



Ms Jeanette Radcliffe
Secretary
Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Ms Radcliffe

**Clarification of information provided at the 2018-19 Budget Estimates
hearing on 31 May 2018**

I am writing to clarify information that was provided to the Committee during its examination of the Department of Human Services in the 2018-19 Budget Estimates hearing on 31 May 2018.

In answering questions from Senator Watt, the following evidence was given by Ms Brill (page 68, Hansard Proof Copy):

Senator WATT: So are the 14 million answered a subset of the 23.379 million successful?

Ms Brill: Yes, they are.

Senator WATT: And the four million 'abandoned' are not included in 'successful'?

Ms Brill: Correct. I could take on notice the abandoned and get you an answer while we're here just to make sure we're absolutely correct.

Ms Brill wishes to clarify her evidence to advise:

The four million 'abandoned' calls are included in 'successful'.

In answering a question from Senator Pratt, the following evidence was given by Ms Rule (page 107, Hansard Proof Copy):

Senator PRATT: The previous childcare subsidy was not means tested. So people did not need to put in an income assessment for those purposes previously?

Ms Rule: There were two aspects to the current childcare funding arrangements, one of which is means tested and one of which is not.

Senator PRATT: There was one that wasn't means tested in order to access it. But it's now all means tested—

Ms Rule: From 1 July.

Ms Rule wishes to clarify her evidence to advise:

From 2 July.

In answering several questions from Senator Pratt, the following evidence was given by Ms Leon (page 108, Hansard Proof Copy):

Senator PRATT: When I filled out this form, nowhere was there any expression of an obligation to me to explain what my household arrangements were for shared care. I responded to the letter from Centrelink, from the Department of Human Services, asking me to disclose my income. I disclosed my income and my income only, because that's all I was asked to do. Nowhere was I notified that I might be applying for something that I'm not eligible for, because previously my whole family was eligible for the rebate at the previous rate. So how are you going to fix this problem?

Ms Leon: I think this is a question that actually overlaps with the responsibilities of DSS, because—

Senator PRATT: But you're the ones that have to educate people and implement it. How are you going to implement it to make sure that someone like me doesn't overclaim?

Ms Leon: We've built the system to implement the policy of DSS, so we may need to take on notice and, between us and DSS, work out how to answer that question, because it sounds like it's partly a policy question.

Ms Leon inadvertently referred to DSS in this evidence (as highlighted above). The Department of Education is the policy department responsible for the Child Care Subsidy, and the highlighted references to DSS in this evidence should in fact refer to the Department of Education.

In answering questions from Senator Patrick, the following evidence was given by Ms Leon (page 132, Hansard Proof Copy):

Senator PATRICK: What I'm trying to get to is how much of that money, since the \$102 million has been expended, has now been spent on the system.

Ms Leon: We can take it on notice, but you've got to understand that the work's being done by people who are already on salary within our department.

Ms Leon wishes to clarify her evidence to read:

We can take it on notice, but you've got to understand that the work's being done by people who are already working within our department.

It would be appreciated if these clarifications of evidence could be provided to Committee Members.

Yours sincerely

Glenn Black
Acting National Manager
Ministerial Coordination and Parliamentary

12 July 2018