

**SENATE COMMUNITY AFFAIRS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
 ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES – 21 FEBRUARY 2019
 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|---|
| 1 | SQ19-000003 | DSP – ANAO 2015-16 Audit – Recommendation 3A | Watt | <p>Senator WATT: Was there any reason that the department, by the time of this report, had not implemented the Auditor-General's recommendation 3A from a report in 2015-16 to develop a more complete set of internal and external performance measures?</p> <p>Ms Deininger: There was an earlier recommendation, and with DSS we undertook some preliminary work. That is now being progressed again through the recommendations in the most recent audit.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Right, but there wasn't really a reason that the previous recommendation hadn't been implemented?</p> <p>Ms Deininger: I'll check if there's some additional information I can provide on that. <i>[page 104]</i></p> |
| 2 | SQ19-000004 | DSP – ANAO 2015-16 Audit – Claims over 84 days | Watt | <p>a) Senator WATT: You do know though that in the Auditor-General's report he—and I think it was a he—noted that in April 2015 your department and the Department of Social Services agreed that claims that take over 84 days would be excluded from the reporting and that when the Department of Social Services requested evidence of this reason for this delay, the Department of Human Services advised that the information was not available. So how are we to believe what we're being told here if there's no information available to back it up?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Sorry, to whom did DSS say that they didn't have the information?</p> <p>Senator WATT: I'm quoting from the Auditor-General's report and it reads as if it was the Department of Human Services that was unable to provide evidence. The quote is: <i>When Social Services requested evidence of this reason for delay, Human Services advised that the information was not available.</i></p> <p>Ms Leon: I don't know on what basis that conclusion would have been arrived at, because we have a regular tally all the time of how many claims are awaiting further information, so there isn't anything that's unavailable about the time that it takes to process claims.</p> <p>Senator WATT: I recognise, Ms Leon, that you weren't the secretary in April 2015, but is there anyone here who was around at that point in time who might be able to explain why the Auditor-General reached this conclusion?</p> <p>Ms Leon: We may have to take that on notice, Senator.</p> <p>Senator WATT: We should have asked Ms Campbell, perhaps, earlier today, but she's gone to Social Services. It's on page 53 of the report, I understand.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I'm happy to take that on notice and just see what the factual background at that time was. <i>[page 106]</i></p> <p>b) Senator WATT: Can I get you to take on notice who specifically in the Department of</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---|---------|--|
| | | | | Human Services made this decision to exclude delays of 84 days and above? Ms Leon: I'm sure we'll be able to provide the position that made that decision and what the background to the decision was. <i>[page 106]</i> |
| 3 | SQ19-000008 | Online Compliance Intervention – Deceased People | Siewert | <p>a) Senator SIEWERT: I want to go to the issue related to deceased people, the answer to the question of online compliance intervention, the number of deaths of recipients of various notifications related to online compliance and the answer to my question HS 28 SQ-18000176. <i>[page 112]</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: I understand and appreciate that you can't necessarily allocate causation. However, the fact remains that there have been people whose families think there is an association. So my question is, as it relates to those particular circumstances: have you had contact from family members of people who consider that there is an association with the online compliance system?</p> <p>Ms Leon: As far as I'm aware, there haven't been any online compliance initiative matters about which families have contacted us to assert that they think that the person's suicide was precipitated by the receipt of a debt notice. I'm happy to take on notice as to whether there were, but, in the knowledge of the officers at the table, we're not aware of any. <i>[page 113]</i></p> <p>b) Senator SIEWERT: There's been some public commentary by some families. Has the department investigated those particular circumstances or looked into or contacted those families? Some families obviously haven't publicised their names.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I'd probably have to take that on notice to the extent it goes to individual cases because we wouldn't necessarily have those at the table. But I'm happy to take on notice—</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Could you take on notice—</p> <p>Ms Leon: whether there have been individual cases and what action the department has taken, to the extent we can do so without compromising the privacy of individuals.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Thank you. That would be appreciated. <i>[page 113]</i></p> |
| 4 | SQ19-000010 | Online Compliance Intervention – Deceased People | Siewert | <p>Ms Leon: Out of the 925,000 assessments that were issued during that period, 2,030 customers passed away, which is a death rate of 0.2 per cent. It's not to say that we are not troubled that people die; it's just to recognise that their death rate is not particularly elevated. In fact, it is less than the death rates amongst relevant other cohorts.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Except you're only comparing that to the overall number of letters that were sent out and, as I've understood what you've said, not to the subsequent escalation of debts.</p> <p>Ms Leon: If we were only to compare a category of people who have—when you say escalation of debts, what do you mean?</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: I mean escalation of the process. You send out a letter, a 'please explain your employment discrepancy'—</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---|---------|---|
| | | | | <p>Ms Leon: I'm just finding out what that data is. I think I've understood your question. We may have that at the table.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Ms Leon: The 2,030 number is a subset. That is the total number of people who died who are within the 925,000 assessments. To give you the subset of assessments that have received a debt notice, I will also have to find out of those what percentage died, and we don't have that at the table, I'm sorry.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: That's where I wanted to go to: to understand just how the process has impacted on a person we need to understand how many steps the people have been through as well, so we're comparing, as you said, like with like. Could you take that on notice?</p> <p>Ms Leon: We'll have to take it on notice. <i>[page 114]</i></p> |
| 5 | SQ19-000013 | Online Compliance Intervention – Deceased People - Vulnerability Indicators | Siewert | <p>a) Senator SIEWERT: I'm trying to talk about the data that is here and the number of people with vulnerabilities who received letters. It seems to me that those with vulnerability indicators are potentially more vulnerable, obviously, to stress, anxiety and depression associated with this process. So I'm particularly interested in the breakdown of those figures, if you're able to, to provide what their vulnerabilities were—obviously, not identifying individuals—</p> <p>Ms Leon: We'll take that on notice. <i>[page 114]</i></p> <p>b) Senator SIEWERT: and the number of people with those particular vulnerabilities, and also where they were in the process. Was it that they had just received an accounts payable notice? Where were they through the process?</p> <p>Ms Leon: We'll see what we can do. It will just depend on how fine-grained the categorisation is at each stage of the process. If we have that, yes, we can give it to you. <i>[page 114]</i></p> |
| 6 | SQ19-000016 | Online Compliance Intervention - Letters | Siewert | <p>Senator SIEWERT: I should say first, have you changed the wording of the letters again?</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: Yes. The initial letter that we sent out is a new letter, and the outcome letter we send is also new. We have changed both letters.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Can you give us copies of those letters tonight?</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: Yes, we can. I don't think that's a major issue. <i>[page 118]</i></p> |
| 7 | SQ19-000018 | DSP Letter | Siewert | <p>Senator SIEWERT: Can I read you some wording that I've been sent, because, quite frankly—</p> <p>Ms Leon: Is this wording from us or from a customer?</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: I don't know.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I just want to know that we're not disclosing anyone's customer details.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: No. They're all blanked out. It's fine. It reads: 'We have reassessed your disability support pension. You were paid more than you were entitled to and you need to pay the money back. Why you owe money: the correct amount of your earnings was not taken into account in the payment made to you from'—and there are dates listed. It said: 'This means you</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|--|
| | | | | <p>have been overpaid'—and it lists a substantial amount of money—'and we are therefore required to recover this amount.' It goes on with more details. Is that a letter that you would—</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: That's not from this program. That could be from this department but that's not from the income compliance program.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: It could be from the department?</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: I don't know; we'd have to look at it, but that's not an income compliance outcome letter.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: I'm pretty certain—I'll double check—that there's no—</p> <p>Mr Storen: Is there a telephone contact number?</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Yes, there is. I found this so incredible that I went and checked the telephone number to make sure that it wasn't bogus, and it is your telephone.</p> <p>Ms Leon: But is it the number that's especially established for the income compliance measure?</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: It's Centrelink. I'd need to go back. Frankly, I was checking that it was a Centrelink one.</p> <p>Ms Leon: If you can provide us the letter, we'll be able to tell you the source and circumstances.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: I'll get a copy during the break. <i>[page 118]</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: This is the letter that I was reading from before. I don't know if you can do it now—</p> <p>Ms Leon: What is the question that you wanted to ask?</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Is this a new letter that's going out? I double-checked, and both numbers go to the employment confirmation—</p> <p>Ms Leon: We'll have to check. If anyone present is able to confirm, we'll get back to you, but otherwise we'll take it on notice to confirm what the nature of the letter was and the circumstances of its being sent. <i>[page 119]</i></p> |
| 8 | SQ19-000020 | Online Compliance Intervention – Deceased People – Geographical Location | Martin | <p>Senator MARTIN: Ms Leon, following on from Senator Dean Smith's line of questioning, I'd be interested to find out the geographical details of those 2,030.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I will see if the relevant officers can come back to the table.</p> <p>Senator MARTIN: You can take it on notice, if you wish.</p> <p>Ms Leon: We don't have that with us at the committee, but I'm happy to take it on notice. I take it you mean by state and territory?</p> <p>Senator MARTIN: Yes, please.</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes, we can certainly do that on notice.</p> <p>Senator MARTIN: If you can expand—I don't want to know that it's 50 in Victoria et cetera. Do you have postcodes?</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---|---------|---|
| | | | | <p>Ms Leon: That will depend on how many there are in each postcode or area. Our usual practice across government is not to disclose where the numbers are less than 10 because of the risk of identifying who the people are.</p> <p>Senator MARTIN: I understand that. I don't need names, just the numbers in specific areas, regions—</p> <p>Ms Leon: We'll take it on notice and see what we can provide. <i>[page 119]</i></p> |
| 9 | SQ19-000022 | Online Compliance Intervention – Costs and Savings | Watt | <p>Senator WATT: The whole robo-debt initiative arose out of a few separate announcements made by government going back to the 2015-16 budget?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WATT: I think there was an announcement made then, then there was a further announcement made in the 2015-16 MYEFO and another one made in the 2016-17 MYEFO. That's right?</p> <p>Ms Leon: That's right.</p> <p>Senator WATT: My recollection is that, for each of those announcements and the savings that those announcements were expected to generate, the savings were partly from what became known as robo-debt but that there were other initiatives as well.</p> <p>Ms Leon: That's right.</p> <p>Senator WATT: I just want to hone in on the robo-debt aspects. My understanding is that across those three announcements the expected savings from what become known as robo-debt was \$1.3 million—is that correct?</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: No. I think, in fiscal terms, one of them was about \$1.3 million.</p> <p>Senator WATT: One of the robo-debt measures?</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: One of the income compliance measures was \$1.3 million. You are right: there are over three and they're parts of budget measures, so they're not easy to see.</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes, the budget measures and the MYEFO measures had a number of initiatives in those figures of which one was robo-debt, but they also, I think, included other income matching and income compliance measures.</p> <p>Senator WATT: What I basically want to do is compare what the expected savings are from the robo-debt measure to the other income compliance measures. I'm interested in where we're up to in the achievement of those savings, and, separately, what costs have been incurred in administrating the robo-debt initiative.</p> <p>Ms Leon: Some of that we'll be able to do at the table but some of it we'll probably have to take on notice. <i>[pages 119-120]</i></p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|---|
| 10 | SQ19-000021 | Debt Recovery | Watt | <p>Ms Leon: I can say that the savings estimate over the life of the combined income data matching measure across the 2015-16 budget and the 2015-16 MYEFO and the 2016-17 MYEFO and, most recently, the adjustments made in the 2018-19 budget, which carried it forward for another year, is \$4 billion. But that's still got some forward years to go. As at 31 December 2018, we had identified \$1.5 billion.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator SINGH: How much has been recovered?</p> <p>Ms Leon: About a third of all of the debts raised has been repaid, a third are under repayment arrangements and a third are awaiting the establishment of repayments.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Can we break these figures down year by year, starting with the expected savings? You've said it's a total of \$4 billion.</p> <p>Ms Leon: There'll be some complexity about this that might require us to take it on notice. I'm not sure that we'll have it. Also because the expected saves and the phasing of them have been adjusted over some of those budget years. That is partly because, as you may recall, there was a period where we slowed down on the debt recovery against what had been forecast while we redesigned the process. That year had to have its projected savings moved forward in the program and rephrased until we had done the redesign and ramped back up to capacity. Secondly, in the most recent budget we readjusted the costs and the saves because the original measure was costed on the assumption that the great bulk of the work would be done online without staff involvement, and we have now applied more staff support and involvement to it, which has just changed the mix of costs and time.</p> <p>Senator WATT: I understand.</p> <p>Ms Leon: It means that the original costing will have changed over time.</p> <p>Senator WATT: With respect, can I cut a deal?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WATT: If we try and be really focused with our questions, can we get really focused answers? We haven't got a lot of time—that's all.</p> <p>Ms Leon: Sure. We can take on notice what the projected spend and save is year by year. [pages 120-121]</p> |
| 11 | SQ19-000019 | Debt Recovery – Targets and Achievements | Watt | <p>a) Senator WATT: There are some adjustments to be made, but, in broad terms, it was expected that over the first four years of the robo-debt measures it would save and claw back \$4 billion?</p> <p>Ms Leon: No, that's the part that we've had to take on notice, because that \$4 billion is what the current save is, which includes where we are in the 2018-19 budget. So we will have to take on notice what the original expected save was.</p> <p>Senator WATT: If you can do that, that would be great. Given that the \$4 billion figure actually runs out to—did you say 2022-23?</p> <p>Mr Storen: That's correct.</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|--|
| | | | | <p>Senator WATT: What portion of that \$4 billion would be expected to be collected by the end of this financial year?</p> <p>Ms Leon: That's what we'll have to take on notice. <i>[page 122]</i></p> <p>b) Senator WATT: What I really want to know is: in the time that this measure has been up and running, what has it been expected to generate in savings? That will be a portion of that \$4 billion—that would be my expectation—with the remainder being collected in the next two or three financial years. And then what I want to be able to do is compare what's actually being raised and recovered, and we've got those figures, in broad terms—\$500 million, \$500 million and \$500 million. Are you able to give me the expected figure up until the 2018-19 year?</p> <p>Ms Leon: We'll be able, on notice, to give you what the originally expected figure was, which will be different to what the now expected figure is. <i>[page 122]</i></p> |
| 12 | SQ19-000017 | Data Matching – Claims from 2010-11 | Singh | <p>Senator SINGH: How many claims would be in that category going back to 2010?</p> <p>Mr Storen: We are largely through the claims that were initiated in 2016-17. I don't have the details of that particular media case. They don't tell us which particular case it is for us to follow-up, to check it. I am more than happy to do that if we have the details.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: I wanted to know how many claims you've got that are dating back to 2010.</p> <p>Mr Storen: It would be reviews from 2016-17 related to a data-match year of the 2010-11 earnings year.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: How many?</p> <p>Mr Storen: I'll take that on notice. <i>[page 124]</i></p> |
| 13 | SQ19-000015 | Online Compliance Intervention - Savings | Watt | <p>a) Senator WATT: Could I just check one thing about all these savings figures. I get the point that it's been adjusted along the way, but am I right that the original announcement made in the 2015-16 budget was projecting \$1.7 billion in savings over five years, but that wasn't entirely about robo-debt. Do you know what the robo-debt figure was there over four years?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I don't know that we'll have that with us.</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: You're asking about the 2015-16 budget?</p> <p>Senator WATT: Yes. You don't have a breakdown of the \$1.7 billion?</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: I think 1.5 of it, in fiscal terms, was income data matching.</p> <p>Senator WATT: So 1.5 over five years?</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATT: I don't know why it would be five. Let me have a look. Having a look at the budget papers it does talk about five years. I don't know why that would be. So \$1.5 billion over five years.</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: I've only got 1.5. I don't know over what period. <i>[page 125]</i></p> <p>b) Senator WATT: What about the announcement in MYEFO 2015-16 that was a total of</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---|---------|---|
| | | | | <p>\$694.8 million. Do you know how much was for robo-debt there?</p> <p>Mr J McNamara: I'd have to take that on notice, because when it got to the MYEFO measure—not that we run the program that way—it broke into PAYG data matching and tax return data matching, so there are separate figures that we would add together now as one measure, but I think they were separated in the original announcement. There are two figures at that point and then when it gets to the 2016-17 MYEFO there are three different figures, because we introduce asset data matching as well. So it becomes quite messy that's all. But we can take that on notice and put that all out. I think we've done that before so we can outline all that. <i>[page 125]</i></p> |
| 14 | SQ19-000014 | Telephony – Complaints | Martin | <p>Mr Jackson: We also monitor complaints, and the complaints regarding call wait times have dropped to 10.8 per cent.</p> <p>Senator MARTIN: From what?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: I don't think we have it broken up purely on call wait times. The secretary might have.</p> <p>Ms Leon: We have complaints where the phone service is the reason. I've got what the figures are now. I just don't know that I have the comparison with the previous year. Here we go. In 2016-17, complaints about a phone service, which is usually about how long it took or that they couldn't get through, amounted to 27,410. I'm sorry, I just don't have the data now. Perhaps I could take that on notice for you, Senator: the figures over time—complaints about phone wait times.</p> <p>Senator MARTIN: And how they've reduced. <i>[pages 130-131]</i></p> |
| 15 | SQ19-000012 | Telephony - Complaints | Watt | <p>Senator WATT: Does the department track the number of complaints that arise when contact is first had with labour hire or Serco staff, as opposed to DHS staff?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Do you have some figures on that? The number of relative complaints?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Horsley: Yes, we do. So—</p> <p>Senator WATT: Again, just because of time, could you table those instead of reading them out, if you've got them handy?</p> <p>Mr Horsley: Certainly, yes. <i>[page 132]</i></p> |
| 16 | SQ19-000011 | Unauthorised Access – Labour Hire Staff | Singh | <p>Senator SINGH: I want to go to something we traversed at last estimates, in relation to instances where labour hire staff have accessed accounts, files or data unlawfully or unethically. The question was asked, and the department has come back and said that, yes, the department has mechanisms in place to detect and act on unauthorised access to records by all staff, including labour hire staff. On how many occasions did labour hire staff access data in unlawful and/or unethical ways?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Of the labour hire staff that we've engaged, there have been—this is since 29 January, 2018—13 cases of unauthorised access, which is approximately 0.6 per cent of the</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------|---|
| | | | | <p>labour hire workforce. Of the 13 cases, 10 of those staff then ceased their assignment with the department as a result of the unauthorised access and the remaining three staff had already ceased their work with the department when we detected their unauthorised access.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: That's from January to January? You said from January 2018, until when—</p> <p>Ms Leon: That's as at the time this briefing was finalised, which was early February. But, yes, January to January is close enough.</p> <p>Senator SINGH: Can you provide how many times that was staff accessing their own data and how many times it was accessing other people's data?</p> <p>Ms Leon: We probably can, but I'll have to take that on notice. <i>[page 132]</i></p> |
| 17 | SQ19-000009 | Labour Hire Staff Redeployment | Singh | <p>Senator SINGH: In relation to the 13 cases that were working for the labour hire that breached their conduct, you said they worked for the labour-hire company and therefore they no longer are doing this DHS work, but could they be repurposed through the labour-hire firms into other DHS work?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I don't believe so, but I will take on notice for you what systems we have in place to make sure that the labour-hire company doesn't just send them back to us under another guise. Labour-hire companies, of course, are keen to maintain their relationship and their reputation with us, so I would think the incentives would be all the other way for them to ensure that they're providing with us a workforce that meets our needs, not to send us people who we've already reported have behaved inappropriately. <i>[page 133]</i></p> |
| 18 | SQ19-000007 | Emergency Management – Cyclone Yasi | Watt | <p>Senator WATT: I'm also interested in comparing the that the department has taken and the government has taken compared to the other really major disaster in recent years in that part of the world: Cyclone Yasi. We are getting some reports that there has been a difference in approach taken, and I'm interested in why.</p> <p>My understanding is that, after Cyclone Yasi in 2011, again there were a large number of extra staff flown up to Townsville. Do you have any figures on how many were flown up?</p> <p>Ms Leon: During Yasi?</p> <p>Senator WATT: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Leon: We certainly wouldn't have them with us. I can see whether any of the officers who might have been with us then would know, but—</p> <p>Senator WATT: In the interests of time, why don't you take it on notice. Where were they were set up? What were their hours? Does anybody know what sort of arrangement was taken?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: We'll take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Do you know whether at the time they had security clearance to process any claims?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I think Yasi is going to predate all of us at the table.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Could you take all of that on notice. <i>[page 133]</i></p> |
| 20 | SQ19-000005 | Emergency Management – | Watt | <p>Senator WATT: In terms of the processing of payments, more generally, my</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|---|
| | | Payment Eligibility Requirements | | <p>understanding is that in 2011, after Cyclone Yasi, there were more generous eligibility requirements than exist now to access the disaster recovery payment.</p> <p>Ms Leon: Again, Home Affairs would have the history on the policy of what has been very variable over a number of disasters, I think. But the policy of eligibility is held by Home Affairs.</p> <p>Senator WATT: You administer the payments.</p> <p>Ms Leon: That's right.</p> <p>Senator WATT: And you are the agency that requires documents and evidence to be produced, in order to qualify for a payment.</p> <p>Ms Leon: If that's required. Whether or not documentation's required also depends on whether the policy settings require it. But I can say, in relation to the flooding in Townsville, that we are not delaying people's payments while they come in with evidence.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Do you know what the documents required in 2011, after Cyclone Yasi, were and how that compares to now?</p> <p>Ms Leon: We'd have to take on notice what the Yasi issue is. <i>[page 135]</i></p> |
| 21 | SQ19-000002 | Emergency Management – Disaster Recovery Allowance | Watt | <p>Mr Jackson: For the disaster recover allowance, there is paperwork required. Ms Lees might be able to give more detail.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Is this the small business one?</p> <p>Ms Leon: No, the allowance is the ongoing income support.</p> <p>Ms Lees: To demonstrate loss of income.</p> <p>Senator WATT: To your knowledge, has the level of evidence required now changed from what happened in 2011 after Yasi?</p> <p>Ms Lees: Not, to my knowledge, relating to the disaster recovery allowance.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Could you take that on notice for us, though?</p> <p>Ms Lees: Yes. <i>[page 136]</i></p> |
| 22 | SQ19-000028 | Telephony Data | Siewert | Please provide the total number of callers who received a busy signal in the 'other category' listed in the Telephony Report 2018-19 as at 31 January 2019. |
| 23 | SQ19-000029 | Centrepay – Consumer Leases | Siewert | <p>a) How many consumer lease providers currently have access to Centrepay?</p> <p>b) Has the number of consumer lease providers and the value of transactions increased over the last 10 years?</p> <p>c) If so, by how much?</p> <p>d) Please provide a breakdown of the value of consumer lease Centrepay deductions in each state.</p> <p>e) Please provide a breakdown of Centrepay customers paying for consumer leases by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Age group; ii) State and territory; iii) Metro/remote; |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---|---------|--|
| | | | | iv) Average income; v) Percentage of income that is going towards leases. |
| 24 | SQ19-000037 | Online Compliance Intervention – Age Groups | Siewert | Can the Department please provide a breakdown by age group for all OCI raised debts? |
| 25 | SQ19-000038 | Online Compliance Intervention – Vulnerable People | Siewert | a) Can the Department confirm whether the OCI system is applied to people who are flagged with a vulnerability indicator or who the Department considers vulnerable? b) Have debts been raised against people who are flagged with a vulnerability indicator or who the Department considers vulnerable? c) How did people with vulnerability indicators end up receiving OCI letters given the proposed pilot of an extension of the OCI system to people with vulnerability indicators was put on hold in August 2018? d) How many people with a vulnerability indicator flagged on their account have been part of the OCI system? |
| 26 | SQ19-000039 | Online Compliance Intervention – Debt Repayments Without Review | Siewert | What is the total number of debts that have been paid by individuals without them seeking any review of that debt, whether the review is internal, a reassessment, a formal review or AAT review)? |
| 27 | SQ19-000040 | Online Compliance Intervention - AAT | Siewert | Please provide how many matters have proceeded before the AAT since the process began, broken down by financial year, outcome of proceedings and settlement |
| 28 | SQ19-000041 | Online Compliance Intervention – Deceased People | Siewert | In reference to a question at the previous estimates (HS 28 SQ18-000176), of the 663 people who were marked as vulnerable/previously marked as vulnerable could the Department please provide the following: a) the median length of time between the last received OCI correspondence and the individual's death; b) the average median debt; c) the number of people who had debts raised; d) the number of people who had made any payment towards the debt; e) the number of people who had entirely paid off the debt; f) the number of people who had sought a review; and g) the breakdown of the 663 people by sex, age and payment type. |
| 29 | SQ19-000042 | Online Compliance Intervention – Deceased People - Investigations | Siewert | a) In reference to a question at the previous estimates (SQ18-000176), has the Department investigated the reports it has been made aware of through the media? b) If not, why not? c) If so, what was the outcome of the investigations? |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|--|
| 30 | SQ19-000023 | Deceased Social Security Recipients | Siewert | <p>a) What is the number of deceased social security recipients in 2017-18 financial year, and 2018-19 year to date, who did not receive an OCI letter? Please provide a breakdown by recipient age; sex; and payment type.</p> <p>b) What is the number of deceased social security recipients in 2017-18 financial year, and 2018-19 year to date, who did receive an OCI letter? Please provide a breakdown by recipient age; sex; and payment type.</p> <p>c) What is the number of deceased social security recipients in 2017-18 financial year, and 2018-19 year to date, who were no longer in receipt of payments and received an OCI letter? Please provide a breakdown by recipient age; sex; and payment type.</p> |
| 31 | SQ19-000024 | Online Compliance Intervention - Debts | Siewert | <p>For all OCI raised debts, can the Department please provide:</p> <p>a) the average/median amount of employment income (including social security payments) by each person in the financial year(s) relevant to the debt;</p> <p>b) the average/median amount of employment income (excluding social security payments) paid by each person in the financial year(s) relevant to the debt;</p> <p>c) the average/median amount of social security payments received in the financial year(s) relevant to the debt; and</p> <p>d) the average and median debt size.</p> |
| 32 | SQ19-000025 | Online Compliance Intervention – Debt Appeals | Siewert | <p>For any debt that has gone to AAT1/AAT2, please provide:</p> <p>a) A breakdown of how many have been settled prior to completion of proceedings.</p> <p>b) What is the average/median debt appealed?</p> <p>c) What is the average/median settled amount?</p> <p>d) How much in legal fees has been incurred handling AAT1/AAT2 appeals of OCI debts?</p> |
| 33 | SQ19-000026 | Online Compliance Intervention / Data-Matching Targets | Siewert | <p>What financial years are currently being targeted/are to be targeted in years ahead by the OCI/data-matching measures? Please provide a breakdown with cost estimate</p> |
| 34 | SQ19-000027 | Online Compliance Intervention | Siewert | <p>Between 1 July 2016 and now:</p> <p>a) How many OCI letters have been sent?</p> <p>b) How many have resulted in debts raised?</p> <p>c) What is the average and median sized debt?</p> <p>d) How many reassessments have been initiated?</p> <p>e) How many of these reassessments have been completed?</p> <p>f) How many formal reviews have been requested/completed?</p> <p>g) How many appeals (AAT) have been requested/completed?</p> <p>h) How many debts have been reduced?</p> <p>i) How many debts have been wiped?</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---|---------|--|
| | | | | j) How many debts have been written off? |
| 35 | SQ19-000030 | Online Compliance Intervention - Debts | Siewert | <p>For all OCI related debts, could the Department please provide a breakdown of the following, according to the financial year(s) the debt relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) OCI letters sent; b) debts raised; c) debts reduced; d) debts wiped; e) total debt; f) average debt size; g) median debt size; h) debts fully repaired; i) debts outstanding; j) money recovered; k) money returned/refunded; l) number of debt recipients where no interaction was recorded, or contact made; m) reviews completed; n) reviews outstanding; o) reassessments completed; p) reassessments outstanding; q) appeals completed; and r) appeals outstanding. |
| 36 | SQ19-000031 | Online Compliance Intervention - Averaging | Siewert | What was the number of debts that were assessed using the averaging tool? |
| 37 | SQ19-000032 | Online Compliance Intervention – Administrative Costs | Siewert | How much money has been spent administering the OCI system? Please provide a breakdown by financial year. |
| 38 | SQ19-000033 | Claim Processing – Average Time | Siewert | Please provide a breakdown of the average time it took to process claims for each payment type, including pensions, Carer Payment, Newstart Allowance, Youth Allowance (separate columns for student and YA Other) in 2017/18 and 2018 to date. |
| 39 | SQ19-000034 | Claim Processing – Youth Allowance | Siewert | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What was the longest period of time taken to process Youth Allowance (student and apprentice) in 17/18? b) In 2017/18, how many successful Youth Allowance (student and apprentice) claimants waited for more than the following for their claim to be approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) two weeks but less than one month; ii) one month but less than two months; iii) two months but less than three months; and |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|---|
| | | | | iv) three months or more. |
| 40 | SQ19-000035 | Crisis Payments – Aggregate Data | Siewert | For the years 2017-18 and 2018 to date, please provide the following information for Crisis Payment (broken down by number and percentage): a) how many claims were made; b) how many claims were rejected; and c) how many claims were successful. |
| 41 | SQ19-000036 | Crisis Payments – Detailed Data | Siewert | Provide a breakdown by Crisis Payment recipients for 2017-18, and 2018 to date by: a) payment type; b) age; c) gender; d) Indigenous/non-Indigenous status; e) State and Territory; f) Crisis Payment recipient by reason for grant; and g) total amount paid to Crisis Payment recipients. |
| 43 | SQ19-000049 | Disability Support Pension – 2018-19 | Siewert | In the period 1 July 2018 to date: a) How many DSP claims have been made? b) How many and what percentage of claims have been successful? c) Provide a breakdown by the number and percentage of Indigenous/non-Indigenous claimants? d) What is the average time taken for a claim to be successful? e) Provide a breakdown of the time (for example number of weeks/months) taken to process DSP claims from 1 July 2018 to date |
| 44 | SQ19-000050 | Disability Support Pension – Claims over 12 months | Siewert | Have any DSP claims taken 12 months (or longer) to process? If yes, how many? |
| 45 | SQ19-000052 | Disability Support Pension - Appeals | Siewert | With regard to DSP Appeals when claims are rejected, in the period 1 July 2018 to date: a) Provide a breakdown of appeals regarding DSP claims, highlighting the number and percentage of appeals at each level and the outcome of the appeal. b) Provide the number and percentage of Indigenous/non-Indigenous recipients that appeal against DSP rejections, indicating level of appeal and outcome. |
| 47 | SQ19-000059 | Disability Support Pension - Reviews | Siewert | a) How many medical reviews have been undertaken in 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018 to date? b) How many of these reviews have led to payment cancellations? c) How many have sought a review, at which level, and what has been the outcome of the review. |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|--|
| 48 | SQ19-000058 | Disability Support Pension - Suspensions | Siewert | <p>a) How many people have utilised the '2 year suspension rules' in 2016-17, 2017-18 and from 1 July 2018 to date?</p> <p>b) Describe what steps that the Department has taken to inform DSP recipients about the suspension provisions?</p> <p>c) Provide a breakdown of the use of these provisions by Indigenous and non-Indigenous recipients.</p> |
| 49 | SQ19-000057 | Disability Support Pension - Claims | Siewert | How many Disability Support Pension claims are waiting to be initiated? |
| 54 | SQ19-000048 | Child Support – Maintenance Action Test | Siewert | <p>How many people applied for the maintenance action test exemption in the last year (calendar or financial), broken down by:</p> <p>a) how many were female;</p> <p>b) how many were male;</p> <p>c) Indigenous/non-Indigenous status;</p> <p>d) how many granted;</p> <p>e) how many were refused;</p> <p>f) percentage of child-support customers who have a maintenance action test exemption; and</p> <p>g) how long does the granted exemption apply.</p> |
| 55 | SQ19-000046 | Child Support – Partial Collection Exemption | Siewert | How many people applied for a partial collect exemption for safety reasons if in a private collect agreement? |
| 56 | SQ19-000044 | Mutual Obligation Requirements - Exemptions | Siewert | <p>a) What was the amount of temporary exemptions from mutual obligation requirements granted?</p> <p>b) Please provide a breakdown for all the reasons and the length that the exemption is applied for, including:</p> <p>i) special circumstances exemptions; and</p> <p>ii) domestic violence.</p> |
| 57 | SQ19-000060 | Ministerial Functions | Bilyk | <p>In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio in calendar year 2018, please provide the following:</p> <p>a) list of functions;</p> <p>b) list of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister's family or personal staff;</p> <p>c) function venue;</p> <p>d) itemised list of costs (GST inclusive);</p> <p>e) details of any food served;</p> <p>f) details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage;</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---|
| | | | | g) any available photographs of the function; and h) details of any entertainment provided. |
| 58 | SQ19-000061 | Departmental Functions | Bilyk | In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc. hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio in calendar year 2018, please provide the following: a) list of functions; b) list of attendees; c) function venue; d) itemised list of costs (GST inclusive); e) details of any food served; f) details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage; g) any available photographs of the function; and h) details of any entertainment provided. |
| 59 | SQ19-000062 | Executive Office Upgrades | Bilyk | Were the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries, upgraded in calendar year 2018? If so, please provide an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). |
| 60 | SQ19-000063 | Facilities Upgrades | Bilyk | Were the facilities of any of the Department's premises upgraded in calendar year 2018, for example, staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment? If so, please provide a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrade together with an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). Please provide any photographs of the upgraded facilities. |
| 61 | SQ19-000064 | Staff Travel | Bilyk | What was the total cost of staff travel for departmental employees in calendar year 2018? |
| 62 | SQ19-000065 | Media Monitoring | Bilyk | a) What was the Department's total expenditure on media monitoring in calendar year 2018? b) Please provide an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all media monitoring contracts in that period. |
| 63 | SQ19-000066 | Advertising and Information Campaigns | Bilyk | a) What was the Department's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns in calendar year 2018? b) What advertising and information campaigns did the Department run in the relevant period? c) Please provide an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in that period. |
| 64 | SQ19-000067 | Promotional Merchandise | Bilyk | a) What was the Department's total expenditure on promotional merchandise in calendar year 2018? b) Please provide an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period. c) Please provide photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise. |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|---------|---|
| 65 | SQ19-000068 | Ministerial Overseas Travel | Bilyk | <p>Please provide an itemised list of the costs of all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio in in calendar year 2018. This list should include the costs of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel; b) ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials; c) accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed; d) meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided; and e) any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided. |
| 66 | SQ19-000069 | Social Media Influencers | Bilyk | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What was the Department's total expenditure on social media influencers during calendar year 2018? b) What advertising or information campaigns did the Department use social media influencers to promote? c) Please provide a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts. d) Please provide an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts. |
| 67 | SQ19-000070 | Child Support - Emails | Patrick | <p>In the Department's response to Question on Notice number 15 from the 2018-19 supplementary budget estimates (portfolio question number SQ18000163) you indicated that the scripts provided to customer service staff did not include advice to customers about using email.</p> <p>Given that in the FY16/17 over 85,000 unencrypted emails were sent to the Department, disclosing private information, why did the Department choose not to change these scripts to inform customers of the privacy risks of sending this information via email?</p> |
| 68 | SQ19-000071 | Child Support – Customers with Outstanding Tax Returns | Patrick | <p>Broken down into a total number, the number of paying parents, and the number of receiving parents, please provide the current numbers of Child Support Agency (CSA) customers who have an outstanding 17/18 tax return as at 31 December 2018.</p> |
| 69 | SQ19-000072 | Child Support - Data | Patrick | <p>This question relates to Question on notice number 952 in the Senate Notice Paper. When I requested the numbers of CSA customers who have not provided tax returns for up to four years, up to seven years, up to 10 years and for more than 10 years I was informed that the Department does not currently report of this data. Isn't it in the Department's interests to identify trends in outstanding tax returns? Why is this not currently being monitored?</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---|---------|--|
| 70 | SQ19-000073 | Additional Child Care Subsidy – Claims Processing | Faruqi | <p>Ms Wilson: We've worked very closely with both the sector and the Department of Human Services. Some of it was that the families and services did not have an understanding of the new arrangements and the information required. The services can actually make the determination about the additional childcare subsidy for the first six weeks, and then it gets referred to DHS. I think that is now working much more smoothly. In terms of the waiting times for processing, they're moving through DHS.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: Do you know how many applications are still waiting to be processed?</p> <p>Ms Wilson: DHS is at Senate estimates later today, I think. I'm happy to take it on notice, or you could ask them yourself.</p> <p>Senator FARUQI: If you could take that on notice, that would be great.</p> |
| 71 | SQ19-000074 | Carers Payment – Use of Intent to Claim Determination | Watt | <p>a) Can the Department please provide month by month claims for Carers Payment from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018, where intent to claim legislative provisions were used? That is, where payments were backdated to the date that contact was made with Centrelink and an entitlement established, rather than the date the application was lodged.</p> <p>b) Can the Department please provide the same figures from 1 July 2018 to 31 January 2019, where the Intent to Claim Determination was the basis for backdating payments?</p> <p>c) Can the Department please provide these figures broken down by class of person as defined in the Determination?</p> |
| 72 | SQ19-000075 | Other Payments – Use of Intent to Claim Determination | Watt | <p>a) Can the Department please provide month by month claims for other payment types from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018, where intent to claim legislative provisions were used? That is, where payments were backdated to the date that contact was made with Centrelink and an entitlement established, rather than the date the application was lodged.</p> <p>b) Can the Department please provide the same figures from 1 July 2018 to 31 January 2019, where the Intent to Claim Determination was the basis for backdating payments?</p> <p>c) Can the Department please provide these figures broken down by class of person as defined in the Determination?</p> |
| 73 | SQ19-000076 | Disability Support Pension – Claims Data | Watt | <p>a) How many people currently have pending applications?</p> <p>b) How many people were rejected in 2017-2018?</p> <p>c) How many people had a successful claim in 2017-2018?</p> |
| 74 | SQ19-000077 | New Staff – Previous Employment | Watt | Does a new staff member, contract or directly employed by DHS have to indicate whether they have work for the department before? |
| 75 | SQ19-000078 | Staffing – Voluntary Redundancy | Watt | <p>a) How many people have taken a voluntary redundancy, received the package and then come back as Labour Hire or a contractor?</p> <p>b) Is this ASL cap driving this?</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|------------------------|---------|--|
| 76 | SQ19-000079 | Pensions | Watt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Did the pensions at October last year get cleared in the week described? b) How long are Australian pensioners waiting now? c) How many Australian pensioners processing times are over the 49 days described? d) How many pensioners were waiting over the 49 days in the month of December? |
| 77 | SQ19-000080 | Newstart - Suspensions | Watt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Can the Department please provide the financial cost of changing the administration of Newstart payment suspensions from Centrelink to employment service providers? b) How much does it cost under the current system to administer Newstart payment suspensions? c) How many people have received a text to notify them that their payment has been suspended? d) Can this please be broken down by payment type including Newstart, Parents Next etc? e) What is the cost of those text messages? |
| 78 | SQ19-000081 | Optical Surveillance | Watt | <p>In response to the questions regarding optical surveillance put to the Department as to why this figure had doubled year on year the Department responded: “there was a higher requirement for optical surveillance in 2017-2018 than the previous year.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Given it is stated in your Annual Report that optical surveillance is said to be used “when other types of investigation techniques were unsuccessful”. Does this mean that double the number of investigations were unsuccessful year on year? b) How much was spent on optical surveillance in 2016-17? |
| 79 | SQ19-000082 | Debt Collectors | Watt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Department has provided the costs of debt collection over the past three financial years and it totals approximately \$45 million. How much do these debt collectors collect? b) Could you provide the corresponding debts collected for the past three financial years? c) Does the Department always collect more than it spends on debt collectors? |
| 80 | SQ19-000083 | Debt | Watt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) At the last senate estimates the Department was asked how much money was currently owed to the government. The Department responded that this figure was \$4.93 billion. Has this figure ever been higher? Has the Department ever been owed more? b) The Department also stated that between the years of 2016-17 and 2017-18 financial years the value of outstanding debt increased by 10%, \$493m how has this happened? c) The Department has a considerable debt collection operation, is that correct? d) When does the department expect that this debt will be paid off? e) What is the Department doing specifically so that the debt doesn't increase by another \$493m in the 2018-19 financial year and beyond? f) Does the Department think they will prevent another nearly half a billion dollar increase on the debt? |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------|--|
| | | | | g) If there were 103,253 debts raised last year and nearly 10 per cent were reduced to non-zero or reduced to zero. Last year it was closer to five percent. Are there double the issues with the debts being raised in the year 2017-18? |
| 81 | SQ19-000084 | Compliance Reviews | Watt | The Department also stated it is no longer initiating compliance reviews for customers' employment income information for the 2011-12 financial year. What is the earliest year the Department is initiating compliance reviews for? |
| 82 | SQ19-000085 | Customer Aggression | Watt | <p>a) The Department was asked last year about what the Department is doing to reduce incidents of aggressing in Centrelink and the Department provided a number of strategies including providing effective and personalised services, de-escalation training, CCTV and security guards. How are these working? Are they proving effective?</p> <p>b) There have been about seven and a half thousand instances for the past three financial years. That is more than 20 a day, is concerning to the Department given their lack of headway in this area?</p> <p>c) The Department also noted that it only reports two or three of these to ComCare. Two or three out of over 7000, can you explain why this figure is so low? Do you think that is acceptable?</p> |
| 83 | SQ19-000086 | Duress Alarms | Watt | <p>a) Are duress alarms are installed in all Centrelink shopfront for the safety of the staff working there?</p> <p>b) These would be seen as a last resort when the actions and measures mentioned above have failed, is that right?</p> <p>c) The Department also noted that it does not collect information about duress alarm activations in a question on notice last estimates. Given the seriousness of these alarms why does the government not monitor this at all?</p> |
| 84 | SQ19-000087 | Farm Household Allowance - Processing | Watt | <p>a) The Department was asked last estimates about the delays and complexities Farmers were facing in getting farm household allowance. The Minister had made some claims about staff numbers, but the Department confirmed that these were not new staff is that correct? No new staff were brought on to handle this FHA processing?</p> <p>b) This was in fact staff moved from other areas, would that include from areas processing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Pensions? ii) Newstart? iii) Disability Support pension? iv) Youth Allowance? <p>c) Please provide the number of staff moved to help process FHA and which area those staff had previously worked in? Or what payments they had previously processed?</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------|---|
| 85 | SQ19-000092 | Farm Household Allowance - Staffing | Watt | <p>a) Ms Leon said at estimates last year that labour hire is: <i>"It's a quick, convenient, flexible way to get some people in to do some work."</i> <i>[Human Services Department Secretary Renee Leon at Senate Estimates 25 October 2018]</i></p> <p>Given bringing on staff is supposed to be all these things, why was no extra staff were brought on to help the farmers without disadvantaging anyone else?</p> <p>b) The Department has been asking staff to man Centrelink services outside of regular hours to meet the demand for FHA assistance, is that correct?</p> <p>c) This has involved asking existing staff to work overtime instead of easily, quickly and flexibly brining on extra staff, is that correct?</p> <p>e) Is this an example of the Department saving money on staff instead of serving Australians?</p> |
| 86 | SQ19-000094 | Staffing – Labour Hire | Watt | <p>a) The Department was asked last year about outsourced staff contracts including approximately \$71m, \$67m and \$78m contracts ending in October 2020. Can you please say which company these contracts are for? And for what services?</p> <p>b) There was another contract for \$33m ending in October 2018, can you please tell us what company this contract is for?</p> <p>c) How many people will these contracts employ?</p> <p>d) The Department has also had two contracts for \$25m with Hays and Chandler Macleod recruitment, what is this for? How long will these contracts run? What are Hays and Chandler Macleod providing Australian tax payers for over \$51m?</p> <p>e) The Department also has over 12 contracts with other recruitment firms all of which are for over \$100,000 dollars and some over \$500,000. Why does the department need so much recruitment?</p> <p>f) Is there high turnover of staff in the labour hire and do they need to be constantly recruited?</p> |
| 87 | SQ19-000095 | Townsville Floods | Watt | <p>Palm Island was affected by the severe storms the same as other areas. Why did Palm Island residents have to wait until 11th February to be able to make a claim when other towns were allowed to make claims from 4th February?</p> |
| 88 | SQ19-000096 | AAT Appeals | Watt | <p>How many cases have gone to the AAT in the last year?</p> |
| 89 | SQ19-000098 | AAT Appeals – Hearing Papers | Watt | <p>a) We understand DHS breached the legislative requirement to deliver hearing papers to the AAT within 28 days for the first time on or about 26th December 2018. Why did this occur?</p> <p>b) How late was your longest overdue case? Can you confirm that some cases were up to 21 days overdue?</p> <p>c) Were affected customers contacted by Centrelink and informed of the delay in providing their hearing papers?</p> |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|------------------------------------|---------|--|
| 90 | SQ19-000097 | External Review of Process | Watt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Has there been a review of the External Review of Decision process? b) Who conducted this? How much did this cost? c) When was this completed? d) How long did it take the department to assess the results of that review? Why did that take so long? |
| 91 | SQ19-000093 | Actions Arising from Review | Watt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What were some of the actions you have taken since that review? b) Have you introduced 'streamline quality check processes'? c) What does this involve? d) Has this reduced the quality level of checking? e) Have more cases been sent to the AAT since this has been in place? |
| 92 | SQ19-000091 | Assessment of Review | Watt | If the external review had been assessed in a timely manner and proper consultation taken place, is there a chance the breach could have been avoided without taking any shortcuts with quality? |
| 93 | SQ19-000090 | Staffing – Labour Hire | Watt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Do workers employed through labour hire have any restrictions on applying for positions in the department? b) When the department flags a position to be filled by labour hire, does the department pay each labour hire firm the same amount across the delegation level e.g. The department pays the same money for an APS 3 regardless if the labour hire staff member works for any firm? c) Are you aware of any disparity between what labour hire agencies pay their staff across delegation levels? d) We understand the department decided to move to name two labour hire recruitment agencies as the preferred agencies: Chandler Macleod and Hays. In some teams with over a dozen APS 5 labour hire staff, there are staff from two agencies, one of them being Chandler Macleod. Are you aware that Chandler Macleod is paying their staff less money than their competitor for the same work? e) What recourse do labour hire staff have to address this disparity with the department that has set the market rate for their work without jeopardising their employment? Can they keep their job but switch providers if they learn their colleagues are getting a higher rate? |
| 95 | SQ19-000088 | Centrelink ESAt Assessment Process | Brown | Please provide current wait times for assessments for the ESAt process, by state/territory? |
| 96 | SQ19-000102 | myGov Security Breaches – Data | Griff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How many security breaches of myGov were there in 2018? In answering please provide a breakdown of the type of breach (e.g. unauthorised access to records, identity theft etc)? b) What was the cause of these breaches (e.g. fraud, hacking, system error etc)? |

| HS No. | PDR | Broad topic | Senator | Question |
|--------|-------------|--|--------------|---|
| 97 | SQ19-000103 | myGov Security Breaches – Public Reporting | Griff | Does the agency publicly report on security breaches of myGov? If so, can you please provide a link to where this information is available? If not, why not? |
| 98 | SQ19-000104 | myGov Security Breaches - Access | Griff | <p>a) What are the steps that are required to verify the identity of a person who is seeking to access a myGov account and claims to have been locked out of the existing myGov account?</p> <p>b) What work has been done to ascertain the robustness of these measures in preventing unauthorised access by, for example, other persons who have relatively intimate knowledge of the account holder?</p> |
| 99 | SQ19-000105 | Asset Tests for Income Support Payments | Whish-Wilson | <p>a) How many Centrelink clients claim non-assessable income as a result of holding account-based pensions or similar financial products held from before 1 January 2015?</p> <p>b) What is the total quantum of non-assessable income claimed by Centrelink clients as a result of holding account-based pensions or similar financial products held from before 1 January 2015?</p> |
| 100 | SQ19-000106 | Program of Support | Siewert | <p>a) How many people (or what percentage) have exited from a Program of Support on the basis that their medical conditions meant that continuing would not improve their ability to prepare for, find, or keep employment?</p> <p>b) How many people have been terminated from a Program of Support as above by Centrelink?</p> |