

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: 'Georgiou review'

Question: 65

Written Senator Bernardi

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

I have heard of a review conducted within DPS Security branch called the 'Georgiou' review, conducted in the early months of 2015.

1. Who commissioned this review?
2. Why was this review commissioned?
3. On what date did this review start?
4. What DPS staff and non-DPS staff were in charge of conducting this review? Please provide as much detail as possible.
5. What did the review examine within the security branch?
6. If the review has concluded:
 - a. On what date did this review conclude?
 - b. Who received the final report of this review?
 - c. Is a copy the report available to be presented to this committee? If so, please provide a copy to the committee. If not, please provide an explanation as to why it cannot be made available to the committee.
 - d. What were the recommendations of the report?
7. Were any other departments involved in this review in any way? (e.g. Attorney-General's Department, Department of PM&C, the AFP) If so, please provide details of the extent they were involved. If not, why were other departments not involved or consulted?
8. Were the Presiding Officers consulted about this review prior to the review starting? Were they involved with it in any way? If so, what was the extent of their involvement? If not, why were they not involved?
9. Did non-DPS personnel involved in the review receive a security clearance to conduct the review?
 - a. If so, were they granted their security clearance before they commenced work on the review? Please provide details for each non-DPS person involved in the review.
 - b. What level of security clearance did they receive?

Staff consultation

During this committee's inquiry into DPS, at the 16 March 2015 hearing, the internal review was discussed. At that hearing, Mr Skill said that "We are not at the stage where we are broadly talking to staff yet".

An answer to a question on notice stated that the "Security Branch Workplace Consultative Committee was consulted on the development of skill sets for security staff, and changes to staffing levels" on 1 April 2015.

10. Was the 1 April 2015 WCC meeting the first time that PSS staff were informed about the review? If not, please provide details of the date when PSS staff were first informed.
11. Has there been any further consultation with PSS staff since 1 April 2015? If so, when and how (via email, meeting etc) did this occur? If not, why has there been no consultation with PSS staff?
12. Please provide a timeline of the dates when PSS staff were informed (since they were first informed to now) about the progress of the review, and were offered opportunities for feedback, attended workshops etc.
13. Can you guarantee that each PSS staff member has been informed about the review and its progress?
14. Have you received any complaints about the consultation process with PSS staff? If so, please provide details of the nature of the complaints.

Answer

1. The Department commissioned the review.
2. Given the agreement of the new MOU between the Australian Federal Police and the Department in relation to operational delivery of security services, and changes to the number of operating points in APH, a review was required to assist the PSS in operating as efficiently as possible.
3. 1 February 2015.
4. Mr Peter Georgiou who was the contracted independent consultant was the lead and he reported to the Director, Security Operations.
5.
 - a. Optimum operating model in regards to staffing.
 - b. Appropriate hours of rostering in line with awards and agreements etc.
 - c. Efficiency in rostering practices including scheduling and forecasting.
 - d. Best practice model for employment i.e. Ongoing/Part-time/Casual etc.
6.
 - a. 31 March 2015.
 - b. Assistant Secretary Security Branch.
 - c. The Georgiou Report is both commercially and security operations sensitive, as it contains details of security operations at Parliament House.
 - d. The report made 8 recommendations relating to the operational capability of the PSS and where efficiency in operations could be realised. All of the recommendations were supported by management as viable options to consider in moving capability and efficiency of the PSS forward. The recommendations and management response were shared with the PSS.
7. No.
8. No this was an operational level assessment of where efficiencies and better practice could be identified.
9.
 - a. The Consultant engaged to undertake the review already possessed an active and current Australian Government security clearance.
 - b. Negative Vetting 2
10. Yes, this was the first official discussion of the potential options for development or staffing levels for the PSS, following funding provided for possible role upgrades and staffing increases.
11. Yes. In addition to the 1 April 2015 meeting, the following meetings/consultations took place:

Date	Meeting
19 May 2015	Email to all PSS Staff on Consultation
20 May 2015	Team Leaders Briefing
27 May 2015	Staff Consultation Session x2
28 May 2015	Staff Consultation Session x2
28 May 2015	Email to all PSS Staff

Date	Meeting
1 June 2015	Staff Consultation Session x2
2 June 2015	Email to all PSS Staff
23 June 2015	Open Day with Assistant Secretary
29 June 2015	Email to all PSS Staff
2 July 2015	Staff Consultation Session x 2
8 July 2016	Staff Consultation Session x 2
23 July 2015	Briefing/ Discussion with the CPSU
29 July 2015	Consultation with the WCC

12. See question 11.
13. Yes. Aside from discussions which would have occurred in teams and through the WCC and CPSU, all PSS officers received the emails regarding the consultation options, how to reply if they were unable to attend a session (through an email) and the progress of the changes.
14. All feedback received through the consultation process was addressed. If staff were unable to attend consultations sessions (which were paid) then alternative arrangements were made to ensure their views were heard by their line managers. Some staff did complain that they wanted more detailed information on specific areas, so a question and answer format was included in emails to directly answer the questions raised.