Senate Standing Committee on Education Employment and Workplace Relations

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE Additional Estimates 2010-2011

Agency - Fair Work Ombudsman

DEEWR Question No.EW0777_11

Senator Abetz asked on 23/02/2011, Hansard page 45.

"Refers to previous Question No EW0556 11"

Question

PREVIOUS QON EW0556_11

Senator ABETZ—Why did you change them? Did you think it would be nice to change them or was something drawn to your attention that required it to be changed? If that is your answer, in relation to each of those 58 can you please take on notice why the change was made and what the change was. We will see how euphemistic the word 'change' actually is. Mr Wilson—Sure.

Answer

The Fair Work Ombudsman has provided the following response.

In question EW0556_11, the Fair Work Ombudsman reported that it had received 58 enquiries regarding rates of pay published in the online pay tools. From these enquiries, 31 were reported as having resulted in a change to the rates of pay in the online tools. The following table provides an analysis of the changes in relation to those 31 enquiries:

Issue	No. of
	enquiries
Classification linking amended or added creating a new phased rate	5
Publishing error – no rates showing in Guide	2
Other (see explanation below)	1
Corrections:	
- Casual loadings were incorrect	7
 Allowance was incorrectly calculated in the Modern Award or 	
the pre-Modern Award	6
 Rates in the on-line tools were incorrectly input 	6
 Changes required because of non-model transitional 	
provisions in the relevant Modern Award	2
- Pay Scale Summary contained error	2*

^{*}A single enquirer logged two enquiries which related to the one issue.

Five enquiries were related to classification linking. Should a change be made to a

classification 'link', or an additional 'link' is added at the request of a user, a new phased rate is generated. These changes are not corrections but rather are changes that result in additional information being presented.

The two publishing errors related to a technical IT problem that did not allow the rates to be published.

One enquiry was originally reported as a change to the online tools. Upon review the one classified as 'Other' did not result in a change to the online tools. It was in fact resolved by providing the client with further advice on how to use one of the online tools correctly.

The remaining 23 enquiries resulted in rates being corrected.

The other 27 enquiries out of the 58 resulted in no changes to online tools.