

# Senate Standing Committee on Economics

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Treasury Portfolio

Additional Estimates

23 – 24 February 2011

Question No: AET 132

Topic: SBT 144

Hansard Page: E 20

Senator Bushby asked:

**Senator BUSHBY**—Thank you. I have some questions on staffing levels. In SBT 144, in response to my question, ‘Have any voluntary or involuntary redundancies been offered to staff; if so, how have staff been identified for such offers; are there such plans for the future?’ you say there have been voluntary and involuntary redundancies offered to staff. Then, in SBT 162, when I was asking about the efficiencies, you say that there were no voluntary or involuntary redundancies offered to staff in order to meet the 2010 MYEFO— which is more specific, I would note. How do those two answers sit with each other?

**Mr D’Aloisio**—Can I take that on board and give you an explanation? I am sorry if there is confusion.

Answer:

The answers ASIC gave to SBT144 and SBT162 describe different situations, one of which is unrelated to staff reductions.

The circumstances described in SBT162 relate to the method in which ASIC said it would be managing to meet its Whole-of-Government Departmental Efficiencies - ASIC stated that it would not be reducing staff numbers in order to create efficiencies. ASIC would instead do this via reductions in travel expenses, office requisites, consultants to learning and development, forensic costs, computer expenses and corporate and operating costs.

In SBT144, ASIC was asked to provide information about general staffing levels. The redundancies referred to in this answer were conducted as a result of a review of one of ASIC's business functions, Shared Services. These redundancies were unrelated to the 2009-2010 Mid Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook and were undertaken as a result of changes required in technology, processes and skills to deliver on the review's recommendations.