

**Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee
—Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing—October 2015**

Answers to Questions on Notice

Parliamentary departments, Department of Parliamentary Services

Topic: **Car Parking**

Question: **50**

Written **Senator Wong**

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 4 December 2015

1. Referring to the Grosvenor Options Paper, at pages 9 and 75, was the recommended governance structure (at point 1) implemented and if so, who sat on the implementation management committee?
2. If it was not implemented, why not?
3. Did Grosvenor have any relationship with the provider that was eventually chosen to supply the car park infrastructure?
4. Can the Department of Parliamentary Services confirm there were no conflicts of interest between Grosvenor and the Department of Parliamentary Services and the staff who were managing the process?
5. How was this documented?
6. Why was the figure on page 17 of the report, identifying car parks, redacted?
7. Why were the case studies on pages 44 to 46 redacted?

Answer

1. In April 2015, a Parliamentary Parking Working Group, consistent with the recommended governance structure, was established to discuss a range of car parking issues within the Parliamentary precinct. The Working Group comprised an SES representative from each of the four Parliamentary Departments and an SES representative from the Department of Finance.:
2. Some of the issues (e.g. Fringe Benefits Tax and non-visitor parking) were considered by the Working Group. Advice was provided to the Presiding Officers after the Working Group's considerations. The other recommendations of the report have been implemented.
3. The carpark infrastructure was provided by CDS Worldwide Pty Ltd (CDS). DPS is not aware of any pre-existing commercial relationship between Grosvenor and CDS.
4. Grosvenor was engaged by DPS through the Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy existing panel arrangement. Based on the documentation available, and noting that relevant senior staff involved in the process are no longer employed by the Department of Parliamentary Services (DPS), DPS is not aware of any conflict of interest. No conflict of interest was declared at the time.
5. It is a requirement for all DPS officers to declare any perceived or potential conflict of interest.
6. The diagram showing the maps was redacted as the placement of the car parks shown was incorrect and very misleading.
7. Information on the case studies was redacted as it related to other Commonwealth organisations, not to DPS or Parliament House.