

**Senate Standing Committee on Education Employment and Workplace
Relations**

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2010-2011**

Agency - Comcare

DEEWR Question No.EW0716_11

Senator Abetz asked on 23/02/2011, Hansard page 7.

Question

**MINUTES OF 15 SEPT 2010 OF THE SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND
COMPENSATION COMMISSION (SRCC)**

Senator ABETZ—Did the minutes of the meeting, as late as 15 September 2010, of the Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Commission include in it: Commissioner Hoy advised that Safe Work Australia will be developing guidelines but not until early 2011. Safe Work Australia may put together a group to workshop this issue. He suggested that Safe Work Australia works with Comcare to develop some words on a rationale to include in a letter to Dr Culvenor. As late as 15 September last year the rationale for knocking out Dr Culvenor had not been determined and had to be workshopped to try to justify this quite ridiculous decision. That is the reality and the minutes now prove that, do they not? Mr Kibble—You will appreciate I do not have the minutes with me, but— Senator ABETZ—Take it on notice and tell me whether my reading of those minutes is an accurate reflection of those minutes. Mr Kibble—Yes, we will take it on notice.

Answer

Comcare has provided the following response

The Minutes from the Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Commission (SRCC) meeting of 15 September 2010 include the words 'Commissioner Hoy advised that Safe Work Australia will be developing guidelines, but not until early 2011. Safe Work Australia may put together a group to workshop this issue. He suggested that Safe Work Australia works with Comcare to develop some words on a rationale to include in a letter to Dr Culvenor.'

At the meeting the SRCC resolved that 'Comcare write to Dr Culvenor providing a rationale for the Commission's decision on five days face-to-face training'. The Commission's decision on the guidelines was made on 8 April 2010. It is incorrect to infer from the September meeting Minutes that that the rationale had to be workshopped to justify the decision. The correct inference is that the SRCC decided to provide Dr Culvenor with an explanation of its April decision.