



Australian Government
Office of the Migration Agents Registration Authority

7 November 2012

Julie Dennett
Committee Secretary
Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

cc: Amy Potts

Dear Ms Dennett

Subject: Correction to Senate records

I am writing to you to correct information provided to the Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing in October 2012, and recorded in Hansard (L&C 15 October 2012).

Firstly, in my opening statement, I stated in part:

A review of CPD indicated that **32** per cent of agents are satisfied with the CPD they complete, which represents an increase of 21 per cent from that indicated in the 2010 survey¹.

The correct information is:

A review of CPD indicated that **82** per cent of agents are satisfied with the CPD they complete, which represents an increase of 21 per cent from that indicated in the 2010 survey.

I would also like to correct my response to Senator Pratt's questions in relation to complaint investigation. In particular, I am referring two questions from Senator Pratt, the first being:

"In terms of the work is done to look at breaches of the Code of Conduct, which we have touched on before, I am interested to know how a MARA officer would go about investigating agents after there has been some complaint or some initial detection of a breach or breaches, and how you work out whether some deeper investigation of that migration agent's work is required—I suppose to audit work that has not been complained about but, because you think there is a general problem with the conduct of that agent."

¹ Hansard L&C 15/10/12, p 14

In my response, I stated in part:

“If it **is not** allocated to an officer for further investigation, there is a discussion at that point about what sort of thing is key in terms of finalising the complaint as quickly and efficiently as possible.²”

The correct information is:

“If it **is** allocated to an officer for further investigation, there is a discussion at that point about what sort of thing is key in terms of finalising the complaint as quickly and efficiently as possible.”

The second question being:

“Okay, that is useful to know; thank you. Can I ask about the process that you go through— you have highlighted this a little bit in what you have said with respect to which complaints you want to investigate. I suppose you have to, for want of a better word, triage when making decisions about which complaints get investigated and to what level.”

In my response, I stated in part:

That is why we have MOUs in place with a number of the regulators in that area. If, for example, the agent's registration has lapsed, and we have complaints about a former agent, we may look at whether or not it is worth putting a lot of effort in considering barring that agent when, if they ever did lodge an application in the future, we could deal with that as a **regulation** issue anyway.

The correct information is:

“That is why we have MOUs in place with a number of the regulators in that area. If, for example, the agent's registration has lapsed, and we have complaints about a former agent, we may look at whether or not it is worth putting a lot of effort in considering barring that agent when, if they ever did lodge an application in the future, we could deal with that as a **registration** issue anyway.”

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Wood
Chief Executive Officer
Office of the MARA

² Hansard L&C 15/10/12, p 19