

Senate Standing Committee on Economics

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Treasury Portfolio

Additional Estimates

26 February 2014

Question: AET 3094

Topic: Redundancies (ATO)

Written: 7 March 2014

Senator BUSHBY asked:

3094) Can the agency outline what criteria is being applied to vet applications for redundancies or to select functional areas in which to concentrate overall staff reductions?

Answer:

3094) Expressions of interest were assessed against the following criteria:

Position assessment

1. Essential for business outcomes now and in future

- This position performs a critical function, which may entail high complexity, highly specialised knowledge or require multiple connections across the ATO.
- The position performs essential business functions which are very difficult to redistribute or deliver through alternative means or other locations.
- It is likely that there would be insufficient resources across the ATO to deliver a required service or function if the position was permanently abolished.
- Significant and ongoing business disruption would occur immediately or within a short period of time (months) if the position was not filled.

2. Important for business delivery now and in future

- While the position performs an important function for the ATO, there are a number of similar positions across the ATO which may mitigate risks if the position was abolished.
- It may be possible to redesign this work to be delivered in a different way or location, but would be likely to encounter some issues that may take some effort to resolve.
- Losing this position won't in itself have an immediate or long term significant impact on ATO business delivery, but if many similar positions were to go this may create some business delivery difficulties.

3. Opportunities exist for efficiencies/alternative delivery

- This business function is reducing/ceasing, there may be an oversupply of positions performing this function, or the location does not match future requirements for efficient business delivery.
- Work can be fairly easily redistributed to existing resources, or delivered through alternative means.
- Loss of position will not cause significant issues for delivery of services to the community, or the reputation of ATO.
- Work may not be considered essential to delivery of business requirements, particularly into the future.

Senate Standing Committee on Economics

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Treasury Portfolio

Additional Estimates

26 February 2014

Person assessment

1. Essential for business delivery now and in future

- The employee has specialised, hard to find or in demand capabilities, that are required for current and future delivery of ATO business. These capabilities may already be specified through workforce plans as high value/highly required into the future.
- If this person left the ATO, it would take a considerable period of time and investment to train and/or build requisite experience for a successor to perform effectively.
- The employee exemplifies and role models the Commissioners' statement expectations, leading others towards achieving our 2020 vision.

2. Important for business delivery now and in future

- While the employee's capabilities may be in strong supply in the ATO, they remain in demand and important for the effective delivery of business outcomes.
- While their departure would not have serious consequences for business delivery, it takes some time and investment to build the capabilities that this employee possesses.

3. Non-essential for business delivery

- The employee's capabilities and experience are widely available, easily accessible or quick to develop with low investment.
- The employee has capabilities that while specialised, are becoming less required for delivery of ATO outcomes.
- There may be an oversupply of these capabilities required for efficient delivery of business now and into the future.

Given the volume of EOIs received as part of this process, Groups undertook a number of prioritisation measures prior to putting recommendations to the assessment panel. For example:

- Groups consolidated all 'like' assessment ratings (e.g. all 3/3 ratings) into categories (i.e. additional consideration areas listed below).
- Groups further dis-aggregated the categories to allow the appropriate number of voluntary redundancies to be recommended e.g. within the 3/3 category (for example, a Group may have an oversupply of staff at a particular classification level and may have a large number of staff who work alone without direct supervision).

Employees in the following categories were more likely to be considered (although these were not determining factors):

1. Working in areas that have identified surplus positions or an incorrect spread of classification levels.
2. Executive level/manager/team leader positions where opportunities for efficiencies exist.
3. Located in sites where a small presence cannot be sustained due to insufficient scope for succession planning or for staff to be mentored and provided with development opportunities.