From: Archer, Glenn [mailto:Glenn.Archer@finance.gov.au]
Sent: Friday, 2 September 2011 7:01 PM
To: Perrem, Kilian (REPS)
Cc: Worthington, Glenn (REPS); Morris, Julia (REPS)
Subject: Report on the role and potential benefit of the National Broadband Network (NBN) [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dr Kilian Perrem
Inquiry Secretary
House of Representatives Standing Committee on
Infrastructure and Communications

Dear Dr Perrem

Further to our conversation this morning regarding the House of Representatives Standing Committee *Report on the role and potential benefit of the National Broadband Network (NBN)* (the Report), I would like to formally express my concerns with two quotes that are attributed to me out of context in the Dissenting Report.

I note that Committee Members who propose to present a dissenting report are not required to seek authorisation from the Chair or other Committee members, as this power resides with individual members, not with the Committee (House of Representatives Practice refers). However, I am concerned that selective use of two quotes from my evidence by Opposition Members, has resulted in me being misrepresented.

Firstly, paragraph 1.22 on page 294 of the Report under the heading, *Should have been a cost benefit analysis*, I am quoted as saying cost would have to be a factor. This comment referred to evidence given about the degree to which fibre has seen a progressive increase in its capacity to support faster broadband speeds and how, in considering alternative approaches, there is a need to be cognisant of the technology that will deliver the greatest benefit into the future (page 42 of House of Representatives Official Committee Hansard, 27 May 2011 refers). This was in response to a question from Mr Fletcher around one of the Inquiry's Terms of Reference: the optimal capacity and technical requirements of a network. The Report also omits evidence given by Mr Edge on page 43 of the Hansard that makes Finance's views on the investment approach clear.

Secondly, paragraph 1.53 on page 302 of the Report under the heading, *Unimpressive preparation for NBN by Commonwealth Departments*, the Report includes a statement from me about the ad hoc nature of tele-working arrangements in Australian Government agencies. This statement has again been taken out of context. While it is correct that there is no Whole-of-Government Tele-working policy and that individual Australian Government agencies make their own arrangements regarding tele-working, generally it is not the case when it comes to ICT staff where a Whole-of-Government policy does exist. In this case I was participating in a discussion regarding the Whole-of-Government ICT Tele-working policy (page 39 of Hansard refers).

I request that my concerns in relation to this misrepresentation be made known to the Committee and I further request that a corrigendum or a further report be presented correcting this misrepresentation.

Regards

Glenn Archer

First Assistant Secretary, Policy and Planning Division
Australian Government Information Management Office
Department of Finance and Deregulation
☎ +61 2 6215 2240 glenn.archer@finance.gov.au

AGIMO blog: www.agimo.govspace.gov.au
Australian Government entry point: www.australia.gov.au
Australian Government public information datasets: data.australia.gov.au