range of different policies and guidelines and in part because there is limited support for territory entities in doing so.

The secure local jobs package will create a strong, clear governance arrangement to enable all parties—tenderers, contractors and territory entities—to comply with obligations that in most instances already exist but are difficult to demonstrate or enforce.

The key way in which this bill ensures a level playing field is through the establishment of secure local job certificates, a certification system which would test employer compliance with workplace relations obligations. The bill will also place obligations on government entities to ensure that tenderers for affected contracts meet a number of requirements, including that they hold a secure local jobs certificate. A secure local jobs certificate would only be granted if a supplier is demonstrably meeting their workplace relations obligations. Auditors will actively verify businesses' compliance with the standards provided for in the secure local jobs code in order to be granted certification.

As I have mentioned, the secure local jobs code, which will be made via disallowable instrument, sets out workplace standards and related requirements to ensure that workers receive the highest possible protections. To ensure further legal protection of workers, the bill also requires the territory to only enter into a contract for certain classes of procurement if the contract includes standard terms in relation to the secure local jobs code. These terms require the provision of adequate training and inductions on workplace safety and employee rights, amongst other things such as ongoing adherence to these standards set out in the code.

The requirements I have outlined would apply to specific categories of services or works for territory entities where insecure or poor work practices have been observed. In the first instance, these will be contracts primarily for construction work, cleaning, security or traffic management services issued after 15 January 2019.

Within 12 months of notification, the scope of the new requirements will be expanded to include all territory government contracts that are primarily for labour and valued above an amount prescribed by legislation. I expect the contract value in this respect will be \$200,000 or more, aligning with the existing threshold at which a number of procurement obligations take effect. The commencement dates are intended to give industry time to prepare and familiarise itself with the new obligations.

To make sure that employers meet their obligations and that there is truly a level playing field, the bill establishes a clear governance framework. It establishes the role of a registrar to oversee the framework, and equips the registrar with powers to conduct investigations and take compliance action against secure local jobs code certificate holders that breach the code. The registrar will be able to receive complaints from somebody who believes on reasonable grounds that the code is being breached, and to respond accordingly.

These measures will help ensure that dishonest businesses cannot seek competitive advantage by circumventing their obligations. To ensure fairness to all involved, the bill also includes the ability to appeal certain decisions relating to secure local jobs code certificates to the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

When the Chief Minister committed to a secure local jobs package, he said it would create an efficient, clear and transparent governance regime for the resolution of disputes, and that is exactly what this bill does. While the bill applies to public contracts for certain categories of services or works, this will have positive flow-on effects throughout the territory as ethical businesses meet these higher standards.

The bill requires the registrar to maintain a publicly accessible register of entities that hold a secure local jobs code certificate as well as those who are prohibited from holding one. This will make it easier for the community to follow the government's example and use their own dollars to support employers that meet the highest ethical and labour standards for their workers. We know that this is something Canberrans care about.

This government acknowledges the importance of unions and industry working together to achieve the best outcomes for workers. In developing this bill and the secure local jobs code, the government has already undertaken extensive consultation with stakeholders. Alongside the presentation of this bill today, a consultation draft secure local jobs code is being released for public comment. As the Assembly knows, this government will always encourage people to have their say. I encourage workers, unions, industry and the wider community to comment on the draft code.

We will continue to work with stakeholders to ensure the best outcomes for workers. This is why the bill also establishes the secure local jobs code advisory council. This council will advise the portfolio minister on the operation of the secure local jobs code and undertake a review of its operation within two years of commencement.

As well as giving businesses time to prepare, the government will seek to assist businesses to meet their obligations. For example, one of the registrar's functions is to promote an understanding and acceptance of the secure local jobs code. The registrar will also develop educational programs to help secure local jobs code certificate holders to meet and maintain their obligations.

Madam Speaker, the government is committed to securing the best conditions we can for workers in businesses and organisations that undertake work for the government. Everyone in the Canberra community will benefit from these nation-leading changes that demonstrate this government's commitment to standing up for workers and their families.

In closing, Madam Speaker, and with the indulgence of the chamber, I might just add a few words to my prepared remarks. I wish to acknowledge that development of the secure local jobs package has been a complex piece of work. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the officials who have worked so hard to get us to this point. Their efforts, and also those of my staff, are greatly appreciated.

I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Debate (on motion by **Mr Wall**) adjourned to the next sitting.

## **Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018**

### **Reference to committee**

**MR WALL** (Brindabella) (10.27): I move:

That:

- (1) the Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018 be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts for inquiry and report, pursuant to standing order 174; and
- (2) the Standing Committee on Public Accounts report back to the Assembly on this inquiry by no later than 25 October 2018.

I am seeking to refer this bill to a committee. The opposition believes that the public accounts committee is probably the most appropriate committee to examine these changes, given that they relate directly to the procurement act. Some consideration was also given to whether or not the education, employment and youth affairs committee might be the appropriate stopping point for it but, given that it does solely deal with the procurement act, it does sit within the existing purview of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

There has been considerable discussion and also considerable concern raised about it in many areas of the community, particularly amongst the business community. I know that the Master Builders Association, the HIA and the Canberra Business Chamber, just to name a few, have raised a number of concerns around this legislation, how it fits in with existing commonwealth laws and its application here in the territory.

Likewise I note that Minister Stephen-Smith has indicated to those stakeholders at various points that there will be further consultation on this bill following its presentation. There is a very good mechanism in the Assembly for consultation; that is, a committee inquiry. It is one that is seldom used for legislation. I think this is an appropriate piece of legislation to be referred to the committee.

I am calling on the committee to report by 25 October. I understand that there is a little bit of discussion to be had around exactly what the reporting date will be, and that this motion is likely to be adjourned in a moment. The reason I am choosing the date of 25 October is that we are seeking to be reasonable both to the Assembly and to the government, in having their legislative agenda debated in the Assembly. It is also about giving due time and consideration to the community to have an opportunity to reflect on the legislation, given that no-one has seen it until a couple of moments ago, prepare a submission, take part in the inquiry and then give the committee due time to report back to the Assembly.

I am also bearing in mind that the public accounts committee has an inquiry underway into rates, which was referred by this Assembly. That is due to report in the sitting week in September. Bearing in mind that workload, I think that an extra couple of weeks is reasonable. The date of 25 October is the end of the first sitting week in October. It would then allow the government to bring that bill back on, should they choose to do so, in the second sitting week in October. I will leave my comments there, and I look forward to receiving support.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (10.31): The Greens are very supportive of this bill overall. We think that there are important principles contained in this legislation. We

also support the principle that where a committee proposes to have a look at a piece of legislation, it should have that opportunity. That is very common in some parliaments. It is not so much a practice in this parliament.

The committees will need to think about how they are going to do this. Committee inquiries here tend to be at the lengthier end of the spectrum. People like to have time to look at these things. If committees are going to deal with legislation, we need to punch it through a bit faster.

We intend to support the referral to a committee, but there needs to be some discussion on the exact timing. I appreciate Mr Wall's comments, but I am also mindful of the timetable that the minister is working to. Ms Le Couteur will shortly seek to adjourn this matter. We will sort that out and come back to it a bit later today.

Debate (on motion by **Ms Le Couteur**) adjourned to a later hour.

### **End of Life Choices in the ACT—Select Committee Amendment to resolution**

**MS CHEYNE** (Ginninderra) (10.32): I move:

That the resolution of the Assembly of 30 November 2017, which established the Select Committee on End Of Life Choices in the ACT be amended by adding the following paragraph:

“(8) notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 241, Committee considerations do not preclude Members from publicly discussing Territory rights, including the current Federal legislative restriction on voluntary assisted dying, to allow all Members to comply with that contained within (4) of the unanimously passed *Voluntary Assisted Dying* motion of 1 November 2017.”.

Madam Speaker, this is a small but important change. You will vividly recall, I am sure, that on 1 November 2017 I moved a motion which called on each member of the Legislative Assembly to raise with federal political colleagues and counterparts, as appropriate, the increasingly paternalistic and unreasonable curtailment of our legislative powers in this place and how poorly this reflects on the commonwealth parliament's understanding of the ACT's capacity to govern itself, and to convey to the commonwealth government and opposition, at every available and appropriate forum, the need to repeal the Euthanasia Laws Act 1997 and to restore to the territories the right to make laws in respect of voluntary euthanasia and voluntary assisted dying. You will recall, Madam Speaker, that this motion was passed unanimously.

On 30 November 2017 a select committee was established. Among its terms of reference is that it inquire into the impact of federal legislation on the ACT determining its own policy on voluntary assisted dying and the process for achieving change.

It was not immediately apparent that both of these motions being passed places members who are on the committee in a very difficult position, thanks to standing order 241. Committee members cannot speak about committee deliberations or proceedings publicly. In this case this includes the impact of federal legislation and the process for achieving change. This is, of course, in contradiction to the unanimously passed motion of 1 November that all members in this place should be conveying to the commonwealth government and opposition the need to repeal the Euthanasia Laws Act and restore territory rights at every available and appropriate forum.

This contradiction has become apparent, and starkly apparent, in the past few weeks since Senator Leyonhjelm did the deal that now sees the federal parliament debating territory rights in coming weeks.

That five members of this place cannot speak of their home, cannot speak about the rights of where they live, cannot speak about the rights that should be afforded in this place simply because of one line in a committee's terms of reference is, frankly, silly. I think there is a broader conversation that we can have in the standing orders review. But the fact remains that this is an issue right now.

During what is probably the best chance this territory has in having its rights restored, elected members of this place not being able to represent their constituents, not being able to represent their wishes when it matters most, is pretty much deplorable.

This is a simple amendment to the terms of reference. It recognises that the committee continues to have an important job to do, and that the federal legislation, while it exists, should be inquired into. It means that members in this place can also fulfil that which was contained in the earlier resolution of the Assembly, particularly at this most important time. I commend the motion to the Assembly.

**MS LE COUTEUR** (Murrumbidgee) (10.36): I rise to support Ms Cheyne's motion. There are probably a couple of things to talk about here. From my point of view, and the point of view of the Greens as a whole, repealing the Andrews legislation has been our policy basically ever since there was Andrews legislation to be repealed.

The Greens have always felt that the citizens of the ACT are equal to the citizens of anywhere else in Australia, and we deserve to have the same legislative rights as anyone else. Our former leader, Bob Brown, moved to introduce legislation in that regard. Our current leader, Richard Di Natale, once moved to introduce legislation in conjunction with former Senator Katy Gallagher, and was preparing to do that again, until Katy Gallagher became former Senator Katy Gallagher.

The Greens policy on this issue is very clear. It is a little unfortunate to have the issue regarding committees, which particularly impinges on my and Shane's ability to say things about this matter. I agree with Ms Cheyne that we do need to make some more substantive changes to the standing orders about what committee members may or may not say. The Greens proposed some changes along those lines in our submission to admin and procedure. I ask admin and procedure to look very carefully at the



competing issues. There is obviously no point in having a committee if it is abundantly obvious that everyone has already made up their minds; equally, MLAs have an obligation to represent their constituents and to talk about issues of importance to them. We have to get a balance which is fair on both of these competing priorities.

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (10.38): The Canberra Liberals will be opposing this motion for a variety of reasons. Firstly, as a member of the committee, neither Mrs Kikkert nor I was advised of this motion as a courtesy.

**Ms Cheyne**: It has been on the notice paper since Monday.

**MRS DUNNE**: It has been on the notice paper since Monday, yes, but if Ms Cheyne wants to make a departure from the established standing orders, it would have been a courtesy for her to flag this issue with her committee colleagues.

**Ms Cheyne**: You could have talked to me about it at any time over the past three days.

**MRS DUNNE**: Ms Cheyne can interject all she likes but I do not resile from the fact that Ms Cheyne, as one member of the committee dealing with another, should have at least had the courtesy of raising this—and it is her initiative—with Mrs Kikkert and me. It is clear that she has raised it with Ms Le Couteur. If it is good enough for Ms Le Couteur, it is good enough for Mrs Kikkert and me.

It is not about wounded pride or being miffed that Ms Cheyne has not raised this issue with Mrs Kikkert and me. The issue is a proposal to radically depart from the standing orders in this place. Quite frankly, it is about Ms Cheyne's personal aggrandisement. An opportunity has presented itself whereby an issue that she is passionate about has been raised in the public, and she feels that she may be constrained in some way from participating in that debate.

I submit that it is not necessary to suspend the provisions of standing order 241. Standing order 241 is quite broad, and there is nothing to stop Ms Cheyne or any other member of the end of life committee speaking in public about something that they believe in, as long as they do not divulge the private deliberations of the committee. A member could, for instance, refer to a published submission. It is on the public record. You do not need to suspend standing order 241 to refer to something which is in the public domain. Members of the public have given evidence in public and that evidence is published. There is nothing to stop a member of this place, either a member of the committee or anyone else, referring to that public evidence.

This motion is unnecessary and unprecedented. On the basis that it is unnecessary, I am opposed to it. On the basis that it is unprecedented that Ms Cheyne wants to find some way of getting around the standing orders, I am opposed to it. The Canberra Liberals will be opposing this motion.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (10.41): I was listening very carefully to what Mrs Dunne had to say. Whilst I think that, on the face of it, she is making a very literal interpretation of the standing orders which is probably a fair one, with respect

to the practice that I have observed in this place and the culture that exists around committees—I, and a number of members, have observed this over the years—there is generally a sense that once you are on a committee and looking at something, you should not speak publicly about it.

There have been occasions both in the chamber and outside when members have felt very curtailed from making a comment. I think the practice has built up and there has been an acceptance that if you are on a committee, you do not make an observation.

As I say, I think Mrs Dunne is perhaps right in a “letter of the law” interpretation, but the practice of this place has been different. The fact that Ms Cheyne has brought forward this proposal is probably wise in the sense that if she wants to be able to participate in the public discourse on that matter, and given the practice that has developed in this place, it is better to do it with the explicit endorsement of this chamber than to run the risk of the prospect of finding yourself in here on a contempt proposition.

I think that the admin and procedure committee needs to look at this matter more thoroughly, as part of the review of standing orders. I know there are proposals to do that. Certainly, there will be some more discussion of this matter. The Greens will be supporting this motion today on the basis that that is our interpretation of what the practice has been; therefore we think it is better to be explicit in this case.

**MRS KIKKERT** (Ginninderra) (10.43): I rise today to speak on the motion from Tara Cheyne. To be honest, I am offended to read the motion and for her to bring it into the chamber because it was not discussed in the committee at all. It is a five-member committee. It is not a one member, two, three or four-member committee. It is a five-member committee.

For her to bring it into the chamber without discussing it with everybody on the committee is offensive and completely rude. I think that she is hijacking committee members and also this inquiry into end of life choices. I urge her to stop doing it because it is completely wrong. Stop hijacking it. It is not an inquiry for herself. It is an inquiry for all Canberrans, including five members of the committee, not just herself. She should have done the right thing and brought it to the committee, where Vicki and I, as well as Caroline and Bec Cody, and Ms Cheyne herself, could sit down as five adults and talk about this issue, rather than hijacking the issue and bringing it into the chamber. Stop doing it. That is all I have to say.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mrs Kikkert. Just a reminder: when you are referring to people, can you use their full name and title.

**Mrs Kikkert:** Yes, thank you.

**MS CHEYNE** (Ginninderra) (10.45), in reply: I do not have too much to say. I would like to thank the Greens for their support for this motion. I do think it is a bit rich for Mrs Dunne to talk about courtesy, given the form that the Canberra Liberals have in this place. Mrs Kikkert’s politicisation of the issue goes directly to underlining all the

points that Mr Rattenbury made. Finally, Mrs Dunne, everything that you just said in this place—

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**Mr Gentleman:** A point of order. Madam Speaker, others in this place were heard without interjection. It is a very important discussion and the member should be heard without interference.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you. It is a timely reminder that, if you have not gathered it by now, I have a very low tolerance for interjections. Ms Cheyne, please continue.

**MS CHEYNE:** While Mrs Dunne believes she is an expert in this place on the standing orders, I would like to note that everything she said today about this being unnecessary contradicts the Clerk's advice.

Question put:

That the motion be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 13

Noes 10

Mr Barr	Ms Orr	Miss C Burch	Mr Milligan
Ms Berry	Mr Pettersson	Mr Coe	Mr Parton
Ms J Burch	Mr Ramsay	Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Ms Cheyne	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Hanson	
Ms Cody	Mr Steel	Mrs Kikkert	
Mr Gentleman	Ms Stephen-Smith	Ms Lawder	
Ms Le Couteur		Ms Lee	

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Executive members' business—precedence**

*Ordered that executive members' business be called on.*

## **National Energy Guarantee**

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (10.50): I move:

That this Assembly:

(1) notes:

- (a) all parties in this Assembly support the ACT government taking a leadership role in addressing climate change, and support the targets of 100 percent renewable electricity by 2020, 40 percent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (on 1990 levels) by 2020, and net zero emissions by 2045; and

- (b) the Federal Government's proposed National Energy Guarantee (NEG) has been broadly criticised for:
  - (i) its weak emissions reduction target that is incompatible with the Paris Climate Agreement commitment;
  - (ii) its predicted negative impact on the renewable energy sector;
  - (iii) its failure to recognise the additionality of state and territory renewable energy targets;
  - (iv) its likely poor economic outcomes for Australian consumers and the Australian economy; and
  - (v) the likelihood it will be used as a "Trojan horse" for policies to prop up Australia's coal industry; and
- (2) calls on the ACT government to:
  - (a) use the upcoming Energy Council meeting to advocate for improvements to the NEG; and
  - (b) only support a national energy policy that addresses the above shortcomings, and that will genuinely help the National Energy Market transition to a more modern, sustainable, affordable, and reliable system.

The national energy guarantee—as it is commonly known, the NEG—is a policy proposed by the federal government, supposedly as a way to improve the reliability of the national energy market, to reduce costs for energy consumers, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is also supposed to provide investment certainty to the electricity generation sector. These are indeed noble goals. Unfortunately, in its current form the NEG is largely false advertising. It will not achieve what it promises. In fact, it is likely to have a negative impact in all of the areas it claims it will improve.

This motion therefore calls on the Assembly to endorse the ACT's position at the upcoming COAG Energy Council meeting to seek improvements to the national energy guarantee. At the meeting we will advocate for improvements to the NEG in an attempt to make it into a workable energy policy. The motion calls on the ACT to support only a national energy policy that will genuinely help the national energy market transition to a more modern, sustainable, affordable and reliable system. We do not believe the current NEG proposal will achieve this.

Members may have noticed that last year the NEG policy suddenly popped into existence. Its speedy appearance was particularly suspicious given that the NEG is supposed to fix one of the most complicated and difficult problems on the policy landscape: the array of challenges facing Australia's electricity sector.

The NEG's strange arrival and its strange form make sense when you look at the environment in which it was born. The federal government had already rejected previous promising energy policies such as the carbon tax, the emissions intensity scheme and, most recently, the clean energy target which was recommended by Australia's Chief Scientist, Alan Finkel, leading a panel of well-recognised leaders in energy policy and other fields who spent many months working on that policy, engaging with stakeholders and travelling overseas to look at what other jurisdictions

are doing to come up with a considered report that received unanimous support across the community outside of the Liberal and Nationals party room.

What was interesting about that was that—

**Mr Coe:** Unanimous support in the community?

**MR RATTENBURY:** Mr Coe is probably right to correct me; I am sure there were those who had reservations. But the point I am making is that that report received extensive support in the community. I will reframe. One should never use the word “unanimous”, because there is always someone with a different view. It received extensive support, and it was recognised as having been thoughtfully done. Instead it was trashed by the Liberal-Nationals party room, and they came out with the NEG as a way through. That was very disappointing, because that work was done with considerable thought.

The government then decided to propose a new energy policy. Of course, it could not look like a carbon tax; a carbon tax is taboo. Nor could it look like an emissions trading scheme or a clean energy target. And so we got the NEG, a Frankenstein’s monster cobbled together out of a policy of bits and pieces that had not already been ruled out by some element of the coalition party room.

That brings us to the point where the architecture has been given extensive scrutiny and a lot of questions have been asked. That is the challenging position we find ourselves in, where we are being told that in the national interest we must agree to an energy policy. That raises the very interesting question of what is the national interest. I think the national interest says that we need not just any old policy but a good energy policy, and we need something that is not just the lowest common denominator that can be agreed by the coalition party room but something that can actually serve the energy sector well. I think it is possible to find that. I have great optimism about the fact that, through the work done by people like Professor Finkel and other energy experts, we can find a sensible way through this.

It has been interesting to reflect on people saying that the NEG is the only game in town. Last July, at a COAG Energy Council meeting in Brisbane, we were told by anybody who would listen and anybody who wanted to make a commentary that Professor Finkel’s report and the clean energy target were the only game in town. It is important to reflect on history and reflect on the political dynamic that is now being thrust upon us: to cut through the spin and actually focus on the policy of this rather than the politics.

The ACT has expressed a number of concerns about the policy. We do believe that the emissions target proposed is simply not adequate. A 26 per cent reduction in emissions from the electricity sector will not meet our Paris climate change commitments. It is clear that that is the case, and that has been reinforced by public comments in recent days, which I will come back to shortly.

Simply asking the electricity sector to reduce its emissions by 26 per cent, so essentially a pro rata approach for all sectors in the Australian economy, is foolish.

We know that the electricity sector is the easiest and cheapest place to reduce emissions. It is the easiest because we have technology readily available and a cost competitive approach. It is easiest also in the sense that politically it is probably the easiest place to cut emissions. If we do not do that and we have to get 26 per cent emission reduction from other sectors, such as transport and agriculture, it is going to be far more problematic and will place a significant burden on other sectors. It will either be more costly or the reductions will not be able to be achieved. I think it is more likely to be the latter, which means that Australia will not meet its Paris climate commitments. Any suggestions to the contrary are, frankly, deceptive.

Driving the emission reduction burden into other, more costly sectors will potentially also cause an unnecessary increase in costs in other areas of life. If we were to stand up today and say, “We are going to take this pro rata approach and require 26 per cent from the agricultural or transport sectors,” we know that that will push up the cost of, for example, food. We need to be very clear about what we are doing if we take this 26 per cent pro rata approach.

Another interesting point is that RepuTex modelling demonstrates that a 26 per cent emissions reduction target would almost certainly be met straightaway when the NEG starts. It will achieve nothing except to potentially stall the renewable energy sector because it will remove the drive for further investment in renewables if the target is met early in the decade. RepuTex have done the modelling. Others have examined this and made the same observation. They may be varied by a year or two, but the expert commentators who have looked at this have made the observation that the emissions reduction target, because of the work that has already been done in renewable energy, will undoubtedly be met in the first couple of years of the decade for which we are setting a 10-year target.

Climate change is a serious problem that will have increasingly severe impacts on our environment and also on our economy. We cannot solve issues in the electricity sector, including the issue of affordability, without properly addressing climate change. That is something that is being lost sight of here at times. What is the motivator behind this? We need to have a serious policy to reduce our emissions in line with what the scientists are telling us we should be doing.

If we are to go down this pathway, we at least need to avoid locking in this woeful target. One of the things we will need to look at is what review mechanism we can put in place that allows future reconsideration of this target. We need a review period that is frequent enough to respond, whether it is the review of the Paris climate change targets, which is due, or further scientific research. We need a mechanism that says that we cannot go backwards. We cannot have a yo-yo effect on the target where, as federal governments come and go, the target moves around. It can only ever go up. That is the direction the energy sector is heading in, and that is where we need to get to. We need to consider a mechanism where this can be done through some sort of notifiable or disallowable instrument so that there is flexibility to enable future increases in response to policy shifts.

One of the other key areas in the discussion is costs. It is clear that costs for electricity in the future will be cheaper with a more ambitious emissions reduction target. The

RepuTex modelling again demonstrates that a NEG with a more ambitious emissions reduction target would save households significantly more when it comes to energy bills. Of course, that applies to businesses as well. Having a higher target makes sense not only for environmental reasons but also for economic reasons.

Numerous energy experts are questioning the assumptions relied upon in the cost modelling. It has been disappointing to see that the full economic modelling has not been made available as part of the discussions in the lead-up to next week's COAG Energy Council meeting.

It is interesting that the modelling claims that the NEG will reduce electricity bills by \$550 a household. But only \$150 of this is actually attributed to the NEG. That reflects the fact that the influx of renewable energy suppliers into the market is reducing the energy cost even under business as usual conditions. That needs to be reflected on thoughtfully as we debate these complex topics. As noted economist Ross Garnaut recently said, it is renewable energy technologies, the very ones that the NEG will stymie because of its design and lack of ambition, that will deliver a "decisive reversal of the relentless and immense increase in electricity prices".

Reliability is another key factor in this discussion. We know that there are going to be coal exits. Coal plants will reach the end of their natural life, and close, over the coming 10 to 15 years. We have already seen that with the Hazelwood coal-fired power station. That closed not because of climate policy or because of a government decision; it closed because the private owners of the Hazelwood coal-fired power station decided simply that it was not economic to keep refurbishing it. They were not prepared to invest the hundreds of millions of dollars that were needed to keep that plant viable. That has led to substantial energy price rises in the wholesale market over the past couple of years.

That points to the fact that we need an orderly transition, and we need to recognise the fact that the private owners of these coal-fired power stations will make rational, self-interested decisions that will have an impact on all of us. We cannot leave it for those driving market forces. That is market failure. What happened with Hazelwood was a terrible market failure. Governments need to step up and ensure that we do not have those sorts of random events having such a significant impact on Australian households and businesses.

The modelling very clearly shows, and the Energy Security Board has provided charts that show this, that a number of coal-fired power stations are going to exit the system in the coming 15 years. We need to be preparing for that. At the moment, the national energy guarantee, in stymying the influx of new supply, will not prepare us for that transition, particularly as we see significant numbers of coal-fired power stations going out in 2032, 2033 and 2034. That is a time line that we need to be preparing for now. I do not think that the reliability mechanism as designed will address this either. It will simply provide the signals too late for what we know is coming down the line.

We also need an assurance that the NEG will not change or be traded for worse energy outcomes. I am concerned that ongoing uncertainty surrounds the NEG because of the continual debate at a federal level. We need confidence that the

NEG will not be used as a mechanism to artificially support expensive and environmentally damaging coal-fired power stations.

Like a gremlin exposed to water, when the NEG enters the coalition party room after the COAG Energy Council, and also the federal parliament, it could very well morph from something that is supposed to be technology neutral, and that is supposed to at least attempt to increase reliability and reduce emissions, into a gross and perverted subsidy for more coal-fired power.

Clearly this is part of the coalition's energy agenda. Last month the coalition voted in favour of a Senate motion calling for the building of new coal-fired power stations. Minister Frydenberg recently enjoyed a coal tour to Queensland, and in the past 24 hours we have seen coalition backbencher George Christensen in Japan touting for new coal-fired power stations in Australia from Japanese coal-fired generators.

It is certainly not worth passing a national energy guarantee, such as it is, if it is accompanied by these side deals that artificially extend the life of coal-fired power stations in Australia. This would be a terrible outcome, and one that would sell future generations in this country short when it comes to reliability of energy supply and dealing with the environmental challenges that are in front of us.

One of the other ironies is that this policy is designed to deliver certainty. We can see that the low level of ambition that is built into it means that there will not be certainty, because this debate will continue to be prosecuted, and as soon as there is a change of federal government in Australia, a new target will be put in place.

There are great challenges here. The ACT have continued to engage in this process mindful of wanting to be constructive, to find a result, but also knowing that the national interest is broader than what is being spun at us. We need to get an outcome that does not just think about the next couple of years, about this current political cycle, or the vagaries of it, but delivers secure energy policy over coming decades and ensures that Australia's energy transition is a smooth, cost-effective and reliable one that ensures fair energy prices for Australian households and businesses.

I commend the motion to the Assembly.

**MR COE** (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (11.05): It has been clear for some time that a national consensus on energy has been desperately needed, and I am pleased to see that the federal government is taking some action on this important issue.

Canberrans have seen power prices continue to rise over the past decade, of course influenced by policies of the ACT government, as well as successive commonwealth governments, and market factors. This sort of speculative regime, speculative in pricing but also speculative in policy, has gone on for too long. It has left many families out of pocket, many unable to use their heaters in winter or air-conditioners in summer and of course, in some parts of Australia, without power altogether. A national consensus must include two key factors: reliability and affordability.



The ACT is part of the national energy market with very little generation within the territory itself. It is a fact that we rely on generators in New South Wales and other states for our power, and this just reinforces the need for a national agreement on energy. However, Minister Rattenbury seemed far more interested in grandstanding to his Greens base instead of negotiating productively with his federal counterparts and with other parliaments. I echo the point made by the Victorian climate change minister, Lily D'Ambrosio, in April last year that if Mr Rattenbury has an issue with the NEG, he should raise it in COAG.

Basically power prices continue to increase. In fact the ACT is the only jurisdiction in the national electricity market with power prices expected to rise between July this year and 2020. This is on top of continuous increases to rates, fees, taxes, and charges in this city which are increasingly making Canberra unaffordable for so many people.

Motions such as this moved by Minister Rattenbury achieve nothing for ACT consumers. This is simply a publicity stunt, and a poor one at that. It is interesting to note that Mr Rattenbury seems to need a motion to encourage himself, as the responsible minister in this area, to discuss the national energy guarantee at the next meeting of the energy council. Surely it is the minister's job to advocate for the ACT in this area. He should not need to move motions calling upon himself to do what he should have already been doing: seeking a better deal for Canberra's energy consumers. Instead of actually achieving a national consensus, Minister Rattenbury seems intent on joining press conferences with the federal Greens leader, moving motions calling upon himself to do the job and grandstanding to his base, which is of course just 10 per cent of the territory vote.

If Minister Rattenbury seeks to block the national energy guarantee, then ACT consumers will likely be worse off. We certainly will not get the reliability and comfort that national consensus can bring. If the minister has concerns, he should be raising them with the commonwealth in a constructive and productive manner instead of moving pointless motions such as this and continuing to grandstand on the issue.

The Canberra Liberals therefore, encourage the minister to get on with the job of seeking to get reliability and lower energy prices for ACT residents. This is something that the government keeps promising to do but has not actually delivered. I do not support the motion.

**MR BARR** (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (11.10): I would like to reiterate and support the comments Mr Rattenbury has made today about the national energy guarantee, and to highlight the significant problems that the federal government has failed to address.

There is a delicious irony about being lectured by the Canberra Liberals about playing to your base and then being lectured about the size of that base. But I will not go any further on that particular topic.

I think we can all agree that the ACT has been a leader in Australian climate policy for over a decade. We will be powered by 100 per cent renewable electricity in

2020, a little under two years from now. We are taking steps today that will see the territory achieve zero net emissions by 2045. As a jurisdiction, we have supported the rollout of more solar panels and batteries to individual homes than any other jurisdiction in the country. We have driven the establishment of new major wind and solar facilities, along with the creation of thousands of new private sector jobs in the process.

We are delivering clean, reliable and affordable energy in a way that recognises and responds to the huge shifts underway in the sector and in our wider economy. This has been a priority for the government throughout our time in office. So we come to the debate about the national energy guarantee with not only a significant investment in getting our national policy settings right but also a long and consistent track record of getting things done.

Our community needs a reasonable, durable framework that can deliver clean, reliable and affordable energy for households and businesses. That is our focus, and that should be standard against which new policies are assessed.

The Turnbull government's national energy guarantee proposal calls to mind the line, which many people's dads have probably used at least once, that if you wanted to get there you would not start from here. We should be under no illusion about the internal Liberal/National party contortions and compromises of principle that have led to the NEG's development. We should not rush past the fact that real damage has been done to the security and reliability of our nation's electricity networks and to the new jobs and investment pipeline because this policy debate has gone on far longer than it should have.

Nevertheless, here we are. We believe that the states and territories have a responsibility to work constructively with the commonwealth parliament to get the best possible outcome on energy and climate policy. We need to improve the proposal that is now in front of us, or it will not achieve its promise of reducing prices and emissions and improving reliability of supply. Expert advice suggests that it could end up having a negative impact in all of the areas that it promises to improve. In that context, there is a series of amendments and adjustments we believe must be made to the national energy guarantee to deal with the serious shortcomings that have been outlined.

The NEG has two components. The first is a series of commonwealth policies intended for eventual introduction to the commonwealth parliament which deal with issues such as the emissions reduction target and its trajectory. The second is the Energy Security Board's framework, which will amend the national electricity laws to establish reliability and emissions reduction obligations on electricity retailers. We believe that both components of the scheme need to be improved in key ways.

On the emissions reduction side, there is a strong view from experts and climate scientists that a 26 per cent emissions reduction target is simply too low and that, if the commonwealth is in any way serious about limiting the impacts of harmful climate change on our economy, our environment and our community, it needs to raise the ambition of this target right now. So as an absolute minimum we want to see

the inclusion of a provision which allows the emissions reduction target to be increased in the future while ensuring that it cannot be wound back. Essentially once a target is set it should become the permanent floor, and a future government would not be able to wind it back.

This would at least make the current government's 26 per cent target an absolute floor for Australia's reduction efforts. This is necessary to give industry certainty when making long-term investment decisions about energy-generating assets. Leaving open the possibility of a future government dramatically cutting back the target will provide no more certainty than we have today.

We simply cannot have yo-yoing targets that go up or down according to the various views, some more valid than others, holding sway within the government of the day. There must also be a review mechanism built into the scheme so that we can assess Australia's progress against the level of emissions reduction necessary to meet our Paris agreement commitments at reasonable intervals. The commonwealth initially said the target would be locked in for five years, increased this to 10 years and then reverted to five years. Five years is still too long a period to lock in a target. It simply must be possible to ramp up the target, to flexibly adjust and ensure that we are making adequate progress on cutting our emissions and preventing harmful climate change.

Importantly, too, the NEG design must make clear that nothing constrains states and territories from pursuing their own renewable energy generation targets for other renewable energy and energy efficiency schemes that exceed the emissions reduction targets set by the commonwealth. These more ambitious renewable electricity and emissions targets need to be additional. They need to be additional to the national emissions reduction target for the electricity sector.

This links into the Energy Security Board's framework. Currently the framework proposes a mechanism through which the voluntary emissions reduction effort by consumers who choose to buy green power can be recognised, but it assumes that all voluntary effort by state and territory governments that have already set more ambitious renewable energy and emissions reduction targets will be subsumed into the national effort. So in effect the ACT, Victoria and Queensland will be doing all of the heavy lifting on national emissions reduction through our ambitious schemes, leaving states like New South Wales to freeload off our efforts. That is not fair, and it is not good enough.

Frankly, if the ESB framework can accommodate additional voluntary action through green power, there should be no technical reason why it cannot also accommodate additional state and territory effort. Canberra households have put their money where their values are in supporting our transition to 100 per cent renewable electricity. We will not let our community's leadership on renewables become the excuse for other parts of Australia doing less.

If the commonwealth agrees to incorporate these adjustments, whether at the next COAG meeting or in further consultation with jurisdictions over the months to come, this will go a long way towards securing the ACT's agreement to sign on. These are

reasonable, constructive proposals that recognise the need for reliable and affordable energy while confirming the ACT's commitment to ambitious emissions reduction and renewables as a responsible way to deliver this and to prevent further harmful climate change.

I look forward to all members of this Assembly supporting the ACT's negotiating position going into the next round of discussions on the national energy guarantee. I note, acknowledge and warmly welcome the fact that all parties in this place have previously stated their commitment to the ACT's 100 per cent renewables target, so I hope that today all parties in this place can stand together in advocating for a national energy deal which protects our hard-won progress but also delivers the best and most sustainable energy and climate outcomes for the future of our nation. I commend the motion to the Assembly.

**MR GENTLEMAN** (Brindabella—Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Urban Renewal) (11.20): I rise to make a few points and to support the motion that my colleague Mr Rattenbury has moved today. The Labor Party has a long and proud history of tackling dangerous climate change. It is something I have spoken about before in this place. The fact is that Labor does not just talk about global warming; we act, and we lead.

Canberra Labor has been at the forefront of Australia's action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and drive a clean energy future. Powering our city with 100 per cent renewable energy is a Canberra Labor initiative and was led by my predecessor as environment minister, Simon Corbell. Renewable energy is the future and it is a future that Canberrans, indeed all Australians, are embracing. Just look at the uptake of rooftop solar on homes across the country. Of course, I am proud to have led efforts to accelerate the take-up in our city through the feed-in tariff.

Why is renewable energy important? To quote a former US President, "It's arithmetic." The Turnbull-Abbott government signed Australia up to the Paris climate agreement. The consequence of this is that Australia has agreed to help limit global warming to two degrees, with an ambition of limiting it to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Experts tell us that to achieve this agreed goal Australia will have to decarbonise by the middle of the century.

The commitment to net zero emissions by around 2050 is one that is being taken up by the private sector. Indeed one of Australia's biggest emitters, AGL Energy, has publicly committed to net zero emissions by 2050. This commitment is shared by the other two biggest companies in the energy sector, Origin Energy and Energy Australia.

Recognising the goal of net zero emissions is one that the Turnbull and Abbott Liberals have signed up to. The question becomes: how is this achieved? How do we get there at the least cost? The answer is the energy sector, and that renewable energy is the key to decarbonising the nation's economy.

Seeking to limit renewable energy and artificially prop up an old, ageing fleet of coal-fired power stations is akin to holding on to the horse and buggy as cars changed

transport or holding on to wireless as copper wire telecommunications changed forever how we connected with each other.

Basing a policy on this premise also fails to grasp the challenge that is being faced. That challenge is how to manage the rapid transition occurring in our electricity sector to ensure affordable, reliable and secure energy generation at the least cost. As I have said the change is being driven by the market—by cost. Renewable energy costs are falling and so are the costs of storage and other products that enable greater and longer deployment of wind, solar and other renewables. Let us make the changes that facilitate this. Surely we have learnt that costs for new technologies fall more quickly than predicted. Change should help new technologies, not preserve outdated ancient ones.

New technologies also bring jobs and investment. The current national energy guarantee, the NEG, appears to do the opposite. According to the Climate Council, the NEG could see the nation forgo 20,000 jobs in the electricity sector. This prediction is based on modelling from Ernst and Young.

If the energy sector does not lead emissions reduction then the burden will fall on other sectors. Limiting renewable energy means that other sectors will have to do more. This is another key failing of the NEG. By capping emissions reductions in the energy sector, as the Turnbull government has proposed, the task of emissions reduction is disproportionately shifted to others, such as our farmers.

Madam Assistant Speaker, you do not have to take my word on this. The potential for the national energy guarantee to do this has been raised by a range of stakeholders. For example, the Agricultural Industries Energy Task Force, in relation to this, has said:

It is important that appropriate consideration be given to outcomes which do not unfairly shift the burden of reductions onto other sectors.

Another consequence of saying no to this motion is saying yes to higher power prices. Placing caps to limit renewable energy or creating barriers to its deployment means that our ageing fleet of electricity generators will not necessarily be replaced with the least-cost option. By not choosing the least-cost path, consumers lose out.

The design of the national energy market, the NEM, means that the cost of replacing these aged coal-fired power stations is ultimately passed on to households and businesses. Consumers may also lose out because the current NEG design could facilitate less competition in the market. The proposed reliability mechanism may make it difficult for new entrants to enter the electricity market because of the complexity of hedging against the obligations under the mechanism.

Price concerns have been raised by experts. Bruce Mountain, Director of the Victorian Energy Policy Centre, in relation to the NEG, has said:

That just makes no sense. If the objective of the policy will be met by the first year of the policy—quite why the policy brings the prices down is not clear.

Mr Mountain's comments also highlight another concern: the design of the NEG lacks transparency. States, territories, stakeholders and consumers are being asked to sign up to the NEG without the detailed modelling undertaken on price and other impacts.

Experts have raised serious concerns about the divergent conclusions reached by the modelling undertaken for the Energy Security Board and work from the Australian Energy Market Operator, AEMO. So serious are these concerns that 23 energy researchers from 11 institutions on Tuesday, 31 July asked for the full release of the NEG modelling. These researchers have written to the six state and territory energy ministers whose jurisdictions cover the NEM, requesting that the modelling be released. They wrote in part:

The proposed National Energy Guarantee is the most significant change to the National Electricity Market since the implementation of the National Electricity Laws in 1996 ...

The Energy Security Board's Final Decision Paper refers to an ACIL Allen study which purports to validate the NEG design. The paper provides insufficient detail on the assumptions, methodology and results of the study and indeed it is difficult to reconcile the claims with our own understanding of energy market dynamics and the Australian Energy Market Operator's Integrated System Plan.

We call on the Ministers to request the ESB to release the ACIL Allen modelling in full, including all assumptions that have a bearing on the modelling of price effects, and to provide access to the modelling team, so that we may have the opportunity to peer review the work.

If the NEG is a good solution, as the Turnbull government contends, it should release all the details and all the modelling for public scrutiny. I suspect that one of the reasons that the full modelling and detailed assumptions are not being released publicly is that it will confirm that the NEG is nothing more than a coal guarantee.

The concerns of transparency are also broader than just the lack of detailed modelling. States and territories are being rushed to make a decision on a policy that has been developed in a relatively short time, a policy that only seeks to lock in the current structures of our electricity system. This begs the questions: if the system is so broken that the immediate solution is required then why the rush to lock in the very structure that seems to be broken? And if the NEG only keeps things as they are now, why can't we take more time to carefully consider and analyse policy? In contrast to the hurried NEG, the current electricity market, the NEM, took 10 years to design and develop.

There is no doubt that a solution is needed to ensure that the transition to a clean energy future occurs at the least cost. However, this needs to be well considered and thought out. The failure to be transparent is another clear indication that the NEG in its current form is far from good. It is also far from good because the design of the NEG may see others free-riding on the efforts that territorians are making, as the Chief Minister pointed out.

The matters I have raised today are only some of the concerns that have been raised about the NEG. Some experts have labelled the current NEG as possibly the fourth or fifth best policy. Given the importance of energy policy to all of us, it is important that we in this place send a clear signal on the issue. We want to see good policy, and a policy that works. We want a policy that delivers a sustainable, affordable and reliable NEM.

I urge all members in this place to support this motion and the principles that it outlines.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (11.29), in reply: I thank colleagues for their contributions to the debate today, particularly the Chief Minister and Mr Gentleman. This is an incredibly important issue for ACT residents. I am very conscious of the role that the ACT government needs to play in thinking about the needs of our direct constituents, thinking about Australia as a whole and thinking about our role as global citizens. All of this comes together under this policy area.

As he is wont to do, Mr Coe chose to play the man rather than comment on the issue. It is important that we bring this issue before the Assembly ahead of the discussions to provide an opportunity for those in this place to debate the issues and express their views and for the Liberal Party to express their views and possibly contribute any ideas they may happen to have to the policy development process.

I can assure Mr Coe that I have been raising this issue extensively in COAG meetings—at the COAG meeting in Hobart late last year, again at the COAG meeting in Melbourne earlier this year—and in phone calls, face-to-face to meetings and text messages with Minister Frydenberg, as well as with ministers from other jurisdictions. I am talking to people about this in all sorts of places.

The fact that it is also in the media reflects the fact that the media is very interested in this issue. I have probably had more phone calls to comment on this issue than on any other. Rest assured that we are talking to the people who need to be talked to on this matter.

There is a long way to go on this matter. The COAG Energy Council is meeting next Friday. The ACT continues to be engaged with other jurisdictions. We are striving to get an outcome here that delivers what we need a national energy policy to do: to deliver affordable and reliable energy, to deliver emissions reductions and to find an agreement that can last for an extended period of time. They are all things that we are trying to put together here. I look forward to working with my colleagues in other jurisdictions to try to find a pathway through this matter. I thank members for their support today and once again I commend the motion to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018**

### **Reference to committee**

Debate resumed.

**MR WALL** (Brindabella) (11.32): Madam Assistant Speaker, I think there is now agreement on the motion that I moved earlier today to refer the procurement amendment bill to a committee.

**Mr Barr**: I am not sure that there is.

**Mr Coe**: We are supporting the amendment.

**Mr Barr**: I think there might have been a question over which committee.

**MR GENTLEMAN** (Brindabella—Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Urban Renewal) (11.32): I move:

Omit “25 October 2018”, substitute “end September 2018”.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (11.33): Madam Assistant Speaker, we will be supporting this amendment, and I am pleased that there is agreement. I seek your clarification as to whether we need to be express in allowing the committee to report out of session rather than having to come back and amend this later. I presume that at the end of September we will not be sitting and that we will need to authorise the committee to report via the Speaker.

**MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER** (Ms Lee): The advice that I have just received from the Clerk is that there will be an opportunity in the September sittings to fix that up.

Debate (on motion by **Mr Barr**) adjourned to a later hour.

## **Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee**

### **Statement by chair**

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (11.34): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services for the Ninth Assembly relating to statutory appointments in accordance with continuing resolution 5A.

I wish to inform the Assembly that during the applicable reporting period—1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018—the committee considered a total of 26 appointments and reappointments to the following bodies: ACT Veterinary Surgeons Board; Tree Advisory Panel; ACT Heritage Council; ACT Climate Change Council; Animal Welfare Advisory Committee; Scientific Committee. I present the following paper:

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee—Schedule of Statutory Appointments—9th Assembly—Period 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018.



**Statement by chair**

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (11.35): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services.

At a private meeting on 28 February 2018, the committee resolved to conduct an inquiry into ACT Libraries. The committee will inquire into the current and future need for library sites and the best, most cost-effective model of library service points with particular reference to (1) the role of libraries within the ACT community; (2) strategic planning for libraries in the ACT, including (a) current practice, (b) potential revisions to current practice and the associated benefits and (c) opportunities for community involvement; (3) the nature and extent of current and future community demand for different library services, including (a) non-digital offerings, (b) digital offerings, (c) education and training opportunities, (d) facilities available for public use, (e) spaces for learning, creativity and achieving social inclusion, (f) other government services collocated with libraries, and (g) any other library services sought by the community; (4) the extent to which ACT Libraries are positioned to respond flexibly to meet current and future community opportunities and demands; (5) the extent to which ACT Libraries are accessible to the community, including (a) opening hours, (b) locations and (c) disability access; (6) the cost-effectiveness of existing branches; (7) comparative analysis of ACT Libraries with library services in other jurisdictions and community take-up of these services; (8) any legislative considerations that may be relevant; and (9) any other relevant matter. The committee will today call for public submissions and the committee will report by March 2019.

**Statement by chair**

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (11.37): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services relating to petitions on community facilities in Farrer.

On 1 August 2017 the committee received petitions numbered 13-17 and 16-17. They are substantively the same petition, one lodged in paper form and one lodged electronically. They were referred to the committee by a motion in the Assembly rather than under standing order 99A, as together, but not separately, they comprise over 500 signatures. As signatories to petitions 13-17 and 16-17, 540 residents of the ACT requested the Assembly to develop and implement a strategic plan for enhanced community facilities in Farrer.

The committee notes that in her response to the petitions the Minister for Transport Canberra and City Services said that she has “referred the petition to TCCS to review it in the context of developing the Territory-wide program for playground upgrades and public realm improvements”. The committee also notes the current opportunity for residents of Farrer to detail their suggestions for improved community facilities and present them directly to TCCS through the better suburbs consultation process.

The committee will not be inquiring further into the matters raised in these petitions but will continue to examine the allocation and distribution of funding for community facilities through the annual reports process.

### Statement by chair

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (11.38): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services relating to petition 18-17. The petition was received by the Assembly on 28 November 2017 and referred to the committee under standing order 99A.

As signatories to petition 18-17, 620 residents of the ACT requested the Assembly to improve the safety and amenity of the infrastructure surrounding the Mount Taylor car park on Sulwood Drive in Kambah for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.

The committee notes that, in her response to the petition, the Minister for Transport and City Services said:

... Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) Directorate's forward planning has identified and co-ordinated a cross-directorate initiative for a number of improvements to the parking and access provisions servicing Mount Taylor and these will be considered.

The committee also notes that funding was allocated in the most recent budget towards improvements in infrastructure at the site.

In light of the minister's commitments and the budget allocation, the committee will not be inquiring further into the matters raised in petition 18-17.

### Statement by chair

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (11.39): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services relating to petition 26-17. The petition was received by the Assembly on 28 November 2017 and referred to the committee under standing order 99A.

As signatories to petition 26-17, 562 residents of the ACT requested the Assembly to call on the government to re-route buses from the cafe area of Anketell Street to an alternative route of Reed Street, Cowlishaw Street and Pitman Street.

The committee notes that, in her response to the petition, the Minister for Transport Canberra and City Services said:

... Transport Canberra does not support the proposal of immediate and permanent rerouting of buses away from Anketell Street ... Transport Canberra and City Services officials will continue to work closely with the Tuggeranong community to discuss longer term options for improved public transport provision within the Town Centre ...

The committee also notes the opportunity for Tuggeranong residents and business owners to present their suggestions directly to Transport Canberra during the current consultation on the new bus network.

The committee will not be inquiring further into the matters raised in this petition, but will continue to monitor the design and operation of the public transport system through the annual reports process.

### **Statement by chair**

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (11.40): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services relating to petition 30-17. The petition was received by the Assembly on 30 November 2017 and referred to the committee under standing order 99A.

The signatories to petition 30-17, 749 residents of the ACT, requested the Assembly to work with the commonwealth government to protect the heritage values of Lake Burley Griffin and the surrounding landscapes, through a heritage listing and amendment to the national capital plan; halt the city to the lake development; and conduct an independent review of the development proposal for West Basin.

The committee notes that, in his response to the petition, the Minister for the Environment and Heritage said that the ACT government will continue to plan for the development of the West Basin area and that the detail of these plans will be open to public consultation. The committee also notes that some of the areas of this petition fall within the responsibility of the National Capital Authority.

Following consideration of the petition and the minister's response, the committee has determined that it will not be holding an inquiry into the matter at this time.

### **Statement by chair**

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (11.42): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make one final statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services, this one relating to petition 31-17. The petition was received by the Assembly on 30 November 2017 and referred to the committee under standing order 99A.

As signatories to petition 31-17, 713 residents of the ACT requested the ACT Assembly to upgrade the playground next to the Torrens shops by allocating additional funding for new play equipment and shade, and re-establishing appropriate access between the Torrens shops at Torrens Place and the playground.

The committee notes that, in her response to the petition, the Minister for Transport and City Services said:

The request for sun protection for the playground has been noted and will be considered as part of any future shade sail installations.

In considering the petition, the committee greatly appreciated the opportunity to meet with the organiser, Ms Natalia Nikolic, and to hear from her directly about the current facilities at the playground and the community's suggestions for improvement. The

committee discussed with Ms Nikolic the avenues that were available to Torrens residents to raise their concerns. The committee notes the current opportunity for residents of Torrens to detail their suggestions for improved community facilities and present them directly to Transport Canberra and City Services through the better suburbs consultation process.

The committee will not be inquiring further into the matters raised in this petition, but will continue to examine the allocation and distribution of funding for playgrounds through the annual reports process.

## **Senior Practitioner Bill 2018**

Debate resumed from 7 June 2018, on motion by **Ms Stephen-Smith**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong) (11.43): The genesis of this bill was a regrettable incident in 2015 at a Canberra primary school when a decision was made to construct an inappropriate withdrawal space for a student who was demonstrating behaviours dangerous to himself and others.

The subsequent review, chaired by Professor Anthony Shaddock, sought to address the many difficulties schools face in managing students with complex needs and challenging behaviours. It is now nearly three years since that report was tabled, and there has been some progress. This bill is one of those outcomes.

Professor Shaddock highlighted, among other issues, the lack of oversight and the need for proper frameworks and processes for such students. In particular, recommendation 11.3 in the report calls for the ACT government to:

... implement a whole-of-government approach, and develop a legislative framework, to regulate the use and independent oversight of restrictive practices in all ACT schools, and other relevant settings.

The bill also has a link with the national framework for reducing and eliminating the use of restrictive practices in the disability sector and the NDIS quality and safeguard framework. Both set time frames for establishing a senior practitioner position in the ACT.

However, the concern of the Canberra Liberals is that, while this bill addresses the requirement for the establishment of such a role, it does not of itself address the fundamental question of the best education setting for students with such complex needs. The legislation, I trust, is just one part of a jigsaw that must continue to be worked on.

I thank the minister, her staff and officials for providing briefings on the bill and coming back to my office with responses and with the amendments that I understand she is tabling today. That addresses many of the concerns we raised. I believe that it makes for a better piece of legislation.

Going to the substance of the legislation, the bill establishes the position of senior practitioner, whose role will be to monitor any restrictive practice affecting vulnerable people in the ACT and to provide a framework, a guide, for carers to follow in the event that a restrictive practice is believed to be, or is, required to ameliorate challenging behaviours. It is fair to say that if such guidance had been available in early 2015, none of the following events affecting that particular student, the parents, the school, other students and staff might have occurred. On that basis it is important that some framework will now be available.

The bill requires that any restrictive practice must only be used in limited circumstances, including in a way that is compliant with human rights, that safeguards the person from harm and that maximises positive outcomes from the intervention.

It will be necessary for any service provider requiring the use of any restrictive practice to prepare a positive behaviour support plan. The plan must detail the exact circumstances requiring restraint, how it will be used and how often it will be used. The draft plan must be submitted to a positive behaviour support panel staffed by specialists. The panel will examine the draft plan and can then approve or not approve the plan. Once approved, the plan is then submitted to the senior practitioner for registration, and a copy is given to the person who is the subject of the plan and their guardian. Plans have to be current and reviewed and/or altered as circumstances require.

Of course, in spite of all those protections there may well be incidents that are unacceptable. In those cases, complaints can be lodged with the senior practitioner, who may commence an investigation. The senior practitioner must inform the service provider that they have received a complaint and an investigation is underway. This is an important requirement.

Under the original draft of the bill, if the senior practitioner felt that informing the service provider would present a risk to the complainant, they would be able to refrain from telling the service provider of the investigation. However, as a complaint can be made by anyone, not just the person who is the subject of a plan, the original bill failed to provide protection for them and may have led to some unintended risks to the person whose plan it is.

I am pleased that the minister has taken on board this concern from my office and has addressed this shortfall in the amendments. The amended bill now allows the senior practitioner to refrain from informing the service provider of certain details of the complaint if they consider that disclosure would not be in the best interests of the person who is the subject of the plan.

The bill also gives investigative powers to the senior practitioner in investigating complaints. These powers are broad and are vital in ensuring that complaints are investigated and plans are administered correctly. Following a complaint, the senior practitioner has the power to make a direction, for example, to amend or prepare a new plan or to use or refrain from using a restrictive practice.

In my briefings I was reassured that these directions would not simply be instructions but that a dialogue would be opened to ensure that the service provider is in a position to follow and deliver on the senior practitioner's direction. The bill allows that if these directions are not followed within the required time the senior practitioner may cancel the plan and then notify the service provider and the person who is the subject of the plan of the cancellation.

The second issue my office raised during the briefing was the category of people who are able to apply for a review of a decision by the senior practitioner to cancel the registration of a plan. The original bill only allowed a service provider to appeal the senior practitioner's decision to cancel a plan and excluded the person who is the subject of the plan.

I am pleased that the minister also took on board this feedback from my office and has acted to address this issue in the amendments. Under the amended bill, both the service provider and the person who is the subject of the plan have standing to appeal the decision to cancel a registered plan to the ACAT.

A number of offences are established by the bill. These include the use of a restrictive practice not in line with a plan, and failure to comply with a direction given by the senior practitioner.

This bill raised some concern within the disability community, particularly from service providers, about the strict liability offence for failing to conform with a direction of the senior practitioner, and the possible unintended and/or disproportionately negative impacts this may have upon people who work within the sector. One service provider I met with was concerned that the associated risk of a 50 penalty unit strict liability offence would be a disincentive for service providers taking on clients who may or do routinely require restrictive practices.

I have been assured by officials, and I am informed by members of the sector who have raised these concerns with directorate staff, that it is certainly not the intention of this bill to trap or catch out hardworking disability service providers who are doing the right thing. I understand that the sector is in ongoing discussions with the minister on this particular issue.

On that basis, the Canberra Liberals will not be opposing clause 47(2) of the bill. I stress that establishing the role of the senior practitioner will not in itself be a silver bullet, and that the root cause of challenges in the sector about the need for and the use of restrictive practices will always require ongoing engagement between clients, providers and the senior practitioner. This cannot simply be a smokescreen of well-intentioned legislation.

I highlight, again, that within the service provider community there are some concerns regarding the burden that the additional reporting framework will present, in particular to small service providers. They are concerned that these new requirements may disproportionately affect them and will divert resources from front-line services

into overwhelming and burdensome paperwork. That is, I trust, a concern that the minister also shares and will continue to keep an eye on.

I thank the minister for the consultative approach she and her office have taken in progressing the various amendments to this bill. The result will be a piece of legislation that is more rigorous, is clearer in its intentions and minimises the risk of unintended consequences.

**MR STEEL** (Murrumbidgee) (11.52): I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting the Senior Practitioner Bill 2018. The bill will bring into being an effective regulatory framework that will protect vulnerable people by reducing and eliminating the use of restrictive practices by service providers in the ACT.

It will establish a system where individuals are able to raise concerns and have their concerns about the use of restrictive practices investigated by the senior practitioner. In situations where the senior practitioner is satisfied that the use of a restrictive practice is not warranted, this bill will enable the senior practitioner to issue a direction for it to be stopped. From 1 July 2019, failure to comply with a direction of the senior practitioner may give rise to a criminal offence.

Just as importantly, the functions and powers set out in this bill put education, awareness raising and sector capacity building at the centre of the senior practitioner's oversight role. The senior practitioner will have a vital leadership role in driving cultural change away from restrictive practices towards positive behaviour support alternatives, which will enhance a person's dignity and protect their human rights and freedoms.

I understand that, during the extensive stakeholder consultations that have informed the development of this bill, members of the ACT community have expressed strong support for the educative role of the senior practitioner. While the bill provides clear definitions of restrictive practices, in line with national safeguards, we know that there is still a lot more work to be done to build awareness across the community of how to recognise and report them.

The senior practitioner will be an invaluable resource for service providers, clients and their families in helping them to understand their rights and responsibilities. The senior practitioner will have a key role in promoting the reduction and elimination of restrictive practices by developing guidelines and standards to drive best practice across a range of settings; disseminating information and providing education about what constitutes a restrictive practice, and affirming the rights of people who may be subject to them; providing advice and issuing directions to providers in response to issues raised; and using research evidence to promote best practice leadership across the sector.

The senior practitioner's key objectives will be supported by the collection and reporting of data on the use of restrictive practices over time. This will help to ensure that education and awareness-raising activities are properly targeted. It will also enable the senior practitioner to monitor the impact of positive behaviour support plans, using the data to measure client outcomes.

A significant strength of this bill is that it enshrines a whole-of-government approach to reducing and eliminating restrictive practices. The oversight will extend to disability services, schools and out-of-home care settings. However, the influence and leadership of the senior practitioner is intended to drive cultural change across all sectors where restrictive practices may be an issue. Changing attitudes and practices across services and achieving better reporting will require the senior practitioner to provide a safe environment in which issues can be discussed and better ways identified to address concerning behaviours.

By facilitating genuinely open and honest communication at all levels, the outcome of the senior practitioner's engagement will be to foster a practice leadership culture. This approach will build the capacity of the sector to reduce and eliminate any restrictive practices in place. The senior practitioner will maintain links with the ACT Human Rights Commission to ensure an ongoing high threshold for the use of any restrictive practice in the ACT.

This bill will protect and improve the rights of vulnerable individuals. I commend it to the Assembly.

**MS LE COUTEUR** (Murrumbidgee) (11.56): I rise to speak in support of the bill presented today by Minister Stephen-Smith. The Greens, of course, support the intent of the bill and the recently established role of the senior practitioner to reduce and eliminate the use of restrictive practices in the ACT.

It is worth noting at this point that there is in fact a broad spectrum of what is classified as a restrictive practice, and it includes the use of chemical, physical and mechanical restraints or restrictions on a person's autonomy. I understand that a significant part of the senior practitioner's role will be to understand and gather information about what restrictive practices are currently being used in the ACT, before developing guidelines and providing an oversight function for their use.

I would also like to acknowledge the positive decision to include health care and school settings in the scope of the legislation, as well as the disability sector. It should be noted that children are amongst the most vulnerable members of our community and that there has been some unfortunate history of restrictive practices in ACT schools. I am sure that many members of this Assembly and the community would recall the incident of a child being restrained in a cage. This is an extreme example, and I note that the government, fortunately, has taken steps to ensure that it will not be repeated in the ACT. However, according to the recent report by the Australian Human Rights Commission into addressing violence against people with disability, it is unfortunately the case that, and I quote:

Children with disability are disproportionately vulnerable to certain forms of violence, abuse and neglect. For example, they may be subject to ungoverned or unapproved restrictive practices, forced sterilisation or abortion, and sexual violence.

Also, as quoted in the commission's report:



The UN International Children's Emergency Fund's 2013 The State of the World's Children Report noted that children with a disability are three to four times more likely to be subjected to violence than children without disability. The report also noted that children who may already be suffering stigma and isolation have also been found to be more likely to suffer physical abuse.

These are sad, sobering facts. The functions and oversight of the senior practitioner in the ACT will have a very important role in addressing and preventing abuse and misuse of restrictive practices, and protecting vulnerable children and adults. I hope, in time, that the monitoring and safeguards afforded by this legislation will be expanded to include aged care, another cohort who, unfortunately, we know are vulnerable to abuse and restrictive practices.

As well as the positive aspects of this bill, I would also like to acknowledge the impact it will have on the disability sector and care providers and others. It will be imperative that they are given ample opportunity and support to understand and implement the legislation. I note that sectors affected by the bill are largely supportive of establishing the office of senior practitioner and of the need to reduce and eliminate restrictive practices in the provision of care.

I am encouraged by the collaborative and consultative approach that the newly appointed senior practitioner has demonstrated in carrying out the role so far. Indeed the education and consultation functions of the office will be critical in ascertaining a true picture of how restrictive practices are used in the ACT, and working with all stakeholders to reduce their use. It is also an important step to comply with the next phase of the national disability insurance scheme, with the establishment of the NDIS quality and safeguards commission in the ACT from 1 July 2019.

I would also like to acknowledge some concerns about the legislation which have been raised by representatives of disability service providers, in relation to compliance with the offences that will not come into effect until the middle of next year, most prominently, the need to take into account carers' abilities to respond to emergency situations, and situations that compromise the safety of the person who is subject to restrictive practices or the people around them. Importantly, there was concern that disability service providers may stop providing support to people with problem behaviours, as an—I am absolutely sure—unintended consequence of the penalties imposed by the legislation.

Indeed the senior practitioner indicated when I met with her that, based on her extensive experience in the field and her consultations that have started and will continue over the coming months, it was likely that she would seek to amend the legislation ahead of its full impact next year. I support such a review, and I anticipate that it will take into account the feedback from the consultations undertaken by the senior practitioner to inform development of policy, standards and guidelines to promote best practice, lead sector capacity building and improve awareness to minimise the use of restrictive practices.

I note, as I said, the concerns of the sector and the canvassing that the senior practitioner is doing. At this stage I am confident that a review will occur before the legislation is fully in operation.

As Greens spokesperson for women and an advocate for the rights of all women, I would like to make some final comments on the nature of restrictive practices specifically in relation to sexual and reproductive health for women with disability. As I mentioned at the start of my speech, restrictive practices can include chemical or pharmacological methods, and this includes contraception. It has only been in the last few decades that the practice of forced female sterilisation has stopped being common for women with disability. Last year Women with Disabilities ACT produced a report entitled *Contraception and consent*. As highlighted in the report, the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women entrenches the reproductive rights of all women, including access to contraception and sexual health education. The report stresses:

If forced sterilisation is now almost unanimously condemned, coercion remains acceptable when it is used for ... contraception.

According to much of the research on this issue, as cited in the report, the reasons this is still regarded as acceptable are societal fear about parenting for people with disability, negating the consequence of high rates of sexual abuse, and managing menstruation.

While recognising that these factors do pose genuine concerns and challenges for carers of people with disability, these are issues which can, in general, be addressed through appropriate support and education and not solely or principally by impinging on the rights of women with disability. We already have in the ACT examples of high quality programs to support people with disability in understanding their sexual and reproductive health needs, such as have been developed by Sexual Health and Family Planning ACT. I hope the work of the senior practitioner will encourage inclusive and rights-based approaches to support this.

All too often, people with disability, and women with disability, are not given a voice in the decisions that impact them. The role of the senior practitioner to consult and provide supports for care providers is an important opportunity to redress this marginalisation. As I said the Greens support this bill.

**MRS KIKKERT** (Ginninderra) (12.04): I rise today to speak briefly on the Senior Practitioner Bill. This proposed legislation is broad in scope and defines providers as either a person or other entity who offers educational services, disability services or the care and protection of children. This means that it will involve children and young people in out of home care.

On this point I honour the good families in Canberra who volunteer to serve as foster carers and kinship carers. This is a labour of love, but it is not always an easy one. Carers take into their homes and into their lives children and young people who are at their most vulnerable, having been removed from their birth parents. In the best of circumstances, this is a complicated situation, and those in out of home care often enter the homes of foster or kinship carers having experienced trauma or having very high needs.

We expect our kinship and foster carers to meet those needs—sometimes for a long time, sometimes for a very short time—as if they were the actual parents. But they are not; so we have an entire regulatory regime looking over their shoulders to make sure that they do not mess up.

Speaking from personal experience, parenting is hard. It can be especially so with someone constantly looking over one's shoulder. But to secure the safety of children who are in the custody of this government, we cannot afford not to monitor these placements. The best result is to give good-hearted, well-intentioned carers the clearest and most explicit guidelines to follow, and then help them to follow them.

This legislation will hopefully do just that. When a child requiring some form of restrictive practice enters a home, it will not be up to the carers alone to figure out what is best practice. Having approved positive behaviour support plans will provide kinship and foster carers with the clear guidance they need to be able to best meet a child's individual requirements, hopefully alleviating much of their worry.

I also note that this bill provides clear legislative guidelines relating to the complaints process, and that virtually all important decisions made under this proposed legislation will be subject to external merits review. Those who may apply to ACAT for consideration of a reviewable decision are specified, but also include “any other person whose interests are affected by the decision”.

As I have stated many times already in this chamber, decisions that have a significant impact on the lives of children and young people, their families and/or their carers, all need to be accompanied by a clear complaints process and access to external merits review. This would help to avoid the situation described by Commissioner Cheryl Vardon in her 2004 review of the territory's care and protection system, where “parents, carers and agencies relayed stories of frustration about having nowhere to go when they disagreed with decisions”. It would, in the words of former Children and Young People Commission Alasdair Roy, “promote high quality evidence-based decision-making”.

I look forward to seeing these principles applied to a far broader range of decisions by this government than just those relating to restrictive practices. I commend this bill to the Assembly.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations) (12.08), in reply: The Senior Practitioner Bill 2018 is a significant bill that will enable vulnerable people in the ACT to achieve a better quality of life, free from unnecessary and unreasonable interventions that limit their human rights.

I take this opportunity to thank the scrutiny committee and members of the opposition, particularly the shadow minister for disability, Ms Lee, for their careful consideration of and comment on the bill. In response to the scrutiny committee's comments, I will table a revised explanatory statement.

I also thank Ms Le Couteur for her active engagement with the bill. In response to her comments here today, I can confirm that the government, and indeed the senior practitioner herself, will monitor the effectiveness of the legislation as it is implemented.

While this legislation is modelled to a large extent on senior practitioner legislation in other jurisdictions, particularly Victoria, its scope is broader. In some ways we are entering uncharted territory, and we will of course continue to monitor how that plays out in practice and make any amendments that may be necessary as we go forward.

I also thank Mrs Kikkert for her comments and acknowledge that yes, indeed, the senior practitioner's role will provide greater support to foster and kinship carers in undertaking their very important work to support the most vulnerable children in our community.

This bill will bring about greater protection from restrictive practices by establishing a formal protection and oversight mechanism for the ACT. It will enshrine the principle that service providers should use restrictive practices only in very limited circumstances, as a last resort, in the least restrictive way and for the shortest period possible in the circumstances.

The purpose of this bill is to establish and define the functions of an ACT senior practitioner and provide a formal framework for the overall reduction and elimination of restrictive practices in the ACT. The Senior Practitioner Bill supports the ACT government's commitment to improving the lives of all people who are vulnerable and potentially subject to restrictive practices, as well as upholding their human rights.

This bill will provide greater and much called for assurance for all providers who work with people who display challenging and complex behaviours. It also ensures that we meet our commitments under the national disability insurance scheme, including the NDIS quality and safeguarding framework and the national framework for reducing and eliminating the use of restrictive practices in the disability sector.

The bill is specifically aimed at regulating the use of restrictive practices by service providers. I wish to make it quite clear that it does not apply to families or informal carers for an individual.

While our commitments under the NDIS have given clear time frames for the establishment of a senior practitioner in the ACT, this bill seeks to provide greater protection for all members of our community who are vulnerable or potentially subject to restrictive practices, not just those with a disability.

The senior practitioner's powers will extend to disability services, including for psychosocial disabilities; schools and other education settings; and children and young people in out-of-home care. Specific exemptions have been made for persons receiving care under the Mental Health Act 2015 to the extent that the act applies, patients in secure mental health facilities and those in custodial prison detention,

including the Bimberi Youth Justice Centre. This is due to existing oversight arrangements specific to those settings which already provide established legislative oversight and regulation.

Other services such as health and hospitals are neither explicitly included nor excluded in the bill. These services will not be subject to oversight by the senior practitioner. However, the definition of provider may be expanded by regulation made under section 8(1)(a)(iv) of the bill. This would only be done in close consultation with key sector and community stakeholders, and allows for a further rollout once the senior practitioner is established and operational.

This bill has been developed following extensive consultation with the ACT community and key government and sector stakeholders. The community has welcomed the educative role of the senior practitioner.

A key aspect of the senior practitioner's role as set out in the bill will be to work alongside the ACT community to provide education and improve awareness of restrictive practices; to produce and disseminate policies, standards and guidelines; to guide decision-making and promote best practice; and to build sector capacity for more positive behaviour supports.

These objectives will be supported by the collection and reporting of key data on the use of restrictive practices over time. The bill empowers the senior practitioner to receive complaints and conduct investigations either in response to a complaint or on their own initiative where restrictive practices are concerned. If the senior practitioner finds that a restrictive practice is being used inappropriately the senior practitioner must give the provider a direction to stop the practice.

As a result of feedback on the draft bill following consultation, including with Ms Lee, as she noted, I will be proposing amendments in the detail stage to section 31(5) of the bill to provide that the senior practitioner must not disclose a particular detail of a complaint if doing so may have an adverse effect on the relevant person for a complaint. This will extend the protection of nondisclosure to the person who may be subject to a restrictive practice where they are not the complainant.

A relevant person for a complaint is defined at new clause 31(6) to protect the interests of persons subjected to a restrictive practice that is being raised as a complaint to the senior practitioner by a third party.

I will also propose that item 5, column 4 of schedule 1 be amended to provide that a person who is the subject of a positive behaviour support plan may apply to ACAT for review of the senior practitioner's decision to cancel registration of that plan.

A priority for the senior practitioner will be to build strong working relationships with other key oversight agencies with the aim of leveraging and enhancing existing safeguarding arrangements and to best meet the needs of people who may be vulnerable to restrictive practices. Any restraints or seclusions identified that fall outside the senior practitioner's role will be reported to the relevant authority.

This bill also creates offences relating to the unauthorised use of restrictive practices. These will take effect from 1 July 2019. Delaying the operation of the offence provisions will ensure that the senior practitioner has time to engage, educate and work through implementation issues with service providers and people affected by the legislation.

I understand there may be some apprehension among service providers about the strict liability offence under section 47 of the bill. Section 47 holds that a provider commits an offence if it fails to comply with a direction of the senior practitioner. Being a strict liability offence, there is no requirement to prove an element of fault such as intention or recklessness on the part of a provider who fails to comply with the direction.

I have met with National Disability Services about this. The government has been very mindful of how section 47 may limit section 22 of the ACT Human Rights Act, which holds that “everyone charged with a criminal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the law”.

In drafting this bill the Community Services Directorate consulted closely with the Parliamentary Counsel’s Office, the ACT Human Rights Commission and the justice and community safety scrutiny teams. The potential impact of the strict liability offence was balanced with the need to facilitate timely enforcement of directions issued by the senior practitioner and protect the rights of vulnerable people who may be subject to restrictive practices.

I am satisfied that the risk for this provision to have unintended adverse consequences for providers and staff, who fear criminal prosecution, will be mitigated by the educative functions and powers of the senior practitioner enshrined in the bill. It is important to note that the bill describes the role of the senior practitioner in providing education on and improving sector awareness of the reduction and elimination of restrictive practices. The opportunity for meaningful engagement with the sector is further supported by the functions of the senior practitioner specified at section 26, which include producing and disseminating policies, standards and guidelines to promote best practice and build sector capacity.

Under section 39 of the bill the senior practitioner may issue a direction following an investigation of an issue if they are satisfied on reasonable grounds that action needs to be taken in relation to the provider. In conducting an investigation the senior practitioner would work closely with a provider to clarify any issues, convey the findings of their investigation and provide advice on the action that is sought by the direction.

I am therefore satisfied that there will be ample engagement and guidance given to providers about what is required to comply with a direction and avoid unwarranted penalties under section 47. There are many strict liability offences already present in ACT legislation, including in the Work Health and Safety Act 2011, which the same providers affected by this bill are aware of and comply with.

I reiterate that the purpose of the bill is to protect the human rights of the most vulnerable members of our community. Again, I thank members for their interest and

engagement in the development of the bill, thank them for supporting it and commend it to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

### **Detail stage**

Bill, by leave, taken as a whole.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations) (12.19), by leave: I move amendments Nos 1 to 4 circulated in my name together [*see schedule 1 at page 2687*] and table a supplementary explanatory statement to the amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

Bill, as a whole, as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, agreed to.

### **Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee Membership**

Motion (by **Mr Gentleman**) agreed to:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 16, Ms Cheyne be discharged from the Standing Committee on Administration and Procedure for the meeting scheduled for 13 August 2018 and that Mr Steel be appointed in her place for that meeting.

### **Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018**

#### **Reference to committee**

Debate resumed.

**MR GENTLEMAN** (Brindabella—Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Urban Renewal) (12.21): Under standing order 144, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted.

Amendment withdrawn.

**MS CHEYNE** (Ginninderra) (12.21): I move the amendment being circulated at least with my signature if not also now in my name. I move:

Omit all words after “That”, substitute:

- “(1) the Government Procurement (Secure Local Jobs) Amendment Bill 2018 be referred to the Standing Committee on Economic Development and Tourism for inquiry and report, pursuant to standing order 174;
- (2) the Standing Committee on Economic Development and Tourism report back to the Assembly this inquiry by no later than the end of September 2018; and
- (3) that Standing Committee on Economic Development and Tourism may table its report into this inquiry when the Assembly is not sitting.”.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I have checked with the Clerk about whether the name needs to be formal. It has been signed, so it is accepted by the Clerk and by the Assembly—

**Mr Hanson:** You do not need her name on it?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** It is in Ms Cheyne’s name because it is her signature. That is the advice I have. If I am wrong on that, I will come back and inform the Assembly. What we have in front of us now is an amendment to Mr Wall’s motion, and the amendment is in Ms Cheyne’s name.

**MS CHEYNE:** This has been agreed to by all parties, Madam Speaker. It makes more sense to go to EDD rather than PAC and, as we heard from your advice before, no later than the end of September 2018 seems reasonable and gives us the necessary flexibility. I commend my amendment to the chamber.

**MR HANSON:** The opposition will be supporting this. I am chair of that committee. I cannot wait.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** We all look forward to that, Mr Hanson.

Amendment agreed to.

Original question, as amended, agreed to.

**Sitting suspended from 12.23 to 2.30 pm.**

## **Ministerial arrangements**

**MR BARR:** Madam Speaker, I advise of ministerial arrangements for today in Minister Fitzharris’s absence. The same as yesterday, Minister Rattenbury will take questions on health, Minister Gentleman—although it is not his birthday today—on transport and city services, and I will take questions on higher education, training and research.



## **Questions without notice**

### **Australian Labor Party—preselection**

**MR COE:** My question is to Chief Minister regarding so-called dirt sheets about a Labor candidate allegedly distributed to members of the Labor Party, including MLAs. Chief Minister, yesterday you said that you were confident that no MLA or staff members were involved in the production or distribution of the material. Chief Minister, have you or your office made any inquiries of MLAs and Assembly staff—or executive staff—to ensure that they were not involved?

**MR BARR:** Yes, I have raised my concern in relation to that material with colleagues and sought assurances that no-one in this building would have anything to do with that, and I have received those assurances.

**MR COE:** Chief Minister, when did you seek these assurances, what inquiries did you make and in what format did you make these inquiries to give you confidence that no MLAs or staff were involved as opposed to just making an assumption?

**MR BARR:** Since the material arrived, and face to face.

**MR PARTON:** Chief Minister, have you seen the material? If so, did your office receive the material at the Assembly?

**MR BARR:** I understand that one piece of material was posted to me. I do not see every piece of mail that comes in to my office, but this was brought to my attention.

### **Planning—development applications**

**MS LE COUTEUR:** My question is to the minister for planning. It relates to reconsideration of development applications. Minister, is there any discretion for ACTPLA staff to accept applications for reconsideration after the statutory timeframe has passed? How much difference is available for the same DA to be reconsidered without it being considered as a new DA?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Ms Le Couteur for the question. There is some availability for directorate staff to look at DAs in regard to the best outcomes for the community. If we look at a development application that has been refused and is resubmitted, there may be an opportunity to look at that development application in regard to the work that the proponent has been doing with the community relating to the application and any other planning work occurring around the source of the application. Yes, there is some scope there. There are definitive timelines of course in our building act. I would be interested to see any particular development application that Ms Le Couteur is interested in.

**MS LE COUTEUR:** Could you answer the first part of my first question: how much difference is allowable for the same DA to be reconsidered without needing to lodge a new DA entirely? That is the major thing.

**MR GENTLEMAN:** My understanding is that it is as long as the development application changes are similar to the original development application. It would have to be the actual area that was allocated in the first development and around the same footprint. But there may be scope for having a look at another development application or looking at changes made by a proponent if it is in line with community views and, of course, with the planning outcomes that the government wants to see for the future.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, does receipt of further information push out the notice and statutory time periods?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** The proponent would need to ask the directorate for an extension on looking at the application. Then the 20-day period would be looked at at the end of the time period. So the time period allocated for the end of discussion on the change to the application would be when the 20-day period starts.

### **Australian Labor Party—preselection**

**MS LAWDER:** My question is to Chief Minister regarding so-called dirt sheets about a Labor candidate allegedly distributed to members of the Labor Party, including MLAs. Chief Minister, did you or any other member of the Assembly refer the content or distribution to the police or any other body?

**MR BARR:** Yes.

**MS LAWDER:** Chief Minister, have you commissioned, or will you commission, an investigation to ensure that there have been no breaches of the Public Sector Management Act, the ministerial code of conduct or any other ACT government code regarding the content or distribution of this material?

**MR BARR:** I have no reason to believe there are any breaches of any of those activities. There is currently an investigation underway in relation to those particular documents. Should that process identify the source of those documents, that may necessitate further action or it may not. In fact, it most likely will not, as I do not believe, and have no reason to believe, that those documents had any origination in this building or indeed within the ACT public sector and, in fact, is completely beyond the purview of this chamber.

**MR COE:** Chief Minister, would you please clarify: did you refer the content or distribution to the police? Secondly, did you or any other MLA receive a copy of the dirt sheet through ACT government or ACT Legislative Assembly delivered mail?

**MR BARR:** The matter was referred to the Government Solicitor for advice. My understanding is that the mail arrived through Australia Post.

### **Land—rural property acquisition**

**MISS C BURCH:** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development. Minister, I refer to a report in the media on 11 July that the value of the

block of land at the centre of the former Land Development Agency's Fairvale land deal has increased in value by 60 per cent in two years. Why did the LDA agree to the subdivision of Fairvale, given that acquiring the remaining part of the property will be more expensive in future?

**MS BERRY:** I understand that this is the subject of an Auditor-General's report and the government will provide a response in due course.

**MISS C BURCH:** Did the LDA agree to the subdivision of Fairvale so it would avoid the \$5 million trigger that would require a business case to be prepared?

**MS BERRY:** As I said in my first response, this particular piece of land was the subject of an Auditor-General's report. The government will respond to the report in due course. I understand that there is significant interest in a response from the government to this report and I have asked for the directorate's and government's response to be provided as soon as possible but certainly within the time frame required.

**MR COE:** Minister, have you commissioned an internal investigation into this subdivision, and will you table the documents related to the subdivision of Fairvale in the Assembly by tomorrow afternoon?

**MS BERRY:** I responded to a question yesterday regarding this particular issue. I said that I had asked for some advice on this particular piece of land. That could be legal advice, and, if it can be tabled, I will table it. Otherwise I will provide the advice that I can to the Assembly about the question, as I responded to the question yesterday.

### **Public housing—renewal program**

**MS CODY:** My question is to the minister for housing and suburban land development. Can the minister update the Assembly on the renewal of public housing across Canberra?

**MS BERRY:** I thank Ms Cody for her question. We are on the homestretch of the public housing renewal program. As everyone in the chamber is aware, this has been an incredible investment in the ACT's public housing, with over 11 per cent of the stock renewed over the life of the program. There is a budget investment of \$608 million over this time to renew and replace, roof-for-roof, 1,288 public housing properties.

There have been 815 dwellings completed and handed over for public housing tenants to date. Currently 419 dwellings are under construction or being purchased for the renewal. An amount of \$345.61 million has been spent so far on the construction and purchase of replacement dwellings. In addition, Housing ACT has continued their capital program, which spent over \$26 million renewing public housing last financial year.

The renewal of public housing is bringing benefits to public housing tenants and changing the lives of people in their new homes. There have been a number of

stories—indeed an art exhibition has been held in this place—on the change it has made to the lives of public housing tenants in the ACT. I understand that those exhibitions will continue to be shown throughout the city. I encourage members who have not had the chance to see it here in the Assembly to get along and see that exhibition in other places in this city and learn the stories of some of our public housing tenants.

**MS CODY:** Minister, how is the renewal program improving the spread of public housing and fostering better outcomes for tenants and the community?

**MS BERRY:** I thank Ms Cody for the supplementary. The renewal program is developing public housing, as everybody knows, all across Canberra. Older and inefficient dwellings that no longer suit the needs of tenants are being replaced. In line with the government's salt and pepper approach, these are being built in every region across Canberra. Over 700 of these homes are in growing areas of Canberra such as Gungahlin and Molonglo. These areas have had limited public housing in the past, and new dwellings will offer more choice for public housing tenants looking to be closer to families, schools and services in those areas.

The government is renewing and building housing near the Northbourne corridor, with 202 new dwellings being built as part of the program. This will build on the established network of public housing in the inner north as well as being placed to utilise transport and services. The new homes provide comfortable, accessible housing that is energy efficient, is more affordable to maintain and meets the needs of some of Canberra's vulnerable residents.

**MS ORR:** Minister, what other investments is the government making to improve the quality of public housing in Canberra?

**MS BERRY:** I thank Ms Orr for her question. Significant measures were announced in this year's budget to improve and build on the quality of public housing in Canberra. Two thousand, two hundred public housing properties will receive energy-efficient products such as split air conditioners through energy efficiency improvement schemes. This \$5.7 million initiative will deliver energy-efficient upgrades to help tenants reduce their power bills and use energy more efficiently, as well as cutting greenhouse gas emissions. This will provide significant savings to tenants, up to \$500 a year in a reduction in energy bills.

The government is delivering a second dedicated culturally appropriate housing project for older Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. This \$4.4 million budget project will build on the success of the first complex. Work has started on the second Common Ground in Dixon. This will be a fantastic project once complete, providing social and affordable housing and a great social mix for tenants. This social mix is working very well at the Gungahlin Common Ground.

Finally, this year's budget has committed an extra \$6.5 million in addition to the \$20 million funded each year for the specialist homelessness services sector. This extra funding is targeted at cohorts at risk of chronic homelessness, including women and children escaping domestic violence, older women and migrant families. This

investment can help prevent the cycle of homelessness and get more people into secure housing. This year's budget is delivering on the government's commitment to support public housing and people who are experiencing homelessness.

### **Land—Molonglo stage 3**

**MS LEE:** My question is to the minister for planning and environment: in May you signed off on an exemption for an environmental impact study for Molonglo stage 3 despite concerns over sewage contamination and explosive ordnance waste. Last year the ACT Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment stated she was uncomfortable with moves to exclude the same project from the environmental impact statement process. Minister, why did you decide to exempt Molonglo stage 3 from the EIS process despite concerns over sewage contamination and explosive ordnance waste?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Ms Lee for the question. It is an important question as we look at future planning for Canberra and the use of previous studies in the area. That is the reason for the decision. The Molonglo River reserve, of course, is a new reserve comprising about 1,280 hectares that follow the river from Scrivener Dam downstream. The draft plan describes the values of the Molonglo River reserve and defines objectives. Consultation on the plan concluded on 23 March this year and submissions received during the consultation period are being reviewed.

In regard specifically to environmental impact statements and the opportunity to look at prior work, the directorate gives me the opportunity to look at all the prior work that occurred in the area to inform me on whether or not an EIS exemption can be granted. It is probably not very good terminology to call it an EIS exemption because, really, it looks at all the previous environmental study work that has occurred. If you like, the work has been done, and that is why we can give that terminology and allow development to go forward.

**MS LEE:** Minister, have you received correspondence or a briefing from the commissioner about proposals to exempt Molonglo stage 3 from the EIS process, and what was your response?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** Yes, we did have a briefing, more on the whole area, and the study that the commissioner has been doing. Indeed she brought up some concerns that she had about previous study recognition. We have taken those on board, and we will be responding to that in the near future.

**MR HANSON:** Minister, will you table the documents related to the decision to exempt Molonglo stage 3 from an EIS in the Assembly by the end of today?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I think I have already outlined those documents. If there is further information I am happy to bring it to the Assembly.

### **Floriade—financial management**

**MRS KIKKERT:** My question is to the Minister for Tourism and Major Events. I refer to media reports of 23 June about significant financial management issues with

Floriade. The deputy director-general of your directorate is quoted as saying, “With the change of personnel and the records that we had available to us it wasn’t exactly clear which invoices related to prepayments as opposed to last year’s delivery as opposed to tidying up the 2016.” Minister, why is the record keeping in your directorate so bad that you cannot determine which invoices are related to which Floriade?

**MR BARR:** In this particular case, invoices for multiple years and multiple contracts for Floriade 2016, 2017 and 2018 were incorrectly coded within that directorate. That issue has been assessed and rectified, and information has been provided, I believe, to the estimates committee in relation to that matter.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Minister, has any supplier been paid twice as a result of the problems with your directorate’s management?

**MR BARR:** I have no advice to that effect.

**MR WALL:** Chief Minister, why is the record keeping in the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate so bad, whether it relates to discussions with the CFMEU, invoices for Floriade or decisions to change the structure of Health?

**MR BARR:** Undoubtedly record keeping needs to improve, and it will.

### **Youth—social participation**

**MS ORR:** My question is to the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth. Minister, what is the government doing to support young people to make positive contributions to our community?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Ms Orr for her question. The ACT government’s youth participation and engagement strategy is implemented through the youth interACT initiative. This initiative provides opportunities for young people to contribute to policy and program discussions and aims to ensure that young people have a real voice on matters that affect them.

Youth interACT engages young people through a range of activities, including the Youth Advisory Council, the young Canberra citizen of the year awards and a number of grant and scholarship programs. Members will be pleased to know that applications are currently open for this year’s round of youth interACT grants. These grants provide funding of up to \$1,500 for young people to organise one-off projects, events and programs that benefit other young people in the community.

Another key component of the youth engagement strategy is the government’s Youth Advisory Council. The Youth Advisory Council develops an annual work plan to guide their strategic direction and identify priority issues affecting young people in the ACT. The focus for the past 12 months has been inclusive sexual health and wellbeing, environment and planning, and youth employment rights and opportunities.

Later this year the Youth Advisory Council will partner with the government's youth engagement team to host an ACT youth assembly. The youth assembly will provide a platform for up to 80 young people to have their voices heard on key issues. Participants will be empowered to speak up on topics that matter to them through a series of interactive sessions to be held right here in the Assembly chamber. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you, Madam Speaker, for granting permission to Canberra's young people to use this place for their own assembly.

**MS ORR:** Minister, how does the government's support for youth-led initiatives fit in with the broader strategy to promote inclusion and participation for all Canberrans?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Ms Orr for her supplementary question. Canberra's young people, we know are, dynamic and diverse and bring a wide range of unique skills and perspectives to our community. It is important for this government to support young people to make their best contribution to our city and our society. Recipients of youth interACT grants from previous years have demonstrated that empowering young people to make their own contributions helps to promote inclusion across a broad cross-section of the community.

Among last year's grant recipients was Trash Mob, a volunteer-run initiative that aims to keep Canberra looking cleaner and greener. All Canberrans benefit from the work that Trash Mob does to clean up our open spaces and the message of environmental conscientiousness they promote. I understand that it has already been spoken of earlier this week in the chamber. I encourage all members to visit Trash Mob's Facebook page to see what work they may have done in each member's own corner of Canberra.

Another of last year's grants winners was Girls Take Over, a program that aims to empower young women to be leaders, giving them the tools and support to help them take action and pursue their dreams. Members are aware of the vital importance of ensuring that our young women are supported and empowered to be a part of the next generation of leaders.

Past youth interACT grants have also supported initiatives and activities focused on the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community, the LGBTI community and multicultural communities. The benefits of the youth-led initiatives such as these supported by the youth interACT grants are felt across the community. I strongly encourage all members of this place to get out into their communities and encourage young people and the organisations that support them to put in an application for the youth interACT grants.

**MS CHEYNE:** Minister, why is it important for the government to have a role in encouraging social participation among young people?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Ms Cheyne for her supplementary question. Young people have life experiences, ideas, thoughts and perspectives that can enrich decision-making processes and ensure that policy decisions and services are appropriate, relevant and responsive to the specific needs of young people. We know that young people face unique challenges. It is important that the government

facilitate appropriate engagement with them to inform our responses to those challenges. The youth interACT initiatives I have mentioned give young people the opportunity to take a leading role in the community and in decision-making processes. The government's strategy facilitates direct engagement with young people to inform how we govern and provides resources to young people so that they can lead their own communities and explore their own solutions to social problems.

Canberra's young people have shown that, when given the right tools, they can be genuine advocates, genuine entrepreneurs and genuine leaders. We need look no further than the evidence that the Youth Coalition gives at many of our inquiries and hearings. We need also look no further than the 2018 Young Canberra Citizen of the Year winner, Ms Dhani Gilbert. She is an exceptional role model in our community. Ms Gilbert, a proud Wiradjuri woman, was awarded the 2018 Young Canberra Citizen of the Year award for her community work, her academic pursuits and her advocacy for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Most recently she was also named the ACT NAIDOC awards young person of the year. I have not got that name right, but members get the drift.

Canberra's young people have genuine contributions to make. It is important that government ensure that these opportunities are not lost. I look forward to seeing how the next round of youth interACT grants will benefit our community. I am also especially excited to see the outcomes of the youth assembly, which will bring us real and considered opinions of young people in our city.

### **Building—code compliance**

**MR PARTON:** My question is to the Minister for Planning and Land Management. Minister, you have repeatedly assured the ACT community that you are confident in the safety of the ACT's buildings and that significant reforms in our building compliance codes over the past five years have improved the quality and compliance of our buildings, including residential buildings. What have you done to ensure that the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate are issuing a certificate of occupancy only for buildings that are compliant with the building code of Australia, fire standards and other relevant construction standards?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Mr Parton for this important question. It is, of course, important that ACT residents feel safe in their properties. The government is aware of some of the detrimental effects on the community and industry of poorly designed and constructed buildings. That is why the ACT government has implemented and continues to implement a series of reforms arising from a review of the ACT building regulatory system. There has been one review. We are not starting a new review; we will continue with the reform program that I announced in June 2016, which was funded in this year's budget. We will also consider the outcomes of the current inquiry that the economic development and tourism standing committee is undertaking.

The reforms aim to ensure that our legislation, administration and regulatory systems are effective and relevant to the industry and the community, are wide reaching and



target all stages of the regulatory system, from training, licensing and design up front through to the construction process and resolving post-occupancy disputes.

These reforms are well supported by industry and community stakeholders.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, what have you done to ensure that private certifiers are approving or signing off on buildings only once they are compliant with the Building Code of Australia, fire standards and other relevant construction standards?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I have prioritised reforms to improve the compliance of residential construction across the ACT. The reform package also includes actions to address issues such as security payments and the building regulatory system as a whole, and problems of course with the Building Act. It will take some time to implement. It may take a few years to start to see the results across the industry. The changes we are making are quite fundamental and extensive. They cover aspects from pre-construction such as design, training and licencing to supervision and verification during construction works right through to post-occupancy dispute resolution.

**MR WALL:** Minister, can you assure buyers of new homes in the ACT that they can be confident that the property they are purchasing is compliant with the building code fire standards or other relevant construction codes?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** Yes, I am very confident in the work that our directorate does. Unfortunately, of course, we may continue to see problems emerge with buildings that are already designed and constructed, some of which were built over a decade ago. We will need to manage these problems as best as we can.

Problems in these buildings, of course, may be very difficult to resolve but a defect found in an older building does not mean that we are going to prevent major defects in new buildings. Of course, we are looking at all of those new buildings to ensure that they comply in all of the circumstances that Mr Wall mentioned.

### **Health—adult mental health unit**

**MRS DUNNE:** My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. I refer to reports yesterday regarding assaults on staff at the Dhulwa mental health unit. The reports indicated that there had been 10 assaults on staff in recent weeks with some staff having to be taken to Canberra Hospital's emergency department. Mr Matthew Daniel of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation said on ABC radio in relation to proposed discussions with management about issues such as violence management training:

... I don't hold out much hope for those discussions because there is a history of denials that there are problems

Why has ACT Health denied that there are problems with security at the Dhulwa mental health unit?

**MR RATTENBURY:** Yes, this example highlights the challenges of working in a forensic mental health space. Whilst it can be a very rewarding job for our staff,

particularly our nurses, it can also be dangerous at times because of the extreme behavioural issues of the clients in that facility.

I am concerned by the commentary of the ANMF. I expect our staff to have the training they need. I will follow up those complaints raised by the Nursing and Midwifery Federation to ensure that we are addressing the points that they have raised. As I said, I expect our staff to have adequate training. This is a young environment in the sense that it is a relatively new facility in the ACT. There is still some degree of development of protocols and standards. But it is important that we ensure a safe working environment for all of our staff as best we can and as soon as possible.

**MRS DUNNE:** Minister, why do staff have concerns about the adequacy of violence management training, and why do you think they have been ignored until now?

**MR RATTENBURY:** As I touched on, this is a difficult environment for staff to work in. There is an ongoing discussion about how we make it safe and what the right training for staff is. With these comments that were made publicly this week, it was the first time that that particular concern has been raised with me, and I will be following it up in the coming days to get to the bottom of those questions.

**MS LEE:** Minister, have there been cases where staff have been unable to return to work due to the extent of injury they have suffered arising out of an assault?

**MR RATTENBURY:** Without going into individual details, the answer to the member's question is, yes, in the short term some staff who have recently been assaulted have been able to return to work immediately. Some have had more time off as a result of the injuries they have sustained.

### **Housing—housing choices**

**MS CHEYNE:** My question is to the Minister for Planning and Land Management: can you update the Assembly on the housing choices consultation and demonstration housing project?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Ms Cheyne for her interest in planning across the city. I begin by thanking everyone who has taken the time to get involved in the housing choices conversation to date. We have received significant feedback from the community on the housing choices discussion paper with more than 600 surveys completed, more than 340 people engaging at community kiosks and over 150 written submissions received. An engagement report providing a full summary of the feedback has been published on the your say website, and individual submissions are available on the EPSDD planning website.

Feedback has been collected via the housing choices collaboration hub. Video recordings of presentations from the collaboration hub, a detailed information kit provided to participants and additional background information have also been published on the your say website.

The feedback to date covers a wide range of topics. They include: ageing in place and downsizing; building construction quality and policy; bush capital and garden city; climate and environment; community engagement; evidence base; housing affordability; housing delivery, ownership and rental models; housing density and infill; housing design quality; housing and block options and types; infrastructure planning; neighbourhood amenity, character and design; the planning system in general; strategic planning; suburb-specific comments; and Territory Plan codes and zones.

The topics I have mentioned demonstrate the complexity of housing policy and related challenges facing the ACT as well the diverse range of community participants involved in the consultation process. We have heard so far in this process that a wide range of housing types is desired and needed to suit the needs of the diverse members of our community.

The demonstration housing project is a key element of the broader housing choices paper. The ACT government is committed to the planning and delivery of housing that supports a vibrant, compact and sustainable city. *(Time expired.)*

**MS CHEYNE:** Minister, can you provide further detail on the collaboration hub undertaken as part of the housing choices consultation?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Ms Cheyne for her supplementary. Following three months of in-depth work by participants, on Saturday, 28 August I was pleased to receive the recommendations from the housing choices collaboration hub about different ways of meeting our city's housing needs.

Over five sessions, members of our community were directly involved in the collaboration hub. Through their participation in the deliberative democracy process, they shared their views to examine our growing city and consider housing choices in particular. Participants shared their thoughts and viewpoints on topics about planning, housing and development in the ACT. The collaboration hub sessions included a range of experts from across industry and government to support discussions and deliberations on ideas, challenges and opportunities.

This has been a new and bespoke engagement process that provided a genuine opportunity for a wide cross-section of the community to bring their own perspectives and ideas to the table. The topics of discussion have included housing types, affordability and use of zoning. It was great to see the energy and commitment of the participants. Their input will now influence the options the government takes forward into future planning and development.

In March, invitations to participate in the hub were sent to approximately 15,000 randomly selected households. Of those that responded, 38 were selected as independent of government by the newDemocracy Foundation, to form a broad and representative cross-section of Canberrans.

I am very pleased with the work that my directorate did—time on weekends, so in their personal time—in coming along to assist in the collaboration hub. They did a great job.

**MR STEEL:** Minister, can you outline to the Assembly the next steps for the housing choices consultation and demonstration housing project?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Mr Steel for the question. There is no one right answer to the question of how we meet our future housing needs. It is quite complex. The collaboration hub has been a genuine opportunity for the citizens of Canberra to influence future housing choices and planning and development in our city. The hub has presented me with a report of their recommendations. The government will now consider the collaboration hub's recommendations and present a formal response in the coming months.

The government will also carefully consider the recommendations presented by the hub, alongside the feedback received through the consultation on the housing choices discussion paper, before developing any proposals for further community engagement. For anyone interested in the recommendations from the hub or the feedback received during consultation on housing choices, the reports on both are published on the your say website.

With regard to the demonstration housing element of the broader housing choices project, the first stage of an expression of interest process has now closed to submissions. I am advised that there has been a great response to the call for proposals, with a diverse group of applicants with a range of ideas received. After assessing proposals received from stage 1 of the EOI, the directorate will refine the requirements for the next stage of the process. Demonstration housing precincts will provide an opportunity to showcase innovative housing design and delivery in a real-world example.

### **Building—code compliance**

**MR WALL:** My question is to the Minister for Planning and Land Management. Minister, the CFMEU have recently embarked on a campaign to discredit certain builders in the ACT. The campaign against certain builders includes claims that imply that buildings currently being offered for sale are not compliant with the Building Code of Australia, fire standards or other relevant construction standards. Minister, are you aware that CFMEU officials have been actively engaged in a smear campaign against certain builders and building companies and also blockading display suites across the ACT?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I am not quite sure how that falls into my portfolio of planning. Interestingly, this is the first I have heard of the actions that Mr Wall has notified us of.

**Mr Wall:** Supplementary question, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Can you resume your seat for one moment, Mr Wall? Mr Wall, I am just mindful that, as the minister alluded to, he is not responsible for the actions of a third party, but ask your question and we will see what it is.

**Mr Wall:** Just on your ruling, Madam Speaker, he might not be responsible for the actions of third parties but the question was specifically whether or not he was aware of those actions, given that they are claims related to buildings that were not compliant with the Building Code of Australia, fire standards or other relevant construction standards, which is, I imagine, an area of the minister's responsibility.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Yes, thank you, Mr Wall.

**MR WALL:** Minister, are you aware of any new buildings in the ACT that are being offered for sale that currently do not comply with the standards set out by the Building Code of Australia?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I gave a full answer earlier on to questions from Mr Parton on the compliance of buildings across the territory. If that is related to that, I will refer the member back to that question. In relation, as I mentioned earlier, to the actions of the particular union: no, this is the first time I have been made aware of them.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, are you aware of any new dwellings in the ACT being offered for sale that do not comply with relevant fire and construction standards?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** No, I have not been briefed on any new buildings that would not comply with those standards.

### **Office for LGBTIQ Affairs—outcomes**

**MR STEEL:** My question is to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, what are some of the significant outcomes that the Office for LGBTIQ Affairs has achieved since its establishment just last year?

**MR BARR:** I thank Mr Steel for the question. The office is the centralised policy development area now for the territory government and provides a single contact point for the community. The office supports the ministerial advisory council and also conducts a range of community forums, surveys and events.

Some of the key outcomes include: extensive work across government and with community groups to implement an engagement campaign and to increase mental health and wellbeing support for LGBTIQ Canberrans; working with Canberra's universities to improve student safety on campus; input into legislative and policy reform, and broader reviews such as the religious freedom review and 2021 census topics; ensuring that public servants across the ACT public sector have access to the training and guidance they need to support LGBTIQ members of the community; and the development of a range of new initiatives in the 2018 budget particularly to support trans and intersex people.

**MR STEEL:** Chief Minister, what are some of the events that the office has been involved in supporting or organising for the community?

**MR BARR:** There is no doubt that visibility and awareness are key to understanding our past and thinking differently about our future. The office has been involved in supporting and organising a number of events for the community. There is the fair day held during the SpringOUT festival, Canberra's annual pride festival. There is support for the inclusive Canberra think tank to examine current and emerging issues facing LGBTIQ Canberrans, in conjunction with the ministerial advisory council. There are educational events on intersex awareness day and transgender day of remembrance.

The office supports the attendance of around 50 young Canberrans at the YWCA's LGBTIQ and Allies prom. There were events during National Reconciliation Week in partnership with the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander LGBTIQ network. There was participation in the 2018 Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras, which involved more than 200 Canberrans.

There were event partnerships with national institutions such as the National Gallery of Australia and the National Film and Sound Archive. Combined, these events were attended by thousands of Canberrans and signal inclusion. They also create safe spaces for LGBTIQ Canberrans, their families and allies to connect with community.

**MR PETTERSSON:** Chief Minister, what benefits have we seen as a result of Canberra's participation in the 2018 Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras parade?

**MR BARR:** Beyond the glitter, the flamboyance and the satire, it is fair to observe that Mardi Gras is one of Australia's biggest events. Canberra's participation received local, national and international recognition. Over 300,000 spectators lined the route of the parade to watch over 12,000 participants take part in the world's biggest celebration of the LGBTIQ community. That figure includes thousands of international guests who came from all over the world to the event. One of the more famous participants in 2018 was Cher.

SBS broadcasts the event and does so in a number of different formats. I am pleased to say that both of the Canberra floats were prominently featured, including the infamous rainbow bus. That achieved significant national and local reach in Sydney and across the nation. Mardi Gras creates opportunities for businesses and cultural institutions to promote their goods and services to the LGBTIQ community and to families and allies. Many businesses take that opportunity. Visit Canberra and the National Gallery of Australia boosted a range of themed social media activity during the Mardi Gras period to reach these target audiences.

### **Crime—motorcycle gangs**

**MR HANSON:** My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. I refer to reports in the media on 18 July that the Finks motorcycle gang had been involved in a violent brawl in Anketell Street near the Tuggeranong bus interchange

on 6 July 2018. Minister, how many members of outlaw motorcycle gangs were involved in a violent brawl near the Tuggeranong bus interchange on this day?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Mr Hanson for his question. Of course, whilst Canberra is a safe city, it does not mean we are immune from crime, and we see these actions of serious criminal gangs operating outside the law. In regard to the exact number, I will have to take that detail on notice.

I assure the Canberra community that this government is taking the issue very seriously. Over the past few years we have provided additional funding and resources to ACT Policing to specifically target criminal gangs. We have also acted to strengthen the law and provide police with additional powers. We will continue to work with the Chief Police Officer and other officials across government to help stop these gangs.

We must remember that there is no quick or easy solution to this sort of violence. I have heard the opposition suggest that there is a simple solution: just bring on one law and it will deal with the problem.

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Members! Mr Hanson and Mr Wall, let the minister answer.

**MR GENTLEMAN:** The challenge of dealing with these gangs is not that simple. As I have said, we are working to deal with the challenge. Taskforce Nemesis to date has charged 264 people, laid a total of 748 charges, and executed 201 search warrants. In addition, ACT Policing have seized assets and cash as part of their efforts to tackle these serious criminal gangs. Even with these laws in other jurisdictions—the laws that Mr Hanson promotes—issues with serious criminal gangs persist.

We will continue working with all our officials to tackle this problem. Any legal change, of course, would need to be effective and comply with human rights laws, as I have mentioned before. We have invested seriously in Task Force Nemesis over recent years. *(Time expired.)*

*Mr Hanson interjecting—*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Beside the interjection, Mr Hanson, do you have a supplementary?

*Mr Barr interjecting—*

**MR HANSON:** I do, Madam Speaker. It's a good one too. If Mr Barr would stop interjecting, I would be able to ask it.

*Mr Barr interjecting—*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Everyone hush.

**MR HANSON:** He continues, Madam Speaker. He continues interjecting.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Mr Hanson, to your question. If you had got there more quickly we might have been on a bit further.

**MR HANSON:** Minister, how have new outlaw gangs operating in the Canberra area increased the risk to the Canberra community?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** Any outlaw gang activity increases risk to the Canberra area. That is why we are investing in ACT police, particularly in Taskforce Nemesis, to ensure that we can arrest this progression. We have committed an additional \$6.4 million in funding over four years. We have employed eight additional staff. This year's budget built on that commitment by providing an extra \$1.6 million.

*Mr Hanson interjecting—*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Mr Hanson, enough.

**MR GENTLEMAN:** The government has also increased funding to the Director of Public Prosecutions to help support the work of Taskforce Nemesis and ACT Policing. Last year, funding of \$970,000 was provided to strengthen their capacity to address organised crime by providing additional prosecutors to specialise in seizing criminal assets, depriving criminal organisations of their financial proceedings of crime. That is the key. If you take the proceeds of crime away from these gangs, you lessen the opportunity for them to be active.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, how many members of outlaw motorcycle gangs have come to Canberra in the past three years?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** The original brief I had when I took over the portfolio was that there around 40 to 42 outlaw motorcycle gang members active in the ACT. My understanding is that there are just under 50 outlaw motorcycle gang members operating in the ACT. So that is the increase we have seen. Of course, in regard to this very important topic, unlike the opposition we do not seek to politicise this issue. We do not go around perpetrating a fraud on Canberrans by pretending that a single legal change will somehow stop these serious criminal gangs from breaking the law.

These gangs have no regard for the law and they do not care what the legislation says. So, unlike those opposite, we are acting; we are investing in ACT Policing with additional resources and equipment to tackle these serious criminal gangs—

*Mr Hanson interjecting—*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Mr Hanson, do you want to hear the answer?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** and we are always happy to support effective measures that are human rights compliant.



*Mrs Dunne interjecting—*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Mrs Dunne, your colleague Mr Milligan is on his feet to ask a question without notice.

### **Crime—motorcycle gangs**

**MR MILLIGAN:** My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. On 8 July, media reports cited police statistics that outlaw motorcycle gang issues made up 75 per cent of the workload of the criminal investigations area. As at 8 July, there have been two attempted murders, six shootings and seven arson attacks attributed to bikie gangs. In 2017 these gangs were believed to be responsible for eight shootings and nine arson attacks. Why do we have a situation where three-quarters of the workload of the criminal investigations area is due to outlaw motorcycle gangs?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** It is a direct result of the focus that ACT Policing have put on criminal outlaw motorcycle gangs. The CPO gave a direction to her criminal investigations unit to ensure that the focus will be on criminal outlaw motorcycle gangs. Mind you, they are still doing other work. I can report that just today four people faced the ACT Magistrates Court this morning on a total of 21 drug trafficking charges, after ACT Policing executed search warrants yesterday.

Members of ACT Policing criminal investigations, assisted by other police, Australian Federal Police and New South Wales officers, executed search warrants for premises in Macgregor, Cook, Macquarie and Queanbeyan as part of Operation Ghar, an ongoing drugs and organised crime investigation. During these searches police seized a trafficable quantity of a substance suspected to be cocaine, more than a thousand pills suspected to be MDMA and approximately \$5,000 in cash. As a result of these search warrants, a 39-year-old man from McKellar, a 32-year-old Cook man, a 46-year-old man from Macquarie and a 20-year-old Queanbeyan woman were arrested. They will face a combined total of 21 charges of trafficking a controlled drug.

While the criminal investigations team is certainly focusing, as the CPO has told them to do, on criminal outlaw motorcycle gangs, it is quite clear from that reading that success in other criminal investigations is being achieved as well.

**MR MILLIGAN:** Minister, why do we have four bikie gangs operating in the ACT when at the beginning of the decade we just had one?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** We have had a detailed briefing on how bikie gangs operate in the ACT, across Australia and across the world. The answer to Mr Milligan's question is competition. They have a market here in the ACT.

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MR GENTLEMAN:** There are interjections of comedy from the opposition but this is a very serious matter. The ACT government is responding by investing in police

operations. Prior to the time Mr Milligan indicated, we had six or more outlaw motorcycle gangs operating in the ACT. We had the Finks in the early days, and the Golden Eagles; we had Hell's Angels and a number of other gangs. It does fluctuate over time. But the answer to Mr Milligan's question is competition, unfortunately.

*Members interjecting—*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** There is too much general interjection. Please all be quiet.

**MR HANSON:** Have police had to put other criminal investigations on the backburner because they have so many resources devoted to the investigation of crimes by members of outlaw motorcycle gangs?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** Clearly, from my reading of the actions in court today, that is not the case.

### **Domestic and family violence—family safety hub**

**MR PETTERSSON:** My question is to the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence: can you please provide the Assembly with an update on the family safety hub?

**MS BERRY:** I thank Mr Pettersson for his question. I have been updating the Assembly regularly around the issue of family safety and the prevention of domestic and family violence in our community. In June this year I presented the Assembly with the annual safer families statement in which I spoke about the family safety hub. I am keen to continue to update the Assembly on the progress of this work as often as I can because I know that there is genuine interest across the chamber in how this work proceeds and the positive impact it will ultimately have on our community.

The hub was officially launched on 11 May this year. The family safety hub was co-designed with the community services sector and with people who have lived experience of domestic and family violence. Their insights told us that a lot of people and communities who experience violence do not recognise it as violence. Power and control particularly are not recognised as violence by victims, perpetrators or the system. We learnt that people are offered generic pathways that do not always meet their needs or aspirations. For example, some people are afraid to access services and they want a non-legal response that does not involve police or child protection.

The insights gathered through the co-design have prompted this government to think differently about the role for the hub in the ACT. It was evident that we did not need a new service with a shiny front door in order to improve access; what was needed was a broad range of systemic reforms requiring a new way of working. The co-design highlighted that collaboration is needed to design and test solutions to systemic problems.

The family safety hub is a network for collaborating on better responses to domestic and family violence and brings together people with expertise to help find and test new solutions. It will then run a series of innovation challenges to identify solutions.

The best of these solutions are being piloted and the pilots that are shown to be effective are used to drive change in the broader justice and service systems.

**MR PETTERSSON:** How was the first family safety hub challenge run, and what were the findings?

**MS BERRY:** I thank Mr Pettersson for the supplementary. As I said, the hub will run a series of innovation challenges where each challenge is focused on tackling a specific problem or topic related to domestic and family violence.

The first challenge for the hub has now commenced. The topic for this challenge is “How might we prevent and intervene early in domestic violence for pregnant women and new parents?” This topic was chosen as the first challenge because research says that women can be at greater risk of experiencing violence from their partners during pregnancy and post partum, especially when they are separated. According to ANROWS, over half of women whose former partners used violence against them experienced violence during pregnancy.

In May, the hub held a two-day workshop to generate new ideas on addressing and responding to domestic violence during pregnancy. Experts from across the service spectrum participated in the workshop and nearly 60 ideas were developed. Specific criteria were used to narrow down the ideas to four potential opportunities.

The first of these opportunities focused on providing free access to legal information for pregnant mums and new parents in locations that they will connect with during their pregnancy or in the earlier period of parenting, such as health or community settings. The idea stems from our insights that people are seeking ways for safe and confidential conversations about their options. We need to provide opportunities for those safe conversations in locations where people are likely to be.

In July, testing of the idea commenced. Testing included working closely with the front-line service providers to identify whether workers think it is a good idea. Participants included antenatal and postnatal midwives, social workers, counsellors, maternity staff from the Centenary hospital, child and family centres in Tuggeranong and Gungahlin, Legal Aid and the Women’s Legal Centre. Feedback from the sector has been invaluable, positive and very supportive of the idea.

**MS CODY:** Minister, what are the next steps for this work and what broader outcomes are you working towards?

**MS BERRY:** In early August, challenge participants will consider the results of the testing period and, based on the findings, a decision will be made as to whether the idea should progress to a short pilot phased in during the remainder of 2018. The government will then evaluate the results of the pilot to determine whether the idea should be scaled across the system.

Evaluation may consider whether the idea: fosters a shared understanding of domestic and family violence; builds capability across the system for evidence-based responses that are culturally appropriate and family-centred; creates new or improved pathways

that better meet the needs of the community; and promotes integration and cohesion across the system.

Additionally, there are three other ideas from the challenge that are being explored. Active work is underway to test the potential for a campaign on reducing the stigma of seeking help when relationships are not okay. This idea could enter into a pilot phase in the second half of 2018, depending on the outcome of the initial testing.

In addition to testing ideas from the first hub challenge, the Office of the Coordinator General for Family Safety is in early discussions around the next hub challenge. The second challenge may commence in late 2018 and focus on financial support and housing options for people experiencing domestic and family violence. I look forward to talking more about this work as it continues.

**Mr Barr:** Madam Speaker, further questions can be placed on the notice paper.

## **Supplementary answers to questions without notice**

### **Land—rural property acquisition**

#### **Land—Molonglo stage 3**

#### **Crime—motorcycle gangs**

**MR GENTLEMAN:** Regarding Mr Milligan's question yesterday about the acquisition of Fairvale, I seek to make the following clarification. On 12 November 2015 the lessee of block 491/517 Stromlo, known as Fairvale, applied to the Planning and Land Authority under section 299 of the Planning and Development Act 2007 to surrender part of the land in the lease over that property. Under section 299(2), the Planning and Land Authority agreed to accept the surrender of part block 491 Stromlo. The process to surrender a crown lease under the Planning and Development Act 2007 is separate from, and distinct from, the power granted to the Planning and Land Authority to subdivide parcels of land.

In regard to Mr Hanson's request for me to table the documents relating to the EIS exemption for Molonglo, I confirm that I will table relevant documents at a later date once all the information has been collated.

Madam Speaker, in responding to an answer in question time today about serious criminal gangs, I may have misspoken. As the Chief Police Officer has said publicly, the total number of members associated with ACT chapters of these criminal gangs is estimated at approximately 60 people.

### **Land—rural property acquisition**

**MS BERRY:** Yesterday, I was asked the question:

... has the Suburban Land Agency received a breach of lease notification from the planning directorate regarding the lack of land management agreements?

The answer to that question is: no.

## Papers

**Madam Speaker** presented the following paper:

Auditor-General Act, pursuant to subsection 17(4)—Auditor-General's Report No 9/2018—ACT Health's management of allegations of misconduct and complaints about inappropriate workplace behaviour, dated 1 August 2018.

### **Call-in powers—block 6 section 79, Giralang Paper and statement by minister**

**MR GENTLEMAN** (Brindabella—Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Urban Renewal) (3.35): I present the following paper:

Planning and Development Act, pursuant to subsection 161(2)—Statement by Minister—Call-in powers—Development application No 201833501—Block 6 Section 79 Giralang, dated 24 July 2018

I ask leave to make a statement in relation to the paper.

Leave granted.

**MR GENTLEMAN:** On 22 June 2018, in my capacity as Minister for Planning and Land Management, I directed, under section 158 of the Planning and Development Act 2007, the Planning and Land Authority to refer to me development application 201833501.

The development application sought approval for, among other things, construction of a mixed-use development, comprising two basement levels; ground floor commercial use consisting of a 1,000 square metre supermarket and other commercial tenancies; four levels of residential use containing 50 residential units; a variation of the crown lease to add a new use and increase the maximum gross floor area; and subdivision of the land. The development application also proposes a new car park on Menkar Close and a reconfigured car park and new drop-off arrangement within the adjacent Giralang Primary School car park.

On 24 July 2018, I approved the application with conditions, using my ministerial call-in powers under section 162 of the Planning and Development Act 2007.

In deciding the application, I gave careful consideration to the requirements of the Territory Plan and the advice of the ACT Heritage Council, the Environment Protection Authority, the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, the Conservator of Flora and Fauna, utility service providers, and other entities and agencies, as required by the legislation and the Planning and Land Authority. I also gave consideration to the representations received by the Planning and Land authority during the public notification period for the development application that occurred between 27 April and 18 May 2018.

I have imposed firm conditions on the approval of the development application that require, among other things: measures to delineate the loading dock of the proposed development from the adjoining school boundary; additional bicycle parking spaces; additional accessible parking spaces; a revised pedestrian link between the substantial development and the adjacent park; measures to protect existing trees adjacent to the site; and verge management and temporary traffic management.

Madam Assistant Speaker, as you would know, the people of Giralang have been denied a local centre for many years. The initial decision to establish a new local centre was made by my predecessor on 17 August 2011. Since then, for seven years, the people of Giralang have been denied the facility as result of a series of prolonged legal challenges that eventually escalated to the High Court. During this time, the government used whatever means it had, and worked tirelessly, to resolve the dispute between the parties. I trust that the use of my ability to call in this new development application will at last signal the end to a long and frustrating journey for the people of Giralang.

The Planning and Development Act 2007 provides for specific criteria in relation to the exercise of my call-in powers. I have used my call-in powers in this instance because I consider that the proposal will provide a substantial public benefit, particularly to the community of Giralang and surrounding suburbs, with the timely delivery of a long overdue local centre. The contemporary mixed-use nature of the facility will benefit the community by combining retail, commercial and living opportunities. To this end, the public benefit will be served by making the facility available to service the local community's immediate commercial and retail needs.

The proposal will also benefit the public by providing greater variety and choice in housing for the community of Giralang and surrounding suburbs. Offsite works such as parking, landscaping and greater pedestrian connectivity will provide additional public benefit to the community, particularly for the adjoining school, by providing improvements to the current parking and set-down arrangements.

The proposed development will contribute to the achievement of the object of the Territory Plan by providing new contemporary development and by enabling commercial opportunities in association with new living opportunities for the local community.

Section 161(2) of the Planning and Development Act 2007 specifies that, if I decide an application, I must table a statement in the Legislative Assembly not later than three sitting days after the day of the decision. As required by the P&D Act, and for the benefit of members, I have tabled a statement providing a description of the development, details of the land where the development is proposed to take place, the name of the applicant, details of my decision for the application, reasons for the decision, and community consultation undertaken by the proponent.

## **Paper**

**Ms Stephen-Smith** presented the following paper:

Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to section 39—Copy of notice provided to the Ombudsman—Community Services Directorate—Freedom of Information request—Decision not made in time, dated 14 June 2018.

## **Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body—report Government response**

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations) (3.40): For the information of members, I present the following paper:

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Act, pursuant to subsection 10B(3)—ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body—Report on the outcomes of the ATSIEB Hearings 2016-17—Seventh Report to the ACT Government—Government response.

I ask leave to make a statement in relation to the paper.

Leave granted.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank the Assembly for the opportunity to table the government response to the 2016-17 ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body hearings outcomes report. The ACT government response covers the seventh Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body hearings held on 12 and 13 April 2017, within the term of the third elected body. The current elected body provided the report to the government on 7 December 2017, and I tabled the report in the Assembly in February this year.

The ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Act 2008 provides a mechanism for the elected body to monitor and report on the services provided, programs administered and outcomes delivered by ACT government directorates for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people living in the ACT. Under section 26 of the act, directors-general of all ACT government directorates were called to present evidence at the 2016-17 public hearings on their respective directorates' spending and decision-making. All relevant directorates provided input to the government response.

The report on the outcomes of the elected body hearings in 2016-17 to the ACT government contains 11 recommendations. The ACT government has agreed to five of the recommendations and agreed in principle to a further three recommendations. The remaining three recommendations have been noted. The government has not disagreed with any of the recommendations. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander subcommittee of the ACT Public Service Strategic Board will monitor the implementation of the report's recommendations.

As I said in February, the elected body hearings process has proved to be a positive method of interaction between the government and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community, culminating in a body of advice that is useful and informing

improvements to service delivery and policy development which will lead to better outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

I look forward to continuing the positive partnership with the elected body to address the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Canberrans and to build on the strengths of the community to reduce and overcome Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander disadvantage.

## **Choice in education**

### **Discussion of matter of public importance**

**MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER** (Ms Cody): Madam Speaker has received letters from Miss C Burch, Ms Cheyne, Ms Cody, Mrs Dunne, Mrs Kikkert, Ms Lee, Ms Orr, Mr Parton, and Mr Steel proposing that matters of public importance be submitted to the Assembly. In accordance with standing order 79, Madam Speaker has determined that the matter proposed by Ms Lee be submitted to the Assembly, namely:

The importance of all parents having an informed choice in determining their children's education.

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong) (3.43): I welcome this opportunity to speak about a subject close to the Canberra Liberals: the important and unassailable right of every parent to choose the schooling that best suits their child.

Parental choice is not a novel or unique concept. Indeed a parent's right to choose the kind of education to be given to their children is included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which commits its signatories to having—and I quote:

... respect for the liberty of parents ... to choose for their children schools, other than those established by public authorities ... to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

In Australia successive federal governments have supported that right through public funding to non-government schools to deliver at least a basic level of resources to ensure that parents have a choice in the type of education that best fits their child's needs. As the association of independent schools council says on its webpage in an article on parents and school choice:

School choice policies underpin pluralism in society. They allow families with different ethnic, religious and cultural identities to choose a school to best meet the needs of their child and their own values, within a frame of common social values.

If you asked a cross-section of parents what they would wish for in their child's education, they would most likely say, in general terms, that they want a school that helps their child to maximise their full potential and that instils in them a lifelong love of learning and an ability to think independently, and a respect for themselves and others. That is also reflected in the ACT Education Act. It supports a child's



enthusiasm for lifelong learning, respect and tolerance of others and an aim to develop every child's potential.

Parents choose a school for their children for a whole myriad of reasons. Some like smaller schools. Some parents want their children to attend the same school from kindergarten to year 10 or 12. Some seek an emphasis on pastoral care, religious education, sport, drama or music.

In my conversations with parents, they often stress how important it is that their child is at their chosen school. One parent from the Tuggeranong area told me that she chose to send her child to a small school in the inner south because it offered a safe, inclusive special needs program that was perfect for her child and her needs.

Another parent thought the most important thing for her child was access to Italian lessons at a bilingual public school in the inner south because it was important for this family that her child appreciate and know her ethnic heritage by continuing to learn the language of her ancestors. Other parents want their son at a boys-only school or their daughters at a girls-only school.

I have met with several parents who, for a wide range of reasons, have chosen to home school their children. Home schooling is not an easy option for parents but one that parents make for their children because it is the best fit for their child's and family's circumstances. With current regulations on home schooling under review, I will not make much further comment at this stage, except to say that it is important that such an option is available and accessible to parents here in the ACT, as it is elsewhere throughout Australia.

Whatever the reason, it is the parents' right to determine what best suits their child. This is reflected in the ACT Education Act, which says under its guiding principles on high quality education:

(b) school education and home education should ...

(iii) encourage parents to take part in the education of their children and recognise their right to choose a suitable educational environment.

In the ACT today we are indeed very fortunate to have a wonderful and wide array of choices for parents. Whether your preference is for a government or a non-government education, there are schools in the ACT that in just about every circumstance cater for a child's educational needs.

Various languages are offered at a myriad of schools from preschool to college; there are gifted and talented classes available throughout Canberra schools; there are accelerated learning programs, drama, engineering, specialist STEM centred schools, and special needs education, all in both government and non-government schools.

There is no single basis for parents' choice of a school for their children. A great many studies point to the various factors that contribute to their decision. A consistent theme is that people place a high value on the availability of choice, even amongst

those who do not actively choose to send their child to a school other than their local one.

Also, interestingly, data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics census of population and housing shows that the growth in the independent sector over the past few decades has come from households across all income brackets. I would suggest that the ACT is the most strongly evident of that fact, and puts paid to the claims of elitism that many want to tag supporters of non-government school education with. I would hope that we have moved on from the notion of elitism, the “us and them” approach that has marred much of the debate on education choice in this place.

Where parental choice has been constrained is in the inability at a number of ACT schools, both government and non-government, to take all the enrolments they receive. The pressure starts for parents at preschool. Parents are told that there is no place for their child at the local preschool and are told to send them elsewhere or, alternatively, are reminded that the year before kindergarten is not compulsory. In other words, don’t worry about sending them to preschool at all.

Pressure on preschool places is not limited to government schools. Unlike other jurisdictions, the ACT is the only one that does not offer financial support to non-government preschool education. We have in effect waiting lists at schools in many areas of the ACT, and that could get worse. Given recent media thought bubbles about extending preschool—or is it child care or is it both—to three-year olds, parental choice may well turn into “wherever we can find a place”.

There are a number of government schools that offer a particular program that a parent may wish to access but cannot because enrolments have been limited to those in the priority enrolment area and/or other selection criteria limitations because there is no ability to increase a school footprint, irrespective of demand or need. Lyneham high comes to mind.

The same may well apply to gifted and talented classes in primary schools. I have asked questions about the number and location of these classes, but the minister was at pains to tell me that such information is not centrally recorded. Is it any wonder then that we have capacity issues in schools when there is apparently such a dearth of data available within the directorate?

Capacity issues in ACT schools have not just happened and ought not to have been a surprise to planners. How areas such as Gungahlin can have a number of schools under enrolment pressure is baffling. New suburbs, of course, bring families and children who need an education. It is pleasing that a new school is under construction at Taylor, but it will not be ready to start taking students until the beginning of next year, and in the first instance will frankly just take the capacity pressure off other schools. In a short space of time these new areas will be populated and we will be back to where we are today, with parents in a race against time to enrol their child at the school of their choice.

Recently parents have learnt there is another restriction on their choice of schools, with the cuts to dedicated school buses. Particularly for parents of young children, the

prospect of putting them on a general commuter bus, to change two or three times and to wait for long periods at bus interchanges, is just not acceptable.

My colleague the shadow minister for transport, Miss Burch, will have more to say on this issue as she continues to highlight the absolute inequity and inadequacy of this government's transport policy for the young, the elderly and the infirm. This government talks big about equity, but when you look beyond the shiny buzzwords, it is clear that it does not actually know what real equity in education is.

As I said at the start of my comments, parental choice in education is not a novel or unique concept. It is outlined clearly in the ACT's own Education Act. It is included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is a part of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It is vital that parental choice remain a priority in education policy in the ACT; and, under a Canberra Liberals government, it will.

**MISS C BURCH** (Kurrajong) (3.52): I thank Ms Lee for the opportunity to speak today about the importance of allowing parents to make informed decisions regarding their children's education. As Ms Lee has already outlined, the Canberra Liberals are strong supporters of choice. Individual choice and individual freedoms are key values held by the Liberal Party, and this extends to the principle of parental choice in education, because there is nobody who is better placed than parents to decide how and where their children will be educated.

Again, as my colleague Ms Lee has mentioned, a key element of this choice is access. In order to exercise choice parents must have access to their preferred educational options. Each school has its own strengths, and it is for parents to decide which school is the best fit for their children. Many Canberra parents choose to send their children to schools outside their local area. Parents make these decisions due to numerous factors, ranging from where they work, where grandparents or carers may live, the subjects and extracurricular activities offered by different schools and whether they want their children to receive a public, Catholic or independent education. Many parents make these decisions based on the transport options available to get their kids to and from school.

It is this access that is currently under threat by the transport minister and the Labor-Greens government. Under the government's proposed changes to the bus network due to commence in 2019, the number of dedicated school buses will be cut from more than 100 to only 47. This will mean that 59 Canberra schools will no longer have dedicated school bus services. Surprisingly, our primary schools are being the hardest hit, with 49 primary schools losing all of their dedicated school buses.

In order to make informed decisions about their children's education, parents need to have confidence that their children will be able to get to and from school quickly and safely. Many trust and rely on school buses to help them do this. When school buses are taken away, it makes it harder for parents to choose these schools. The Labor-Greens government's savage cuts to school buses takes away that confidence and reduces access. Removing access to school buses removes choice for many Canberra families.

The minister claims that these cuts are justified for two key reasons: firstly, because general network services will be expanded to 30 per cent more schools; and, secondly, because only five per cent of primary school children catch dedicated school bus services. While this may be the case, it has done little to alleviate parents' concerns. This February's school census tells us that there are over 45,800 primary school children in the ACT. This means that, according to the government's own figures, almost 2,300 primary school children catch school buses every day. That is 2,300 vulnerable young children whose safety will be at risk with these cuts to school buses.

While general network services may be expanded, many parents have raised significant concerns around the safety of unaccompanied young children on the general public network and at interchanges. Travelling on the general network will require many more children to transfer through bus interchanges and walk further to and from bus stops. In many instances this will also result in longer commutes for children.

Recent abduction attempts on children near schools have parents worried that it is only a matter of time before a child is taken. Not long ago parents of schoolchildren received letters from the government outlining concerns for children's safety in light of these abduction attempts. This is at the same time that those opposite are cutting school buses. It is disingenuous for the Labor-Greens government to say that it is concerned about children's safety while they are also slashing school buses.

It shows no regard for the safety of children to expect unaccompanied young children to walk long distances to their nearest stop, travel on general public buses and wait at interchanges for connecting services. If parents cannot have confidence that their children can get to and from school safely, how could they then choose to send their children to that school? This is what I mean when I say that meaningful, informed choice requires access.

Longer travel times for our kids also mean less time to do their homework. Longer travel times mean less time to spend on extracurricular activities. Longer travel times mean less time to spend with families and less time to spend just being a kid. These are all factors which impact parents' choice.

The Canberra Liberals have heard from many parents, grandparents, teachers and principals across the territory about what cuts to school buses will mean for their choice of schools. Parents in Crace are saying that their children will have to travel to the Gungahlin interchange and back out again, just to get to and from Catholic schools in neighbouring suburbs. Parents in Woden have told us that their children will have to catch three buses in order to get home. That is six buses a day.

Parents in Gleneagles, in Kambah, have told us that their 10 and 12-year-old children will have to walk 1.8 kilometres to the nearest bus stop, catch the local bus to an interchange and then transfer to a public bus to get to school. Their total travel time is likely to quadruple and their safety will be at risk.

Parents in Gordon have told us that their 12 and 14-year-olds will have to walk 25 minutes carrying heavy schoolbags to Lanyon shops, and they are very concerned that these local shops will become a hangout for school gangs and creeps preying on vulnerable children. Parents in Hawker and Macgregor are worried about what is going to happen when children from all different schools, of all different ages, are lumped together at public interchanges.

Parents with children at different schools in Dickson have told us that their kids currently catch the same school bus, and that under the new bus network that will no longer be possible. Again this is impacting on parents' choice to send siblings to neighbouring schools.

The ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Associations has said that parents still have a strong preference for dedicated school bus services. The Association of Independent Schools have described the cuts to school buses as a foundational change that will hit their schools and the children that attend them particularly hard, because their students tend to use buses more often and from a much younger age than those in the public system. They have also hit out at the lack of information that the government has provided on the impact that these changes will have. Principals are worried for their students about what will happen when they all rush out at the end of the school day and there is no room on the next public bus.

The Association of Parents and Friends of ACT Schools have also raised serious concerns about duty of care. They have said that, especially for younger children, the government is just throwing these kids in at the deep end and waiting to see what happens. Parents want an unbroken chain of duty of care that passes from themselves, to the school bus driver, to the teachers at their children's schools. The Labor-Greens government's cuts to school buses are breaking this chain and disrupting the duty of care. How is it that this government can provide buses for Mardi Gras, almost 300 kilometres away, but not for Canberra schoolchildren?

Many parents across Canberra have chosen where to live and where to send their children to school based on access to school buses. Now the Labor-Greens government is taking that choice away from them. The Labor-Greens government is making it harder for parents to choose Catholic and independent schools. The government is making it more difficult for parents to rely on buses instead of driving their children to school. The Labor-Greens government is making it more difficult for parents and carers to choose to work, as many have told us that they will be adjusting their work hours so that they can drive their children to school.

By restricting access to schools, the Labor-Greens government is restricting parents' ability to make informed choices about how and where their children are educated.

**MS BERRY** (Ginninderra—Deputy Chief Minister, Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Women and Minister for Sport and Recreation) (4.00): I welcome the chance to talk about our schools, and thank Ms Lee for bringing forward this very important matter of public

importance. It is always great to talk about some of the work that is happening in ACT schools and the government's commitment to this vital area of service to the ACT community.

Of course, every parent wants the very best for their child, both during childhood and into their future lives. Decisions about education are some of the most significant that a parent will make. Of course, that comes with a desire to be informed about the opportunities available at a school.

The most informed choices about important decisions like where to send children to school come from firsthand experience. The best way for parents to have this experience is to visit their local school, talk with the principal and other teachers and support staff, see learning in action, and observe the interactions between teachers and parents. There are also other ways to connect with schools, such as through open days, fetes, other events and celebrations. All of these opportunities allow parents a real chance to understand how their local school community comes together, and applies to schools in all sectors: government, non-government and religious education.

In the ACT we are incredibly fortunate to have an excellent school system. I am very proud to be a former student of the public school system here in the ACT. I know that our teachers in all of our schools are equally committed to understanding their students and making sure that they meet their learning needs. ACT parents have been spoilt for choice.

In ACT public schools the government's priority, consistent with the expectations of the Education Act, is to make sure that every ACT child and young person has guaranteed access to their neighbourhood school. Our goal is to ensure that parents who choose public education find the local school to be a great school, where excellent, personalised learning happens and relationships are made that can last a lifetime.

In my time as minister, I have found that in every case schools are striving towards this goal. Through the future of education conversation, my observations have been validated, alongside some excellent discussion of the necessary next steps to keep up this work.

I have heard parents say that they want their children to be happy to go to school, inspired and positive about life, enjoying learning and willing to try new things and accept new challenges. Schools have raised that it is important for children to have a love of learning and the ability to engage as successful members of the community. Students themselves have said similar things.

It also shows in the growth in demand for public school education. The government has responded by prioritising infrastructure investment to make sure that schools can provide high quality learning environments in both new and established schools. For example, more than \$23 million has been invested to modernise Belconnen High School from 2015 to 2018. The Caroline Chisholm Centre for Innovation and Learning has been completed, with an investment of \$5.7 million. \$85 million over four years has been invested through the public school infrastructure upgrade

programs to expand and upgrade schools in all regions. \$47 million has been allocated to construct a new P-6 school in Molonglo, and planning will begin for a new year 7 to 10 campus, so that families in this community can have the confidence that high quality public education in modern learning facilities will be available.

In Gungahlin, one of the fastest growing regions in Australia, over \$60 million has been invested or will be invested in school expansions in the area, such as at Gold Creek, Neville Bonner, Harrison, Franklin, as well as other schools, before counting investment in a new school at Taylor. The government is doing the work and making the investments required so that every school provides a great choice to parents.

Even in wealthy communities like the ACT, children start life in vastly different places, with different backgrounds and circumstances affecting their opportunity for a decent life. Education has an incredible power to level all of this out. Education allows all children to reach their potential, and a child's potential is not determined by the things they have going on, even if these things create barriers to opportunity. The ACT government believes that every child deserves a great education and the life chances that flow from it, and it will do this by providing equity and by responding to the needs of each individual. School is not a race where some students come first and some come last, even if some want to see this as a competition.

The problem with current reporting based on My School is that it ignores all of this and lines children and schools up like participants in a competition. It can also lead to behaviour that compounds disadvantage as people seek out supposedly "better" schools. I have heard a growing number of people in our community—students, parents, teachers, principals and experts—voice similar concerns. And as I have watched my own children and their peers in this journey through school, I have also come to share these concerns.

It is important that when we are talking about ACT schools and school education more broadly, we do talk about NAPLAN. These performance measures should be understood by anybody interpreting them, and they should be appropriately used. Unfortunately, this is not the case for NAPLAN and My School as the situation currently stands. That is why I have initiated, and the ACT is now leading, a review of NAPLAN reporting, to look at whether it is really going to do more harm than good.

When we admit that some schools and students have started behind, noticing that some schools and students are not achieving to expected levels becomes more significant. It gives teachers, school leaders and system administrators cause to take a look a little closer, understand the context and work out how best to support, encourage and direct resources. But it also highlights why information like NAPLAN is not appropriate or particularly useful for informing parent choice.

My encouragement to parents when making a decision about a school for their children is, first off, to get a firsthand view, visit their local school, talk to the principal, teachers and support staff, and be informed about the community that they have the opportunity to join.

Finally, I want to comment quickly on the consultation process that is now occurring with regard to bus services across the city, including bus services to ACT schools. I have had the chance to meet with the independent schools association, who say that they are open-minded. They do want more information but they are keen to work together with the government on solutions for how best to support children and their families in getting to their schools, as well as looking at other ways that children can travel to school, making sure that there are opportunities for active travel, like walking and cycling to school.

I think it is unnecessary for the Canberra Liberals to go out and start scaring parents and children about safety issues that they perceive happening on public buses. That is not the experience that I have had in this town on buses, and not the experience that my children have had catching buses to and from school.

First of all, let us have the conversation, go through the consultation process and make sure that the government gets feedback from each of the people in the community that they need to hear from, so that a decision can be made that best meets everybody's needs in the community. Scaring people unnecessarily is not the best way forward.

**MRS KIKKERT** (Ginninderra) (4.08): I am delighted that Ms Lee has brought this matter of public importance before the Assembly today. I speak from the perspective of a mother of five children, all five of whom are currently enrolled in three of Canberra's public schools, including a primary school, a high school and a college.

As you can guess, the idea that all parents should have an informed choice in determining their children's education is important to my husband and me. The whole concept of education is deeply important to our entire family. From the time our eldest was born, we have sought to do everything we could to provide the best educational opportunities for our kids. For example, we filled our basic rental accommodation with books and made sure that we regularly read to our children. As they have grown and entered the formal educational system, we have continued to care deeply about their learning and making sure that they are enrolled in schools that are a good fit for their needs and for the needs of our family unit.

It may seem obvious to point out, but no-one on this planet knows more about individual children than their parents. This is one of the central reasons why all parents must have the right to make informed choices regarding their children's education. This right is so important, in fact, that it was enshrined in article 26 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

This guarantee could not be any clearer. Before all else, it is up to parents to choose the kind of education that their children participate in. Any other policy, procedure or approach encroaches on and violates a fundamental human right. This prerogative of parents must always be honoured and protected in the ACT.



Choosing the kind of education entails a great number of other choices as well, including where children might engage in formal learning. For our family the correct choice has always been to enrol our kids in public schools, and I appreciate the fact that here in the ACT we have a number of schools that we could choose from. Our eldest picked the college that he is currently studying at because its programs met his very specific interest. At the same time, it is easy for me to acknowledge that the correct choice for other families may look different from the choices that my husband and I have made for our children and that they have made for themselves as they have grown older.

This is part of supporting the individual freedom and equality of opportunity that we, as Canberra Liberals, proudly endorse. One size fits all can seem like an easy shortcut to equality but it never is, because we are not dealing with uniform products. We are, rather, dealing with wonderfully complex individuals.

The very best way to meet the needs of a richly pluralistic society filled with truly distinct individuals is to make sure that as many options as possible are on the table for education, and allow parents and carers to determine their children's education.

## Visitor

**MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Karin MacDonald, former Member for Brindabella for the ALP.

## Choice in education

### Discussion of matter of public importance

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (4.12): I am pleased to have the opportunity to talk today on this important topic. The Greens believe that high quality, free education is a keystone of our democracy and a basic human right. We want to ensure that every student, no matter where they are educated, has access to an education that meets their needs and aspirations and gives them the skills and capacity to meaningfully participate in society.

Evidence shows that a large percentage of our students will struggle with some aspects of learning and some will struggle with the school environment. We know that each and every student has different needs and that parents want to take the best decisions for their children. Furthermore, a responsive and relevant education system is underpinned by community involvement and recognises that parents and carers play a critical role in the education of their children.

The decisions that parents and carers make include where their child is educated and what additional supports they might need to improve their social and learning outcomes. Because each child has different needs and circumstances, this means that there is not one right answer for everyone. For some children the best option might be a co-ed school, while some others may do better in a single-sex environment. Some children will do well in a large school with a wide variety of academic and

extracurricular options, while others will thrive in a small, intimate environment. And some children will do best in a home education setting, with parents providing a more tailored education approach.

All of these are valid choices and reflect the different circumstances of ACT families. But, as this matter of public importance rightly notes, parents need to have access to sufficient information in order to be able to make these important decisions. I would also argue that those choices need to be accessible so that parent choice is not restricted by financial means.

That is why the Greens are proud supporters of our public education system, which is the default education option for many people. We recognise the importance of a diverse education system with schools that cater to a range of needs across the public and independent sectors, as well as for various religious and cultural communities. Students in all of these schools need to be supported, as do students in home education, and parents have the right to make the choice that best suits their child.

However, what should not be overlooked in this debate are the structural and financial barriers that limit parent and student choices and ultimately lead to worse education outcomes across our community. The Greens believe that all Canberrans should be free to make a choice about their education, regardless of their economic circumstances. We believe that you should not be free to choose your education provider only if you can afford it.

We should not limit the choice of parents to only public education but we must ensure that the default option of public education is a high quality one. What this means in practice is that our public education system needs to be well funded so that it provides a range of excellent education options for everyone in our community. Key to this is ensuring that we get needs-based funding right.

The national agreement on this started with David Gonski's work a number of years ago but unfortunately it still has not landed, in that national funding agreements are still shifting and still are not quite right. This continues to have impacts on many children who are attending schools, usually public schools, which are being inequitably funded.

The Greens want to see the full implementation of government and non-government education funding based on a formula that supports equity of educational outcomes and that is allocated in a transparent, accountable and needs-based manner such as that outlined in Gonski principles. It was deeply disappointing to see the federal government back away from their commitment to the full Gonski model, and the Greens will continue to call for this to be reinstated.

As well as addressing funding needs, the Greens acknowledge the importance of recognition of teaching as a highly respected and valued profession, and of investment in quality, training and resources to enable our teachers to do their jobs. Investment in a professional and well-supported education workforce with access to innovative professional development opportunities will lead to better education outcomes for students regardless of which education provider they choose.

As a former education minister, I am aware of how our education laws in the ACT can impact on the choices parents make regarding their children's education. Members would be aware that the Education Amendment Bill 2017 is currently before the Assembly. Without pre-empting a future debate, I take this opportunity to reiterate the importance of genuine and sufficient community consultation with the sector being directly impacted before the bill is debated.

I acknowledge the concerns of community groups such as the Home Education Association about aspects of the bill, including the removal of the provisional registration process. The details outlined in the regulations will be important for allowing the community to understand what the practical impact of these proposed changes will be and ensure that they, and we, can make an informed decision about this issue. I hope that once the regulations are released the community will have sufficient time to consider and be consulted on them.

It is the responsibility of government to ensure the provision of high quality, well-resourced and safe learning environments that are open to all students. Once these options are available, parents should then be able to make informed choices about the education of their child. But choice is not just a matter of providing a range of options. A range of options needs to be accessible and affordable for all members of our community.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations) (4.17): I thank Ms Lee for bringing this matter to the Assembly today. This is an important issue for the Assembly to discuss because it goes to the core of what our community decides school education should be.

As members would be aware, I am a proud product of Canberra's public school system. As a child I attended a number of local public schools, first at O'Connor co-op and Turner Primary, as it was then, now Turner School, then at Lyneham High School and Dickson College.

I am proud to be part of a government that is continuing Canberra's long tradition of quality public schools and public education. I am proud to be a member of a government that is focused on educational equity, and I know that Minister Berry is resolute in her pursuit of equitable outcomes for every child who attends an ACT school. I have had the opportunity to visit a number of local schools in my capacity as a minister and a member representing Kurrajong.

We all know that quality school education provides the best chance to prevent those who are confronting disadvantage from being trapped by it. A good education will not benefit only a child but also improve the lives of their children and grandchildren. As I said in my first speech in this place, I have always understood that I came from a privileged background. That privilege is in part the depth of education that my parents and grandparents were privileged to have.

A large contributor to societal inequality is inequity in education, beginning before children even reach school. In this regard, it is little surprise that some schools report lower mean scale scores in NAPLAN. Children do not start school at the same stage of learning and development. This effect is amplified through residualisation, where children who are starting behind become concentrated in some schools.

Of course it is important for parents to be able to make an informed choice about school education. However, it is also vitally important that parents make appropriate use of the right information, and that that information is properly understood. That is not the case for NAPLAN and My School as the situation currently stands. The purpose of data like this is to help governments identify where disadvantage and lower achievement are concentrated. Its purpose is to help to target resources, expand early learning and intervention and provide extra support for parents and schools that need it the most.

There is compelling evidence that marketisation of school education harms equity in education access and outcomes. Analysis of evidence about school competition and associated market mechanisms has shown that these things have negligible effects on education quality. Indeed, these approaches risk increased segregation based on the background of students.

Having not spoken in relation to the motion on the Space Agency yesterday, I thought I had missed the opportunity to quote my former boss Senator Kim Carr, but no. In 2004 Senator Carr said:

... the purpose of reporting is not to belittle people. It is not to set people up in rank order to set up leagues tables and the like. It is not to be used as a competitive device, as a marketing instrument, as if education was some sort of commodity that could be listed on a stock exchange. It is about advancing the educational interests of students. That is the first criteria.

The second is about providing information to assist schools and teachers to actually improve performance in developing teacher programs and meeting the learning needs of students.

It is wrong to simplify school performance down to a competitive exercise that ignores all of the factors that influence the different opportunity each student has to achieve at school. As Minister Berry has said, it is vital that parents have access to assessment data about their children so that they can support them through their learning and development. Teachers and individual students need this information too. But this information, particularly through aggregate measures such as standardised testing, is a poor indication of school performance and therefore not well suited to informing parent choice in the way that it is currently presented.

As others have said in this debate, children are individuals, and different schools will suit different kids. The best way to understand the choices available to a parent is to visit schools, talk to other parents and talk to the teachers. Teachers, of course, are the key to an excellent education.

As Ms Berry did, I want to respond briefly to Miss Burch's speech. Miss Burch at one point called the government "disingenuous". At the same time she is claiming that the new bus network is a done deal. Ms Fitzharris has repeatedly said that the government is undertaking a genuine process of consultation with the community on the new bus network.

Miss Burch claimed that parents have expressed a strong preference for dedicated school bus services, but the data shows that only one in 20 primary school children catch the bus to school. I can assure Miss Burch that the directorate's and the government's intention is to improve bus services across Canberra based on data and based on what we actually know about how people behave. This includes improving services for school students, making catching the bus a better and an easier choice. What I am worried about is, as Ms Berry said, the Canberra Liberals' never-ending scare campaigns and fearmongering.

In other capital cities across the country, school children happily use regular public transport systems to get to and from school. Talking about choice, a bus that goes each way once per day does not actually provide much choice for those who want to engage in after-school activities, and it does not increase safety for kids who miss the bus and are left stranded at a bus stop that only serves school buses.

We do need to have an informed discussion on this subject, and that is exactly what this government is doing. That is exactly what Transport Canberra and City Services is doing. It is very important to hear about the experience of parents and school children in using the buses that they have today, and how they consider they will be able to use the buses in the new network. I strongly encourage those opposite to in turn encourage their constituents to engage in the formal consultation process and to provide their feedback to Transport Canberra and City Services. I can assure them that all feedback received will be taken seriously.

*Discussion concluded.*

## **Animal Diseases Amendment Bill 2018**

Debate resumed from 7 June 2018, on motion by **Mr Gentleman**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (4.25): This amendment bill makes the marking of sheep, goats and pigs in the ACT mandatory under the national livestock identification system. It is a nationally agreed scheme which is currently only mandatory for cattle. Its principal purpose is to provide birth to death traceable information on domestic livestock to assist in the biosecurity management or disease management of livestock. We will be supporting the bill, but I will just make a few brief comments on it.

The national livestock identification system, NLIS, is Australia's system for tracing domestic stock. It uses visually readable ear tags printed with a property identification

code to identify locations, just like the one I have here. Traceability is provided by the combination of ear tags, movement documents and uploads of all mob-based movements to saleyards, abattoirs and other properties in the NLIS database.

Through the management of certain diseases, the NLIS helps Australia to maintain access to key export markets. It provides a mechanism to manage food safety or disease outbreaks, and is implemented by industry in partnership with governments across Australia. It is currently mandatory for cattle in the ACT.

It was introduced for sheep and goats in New South Wales on 1 January 2006. Internal trade in sheep and goats within the ACT—that is, between properties—is currently not required to be recorded. There is no commercial facility for the sale or slaughter for sheep or goats in the ACT, so virtually all sheep in the ACT are, by default, covered by mandatory New South Wales regulation. The bill now makes it mandatory for sheep and goats in the ACT.

A key driver for the creation of the NLIS in Australia was to ensure the adequacy of arrangements for the identification and tracing of cattle in the event of a major exotic disease outbreak. Diseases such as foot-and-mouth disease would be devastating to Australia. Foot-and-mouth disease is a highly contagious animal disease that has had a number of outbreaks in other countries. For example, the 2001 outbreak in the United Kingdom caused losses of more than £8 billion, approximately \$A19 billion. The Australian government estimates that a small foot-and-mouth disease outbreak, controlled in three months, could cost around \$A7.1 billion while a large 12-month outbreak could cost \$A16 billion. There are many diseases that could cause similar devastation to our agricultural industries.

Though the NLIS on its own would not prevent a disease outbreak, it is able to reduce the financial and social impact of a disease epidemic due to its accurate identification and rapid traceability capabilities.

In the ACT, the agricultural sector is a small but important industry worth tens of millions of dollars. There are over 20,000 hectares of land leased for agriculture in the ACT. Commercial animal production here mainly involves the grazing of sheep and cattle; the explanatory statement says that the ACT has 48,000 sheep and 7,000 cattle. Sheep are mainly held for wool production.

The ACT is surrounded by a rich region with agricultural production worth hundreds of billions of dollars annually. The management of agriculture in the ACT, particularly disease management, has the potential to have a significant impact on agriculture in the wider region. For biosecurity reasons, it is therefore important that coordinated cross-border management occurs. The NLIS is one method for that cross-border cooperation.

There are some claims that the benefits of these new requirements are much more significant than the cost. The ability to quickly trace an outbreak of disease or a biosecurity event back to the property of origin will allow more rapid containment and quarantine, for example, and would likely reduce the impacts on other producers, allowing the risk to be managed in a more effective and efficient manner.

Advantages of the NLIS include reducing the potential consequences or costs of pest and disease outbreaks. Potential benefits also arise from mitigating food safety risks, improving product integrity and reducing market access restrictions. Farm productivity and animal welfare were also noted as protection benefits from improved traceability and animal identification.

While the bill should not have any significant new additional financial impacts on landholders or the government, we should acknowledge that there is a small cost to landholders. The cost of tags is already a default cost currently being carried by ACT landholders. This could be in the order of several thousand per landholder. Despite its benefits, it is sometimes seen as another tax on business. Some local landholders are concerned about the potential for higher costs from the NLIS scheme in the future.

The ACT will currently require only numbered ear tags, which are worth just a few cents each, the system currently used in New South Wales. However, the Victorian government uses a much more expensive version of the scheme which mandates the use of electronic readable sheep ear tags which cost several dollars each. If at some point the Victorian model were imposed in the ACT, this would be a serious new cost to the ACT sheep industry.

The scrutiny committee raised some issues which have been addressed by the minister. One issue which may remain of concern is about privacy and the management of private information. This is a concern that is shared across many domains. The minister has provided reassurances on this issue, but it is an area that we will continue to monitor.

While we recognise the increased costs of the full implementation and restrictions imposed by the NLIS scheme for our agricultural industries, and the issues around data privacy, the Canberra Liberals support this bill for biosecurity management reasons.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (4.32): I would like to make a few short remarks about the Animal Diseases Amendment Bill. The bill is chiefly about biosecurity for the ACT.

I know from my previous years as the minister responsible for agriculture and biosecurity that it is very important that animal diseases are able to be quickly managed by biosecurity authorities to reduce the impacts of any outbreaks of animal diseases if and when they happen. Of higher importance, of course, is trying to avoid any disease outbreaks. Knowing exactly where different types of animals are being kept will aid authorities to communicate with owners as fast as possible and, hopefully, reduce outbreaks and the impact of outbreaks.

The bill updates some of the requirements around tagging stock animals in the ACT. Tagging requirements have been around for some time now. I note that the national livestock identification scheme commenced in 1999. This bill updates those tagging requirements to reflect our ACT biosecurity needs. The system is primarily

about tracking animals being moved around the country and was established to aid with animal disease and food safety management. Animals are required to be tagged before they are moved off their property of birth, and that tag is to remain with the animal for their lifetime.

For people who cannot picture what the tagging is like, it is like piercing their ears. There are different colours for different animals and different years. This traceability mechanism can aid authorities in better managing an animal disease outbreak as they will be able to contact all owners of stock within the relevant area in much faster time frames. The NLIS was an important tool when the national and international outcry about live exports of Australian cattle was being looked into. Being able to trace where animals had come from was a key part of enabling authorities to look into where the cattle that were being put on boats and sent across the oceans had actually come from.

The NLIS is a nationally agreed scheme but needs to be legislated within each jurisdiction. This bill before us today puts into place the ACT's next steps in updating the scheme to align with improvements that have been nationally agreed with agriculture ministers around the country.

When it was introduced in 1999, the scheme was only for cattle, but in 2009 it was expanded to also include sheep and goats. Pigs have been added to the list of animals that require NLIS identification, from early this year.

The bill creates the requirement for livestock owners in the ACT to obtain a property identification code, PIC, which can be obtained through our Chief Veterinary Officer. All stock will be required to have this code included in their tag information.

The definition of "livestock" for the purposes of this bill is quite broad. It includes not only cattle, sheep, goats and pigs, as per the existing NLIS requirements, but also camelids, equine family members and large and small poultry. To be clear, camelids include not only the obvious camels, but also alpacas and llamas. This bill excludes vicunas and guanacos. The bill includes equine family members—not just horses, but also donkeys, asses, mules and zebras. Large poultry, if you were wondering, includes emus and ostriches.

Any operators of abattoirs, saleyards and stock events in the ACT must obtain a property identification code. The creation of a property identification code will also mean that it will be important to report any stock movements, as otherwise the property code will not match the information behind the tag on each animal. Stock movements will therefore need to be tracked. This is also reflected in the next bill we are going to debate today, the Stock Amendment Bill.

There are some stock movement exemptions within the bill, such as carcasses being moved to the zoo; and there are also provisions that allow for emergency movements such as in floods or fires, which must be sought from, or reported to, the Chief Veterinary Officer.



Similarly, it is extremely important, in order to keep the scheme workable, for all sales or transactions of animals to be reflected in their tags, and for any identifying information to reflect the most current and correct information. There are a range of provisions in this bill that create penalties for the various situations that might arise if this information is not kept up to date. The bill requires the relevant director-general to keep a register of all stock. This must be kept up to date.

Having said all that, this is clearly very important updating legislation for this sector in our community. The Greens will be supporting this bill today.

**MR GENTLEMAN** (Brindabella—Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Urban Renewal) (4.37), in reply: I thank members for their contribution to today's debate on the bill. I am pleased to talk about the Animal Diseases Amendment Bill 2018. The bill makes a number of amendments to the Animal Diseases Act 2005. These amendments extend implementation in the ACT of the national livestock identification system, known as the NLIS, for the identification and traceability of livestock.

I wish to explain the importance of the NLIS for biosecurity, how it impacts on the rural sector in the ACT, and the limitations in our current legislation.

The purpose of this bill is to extend the application of the NLIS to sheep, goats and pigs in the ACT. At present, our legislation requires the application of NLIS only to cattle.

The bill makes it mandatory to identify these animals with a permanent identifier, and to record their movements. The bill also requires that movement and transaction information about cattle, sheep and goats is uploaded electronically to the NLIS database. A future amendment will be made requiring pig records to be uploaded to the NLIS database once the New South Wales regulation is finalised. This will allow for cross-border consistency in NLIS requirements with respect to pigs.

These measures are being introduced for the improvement of biosecurity in the ACT. Biosecurity is a high priority, essential for animal disease control and ensuring food security and market access for our primary producers.

Australia is free from many agricultural and aquatic pests and diseases. Our clean and green reputation is a major trading advantage, so an animal disease outbreak or chemical residue incident could cripple the livestock industry and lead to the collapse of export markets.

The ability to effectively trace stock is critical in an emergency animal disease response. This was most recently demonstrated in 2017 with the blue-tongue virus incident in Victoria where property identification codes and the NLIS database were instrumental in tracing animal movements and tracking surveillance activities. They provided vital information that helped to determine the extent of the problem and informed the response plan.

Being able to trace livestock movements is increasingly important to assure our trading partners about the safety of our food and the integrity of our animals. Modern and effective biosecurity legislation is required to ensure that ACT primary producers have continued access to interstate and overseas markets. The bill's amendments help to protect our livestock industry and the broader community and environment from potential disease outbreaks.

Sheep and cattle grazing is the primary activity conducted on rural land in the ACT. We have about 48,000 sheep, 7,000 cattle and 1,500 horses. We have 195,000 chickens on our poultry farms. Currently there are no feedlots, abattoirs or piggeries.

The ACT government is responsible for monitoring Canberra saleyards, with approximately 400 cattle passing through monthly. The gross value of livestock commodities produced in the ACT in 2016-17 was over \$7 million according to the data from the ABS. Nationwide, the gross value of livestock commodities is approaching \$30 billion annually.

Protecting the lucrative livestock industry is of paramount importance to Australia. Currently there is limited legislation in the ACT mandating the recording of stock movements. It is currently an offence, under section 47 of the Animal Diseases Act 2005, to move taggable stock that is not tagged. It is also a requirement of the Animal Diseases Regulation 2006 for cattle to be tagged with an approved NLIS device.

However, it is currently not mandatory in the ACT for sheep, goats and pigs to be fitted with an identification device and it is not mandatory for these livestock owners to have the property identification code, PIC. This means that a mob of sheep can be moved within the ACT from property to property without movements being recorded in the NLIS database. This creates difficulties in tracing the movements of stock in the event of disease outbreak.

The NLIS is Australia's system for the permanent whole-of-life identification and traceability of livestock. This system aims to ensure that individual cattle, and also sheep, goats and pigs, can be traced from birth to slaughter or export. NLIS is endorsed by major producers, feedlots, agents, saleyards and processor bodies. The database identifies animals and their physical location, by the PICs, and provides electronic access to information. The NLIS helps rural landholders and other livestock industry participants to meet national livestock traceability performance standards.

In the ACT, currently only cattle are required to have the device fitted and their movements traceable through the database. As cattle move between properties with different PICs, this is recorded in the NLIS database. Cattle can be traced on and off different properties, saleyards and abattoirs. This is important. If, for example, chemical or antibiotic residues are detected in a meat at an abattoir, the property where the affected stock were last held can be identified and investigations done on the property as to why the residues occurred. Knowing all the properties on which the animals resided means that the problem can be more quickly addressed.

I would like to provide some information about the property identification codes, PICs, because they are an important component of the NLIS. Property information helps build a territory-wide picture about the agricultural land use and livestock numbers for biosecurity purposes. PICs are fundamental to the NLIS because they provide traceability to specific properties. With a PIC, property occupiers can obtain permanent identified devices for their animals, identify their property for movement recording and enrol in an industry quality assurance program.

PICs are currently not mandatory. The legislation will make PICs mandatory for all properties in the ACT where cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, horses, donkeys, mules, deer, camels, alpacas, llamas and certain numbers of small or large poultry are kept. Information on PICs will be recorded in a territory register held by the director-general with administrative responsibility for the Animal Diseases Act.

Many ACT rural landholders already have PICs because it is mandatory to provide a PIC when delivering cattle, sheep and goats to properties, saleyards or abattoirs in New South Wales, where the NLIS is already in place. A PIC also needs to be provided to owners or transporters of livestock delivered from other jurisdictions. Making PICs mandatory in the ACT for all cattle, sheep, goats and pigs will ensure that diseases or contaminated livestock being moved from one property to another in the ACT can be located. Mandatory PICs will help ACT rural landholders purchase livestock from other jurisdictions. Extending the requirement for a PIC to properties where other livestock are kept, such as horses and poultry, will make it easier to locate these animals in a biosecurity or food safety incident. During the equine influenza outbreak in 2007, the ACT government's response was hampered by a lack of knowledge about the location of horses.

Poultry production is also at risk, with a number of outbreaks of avian influenza in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland since 1976. However, a PIC will be required only by owners of 100 or more small poultry such as chickens, ducks or geese, and 10 or more large poultry, such as emus and ostriches. Recreational poultry owners will not be affected by the amendments.

PICS will also be mandatory for saleyards and properties on which stock events such as the Canberra show are held. Should an abattoir, feedlot or piggery ever be established in the ACT, it would also require a PIC.

All stock and station agents trading in livestock in the ACT will require an agent identification code. Stock and station agents are often temporarily in charge of livestock at saleyards and other properties and have responsibilities for ensuring the traceability of livestock under the NLIS.

The bill's other amendments relate to stock required to be identifiable under the NLIS: cattle, sheep, goats and pigs. The bill's amendments will have the greatest impact on the ACT's rural landholders. Rural landholders are already familiar with the NLIS through trading with New South Wales and because the NLIS regulations for cattle have been in place since 2004. Also, the benefits of good biosecurity are well known amongst rural landholders, other livestock industry participants and the broader community.

Rural landholders have already been notified by letters about the bill's amendments. There is a provision for the bill to commence on a day fixed by the minister. This will ensure that rural landholders and other stakeholders have the opportunity to become aware of the new requirements and have time to comply with them before the bill commences.

The ACT government will undertake targeted communication and engagement with all livestock industry stakeholders during implementation of the new NLIS requirements. Livestock stakeholders include saleyard operators, stock and station agents, operators of livestock events and people keeping livestock for recreational purposes and as pets, as well as rural landholders.

The amendments made by the bill will not have significant additional financial impacts on landholders or the ACT government. Costs largely arise from additional requirements for attaching NLIS-approved permanent identifiers to sheep, goats and pigs. There will be administration, enforcement and compliance costs for government. However, given that the systems are already in place for tracing cattle, the additional costs of expanding the NLIS are not expected to be onerous on government. Stock owners are not charged a fee for obtaining a PIC, and the benefits of improved biosecurity for the ACT far outweigh these minor costs to industry.

As the ACT member on the Agriculture Ministers Forum, Agmin, I am pleased that the NLIS will be implemented more widely in the ACT. NLIS arrangements for cattle, sheep, goats and pigs have been agreed through Agmin and its predecessors in a process spanning nearly two decades. Through the NLIS, the ACT and other jurisdictions will ensure that Australia's livestock traceability performance standards are met. Australia's traceability systems for agriculture are currently being reviewed as part of Agmin's work plan. The bill's amendments will contribute towards the effectiveness and consistency of Australia's traceability arrangements.

In summary, the Animal Disease Amendment Bill will improve the ACT's biosecurity by implementing the NLIS for sheep, goats and pigs. This means that we will be able to trace these animals in the event of a livestock disease outbreak or food safety incident. Mandatory requirements for PICS will facilitate trade with other jurisdictions and enhance the ACT's biosecurity arrangements for other livestock, including poultry and horses.

The bill's amendments honour our commitment to the NLIS and the national traceability performance standards and help protect Australia's livestock industries and international market access. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

## Stock Amendment Bill 2018

Debate resumed from 7 June 2018, on motion by **Mr Gentleman**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (4.50): The purpose of this bill is to amend the Stock Act 2005. The bill will make two substantive changes: changes to the way stray stock are dealt with; and changes to the permit system for travelling stock by foot. These are simple changes, and we will be supporting this bill today.

The Stock Amendment Bill has two primary goals: firstly, to encourage property owners to ensure that their livestock are contained securely on their properties; and, secondly, as a way to limit the spread of disease, injury to livestock and insemination of stud livestock, and consumption of fodder and damage to crops by stock that has strayed from their original property.

Part 4 of the Stock Act has historically been about requiring anyone transporting stock to have a document from the government or the owner of the stock that proves ownership of the stock and the point of origin of the stock. This was a way of tracking the movement of stock. Since 2005 there have been significant changes to the national livestock identification scheme. This, along with increased technology, has changed how stock movements are managed across Australia. As such this section of the act is no longer necessary and is supposedly now only about ensuring that public safety is looked after when stock are being moved.

As such this bill amends part 4 of the Stock Act to clarify that owners of stock must obtain a permit to travel stock when it involves driving stock on foot in public areas. It does not matter if this movement is for long-distance travel by stock walking from one area to another, roadside grazing for short periods of time or routine movements between two or more properties owned or occupied by the same person. In some ways it seems that this is typical of this government: they do not trust graziers who have been moving stock for such a long time, and who may know better than the public servants sitting in Civic. Graziers are well placed to assess the risks, and undergo training to do so.

I would hope that these new requirements do not require rural landholders to have to seek government permission every time they move their stock for routine matters, and I do not expect that that will be required. The government have assured me that these permits will be granted for periods of around 12 months to address these concerns. I look forward to seeing regulations that outline this. We will monitor this to see whether there are problems with the day-to-day management.

I also had questions about the movement of stock without a permit in cases of emergency. This was of particular concern considering the fact that any breach of this section of the act will be a strict liability offence. I have been advised that under section 41 of the Criminal Code a person is not criminally responsible for an offence if it is carried out in response to an emergency.

Moving on to the changes as to how stray stock are dealt with, currently, under the act, the director-general and the occupier of the land have the right to impound trespassing stock. If any stock are seized the director-general must give notice to the owner, or give notice publicly if the owner is unknown. Section 39 of the act provides that the stock must be put up for sale at auction if the stock is not released within 14 days of notice of the impounding being given.

The bill makes changes to the way that government can handle the sale or removal of stock. In doing so it provides the director-general with considerable scope to exercise their discretion when coming to a solution. The bill allows the government to dispose of the animal in a number of ways, such as selling them at auction, selling them by some other means, giving the stock away or disposing of the stock, including killing the stock.

I must admit it surprises me that this Labor-Greens government is constantly coming up with new ways to legislate for the ability to kill animals. However, under the new legislation, the government will not be able to kill any stock unless it is too costly to sell them, or for animal welfare reasons, although this power already existed under section 86 of the Animal Welfare Act 1992.

In our discussions with the minister's office on this amendment, I asked the question about how often stock are impounded and sold at auction, and I was informed of two instances. In 2004 there was a calf that was impounded. No-one in the directorate recalls what the outcome of that event was. Apparently, in 2005 there was also a horse that was impounded and sold for the cost of the advertisement in the newspaper. Again the collective memory of the directorate could not recall the specific details. Of course, given that the legislation at that time said it was meant to be sold at auction under those current arrangements, I am not sure how it was sold for the cost of the ad, unless the ad was perhaps very expensive. So it appears that two instances can be recalled in the past 15 or so years. This is apparently a routine review of the legislation to tidy it up, but it does give the government further powers and decreases the individual freedoms of graziers.

It might be nice if, instead of bringing in more legislation—which, incidentally provides greater ability to kill animals—that increases the burden on graziers when it comes to transportation options for stock between paddocks, the time was better spent on finding ways to make lives easier for Canberrans, including graziers, and finding ways to support our farmers, who, by all accounts, are doing it pretty tough at the moment.

We will continue to monitor the situation about graziers' permits to move cattle, to ensure that this government is being fair about the application process, and ensuring that it is not an unnecessary burden on the individual grazier. We will be supporting the legislation today. Finally, I would like to thank the minister and his office for their consultation with my office on the bill.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (4.56): I would like to make a few short remarks about the Stock Amendment Bill. I remember from my days as minister responsible

for the Stock Act that people seemed to think that there was not much need for legislation, given that we do not have vast levels of stock in the ACT. Many of our rural lessees would disagree with them. Possibly because we have smaller stock numbers than other jurisdictions, this is an area that gets relatively little attention here. But I do understand the need to tidy up some of the provisions in our legislation to make it more workable, and, perhaps precisely because we have smaller numbers here, we have some specific issues that need to be addressed.

One of those issues is that our legislation at the moment requires that any animals that have been found and have been impounded, and are unable to be reunited with their owner, are auctioned by the director-general. The bill today instead amends this requirement and allows the director-general to sell the animals through other means, for example, by selling them directly or, unfortunately, if necessary, destroying them. This sounds extreme, but in the case of sound animal welfare reasons for this, it is good for the director-general to have this option.

This bill also updates the act to reflect the fact that the Animal Diseases Act now includes requirements for stock to be identifiable; thus if someone is moving stock they do not need to be able to prove that they have permission from the owner. The amendment removes the requirement for the stock owner to issue a permit for the stock to travel, and also clarifies that the definition of “travel” with stock in this context means moving stock on foot. In these situations the director-general is instead responsible for issuing the permit to travel, or move, the stock, as they will need to assess the road safety implications of this movement.

These are the key amendments in this bill, and the Greens will be supporting them today.

**MR GENTLEMAN** (Brindabella—Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Urban Renewal) (4.58), in reply: I thank members for their contributions to the debate on this bill. The bill makes limited amendments to the Stock Act 2005 with the aim of updating the act.

The bill provides the Director-General of the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate with more flexible options for dealing with impounded stock and updates the provisions in the act relating to permits for moving stock on foot.

First of all, I would like to provide some relevant information about the Stock Act. One of the aims of the Stock Act is to encourage rural landholders to ensure that their livestock are contained securely on their properties. The risks posed by escaped or trespassing livestock include collisions with motor vehicles and the potential for people to be seriously injured or even killed. This is a real risk in Canberra because of the many high-speed roads adjacent to livestock paddocks. Furthermore, the impact of straying livestock trespassing onto neighbouring properties can include the spread of disease, injury to livestock, insemination of stud livestock and consumption of fodder and damage to crops.

To deal with straying or trespassing stock, the Stock Act has a number of provisions about the impounding of stock. Part 5 of the act permits the director-general and the occupier of the land to impound trespassing stock. The act requires the director-general to give notice of the impoundment of stock either to the owner, if identified, or publicly. There are provisions about the release of impounded stock and fees payable by the owner to the territory to maintain and travel the impounded stock.

If impounded stock are not released, the act currently provides that impounded stock must, in the first instance, be disposed of by selling them at auction. Section 39 in part 5 of the act provides that the director-general must offer the stock for sale at auction if the stock is not released within 14 days of notice of the impoundment being given.

It has become apparent that this requirement to sell at auction is not the best use of government resources and is not always the best outcome for the stock involved. The costs associated with administering the auction process when only a small number of animals is involved is not justified and there may be potential for animal welfare issues associated with keeping social animals in isolation from their normal mob-based social environment.

The requirement for the director-general to sell impounded stock by auction works well in situations involving large numbers of stock but it is not so suitable when small numbers of animals or single animals are involved, and straying or trespassing by small numbers of stock or single animals is more usual in Canberra than entire straying herds. The bill therefore makes amendments to the Stock Act to enable the director-general to exercise some discretion in implementing solutions in relation to impounded stock that are more cost effective, pragmatic and avoid potential animal welfare issues associated with keeping social animals in isolation.

The bill amends part 5, section 39 to provide sale of the stock as one of the options available to the director-general after they have been impounded and not released to the owner within a period of 14 days. New section 39 permits the director-general to dispose of the stock by selling them at auction or another means of sale or by disposing of the stock, including destroying the stock, as the director-general considers appropriate.

I wish to emphasise that the director-general may only destroy or dispose of the stock after the 14-day notice period of the impoundment has expired and it is not practicable or desirable to sell the stock because of cost, animal welfare or other reasons. I would also like to point out that the bill in no way affects the ability of a veterinary surgeon to humanely destroy an animal that is sick, diseased or injured in accordance with section 86 of the Animal Welfare Act 1992.

I would now like to turn to the second set of amendments made by the bill. These relate to part 4 of the Stock Act, which is about travelling stock. Part 4 of the Stock Act has historically been about requiring anyone transporting stock to have a document from the government or the owner of the stock that proved ownership of the stock at the point of origin of the stock. The permit system was also about tracing stock movements in case of a disease outbreak.



Since the Stock Act was made there have been changes that affect the movement of livestock in the ACT. Much of the land that was previously rural has been repurposed for urban development, with a corresponding decrease in the number of farms and livestock. This, and better modes of vehicle transport, has resulted in droving stock decreasing significantly.

Also, the national livestock identification system, Australia's system for identification and traceability of stock, has expanded, and provides a better way of tracing stock movements. This national system is being implemented under amendments to the Animal Diseases Act 2005. This means that part 4 of the Stock Act is now mostly about ensuring the public's safety when stock is being moved on foot in areas accessible to the public. The government needs to be able to review the proposed movement and assess any risk to the public of the proposed movement.

The bill amends part 4 of the Stock Act to clarify that owners of stock must obtain a permit to travel stock from the director-general when it involves driving the stock on foot in public areas such as along roads, unless they have a permit issued under a corresponding law in another jurisdiction. This could be long-distance travel by stock walking from one area to another, roadside grazing for a short period of time or routine movements between two or more properties owned or occupied by the same person.

The Stock Act is also being amended by the bill to remove the right of an owner of stock to issue a permit to travel the stock. This requirement was needed historically so that people droving stock along a road could prove the stock had not been stolen. This is no longer necessary because the national livestock identification system includes mechanisms for the identification of stock and it is not appropriate for an owner to issue a permit when the risks associated with the movement of the stock need to be assessed by the government for public safety reasons.

In finishing, I want to point out that the bill contains two strict liability offences. These offences are already in the Stock Act and are only amended by the bill for technical reasons to remove the reference to an owner issuing a permit. There has been no change to the maximum penalty of 50 penalty units.

In summary, the Stock Amendment Bill gives greater flexibility to government to deal with impounded stock that has not been claimed by the owner. Being able to sell small numbers of animals without going to auction will reduce the cost to government and benefit stock owners claiming the balance of proceeds. Restricting the issue of permits to the director-general for travelling stock that are unrestrained and on foot improves public safety.

The bill is another example of the government's keeping a close eye on the territory's legislation and making sure it is as up to date as possible. It also works effectively to reduce red tape, allows the government to meet its obligations in a cost-effective way and continues to have public safety and animal welfare as a priority. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

## **Adjournment**

Motion (by **Mr Gentleman**) proposed:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

## **Schools—visits**

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong) (5.06): I take this opportunity to highlight to the Assembly two school visits that I made what now seems long time ago, in the life known as pre-estimates. The first was an invitation I had to join in the Reconciliation Day celebrations at St Benedict's school at Narrabundah in June.

St Benedict's is a small Catholic system co-educational primary school catering for students from kindergarten to year 6. At the time of the August 2017 census the student population totalled 151 students. That included 63 boys and 88 girls, 10 students identifying as Indigenous, four students with a disability, and 10 students with English as an additional language or dialect.

The staff of 21 are led by principal Mrs Rachel Smith, another wonderful, committed, enthusiastic school leader, passionate about her school, her students and the parents. Mrs Smith speaks with great pride about the school's warm, vibrant and friendly learning community, especially its dedicated staff, welcoming parents and the growth and development of its students.

At the morning tea before we ventured outside for the launch of the new reconciliation garden, I spoke with a number of parents. They confirmed how dedicated the staff are and how welcoming and supportive all students are of each other. One parent was particularly appreciative of the school, outlining how important it was for her child to be at the school, even though it was not the closest to where they lived, because of the school's education program for students with special needs.

It was not a particularly warm day, and when we all ventured outside to launch the school's reconciliation garden the students were exceptionally well behaved given the weather. The official program started with a smoking ceremony—at first a little difficult to get going in the windy conditions—and a welcome to country delivered by "Mr Ngunnawal", the first time we have had a chance to meet off the Twitter-sphere.

Various students outlined the importance of reconciliation, of the contribution our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Canberrans make to our community, and of the

significance of the new reconciliation garden in their school. I was invited to paint a rock for placement in the garden, and much fun and ribbing was had at the guests' ability to paint without getting it everywhere but on the rock. I did have to maintain that it was a particular challenge trying to stop my hair flying into all the paint. All too soon it was time to go. A special thank you to principal Smith and her staff, especially the wonderfully energetic Mel Stratford, who sought me out on Twitter to invite me to join them for this special event.

The next school visit I will talk about tonight was to St Clare's College at Griffith. St Clare's is a senior school, so years 7 to 12, for girls. It has a long history, being established on its current site in 1965 as the Catholic Girls' High School Griffith. Enrolment on opening day consisted of 183 girls in years 7 and 8, taught by eight sisters. The school officially became St Clare's in 1980, being named after two significant women: St Clare of Assisi, who was considered to represent an ideal of womanhood; and Sister Clare Slattery, the founding principal of the college.

Today the school is headed by principal Mr Brad Cooney and in recent years has had a significant rise in enrolments from across all of Canberra and close interstate areas. Students are offered the opportunity to study a wide variety of subjects, including a strong focus on engineering, metal fabrication and car mechanics, as well as the more traditional standard subjects and co-curricular courses like drama, music and art. The school has an impressive success rate of students going on to university, with 85 per cent gaining entry. The school also has a strong emphasis on community and volunteer service and a growing reputation for involvement in community groups.

I thank Mr Cooney for his time and openness in talking to me about the particular rewards and challenges of leading an all-girls school, the enormous responsibility today's teachers have in dealing with more than just teaching a silo academic subject, and the tremendous support the school has from his students, parents and teachers.

Once again, this visit confirmed what I quickly realised in starting these school visits: that Canberra is very proud of our educational standards and choice. I continue to be impressed with what our parents have to choose from in our region. Parental choice, as I mentioned earlier in the matter of public importance discussion, is critical to a positive, quality education for every child entering school. The two schools I have mentioned tonight demonstrate only some of the wide choice available in Canberra.

### **Federal government—territory rights**

**MS CHEYNE** (Ginninderra) (5.11): This is the last opportunity I have to speak in this place on territory rights before the Senate continues to debate, and potentially votes on, the Leyonhjelm bill to overturn the Euthanasia Laws Act 1997. I want to put on the record, for the purposes of this place and also federal parliament, my views.

It is just not right that the act exists. It was not right in 1997 and it is not right in 2018. Canberra citizens should not be second class simply because we live in a territory rather than a state. We are a mature jurisdiction and we should have the right to debate and decide for ourselves if we want laws on voluntary assisted dying. We should not have such an important issue decided for us by an entirely different

parliament made up of people who, for the most part, do not represent us or our interests.

I want to put on the record that I formally implore all federal politicians to listen to the citizens of the ACT and the Northern Territory when they make their decision on how to vote on the Leyonhjelm bill. How would they feel if people who did not represent them were making decisions that affected them? I thank Dave Smith, Andrew Leigh and Gai Brodtmann, who I know will be voting in support of restoring our rights, and of course Katy Gallagher for her leadership in the Senate on this previously.

I ask the citizens of Canberra to reach out to your friends and your family who live interstate. Ask your friends and family who live interstate to write to their federal representatives. We can get this overturned only with the help of all Australians. It is a matter of fairness. It is a matter of rights. And it simply comes down to doing what is right.

### **Canberra Institute of Technology—heart health program**

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (5.13): Over the past few months, I have been trying to get to the bottom of changes that have been made to the CIT heart health program. This program is much appreciated and highly valued by its participants, mainly seniors. They enjoy their involvement through healthy physical exercise and social interaction.

In February, some participants visited Mr Coe to tell him that the CIT had made some changes, primarily to reduce class sizes. Their concern was that this would impact on the important element of social interaction of the group. This came on the back of a string of correspondence in late 2017 between participants and the Minister for Veterans and Seniors and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Whilst acknowledging the reason for the change—mainly, as I understand it, associated with OH&S considerations—the program participants called the changes “abrupt” and were concerned about lack of consultation. In a letter to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, program participants said: “These abrupt changes created the situation of fracturing important support and connections for programme participants of long standing.” The participants went on to say: “Though not intentional, these changes have had the effect of disrupting what was a model of best practice for an inclusiveness fitness group that also relied strongly on the robust social ties and supports that developed among the members over many years.”

Since February, I have had correspondence with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, who keeps telling me stories that the program participants have been unable to corroborate. Primarily, these differences of view have been about a lack of consultation and the manner in which a survey of participants was conducted.

Even an issue as seemingly trivial as name tags has emerged. The government has said that it is too expensive to be issuing name tags for each class. Surely a plastic sleeve with a card inserted, issued at a pick-up and drop-off point, would not be beyond the fiscal constraints of this government.

Apparently the government said that it would facilitate and fund continuing social interaction, but this extended to one function last year. Nothing has been arranged since, except for a gathering that the group organised on its own initiative.

Based on this government's record, and on its many other similar so-called community consultation exercises, I tend to place considerably more store on what the participants are telling me. They tell me that the consultation and survey process has been clunky and even selective. I would suggest that it was designed to achieve a particular outcome. Even meetings at which it was promised a ministerial staffer would attend were for naught, because the staffer pulled out. In one case, this was advised only moments before the meeting was due to begin.

Does this sound familiar to members in this place? I think it does. Given the conflicting stories that I have received, I have put a range of questions on notice. They include a question about what alternatives were considered. Perhaps one of those might have been to put two staff in each session, so that class sizes were maintained but OH&S requirements were satisfied as well. I hope that we will receive a reasonable answer to these questions. In any event, it will be a chance for the government to be a little more candid in its responses than it has been hitherto. I hope the government will seize the opportunity.

The CIT heart health program is an important one for our seniors because it fosters health and promotes social interaction. I hope the government will open its eyes eventually and see those benefits and help to restore a program which had been so successful over such a long period.

### **Federal government—territory rights Environment—climate change**

**MS LE COUTEUR** (Murrumbidgee) (5.17): I thank Ms Cheyne for her reminder that today could be the last time that we have to express the fact that the people of the ACT are equal to the other people in Australia, and we deserve our full democratic right. I very much hope that the Senate agrees with this view this evening.

The other thing that I am going to speak about tonight is climate. It is summer in the Northern Hemisphere and the weather is getting hotter.

At least three people have died and thousands have been evacuated in California as eight active wildfires continue to burn across the state. California has had a five-year drought, which has killed 129 million trees. They are burning in the fires. There are currently more than 3,000 firefighters fighting. I note the media release from Minister Gentleman saying that 10 of ours will be joining their Californian comrades.

In Japan, it is no better. Eighty people died in July from heat, and more than 35,000 people in Japan were admitted to hospital for heatstroke. The high temperatures follow record rainfall which caused floods and landslides in Japan and killed more than 220 people.

In the past decades, people like me may have believed that climate change was causing extreme weather, but the response of climate deniers has always been that you cannot prove it, the weather is always variable, and Australia is the land of drought and flooding rain.

Now scientists are saying—here I quote from the *Guardian*—that “This is the face of climate change”. This came from Professor Michael Mann at Penn state university, who is one of the world’s most eminent climate scientists. He went on to say:

We literally would not have seen these extremes in the absence of climate change ... The impacts of climate change are no longer subtle ... We are seeing them play out in real time and what is happening this summer is a perfect example of that ... We are seeing our predictions come true ... As a scientist that is reassuring, but as a citizen of planet Earth, it is very distressing to see that as it means we have not taken the necessary action.

As a fellow citizen of the Earth, I am very distressed that we are not taking sufficient action to stop the greenhouse effect changing our climate. In the ACT, we have a target to be carbon neutral by 2050. This is good. If the whole world adopted this policy, we would all be a lot better off than we are now.

Despite our admirable policy, we cannot rest on our laurels; we need to do more. Our climate change target, with the exception of electricity, only relates to greenhouse gases emitted in the territory. The ACT imports most of its food and other material goods. Because of this, Canberra’s ecological footprint, when it was evaluated in 2011-12—the most recent time, unfortunately, that it was done—came in at 8.9 global hectares per person. At that, we are 3½ times the global average per person, we are above the average footprint for Australians, and we are at 14 times the land area in the ACT.

The message is that as well as addressing our democratic deficit, we need to do more for our environment if we want our children to be able to inherit the beautiful and resilient world that we have the pleasure to live in now.

### **Federal government—territory rights Plastic Free July**

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (5.21): I would also like to echo Ms Cheyne’s remarks that the ACT and the Northern Territory should be able to make their own laws regarding all the same rights the states have.

For the month of July I participated in the Plastic Free July challenge. This was the first time I had taken part in the challenge. I would like to take the opportunity this evening to speak about how important this initiative is both locally and nationally.

The Plastic Free July challenge was founded by the Plastic Free July Foundation, with the mission to build a global movement that dramatically reduces plastic use and improves recycling. According to the foundation, over 2 million people across the

globe participate in the Plastic Free July challenge annually. It is a movement that is beginning to make huge social change. Here in Australia we have seen programs like the ABC's *War on Waste* shine the national spotlight on the rising issues of waste and consumption, particularly single-use plastic.

The aim of the Plastic Free July challenge is pretty simple and self-explanatory. However, being disciplined enough to commit to the challenge actually proved to be more difficult than I first assumed. Making the switch to a reusable keep cup, refusing straws at cafes and restaurants and bringing my own bag to the supermarket instead of using the thicker, less biodegradable bags were just some of the behavioural changes I made over the 31 days.

After a few days of taking part in the challenge I realised that some of my colleagues in this place needed a bit of encouragement to get on board as well. In budget estimates hearings I noticed that the Chief Minister was drinking out of a disposable coffee cup. I was not going to let that slide, considering I was going to be spending a few days sitting across from him. I thank and congratulate the Chief Minister for quickly making the switch to a reusable coffee cup after I placed one on his desk for him to use. I note that I have seen him walking across the road with a disposable cup a few times since then, so I would like to put it on the record that I will be holding him to his commitment to use a reusable cup.

Minister Ramsay and Mr Steel also committed to take part in the challenge, and I will be checking up on both of them to see how they went. Mr Steel did mention to me in passing the other day that he did not do as well as he would like to have done, so he might need some encouragement from his staff and constituents to make the behavioural change that will help the environment.

While a number of Assembly members took up the challenge, I know that local residents and businesses in my electorate of Yerrabi have also made the switch from single-use plastic to reusable materials. Frankies at Forde, a popular café in Yerrabi's north, is continuing to implement changes in the way it provides food and beverage services to customers. On 1 July last year Frankies banned takeaway cups in favour of reusable cups and encouraging people to sit down and enjoy their coffee. A year on, Frankies have done the numbers. They have saved 45,000—yes, 45,000—disposable cups from going into Canberra's landfill. This is an incredible saving. I congratulate Frankies for taking the initiative to make such a substantial positive impact on our environment.

Although Plastic Free July has now ended, I will be continuing to say no to plastics as often as I can, and I strongly encourage all members as well as my constituents to get on board as well.

### **ACTION bus service—network**

**MISS C BURCH** (Kurrajong) (5.24): I rise today to speak on behalf of all the Canberrans who feel let down by this government, the many Canberrans who rely on buses to get around our city and the many parents who rely on dedicated school buses to get their kids safely to school, as well as the many Canberrans who were promised

by the Chief Minister that his government would deliver better and more representative consultation.

Earlier today Ms Stephen-Smith claimed that the government is taking consultation on the proposed new bus network very seriously. However, so far this consultation process has been laughable.

My colleagues and I have attended many of these Transport Canberra roadshows, and it is very clear that the government and the Labor MLAs often in attendance are not interested in listening to the overwhelming criticism of the proposed bus changes. Community members who air their frustration are often asked to wait to speak to officials at the end of the meeting, as officials are clearly unwilling to publicly address their concerns. All too often residents' concerns about Xpresso services and school bus services are being dismissed, with officials running the same line over and over again that there will be more Rapid services.

I really do feel for these Transport Canberra officials, with the difficult sales job that the minister has put on them. I note that Transport Canberra has actively changed its language at these roadshows. Rather than being about receiving feedback from residents, Transport Canberra is now interested in "helping Canberrans adjust to the new network", a change that many residents have noticed and has led many to believe that this consultation is disingenuous and these changes are largely set in stone.

The other damning part of this consultation process is the fact that the government is yet to release the timetables associated with the proposed new network. How can you call this real consultation when residents are unable to make informed judgments about whether they will be able to get to work on time? How is it real consultation when commuters cannot tell how long their journey will take? How is it real consultation when parents do not know how long their children will be waiting at interchanges after school buses have been cancelled? Bus users cannot possibly inform Transport Canberra and Ms Fitzharris on how these changes really affect them if they do not truly know what the changes are.

The minister, Transport Canberra officials and Ms Stephen-Smith earlier today have all claimed that the proposed new network is based on data showing how residents are currently using bus services. However, how can residents believe this claim when this data has not been released? The fact is, this government slaps the label "consultation" on anything and everything but does not understand what it means.

Let me tell members what real consultation looks like. Over the past month Canberra Liberals MLAs have been out in the community canvassing real opinions about the new bus network. Far from what those opposite would have you believe, Canberrans are not happy. As I mentioned earlier today, we have heard from countless parents, grandparents, teachers and principals across Canberra about the significant impact that cuts to dedicated school buses will have on their schools and families. Last week Ms Lee and I heard from elderly residents in Braddon about how changes to the number 7 bus will severely impact their community as well as homeless shelters in the local area.



On Monday I heard from Narrabundah residents about how the cuts late last year severely impacted their community, and about how the changes to the new network will exasperate the community even further. My colleagues Mr Coe and Mr Milligan have been actively consulting with residents in Crace retirement village, as they are set to lose bus route 54, as well as residents in Giralang and Kaleen about the loss of services to the city.

My colleagues in Brindabella, Murrumbidgee and Ginninderra have heard from countless frustrated constituents about the cancellations of Xpresso services and how the new Rapid services threaten to lengthen the journey of hundreds of Canberrans. In fact at the inner south roadshow public transport officials themselves actually acknowledged that Rapids have never been an appropriate name for these services.

These are only a handful of examples of the many local community councils and P&C and residents associations that have been in constant discussion with the Canberra Liberals because it is very clear to them that the government does not care and will not listen.

Ms Stephen-Smith will be pleased to know that the Canberra Liberals have been referring these many concerned residents to the government's consultation process. It is this process that is the problem. The overwhelming feedback we are receiving from residents who have participated in government consultation is that the government does not care and is not listening. The overwhelming feedback that we are receiving is that this is a half-baked attempt at consultation and these changes are already set in stone. If the government is truly taking community feedback seriously, the government will release timetables and data to allow the community to provide real feedback on the proposed new network.

### **Federal government—territory rights Environment—plastic bag ban**

**MS CODY** (Murrumbidgee) (5.29): I stand today to follow my colleagues and talk about a matter that is very dear to my heart—territory rights. We have heard over a number of years that the ACT and the Northern Territory have very different rights to the states, and this is just not fair. How is it that the people of the ACT have the right to vote for people to represent them, to represent their views in parliament, but that that same parliament cannot make certain laws for the Canberra community?

Last week the Select Committee on End of Life Choices in the ACT heard from Mr Marshall Perron, a former Chief Minister for the Northern Territory. Mr Perron spoke very passionately about his battles with the federal government on what is commonly referred to as the Andrews bill. Mr Perron said:

The Chief Ministers of both territories are the representatives of the citizens who live in those places and have every right, indeed, a responsibility to act on behalf of those citizens. Unfortunately, federal politicians it seems in many cases regard the next tier of government with some disdain, and that is shown in the federal *Hansard* debates.

As my colleague Ms Cheyne has said, as well as Ms Le Couteur and Ms Orr, in the week beginning on 14 August Senator Leyonhjelm is introducing a bill that seeks to remove what is commonly referred to as the Andrews bill, restoring territory rights for the citizens of the ACT and the Northern Territory. I implore all Canberrans and all community members in Australia—everyone—to write to their politicians and make it very clear that the territories deserve to have the same rights as the states.

Whilst I am talking about the people of Canberra, and what a fantastic community we have, I would also like to note my disdain for the comments made by Mr Steve Price last night on *The Project*. Canberra bashing is not okay. Canberra bashing is appalling. Mr Steve Price was in a debate about the plastic bag ban and was supporting the Coles backflip nationally to stop the plastic bag ban which we have had in the ACT for many years, and which has been very successful. As Ms Orr said, reusing plastic is a very good idea. Mr Price said, “That’s Canberra, Dee. Please don’t quote Canberra at us. We’re talking about real cities like Melbourne and Sydney where there’s people.”

Well, Mr Price, there are a damn lot of people in Canberra, 400,000 people, and I am pretty sure they are not very happy with you.

### **Federal government—territory rights**

**MR PETTERSSON** (Yerrabi) (5.32): I am a proud Canberran. I am proud of our local democracy. I am proud of the history contained within the Legislative Assembly. I am proud of the way members in this place conduct themselves; well, most of the time.

It is because of this, my pride in our ability to determine our own way of life, that I urge those in the federal parliament to overturn the Andrews bill. This debate, this piece of legislation, is first and foremost about the rights that we afford to territories. I do not think anyone sincerely holds a belief that people living in the ACT or the Northern Territory are less cognisant of political discourse or the magnitude of their decision-making. But our laws do.

Our laws have created a two-tiered system in which Australian citizens are less empowered to make decisions based upon their postcode. It is demeaning and it is unfair. The Andrews bill is an outdated piece of legislation.

The whole situation is quite laughable, when you think about it. The Northern Territory legalises euthanasia; the commonwealth government revokes the power of the territories to legislate on euthanasia. Victoria legalises euthanasia; the territories are still unable to legislate on euthanasia. It appears that the only way out of this mess is to have a Senate crossbench deal to sell out working people and their unions by voting for the ABCC. Let us not conflate these issues. Let us stop playing games. Let us stop horse trading. Let us just talk about the issue at hand.

The federal parliament will, in a few weeks, consider the Andrews bill again. I urge all federal members of parliament to restore the rights of the Australian Capital Territory. The Andrews bill needs to be overturned.

## **Federal government—territory rights**

**MR STEEL** (Murrumbidgee) (5.34): I also rise to speak in support of territory rights. In the Labor Party we stand by a very fundamental principle, which is one vote, one value. Since 1997 the value of our vote here in the ACT has meant less than in any other state in the country, and that needs to be overturned.

Members in the federal parliament who represent Menzies, Hasluck or a range of electorates outside the ACT, or indeed senators representing states and not the ACT, may have a genuine interest in the territory and what happens here. But they do not live here, with the exception of the Prime Minister. They do not live here, and over the 30 years of this Assembly's existence, I think we have demonstrated that we can have a mature and respectful discussion about a whole range of different matters, and that should also include voluntary assisted dying. Just as every other state has the right to vote on these laws, we in the Assembly should have the right to be able to vote on those laws, too.

Victoria has passed those laws. We should also remember that New South Wales has very actively considered whether they want those laws in place in that jurisdiction. While it was voted down, they may indeed seek to bring those laws on again. There could be a very peculiar situation, with the ACT being an island within New South Wales, where they have voluntary assisted dying, and Victoria has voluntary assisted dying, and we have no ability to legislate in that area. It is obvious what the repercussions of that could be, with people potentially moving interstate to be able to access these sorts of rights.

When it comes to this debate, I hope that members and senators are thinking about the fact that after 30 years this place is capable of having a respectful and mature discussion. Regardless of their views on euthanasia, they should do the right thing and make sure that they are treating all Canberrans with the same respect afforded to every other single citizen in this country who lives in a state.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

**The Assembly adjourned at 5.37 pm until Tuesday, 14 August 2018, at 10 am.**

## Schedule of amendments

### Schedule 1

#### Senior Practitioner Bill 2018

Amendments moved by the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth

**1**

**Clause 31 (5)**

**Page 26, line 13—**

*omit*

complainant's

*substitute*

relevant person's

**2**

**Clause 31 (5)**

**Page 26, line 14—**

*omit*

complainant

*substitute*

relevant person

**3**

**Proposed new clause 31 (6)**

**Page 26, line 17—**

*insert*

(6) In this section:

***relevant person*** means—

- (a) a person who is the subject of a positive behaviour support plan about which a complaint is made; or
- (b) a person who is subject to a restrictive practice about which a complaint is made; or
- (c) if a complainant is not a person mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b)—the complainant.

**4**

**Schedule 1, item 5, column 4**

**Page 44—**

*omit schedule 1, item 5, column 4, substitute*

- person the subject of plan  
provider responsible for cancelled plan

## Answers to questions

### ACT Policing—Firearms Consultative Committee (Question No 1052)

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 23 March 2018:

- (1) Who is on the current ACT Firearms Consultative Committee and how long (a) has each person served on the Committee and (b) are their remaining terms.
- (2) How are appointments to the ACT Firearms Consultative Committee determined.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Firearms Consultative Committee (FCC) comprises members and ex-officio members. The ex-officio members are the ACT Deputy Registrar of Firearms and a representative from the Legislation, Policy and Programs (LPP) branch in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate (JACS). The terms and lengths of service of these members varies according to the position holder. Other members are appointed by me as Minister responsible for the *Firearms Act 1996*.

The FCC members advise on and consider matters of firearms policy in a voluntary capacity. Members of the FCC are appointed in their own right rather than as a representative of their firearms club or organisation. There is a broad base of knowledge on the committee about a range of types of firearms and related activity. The lengths of service of members and remaining terms are itemised below:

FCC member	Length of service as of 1 April 2018	Remaining duration of current term as of 1 April 2018
Member one	At least 15 years and 9 months*	8 months
Member two	At least 15 years and 9 months*	8 months
Member three	At least 15 years and 9 months*	8 months
Member four	2 years and 3 months	8 months
Member five	7 years and 3 months	8 months
Member six	5 years and 3 months	8 months
Member seven	1 year	8 months
Member eight	1 year	8 months
Member nine	1 year	8 months

There is a concern that the publication of their names in Hansard may make them a potential target for criminal activity. I would ask you to consider this concern and consequently accept the answer.

- (2) At the start of the appointment process, JACS sends a request for expressions of interest to the ACT firearms community and current FCC members.

The criteria for appointment to the FCC are the ability to provide considered and knowledgeable advice to the government on firearms and related legislation and to be able to represent the views of the firearms community rather than just an individual perspective. Applications are received by JACS.

Appointments are determined by an assessment panel which assesses the applications and provides me with recommendations. In the most recent recruitment process, the panel comprised of a senior representative from LPP and the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate, and the acting Chair of the FCC. JACS consults on the proposed recommendations with the Office for Women, the Community Participation Group and the Office for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs. As the FCC is not a statutory body, Assembly Standing Committee consultation is not required.

Following my agreement and Cabinet endorsement, I sign the instrument of appointment. Candidates are appointed to the FCC on the commencement date stated in the instrument. JACS then sends letters to applicants notifying them of the outcome of the selection process. Lastly, appointees are asked to sign the ACT Boards and Committees Code of Conduct, Conflict of Interest and background declaration forms.

\*Records within LPP indicate these individuals have been FCC members since at least 2002. Further records outside of LPP would need to be obtained at financial cost in order to determine whether these individuals were members prior to 2002, and were unable to be obtained in time for provision of this response.

---

### **Government—vehicle fleet (Question No 1325)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) How many cars are currently in the ACT Government vehicle fleet.
- (2) In relation to the cars currently in the ACT Government vehicle fleet, (a) what brands are they, (b) when were they purchased, (c) what are the leasing terms, (d) how are they allocated by directorate and (e) by what methods will they be disposed of.
- (3) What is the total estimated cost of the 600 electric vehicles that are to be purchased.
- (4) Under what financing arrangement and over what period of time will the 600 electric vehicles be purchased.
- (5) Under what tender/contract arrangement will the purchases be made.
- (6) If the purchases are to be made by tender, (a) who will be eligible to submit a tender, (b) what will the tender process be and (c) what is the estimated timeframe for the tender process.
- (7) What is the cost per vehicle of the 600 electric vehicles to be purchased.
- (8) Where will these cars be sourced from.
- (9) What is their country of origin.
- (10) What servicing arrangements will be made for these cars.
- (11) When was the decision made to change to an all-electric vehicle fleet.

(12) Who made the decision.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1) At 1 May 2018, the Territory leased 636 passenger and light commercial vehicles (covering pool and executive vehicles). In addition, some Directorates have purchased particular vehicles, typically special purpose heavy vehicles such as emergency vehicles, and plant such as ride-on mowers.

(2) In relation to the cars currently in the ACT Government vehicle fleet

(a) The table below shows currently leased pool passenger and light commercial vehicles by brand and model, along with numbers of that brand/model including executive vehicles.

VEHICLE TYPE	VEHICLE NUMBER
TOYOTA COROLLA	89
HYUNDAI i30	75
TOYOTA YARIS	68
KIA CERATO	45
TOYOTA PRIUS C – HATCH - HYBRID	23
HYUNDAI ACCENT	21
SUBARU FORESTER	22
NISSAN X-TRAIL	26
MAZDA CX-5	21
TOYOTA RAV4	17
NISSAN LEAF - EV	16
FORD MONDEO	16
TOYOTA CAMRY - HYBRID	11
MITSUBISHI ASX	13
HYUNDAI iMAX	12
HYUNDAI i40	11
HOLDEN CRUZE	10
KIA SPORTAGE	9
FORD TERRITORY	8
MAZDA CX-3	8
MITSUBISHI OUTLANDER AWD PHEV	8
KIA RIO	7
MITSUBISHI MIRAGE	7
KIA CARNIVAL	6
NISSAN QASHQAI	10
VW MULTIVAN	5
VW PASSAT	5
MAZDA 3	5
HYUNDAI SANTA FE	4
HOLDEN CADDY LIFE	4
SUBARU OUTBACK	4
FORD FIESTA	4

VEHICLE TYPE	VEHICLE NUMBER
NISSAN PULSAR	4
HONDA CR-V	3
HYUNDAI i30CW	2
SUBARU XV	3
MAZDA 2	3
HYUNDAI ix35	2
TOYOTA PRIUS	2
MERCEDES-BENZ VALENTE	2
FIAT PUNTO	1
HOLDEN COMMODORE SPORTS WAGON	2
HONDA ODYSSEY	2
VW TIGUAN	2
MAZDA 6	1
AUDI A3	1
HOLDEN TRAILBLAZER	1
MITSUBISHI PAJERO	1
HOLDEN COLORADO 7	1
HONDA ACCORD	1
FIAT FREEMONT	1
AUDI A4	1
KIA OPTIMA	1
HYUNDAI i20	1
TOYOTA LANDCRUISER PRADO	1
HYUNDAI TUCSON	1
VW GOLF	2
FIAT VITO	1
SKODA SUPERB	1
PRIUS V - HYBRID	1
SUZUKI SWIFT	1
RENAULT CLIO	1
TOYOTA TARAGO	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>636</b>

(b) The vehicles in the above table were leased (not purchased) at various times, and will typically have a 24-48 month lease period. A recent fleet policy provides that passenger and light commercial vehicles are leased for 48 months unless Territory fleet provider sgfleet recommends a different lease period based on projected or actual vehicle use.

(c) The contractual lease terms and conditions for Territory passenger, light commercial and heavy vehicles are as provided under the Commonwealth Government's Fleet Services Contract (FSC). The Territory joined the FSC in April 2015 as a value for money and efficient leasing option. The lease provider under the FSC is sgfleet. The Territory has adopted a policy of taking passenger and light commercial vehicles on a 48 month lease since this usually optimises vehicle use and minimises costs. Some vehicle leases are adjusted for a shorter or longer term on sgfleet's advice depending on distance travelled.



(d) Pool fleet vehicles are not allocated to Directorates through a centralised allocation process. Rather, Directorates determine their upcoming fleet requirements, and vehicles are sourced through a co-ordinated process.

The Territory has introduced an annual bulk order process whereby all passenger and light commercial vehicles with leases expiring in the upcoming financial year are identified by sgfleet. A matrix of vehicles representing value for money across different vehicle sectors (e.g. small, medium, large passenger vehicles) is also produced by sgfleet. This matrix is based on a similar recommended vehicle listing prepared by sgfleet for the Commonwealth, and is customised to meet specific Territory requirements. Directorates indicate which replacement vehicles they require to be delivered in the upcoming financial year, and sgfleet places orders with manufacturers. Directorates are being encouraged to cut back on overall vehicle numbers, particularly through non-replacement of low kilometre vehicles.

Allocation of vehicles within Directorates occurs at the Directorate level. Work groups within Directorates develop a case for allocation of one or more vehicles. Directorate executives approve proposed vehicles for each bulk order.

(e) Vehicles leased under the Fleet Services Contract (FSC) are disposed of by sgfleet, with a profit share applying where the price received for a vehicle exceeds previously calculated residual value. The Territory recoups funds under this profit share arrangement.

- (3) It is not anticipated that the electric vehicles will be purchased. Rather, the current intention is that they will be leased in accordance with the Territory's FSC participation. Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate contract manages the sgfleet arrangement, and is currently working with sgfleet to source large numbers of electric vehicles to meet the commitments under the Action Plan.

The Action Plan indicates that at least 50% of all newly leased ACT Government fleet passenger vehicles will be zero emissions vehicles in 2019-20 (where fit for purpose). The Action Plan also provides that all newly lease ACT Government passenger fleet vehicles will be zero emissions vehicles from 2020-21 (where fit for purpose). This commitment translates to approximately 266 vehicles during the period 2019-20 to 2021-22. This figure does not allow for anticipated reductions in overall Territory passenger vehicle numbers, and for possible non-selection of electric vehicles in some cases on a fit for purpose basis.

- (4) The Territory's vehicle leases with sgfleet under the FSC are operating leases financed by the Commonwealth Bank. Passenger vehicle leases are typically taken over a 48 month period, although sgfleet may recommend a longer lease period for electric vehicles to reduce the monthly lease cost (encompassing vehicle and maintenance costs costs).
- (5) As with other Territory passenger vehicles, electric vehicles will be leased under the Territory's participation in the Commonwealth's Fleet Services Contract.
- (6) Not applicable, due to anticipated leasing of vehicles.
- (7) The manufacturer cost per vehicle, to be converted into a monthly lease cost by sgfleet, will depend on the particular vehicle selected. Some electric vehicle brands

are typically more expensive than others. An indicative manufacturer price for one small electric passenger vehicle currently available in Australia in small numbers, and anticipated to be more widely available shortly, is \$45,000. sgfleet has calculated a monthly rental for this vehicle of \$1,065 (inclusive of maintenance) taken over 60 months. This monthly rental figure does not include the cost of charging infrastructure.

The Territory has no intention to purchase 600 passenger Electric Vehicles (EVs) in a one off bulk order procurement. EV manufacturers currently have limited numbers of Right Hand Drive passenger vehicles scheduled for Australian delivery. The Right Hand Drive portion of the EV vehicle market represents 10% of the world's production of EVs with the majority of those vehicles being exported to the United Kingdom with smaller numbers of EVs entering Australia.

In April 2015 the Territory has exercised an "Opt In" option arrangement to lease its fleet passenger, light commercial and heavy commercial vehicles through the Commonwealth Fleet Services Contract (FSC) through the Commonwealths contracted vehicle leasing provider sgfleet. It is the intention of the Territory to progressively introduce greater numbers of leased EVs into the passenger vehicle pool. The estimated EV numbers over the first three years of the "Action Plan" are included at item 3 paragraph 2 of this response.

- (8) CMTEDD is currently working with Territory lease provider sgfleet to identify manufacturers with capacity to provide electric vehicles to meet the Territory's requirements.
- (9) That will depend on the particular electric vehicles selected to meet the Territory's leasing requirements. Potential countries of supply include Japan, South Korea, China, Germany, France and the United States.
- (10) sgfleet is currently liaising with electric vehicle manufacturers and dealers to understand their current and anticipated ACT servicing arrangements.
- (11) Budget Committee of Cabinet agreed on 9 April 2018 (18/086/BUD) to the release of 'The ACT's Transition to Zero Emissions Vehicles Action Plan 2018-2021' which includes an action to ensure all newly leased passenger fleet vehicles are zero emissions vehicles from 2020-21 (where fit for purpose).
- (12) Budget Committee of Cabinet.

---

### **Government—carers strategy (Question No 1327)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How does the ACT Government define a young carer and based on this definition, how many (a) young carers are there in the ACT and (b) people are being cared for by young carers.
- (2) How many young carers (a) work full or part-time, (b) study full or part-time or (c) are not employed or studying.

- (3) What services are available to young carers.
- (4) Does the Government provide (a) any training to help carers deal with specific disabilities or health issues, (b) financial support to young carers and (c) any support for culturally and linguistically diverse young carers; if so, what support does the Government provide.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Government acknowledges the diversity of young carers in Canberra, who provide assistance and support in many different ways. This diversity means that it is difficult to establish an agreed definition for young carers, or for carers more generally. Carers ACT, the peak body for carers in the ACT, defines young carers as people aged up to 25 who regularly care for a family member or other person who has a disability, a mental health issue, alcohol and/or drug problems, chronic illness or is frail aged. A young carer may not be the primary carer, but usually has additional responsibilities at home compared to other people their age.
  - (a) According to the 2015 Survey of Disability, Ageing and Carers (SDAC), undertaken by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, there were an estimated 272,200 young carers in Australia. <sup>1</sup> This equated to approximately 1 in 12 (8.3%) people aged under 25 in Australia being carers.<sup>2</sup>

ACT-level SDAC data indicates that as of 2015, 4,000 people aged up to 24 identified as either a primary carer or a carer in the ACT. <sup>3</sup> The ACT-level data in SDAC should be used with caution due to the small sample size of carers.<sup>4</sup>

  - (b) The ACT Government does not collect data on the number of people being cared for by young carers. Carers ACT however reports that in the 2016–17 financial year it supported a total of 184 young carers, who were caring for 144 care recipients. Carers ACT notes that some families have more than one young carer, and others have a young carer supporting more than one person.
- (2) The ACT Government does not collect specific data on the number of young carers who are studying or working. The final report of a research project into the caring responsibilities of young carers, undertaken by the Social Policy Research Centre at the University of New South Wales, based on 2006 ABS data, indicated that:
  - for the carer cohort aged 15-19 years in the ACT in 2006, 74.2 per cent of male carers and 75.9 per cent of female carers were in study, and 44.3 per cent of male carers and 52.4 per cent of female carers were in employment, and
  - for the carer cohort aged 20-24 years in the ACT in 2006, 40.3 per cent of male carers and 39.5 per cent of female carers were in study, and 75.7 per cent of male carers and 72.8 per cent of female carers were in employment.<sup>5</sup>

As this research reflects a previous generation of young carers, it may not reflect the current situation of young carers in the ACT.

- (3) The ACT Government provides a range of supports to assist vulnerable children, young people and their families, through the Child, Youth and Family Services Program. Individual support for young carers is co-ordinated by the Student Engagement area of Education on a case-by-case basis.

The Child, Youth and Family Services Program comprises a mix of services from group programs to case management. While all services funded under the Child, Youth and Family Services Program offer support and services that may be relevant to young carers, one organisation receives dedicated funding to offer targeted supports to young carers.

The Community Services Directorate, through the Child, Youth and Family Services Program, provides funding to Anglicare NSW South, NSW West and ACT to deliver the Young Carers and their Families Engagement and Support Service (also known as CYCLOPS).

CYCLOPS is a program supporting young people aged between 10 and 25 years, who care for a family member who experiences physical or intellectual disability, mental health issues, alcohol and other drug related issues and/or chronic illness.

The service works with the young person and their family, as well as other people identified by the young person as being important to them in their role as a carer, to identify the needs of the young person and their family and promote the health development and wellbeing of the young person.

CYCLOPS provides individual and group activities that build on the strengths of the young person and their family using a case management approach. The service works in partnership and collaboratively with other services to ensure complementary services are provided and that gaps in service provision are addressed and to prevent duplication of services.

During the period July to December 2017, CYCLOPS provided case management support to 56 young carers. In addition to case management support, CYCLOPS offers information, education and support through group activities, newsletters, and school support groups.

Of the 56 young carers engaged in case management support, 100 percent of participants indicated that they were assisted by the supports and services offered by CYCLOPS.

(4)

- (a) ACT Health funds Carers ACT to deliver the Community Access Support Program, which provides education and social support, financial education, and complex family support. This program is not targeted at specific disabilities or health issues, but is applicable across the spectrum of disabilities and health issues. It is not specifically targeted to young carers, but young carers are able to access this program for education and training.

The Community Services Directorate, through the Office for Disability, provides funding to Carers ACT for advocacy services, including advocacy support to help carers deal with disability or health related issues. Carers ACT has recently announced that it is boosting mental health support for young carers by hiring its first counsellor for young carers.

- (b) The ACT Government does not provide direct financial support to young carers. Financial supports for carers, including young carers, such as Carer Payment and Allowance, and the Young Carers Bursary Program, are the responsibility of the Australian Government.

Carers ACT provides financial assistance to young carers in the ACT through a longstanding relationship with Shaw Building Group and its partners. This partnership has enabled Carers ACT to provide scholarships totalling almost \$1 million to young carers over the 13 years of the program.

- (c) The ACT Government delivers support that may be accessed by all young carers, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, through the CYCLOPS program, which provides support that builds on the strengths of each young carer and their family.

<sup>1</sup> Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2016. *Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia: Summary of Findings: 2015*. Catalogue number 4430.0, Canberra: ABS.

<sup>2</sup> Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2017. *Australia's welfare 2017*. Australia's welfare series no. 13. AUS 214. Canberra: AIHW

<sup>3</sup> ABS 2017, 'Table 32.1 All persons, living in households, carer status, by age and sex—2015, estimate', *Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia: Australian Capital Territory: 2015*, Catalogue number 4430.0, Canberra: ABS.

<sup>4</sup> ABS 2017, 'Table 32.2 All persons, living in households, carer status, by age and sex—2015, Relative Standard Error of estimate', *ibid*, Canberra: ABS. The ABS notes there is a relative standard error of 40.1% in the sample for carers less than 15 years of age, and 22.4% in the sample for carers between 15 and 24 years of age.

<sup>5</sup> Cass, B, Brennan, D, Thomson, C, Hill, T, Purcal, C, Hamilton, M, and Adamson, E 2011. Tables 3.8 and 3.9, *Young carers: Social policy impacts of the caring responsibilities of children and young adults*, Report prepared for ARC Linkage Partners, Sydney: SPRC UNSW.

## Government—concession programs (Question No 1340)

**Mr Coe** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

Can the Chief Minister provide a breakdown of the total (a) number of applications for ACT Concessions Programs, (b) number of applications approved and (c) value of payments made, broken down by financial year since (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2015-16, (x) 2016-17 and (xi) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Data is provided in the tables below with the following notes:

- Data is not available for 2007-08 for Home Buyer Concession Scheme. The Pensioner Duty Concession Scheme commenced in 2008-09.
- The ACT Revenue Office does not hold information for the Community Assistance Schemes from 2007 to 2010, and for the Taxi Subsidy Scheme and Electricity and Gas in 2010-11. The Revenue Office did not manage these schemes during that period and this data was not transferred to the Revenue Office.
- Data for 2011-12 to 2016-17 was provided on 12 December 2017 in Question on Notice 25 in the Inquiry into referred 2016-17 Annual and Financial Reports.
- Data for Public Transport does not include trips for April 2018.

Concessions & Community Assistance Schemes	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	Approved	Declined	Total Applicants	\$'000	Approved	Declined	Total Applicants	\$'000
Home Buyer Concession Scheme	DATA NOT AVAILABLE				2,027	79	2,106	14,679
Pensioner Duty Concession Scheme					75	3	78	845
Over 60's Home Bonus Scheme	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0
Disability Duty Concession Scheme	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0

Concessions & Community Assistance Schemes	2007-2008				2008-2009			
	2,502	15	2,517	16,500	2,958	30	2,988	20,500
First Home Owners Gant								
General Rates	DATA NOT AVAILABLE							
Motor Vehicle Registration and Licenses								
Public Transport (total trips)								
Spectacles and Senior Spectacles Schemes								
Electricity and Gas								
Water and Sewerage								
Taxi Subsidy Scheme (active members)								
Funeral Assistance Program								
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$16,500</b>				<b>\$36,024</b>

Concessions & Community Assistance Schemes	2009-2010				2010-2011			
	Approved	Declined	Total Applicants	\$'000	Approved	Declined	Total Applicants	\$'000
Home Buyer Concession Scheme	2,010	136	2,146	13,887	1,546	86	1,632	12,492
Pensioner Duty Concession Scheme	57	5	62	687	91	1	92	1,122
Over 60's Home Bonus Scheme	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0
Disability Duty Concession Scheme	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0
First Home Owners Gant	3,568	40	3,608	23,300	2,816	10	2,826	17,900
General Rates	DATA NOT AVAILABLE				14,406	0	14,406	6,534
Motor Vehicle Registration and Licenses					38,755	0	38,755	2,967
Public Transport (total trips)					8,993,118	0	8,993,118	7,216
Spectacles and Senior Spectacles Schemes					15,743	0	15,743	1,234
Electricity and Gas					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Water and Sewerage					13,626	0	13,626	5,526
Taxi Subsidy Scheme (total trips)					N/A	N/A	0	927
Funeral Assistance Program					33	0	33	133
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$37,874</b>				<b>\$65,507</b>

Concessions & Community Assistance Schemes	2017-April 2018			
	Approved	Declined	Total Applicants	\$'000
Home Buyer Concession Scheme	1,169	71	1,240	6,555
Pensioner Duty Concession Scheme	120	5	125	1,381
Over 60's Home Bonus Scheme	1	1	2	4
Disability Duty Concession Scheme	6	0	6	64
First Home Owners Gant	1,555	17	1,572	14,764
General Rates	14,738	0	14,738	10,565
Motor Vehicle Registration and Licenses	53,446		53,446	3,709
Public Transport (total trips)	5,165,561	0	5,165,561	6,700
Spectacles and Senior Spectacles Schemes	11,260	0	11,260	1,808
Utilities concession	29,331	0	29,331	20,828
Taxi Subsidy Scheme (total trips)	84,091	0	84,091	1,822
Funeral Assistance Program	28	2	30	242
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$71,848</b>

## Government—payments (Question No 1341)

Mr Coe asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the value of payments returned to individuals after successful objection applications or appeals to the ACT Revenue Office or ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal by (a) objection type, (b) payment type, such as charge, interest, penalty and (c) number of recipients, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

If an appeal or objection finds a taxpayer has been overcharged, the relevant taxpayer's account is generally adjusted to reverse the overcharging, plus any necessary adjustments for interest. Not all successful appeals result in the returning of money to taxpayers as the tax in dispute may not have been received by the ACT Revenue Office. There is no separate record keeping of the value of payments returned to taxpayers following successful appeals and objections. Answering this question would require a detailed examination of the accounts of around 500 taxpayers with successful and partially successful objections and appeals over the period since 2007-08. This would entail a considerable diversion of resources resulting in interruptions and delays to the work of the ACT Revenue Office.

---

**Government—payments  
(Question No 1342)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the value of payments made by individuals while their objection applications and appeals were being processed by the ACT Revenue or ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal by (a) objection type, (b) payment type, such as charge, interest, penalty and (c) number of payees, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

There is no separate recording of payments made by taxpayers while objections and appeals are being processed. Providing an answer to this question would require a detailed examination of around 2,700 accounts over the time period between when a taxpayer's objection was received and when it was finalised (either from an objection decision or an ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal ruling). This would entail a considerable diversion of resources, resulting in interruptions and delays to the work of the ACT Revenue Office.

---

**Government—concession programs  
(Question No 1344)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the total (a) number of applications for assistance, rebates, or concessions received by the ACT Revenue Office under community concession and assistance programs, (b) number of applications approved and (c) value of payments made broken down by type of assistance program or scheme during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2015-16, (x) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

This data is provided in the response to Question on Notice 1340.

---

**Government—revenue collection transformation program  
(Question No 1345)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) Can the Treasurer provide an update on the Revenue Collection Transformation Program, including the (a) initiatives and expected outcomes of the program, and whether they have been met, (b) timeframe for implementation, (c) expected total cost of the program, (d) total value spent to date on the program and (e) entities involved in the program, including third party service providers and stakeholder groups.
- (2) Have third parties been engaged to assist with the Revenue Collection Transformation Program, if so, can the Treasurer provide the (a) name of the entity, (b) value of the contract, (c) services provided, (d) procurement method, (e) period of contract, (f) contract name and (g) contract number.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) The Revenue Collection Transformation Program is one aspect of a comprehensive medium-term plan to refocus and modernise the operations of the ACT Revenue Office (ACTRO). The ACT Revenue Office Future Operating Model outlines eight priority areas for reform in the Revenue Office: customers and channels; services and information; policy and legislation processes; people and organisation; leadership and governance; stakeholder engagement; and systems.

The Revenue Collection Transformation Program provides funding for the ACTRO priority reform area - systems - recognising that ACTRO IT systems are reaching the limits of their useful life and will become complex and costly to maintain and support in the future.

Upgraded systems will also contribute to improvements in other ACTRO priority areas by more easily accommodating changes to the tax system, offering improved services to customers, and delivering efficiencies to government. To date the program has:

- Decommissioned the most vulnerable ACTRO legacy IT system (TRS) with all return based taxes (including payroll tax) and conveyance duty being moved to a new IT platform (TRev).
- Deployed a self-service portal to allow taxpayers of return based taxes to register and lodge returns on-line. This portal is being exposed to taxpayers in phased releases.
- Launched a new ACTRO website that provides comprehensive information on ACT taxes for customers.
- Undertaken scoping for consideration of transferring land based taxes (rates and land tax) to the TRev platform.

The move of conveyance duty to the TRev platform has allowed the implementation of Barrier Free conveyancing from September 2017, whereby the point of paying conveyancing duty has moved from before the time of settlement in a property transaction to after the time of settlement thereby providing savings to customers and red tape reductions. The self-service portal allows easy interaction with ACTRO for payroll taxpayers. As part of the implementation of



TRev, the Revenue Office itself has undergone a significant transformation with the creation of a new centralised call centre, the integration of compliance and debt functions, the creation of a legal services unit and a business intelligence capability.

- (b) The first phase of the program runs from 2015-18. The second phase runs until 2019. Further phases of the program have not yet been considered.
- (c) \$30.2 million was allocated to the program in 2014-15. \$2.25 million was allocated in 2017-18. It is likely that the program will marginally exceed the funding envelope when the first phase concludes on 30 June 2018.
- (d) At 30 April 2018 expenditure on the program was \$32,171,312.
- (e) DB Results Pty Ltd and their suppliers (Intrasoft International and Outsystems) and Shared Services ICT

(2) Yes.

- (a) DB Results Pty Ltd
- (b) A number of Statements of Work were developed for different stages of the program:

Statement of Work 1 Release 1 Elaboration	\$478,039
Statement of Work 2 Release 1 Elaboration Stage 2 (Bridging)	\$574,400
Statement of Work 3 Release 1 Elaboration Stage 3	\$2,304,800
Statement of Work 4 Release 1 Construction	\$5,859,810
Statement of Work 5 Release 1 Construction Organisational Change Management –	\$119,600
Statement of Work 6 Release 1 Transition	\$1,024,580
Statement of Work 7 Self Service Portal Blueprint	\$80,000
Statement of Work 8 Release 2 Elaboration Prelude	\$70,000
Statement of Work 9 Tax Self Service Portal	\$1,295,570
Statement of Work 10 Release 2 Elaboration	\$781,780
Statement of Work 13 – Support Services (14/10/17 – 31/12/17)	\$202,500
Statement of Work 14 – Support Services (1/1/2018 – 30/4/17)	\$5459

- (c) Provision of software implementation, maintenance and support services for the ACT Revenue Office Revenue Collection and Management System
- (d) Open Tender
- (e) 4 years – Commenced 9 November 2015
- (f) ACT Revenue Office Revenue Collection and Management System
- (g) 22538.211

## **Land—tax (Question No 1346)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the total revenue captured through land tax broken down by (a) suburb and (b) type of dwelling, such as houses, units or commercial properties, for each financial year from 2007-08 to 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

**Table 1: Commercial properties** (*Note: Land Tax for commercial properties was abolished from 2012-13 onwards*)

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Acton	\$5,141	\$6,045	\$6,646	\$7,228	\$7,694
Ainslie	\$56,963	\$81,355	\$77,858	\$75,454	\$83,262
Amaroo	\$18,301	\$16,948	\$18,119	\$18,395	\$17,737
Aranda	\$12,460	\$16,156	\$17,582	\$18,340	\$18,155
Banks	\$4,431	\$4,961	\$5,461	\$6,109	\$6,782
Barton	\$1,585,112	\$1,950,242	\$1,949,784	\$2,655,019	\$2,516,311
Beard				\$180,838	\$294,218
Belconnen	\$2,560,422	\$3,146,564	\$4,254,034	\$4,315,576	\$3,687,452
Belconnen District	\$32,097	\$70,616	\$69,563	\$70,074	\$68,955
Bonner		\$941	\$8,476	\$52,975	\$51,956
Bonython	\$8,132	\$9,443	\$10,304	\$10,839	\$10,879
Braddon	\$1,827,487	\$2,130,590	\$2,376,682	\$2,587,948	\$2,837,629
Bruce	\$268,843	\$411,327	\$706,676	\$483,232	\$617,853
Calwell	\$111,200	\$137,223	\$145,901	\$134,241	\$130,424
Campbell	\$106,527	\$122,451	\$133,489	\$138,818	\$136,353
Canberra Central	\$38,653	\$41,052	\$40,231	\$41,917	\$41,362
Casey	\$192,401	\$773,449	\$200,607	\$3,257	\$13,727
Chapman	\$10,717	\$12,281	\$13,718	\$14,487	\$13,915
Charnwood	\$79,711	\$91,327	\$98,394	\$118,568	\$113,622
Chifley	\$5,194	\$6,520	\$10,336	\$16,379	\$5,455
Chisholm	\$137,270	\$151,037	\$116,043	\$119,993	\$132,798
City	\$7,112,896	\$9,190,020	\$9,499,391	\$9,632,067	\$9,546,735
Conder	\$216,138	\$247,593	\$262,868	\$271,271	\$262,779
Cook	\$4,407	\$5,579	\$5,969	\$6,060	\$5,834
Coree	\$291	\$332	\$359	\$459	\$1,939
Cotter River	\$62	\$71	\$77	\$80	\$80
Crace					\$9,930
Curtin	\$86,856	\$100,445	\$109,629	\$118,205	\$109,828
Deakin	\$746,902	\$971,101	\$1,134,896	\$1,286,767	\$1,193,763
Dickson	\$943,238	\$1,173,788	\$1,258,143	\$1,283,061	\$1,286,727
Downer	\$6,246	\$7,410	\$8,118	\$8,772	\$8,810
Duffy	\$4,255	\$5,409	\$6,477	\$10,821	\$6,328
Dunlop	\$8,649	\$14,743	\$15,114	\$15,856	\$15,570
Evatt	\$9,939	\$11,186	\$12,141	\$12,377	\$11,840
Fadden	\$5,207	\$5,827	\$6,252	\$6,524	\$6,453
Farrer	\$5,562	\$6,731	\$7,461	\$7,076	\$6,843
Fisher	\$7,346	\$8,476	\$9,193	\$9,523	\$9,254
Florey	\$20,610	\$24,951	\$26,941	\$27,418	\$26,307
Forde		\$10,378	\$25,353	\$43,071	\$31,984
Forrest	\$347,658	\$475,748	\$495,323	\$548,935	\$665,903
Franklin					\$82,203
Fraser	\$3,434	\$4,156	\$4,599	\$4,773	\$4,475
Fyshwick	\$6,179,835	\$7,485,084	\$8,332,702	\$8,906,152	\$8,364,112
Garran	\$33,723	\$40,072	\$43,685	\$45,561	\$44,754
Gilmore	\$576	\$662	\$715	\$748	\$736
Giralang	\$8,620	\$10,554	\$11,493	\$11,779	\$16,335
Gordon	\$6,644	\$7,635	\$8,356	\$8,804	\$8,632
Gowrie	\$14,885	\$16,925	\$18,356	\$19,038	\$18,733
Greenway	\$2,035,764	\$2,453,119	\$2,726,159	\$2,736,366	\$2,659,044
Griffith	\$1,530,959	\$1,722,321	\$1,940,741	\$2,054,255	\$2,003,623
Gungahlin	\$735,026	\$1,091,880	\$1,389,392	\$1,607,800	\$1,560,236
Hackett	\$13,130	\$14,498	\$15,550	\$15,810	\$15,236
Hall	\$50,048	\$71,293	\$77,530	\$80,601	\$78,282
Harrison		\$22	\$25,791	\$85,969	\$131,922

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Hawker	\$129,024	\$145,764	\$180,805	\$181,173	\$131,626
Higgins	\$9,395	\$11,995	\$14,371	\$14,373	\$13,815
Holder	\$5,842	\$6,637	\$7,218	\$7,490	\$7,270
Holt	\$192,235	\$229,605	\$257,288	\$262,024	\$252,217
Hughes	\$20,791	\$23,271	\$25,239	\$25,794	\$24,759
Hume	\$751,002	\$1,138,860	\$1,593,742	\$2,193,699	\$1,930,744
Isaacs	\$14,749	\$22,126	\$23,849	\$28,327	\$23,258
Isabella Plains	\$8,733	\$9,650	\$10,383	\$10,561	\$10,144
Jerrabomberra	\$43,834	\$52,361	\$57,321	\$44,204	\$31,606
Kaleen	\$97,347	\$111,799	\$119,977	\$122,776	\$118,794
Kambah	\$202,309	\$241,538	\$262,477	\$272,834	\$262,950
Kingston	\$848,981	\$1,178,466	\$1,426,741	\$1,585,505	\$1,681,124
Kowen	\$1,047	\$1,139	\$1,199	\$1,237	\$1,237
Latham	\$7,842	\$9,426	\$10,543	\$10,069	\$8,756
Lawson	\$1,264	\$1,498	\$1,660	\$1,760	\$1,723
Lyneham	\$226,806	\$333,037	\$593,931	\$644,005	\$470,833
Lyons	\$18,155	\$21,406	\$23,869	\$25,371	\$23,557
Macarthur	\$436	\$498	\$537	\$561	\$552
Macgregor	\$5,534	\$11,690	\$12,347	\$12,623	\$12,256
Macquarie	\$175,049	\$345,219	\$358,486	\$368,680	\$361,635
Majura	\$296,846	\$360,149	\$415,733	\$461,431	\$509,896
Mawson	\$244,119	\$269,265	\$289,902	\$293,344	\$281,828
McKellar	\$17,913	\$19,923	\$21,155	\$21,844	\$30,605
Melba	\$15,101	\$17,026	\$18,479	\$19,002	\$18,318
Mitchell	\$1,584,755	\$1,892,315	\$2,171,582	\$2,229,587	\$2,124,636
Monash	\$11,240	\$12,863	\$13,998	\$14,469	\$13,996
Narrabundah	\$100,308	\$138,242	\$144,042	\$136,465	\$127,008
Ngunnawal	\$28,534	\$31,439	\$29,003	\$30,266	\$30,622
Nicholls	\$107,424	\$146,993	\$144,754	\$155,000	\$189,672
O'Connor	\$38,991	\$44,393	\$48,800	\$50,497	\$49,202
O'Malley	\$228	\$261	\$282	\$294	\$288
Oaks Estate	\$7,233	\$8,226	\$8,724	\$9,074	\$8,845
Paddys River	\$3,781	\$4,164	\$4,463	\$4,547	\$4,391
Page	\$4,933	\$5,483	\$5,935	\$6,046	\$11,297
Palmerston	\$7,817	\$8,916	\$9,733	\$10,242	\$10,046
Parkes	\$801	\$917	\$988	\$1,032	\$1,015
Pearce	\$4,746	\$5,371	\$5,837	\$6,128	\$6,016
Phillip	\$2,810,710	\$3,636,365	\$3,978,648	\$3,971,457	\$3,699,880
Pialligo	\$29,727	\$40,275	\$47,456	\$55,102	\$61,368
Red Hill	\$35,471	\$39,847	\$42,810	\$44,173	\$43,238
Reid	\$4,252	\$4,967	\$4,173	\$587	\$587
Richardson	\$8,278	\$9,147	\$9,825	\$9,986	\$9,611
Rivett	\$4,634	\$5,668	\$6,655	\$7,410	\$7,120
Scullin	\$19,812	\$23,236	\$25,913	\$27,170	\$26,584
Spence	\$11,446	\$13,576	\$15,301	\$15,933	\$15,263
Stirling	\$4,791	\$5,585	\$5,961	\$6,176	\$6,018
Stromlo	\$3,139	\$5,198	\$5,754	\$5,692	\$5,154
Symonston	\$356,307	\$562,868	\$722,932	\$812,855	\$797,305
Tharwa	\$2,356	\$2,703	\$3,009	\$3,304	\$3,240
Theodore	\$2,361	\$2,654	\$2,872	\$2,951	\$2,850
Torrens	\$8,006	\$8,881	\$9,532	\$9,719	\$9,387
Tuggeranong	\$23,818	\$30,637	\$36,631	\$40,086	\$38,537
Turner	\$315,759	\$406,549	\$407,118	\$409,724	\$389,621
Wanniassa	\$339,248	\$386,257	\$407,338	\$417,936	\$403,183
Waramanga	\$13,913	\$18,980	\$21,844	\$22,517	\$19,531
Watson	\$98,559	\$119,624	\$129,922	\$170,862	\$142,475
Weetangera	\$4,023	\$4,717	\$5,031	\$5,138	\$4,981
Weston	\$340,442	\$380,972	\$410,925	\$413,666	\$398,250
Weston Creek	\$104,263	\$119,966	\$129,632	\$135,652	\$133,352
Woden Valley	\$294	\$338	\$365	\$383	\$377
Yarralumla	\$252,648	\$290,134	\$305,055	\$317,707	\$313,414

**Table 2: Residential houses**

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Ainslie	\$1,082,110	\$1,227,723	\$1,339,635	\$1,529,608	\$1,662,647	\$1,960,011
Amaroo	\$370,103	\$451,055	\$519,751	\$604,741	\$718,470	\$717,569
Aranda	\$301,605	\$356,990	\$424,461	\$458,381	\$530,627	\$608,569
Banks	\$174,074	\$196,410	\$251,863	\$336,346	\$413,869	\$400,937
Barton	\$86,075	\$112,847	\$116,295	\$117,823	\$205,652	\$143,601
Belconnen	\$356,545	\$358,943	\$416,745	\$215,735	\$253,552	\$279,735
Bonner			\$12,814	\$86,591	\$224,145	\$367,464
Bonython	\$117,647	\$151,224	\$211,800	\$339,991	\$292,580	\$280,131
Braddon	\$469,912	\$533,071	\$551,644	\$592,450	\$608,220	\$727,566
Bruce	\$219,976	\$475,174	\$386,727	\$464,751	\$577,803	\$528,259
Calwell	\$268,648	\$318,555	\$372,196	\$469,601	\$545,681	\$518,885
Campbell	\$746,582	\$870,497	\$952,103	\$1,074,547	\$1,088,168	\$1,290,109
Casey			\$98,461	\$290,064	\$342,572	\$477,239
Chapman	\$223,276	\$237,417	\$264,794	\$315,417	\$372,962	\$395,054
Charnwood	\$111,587	\$139,020	\$165,758	\$230,169	\$261,587	\$234,279
Chifley	\$386,407	\$441,151	\$532,148	\$617,853	\$706,288	\$761,590
Chisholm	\$221,287	\$260,665	\$328,752	\$420,645	\$530,052	\$512,104
City						
Conder	\$178,342	\$215,924	\$258,207	\$319,823	\$386,657	\$362,705
Cook	\$248,631	\$298,066	\$317,614	\$373,139	\$436,121	\$516,041
Coombs						
Crace	\$376,326	\$1,588,525	\$407,075	\$16,080	\$129,321	\$301,251
Curtin	\$732,806	\$854,818	\$988,864	\$1,202,064	\$1,341,968	\$1,495,630
Deakin	\$1,015,777	\$1,110,482	\$1,193,529	\$1,311,598	\$1,340,875	\$1,585,021
Denman Prospect						
Dickson	\$455,675	\$518,066	\$531,687	\$606,953	\$704,701	\$881,194
Downer	\$724,097	\$852,579	\$926,598	\$1,080,908	\$1,221,548	\$1,373,643
Duffy	\$433,440	\$482,434	\$351,698	\$309,989	\$387,856	\$424,744
Dunlop	\$252,292	\$333,894	\$403,303	\$514,564	\$589,850	\$548,455
Evatt	\$299,244	\$374,845	\$414,968	\$473,278	\$536,401	\$534,929
Fadden	\$125,537	\$140,369	\$163,245	\$203,021	\$237,911	\$255,046
Farrer	\$305,686	\$381,388	\$420,175	\$476,250	\$505,947	\$557,350
Fisher	\$271,006	\$303,568	\$314,805	\$352,396	\$418,212	\$465,388
Florey	\$341,807	\$396,187	\$429,326	\$488,037	\$603,806	\$598,456
Flynn	\$168,530	\$198,637	\$238,394	\$295,326	\$338,077	\$327,892
Forde	\$14,371	\$101,315	\$201,575	\$304,888	\$323,881	\$424,895
Forrest	\$623,922	\$708,850	\$709,797	\$758,485	\$830,096	\$864,563
Franklin	\$6,488	\$23,557	\$169,089	\$354,052	\$525,024	\$657,836
Fraser	\$52,504	\$66,622	\$81,712	\$96,739	\$114,185	\$114,309
Garran	\$446,670	\$535,685	\$581,517	\$629,235	\$694,994	\$846,513
Gilmore	\$132,915	\$155,740	\$194,212	\$215,644	\$234,169	\$223,843
Giralang	\$210,544	\$256,795	\$294,367	\$352,270	\$407,473	\$394,900
Gordon	\$326,829	\$361,244	\$414,934	\$502,909	\$585,226	\$521,277
Gowrie	\$110,156	\$119,788	\$135,067	\$170,063	\$221,089	\$202,560
Greenway	\$46,044	\$59,488	\$67,005	\$81,060	\$92,112	\$79,438
Griffith	\$957,477	\$1,027,950	\$1,169,872	\$1,297,740	\$1,186,706	\$1,408,431
Gungahlin	\$654,119	\$802,257	\$898,657	\$1,045,884	\$1,099,337	\$1,036,707
Hackett	\$344,745	\$388,694	\$432,943	\$496,715	\$553,676	\$611,936
Hall	\$53,016	\$57,881	\$62,988	\$59,348	\$60,105	\$58,725
Harrison	\$236,144	\$460,605	\$656,550	\$866,694	\$910,790	\$906,187
Hawker	\$144,057	\$186,168	\$215,433	\$232,596	\$255,540	\$245,285
Higgins	\$158,534	\$186,799	\$214,839	\$257,729	\$320,279	\$317,796
Holder	\$155,301	\$170,444	\$190,749	\$230,564	\$288,943	\$330,533
Holt	\$192,883	\$230,789	\$255,222	\$311,147	\$362,577	\$345,897
Hughes	\$447,421	\$513,332	\$546,392	\$591,754	\$619,416	\$689,495
Isaacs	\$245,909	\$293,844	\$344,573	\$426,678	\$456,967	\$517,741
Isabella Plains	\$167,890	\$201,542	\$235,273	\$300,131	\$358,633	\$343,018
Jacka						\$405

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	
Kaleen	\$554,760	\$676,397	\$778,277	\$949,928	\$1,109,258	\$1,140,392
Kambah	\$846,283	\$975,548	\$1,062,579	\$1,216,075	\$1,420,270	\$1,352,220
Kingston	\$161,425	\$257,237	\$457,424	\$633,174	\$748,154	\$382,585
Latham	\$173,747	\$203,497	\$229,002	\$295,831	\$343,337	\$314,322
Lawson						
Lyneham	\$396,340	\$497,944	\$589,409	\$663,583	\$732,824	\$781,357
Lyons	\$311,718	\$436,733	\$565,721	\$655,514	\$665,887	\$708,688
Macarthur	\$44,261	\$53,522	\$57,883	\$64,007	\$84,170	\$100,960
Macgregor	\$122,664	\$174,521	\$275,949	\$348,150	\$448,602	\$457,393
Macquarie	\$309,701	\$356,642	\$356,460	\$391,254	\$473,299	\$527,741
Mawson	\$285,873	\$367,131	\$458,396	\$530,770	\$588,097	\$655,017
McKellar	\$162,685	\$195,350	\$218,082	\$230,987	\$269,819	\$271,583
Melba	\$135,924	\$158,788	\$180,057	\$225,665	\$248,746	\$240,312
Monash	\$234,038	\$271,887	\$313,841	\$381,618	\$442,015	\$422,858
Moncrieff						
Narrabundah	\$986,677	\$1,187,264	\$1,418,730	\$1,701,520	\$1,900,143	\$2,074,521
Ngunnawal	\$560,241	\$627,105	\$701,206	\$845,091	\$974,370	\$944,066
Nicholls	\$382,595	\$434,294	\$458,858	\$520,774	\$616,191	\$631,886
O'Connor	\$1,477,578	\$1,702,341	\$1,805,597	\$1,877,234	\$1,982,005	\$2,374,677
O'Malley	\$573,205	\$545,269	\$562,690	\$589,773	\$559,946	\$726,600
Oaks Estate	\$4,138	\$5,114	\$7,087	\$13,760	\$17,541	\$17,963
Oxley	\$72,380	\$83,165	\$103,083	\$125,221	\$147,627	\$143,805
Paddys River	\$130	\$190	\$598	\$1,194	\$1,846	\$1,598
Page	\$326,298	\$385,498	\$430,078	\$489,867	\$589,236	\$604,833
Palmerston	\$293,057	\$320,980	\$353,358	\$415,292	\$489,989	\$492,030
Pearce	\$238,020	\$290,402	\$353,032	\$421,707	\$495,783	\$560,968
Phillip	\$110,555	\$129,324	\$140,591	\$159,336	\$171,533	\$163,690
Pialligo	\$6,370	\$8,167	\$9,963	\$12,241	\$12,721	\$14,717
Red Hill	\$1,012,374	\$1,168,256	\$1,299,644	\$1,339,073	\$1,346,983	\$1,722,526
Reid	\$333,632	\$351,158	\$357,270	\$357,551	\$375,158	\$403,892
Richardson	\$101,259	\$128,338	\$138,719	\$183,539	\$223,108	\$218,735
Rivett	\$231,013	\$264,738	\$294,394	\$342,451	\$394,864	\$399,613
Scullin	\$217,449	\$253,518	\$274,841	\$296,912	\$342,912	\$331,071
Spence	\$84,611	\$113,140	\$132,588	\$170,466	\$191,329	\$182,223
Stirling	\$120,470	\$128,403	\$142,741	\$166,653	\$186,885	\$202,974
Symonston	\$12,485	\$20,817	\$11,378			
Taylor						
Tharwa	\$6,325	\$6,648	\$5,172	\$5,172	\$5,411	\$3,359
Theodore	\$149,846	\$159,110	\$171,991	\$214,746	\$250,368	\$223,968
Throsby						
Torrens	\$248,877	\$281,435	\$356,706	\$457,755	\$529,748	\$569,823
Tuggeranong	\$6,242	\$7,082	\$7,922	\$8,832	\$9,158	\$11,088
Turner	\$606,224	\$643,677	\$687,268	\$734,930	\$846,794	\$933,414
Uriarra		\$2,262	\$3,717	\$6,205	\$6,925	\$4,844
Wanniassa	\$370,111	\$430,555	\$510,936	\$677,694	\$827,352	\$801,127
Waramanga	\$220,980	\$253,216	\$289,422	\$339,999	\$397,688	\$422,438
Watson	\$508,279	\$609,100	\$682,988	\$771,976	\$856,539	\$1,000,747
Weetangera	\$166,716	\$202,434	\$256,309	\$305,661	\$337,986	\$386,245
Weston	\$258,817	\$310,635	\$360,933	\$409,245	\$476,453	\$533,376
Wright					\$4,617	\$119,371
Yarralumla	\$1,060,679	\$1,198,520	\$1,312,707	\$1,419,258	\$1,416,621	\$1,611,858

Table 2: Residential houses (continued)

Suburb	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD)
Ainslie	\$2,000,838	\$1,572,728	\$1,599,617	\$1,682,780	\$1,620,824
Amaroo	\$773,139	\$837,563	\$834,269	\$869,812	\$683,486
Aranda	\$644,191	\$574,022	\$601,805	\$647,913	\$453,278
Banks	\$436,955	\$503,202	\$511,388	\$498,308	\$499,426
Barton	\$159,641	\$183,650	\$148,452	\$127,513	\$120,872
Belconnen	\$347,615	\$366,832	\$371,565	\$387,972	\$392,593

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Bonner	\$478,826	\$737,133	\$791,854	\$894,496	\$1,009,415
Bonython	\$282,944	\$313,357	\$323,782	\$315,491	\$330,241
Braddon	\$732,773	\$573,203	\$582,222	\$637,154	\$668,770
Bruce	\$576,811	\$629,741	\$683,297	\$773,430	\$733,972
Calwell	\$547,445	\$580,995	\$570,201	\$623,125	\$481,197
Campbell	\$1,243,895	\$898,752	\$922,569	\$1,062,098	\$1,086,608
Casey	\$680,267	\$831,226	\$857,422	\$938,191	\$766,860
Chapman	\$381,766	\$347,363	\$330,093	\$356,054	\$320,135
Charnwood	\$247,026	\$295,730	\$323,951	\$338,043	\$278,282
Chifley	\$822,797	\$710,160	\$681,958	\$696,725	\$542,194
Chisholm	\$521,091	\$513,751	\$510,111	\$526,563	\$533,039
City	\$84,610			\$38,226	
Conder	\$374,431	\$410,693	\$412,599	\$431,410	\$445,440
Cook	\$554,590	\$448,246	\$408,738	\$431,453	\$328,379
Coombs	\$812	\$119,680	\$107,662	\$270,749	\$196,497
Crace	\$467,946	\$719,638	\$775,496	\$913,130	\$763,095
Curtin	\$1,596,760	\$1,327,982	\$1,299,364	\$1,376,014	\$997,303
Deakin	\$1,637,718	\$1,256,064	\$1,213,757	\$1,254,194	\$901,840
Denman Prospect				\$415,094	\$198,602
Dickson	\$981,718	\$863,624	\$913,483	\$1,050,139	\$995,339
Downer	\$1,443,563	\$1,299,960	\$1,400,360	\$1,492,881	\$1,135,832
Duffy	\$474,074	\$435,137	\$415,657	\$417,650	\$306,722
Dunlop	\$581,044	\$728,299	\$741,612	\$738,572	\$785,319
Evatt	\$554,035	\$588,470	\$635,771	\$667,199	\$716,458
Fadden	\$278,065	\$240,368	\$229,961	\$265,925	\$206,637
Farrer	\$612,139	\$545,895	\$524,694	\$530,177	\$574,555
Fisher	\$523,099	\$482,812	\$465,693	\$473,246	\$343,808
Florey	\$652,667	\$662,883	\$656,054	\$679,677	\$699,525
Flynn	\$353,979	\$355,219	\$350,446	\$368,460	\$298,202
Forde	\$429,614	\$516,417	\$531,925	\$578,555	\$642,802
Forrest	\$885,605	\$652,138	\$653,984	\$684,356	\$642,904
Franklin	\$748,445	\$896,128	\$953,318	\$1,085,118	\$1,152,663
Fraser	\$125,667	\$136,194	\$138,077	\$139,231	\$138,642
Garran	\$923,868	\$763,185	\$700,065	\$749,469	\$758,964
Gilmore	\$254,872	\$279,612	\$289,644	\$293,661	\$293,905
Giralang	\$412,180	\$428,878	\$459,399	\$509,461	\$405,983
Gordon	\$573,632	\$644,184	\$636,520	\$681,824	\$555,762
Gowrie	\$220,472	\$273,062	\$265,847	\$282,035	\$280,033
Greenway	\$83,915	\$94,887	\$188,507	\$251,940	\$152,347
Griffith	\$1,393,182	\$1,223,760	\$1,213,165	\$1,016,235	\$980,598
Gungahlin	\$1,149,163	\$1,353,394	\$1,404,019	\$1,516,948	\$1,588,292
Hackett	\$659,794	\$542,356	\$552,853	\$601,112	\$501,986
Hall	\$52,322	\$42,621	\$35,830	\$37,741	\$33,125
Harrison	\$1,041,181	\$1,284,518	\$1,338,288	\$1,496,007	\$1,210,547
Hawker	\$277,904	\$279,812	\$254,433	\$281,588	\$305,369
Higgins	\$347,239	\$358,169	\$368,188	\$444,991	\$416,995
Holder	\$404,363	\$388,607	\$392,095	\$407,795	\$393,478
Holt	\$395,398	\$461,376	\$478,436	\$504,561	\$523,172
Hughes	\$790,600	\$651,312	\$615,768	\$659,270	\$685,912
Isaacs	\$537,598	\$449,803	\$434,915	\$440,391	\$432,233
Isabella Plains	\$346,805	\$404,282	\$414,074	\$440,148	\$470,640
Jacka	\$6,143	\$23,214	\$51,054	\$29,900	\$35,144
Kaleen	\$1,217,175	\$1,221,772	\$1,277,099	\$1,417,303	\$1,443,940
Kambah	\$1,401,029	\$1,489,805	\$1,498,832	\$1,641,979	\$1,752,230
Kingston	\$323,325	\$259,921	\$302,263	\$367,357	\$346,919
Latham	\$350,407	\$381,246	\$381,555	\$422,431	\$462,106
Lawson			\$243,058	\$191,151	\$239,574
Lyneham	\$817,593	\$721,288	\$733,376	\$776,176	\$591,508
Lyons	\$743,158	\$598,254	\$599,782	\$647,903	\$627,267
Macarthur	\$121,398	\$137,285	\$126,187	\$135,685	\$132,756
Macgregor	\$519,814	\$714,225	\$774,168	\$847,002	\$901,411

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Macquarie	\$597,836	\$550,928	\$559,607	\$615,605	\$588,555
Mawson	\$681,100	\$570,153	\$537,162	\$574,876	\$426,664
McKellar	\$301,244	\$314,936	\$308,823	\$317,548	\$240,548
Melba	\$250,368	\$262,409	\$270,294	\$305,378	\$328,324
Monash	\$464,667	\$505,760	\$513,599	\$541,890	\$429,209
Moncrieff			\$17,816	\$377,991	\$323,134
Narrabundah	\$2,109,596	\$1,712,465	\$1,729,348	\$1,811,037	\$1,426,479
Ngunnawal	\$1,089,126	\$1,455,835	\$1,559,356	\$1,656,218	\$1,763,037
Nicholls	\$660,103	\$629,026	\$571,350	\$591,083	\$618,635
O'Connor	\$2,372,664	\$1,987,447	\$2,048,255	\$2,141,244	\$2,099,538
O'Malley	\$751,698	\$578,787	\$588,247	\$635,834	\$627,901
Oaks Estate	\$19,312	\$20,462	\$21,598	\$24,051	\$27,019
Oxley	\$134,520	\$139,062	\$127,640	\$125,988	\$136,097
Paddys River	\$1,598	\$1,995	\$2,040	\$2,185	\$2,315
Page	\$638,392	\$595,044	\$601,877	\$655,390	\$687,415
Palmerston	\$520,323	\$594,326	\$623,622	\$671,514	\$707,378
Pearce	\$611,899	\$492,165	\$444,096	\$455,844	\$444,692
Phillip	\$299,141	\$362,316	\$381,858	\$501,718	\$420,403
Pialligo	\$14,855	\$14,713	\$17,464	\$18,177	\$7,863
Red Hill	\$1,705,979	\$1,248,508	\$1,207,675	\$1,206,120	\$1,148,999
Reid	\$371,743	\$290,950	\$307,766	\$342,836	\$365,563
Richardson	\$232,766	\$267,954	\$289,329	\$313,001	\$241,773
Rivett	\$445,019	\$450,720	\$446,598	\$496,586	\$519,285
Scullin	\$391,750	\$390,320	\$434,310	\$479,095	\$360,258
Spence	\$195,378	\$208,171	\$223,620	\$256,823	\$193,854
Stirling	\$231,547	\$219,230	\$217,920	\$222,972	\$187,966
Symonston					
Taylor					\$30,208
Tharwa	\$3,688	\$4,409	\$4,808	\$5,323	\$6,923
Theodore	\$247,542	\$299,588	\$313,509	\$309,082	\$238,936
Throsby					\$113,419
Torrens	\$558,735	\$496,482	\$476,018	\$453,422	\$442,154
Tuggeranong	\$11,177	\$8,603	\$8,648	\$8,793	\$8,153
Turner	\$1,005,416	\$763,642	\$744,212	\$824,769	\$616,802
Uriarra Village	\$3,162	\$1,929	\$3,479	\$5,095	\$7,908
Wanniassa	\$786,125	\$835,113	\$851,042	\$854,275	\$861,200
Waramanga	\$456,774	\$428,407	\$424,787	\$430,366	\$440,743
Watson	\$1,148,210	\$1,092,259	\$1,097,136	\$1,172,824	\$1,350,134
Weetangera	\$410,678	\$362,809	\$343,164	\$373,722	\$295,555
Weston	\$563,852	\$487,076	\$565,130	\$791,459	\$836,238
Wright	\$218,201	\$300,484	\$268,866	\$249,919	\$170,612
Yarralumla	\$1,707,079	\$1,218,147	\$1,159,659	\$1,240,373	\$1,230,720

**Table 3: Residential apartments**

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Ainslie	\$104,298	\$117,008	\$132,308	\$176,110	\$178,813	\$172,475
Amaroo	\$74,141	\$86,984	\$91,078	\$102,548	\$120,518	\$118,143
Aranda	\$14,874	\$17,099	\$21,266	\$23,942	\$31,072	\$30,960
Banks	\$39,887	\$46,352	\$52,582	\$66,362	\$72,974	\$71,972
Barton	\$240,058	\$292,344	\$353,924	\$379,017	\$432,389	\$439,323
Belconnen	\$338,074	\$382,209	\$444,168	\$563,219	\$642,951	\$681,150
Bonner					\$6,638	\$24,710
Bonython	\$91,333	\$109,637	\$137,389	\$176,953	\$197,583	\$210,858
Braddon	\$470,732	\$568,099	\$639,866	\$734,975	\$838,323	\$884,263
Bruce	\$273,829	\$370,650	\$433,857	\$526,874	\$623,355	\$620,845
Calwell	\$36,554	\$41,761	\$50,753	\$60,648	\$68,384	\$74,517
Campbell	\$115,204	\$128,153	\$145,187	\$170,741	\$192,454	\$207,787
Casey				\$10,088	\$20,883	\$27,673
Chapman	\$893	\$952	\$1,054	\$1,228	\$1,403	\$2,563
Charnwood	\$12,804	\$14,431	\$18,419	\$22,653	\$26,873	\$27,353

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	
Chifley	\$72,022	\$89,958	\$104,415	\$121,522	\$154,525	\$173,005
Chisholm	\$4,686	\$4,403	\$4,558	\$7,309	\$10,859	\$11,857
City	\$172,025	\$230,730	\$270,844	\$321,558	\$317,797	\$312,988
Conder	\$37,272	\$41,397	\$44,796	\$48,226	\$53,212	\$55,363
Cook	\$83,967	\$94,148	\$107,076	\$124,229	\$139,973	\$133,957
Coombs						
Crace						
Curtin	\$68,656	\$79,696	\$93,860	\$120,043	\$143,673	\$148,415
Deakin	\$55,899	\$64,331	\$73,986	\$82,801	\$140,593	\$171,439
Dickson	\$39,443	\$45,132	\$50,134	\$64,147	\$114,694	\$127,544
Downer	\$48,107	\$55,734	\$64,291	\$74,084	\$88,063	\$88,658
Duffy	\$19,293	\$23,819	\$27,961	\$32,675	\$35,553	\$34,658
Dunlop	\$7,274	\$8,095	\$9,991	\$11,937	\$17,807	\$20,620
Evatt	\$11,604	\$15,641	\$21,394	\$29,091	\$36,366	\$36,075
Fadden	\$4,094	\$4,557	\$4,157	\$5,901	\$7,932	\$8,124
Farrer	\$35,316	\$44,271	\$50,069	\$52,650	\$59,881	\$67,308
Fisher	\$10,535	\$12,530	\$18,074	\$24,699	\$26,052	\$26,099
Florey	\$79,384	\$86,314	\$99,697	\$125,441	\$146,650	\$148,622
Flynn	\$1,911	\$3,951	\$5,021	\$8,304	\$9,447	\$12,996
Forde				\$1,424	\$30,272	\$55,381
Forrest	\$292,475	\$254,667	\$282,068	\$297,237	\$312,872	\$425,105
Franklin			\$793	\$7,056	\$26,081	\$63,310
Fraser	\$3,912	\$5,752	\$5,952	\$7,653	\$9,431	\$13,776
Garran	\$75,501	\$86,567	\$106,026	\$116,862	\$138,966	\$149,675
Gilmore	\$8,903	\$10,820	\$14,376	\$31,453	\$37,168	\$36,196
Giralang	\$13,995	\$17,854	\$20,861	\$27,030	\$29,776	\$28,965
Gordon	\$78,936	\$90,324	\$97,206	\$112,332	\$132,492	\$142,319
Gowrie	\$2,911	\$3,051	\$3,408	\$4,930	\$5,732	\$6,670
Greenway	\$118,089	\$145,618	\$159,439	\$195,191	\$229,437	\$241,203
Griffith	\$526,272	\$593,465	\$664,467	\$738,575	\$809,531	\$811,293
Gungahlin	\$70,647	\$92,594	\$105,854	\$122,010	\$169,096	\$181,417
Hackett	\$58,741	\$70,109	\$64,750	\$72,773	\$79,535	\$78,762
Hall						
Harrison	\$9,255	\$16,234	\$23,471	\$35,174	\$41,215	\$62,452
Hawker	\$79,777	\$87,393	\$94,984	\$115,121	\$136,020	\$138,653
Higgins	\$6,469	\$8,109	\$11,330	\$13,891	\$16,125	\$15,701
Holder	\$28,815	\$33,253	\$39,608	\$48,483	\$56,169	\$64,626
Holt	\$61,922	\$66,377	\$75,464	\$88,213	\$92,962	\$96,086
Hughes	\$40,982	\$43,769	\$44,910	\$53,576	\$60,224	\$64,246
Isaacs	\$66,625	\$74,926	\$81,208	\$87,316	\$100,557	\$97,802
Isabella Plains	\$50,712	\$56,104	\$59,970	\$71,021	\$86,575	\$92,521
Jacka						
Jerrabomberra	\$236					
Kaleen	\$25,623	\$28,404	\$28,919	\$39,142	\$45,441	\$45,393
Kambah	\$74,843	\$81,291	\$92,013	\$111,841	\$137,368	\$146,679
Kingston	\$840,890	\$967,375	\$1,064,781	\$1,215,790	\$1,315,804	\$1,336,794
Latham	\$15,998	\$16,969	\$17,998	\$21,616	\$26,639	\$28,301
Lawson						
Lynham	\$205,442	\$242,498	\$269,375	\$319,916	\$413,014	\$464,837
Lyons	\$103,053	\$116,491	\$135,399	\$159,656	\$193,531	\$206,688
Macarthur	\$2,390	\$2,434	\$2,423	\$2,848	\$3,354	\$3,398
Macgregor	\$4,498	\$5,291	\$9,942	\$20,311	\$33,592	\$42,468
Macquarie	\$45,323	\$59,081	\$76,484	\$87,021	\$98,732	\$94,219
Mawson	\$125,461	\$148,911	\$171,831	\$197,291	\$233,230	\$243,094
McKellar	\$10,821	\$12,393	\$12,861	\$14,595	\$16,345	\$15,849
Melba	\$19,810	\$23,928	\$29,424	\$35,517	\$41,095	\$41,689
Monash	\$66,479	\$75,186	\$84,400	\$101,509	\$115,147	\$120,204
Moncrieff						
Narrabundah	\$150,806	\$180,102	\$218,210	\$241,236	\$266,809	\$269,334
Ngunnawal	\$96,408	\$112,742	\$127,602	\$144,479	\$167,635	\$179,563
Nicholls	\$97,184	\$105,818	\$112,558	\$125,056	\$146,085	\$152,646



Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
O'Connor	\$164,596	\$206,937	\$226,800	\$283,272	\$318,375
O'Malley	\$36,565	\$43,782	\$63,365	\$101,681	\$125,096
Oaks Estate	\$3,405	\$3,610	\$3,546	\$3,402	\$3,689
Oxley	\$20,838	\$25,228	\$26,660	\$32,075	\$35,977
Page	\$35,434	\$41,808	\$54,318	\$70,366	\$86,308
Palmerston	\$219,556	\$243,217	\$265,953	\$303,635	\$348,663
Pearce	\$72,505	\$82,682	\$91,675	\$99,485	\$109,253
Phillip	\$274,858	\$309,693	\$344,847	\$389,335	\$447,312
Red Hill	\$125,096	\$147,514	\$193,279	\$203,963	\$243,596
Reid	\$110,502	\$118,856	\$129,640	\$148,138	\$163,230
Richardson	\$5,263	\$5,822	\$5,577	\$7,308	\$10,684
Rivett	\$8,021	\$8,133	\$9,914	\$11,609	\$14,727
Scullin	\$31,741	\$39,720	\$43,315	\$49,193	\$65,255
Spence	\$1,453	\$2,070	\$3,663	\$5,534	\$10,105
Stirling	\$25,186	\$30,498	\$33,499	\$37,654	\$45,118
Theodore	\$19,564	\$21,098	\$21,240	\$25,894	\$33,960
Torrens	\$22,499	\$25,891	\$29,013	\$34,528	\$37,954
Turner	\$350,682	\$423,810	\$476,251	\$551,702	\$644,585
Wanniassa	\$29,501	\$34,884	\$44,326	\$60,269	\$71,057
Waramanga	\$18,304	\$18,611	\$21,075	\$25,856	\$30,891
Watson	\$141,418	\$150,880	\$161,991	\$189,200	\$220,932
Weetangera	\$27,626	\$32,914	\$38,930	\$48,098	\$45,964
Weston	\$30,183	\$36,057	\$37,264	\$43,305	\$51,412
Wright					
Yarralumla	\$250,428	\$281,643	\$342,862	\$363,823	\$396,681

Table 3: Residential apartments (continued)

Suburb	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD)
Ainslie	\$175,031	\$185,996	\$201,480	\$209,961	\$250,922
Amaroo	\$123,113	\$183,779	\$181,676	\$192,271	\$208,203
Aranda	\$29,478	\$49,259	\$36,137	\$40,559	\$39,823
Banks	\$81,292	\$126,449	\$129,570	\$140,535	\$186,051
Barton	\$451,267	\$734,796	\$853,843	\$921,883	\$1,404,995
Belconnen	\$762,552	\$2,242,138	\$2,384,264	\$2,651,112	\$3,578,259
Bonner	\$45,284	\$103,328	\$111,419	\$129,811	\$176,927
Bonython	\$217,662	\$392,833	\$400,011	\$418,992	\$563,346
Braddon	\$980,772	\$2,285,220	\$2,646,151	\$2,881,535	\$4,006,561
Bruce	\$701,766	\$1,660,798	\$1,747,642	\$1,924,132	\$2,580,229
Calwell	\$80,995	\$163,122	\$169,090	\$182,074	\$187,439
Campbell	\$224,273	\$353,144	\$375,313	\$425,870	\$852,838
Casey	\$40,971	\$155,969	\$187,940	\$233,995	\$228,564
Chapman	\$1,314	\$1,800	\$1,862	\$9,715	\$16,648
Charmwood	\$30,229	\$65,085	\$63,715	\$67,326	\$68,922
Chifley	\$205,859	\$324,457	\$329,589	\$349,482	\$368,239
Chisholm	\$22,938	\$23,124	\$23,113	\$23,473	\$33,006
City	\$388,771	\$1,518,128	\$1,580,864	\$1,806,356	\$2,433,962
Conder	\$62,319	\$115,221	\$118,957	\$123,359	\$157,683
Cook	\$146,981	\$217,807	\$222,399	\$233,776	\$266,758
Coombs			\$13,089	\$91,235	\$110,243
Crace	\$2,144	\$40,018	\$97,865	\$124,490	\$131,856
Curtin	\$155,585	\$260,547	\$286,473	\$325,138	\$355,537
Deakin	\$180,626	\$246,279	\$245,166	\$262,581	\$270,892
Dickson	\$155,675	\$320,078	\$356,613	\$437,269	\$629,927
Downer	\$91,158	\$147,975	\$159,391	\$186,741	\$206,712
Duffy	\$42,010	\$82,458	\$96,914	\$94,872	\$100,996
Dunlop	\$23,791	\$56,480	\$53,421	\$63,465	\$79,031
Evatt	\$39,370	\$75,827	\$79,442	\$85,574	\$116,188
Fadden	\$8,159	\$12,368	\$11,114	\$10,473	\$13,835
Farrer	\$72,278	\$108,616	\$111,357	\$119,310	\$175,366
Fisher	\$26,939	\$36,864	\$43,905	\$46,144	\$42,193

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Florey	\$161,776	\$267,114	\$269,665	\$295,955	\$430,833
Flynn	\$10,995	\$13,777	\$14,152	\$15,344	\$13,224
Forde	\$71,863	\$139,670	\$143,921	\$161,996	\$215,906
Forrest	\$440,245	\$538,023	\$545,978	\$581,325	\$755,358
Franklin	\$95,282	\$494,635	\$583,737	\$781,687	\$1,134,801
Fraser	\$13,488	\$17,843	\$16,271	\$11,955	\$14,190
Garran	\$162,943	\$299,458	\$315,684	\$349,583	\$489,431
Gilmore	\$39,822	\$68,391	\$74,679	\$85,685	\$109,717
Giralang	\$33,838	\$58,697	\$59,032	\$61,108	\$62,305
Gordon	\$156,954	\$324,818	\$329,730	\$343,817	\$337,580
Gowrie	\$10,550	\$17,140	\$17,260	\$21,702	\$25,580
Greenway	\$258,192	\$556,233	\$590,749	\$712,049	\$1,362,498
Griffith	\$858,481	\$1,473,217	\$1,548,732	\$1,797,586	\$2,660,124
Gungahlin	\$203,361	\$520,511	\$546,394	\$617,151	\$815,419
Hackett	\$89,792	\$146,745	\$166,123	\$194,492	\$212,522
Hall			\$321	\$1,437	\$1,911
Harrison	\$86,055	\$446,968	\$571,843	\$736,826	\$726,006
Hawker	\$148,574	\$257,043	\$270,152	\$300,896	\$436,903
Higgins	\$18,545	\$29,841	\$30,228	\$35,241	\$47,951
Holder	\$70,485	\$117,547	\$119,542	\$132,412	\$200,098
Holt	\$106,512	\$265,931	\$271,505	\$294,358	\$383,276
Hughes	\$75,220	\$150,925	\$154,222	\$156,729	\$226,954
Isaacs	\$114,143	\$150,516	\$151,058	\$156,012	\$218,885
Isabella Plains	\$99,151	\$211,067	\$221,995	\$245,473	\$353,901
Jacka	\$263	\$6,807	\$19,378	\$21,453	\$34,478
Jerrabomberra		\$453	\$1,883	\$2,028	\$2,420
Kaleen	\$47,124	\$88,731	\$95,792	\$110,080	\$157,133
Kambah	\$166,294	\$304,066	\$321,000	\$347,497	\$495,668
Kingston	\$1,428,613	\$2,439,844	\$2,546,976	\$2,928,260	\$4,580,266
Latham	\$28,261	\$57,744	\$63,401	\$68,514	\$79,968
Lawson				\$29,874	\$413,079
Lyneham	\$493,341	\$1,142,725	\$1,253,897	\$1,388,647	\$1,442,143
Lyons	\$237,182	\$512,124	\$546,455	\$599,722	\$846,092
Macarthur	\$3,638	\$6,126	\$6,344	\$7,084	\$7,817
Macgregor	\$47,813	\$102,675	\$108,419	\$119,871	\$161,923
Macquarie	\$109,086	\$241,193	\$245,785	\$284,360	\$374,009
Mawson	\$258,985	\$496,995	\$526,233	\$574,930	\$617,718
McKellar	\$16,814	\$26,957	\$32,010	\$32,866	\$34,575
Melba	\$44,299	\$78,338	\$81,774	\$89,435	\$121,294
Monash	\$128,793	\$247,660	\$259,406	\$280,166	\$294,704
Moncrieff					\$7,861
Narrabundah	\$287,153	\$492,789	\$522,150	\$574,349	\$607,504
Ngunnawal	\$203,750	\$415,847	\$424,647	\$467,196	\$634,013
Nicholls	\$165,608	\$257,826	\$251,040	\$253,406	\$349,627
O'Connor	\$376,382	\$525,146	\$552,937	\$608,332	\$857,007
O'Malley	\$164,052	\$141,362	\$136,821	\$123,482	\$174,829
Oaks Estate	\$3,973	\$18,018	\$19,650	\$24,114	\$31,996
Oxley	\$40,697	\$68,185	\$68,604	\$65,114	\$98,644
Page	\$104,633	\$179,732	\$201,135	\$227,577	\$334,929
Palmerston	\$367,433	\$536,664	\$535,188	\$556,509	\$806,593
Pearce	\$118,289	\$185,170	\$194,022	\$217,540	\$322,671
Phillip	\$565,177	\$1,104,309	\$1,212,686	\$1,342,370	\$2,090,542
Red Hill	\$280,231	\$266,231	\$258,038	\$265,066	\$342,583
Reid	\$166,606	\$280,579	\$355,246	\$413,580	\$556,068
Richardson	\$14,279	\$24,566	\$22,801	\$24,707	\$25,819
Rivett	\$16,322	\$28,596	\$32,193	\$34,381	\$49,083
Scullin	\$80,386	\$159,490	\$178,623	\$192,922	\$193,612
Spence	\$16,146	\$27,129	\$29,579	\$29,690	\$30,820
Stirling	\$49,442	\$95,955	\$97,208	\$103,023	\$106,815
Theodore	\$39,284	\$72,757	\$77,979	\$89,676	\$93,185
Torrens	\$44,153	\$74,347	\$76,990	\$69,654	\$108,170

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Turner	\$750,661	\$1,486,055	\$1,535,322	\$1,679,042	\$1,782,967
Wanniassa	\$81,439	\$137,676	\$151,413	\$161,790	\$226,588
Waramanga	\$48,380	\$75,753	\$79,883	\$84,651	\$112,861
Watson	\$290,484	\$697,859	\$739,433	\$801,444	\$1,053,422
Weetangera	\$50,835	\$77,611	\$82,642	\$86,655	\$92,638
Weston	\$54,744	\$98,398	\$104,200	\$106,599	\$174,800
Wright		\$21,264	\$256,974	\$307,227	\$355,386
Yarralumla	\$446,628	\$485,579	\$490,885	\$501,704	\$652,013

### Land—tax (Question No 1347)

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the revenue generated by land tax from (a) part and (b) full quarter payments, broken down by (i) suburb, and (ii) type of dwelling, such as houses, units or commercial properties, for each financial year from 2007-08 to 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) The general principle for land tax is a full quarter's liability arises if a property is rented on the first day of a quarter, regardless of how many days in that quarter the property is rented. From 1 July 2018, the rented test will be replaced with a test of whether the property is the owner's principal place of residence or not and will apply based on the status of the property on the first day of each quarter.

The only circumstance where a part quarter land tax liability arises is when a property starts or stops being rateable during the quarter, i.e. a lease is created or abolished part way through a quarter and the property is also rented during that quarter. This occurs very rarely. These provisions will be repealed from 1 July 2018.

The ACT Revenue Office IT system is unable to provide data on part quarter payments.

- (b) See answer to Question on Notice 1346.

### Land—tax (Question No 1348)

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the total number of land tax payers broken down by (a) suburb and (b) type of dwelling, such as houses, units or commercial properties, for each financial year from 2007-08 to 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

**Table 1: Commercial properties (Note: Land Tax for commercial properties was abolished from 2012-13 onwards)**

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Acton	5	5	5	6	6
Ainslie	20	21	22	21	22
Amaroo	2	1	1	1	1
Aranda	2	2	2	2	2
Banks	6	6	6	6	6
Barton	90	107	110	126	123
Beard				37	65
Belconnen	231	237	247	245	245
Belconnen District	13	15	13	12	12
Bonner		1	3	3	3
Bonython	6	6	6	6	6
Braddon	154	154	155	162	167
Bruce	62	64	74	73	80
Calwell	10	10	10	8	8
Campbell	36	36	36	36	36
Canberra Central	3	3	3	3	3
Casey	1	2	2	3	3
Chapman	2	2	2	2	2
Charnwood	13	13	14	15	15
Chifley	8	8	9	7	6
Chisholm	16	16	14	14	15
City	370	374	378	376	378
Conder	13	13	13	13	13
Cook	5	5	5	5	5
Coree	2	2	2	3	4
Cotter River	1	1	1	1	1
Crace					1
Curtin	27	27	27	27	26
Deakin	331	332	332	332	328
Dickson	249	250	248	247	252
Downer	2	2	2	2	2
Duffy	6	6	6	6	6
Dunlop	1	1	1	1	1
Evatt	6	6	6	6	6
Fadden	7	7	7	7	7
Farrer	8	8	8	8	8
Fisher	10	10	10	10	10
Florey	11	15	15	15	15
Forde		3	4	5	15
Forrest	27	28	27	29	30
Franklin					4
Fraser	2	2	2	2	2
Fyshwick	1043	1049	1058	1093	1137
Garran	27	27	27	27	27
Gilmore	1	1	1	1	1
Giralang	2	2	2	3	3
Gordon	4	4	4	4	4
Gowrie	3	3	3	3	3
Greenway	118	120	123	121	120
Griffith	208	207	208	208	216
Gungahlin	130	133	137	144	207
Gungahlin District	15	15	15	15	15
Hackett	7	6	6	6	6
Hall	11	11	11	11	11
Harrison		1	3	4	5
Hawker	52	52	52	52	51
Higgins	7	7	7	7	7
Holder	6	6	6	6	6
Holt	23	23	23	23	23
Hughes	8	8	8	8	8
Hume	218	220	235	243	247

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Isaacs	5	5	5	10	9
Isabella Plains	2	2	2	2	2
Jerrabomberra	13	14	14	14	14
Kaleen	22	22	22	22	22
Kambah	53	54	54	53	58
Kingston	115	117	149	159	155
Kowen	3	3	3	3	3
Latham	3	3	3	3	2
Lawson	1	1	1	1	1
Lyneham	55	56	57	56	56
Lyons	9	9	9	9	9
Macarthur	2	2	2	2	2
Macgregor	4	4	5	4	4
Macquarie	50	56	55	54	54
Majura	11	11	11	11	11
Mawson	64	63	63	64	64
McKellar	6	6	6	7	7
Melba	6	6	6	6	6
Mitchell	410	436	453	451	484
Monash	4	4	4	4	4
Narrabundah	22	23	24	23	22
Ngunnawal	12	12	11	11	11
Nicholls	17	20	19	19	20
O'Connor	18	18	18	18	18
O'Malley	1	1	1	1	1
Oaks Estate	9	9	9	9	9
Paddys River	5	5	5	5	5
Page	4	4	4	4	5
Palmerston	7	7	7	7	7
Parkes	1	1	1	1	1
Pearce	7	7	7	7	7
Phillip	275	277	278	280	278
Pialligo	6	6	6	7	8
Red Hill	9	9	9	9	9
Reid	2	2	2	1	1
Richardson	2	2	2	2	2
Rivett	7	7	7	7	7
Scullin	9	9	9	9	9
Spence	7	7	7	7	7
Stirling	3	3	3	3	3
Stromlo	7	8	8	7	6
Symonston	26	26	27	27	27
Tharwa	3	3	5	5	5
Theodore	3	3	3	3	3
Torrens	12	12	12	12	12
Tuggeranong	14	14	15	15	15
Turner	78	77	77	76	76
Wanniassa	69	77	76	76	76
Waramanga	11	11	11	11	11
Watson	12	12	12	15	15
Weetangera	9	9	9	9	9
Weston	67	67	67	67	67
Weston Creek	4	4	4	4	4
Woden Valley	1	1	1	1	1
Yarralumla	40	40	40	41	41

Table 2: Residential houses

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Ainslie	334	338	351	341	338	328
Amaroo	325	346	354	361	355	368

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Aranda	130	136	138	133	142	141
Banks	197	195	205	218	218	221
Barton	13	16	15	13	12	11
Belconnen	137	131	127	128	123	122
Bonner			15	88	206	324
Bonython	112	132	140	137	139	139
Braddon	108	115	109	111	104	105
Bruce	128	148	145	165	172	179
Calwell	271	271	260	266	263	267
Campbell	175	185	189	201	195	192
Casey			131	265	263	359
Chapman	98	95	97	98	102	98
Charnwood	141	142	140	163	162	155
Chifley	181	181	189	178	183	178
Chisholm	227	230	237	243	242	239
City						
Conder	182	173	184	185	200	198
Cook	149	155	150	156	146	153
Coombs						
Crace	1	1	1	36	138	260
Curtin	290	293	311	331	322	306
Deakin	206	196	197	194	201	197
Denman Prospect						
Dickson	191	196	189	190	188	190
Downer	306	313	318	332	339	338
Duffy	126	131	140	136	144	141
Dunlop	293	318	328	358	367	385
Evatt	258	265	238	243	249	267
Fadden	97	100	92	97	92	98
Farrer	152	161	159	153	148	151
Fisher	162	163	155	161	161	174
Florey	269	271	267	269	275	274
Flynn	136	135	133	148	152	155
Forde	29	53	98	139	209	256
Forrest	49	51	52	47	49	45
Franklin	6	30	140	283	352	408
Fraser	49	53	56	58	58	62
Garran	150	150	146	149	154	156
Gilmore	110	115	124	122	108	114
Giralang	159	159	169	177	186	184
Gordon	300	298	301	305	301	296
Gowrie	103	105	98	106	111	112
Greenway	42	49	45	46	48	46
Griffith	153	152	162	157	151	141
Gungahlin	594	622	620	625	620	623
Hackett	147	148	154	153	152	148
Hall	11	11	13	13	11	10
Harrison	257	361	451	479	494	529
Hawker	92	99	100	94	91	84
Higgins	134	140	140	147	155	150
Holder	109	118	107	114	120	123
Holt	206	206	200	206	211	216
Hughes	170	173	169	165	159	158
Isaacs	113	116	128	137	135	128
Isabella Plains	180	190	188	191	196	196
Jacka						1
Kaleen	385	392	407	417	434	440
Kambah	667	690	667	657	667	667
Kingston	24	28	49	48	48	47
Latham	167	162	162	188	181	180

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Lawson						
Lyneham	182	194	201	196	201	191
Lyons	151	150	147	157	156	156
Macarthur	41	42	39	37	42	48
Macgregor	117	162	239	255	348	369
Macquarie	165	167	155	155	164	164
Mawson	137	146	144	147	150	149
McKellar	123	123	126	113	116	117
Melba	118	115	114	119	118	119
Monash	194	199	195	201	198	196
Moncrieff						
Narrabundah	349	357	380	388	399	384
Ngunnawal	646	671	651	680	690	705
Nicholls	272	269	266	274	274	282
O'Connor	414	406	400	391	373	379
O'Malley	97	79	74	70	71	78
Oaks Estate	8	7	7	10	11	13
Oxley	54	58	59	58	63	59
Paddys River	1	1	1	1	1	1
Page	224	226	226	232	235	228
Palmerston	265	264	262	270	280	286
Pearce	109	117	115	113	114	123
Phillip	87	92	89	91	87	89
Pialligo	2	2	2	2	2	2
Red Hill	170	175	180	180	167	171
Reid	52	52	49	51	49	47
Richardson	112	113	108	118	122	121
Rivett	168	171	167	163	168	166
Scullin	164	170	161	161	160	159
Spence	83	90	88	95	96	91
Stirling	65	62	63	75	69	71
Symonston	1	1	1			
Taylor						
Tharwa	5	4	3	3	3	2
Theodore	146	143	131	135	139	127
Throsby						
Torrens	121	123	132	141	142	138
Tuggeranong	1	1	1	1	1	1
Turner	108	112	113	112	114	115
Uriarra Village		1	2	4	4	3
Wanniassa	309	310	306	330	350	330
Waramanga	148	155	156	150	152	149
Watson	239	265	267	271	291	345
Weetangera	93	91	104	101	105	103
Weston	157	167	169	164	171	186
Wright					5	19
Yarralumla	176	179	179	181	180	163

**Table 2: Residential houses (continued)**

Suburb	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Ainslie	325	307	320	311	304
Amaroo	365	373	360	348	331
Aranda	134	139	134	134	123
Banks	228	234	240	221	212
Barton	12	12	11	10	10
Belconnen	122	124	124	128	125
Bonner	423	468	481	493	492
Bonython	137	139	138	122	122
Braddon	101	100	99	103	104
Bruce	187	197	197	197	188

Suburb	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Calwell	263	251	253	251	233
Campbell	183	166	170	181	178
Casey	509	520	470	432	439
Chapman	98	98	95	96	80
Charnwood	157	164	167	157	158
Chifley	185	183	169	172	163
Chisholm	230	217	220	202	202
City	1			1	
Conder	200	196	188	185	174
Cook	153	139	132	122	116
Coombs	1	71	62	65	67
Crace	383	404	407	428	427
Curtin	309	317	306	307	287
Deakin	199	197	189	186	169
Denman Prospect				142	74
Dickson	185	193	205	213	210
Downer	330	338	342	338	330
Duffy	145	141	130	128	117
Dunlop	385	390	383	351	353
Evatt	263	264	274	280	270
Fadden	98	85	86	90	86
Farrer	154	163	151	144	150
Fisher	167	170	156	149	136
Florey	274	268	264	258	252
Flynn	161	157	146	144	150
Forde	273	262	251	252	250
Forrest	48	49	46	47	46
Franklin	427	423	432	437	429
Fraser	64	60	65	54	54
Garran	158	162	154	155	159
Gilmore	116	116	118	111	106
Giralang	190	179	184	185	177
Gordon	298	310	298	302	287
Gowrie	116	123	115	110	103
Greenway	44	46	47	44	38
Griffith	138	141	138	135	127
Gungahlin	615	624	619	625	612
Hackett	142	146	146	147	150
Hall	8	9	8	7	6
Harrison	559	587	594	606	609
Hawker	85	93	91	91	97
Higgins	146	142	139	151	149
Holder	137	140	133	125	121
Holt	227	227	226	223	220
Hughes	163	163	149	150	153
Isaacs	126	124	116	113	114
Isabella Plains	193	190	191	184	181
Jacka	5	13	15	14	16
Kaleen	456	444	456	451	436
Kambah	656	649	645	637	625
Kingston	45	44	46	45	44
Latham	180	179	174	179	188
Lawson			24	30	33
Lyneham	190	194	192	190	179
Lyons	151	160	152	158	153
Macarthur	55	57	53	51	49
Macgregor	413	413	427	432	418
Macquarie	171	167	162	166	158
Mawson	153	149	137	139	136
McKellar	118	120	115	112	109
Melba	117	116	118	125	126



Suburb	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Monash	205	211	203	203	197
Moncrieff			19	231	123
Narrabundah	382	377	379	384	364
Ngunnawal	766	805	809	768	769
Nicholls	280	268	240	233	224
O'Connor	382	387	383	381	375
O'Malley	75	76	76	82	83
Oaks Estate	11	10	11	11	12
Oxley	56	54	55	49	47
Paddys River	1	1	1	1	1
Page	215	213	216	217	211
Palmerston	280	275	281	288	277
Pearce	130	125	116	106	111
Phillip	92	91	90	86	79
Pialligo	2	2	2	2	1
Red Hill	178	172	166	161	150
Reid	38	43	41	47	50
Richardson	127	132	135	133	129
Rivett	167	167	163	168	167
Scullin	165	164	177	181	170
Spence	90	93	99	104	101
Stirling	75	79	76	70	76
Symonston					
Taylor					10
Tharwa	2	2	2	2	3
Theodore	135	143	148	138	126
Throsby					77
Torrens	133	128	131	126	116
Tuggeranong	1	1	1	1	1
Turner	117	120	108	113	103
Uriarra Village	2	1	2	3	3
Wanniassa	319	329	329	323	309
Waramanga	147	146	143	136	132
Watson	365	359	362	357	383
Weetangera	96	97	93	93	96
Weston	179	162	187	212	209
Wright	52	83	79	72	68
Yarralumla	178	169	154	154	148

Table 3: Residential apartments

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Ainslie	64	67	77	81	73	74
Amaroo	131	133	125	127	128	129
Aranda	15	19	21	20	24	21
Banks	85	81	85	93	88	84
Barton	330	390	385	441	497	516
Belconnen	718	712	1060	1423	1329	1692
Bonner					22	68
Bonython	237	270	278	292	296	290
Braddon	1275	1329	1341	1365	1386	1521
Bruce	644	743	943	1076	1127	1164
Calwell	115	111	124	126	125	127
Campbell	200	196	196	204	215	225
Casey				20	33	84
Chapman	1	1	1	1	1	3
Charnwood	40	42	48	49	47	46
Chifley	166	170	170	170	185	204
Chisholm	13	11	9	11	14	15
City	730	889	1026	1022	972	940
Conder	85	87	84	80	82	80

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Cook	147	148	146	148	145	139
Coombs						
Crace						
Curtin	156	159	162	170	176	182
Deakin	36	37	40	77	128	156
Dickson	94	101	99	117	165	187
Downer	73	76	73	88	88	92
Duffy	46	48	50	52	46	45
Dunlop	19	18	20	24	27	34
Evatt	36	36	40	47	50	54
Fadden	7	7	5	8	8	8
Farrer	58	63	65	63	63	65
Fisher	18	20	25	26	24	23
Florey	164	167	178	178	177	177
Flynn	5	8	11	12	14	16
Forde				8	60	93
Forrest	201	234	249	236	239	291
Franklin			2	65	136	468
Fraser	7	9	8	12	12	15
Garran	211	214	221	224	225	222
Gilmore	15	17	24	41	44	42
Giralang	27	27	31	34	32	34
Gordon	240	249	239	237	246	240
Gowrie	6	5	5	6	6	7
Greenway	275	329	331	325	334	469
Griffith	954	955	954	947	1006	1001
Gungahlin	239	255	269	308	375	388
Hackett	116	116	96	97	97	99
Hall						
Harrison	24	28	36	49	53	240
Hawker	172	169	163	188	181	178
Higgins	11	14	15	16	16	16
Holder	60	66	67	73	69	78
Holt	223	219	217	220	209	213
Hughes	91	91	86	91	93	92
Isaacs	77	77	75	72	71	71
Isabella Plains	152	151	146	152	157	152
Jacka						
Jerrabomberra	1					
Kaleen	65	65	65	68	68	70
Kambah	192	194	188	192	202	204
Kingston	1133	1118	1157	1196	1331	1613
Latham	34	33	31	33	39	39
Lawson						
Lyneham	518	526	537	570	912	933
Lyons	247	243	248	260	272	285
Macarthur	5	5	4	4	4	4
Macgregor	12	11	31	38	58	66
Macquarie	90	127	135	130	128	125
Mawson	294	302	320	327	342	351
McKellar	19	19	17	17	18	17
Melba	43	47	52	51	50	53
Monash	182	182	190	187	181	178
Moncrieff						
Narrabundah	309	322	325	319	318	375
Ngunnawal	286	301	304	306	306	305
Nicholls	174	165	159	160	160	165
O'Connor	228	234	245	264	281	303
O'Malley	24	26	29	44	44	43
Oaks Estate	20	19	18	16	17	18
Oxley	48	50	50	50	48	47

Suburb	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Page	73	75	84	89	97	103
Palmerston	351	340	336	341	341	336
Pearce	145	148	146	137	129	126
Phillip	626	619	607	615	627	763
Red Hill	94	92	98	102	104	104
Reid	189	187	186	187	199	192
Richardson	16	16	15	16	17	20
Rivett	20	18	20	18	20	19
Scullin	77	80	81	81	89	92
Spence	3	3	5	6	11	15
Stirling	68	71	68	70	71	68
Theodore	62	61	55	57	59	60
Torrens	38	38	38	42	39	42
Turner	843	864	891	927	1015	1047
Wanniassa	75	74	76	83	83	89
Waramanga	36	36	37	36	38	46
Watson	498	479	445	453	482	500
Weetangera	36	37	42	42	36	46
Weston	71	70	72	71	69	68
Wright						
Yarralumla	118	118	122	121	143	141

**Table 3: Residential apartments (continued)**

Suburb	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Ainslie	71	74	73	72	63
Amaroo	125	118	113	113	115
Aranda	19	19	18	20	18
Banks	86	87	88	88	83
Barton	509	500	601	573	719
Belconnen	1757	2045	2021	2097	2059
Bonner	82	86	88	92	90
Bonython	282	279	276	266	249
Braddon	1745	1847	2087	2026	2047
Bruce	1321	1378	1379	1373	1354
Calwell	128	125	122	120	115
Campbell	222	223	266	252	487
Casey	131	151	166	186	173
Chapman	1	1	1	7	8
Charnwood	49	50	46	46	44
Chifley	208	209	216	213	188
Chisholm	19	17	15	14	16
City	1362	1405	1395	1485	1456
Conder	86	88	82	81	75
Cook	138	137	136	135	131
Coombs			26	129	89
Crace	23	62	91	100	109
Curtin	178	181	197	198	199
Deakin	148	149	149	141	140
Dickson	224	234	251	293	299
Downer	91	96	101	108	108
Duffy	51	68	68	62	58
Dunlop	38	45	40	45	38
Evatt	53	57	56	56	58
Fadden	7	8	8	6	6
Farrer	65	67	67	63	65
Fisher	24	22	25	24	21
Florey	182	178	175	173	170
Flynn	11	9	9	9	7
Forde	101	108	112	107	100
Forrest	288	288	281	276	269

Suburb	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Franklin	429	592	570	709	851
Fraser	14	12	10	8	6
Garran	213	217	229	227	231
Gilmore	44	46	49	54	46
Giralang	35	39	36	35	35
Gordon	240	252	243	234	231
Gowrie	10	10	10	11	11
Greenway	428	433	452	542	1102
Griffith	1056	1021	1100	1146	1194
Gungahlin	419	433	442	441	474
Hackett	101	105	116	118	112
Hall			1	1	1
Harrison	296	484	556	630	637
Hawker	178	178	180	180	181
Higgins	18	18	19	20	20
Holder	77	78	78	79	79
Holt	218	224	223	216	213
Hughes	100	103	102	97	97
Isaacs	74	80	78	76	66
Isabella Plains	156	159	162	166	159
Jacka	2	7	37	18	22
Jerrabomberra		1	1	1	1
Kaleen	66	63	71	71	72
Kambah	212	222	220	223	212
Kingston	1731	1767	1804	2058	2040
Latham	37	41	45	45	41
Lawson				56	319
Lyneham	926	914	992	975	950
Lyons	298	379	393	390	384
Macarthur	4	4	4	4	4
Macgregor	70	80	85	83	74
Macquarie	158	180	177	181	185
Mawson	345	358	368	359	344
McKellar	18	17	19	19	18
Melba	51	54	53	53	51
Monash	177	179	182	177	171
Moncrieff					4
Narrabundah	370	353	361	364	344
Ngunnawal	314	318	313	311	307
Nicholls	159	161	154	144	134
O'Connor	325	319	351	334	333
O'Malley	44	43	39	35	36
Oaks Estate	18	17	19	23	23
Oxley	46	49	45	41	38
Page	110	120	129	133	135
Palmerston	333	329	322	300	284
Pearce	122	121	125	127	127
Phillip	769	876	884	894	1222
Red Hill	103	110	105	99	96
Reid	187	221	252	255	245
Richardson	20	18	16	16	17
Rivett	19	19	23	20	21
Scullin	101	116	118	116	107
Spence	17	18	24	18	19
Stirling	67	70	68	64	60
Theodore	61	56	59	60	54
Torrens	40	41	42	41	43
Turner	1058	1091	1110	1089	1063
Wanniassa	88	91	102	93	91
Waramanga	55	54	53	50	50

Suburb	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Watson	556	583	598	583	565
Weetangera	45	46	47	44	43
Weston	68	69	69	68	78
Wright		51	337	278	295
Yarralumla	152	184	171	168	166

---

**Land—tax**  
**(Question No 1349)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the total number of land tax payers which have only paid for part of the quarter broken down by (a) suburb and (b) type of dwelling, such as houses, units or commercial properties, for each financial year from 2007-08 to 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

See answer to Question on Notice 1347.

---

**Land—tax**  
**(Question No 1350)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the total number of prospective land tax payers who have received a land tax exemption broken down by (a) suburb and (b) type of dwelling, such as houses, units or commercial properties and (c) reason for exemption, for each financial year from 2007-08 to 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Land tax is currently payable where a house or unit is leased to tenants. Land tax is also payable by corporations where they own a house or unit.

Exemptions are provided under Section 11(2) and Section 12 of the *Land Tax Act 2004*.

Section 11(2) allows for an exemption of up to two years for corporations which are building new residential premises and the premises are to be sold by the corporation when finished.

Section 12 allows for exemptions on compassionate grounds. The ACT Revenue Office has granted two exemptions since 2012.

The following tables provide data on the number of exemptions, by suburb and financial year for exemptions granted under Section 11(2) for houses and units.

**Table 1: Houses**

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD)
Amaroo							19				1
Aranda										1	
Barton		1		1							
Bonner			180	72	96	44	12	1	1		1
Bonython	3										
Braddon	1	1		2					1	1	
Bruce	1					2		1		1	
Campbell	1			1						1	
Casey			274	242	180	368	366	70	1	1	
Chapman										1	
Charnwood		2									
Chifley	1	2		2		1				7	
Chisholm		1									
Cook										1	
Coombs							48	207	2		
Crace			177	177	506	362	100	1			
Curtin	1										
Deakin		2		2						1	1
Denman Prospect									2	60	143
Dickson		1	7	1	4						5
Downer							1			2	1
Duffy			1								
Dunlop			1	60							1
Evatt			2								
Fadden				1							
Farrer						2					
Fisher	1		1					2	2		
Forde	6	13	66	122	209	4	1				
Forrest	1			2			1		1	3	
Franklin	2	8	19	101			2	1	1	1	
Fraser			2								
Garran					1				1		
Gilmore		1			1						
Greenway	1						1				
Griffith		1	2	1		1					1
Gungahlin	1	3						3			5
Hall								1			
Harrison	2	6	29		88	7		1			
Higgins				1						2	
Holder			1							1	
Hughes			1				2			1	
Jacka						26	2	1			
Kaleen					2				1	1	
Kambah		4	2		1				1	2	1
Kingston	2	2	1							1	
Latham			1								1
Lawson								14	13		
Lyneham				3		1		2	2	4	
Lyons	2	1		1					1		
Macgregor		6	119	126	240	67	59	1	1	1	1
Macquarie		1						1	2	1	
Mawson		2	3	1	1	1	3	3		1	1

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD)
Monash			1		1						
Moncrieff									18	100	1
Narrabundah				1				2		1	1
Ngunnawal						46	273	198	9		1
O'Connor	1		1	3		2		1		1	
Page			1		2			4			
Palmerston									1		
Pearce		2	1	2							
Phillip							2				
Red Hill							1	2	1	1	
Rivett	1	1								1	
Scullin										1	
Taylor											12
Theodore			1								
Throsby										8	59
Torrens									1		
Turner	1		4	1		2		3	7	2	1
Wanniassa		1									
Waramanga		2									
Watson		5			107	26	1				
Weetangera		1						1		1	1
Weston					94			62			
Wright					42	97	21	3			1
Yarralumla			2		2			1	2		

Table 2: Units

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD)
Ainslie					4					1	
Amaroo									4		
Aranda						1	8	1	10	1	
Banks									1		
Barton				1	116		1	136			
Belconnen		2	95	205		348	254	246		331	
Bonner			4	4	92	45					
Bonython			1		28					1	
Braddon		1	1	3	42	117	318	255	9	13	
Bruce		3			136	73		37			
Campbell		1			15	5		1	50	47	
Casey			7	69	29	67	165	82	25	20	
Chapman						3		1	19	5	1
Charnwood				1						1	
Chifley			1	11	15	5	11		11	16	4
Chisholm				1							
City	1					12	549			191	
Cook										1	
Coombs							1	3	190	154	3
Crace						3	38	105	50		
Curtin		1	1	27			1		10	2	5
Deakin				115	63			5			3
Denman Prospect											5

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD)
Dickson		3	4	79	20	42	31	19	1	36	1
Downer			1	17			9	1	1	23	
Duffy		1			1		7	16			2
Dunlop				33	8			8		8	
Evatt				12							
Farrer										2	4
Fisher				3					1	4	
Flynn										4	2
Forde			8	78	44	39	10	9	6		
Forrest				3	2	52	2		4	1	
Franklin			2	30	219	280	26	280	89	254	
Fraser				7							2
Garran				3	1	6	4	1	13	5	5
Gilmore			1	8					3	4	
Giralang											1
Gordon								1			
Greenway		1	5			145			96	1	
Griffith		1	3	1	25	1	75	1	210	51	1
Gungahlin	1			62		40				9	
Hackett											3
Harrison	1		3	2	76	245	156	192	285	101	
Hawker											3
Higgins							2		3		
Holder				1	9						3
Holt										2	1
Hughes				10		1		2		2	2
Jacka						5	47	35	47		
Kaleen								4		4	
Kambah			2	11	9			2		8	2
Kingston		2	4		252	336	120	138	171	506	
Latham					13			2	1		3
Lawson								4	11	362	
Lyneham		1	2	21	21	34	13		12		1
Lyons		1	1	20	16	16				2	5
Macgregor			73	14	59		1	7		2	
Macquarie			1	1	6	9	70		3	28	1
Mawson		1	2	23	24	2	9	23	3		
Melba											1
Monash					2						
Moncrieff									3	16	1
Narrabundah				1		69			1	8	2
Ngunnawal								1			
O'Connor		2	4	15	14	32	27	3	30	10	4
O'Malley				17							
Oaks Estate								1			
Page		1	1		11	9	10	9	7	2	
Pearce			1	5					2	12	5
Phillip				1	172			201	1	1	
Red Hill					5			1	4	2	2
Rivett	1									1	2
Scullin			1		10	1	9				1
Spence					1	11			8		3
Stirling											2
Taylor											5
Theodore			1	6							
Throsby											5



	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD)
Torrens					2						1
Turner		2	2	2	76	11	24	6	52	28	1
Wanniassa					2	5	11		16		
Waramanga					3	26				2	
Watson				2	75	114			13		2
Weetangera			1	1	8	4			1		3
Weston							3	6			1
Wright					2	1	20	595	209		
Yarralumla				1	19		36				

### Land—tax (Question No 1351)

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the average number of days per quarter that property owners paid land tax when paying land tax for only part of a quarter, broken down by (a) suburb and (b) type of dwelling, such as houses, units or commercial properties, for each financial year from 2007-08 to 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

See response to Question on Notice 1347.

### Land—tax (Question No 1352)

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) What modelling was done on the effectiveness of the amendments in relation to the *Land Tax Amendment Act 2018* on improving housing affordability issues.
- (2) Can the Treasurer advise in relation to the modelling referred to in part (1), the (a) minimum number of properties that would need to be put on the market to improve housing affordability issues, (b) number of vacant properties in the ACT (c) minimum number of vacant properties that would need to be put on the market to improve housing affordability issues (d) expected number of vacant properties that would be put on the market to improve housing affordability issues after the changes (e) number of properties owned by foreign investors, (f) minimum number of foreign investment properties that would either need to be put on the market, or the minimum number of investors that would need to be deterred from purchasing property, to improve housing affordability issues, (g) expected number of foreign investment properties that would either be put on the market, or the expected number of investors that would be deterred from purchasing property, to improve housing affordability issues, (h) number of properties that are owned by interstate buyers and their share of the

property market, and how that affects housing affordability for local residents and (i) how the ACT Government will measure and monitor the effectiveness of these changes to land tax as they relate to housing affordability.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1) The *Land Tax Amendment Bill 2018* (the Act) implements two initiatives:

- applying land tax to properties which are not the owner's principal place of residence; and
- the introduction of a foreign ownership surcharge.

From 1 July 2018 land tax will apply to all residential dwellings that are not the owner's principal place of residence whether they are rented or not. This initiative is aimed at increasing the number of residential properties available for rent. Properties left vacant by the owner will now attract land tax.

A foreign ownership surcharge will apply to foreign-owned residential property from 1 July 2018. The charge will be 0.75 per cent of the property's average unimproved value and is aimed at improving local home buyers' competitiveness in the Territory housing market.

The anticipated effect of the amendments to the Act is based on the application of supply and demand principles, rather than empirical modelling. The amendments to the Act are one element of a broad range of housing and homelessness related initiatives that will form part of the Housing Strategy which will be released later in 2018.

(2)

- (a) See answer to part (1).
- (b) See answer to part (1). As part of the analysis of the amendments to the Act, it was estimated around 2,500 residential dwellings are vacant in the ACT over a 12 month period.
- (c) See answer to part (1).
- (d) See answer to part (1).
- (e) See answer to part (1). As part of the analysis of the amendments to the Act, it was estimated around 200 to 300 foreign investors would be impacted based on information from the Foreign Investment Review Board annual reports.
- (f) See answer to part (1).
- (g) See answer to part (1).
- (h) See answer to part (1). Interstate property investors will not be subject to the foreign ownership surcharge and were not analysed as part of these amendments.
- (i) As noted in part (1), the amendments to the Act are part of a broader strategy to address housing affordability in the ACT. Housing affordability is closely monitored by the Government through a number of indicators on housing costs relative to incomes across different income groups which will be used to assess the effectiveness of the strategy as a whole over time.

---

**Land—tax**  
**(Question No 1353)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How will the Revenue Office determine which properties to investigate further when using aggregate data collected from utilities in relation to modelling undertaken for the *Land Tax Amendment Act 2018*.
- (2) How were the utilities usage thresholds determined in relation to modelling undertaken for the *Land Tax Amendment Act 2018*.
- (3) Will the Revenue Office request or receive data from utilities for use in relation to land tax or other taxation matters; if so, can the Treasurer provide (a) what data will be requested or received, (b) how often the data will be requested or received, (c) how the data will be used and (d) whether there are any privacy risks associated with the data; if not, why not.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The modelling undertaken on utilities data was for the purpose of estimating the revenue impact of changes to land tax contained in the *Land Tax Amendment Act 2018*. The approach to compliance by the ACT Revenue Office to implement these changes is yet to be fully determined and will evolve over time. Aggregate data obtained from utilities companies is unlikely to provide sufficient detail to assist with land tax compliance investigations.
- (2) For electricity, an average daily threshold of 3 kilowatt hours was used and for water an annual threshold of 20 kilolitres was used. Utility providers advised consumption below these amounts is a reliable indication a property is vacant.
- (3) Should the ACT Revenue Office wish to use data on power and water usage for compliance purposes in the future, this can be obtained from utility companies using the investigative powers in Division 9.2 of the *Taxation Administration Act 1999*. The privacy risks associated with this data are the same as other data held by the ACT Revenue Office, including that collected from third parties. The Revenue Office holds and uses this data in accordance with both its privacy policy and the *Information Privacy Act 2014*.

---

### **Land—rent scheme (Question No 1354)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the total (a) number of applications for the Land Rent Scheme received by the ACT Revenue Office, (d) number of applications approved and (c) value of payments made; broken down by each financial year since its commencement to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The information is shown in the table below. The ACT Revenue Office does not record the number of Land Rent applications received – only successful applications are recorded.

Year	Number of successful land rent applications approved each year	Value of payments made by land rent participants (\$'000)
2008-09	3	-
2009-10	95	117
2010-11	136	695
2011-12	621	2,618
2012-13	409	7,408
2013-14	260	9,884
2014-15	168	11,618
2015-16	325	10,834
2016-17	77 <sup>1</sup>	9,250

<sup>1</sup> The low number of approved applications is due to a limited number of blocks released (only Taylor and Throsby released land rent blocks in 2016-17) and a setting of the threshold block value at \$300,000 in February 2015.

### **Housing—first home owners (Question No 1355)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the total (a) number of applications for the First Home Owner's Grants received by the ACT Revenue Office, (ii) number of applications approved and (iii) value of payments made; broken down by each financial year since its commencement to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

This information can be found in the following responses to questions on notice:

- Question on Notice 3 in the 2014-15 Chief Minister Treasury and Economic Development Annual Report hearings;
- Question on Notice 25 in the Inquiry into referred 2016-17 Annual and Financial Reports; and
- Question on Notice 1340.

### **Government—notifiable invoices (Question No 1356)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Given that the ACT Government Notifiable Invoices Register March 2018 included payments to (a) Bastion EBA Pty Ltd for 'Review of Performance Fee Agreements', (b) Chin Communications Pty Ltd for 'Translation Fees', (c) Integral Lighting Pty Ltd for 'LED gallery lighting', (d) Relational Data Systems Pty Ltd for 'Land Title System Modernisation Project Cost', (e) The Trustee for Secom Technical Service Unit Trust for 'Security Maintenance Contract - Bimberi Youth Justice Centre', (f) Snapcracker Research and Strategy Pty Ltd for 'Visitor Segmentation Research', and (g) Talent International (ACT) Pty Ltd for 'Professional services for Revenue Collection Transformation Program', can the Treasurer advise (i) whether each contract linked with the identified payments are published; if so, the date it was published and where; if not,

why not, (ii) the contract number, (iii) the contract name, (iv) value of the contract, (v) execution date, (vi) expiry date, (vii) procurement methodology and (viii) summary of services provided under each contract.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) Bastion EBA Pty Ltd for 'Review of Performance Fee Agreements'
  - (i) The contract was not published at the time of exchange due to an administrative oversight. This has since been rectified with notification sent to update the ACT Government Contracts Register on 31 May 2018.
  - (ii) Contract number for BASTION EBA is 001.
  - (iii) Review of ACT Government Performance Fee Agreements.
  - (iv) \$70,000 excluding GST.
  - (v) The contract execution date is 31 November 2017.
  - (vi) The contract expiry date is 31 December 2017.
  - (vii) Multiple quotations were sought.
  - (viii) Consultation and review in respect of ACT Government agreements with major sporting teams.
- (b) Chin Communications Pty Ltd for 'Translation Fees'
  - (i) The contract was not published at the time of exchange due to cultural sensitivities associated with the engagement of an external translator. These issues have been resolved and will be loaded to the register shortly.
  - (ii) The contract number is 201217.
  - (iii) The contract name is Translation Fees.
  - (iv) The value of the contract is \$28,532.00 (GST inclusive).
  - (v) The contract execution date is 20 December 2017.
  - (vi) The contract expiry date is 28 January 2018.
  - (vii) A Single select procurement was conducted. Background: Chin Communications Pty Ltd had previously and successfully assisted the Directorate (Governance and Community Liaisons) in managing issues relating to international students.
  - (viii) Services provided under this contract are translation services for in-country parent/teacher interviews, facilitating two way information exchange regarding student academic progress, attendance, behaviour and welfare.
- (c) Integral Lighting Pty Ltd for 'LED gallery lighting'
  - (i) Relevant documentation linked to the identified payment to Integral Lighting Pty Ltd for LED Gallery Lighting was uploaded to the contracts register on 24 May 2018.
  - (ii) Order number 37808.
  - (iii) Purchase of LED lighting units.
  - (iv) \$246,178.90.
  - (v) 14 December 2017.
  - (vi) 14 December 2018.

- (vii) A single select procurement was conducted.
- (viii) Purchase of LED lighting units.
- (d) Relational Data Systems Pty Ltd for 'Land Title System Modernisation Project Cost'
  - (i) The contract was published on 30 May 2018 on the Tenders ACT Contract Register.
  - (ii) The contract number is 26584.110.
  - (iii) The contract name is Upgrade and Support of Tarquin Land Titles System.
  - (iv) The value of the contract is \$1.056m (GST Inclusive).
  - (v) The contract execution date is 23 March 2017.
  - (vi) Upon successful delivery of services.
  - (vii) Single Select Process.
  - (viii) The Land Titles Modernisation Project mandate is to deliver a new online Land Titles Register providing access to the Public, Industry Subscriber and to ACT Govt. users, including;
    - Replace the existing Tarquin with the new ACT Land Information System (ACTLIS) and deliver new ICT infrastructure, ensuring supportability.
    - Allow online purchases and account payments by credit card.
    - Provide a better user experience accessible from normal web browsers on all computers, tablets and mobile phones.
    - Deliver searches by the use of street addressing and other property and title details.
    - Modernise business processes so there is less reliance on data entry and manual monthly account generation.
    - Deliver benefits to industry by way of more efficient user and account management facilities.
    - Deliver reporting functions to the ACT Revenue Office and the Australian Taxation Office.
    - Deliver a Title Watch Service whereby the public and industry will receive an alert on a Title should there be a dealing lodged with the Land Titles Office.
    - Rationalise the 85 Land Titles Dealings currently managed by the Land Titles Office and migrate those from Tarquin to ACTLIS.
- (e) The Trustee for Secom Technical Service Unit Trust for 'Security Maintenance Contract - Bimberi Youth Justice Centre'
  - (i) The contract was published on 12 February 2014 on the Tenders ACT Contract Register.
  - (ii) The contract number is 2013.22142.220.
  - (iii) The contract name is Maintenance Services for Bimberi Youth Justice Centre Security System.
  - (iv) The value of the contract is \$1,225,400.00.

- (v) The contract execution date is 12 February 2014.
  - (vi) The contract expiry date is 30 June 2018.
  - (vii) A select procurement was conducted. (A 'select procurement' is an approach to a limited number of potential vendors, as compared to a 'single select procurement' which is an approach to only one potential vendor. Both approaches are allowable under the *Government Procurement Act 2001*.)
  - (viii) Services provided under this contract are Maintenance of the security system and security devices at the Bimberi Youth Justice Centre.
- (f) Snapcracker Research and Strategy Pty Ltd for 'Visitor Segmentation Research'
- (i) The contract was published on 30 May 2018 on the Tenders ACT Contract Register.
  - (ii) The contract number is VC201701.
  - (iii) The contract name is ACT Visitor Segmentation.
  - (iv) The value of the contract is \$176,000 (GST Inclusive).
  - (v) The contract execution date is 22 June 2017.
  - (vi) The contract expiry date is 22 December 2017.
  - (vii) Procurement Methodology 3 Quote.
  - (viii) To produce a domestic short break visitor segmentation for VisitCanberra and Events ACT, alongside understanding the motivations behind short break travel by Australians.
- (g) Talent International (ACT) Pty Ltd for 'Professional services for Revenue Collection Transformation Program'
- (i) No. The contract is an employment contract.
  - (ii) Not applicable.
  - (iii) Services Agreement – Business Analyst.
  - (iv) \$220,000.
  - (v) 14 June 2017.
  - (vi) 30 June 2018.
  - (vii) Recruitment Process – Agency.
  - (viii)
    - Assist with identification and mapping of baselines and future state business processes, elicit and document business rules, user cases and other business and ICT design artefacts.
    - Provides support and assistance to the program with following tasks:
      - Baselines elicitation and documentation.
      - Manage a work package with minimal guidance from senior team members.
      - Facilitate Joint Application Design workshops with the business, ICT and vendor stakeholders.
      - Documentation of the future state design.
      - Facilitation of the business stakeholders training.
      - Traceability maintenance of business requirements to other SDLC artefacts.

- Other business and ICT related tasks as directed.

The process for loading contracts to the ACT Government's Contracts Register is advised below.

Where an individual Territory entity undertakes a simple procurement (having an estimated value of between \$25,000 and \$200,000) without the assistance of the central procurement function, they are required to provide details to Goods and Services Procurement of the executed contract in sufficient time to allow uploading to the Contract Register.

When a complex procurement (having an estimated value of \$200,000 or more) is done with assistance of Goods and Services Branch, at the receipt of a copy of the final executed contract from the client, the procurement officer assisting the client will load the contract to the Contract Register.

Infrastructure contracts are loaded to the Contracts Register by Contracts team in Infrastructure Finance and Capital Works.

---

### **Education Directorate—staff (Question No 1358)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Education Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

a) Full time equivalent (FTE):

<b>Classification Group</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
Executive Officers	17.0	17.0	15.0	14.0	13.0	14.0	15.0	16.0	17.0	15.1	19.0
Senior Officers	71.7	105.2	101.4	111.6	116.2	126.6	137.3	137.9	129.5	141.9	157.5

b) Headcount:

<b>Classification Group</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
Executive Officers	18	17	15	14	13	14	15	17	17	16	19
Senior Officers	76	108	104	115	122	132	144	146	138	149	165



## c) ACT public service classification type (FTE):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.2	7.0	6.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
Executive 1.3	6.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	11.0
Executive 2.4	1.0		2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0		0.0			2.0
Executive 2.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0					1.0
Executive 2.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Executive 3.7							1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Executive 3.10	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0
Infrastructure Mgr/Specialist1										1.0	1.0
Infrastructure Officer 3								8.0	6.6	7.0	6.0
Infrastructure Officer 4								1.0	2.0		1.0
Infrastructure Officer 5								1.8	2.8	3.0	3.0
Manager 1	2.0										
Manager 2	1.0										
Senior Info Tech Off B	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0							
Senior Info Tech Off C	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0							
Senior Officer A	3.0	10.6	9.0	10.2	14.3	14.4	16.1	12.4	14.8	19.0	15.1
Senior Officer B	19.7	24.6	24.0	32.3	25.6	28.9	31.1	35.6	33.8	36.5	46.2
Senior Officer C	40.2	62.2	60.6	60.2	71.4	78.2	86.1	75.0	65.5	71.5	81.1
Senior Prof Officer A	1.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Senior Prof Officer B	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Senior Prof Officer C	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

## c) ACT Public Service classification type (Headcount):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Contract Chief Executive	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Contract Executive	17	16	14	13	12	13	14	16	16	14	18
Executive 1.2	7	6	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	1
Executive 1.3	7	8	7	6	5	5	7	7	9	9	11
Executive 2.4	1		2	2	2	1		1			2
Executive 2.5	1	1	1	1	1	2					1
Executive 2.6	1	1	1	1		1	2	2	2	2	2
Executive 3.7							1	2	2	1	1
Executive 3.10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
Infrastructure Mnggr/Specialist 1										1	1
Infrastructure Officer 3								8	7	7	6
Infrastructure Officer 4								1	2		1

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Infrastructure Officer 5								2	3	3	3
Manager 1	2										
Manager 2	1										
Senior Info Tech Off B	1	1	1	1							
Senior Info Tech Off C	2	2	2	2							
Senior Officer A	3	11	9	11	15	15	19	14	16	19	16
Senior Officer B	21	26	26	34	29	31	33	38	36	38	48
Senior Officer C	43	63	61	61	73	81	88	79	70	77	86
Senior Prof Officer A	1	3	3	4	3	3	1	2	2	2	2
Senior Prof Officer B	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Senior Prof Officer C	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1

d) General administrative division:

In tables (c) full-time equivalent and (c) headcount, senior officers have been shaded to identify the classifications in the *ACT Public Service Administrative and Related Classifications Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

Note: Information about Housing and Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence staff is provided in the response to Question on Notice 1438 from the Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion.

Note: Information about Suburban Development staff is provided in the response to Question on Notice 1413 from the Minister for Environment and Heritage.

Note: Information about Sport and Recreation staff is provided in the response to Question on Notice 1422 from the Chief Minister.

---

### Health—multicultural health policy unit (Question No 1359)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How does the Multicultural Health Policy Unit (the Unit) fit into the overall policies of ACT Health.
- (2) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of staff attached to the Unit by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount and (c) ACT public service classification type, during (i) 2013-14, (ii) 2014-15, (iii) 2016-17 and (iv) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) Was the Unit disbanded by the ACT Government; if so, can the Minister advise (a) why the Unit was disbanded, (b) the date the Unit was disbanded and (c) who made the determination to disband the Unit; if not, (a) why there have been no public

updates from the Unit since 2015 and (b) an outline of the work the Unit has undertaken since 2015.

- (4) Can the Minister provide a status update on the implementation and effectiveness of the Towards Culturally Appropriate and Inclusive Services: A Co-ordinating Framework for ACT Health 2014-2018 and further updates to the policy.
- (5) What date was the webpage <http://www.health.act.gov.au/multicultural> last updated.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Multicultural Health Policy Unit (MHPU) had responsibility for overseeing and progressing ACT Health's multicultural policy.

Policy and Stakeholder Relations Branch (which included the MHPU) was restructured in September 2017 to:

- Reflect changes in ministerial and departmental structures;
- Provide more holistic and strategic policy advice;
- Improve the responsiveness of policy advice to government; and
- Provide better support and governance in policy development.

As a result all existing units of the Policy and Stakeholder Relations Branch, including but not limited to the MHPU, were reorganised to meet the above objectives. The MHPU policy functions are incorporated into this new structure.

The restructure better serves the culturally and linguistically diverse community by enabling staff to be agile and responsive across all health service areas. Diversity issues are now considered across the health portfolio by all policy staff, rather than just being seen as the responsibility of a single area or unit.

(2)

	2013-14	2014-15	2016-17	2017-18*
Full-time equivalent	SOGA x 1 ASO6 x 1	SOGA x 1 ASO6 x 1	SOGA x 1 SOGC x 0.66 ASO5 x 1	SOGA x 1 SOGC x 1.66 ASO6 x 1 ASO5 x 1
Headcount	SOGA x 1 ASO6 x 1	SOGA x 1 ASO6 x 1	SOGA x 1 SOGC x 1 ASO5 x 1	SOGA x 1 SOGC x 2 ASO6 x 1 ASO5 x 1

\*subsumed into Health Policy Unit September 2017.

- (3) See answer to question 1.

(3a) Policy and Stakeholder Relations continues to engage in a range of activities and forums to support the development of multicultural health policy, this includes convening the ACT Health Multicultural Reference Group. The Branch also participates in the ACT Multicultural Framework Inter-Directorate Implementation Committee, the Refugee and Humanitarian Settlement Group and the Cultural Competence Stakeholder Meeting.

(3b) As outlined below, an implementation report against *Towards Culturally Appropriate and Inclusive Services, a Co-ordinating Framework (2014—2018)* is underway and will inform the development of a Diversity Framework.

The publication *Using Health Services in the ACT*, which is a complementary flyer of key information available in seven languages, is under review. Other work includes ongoing liaison with National Translating and Interpreting Service and projects on workplace inclusion.

- (4) Implementation of *Towards Culturally Appropriate and Inclusive Services, a Co-ordinating Framework (2014—2018)* continues. This includes promotion of interpreters through the national Translating and Interpreting Service, with reports provided to the Partnering with Consumers/Patient Experience Network Group.

The framework will be evaluated in the coming months to inform the development of a new Diversity Framework to come into effect from 2019. This will include culturally and linguistically diverse populations. Development of the Diversity Framework has commenced.

- (5) The ACT Health website includes a variety of sections with information relating to multicultural health in the ACT. The webpage <http://www.health.act.gov.au/multicultural> was last updated on 8 April 2015. The ACT Health Website is currently under review.

## ACT Health—staffing (Question No 1360)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of staff employed by ACT Health by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type or equivalent and (d) whether they are classed as administrative or health professional, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

a) Full-time equivalent (FTE):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Administrative Officers	720.2	784.7	768.3	789.4	795.6	861.4	871.9	897.8	901.4	922.6	963.9
Dental	9.2	11.1	9.7	12.9	10.9	13.5	14.7	18.1	13.3	14.1	12.1
Executive Officers	17.0	18.0	20.0	17.0	20.0	22.0	21.1	23.0	25.0	30.0	41.4
General Service Officers & Equivalent	373.7	379.6	389.6	396.2	399.4	424.8	437.1	440.9	462.0	446.6	452.5
Health Assistants	37.2	35.2	33.9	39.8	42.8	56.1	72.5	70.0	84.7	99.6	91.2
Health Professional Officers	675.0	728.5	742.3	796.4	831.0	897.2	911.5	972.0	974.0	995.1	1014.3
Information Technology Officers	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
Legal Officers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Medical Officers	480.6	545.6	574.7	603.2	666.3	742.5	782.4	790.1	807.3	819.8	834.4
Nursing Staff	1693.4	1788.4	1949.1	2025.6	2154.8	2218.7	2338.9	2458.5	2529.5	2627.7	2687.8
Professional Officers	4.0	5.0	11.5	14.0	12.6	9.4	12.8	14.6	14.1	5.9	8.7
Senior Officers	231.9	255.1	298.3	314.3	327.5	354.6	361.1	368.2	375.4	383.7	417.7
Teacher	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Technical Officers	109.6	126.7	138.8	147.4	147.7	141.5	149.2	136.3	129.5	118.3	118.4
Trainees and Apprentices	4.0	4.0	3.0	8.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.4	6.0	11.0	10.0
<b>FTE Totals:</b>	<b>4359.3</b>	<b>4684.2</b>	<b>4941.7</b>	<b>5166.7</b>	<b>5416.0</b>	<b>5749.1</b>	<b>5979.9</b>	<b>6195.4</b>	<b>6324.2</b>	<b>6476.3</b>	<b>6655.5</b>

## b) Headcount:

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Administrative Officers	795	861	843	872	874	940	943	975	982	1008	1080
Dental	14	17	14	16	14	17	18	22	16	17	15
Executive Officers	17	18	20	18	20	22	22	23	27	30	43
General Service Officers & Equivalent	417	426	427	444	451	472	474	495	515	503	517
Health Assistants	42	39	38	43	47	64	85	81	97	115	109
Health Professional Officers	768	826	858	912	955	1015	1045	1126	1105	1133	1179
Information Technology Officers	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2
Legal Officers	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medical Officers	529	596	630	690	739	814	857	876	904	914	994
Nursing Staff	2034	2139	2317	2412	2579	2626	2766	2884	2973	3108	3203
Professional Officers	4	5	13	15	14	12	16	16	15	8	11
Senior Officers	245	270	313	329	345	373	381	387	396	408	448
Teacher	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Technical Officers	142	164	181	191	182	177	182	171	156	145	146
Trainees and Apprentices	4	4	3	8	5	4	4	4	7	12	10
<b>Headcount Totals:</b>	<b>5015</b>	<b>5368</b>	<b>5660</b>	<b>5953</b>	<b>6228</b>	<b>6540</b>	<b>6797</b>	<b>7064</b>	<b>7195</b>	<b>7403</b>	<b>7758</b>

c) ACT public service classification type or equivalent:  
Classification types are listed in the above tables.

## d) Administrative or health professional:

In tables (c) full-time equivalent and (c) headcount, administrative and health professionals have been shaded to identify the classifications in the *ACT Public Service Administrative and Related Classifications Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

\*We have applied the caveat that 'health professional' will include Medical, Nursing, Allied Health and Professional Officers.

\*We have applied the caveat that 'administrative' will include Administrative Officers, Executive Officers, Senior Officers, Information Technology Officers, Teachers and Legal Officers

## Government—vehicle fleet (Question No 1362)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of vehicles in the Government fleet by vehicle type.

- (2) What is the total number of electric vehicles in the Government fleet.
- (3) What is the (a) timeframe for the replacement of all Government fleet vehicles with electric models and (b) the projected total cost of the replacement.
- (4) What process will be followed when procuring the new electric vehicles.
- (5) What is the total cost of (a) procuring and (b) maintaining electric vehicles in the Government fleet and how does this cost compare with other vehicle types in the Government fleet.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The table below shows currently leased pool passenger and light commercial vehicles by brand and model, along with numbers of that brand/model including executive vehicles.

VEHICLE TYPE	VEHICLE NUMBER
TOYOTA COROLLA	89
HYUNDAI i30	75
TOYOTA YARIS	68
KIA CERATO	45
TOYOTA PRIUS C – HATCH - HYBRID	23
HYUNDAI ACCENT	21
SUBARU FORESTER	22
NISSAN X-TRAIL	26
MAZDA CX-5	21
TOYOTA RAV4	17
NISSAN LEAF - EV	16
FORD MONDEO	16
TOYOTA CAMRY - HYBRID	11
MITSUBISHI ASX	13
HYUNDAI iMAX	12
HYUNDAI i40	11
HOLDEN CRUZE	10
KIA SPORTAGE	9
FORD TERRITORY	8
MAZDA CX-3	8
MITSUBISHI OUTLANDER AWD PHEV	8
KIA RIO	7
MITSUBISHI MIRAGE	7
KIA CARNIVAL	6
NISSAN QASHQAI	10
VW MULTIVAN	5
VW PASSAT	5
MAZDA 3	5
HYUNDAI SANTA FE	4
HOLDEN CADDY LIFE	4

VEHICLE TYPE	VEHICLE NUMBER
SUBARU OUTBACK	4
FORD FIESTA	4
NISSAN PULSAR	4
HONDA CR-V	3
HYUNDAI i30CW	2
SUBARU XV	3
MAZDA 2	3
HYUNDAI ix35	2
TOYOTA PRIUS	2
MERCEDES-BENZ VALENTE	2
FIAT PUNTO	1
HOLDEN COMMODORE SPORTS WAGON	2
HONDA ODYSSEY	2
VW TIGUAN	2
MAZDA 6	1
AUDI A3	1
HOLDEN TRAILBLAZER	1
MITSUBISHI PAJERO	1
HOLDEN COLORADO 7	1
HONDA ACCORD	1
FIAT FREEMONT	1
AUDI A4	1
KIA OPTIMA	1
HYUNDAI i20	1
TOYOTA LANDCRUISER PRADO	1
HYUNDAI TUCSON	1
VW GOLF	2
FIAT VITO	1
SKODA SUPERB	1
PRIUS V - HYBRID	1
SUZUKI SWIFT	1
RENAULT CLIO	1
TOYOTA TARAGO	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>636</b>

(2) The Territory currently has 16 electric vehicles in its leased fleet.

(3)

- (a) The ACT's Transition to Zero Emissions Vehicles Action Plan 2018-21 provides that at least 50% of all newly leased ACT Government passenger fleet vehicles will be zero emissions vehicles in 2019-20 (where fit for purpose). The Action Plan also provides that all newly leased ACT Government passenger fleet vehicles will be zero emissions vehicles from 2020-21 (where fit for purpose). This commitment translates to approximately 266 vehicles during the period 2019-20 to 2021-22. This estimate does not allow for anticipated reductions in overall Territory passenger vehicle numbers, and for possible non-selection of electric vehicles in some cases on a fit for purpose basis.

- (b) It is not currently possible to estimate total cost of leasing this number of electric vehicles, since this will depend on the models made available, and associated costs.
- (4) The Territory joined the Commonwealth Government's Fleet Services Contract (FSC) in April 2015 as a value for money and efficient way of procuring passenger and light commercial vehicles. Vehicles procured under the FSC are leased, with the lease provider being sgfleet, and the Commonwealth Bank as financier.

The Territory has introduced an annual bulk order process under the FSC whereby all passenger and light commercial vehicles with leases expiring in the upcoming financial year are identified by sgfleet, along with a matrix of vehicles that represent value for money across different sectors (e.g. small, medium, large passenger vehicles). This matrix is based on a similar recommended vehicle listing prepared by sgfleet for the Commonwealth, and is customised to meet specific Territory requirements. Directorates indicate which replacement vehicles they require to be delivered in the upcoming financial year, and sgfleet places orders with manufacturers.

It is anticipated that this established bulk order leasing process will be applied to procuring electric vehicles for the Territory. Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate contract manages the Territory's FSC participation, and is currently working with sgfleet to identify manufacturers with capacity to meet the Territory's electric vehicle requirements.

- (5) It is not possible to provide a total cost of procuring and maintaining electric vehicles in the numbers required under the Action Plan since it is unclear at this stage which manufacturers will be providing vehicles, and what their maintenance arrangements and costs will be. However, one indicator of possible electric vehicle fleet costs is provided by sgfleet's costings for a small electric vehicle currently available in the Australian market in small numbers, and anticipated to be more widely available soon. That electric vehicle has a manufacturer's price of approximately \$45,000. sgfleet has calculated a monthly rental for this vehicle of \$1,065 (inclusive of maintenance) taken over 60 months. This monthly rental figure does not include the cost of charging infrastructure.

---

### **ACT Ambulance Service—crews (Question No 1363—revised answer)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many emergency ambulance shifts in the past 30 days have fallen below minimum crewing levels.
- (2) How many emergency ambulance shifts in the past 30 days required overtime hours worked by ambulance officers and how many overtime hours were worked during this time.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:



- (1) The ACT Ambulance Service (ACTAS) currently aims to have 10 emergency ambulance crews during each shift and provides for two additional demand crews each 24 hour period. These crews assist in the management of peak periods of community demand. Crewing levels are currently being reviewed by ACTAS.

***For the period 11 April 2018 to 10 May 2018, there were 16 shifts where fewer than 10 emergency ambulances were available at some point during a shift. There are two shifts per day (day shift/night shift), which totals 60 shifts for the 30 day period.***

As stated previously, there are occasions when ACTAS accepts operating with fewer than 10 emergency ambulance crews. For example, if it is known that there are not enough staff rostered to crew 10 emergency ambulances in the middle of a day, every effort has been made to back fill the rostered shifts.

This same effort to back fill rostered shifts might not be applied for night shifts during the middle of a working week. In these instances ACTAS accepts operating with fewer than 10 emergency ambulance crews in the knowledge that the high standard of care for the community is maintained.

- (2) For the period 11 April 2018 to 10 May 2018, there were 30 shifts that required overtime to maintain crewing levels. There were also four demand shifts that required overtime to maintain crewing levels. There was a total of 637.5 hours of overtime during this period.

As announced by the ACT Government in December 2017, an additional 23 paramedics would be recruited to further assist ACTAS in maintaining crewing levels and reducing hours of overtime.

Eight new emergency staff completed their induction training, and commenced on the ACTAS roster from 7 May 2018. A further 15 new emergency staff will be recruited in the 2018-19 financial year.

---

### **Bushfires—controlled burns (Question No 1376)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Environment and Heritage*):

- (1) What steps does the ACT Government take to ensure that residents who suffer from asthma, or other breathing-related conditions, are warned of hazard reduction burns taking place in their area.
- (2) What is the standard timeframe for warning residents prior to burn(s) commencing.
- (3) What support, if any, is available to residents suffering a health reaction to smoke inhalation during a hazard reduction burn.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) All prescribed burns planned to be undertaken by the ACT Parks and Conservation Service (PCS) in any one financial year are identified in the annual Bush Fire Operational Plan (BOP). The annual BOP is drawn from the Regional Fire

Management Plans, which cover a ten year period of activities on ACT Government managed land, and have been through an extensive and wide ranging community consultation process prior to being finalised.

The annual approved and endorsed BOP can be found on the EPSDD website by following the links to Fire Management. The web site provides extensive information about all fuel management activities on government managed land and includes an interactive map with notifications of upcoming prescribed burns. A new feature is an RSS Feed that enables people to register their name so they can then receive automatic updates sent to their home address advising them of forthcoming burns. In addition the PCS has worked closely with ACT Health and the ACT Asthma Foundation with direct links provided for more information on the EPSDD web site.

PCS has developed a leaflet about Asthma and preventative actions with regard to bush fire smoke. This leaflet, along with more detailed information about the forthcoming burn, is placed in the letter boxes of all adjacent houses several days prior to implementing a prescribed burn in the urban areas. Extensive media coverage across commercial radio, television and social media is always sent out the day before the burn to advise as many people as possible about the burn intentions.

- (2) Prescribed burning undertaken by ACTPCS is only undertaken when suitable weather conditions prevail. Notifications to the community are sent out as soon as it is apparent that the predicted weather conditions are favourable. All notifications are made at least 24 hours prior to ignition as per the requirement of the *Emergencies Act 2014* (section 123 (2) (b))
- (3) The Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate web site has a direct link to the Asthma Foundation website which identifies a list of actions and tips around Asthma and bush fire smoke. The handout that is placed in letter boxes by PCS staff prior to the burn taking place also has detailed information on smoke and Asthma. In addition all media, both electronic and published, has information and links to the latest advice on how to deal with any health reactions that people may experience due to smoke from prescribed burns.

## **Planning—light rail (Question No 1378)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Transport and City Services*):

Will all legislative planning exemptions introduced by the *Planning and Development (Capital Metro) Legislation Amendment Act 2014* relating to Stage 1 of Light Rail apply to Stage 2; if not, can the Minister advise what legislative exemptions introduced by the *Planning and Development (Capital Metro) Legislation Amendment Act 2014* will apply to Stage 2 and why others will not.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

To the extent that the *Planning and Development Act 2007* applies to light rail Stage 2 the exemptions provided in the *Planning and Development (Capital Metro) Legislation Amendment Bill 2014* will also apply.

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1381)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There were 13 FOI requests pending with the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, as reported in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17. With regard to those pending matters, the following was determined:

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>(a) Date received</b>	<b>b) Date finalised</b>	<b>c) Pending as at 11 May 2018</b>
1	Apr-17	Jul-17	No
2	May-17	Jul-17	No
3	May-17	Jul-17	No
4	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
5	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
6	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
7	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
8	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
9	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
10	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
11	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
12	Jun-17	Transferred to EPSDD as part of changes to Administrative Arrangement on 1 July 2017	
13	Jun-17	Transferred to EPSDD as part of changes to Administrative Arrangement on 1 July 2017	

- (2) None of the FOI requests identified remained pending with CMTEDD as at 11 May 2018. The status of the FOI requests transferred to EPSDD are included in the response from EPSDD to Question on Notice - 1395.

Land Development Agency:

- 1) There were 2 FOI requests pending with the Land Development Agency at year end 2016-17, as reported in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17. With regard to those pending matters, the following was determined:

Request No.	(a) Date received	b) Date finalised	c) Pending as at 11 May 2018
1	May-17	Transferred to EPSDD as part of changes to Administrative Arrangement on 1 July 2017.	
2	Jun-17	Transferred to EPSDD as part of changes to Administrative Arrangement on 1 July 2017.	

- 2) The status of the 2 pending Land Development Agency FOI's have been reported by the EPSDD in their response to the Question on Notice – 1395.

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1382)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Urban Renewal, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1395.

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1383)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Urban Renewal, upon notice, on 11 May 2018  
(redirected to the Minister for Economic Development):

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1381.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1384)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Speaker, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms J Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1)-(2) I am advised that the Office of the Legislative Assembly did not have any FOI requests identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17.

The ACT Audit Office reported one FOI request as 'decision pending' in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate 2016-17 Annual Report.

- (a) The FOI request was received by the ACT Audit Office on 25 September 2015;  
and
- (b) The status of the request remains as 'decision pending'.

The ACT Electoral Commission did not receive any FOI requests during the 2016-17 reporting period.

- (2) Regarding the request that is recorded as 'decision pending':
  - (a) The ACT Audit Office is waiting to hear from the applicant who made the request. To date, the applicant has not provided a deposit of fees relating to the charges for processing the request; and
  - (b) The ACT Audit Office will resume processing the request once a deposit of fees relating to charges for processing the request is received from the applicant.

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1385)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1381.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1386)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Community Services Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1405.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1387)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.

- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please see the following data regarding the status of FOI requests pending at the end of FY 2016-17 for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate:

- (1) There were four FOI requests pending with the JACS directorate at year end 2016-17.

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>(a) Date received</b>	<b>b) Date finalised</b>	<b>c) Pending as at 11 May 2018</b>
1	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
2	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
3	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
4	Jun-17	Jul-17	No

- (2) None of the FOI requests identified were pending as at 11 May 2018.

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1388)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1387.

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1389)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.

- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Community Services Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1405.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1390)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1381.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1391)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Sport and Recreation*):

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the responses to Questions on Notice 1381 and 1409.

---



**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1392)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Community Services Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1405.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1393)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Community Services Directorate and the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the responses to Questions on Notice 1405 and 1395.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1394)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.

- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1395.

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1395)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate has determined that the number of FOI's for which decisions were pending at year end 2016-17, as reflected in Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, was incorrectly stated. The actual number of pending FOI's at year end was 8, not 13 as reflected in the report.

Additionally, 2 pending FOI requests held by LDA and 2 held by CMTEDD were transferred to EPSDD on 1 July 2017.

- (1) The following data relates to the 8 FOI's identified as pending with EPSDD at year end 2016-17.

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>(a) Date received</b>	<b>(b) Date finalised</b>	<b>(c) Pending as at 11 May 2018</b>
1	May 2017	March 2018*	No
2	May 2017	August 2017	No
3	June 2017	August 2017	No
4	June 2017	August 2017	No
5	June 2017	August 2017	No
6	June 2017	July 2017	No
7	June 2017	August 2017	No
8	June 2017	September 2017	No

\* First decision on 28 July 2017, additional documents released 20 March 2018.

FOI requests transferred from CMTEDD:

Request No.	(a) Date received	b) Date finalised	c) Pending as at 11 May 2018
1	June 2017	August 2017 (withdrawn)	No
2	June 2017	April 2018	No

FOI requests transferred from the Land Development Agency:

With regard to the 2 FOI's identified as pending with the Land Development Agency as at year end 2016-17, the following was determined:

Request No.	(a) Date received	b) Date finalised	c) Pending as at 11 May 2018
1	May 2017	August 2018	No
2	June 2017	N/A	Yes

(2) Requests remaining pending as at 11 May 2018:

EPSDD: None of the 8 FOI requests identified were pending as at 11 May 2018.

CMTEDD: None of the 2 FOI requests identified were pending as at 11 May 2018.

Land Development Agency: One request remained pending as at 11 May 2018. This request was received by transfer from CMTEDD following the *Administrative Arrangements 2017 (No 1)* and is being processed as two requests as the FOI request relates to two separate blocks. Processing delays are attributed to activities associated with Machinery of Government changes, applicant confirmation of scope revision, and resourcing pressures due to a large volume of requests and the introduction of the new FOI legislation. The request is expected to be finalised on 30 June 2018.

## **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1396)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Berry**: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Community Services Directorate and the Justice and Community Safety Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the responses to Questions on Notice 1405 and 1387.

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1397)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Tourism and Major Events upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1381.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1398)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1381.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1399)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for the Arts and Community Events, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for

which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.

- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1381.

---

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1400)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Veterans and Seniors, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Community Services Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1405.

---

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1401)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1395.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1402)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1387.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1403)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1387.

---

**Government—freedom of information requests  
(Question No 1404)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Health Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1408.

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1405)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Community Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There were 18 FOI requests pending with the Community Services Directorate at year end 2016-17, as reported in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17. With regard to those 18 pending matters, the following was determined:

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>(a) Date received</b>	<b>b) Date finalised</b>	<b>c) Pending as at 11 May 2018</b>
1	Mar-16	Dec-17	No
2	Dec-16	Aug-17	No
3	Feb-17	Jul-17	No
4	Mar-17	Jan-18	No
5	Mar-17	Pending	Yes
6	Mar-17	Pending	Yes
7	Mar-17	Dec-17	No
8	Mar-17	Pending	Yes
9	Apr-17	Feb-18	No
10	Apr-17	Jul-17	No
11	May-17	Withdrawn	No
12	May-17	Apr-18	No
13	Jun-17	Jul-17	No

Request No.	(a) Date received	b) Date finalised	c) Pending as at 11 May 2018
14	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
15	Jun-17	Aug-17	No
16	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
17	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
18	Jun-17	Aug-17	No

(2) Three of the FOI requests identified remained pending with CSD as at 11 May 2018.

FOI No.	(a) Reasons for delay:	(b) Date FOI expected to be finalised:
5	Large size - agreement for staged release	Jun-18
6	Request deferred under section 20, FOI Act 1989	Aug-18
8	Large size - agreement for staged release	Jun-18

---

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1406)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Community Services Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1405.

---

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1407)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.



- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There were 14 FOI requests pending with the Education Directorate at year end 2016-17, as reported in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17. With regard to those pending matters, the following was determined:

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>(a) Date received</b>	<b>b) Date finalised</b>	<b>c) Pending as at 11 May 2018</b>
1	Feb-17	Oct-17	No
2	Mar-17	Aug-17	No
3	Mar-17	Aug-17	No
4	Mar-17	Aug-17	No
5	Mar-17	Aug-17	No
6	Mar-17	Aug-17	No
7	Jun-17	Sep-17	No
8	Jun-17	Oct-17	No
9	Jun-17	Oct-17	No
10	Jun-17	Oct-17	No
11	Jun-17	Oct-17	No
12	Jun-17	Oct-17	No
13	Jun-17	Oct-17	No
14	Jun-17		Yes

- (2) One of the FOI requests remained pending with the Education Directorate as at 11 May 2018. The request required a large volume of documents to be collated and reviewed, as well as consultation with third parties. The majority of the documents did not require consultation with third parties and were released to the applicant in December 2017. A small number of documents are being considered for the stage 2 release, which is anticipated to be completed by 30 June 2018.

---

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1408)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please see the following data regarding the status of FOI requests pending at the end of FY 2016-17 for the Health Directorate:

- (1) There were 10 FOI requests pending with the Health Directorate at year end 2016-17.

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>(a) Date received</b>	<b>b) Date finalised</b>	<b>c) Pending as at 11 May 2018</b>
1	Mar-17	Jul-17	No
2	May-17	Jul-17	No
3	May-17	Aug-17	No
4	May-17	Jul-17	No
5	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
6	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
7	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
8	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
9	Jun-17	Jul-17	No
10	Jun-17	Oct-17	No

- (2) None of the FOI requests identified remained pending with the Health Directorate as at 11 May 2018.

---

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1409)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There were 12 FOI requests pending with the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate at end 2016-17, as reported in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17. With regard to those pending matters, the following was determined:

<b>Request No.</b>	<b>(a) Date received</b>	<b>b) Date finalised</b>	<b>c) Pending as at 11 May 2018</b>
1	25-Nov-16	18-Oct-17	No
2	11-Apr-17	15-Aug-17	No
3	01-May-17	15-Aug-17	No
4	19-May-17	13-Sep-17	No
5	23-May-17	27-Jul-17	No
6	24-May-17	11-Jul-17	No
7	30-May-17	28-Jul-17	No
8	02-Jun-17	11-Jul-17	No

Request No.	(a) Date received	b) Date finalised	c) Pending as at 11 May 2018
9	06-Jun-17	28-Jul-17	No
10	06-Jun-17	28-Jul-17	No
11	27-Jun-17	04-Jul-17	No
12	29-Jun-17	08-Aug-17	No

(2) None of the FOI requests identified in part (1) were pending as at 11 May 2018.

---

### **Government—freedom of information requests (Question No 1410)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Higher Education, Training and Research, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For each FOI request identified as pending in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate Annual Report 2016-17, by each directorate and government agency for which you are responsible, what (a) was the month and year the request was received, (b) was the month and year the request was finalised, or whether the request is still pending.
- (2) If any requests have been identified as pending in part (1), (a) what were the reasons for delay in finalising the request and (b) when are they expected to be finalised.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regard to the status of FOI requests held by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate at year end 2016-17, I refer the Member to the response to Question on Notice 1381.

---

### **Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1411)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1413 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Environment Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

---

### Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1412)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Urban Renewal, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1413 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Environment Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

### Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1413)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

a) Full-time equivalent (FTE):

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	9.0	16.4	16.0	14.0	11.0	16.0	14.0	13.0	17.0	21.0	24.3
Senior Officers	141.3	191.4	205.7	245.9	252.2	239.3	242.5	207.4	219.2	278.3	326.0

b) Headcount:

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	9	17	16	14	11	16	14	13	18	21	25
Senior Officers	145	199	216	257	266	251	255	219	230	291	340

c) ACT public service classification type (FTE):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1							1.0			1.0	
Executive 1.2		1.0	2.0	1.0			1.0		3.0	2.0	1.0
Executive 1.3	4.0	6.4	8.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	6.0	12.0

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 2.4	2.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	4.0
Executive 2.5	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0						1.0	1.0
Executive 2.6					2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.3
Executive 3.7	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
Executive 3.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0							
Executive 3.9		1.0	1.0								
Executive 3.10				1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.0
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 1										1.0	1.0
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 2											2.0
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist3									5.3	10.6	12.4
Infrastructure Officer 3								10.8	13.8	12.8	18.8
Infrastructure Officer 4								16.7	10.0	16.0	13.9
Infrastructure Officer 5								10.1	4.8	6.8	8.0
Manager	2.8	2.8									
Sen Public Affairs Off 1			1.0	1.0	1.0						
Senior Officer A	19.0	29.0	32.5	39.7	37.6	30.1	31.6	19.8	23.6	24.0	27.2
Senior Officer B	36.8	56.1	58.4	66.5	73.0	70.1	71.6	44.4	53.9	65.3	74.6
Senior Officer C	61.3	75.2	85.0	94.1	99.2	104.7	106.4	77.5	81.9	111.2	136.0
Senior Prof Officer A	6.0	6.0	5.7	9.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	8.0	8.0
Senior Prof Officer B	4.9	5.9	5.9	10.3	8.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	7.0	5.0	5.9
Senior Prof Officer C	10.5	16.4	16.2	24.2	25.4	19.4	22.0	15.1	14.0	17.7	18.2
Senior Tech Officer C			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0				

## c) ACT public service classification type (Headcount):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1							1			1	
Executive 1.2		1	2	1			1		3	2	1
Executive 1.3	4	7	8	5	6	7	4	4	2	6	12
Executive 2.4	2	3	2	4	1	4	3	5	9	6	4
Executive 2.5	1	3	1	1						1	1
Executive 2.6					2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Executive 3.7	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	3
Executive 3.8	1	1	1	1							
Executive 3.9		1	1								
Executive 3.10				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 1										1	1
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 2											2
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist3									6	11	13
Infrastructure Officer 3								11	14	13	19
Infrastructure Officer 4								17	10	17	15
Infrastructure Officer 5								11	5	7	8
Manager	3	3									
Sen Public Affairs Off 1			1	1	1						
Senior Officer A	19	29	33	41	38	31	32	21	25	24	28
Senior Officer B	38	57	59	68	77	73	75	48	56	67	77
Senior Officer C	63	81	93	101	108	112	114	82	87	119	144
Senior Prof Officer A	6	6	6	9	7	7	5	5	5	8	8
Senior Prof Officer B	5	6	6	11	8	7	5	8	7	5	6
Senior Prof Officer C	11	17	17	25	26	20	23	16	15	19	19
Senior Tech Officer C			1	1	1	1	1				

## (d) General administrative division:

In tables (c) full-time equivalent and (c) headcount, senior officers have been shaded to identify the classifications in the *ACT Public Service Administrative and Related Classifications Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

Note: Information about Emergency Services staff is provided in the response to Question on Notice 1417 from the Attorney-General.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1414)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1413 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1415)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1413 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1416)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable

Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1413 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

### **Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1417)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

a) Full-time equivalent (FTE):

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	30.0	32.5	40.0	41.0	40.0	39.0	44.0	39.0	39.0	39.1	40.0
Senior Officers	149.3	171.5	157.2	199.7	217.8	228.9	220.6	202.0	219.8	251.1	243.2

b) Headcount:

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	30	33	42	41	40	39	44	39	39	40	40
Senior Officers	156	177	165	210	226	238	229	209	230	268	258

c) ACT public service classification type (FTE):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	3.0	2.0	6.4	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	3.0	2.0	4.0
Executive 1.2	8.0	9.7	11.0	9.0	9.0	7.0	8.0	7.0	9.0	8.0	7.0
Executive 1.3	9.0	9.8	11.6	15.0	14.0	14.0	18.0	14.0	12.0	13.1	12.0
Executive 2.4	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0
Executive 2.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Executive 2.6	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0			1.0	1.0	4.0
Executive 3.7	1.0	1.0	1.0				2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
Executive 3.9				1.0							
Executive 3.10	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 3.11					1.0						
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 2									2.0	1.0	1.0
Principal Research Off								0.7		0.1	
Senior Info Tech Off B	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8
Senior Info Tech Off C	1.0										
Senior Officer A	19.9	19.2	14.8	25.8	24.3	34.3	27.5	32.9	29.9	53.4	47.8
Senior Officer B	34.7	42.7	41.8	52.5	57.8	54.8	58.9	51.2	62.5	55.6	57.6
Senior Officer C	79.7	96.6	89.6	107.8	123.1	128.8	123.6	106.6	115.8	129.5	129.4
Senior Prof Officer A	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.6	1.6	2.0	1.6	2.6	2.6	4.6	1.6
Senior Prof Officer B	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
Senior Prof Officer C	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Superintendent BRC	1.0										
Work Cover Manager A	0.0										
Work Cover Manager B		1.0									
Work Cover Manager C	3.0	1.0	1.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	1.0				

## c) ACT public service classification type (Headcount):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	3	2	7	5	6	6	6	6	3	2	4
Executive 1.2	8	10	11	9	9	7	8	7	9	8	7
Executive 1.3	9	10	12	15	14	14	18	14	12	14	12
Executive 2.4	2	3	3	3	4	6	6	6	5	6	5
Executive 2.5	4	4	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	5	5
Executive 2.6	2	2	2	2	2	2			1	1	4
Executive 3.7	1	1	1				2	2	3	3	2
Executive 3.9				1							
Executive 3.10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
Executive 3.11					1						
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 2									2	1	1
Principal Research Off								1		1	
Senior Info Tech Off B	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Senior Info Tech Off C	1										
Senior Officer A	21	20	18	27	25	35	29	33	31	55	50
Senior Officer B	35	44	44	54	60	57	61	52	65	59	60
Senior Officer C	84	100	92	115	128	135	128	112	122	140	139
Senior Prof Officer A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	5	2
Senior Prof Officer B	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	1
Senior Prof Officer C	4	5	4	5	4	3	3	3	3	4	4
Superintendent BRC	1										



Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Work Cover Manager A	1										
Work Cover Manager B		1									
Work Cover Manager C	3	1	1	3	2	1	1				

d) General administrative division:

In tables (c) full-time equivalent and (c) headcount, senior officers have been shaded to identify the classifications in the *ACT Public Service Administrative and Related Classifications Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

### **Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1418)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1417 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

### **Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1419)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1417 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1420)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1417 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1421)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1417 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1422)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic

Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

a) Full time equivalent (FTE):

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	42.8	45.6	41.8	56.6	63.0	62.7	63.6	70.0	75.0	72.4	76.0
Senior Officers	472.8	494.2	503.6	581.8	619.2	658.3	686.7	852.7	913.3	890.1	861.3

b) Headcount:

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	44	46	42	57	64	63	64	70	75	73	76
Senior Officers	483	503	513	596	634	673	702	875	939	917	888

c) ACT Public Service classification Type (FTE):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	3.0	2.0	1.0		1.0			1.0	1.0	2.0	5.0
Executive 1.2	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Executive 1.3	21.8	22.6	23.8	31.6	36.0	36.0	37.0	39.0	39.0	40.4	42.0
Executive 2.4	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	7.0	6.7	5.6	9.0	12.0	9.0	11.0
Executive 2.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
Executive 2.6	5.0	5.0	3.0	6.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	3.0
Executive 3.7	1.0	1.0		1.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	1.0
Executive 3.8				1.0							3.0
Executive 3.9									1.0	3.0	2.0
Executive 3.10					1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Executive 3.11	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0		1.0	1.0
Executive 3.12	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Building Trade Inspector Mngr								2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
CMD Manager	6.0	2.0									
CMD Senior Officer	3.0										
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 1										7.0	10.0
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 2									2.0	5.0	1.0
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 3									3.6	1.5	4.0
Infrastructure Officer 3								14.0	11.0	23.6	11.0
Infrastructure Officer 4								27.6	30.3	27.6	32.2
Infrastructure Officer 5								12.0	13.0	3.0	1.0
Manager	11.3	10.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0					
Manager 3	3.0										
Senior Info Tech Off A			1.0		1.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Senior Info Tech Off B	14.9	15.9	15.9	15.0	11.9	16.9	16.9	15.9	17.9	18.9	15.5
Senior Info Tech Off C	43.0	49.0	48.0	53.8	59.3	64.3	71.3	83.0	84.2	84.9	87.5
Senior Officer	4.0	4.0	1.7	1.0	1.0	1.0					
Senior Officer A	67.0	80.4	78.4	101.1	118.7	122.7	120.7	138.0	141.8	134.9	137.7
Senior Officer B	91.9	112.1	120.1	146.1	155.7	161.7	169.9	176.9	209.1	204.3	195.5
Senior Officer C	193.8	183.5	197.2	220.1	222.9	244.8	257.8	360.6	380.2	354.9	342.7
Senior Prof Officer A	10.0	13.7	12.0	10.9	11.5	10.0	10.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
Senior Prof Officer B	12.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	14.9	17.0	17.0	3.0			0.8
Senior Prof Officer C	12.8	15.2	20.2	21.7	20.2	15.9	19.1	12.7	12.1	14.6	14.4
Senior Tech Officer C								1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
Work Cover Manager C								2.0		1.0	1.0

## c) ACT Public Service classification Type (Headcount):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	3	2	1		2			1	1	2	5
Executive 1.2	5	7	5	7	4	4	5	4	5	5	4
Executive 1.3	23	23	24	32	36	36	37	39	39	41	42
Executive 2.4	1	2	2	3	7	7	6	9	12	9	11
Executive 2.5	4	4	5	5	5	5	3	3	2	2	3
Executive 2.6	5	5	3	6	4	3	5	6	5	5	3
Executive 3.7	1	1		1	3	3	4	5	7	3	1
Executive 3.8				1							3
Executive 3.9									1	3	2
Executive 3.10					1	1	1	1	1	1	
Executive 3.11	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1		1	1
Executive 3.12	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1
Building Trade Inspector Mngr								2	2	2	2
CMD Manager	6	2									
CMD Senior Officer	3										
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 1										7	10
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 2									2	5	1
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 3									4	2	4
Infrastructure Officer 3								14	11	24	13
Infrastructure Officer 4								28	31	28	33
Infrastructure Officer 5								12	13	3	1
Manager	12	11	2	2	2	2					
Manager 3	3										
Senior Info Tech Off A			1		1	2	4	2	3	4	2
Senior Info Tech Off B	15	16	16	15	12	17	17	16	18	19	16
Senior Info Tech Off C	43	49	48	54	60	65	72	84	85	86	89

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Senior Officer	4	4	2	1	1	1					
Senior Officer A	69	81	80	105	122	126	125	142	146	138	140
Senior Officer B	95	113	122	149	160	164	174	181	217	210	204
Senior Officer C	198	189	202	226	227	252	263	372	391	369	353
Senior Prof Officer A	10	14	12	11	12	10	10	2	2	2	1
Senior Prof Officer B	12	8	7	10	16	17	17	3			1
Senior Prof Officer C	13	16	21	23	21	17	20	14	13	15	15
Senior Tech Officer C								1	1	2	2
Work Cover Manager C								2		1	1

d) General administrative division

In tables (c) full-time equivalent and (c) headcount, senior officers have been shaded to identify the classifications in the *ACT Public Service Administrative and Related Classifications Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

### **Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1423)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Economic Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1422 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

### **Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1424)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1422 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1425)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1422 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1426)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1422 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1427)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Higher Education, Training and Research, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1422 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

### **Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1428)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1422 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

### **Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1429)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for the Arts and Community Events, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1422 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1430)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Tourism and Major Events, upon notice, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1422 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1431)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Community Services Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1438 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1432)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Community Services Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.



**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1438 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1433)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Community Services Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1438 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1434)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Community Services Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1438 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1435)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Community Services Directorate and former

equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1438 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorates staffing  
(Question No 1436)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Community Services Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1438 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorates staffing  
(Question No 1437)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Veterans and Seniors, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Community Services Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1438 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorates staffing  
(Question No 1438)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Community Services Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

a) Full time equivalent (FTE):

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	16.0	22.0	17.6	23.0	20.0	22.0	25.0	22.0	21.0	21.0	22.0
Senior Officers	167.9	167.0	169.7	191.3	212.0	214.3	215.4	223.3	206.6	175.4	187.8

b) Headcount:

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	16	22	18	23	20	22	25	22	21	21	22
Senior Officers	166	169	173	196	217	221	224	231	215	182	198

c) ACT Public Service classification type (FTE):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0				
Executive 1.2	2.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
Executive 1.3	4.0	8.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	9.0	11.0	10.0	11.0	9.0
Executive 2.4	2.0	1.0		4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Executive 2.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.0			1.0			
Executive 2.6	3.0	2.0	2.6	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Executive 3.7				1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
Executive 3.10	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Manager 1	2.0										
Senior Officer A	30.1	24.6	27.8	29.1	32.5	40.8	43.0	42.6	39.6	40.5	39.5
Senior Officer B	38.7	35.9	34.8	42.1	44.9	47.4	45.9	44.4	33.6	33.9	35.3
Senior Officer C	92.7	100.4	102.9	116.5	131.6	125.1	125.5	135.3	131.4	100.0	112.0
Senior Prof Officer B	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Senior Prof Officer C	2.4	4.0	2.2	1.6	1.0						

c) ACT Public Service classification type (headcount):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1				
Executive 1.2	2	4	4	6	2	2	2	1	1	1	2
Executive 1.3	4	8	5	6	6	7	9	11	10	11	9
Executive 2.4	2	1		4	5	5	5	4	3	3	3
Executive 2.5	3	4	3	1	1			1			
Executive 2.6	3	2	3	3	4	5	6	3	4	4	5
Executive 3.7				1		1	1	1	2	1	2
Executive 3.10	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Manager 1	2										
Senior Officer A	30	25	28	30	33	41	44	43	40	41	41

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Senior Officer B	37	36	35	44	46	49	48	46	34	35	37
Senior Officer C	92	102	105	118	135	130	131	141	139	105	119
Senior Prof Officer B	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
Senior Prof Officer C	3	4	3	2	1						

d) General administrative division:

In tables (c) full-time equivalent and (c) headcount, senior officers have been shaded to identify the classifications in the *ACT Public Service Administrative and Related Classifications Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

Note: Information about Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations staff is provided in the response to Question on Notice 1422 from the Chief Minister.

### Government—directorate staffing (Question No 1439)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Health Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division; during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

a) Full-time equivalent (FTE):

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	17.0	18.0	20.0	17.0	20.0	22.0	21.1	23.0	25.0	30.0	41.4
Senior Officers	231.9	255.1	298.3	314.3	327.5	354.6	361.1	368.2	375.4	383.7	417.7

b) Headcount:

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	17	18	20	18	20	22	22	23	27	30	43
Senior Officers	245	270	313	329	345	373	381	387	396	408	448

c) ACT Public Service classification type (FTE):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	1.0										1.0
Executive 1.2	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Executive 1.3	7.0	8.0	8.0	3.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	17.0
Executive 2.4	3.0	4.0	6.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	9.0	11.0	12.0	15.0	15.4

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 2.5	1.0	2.0	3.0								1.0
Executive 2.6			1.0				1.1	1.0	0.0	2.0	3.0
Executive 3.7	1.0	1.0									
Executive 3.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Executive 3.10	1.0										
Executive 3.11		1.0			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist3										1.0	1.0
Infrastructure Officer 4									1.0	1.0	1.0
Infrastructure Officer 5											1.0
Principal Research Off			1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0
Principal Rsrch Fellow			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0					
Sen Public Affairs Off 2	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0				
Senior Info Tech Off A	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	1.0		1.0		
Senior Info Tech Off B	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Senior Info Tech Off C	1.4	1.4	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.7
Senior Officer A	29.6	36.0	43.6	46.0	52.5	54.5	56.2	57.5	67.1	63.2	67.2
Senior Officer B	50.9	56.1	74.9	86.2	85.5	92.1	92.8	101.9	100.7	106.6	130.1
Senior Officer C	132.6	144.3	157.5	155.9	166.2	185.3	195.7	193.7	192.7	199.7	202.6
Senior Prof Officer A	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.7	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.9	2.0
Senior Prof Officer B	4.0	1.0	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.0	1.0
Senior Prof Officer C	3.4	4.2	4.3	6.0	6.7	3.8	4.5	4.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
Senior Research Off 1				1.0		0.8				0.2	1.1
Senior Research Off 2			0.4			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		
Senior Research Officer				0.5	0.5						
Senior Tech Officer C		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

## c) ACT public service classification type (Headcount):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	1										1
Executive 1.2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
Executive 1.3	7	8	8	4	5	6	6	5	9	9	17
Executive 2.4	3	4	6	11	11	11	9	11	12	15	16
Executive 2.5	1	2	3								1
Executive 2.6			1				2	1	1	2	3
Executive 3.7	1	1									
Executive 3.8	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3
Executive 3.10	1										
Executive 3.11		1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist3										1	1
Infrastructure Officer 4									1	1	1

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Infrastructure Officer 5											1
Principal Research Off			1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Principal Rsrch Fellow			1	1	1	1					
Sen Public Affairs Off 2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1				
Senior Info Tech Off A	1	2	2	3	3	3	1		1		
Senior Info Tech Off B	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Senior Info Tech Off C	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
Senior Officer A	30	36	44	46	53	55	58	58	68	65	72
Senior Officer B	52	58	78	90	89	97	98	106	105	113	136
Senior Officer C	143	156	167	165	178	198	208	207	207	215	220
Senior Prof Officer A	6	6	6	7	4	4	2	2	3	3	2
Senior Prof Officer B	4	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
Senior Prof Officer C	4	5	5	7	8	4	5	4	3	3	4
Senior Research Off 1				1		1				1	2
Senior Research Off 2			1			1	1	1	1		
Senior Research Officer				1	1						
Senior Tech Officer C		1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1

d) General administrative division:

In tables (c) full-time equivalent and (c) headcount, senior officers have been shaded to identify the classifications in the *ACT Public Service Administrative and Related Classifications Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

Note: Information about Higher Education, Training and Research staff is provided in the response to Question on Notice 1422 from the Chief Minister.

### Government—directorates staffing (Question No 1440)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Health Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division; during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1439 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Health Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1441)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, upon notice, on 11 May 2018, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by the Health Directorate and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division; during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1439 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Health Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1442)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by Transport Canberra and City Services and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1443 for the requested information concerning executive and senior staffing for the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate staffing  
(Question No 1443)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of executive, senior officer or equivalent level staff employed by Transport Canberra and City Services and former equivalent directorates by (a) full-time equivalent, (b) headcount, (c) ACT public service

classification type and (d) general administrative division, during (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09, (iii) 2009-10, (iv) 2010-11, (v) 2011-12, (vi) 2012-13, (vii) 2013-14, (viii) 2014-15, (ix) 2016-17 and (x) 2017-18 to date.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

a) Full-time equivalent (FTE):

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	25.0	18.0	19.0	18.0	19.0	19.0	26.8	25.0	28.9	30.9	29.9
Senior Officers	246.0	243.0	227.5	190.1	205.8	214.2	213.5	192.9	201.3	193.0	222.8

b) Headcount:

Classification Group	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive Officers	25	19	19	18	19	19	27	25	29	31	30
Senior Officers	254	247	231	192	209	219	219	198	205	195	228

c) ACT Public Service classification type (FTE):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0				2.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	1.9
Executive 1.2	6.0	6.0	7.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Executive 1.3	8.0	4.0	3.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	10.0	14.0	17.0	18.0
Executive 2.4	6.0	3.0	3.0		1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0		1.0	
Executive 2.5			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Executive 2.6	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
Executive 3.7									1.0	1.0	1.0
Executive 3.9									1.0	1.0	1.0
Executive 3.10	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.0	2.0		
Executive 3.12							1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Infra Manager/Specialist								1.0			
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 1									4.0	3.0	4.0
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 2											1.0
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist3									5.0	5.0	6.0
Infrastructure Officer 3								5.0	21.0	21.0	25.1
Infrastructure Officer 4								6.0	9.0	14.0	16.0
Infrastructure Officer 5								4.0	1.0		1.0
Manager	5.0										
Manager Grade B	3.0										
Manager Grade C	5.9										
Senior Info Tech Off B				1.0	1.0	1.0					
Senior Officer A	23.9	31.8	27.6	20.0	23.6	23.0	26.9	17.9	26.0	29.0	41.8
Senior Officer B	53.2	53.7	55.8	46.5	45.9	55.8	54.6	53.3	47.0	45.5	44.0
Senior Officer C	97.6	100.6	89.5	74.4	86.0	89.9	89.2	73.4	72.1	65.5	75.9
Senior Prof Officer A	12.0	10.0	10.0	10.8	11.8	8.8	8.8	4.8	2.8		
Senior Prof Officer B	8.0	10.0	12.8	10.8	6.8	11.0	13.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
Senior Prof Officer C	33.5	31.8	24.8	20.5	24.7	19.7	16.0	16.4	5.4	1.0	1.0
Senior Tech Officer B							1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Senior Tech Officer C	4.0	5.0	7.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0



## c) ACT Public Service classification type (Headcount):

Classification	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Executive 1.1	1	1	1				2	3	3	3	2
Executive 1.2	6	6	7	4	4	3	4	4	3	2	2
Executive 1.3	8	4	3	8	9	10	12	10	14	17	18
Executive 2.4	6	3	3		1	1	2	2		1	
Executive 2.5			3	3	3	3	4	2	2	3	2
Executive 2.6	3	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3
Executive 3.7									1	1	1
Executive 3.9									1	1	1
Executive 3.10	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2		
Executive 3.12							1	1	1	1	1
Infra Manager/Specialist								1			
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 1									4	3	4
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist 2											1
Infrastructure Mngr/Specialist3									5	5	6
Infrastructure Officer 3								5	21	21	26
Infrastructure Officer 4								6	9	14	16
Infrastructure Officer 5								4	1		1
Manager	5										
Manager Grade B	3										
Manager Grade C	6										
Senior Info Tech Off B				1	1	1					
Senior Officer A	24	32	28	20	24	23	28	18	27	29	42
Senior Officer B	55	55	56	47	47	56	55	54	48	46	46
Senior Officer C	101	102	91	75	87	93	92	77	73	67	78
Senior Prof Officer A	13	10	10	11	12	9	9	5	3		
Senior Prof Officer B	8	10	13	11	7	11	13	5	3	3	2
Senior Prof Officer C	35	33	26	21	25	21	17	17	6	1	1
Senior Tech Officer B							1	1	1	1	
Senior Tech Officer C	4	5	7	6	6	5	4	5	4	5	5

## d) General administrative division:

In tables (c) full-time equivalent and (c) headcount, senior officers have been shaded to identify the classifications in the *ACT Public Service Administrative and Related Classifications Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017*.

Note: Information about Higher Education, Training and Research staff is provided in the response to Question on Notice 1422 from the Chief Minister.

### Alexander Maconochie Centre—review (Question No 1444)

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) In relation to the Independent Inquiry into the Treatment in Custody of Steven Freeman and the Government's response and progress on the issues identified, can the

Minister provide an update to recommendation 1 including (a) how has electronic surveillance improved, (b) does it meet best practice protection for, and the security of detainees, (c) have all Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC) custodial officers been trained in operating closed circuit television cameras and (d) have protocols been developed for camera settings, movement and recording.

- (2) In relation to recommendation 2, can the Minister provide (a) confirmation on whether ACT police now accord higher priority to the investigation of serious assaults at the AMC, (b) what approach is used for assaults that are not defined as serious and whether these are still referred to police and what priority they are given and (c) how many incidents has the newly established Violence Reduction Team (VRT) reviewed and how many of these have been referred to ACT police.
- (3) In relation to recommendation 3, what evidence does the Minister have that supports a pro charge and pro prosecution approach has been adopted by ACT Policing and the ACT Director of Public Prosecutions.
- (4) In relation to recommendation 4, (a) has a contract or memorandum of understanding been established between ACT Health and ACT Corrective Services to ensure that they share information to assist in the provision of health care for AMC detainees and (b) what other operational and governance arrangements have been improved to provide clear direction on roles and responsibilities for primary and mental health service delivery at the AMC.
- (5) In relation to recommendation 5, (a) what is the current status of integrating Winnunga Nimmityjah Aboriginal Health Service into the provision of health care at the AMC, (b) are other health care providers working in partnership with Winnunga, (c) is information and data sharing occurring; if so, is this in paper/hardcopy form or through an electronic management system, (d) how many meetings have been held with the working group established to develop a best practice model for Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander Health Service Delivery at AMC and (e) has a model in fact been developed and implemented; if so, what are the performance measures being used to track the implementation of this model.
- (6) In relation to recommendation 6, (a) has a separate remand prison, area or process been established for indigenous detainees at the AMC and (b) has the Centre Logic been implemented that charts accommodation placements, detainee classification, movement of detainee cohorts and program access; if so, how has the implementation of this Logic approach informed future operating models.
- (7) In relation to recommendation 7, (a) has the Health Services Commission (of the ACT Human Rights Commission) completed their independent investigation into the prescription of methadone to detainees at the AMC, (b) have the processes and procedures for the methadone program used by ACT Health been fully reviewed and updated to reflect national standards and (c) has ACT Health implemented the electronic methadone dosing system.
- (8) In relation to recommendation 8, (a) has the Justice and Community Safety Directorate developed and implemented an Inspectorate of Custodial Services function, (b) how many reports or incidents have been reviewed by this area since it was established and (c) what happens to the reports once they have been reviewed, are they passed on to the ACT Ombudsman, to ACT police or other agencies.

- (9) In relation to recommendation 9, can the Minister provide (a) a list of the conclusions from the independent inquiry that have been identified for further remedial action and (b) detail on what steps the Government is taking to address the points raised in those conclusions.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement tabled in the Assembly on 20 February 2018 provides detailed information on the progress of each of the recommendations made in the Moss Review.

- (1) (a) Refer to the Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement for detail.
- (b) Refer to the Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement for detail.
- (c) 96 officers have been trained on Master Control Room (MCR) operations to a level where they are competent in operating CCTV. MCR training remains an ongoing training package for relevant officers at the AMC.
- (d) There are no specific industry standards related to the use of CCTV within Correctional facilities, however, ACTCS has established standards through the development of policies and procedures.
- (2) (a) Refer to the Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement for detail.
- (b) At the time of an incident the Area and Operations Managers consult and decide if the incident requires a referral to ACT Policing. ACT Policing determine the priority to be given to alleged assaults and investigate incidents when there is sufficient evidence to proceed.
- (c) The AMC Security Team review all assaults. The Violence Reduction Team (VRT) holds committee meetings to strategically review and discuss violent incidents and trends. It is not a forum that reviews specific incidents or refers incidents to ACT Policing as referrals are made shortly after the incident where necessary.
- (3) Refer to the Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement for detail.
- (4) (a) Yes. A formal Arrangement was signed by the Directors-General of Justice and Community Safety and ACT Health on 14 August 2017. The Information-Sharing Schedule of the Arrangement was signed on 20 November 2017 by the Executive Directors of ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) and Mental Health, Justice Health and Alcohol and Drug Services. This schedule addresses information sharing to enhance service delivery arrangements for detainees by the improved transfer of relevant and timely information between agencies.
- (b) The Arrangement sets a clear statement of intent for the provision of health services for detainees. Refer to the Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement for detail. In addition, ACTCS and Justice Health regularly meet to discuss strategic and functional matters.

- (5) (a) Winnunga Nimmitjyah Aboriginal Health and Community Services (Winnunga) are currently being integrated into the provision of health care at the AMC. Refer to the Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement for detail.
- (b) The ACT Government is working directly with Winnunga.
- (c) Information and data sharing arrangements are being considered by the operational working group that consists of officers from ACT Health, ACTCS and Winnunga, as part of implementation of recommendation 5.
- (d) In 2017 a working group of staff from ACT Health, ACTCS and Winnunga met on three occasions to develop the Winnunga Nimmitjyah Aboriginal Health and Community Service – AMC Collaborative Health Care Model (the model). In 2018 this group met a further three times.
- Three further subgroup meetings have also occurred in 2018 to consider operational details.
- (e) Consultation is ongoing regarding the operationalisation of the model. Refer to the Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement for further detail.
- (6) (a) Refer to the Moss Implementation Annual Report and Ministerial Statement for further detail.
- (b) A report has been provided to ACTCS Executive regarding the AMC Centre Logic. This document provides context to the issues and challenges faced within the AMC and will be used to inform the future ‘operating model’ for the centre.
- (7) (a) On 9 March 2018, the ACT Health Services Commissioner released the report into the review of the Opioid Replacement Treatment program at the AMC.
- (b) Yes. Processes and procedures for the methadone program used by ACT Health have been drafted in line with the national guidelines and were implemented in August 2017.
- (c) Yes. ACT Health has implemented the electronic methadone dosing system.
- (8) (a) Yes. On 30 November 2017 the ACT Legislative Assembly passed the *Inspector of Correctional Services Act 2017*. This legislation established an independent inspector. An Inspector was appointed on 14 March 2018.
- (b) None to date.
- (c) *The Inspector of Correctional Services Act 2017* s27(1) states that the Inspector must give a report on each examination and review conducted by the Inspector to the Legislative Assembly within six months of completing the examination and review.
- (9) (a) Refer to the Moss Annual Report for detail on each of the conclusions under recommendation 9 and the remedial actions taken.
- (b) In addition to response (9)(a) the Moss Implementation Steering Committee, led by Independent Chair, Mr Russel Taylor AM, continues to monitor progress being

taken by the ACT Government to fully implement the Moss Review recommendations. Actions to address the conclusions under Recommendation 9 is being progressed by an Inter-Directorate Project team led by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

---

**Planning—Moncrieff  
(Question No 1445)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development*):

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Access Canberra is advising residents of Moncrieff that the Minister's Directorate has not yet handed over the suburb to Transport and City Services.
- (2) Is the Minister aware that this management arrangement is the reason residents are given for Fix My Street requests not being actioned in a timely manner.
- (3) What are the criteria for a suburb officially becoming a suburb and are the same criteria and standards used for all suburbs from development to completion.
- (4) When will Moncrieff be handed over to Transport and City Services Directorate.
- (5) How are requests for suburb maintenance and services handled when a suburb remains under the management of the Suburban Land Agency?
- (6) What is the additional cost of having the management and administration of municipal services duplicated.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Suburban Land Agency has advised me that certain areas in Moncrieff, such as the Community Recreation Park and the Stage 6B open space, are currently on consolidation for the next three to six months, depending on the rate of growth of the plants. Until the end of the consolidation period these soft landscapes will remain the responsibility of the relevant Suburban Land Agency contractor. Therefore Access Canberra are correct in advising residents that these areas have not been handed over to Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate (TCCS). The Suburban Land Agency works closely with the TCCS to ensure land is formally handed over to them, as the asset owner, at the end of a project. There are numerous construction stages that make up an estate and the handover process can occur over a period of time. As such, there will be different areas within a new suburb where either TCCS or the Suburban Land Agency's contractors are responsible for management/maintenance of assets.
- (2) No, neither the Suburban Land Agency or my office have been made aware of this. The Suburban Land Agency works with TCCS to effectively manage communication with stakeholders about handover of assets and therefore ensure that Fix My Street requests are actioned by the correct land manager in a timely manner.
- (3) The creation of suburbs (Divisions) occurs under the *Districts Act 2002*. The Structure Plans within the Territory Plan typically identify the location of new suburbs. Prior to new suburbs being released for development, the Environment, Planning and

Sustainable Development Directorate will undertake further work to define a suburb's boundary by a Deposited Plan. The ACT Place Names Committee provides advice to establish policies for the naming of divisions (suburbs) and public places on Territory Land in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). The Public Place Names Act 1989 and supporting legislative instruments provide guidance as to the naming of places within the Territory. The following link provides an overview of the process: [http://www.planning.act.gov.au/tools\\_resources/place\\_search/place\\_names/place\\_naming\\_processes](http://www.planning.act.gov.au/tools_resources/place_search/place_names/place_naming_processes)

- (4) As noted in the response to question (1), the majority of public assets in Moncrieff have been handed over to TCCS, however the soft landscape of the Moncrieff Community Recreation Park (CRP) and Stage 6B open space are currently on consolidation for the next three to six months, depending on the rate of growth. The soft landscaping associated with the pedestrian trails and bridge project, although technically completed, has not reached consolidation due to growing conditions. It is anticipated that the asset handover will occur by the end of winter at which time the consolidation period will be three to six months. Until the end of the consolidation period these soft landscapes will remain the responsibility of the relevant Suburban Land Agency contractor.
- (5) The relevant contractor for each stage of development maintains the works until either Operational Acceptance or the end of consolidation (for soft landscaping). The Suburban Land Agency manages requests and regularly monitors estates during the consolidation period and if found to require maintenance then the relevant Suburban Land Agency contractor is advised that action is required.
- (6) The Suburban Land Agency works closely with TCCS to ensure all parties are aware of their responsibilities throughout the process. This ensures the costs of management and administration are used effectively to maintain public assets and are not duplicated.

---

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees  
(Question No 1446)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) What reasons can the Minister give for the poor results of the Throughcare program for Indigenous male participants.
- (2) Why did the Evaluation of the ACT Extended Throughcare Pilot Program by the University of New South Wales Social Policy Research Centre fail to identify the reasons behind these results.
- (3) Why did a 114-page page evaluation of the program contain just 11 lines about Indigenous clients?
- (4) Can the Minister provide data on the number of Indigenous clients that commence and then actually complete the Throughcare program.
- (5) Can the Minister provide data for the specific drop-off points for Indigenous clients throughout the program.

- (6) What kind of handover occurs for indigenous clients to other service providers following the expiry of the extended Throughcare program period.
- (7) Which Indigenous service providers or agencies are engaged or consulted with regarding the Throughcare program.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Engagement with the ACT Extended Throughcare Program (the Program) is voluntary, meaning that clients are able to access the service as and when they choose. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients must voluntarily engage with the program, as is the case with all other program participants.

There are limited non-government organisations (NGOs) currently servicing the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community in the ACT.

Notwithstanding these factors, the ACT Government is committed to providing the best possible Extended Throughcare Program. This is why a comprehensive Evaluation of the program (see below) was undertaken.

The findings of the Evaluation have demonstrated to ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) what aspects of the program work well (the report noted, for example, the good outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women) and which aspects of the program could be improved.

ACTCS has incorporated this feedback into changes made to the program.

- (2) As participation in the Program is voluntary, the evaluation did not examine the reasons why ACTCS clients fail to engage with the Program.
- (3) The content of the evaluation is a matter for the reviewers. Nonetheless, the Evaluation reported on the general activities and services provided by the Program. At the time of the evaluation, these activities applied to all participants, regardless of Indigenous status.

Section 28 of the Evaluation provided further statistical data on the representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the adult prison population, the program study, and the control groups.

The Evaluation noted that the Program study group and the Program control group encompassed high proportions of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and men, reflective of the high Indigenous prison population rates.

However, following the Evaluation, in order to further increase the participation rates of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men, ACTCS restructured the eligibility criteria, allowing eligible Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander males to access the Program after a shorter period in custody.

The proposed restructure was submitted to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body for consideration, with ACTCS receiving support for the proposal.

Additionally, ACTCS created the position of Indigenous Throughcare Transition Officer, to provide additional support to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients who engage with the Program.

- (4) The Program aims to provide a service coordination point for other community service providers in the ACT and works with a wide range of service providers and NGOs to best support the diverse needs of the clients. Clients access the service voluntarily and the length of time a client engages with the Program varies based on the individual's needs. As such, clients do not 'complete' the Program - the depth and duration of every client's engagement varies. ACTCS therefore cannot provide 'completion' data.
- (5) As clients voluntarily engage with the Program, the frequency and consistency of engagement varies greatly among participants depending on individual circumstances. ACTCS does not record data for specific drop off points of participants in the Program.
- (6) The Program does not provide a handover service, as a client's participation in the program is voluntary. The Program works collaboratively with other service providers for the duration of a client's voluntary engagement with the service.
- (7) The Program works primarily with the Aboriginal Legal Service (ALS), but is also connected with Tjillari Justice Aboriginal Corporation and Gudan Gulwan to provide support to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients.

Additionally, as part of the Justice and Community Safety Directorate's Community Justice Program, the ALS is contracted to provide throughcare support to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients.

---

### **Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders—Boomanulla Oval (Question No 1448)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) Given that on 12 April 2018 the Minister responded to question on notice No 1057 stating that whilst the Request for Tender processes is worked through, the ACT Government will commence interim work at Boomanulla Oval to enable the facility to reopen to the community later this year for information recreational and cultural use, (a) can the Minister provide further detail on the timeline for commencing and completing this work, (b) can the Minister provide a definition of what informal recreational and cultural use entails, (c) can the Minister confirm who will undertake the interim management of this facility, (d) what will be the process for community groups, sporting clubs and indigenous stakeholders to request access to this facility and (e) will there be charges associated with this use of Boomanulla; if so, what will they be.
- (2) Can the Minister clarify why Boomanulla is being positioned as a cultural facility when the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Centre already operates at Yarramundi.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1)
  - a) On 21 May, clean-up works commenced at Boomanulla Oval, including a full damage assessment to better inform the interim works required to reactivate the



facility. The Elected Body and key community representatives identified by the Elected Body are being consulted prior to rectification works commencing. A timeline will be confirmed as part of this process.

- b) The term informal recreation covers a range of activities that would typically occur at other informal use ovals around the city. This could include walking a dog, kicking a ball, throwing a Frisbee and various other recreational activities. The interim works will not, at this stage, restore the oval to a level that is suitable for formal sporting use (match play or training).

The cultural facility reference in my previous response was in acknowledgement of the longstanding connection the local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community has to Boomanulla Oval. Ongoing discussions with representatives of that community have clarified that culture is inherent in all activities and places that are important to and part of what defines the people in that community. The facility is to be initially reopened for informal recreation and community use, noting culture will be inherent in such use of the facility by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

- c) Transport Canberra and City Services, who manages and maintains other sport and recreation facilities around the city, will be responsible for management arrangements in the interim until a longer term outcome for the facility is determined.
- d) The process for community groups, sporting clubs and indigenous stakeholders to request access to this facility is currently being worked through in consultation with the Elected Body.
- e) The arrangements for access and use of Boomanulla are currently being worked through in consultation with the Elected Body.
- (2) Boomanulla Oval has been both a sporting and meeting place for the Territory's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community for over 30 years. It has a history rich in stories of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander sporting success, personal achievement, community gatherings and youth support.

Over the years, Boomanulla Oval has been used for many purposes, including:

- being used as the home ground for the Boomanulla Raiders rugby league and cricket teams;
- general sporting activities;
- community meetings;
- education and training programs; and
- NAIDOC Week celebrations.

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Centre at Yarramundi Reach is a culturally appropriate meeting and conference facility and art gallery.

---

### **Sport—fencing (Question No 1450)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that the Commonwealth Fencing Titles was denied a sports grant to assist in putting on the Veteran Fencing Championships in Canberra due to be held 23-28 November 2018.
- (2) Are there any options for additional funding to be provided to ensure this international event is a success for the fencing community in Canberra.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The ACT Fencing Association applied for funding support for the 2018 Commonwealth Fencing Championships under the *ACT Event Fund 2018* – a competitive annual grant round administered by Events ACT. Unfortunately, the Association were unsuccessful with their funding request following a rigorous merit-based application and assessment process.

The Association was provided with specific feedback on their unsuccessful application and also provided with details for seeking further advice from Events ACT around event planning and promotional opportunities.

Active Canberra continues to provide assistance to local sporting organisations through the Sport and Recreation Grants Program – this includes annual operational support for the ACT Fencing Association. The guidelines of the Sport and Recreation Grants Program do not support specific funding of events.

There are no additional funding options available to support the event in November 2018.

---

### **Sport—ground maintenance (Question No 1451)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's response of 3 May 2018 to question on notice No 1059, can the Minister provide an answer to part (5) of the question which asked if the Minister can confirm "that this sporting oval is due to be replaced in two years' time".
- (2) In relation to the Minister's answer that stated no Safety Data Sheet (SDS) was available due to the age of the material used on the synthetic surface at Gold Creek School and given that preparing and providing an SDS is mandatory where a substance, mixture or article is a hazardous chemical and manufacturers and imports of hazardous chemicals must prepare a SDS in accordance with the model Code of Practice for the Preparation of Safety Data Sheets for Hazardous Chemicals, will the Minister commit to sourcing one for the SBR rubber material.
- (3) Can the Minister advise how parents, teachers and other visitors to the Gold Creek School are made aware of hazardous materials used on the Gold Creek sporting oval.
- (4) Can the Minister confirm if the current state of the oval, the use of the SBR rubber and the plans for replacement have been communicated to stakeholders such as the Gold Creek School Parents and Citizens Association.

- (5) How are other users of this sports ground, such as Holy Spirit Catholic Primary School, informed about the use of SBR rubber crumb and the plans for replacement and upgrade.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) I can confirm that replacement of the synthetic surface at Nicholls Neighbourhood Oval will be funded in the 2018-19 ACT Budget for completion in 2019-20.
  - (2) As I previously advised, relevant standards were met at the time of installation and there is no information to suggest the material is hazardous. I have, however, asked officials in the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate to investigate testing of the material to confirm that it is not hazardous.
  - (3) As I previously advised, relevant standards were met at the time of installation and there is no information to suggest the material is hazardous.
  - (4) I am unaware of any formal communications with the Gold Creek School Parents and Citizens Association relating to the Nicholls Synthetic Oval.
  - (5) The government has now publicly announced funding for the upgrade and will include all affected stakeholders in communications about this project. Approved for circulation to the Member and incorporation in Hansard.
- 

### **Transport—parking (Question No 1452)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) In relation to car parking in Gungahlin Town Centre, can the Minister confirm that the current Park and Ride at The Valley Way is at 100 percent capacity most mornings by 9 am.
- (2) What plans are there for long-term parking solutions, not temporary parking, for commuters in this area.
- (3) How many permanent parking spaces will be available for commuters in the Gungahlin Town Centre in (a) 2018, (b) 2019 and (c) 2020.
- (4) What will be the location of these parking spaces in relation to public transport options.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Site visits undertaken in the week of 28 May 2018 revealed less than 50% occupancy at 9am for the Park and Ride parking area on The Valley Avenue.
- (2) As Gungahlin town centre continues to grow, new development will continue to increase the supply of parking in accordance with the requirements of the Territory Plan.

- (3) All day commuter parking is available at the existing Park and Ride facility, basement parking of the Gungahlin Market Place and Kmart Gungahlin and at the Gungahlin Oval. There are approximately 4,200 off-street parking spaces in the Gungahlin town centre. New development is anticipated to generate extra supply, increasing the overall number off-street spaces in the town centre. Parking provision requirements will continue to be reviewed as changes to the bus network and light rail are implemented.
- (4) Approximately 75% of off street parking spaces are within a 400 metre catchment of the light rail and bus stations.
- 

## Questions without notice taken on notice

### Roads—Ashley Drive

**Mr Gentleman** (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Ms Lawder on Wednesday, 9 May 2018*):

- Works on the section of Ashley Drive between Erindale Drive and Isabella Drive initially progressed very well and early projections anticipated completion in the first quarter of 2018.
- Due to the requirement to relocate an existing water main (not identified at time of design) and the project encountering unsuitable subgrade material, the project experienced delays.
- TCCS anticipate that Ashley Drive will be open to traffic by end of June 2018. Finalisation of works (including clean up and maintenance) will occur early July in preparation for a formal opening.

### Planning—land use

**Mr Gentleman** (*in reply to a question by Mr Parton on Thursday, 10 May 2018*):

The Government would not list PRZ1 Urban Open Space blocks on the Indicative Land Release Program for sale. The land release program is intended to release sites to the market that are suitable for development and are generally zoned for residential, commercial industrial or community uses in a manner that is consistent with the Territory Plan.

Land zoned for urban open space would not be offered to the market for sale, however there are circumstances where urban open space may be sold by direct sale for uses consistent with the zoning. One such example is the sale of land to a Canoe Club on the foreshore of Lake Burley Griffin. The land is Designated Land under the National Capital Plan with an Urban Open Space Overlay. This is an appropriate sale of urban open space land.

It is possible that land that is zoned PRZ1 may be identified for a future development opportunity. Such a proposal is subject to a sequence of statutory planning steps involving consultation with the community, scrutiny by an Assembly Committee as well as Tabling in the Legislative Assembly that results in it being rezoned and

suitable for release to the market. For example an area of Urban Open Space adjacent to the public housing redevelopment site in Lyons was rezoned to a residential zone RZ5 High Density through a Territory Plan Variation process. The site is now appropriately zoned for development and will be released as part of the development site in 2018-19.

### **Kippax Group Centre Master Plan**

Development of a master plan for the Kippax group centre is in its final stages and has undergone extensive community and stakeholder engagement, including a focussed community panel process in late 2017.

The community panel recommended changes to the draft master plan, particularly in relation to the potential retail expansion of Kippax Fair to the east of the existing shopping centre and the part rezoning of the existing district playing fields.

The existing district playing fields that are affected by the potential change are currently zoned PRZ1: Urban Open Space. The revised draft master plan recommends rezoning part of this area to CZ1: Core to facilitate the potential retail expansion at the centre.

The changes to the draft master plan have generally been supported by the broader community through the final stage of engagement that concluded in March 2018.

The recommendations in the master plan, if supported will be implemented through a variation to the Territory Plan to amend the Holt Precinct Code.

### **Rural fire services—Molonglo**

**Mr Gentleman** (*in reply to a question and supplementary questions by Mr Hanson and Mr Coe on Thursday, 10 May 2018*):

I thank the members for their questions. I refer them to my answer to Question on Notice No 1364 asked by Mr Coe.

### **Cabinet—meetings**

**Mr Barr** (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Mr Coe on Thursday, 10 May 2018*):

Section 23 of the FOI Act does not stipulate a timeframe for the publication of information under the Open Access Information Scheme.

As at Tuesday, 4 June 2018, Cabinet Decision summaries to the week beginning 30 April 2018 are available on the Open Government website at:

[https://www.cmtedd.act.gov.au/open\\_government/inform/cabinet-decisions](https://www.cmtedd.act.gov.au/open_government/inform/cabinet-decisions)

The transition to the new Open Access regime resulted in delays in the public release due to a revision in the way the documents are now compiled.

Once compiled, the draft Cabinet decision summaries are noted by Cabinet and, under the *Freedom of Information Act 2016*, I as Chief Minister am the decision maker on the release of Cabinet decision summaries.

### **Planning—Territory Plan**

**Mr Gentleman** (*in reply to a supplementary question by Ms Le Couteur on Tuesday, 5 June 2018*):

The development on the western side of Woden Town Square Ms Le Couteur refers to is the redevelopment of Borrowdale House. This development was approved in May 2017 for 258 upper level car spaces and 425 square meters of commercial space at ground level.

While Woden Town Centre is undergoing an important revitalisation with a number of significant residential developments being approved or proposed, a key concern of both the ACT Government and the Woden community is the need to ensure the town centre is a viable and competitive location for employment.

Lovett Tower, Canberra's tallest commercial building is currently largely vacant. One of the difficulties the owner has had in attracting tenants to Lovett Tower is the limited parking associated with it. The redevelopment of Borrowdale House will ensure Lovett Tower remains an attractive employment location by providing a parking option for future tenants of the tower.

The overshadowing of Woden Town Square was an important consideration during the assessment of the development. Compared to the original building, the new development is three metres higher and will result in only a minor increase in overshadowing of the town square after 2pm in June. This overshadowing will not be 'significant', as Ms Le Couteur has suggested.

At the time of approval, Borrowdale House was boarded up and covered in graffiti. The new development will provide active and attractive retail frontages which open out onto Woden town square and ensure the significant employment opportunities of Lovett Tower, as well as a sunlit Woden town square, are retained.

### **Hospitals—waiting times**

**Mr Rattenbury** (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Parton on Wednesday, 6 June 2018*):

ACT Health provides the Minister for Health and Wellbeing with regular reports on Emergency Department (ED) performance.

The Minister for Health and Wellbeing receives National Emergency Access Target reports daily. These reports detail performance metrics against the national target for ED presentations completed within four hours, for the prior 24 hour period.

The Minister for Health and Wellbeing is also provided with weekly ED performance reports, in relation to ED performance at Canberra and Calvary hospitals. These reports detail the previous week's trend in ED performance, in terms of the percentage

of presentations completed within four hours, for each hospital and the ACT aggregate. They also detail the trend in number of presentations, in each hospital and the ACT aggregate. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing reviewed the first weekly ED Performance Report on 10 September 2017.

### **Land—Dickson land swap**

**Mr Barr** (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Mr Coe on Wednesday, 6 June 2018*):

The Auditor-General's Report into the Tender for the Sale of Block 30 (Formerly Block 20) Section 34 Dickson does not make any finding that Territory records relating to the matters under audit existed that could not be provided to the ACT Audit Office. There is no reference in the Report to documents having gone 'missing'.

Further, I am advised that the Director-General of the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate has written to the Auditor-General and to the Chair of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts (PAC), to request further detail on the assertion made to the PAC, that documentation had gone 'missing' to allow him to initiate a full and prompt investigation of the issue.

### **Budget—Canberra Institute of Technology**

**Ms Fitzharris** (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Wall on Wednesday, 6 June 2018*):

No CIT campuses will be impacted by the changes in staffing levels. CIT have advised that the workforce numbers and skills mix needed to run CIT differs depending on what courses students are studying and industry needs.

### **Budget—Canberra Institute of Technology**

**Ms Fitzharris** (*in reply to a supplementary question by Ms Lee on Wednesday, 6 June 2018*):

No CIT courses will be impacted by the changes in staffing levels. CIT have advised that the workforce numbers and skill mix needed to run CIT differs depending on what courses students are studying and industry needs.

### **Courts—building works**

**Mr Ramsay** (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Mr Hanson on Wednesday, 6 June 2018*):

- When will the Court building be complete

The courts building is being delivered in two stages. The contractor (Juris) have advised that they expect completion of Stage 1 to be achieved late August / September 2018. Stage 2 is expected the first half of 2019.

- What is the final projected total cost for this project (take the details on notice)

The cost of the project to the Territory is measured as a Net Present Cost

(NPC) of the future payments to be made to Juris over the term of the contract. At the date of entering into the contract, the NPC was calculated at \$250.4 million as set out in the published Contract Summary. Due to the delays in construction the NPC of the future payments due to be made by the Territory will reduce from the amount initially expected. The extent of this reduction will not be calculated until after both Stages have been completed.

- Who is responsible for the extra costs associated with the delay

Juris are responsible for the extra costs associated with the delay.

### **Budget—health funding**

**Mr Rattenbury** (*in reply to a question by Mr Coe on Thursday, 7 June 2018*):

The decrease in Appropriations is mainly due to a reduction in Territorial funding as shown below:

	2017-18	2018-19	Variance
Health Directorate			
- Controlled Recurrent Payments	313,371	310,654	-2,717
- Territorial	18,593	2,620	-15,973
LHN Directorate			
- Controlled Recurrent Payments	656,143	669,990	13,847
	<b>988,107</b>	<b>983,264</b>	<b>-4,843</b>

Territorial Appropriation is used to fund capital grants to external organisations (such as Calvary Public Hospital). The reduction in 2018-19 is reflective of a smaller capital program in 2018-19.

Excluding Territorial, the level of Appropriation to Health and the Local Hospital Network (LHN), is increasing by over \$11 million. This, coupled with increased Commonwealth funding through the LHN, will fund expense initiatives in 2018-19.

### **Budget—infrastructure**

**Mr Gentleman** (*in reply to a supplementary question by Ms Lawder on Thursday, 7 June 2018*):

1,330 trees represents approximately ¼ of a % of the current street tree population.

### **Greyhound racing—transition package**

**Mr Ramsay** (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Ms Le Couteur on Thursday, 7 June 2018*):

There have been no applications for transition support submitted to the Greyhound Industry Transition Taskforce, from either people seeking support to exit the industry, or from people seeking assistance to re-home greyhounds.

While Woden Community Service has had a range of conversations with affected



parties, these have not yet resulted in formal applications. Consequently, there have been no funds expended on individual transition support packages or re homing assistance to date.

The Taskforce will accept applications until 30 June 2018, and Woden Community Service remains available to assist in preparing and submitting applications by that deadline.

With respect to the exceptional circumstances under which the Taskforce may approve additional re-homing support, there are two main categories of cases.

The first category is where there is evidence that a significant proportion (at least 60%) of an ex-racing greyhound's racing activity was carried out at the Canberra Greyhound Racing Club.

The second category is where financial assistance in excess of the \$2000 cap is sought, if there is evidence that a particular greyhound has injuries, behavioural issues, dental problems or other veterinary needs that could be addressed to increase that hound's chances of successful re-homing.

### **Land—sales**

**Mr Gentleman** (*in reply to a question and supplementary questions by Ms Lee and Mr Parton on Thursday, 7 June 2018*):

Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick has been valued in accordance with standard operating procedures relating to the direct sale of land. In lieu of a competitive process, three market valuations were originally undertaken in May 2017, and the highest valuation was adopted as the market value for the site. At that time the land was valued at \$970,000 (ex GST).

In May 2018, this valuation was updated and reconfirmed by the same valuation provider that supplied the adopted valuation. To date the land has not been sold.

The land has not been offered for sale publically as the proposed purchaser independently identified the land and applied for a direct sale to purchase it as a contiguous land parcel. The land was considered suitable for direct sale as a contiguous parcel because it met the relevant criteria under section 122 of *Planning and Development Regulation*.

At this time four valuations have been undertaken over the land.

As a matter of course, when a Crown lease is granted by way of direct sale the details of the sale are required to be tabled under section 242 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*. This is undertaken on a quarterly basis.