

#### CASE NO.10: PAYMENTS TO SPOUSES

**Claim:** It is alleged that DFAT approved a payment to spouses of \$15 per hour from representation allowance in a way that would permit tax evasion.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review showed that DFAT officers in receipt of representation allowance may now acquit payments to their spouses at the rate of \$15 per hour up to a limit of 20% of the representation allowance. The payments to spouses are acquitted in relation to services provided by the spouses to assist in officers' representational activities. The Department does not regard itself as the employer of the spouses who receive this benefit and does not maintain consolidated records of the payments to spouses or issue group certificates or statements of earnings to them.

In the sample of HOM quarterly representation acquittal returns reviewed by Committee staff, 12 of 29 HsOM claimed for spouse payments, claiming amounts ranging from \$30 to \$450 in a three month period.

Australian tax might be evaded in these cases through those spouses who have income above the tax free threshold and who are liable to pay Australian income tax not declaring payments received, or through officers not declaring spouses' incomes when claiming dependants' rebates. In either case, the amounts of money involved would be small.

It appears that representation allowance entitlements were not increased when the provision for spouse payments was introduced in 1990. This could imply some diversion of representational expenditure towards support activities which were previously provided free of charge by spouses. DFAT officers suggested to Committee staff that any reduction in some forms of representational activity consequent on that diversion, if it occurred, might have been more than offset by an increase in representational activity through home entertainment.

#### CASE NO. 11: ALLEGED INCORRECT PAYMENTS UNDER REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCE

**Claim:** It is alleged that a HOM has been allowed incorrectly to acquit expenses outside his or her area of accreditation.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review showed that the HOM had acquitted expenses outside his area but did so in accordance with rules that allow such acquittal where the activity relates to the area of accreditation.

**Responses:** Both the Department and the HOM responded that the expenses in question had been legitimate representational expenses acquitted in accordance with the provisions for that entitlement.

Mr Carroll told Committee staff that he was aware of the possibility that such acquittals could be legal but had assumed in this case that they were not. He expressed disquiet at the existence of the provision allowing for acquittal of expenses incurred outside the area of accreditation because of the possibility of fraud.

#### CASE NO. 12: ALLEGED FAILURE TO STOP REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCE

**Claim:** It is alleged that a HOM has continued to receive representation advances despite his or her returns failing audit review each quarter.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review showed that most of the HOM's returns since June 1989 have been accepted without question. Minor queries were raised about some and two sets were returned because they were not typed and photocopies rather than original receipts had been supplied for some purchases. The HOM then engaged in a written exchange with an officer in the Conditions of Service Section in which he or she accused the latter of nit-picking. All the queries which had led to the return of the documents were resolved. A number of the HOM's advances were withheld over the period because he or she was under-expended and he or she offered at one point to return some of the under-expended advance to the Department.

**Responses:** The Department confirmed that the HOM's returns had not been regularly queried and had not failed audit scrutiny every quarter. DFAT advised that it is not unusual for advances to be withheld due to underspending. The HOM responded to the claim, stating that he or she was not aware of and had not been advised of any failure of his or her representation allowance returns. The HOM commented:

Representation funds have for a number of reasons been underspent (there is no obligation to spend such funds for the sake of it - nor any sense in doing so).

#### CASE NO. 13 - REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCE: ALLEGED UNJUSTIFIED CHANGE

**Claim:** It is alleged that a senior officer increased the HOM representation allowance entitlement at a post prior to taking up the position of HOM at that post, taking the allowance for that post above that applicable to a more important post in the region.

**Responses:** The Department responded:

The base for Head of Mission representation allowance was established some years ago using a methodology which includes a 'post activity rating' and actual per capita local costs for a set regime of representation functions and guests. The rates are reviewed periodically, and were last adjusted in 1990.

The Department informed the Committee that the HOM representation allowance at the post in question was increased prior to the officer's taking up duty there but that the increase was the result of a global review which led to an across-the-board increase for all HsOM.

The Department denied that the post in question attracts a higher HOM representation allowance entitlement than the neighbouring post mentioned in the claim but pointed out that a comparison in Australian dollars will, in any case, not be a particularly accurate reflection of the relative importance of posts because of differing local costs.

The officer also responded, recalling that there had been a world-wide review of representation allowances in 1989 or 1990. The review had increased all rates in line with a CPI index set by the Department of Finance and they then had been reduced by the

amount of the Government's imposed efficiency dividend. Neither of these factors had been set by the officer.

The officer stated that he or she had done nothing to vary the relative rating of posts for representation allowance purposes.

The officer commented that his or her former duties in relation to disciplining, instructing and counselling officers had led in the past to "similar unsubstantiated and malicious allegations made by similarly anonymous officers with a grievance against me because I did my job honestly".

#### **CASE NO. 14: ALLEGED ABUSE OF BOARDING SCHOOL ASSISTANCE - GENERAL**

**Claim:** It is alleged that young children living with the divorced spouses of DFAT officers suddenly return to the officers' custody when they reach the age at which boarding school entitlements begin.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review of the 56 current boarding school approvals revealed two cases where officers had taken responsibility for children who had previously been the responsibility of their divorced spouses and the children had subsequently been placed in boarding school. The approvals in both cases were in accordance with the rules.

#### **CASE NO. 15 - ALLEGED SPECIFIC ABUSE OF BOARDING SCHOOL ASSISTANCE**

**Claim:** It is alleged that a HOM conspired with a senior officer in Canberra to gain illegal approval to boarding school assistance, overriding the objections of the officer normally responsible for approving the entitlement. The HOM was directed to repay all monies by the Auditor-General after the matter was reported to the Auditor-General and the Australian Federal Police by the ORC.

**Responses:** The Department responded that a materially different claim regarding the same approval of boarding school entitlement was raised by the ORC and is described as Case 63 in Audit Report 15 of 1990-91. The current claim differed from the earlier one in that a different senior officer in Canberra was described as having approved the claim over the objections of a different middle-ranking officer. The Department stated that the officer now claimed to have objected to the approval was in fact on an overseas posting at the relevant time and the application was actually approved without objection by the then Director of the relevant section.

The Department said that it was unaware of any ANAO direction that monies be repaid, and that such a direction would be surprising in view of the ANAO's conclusion in Audit Report No.15 of 1990-91 that the papers submitted by the HOM fully supported the claim for education assistance.

The HOM described the claim as 'entirely unfounded' and stated that the basic facts in the claim are wrong. He or she is not in receipt of boarding school assistance, but receives education assistance for one child who attends a government school. He or she had no discussions or correspondence with the senior officer prior to the approval of the

claim, has never received a direction from the Auditor-General on this matter, and had been advised by the Department at the time of the ORC allegation that the ANAO had examined the papers and found them to be in order.

#### CASE NO. 16: ALLEGED SPECIFIC ABUSE OF BOARDING SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

**Claim:** It is alleged that two officers at different posts conspired with a third in Canberra to delay their return to Australia until after the end of January 1992 to accrue entitlement to an additional year of assistance with boarding school fees.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review showed that neither of the officers said to have delayed their return had done so and that neither has or ever had children in boarding school.

**Responses:** The Department and the officers concerned denied the claim and pointed to the obvious inaccuracies in it.

Mr Carroll subsequently informed Committee staff that he had been further advised that the conspiracy related to extension of entitlement to tuition fees, not boarding school fees, and that he had been misinformed as to the identity of one of the officers. He expressed concern that the Department had not responded to the Committee in relation to possible fraud by the officer who should have been named in the submission, saying that he believed that the identity of the real offender would have been obvious to the Department from the context of the claim.

The claim had named a fourth officer as having been disadvantaged by the alleged malpractice and Mr Carroll believed that the Department should have responded to the claim in relation to the officer who had been replaced by the fourth officer as well as responding in relation to the officer wrongly named in the submission. However, the Committee Secretary, in seeking comment from the Department on the claims about the officers who had been adversely mentioned, had not referred to the part of the claim in which the fourth officer was mentioned so that the Department did not have that basis for recognising the mistake in the submission.

#### CASE NO. 17 - ALLEGED SPECIFIC ABUSE OF BOARDING SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

**Claim:** It is alleged that three officers gained illegal approval for boarding school assistance. One was said to have made a telephone application for the assistance and to have had the application approved by senior officers over the objections of the officers with operational responsibility and to have received the entitlement for six years.

**Responses:** Committee staff did not review files in relation to this claim. The Department informed the Committee that the same claim had been made by the ORC, thoroughly investigated by the Department and the Australian Federal Police and found to be unsubstantiated. In addition, the Department stated, the Australian National Audit Office had reviewed the Department's handling of education assistance payments and had concluded that entitlements were correctly calculated and approved and paid to officers.

DFAT informed the Committee that, at the time of its investigation of the previous allegations, it had thoroughly reviewed the legislative and administrative provisions relating to education assistance and the decision making process in general. The review

had concluded that the provisions were generally being applied appropriately but that in some cases documentation had been incomplete. The Department said that procedures have now been changed so that applications for education assistance prior to commencement of posting are made in writing and any change of circumstances which could affect entitlement is notified to the Department. The new procedures involve a checking mechanism to ensure that two officers are involved in verifying entitlements to education assistance.

Two of the three officers named in the submission responded to the claims. Both pointed out that the claims had been made previously and refuted and both denied any improper conduct. One officer supplied details of the assistance he or she received with boarding school fees. These details differed in material respects from those provided in the DFAT Reform Group submission, especially as regards the duration and cost of the approval and the likely costs of the alternative suggested by the DFAT Reform Group.

#### CASE NO. 18: ALLEGED ABUSE OF REUNION TRAVEL - GENERAL

**Claim:** It is alleged that reunion travel entitlements are widely abused to allow officers to "swan around international resorts".

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed all approvals for reunion travel on the files relating to the 56 current boarding school approvals. The review showed that the entitlements are occasionally used to allow parents and children to meet in a location other than Australia or the post but always on the basis that there is no additional cost to the Commonwealth. Two cases were observed where officers had broken their journey on reunion trips, possibly in breach of the spirit but not the letter of the reunion fare entitlement.

#### CASE NO. 19 - ALLEGED SPECIFIC ABUSE OF REUNION TRAVEL

**Claim:** It is alleged that an officer used a number of his or her child's reunion travel entitlements for holiday trips through world holiday resort locations.

**Responses:** The Department responded that allegations about this officer had been investigated and refuted by the Department and the Australian Federal Police. The officer responded with details of reunion travel by him or her and his or her children during the posting in question. This information indicated that all reunion travel had been to Australia (by the officer), to the country of residence of the officer's parents (by officer and children) or to the post (by the children). The officer argued that there had been no additional cost to the Commonwealth through the arrangements that had been made and that there had probably been savings. He or she had made the arrangements to avoid subjecting young children to lengthy and arduous travel to a hardship post and to take the opportunity during the reunion to discuss matters with his or her former spouse or to allow his or her children to spend time with his or her parents.

In discussion with Committee staff, Mr Carroll did not classify this use of the reunion entitlements as a breach of the law but rather as an excessively generous entitlement.

#### CASE NO. 20: CHANGE OF STATUS OF LEAVE WITHOUT PAY

**Claim:** It is alleged that the status of an officer's leave without pay was changed retrospectively and improperly from "self interest" to "public interest" to the officer's

benefit. This claim was previously made by the ORC and investigated and rejected by the DFAT Special Investigator and the Australian National Audit Office.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. Review of the files showed that the change of status occurred relatively shortly after the grant of the leave. The officer had applied for leave without pay to work for an organisation not listed in the Personnel Management Manual as attracting "public interest" status and special approval from DIR was therefore required for it to be so classified. The officer applied for this to be done and the leave appeared to have been granted initially on a "self interest" basis only because DIR approval for "public interest" leave could not be obtained quickly enough. There was no unreasonable delay in seeking DIR approval and the change of status was approved by DIR on the basis of a convincing and apparently factual case put forward by DFAT.

The Special Investigator speculated that the ORC claim might have been based on a misinterpretation of part of a letter written by the officer to the Department. A copy of the same letter was supplied to the Committee as an attachment to the DFAT Reform Group submission. One inference which could be drawn from the letter in the absence of any other knowledge of the case is that a reasoned, initial decision not to approve the leave in the "public interest" was reversed towards the end of the two-year period of leave. This did not happen nor is it the only way in which the relevant part of the letter can be read.

## MISUSE OF OFFICIAL VEHICLES

### CASE NO. 21 - ALLEGED MISUSE OF PETROL CHARGE CARDS BY SES OFFICERS

**Claim:** It is alleged that an audit check of an ORC allegation found that 54% of SES officers were incorrectly charging petrol and other items to their "Comcar credit cards" and that the cost of the incorrectly charged petrol was recovered at the duty free rate.

**File search:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review showed that on 16 August 1990 a DFAT auditor was instructed to investigate a claim made the previous week by the ORC to the effect that SES officers had used Government-issued petrol credit cards for private holiday travel and that leave records were not being checked to prevent this practice.

The auditor checked the credit card petrol purchases of a sample of 14 SES officers based in Canberra during 1989-90, found several irregularities and recommended corrective action. The recommendations were promptly accepted by Departmental management. The auditor then checked all commercial credit card purchases of petrol for cars on issue to all SES officers based in the Department in Canberra for the whole of 1989-90 and who took leave during the year. He or she found that a large proportion of these officers had used their credit cards to buy petrol while on recreation leave. This was contrary to the conditions of issue of private-plated cars and to departmental instructions.

The initial audit report on this matter stated that 54% of the 51 officers whose records had been reviewed had used their charge cards incorrectly. A later revision to the report

reduced the proportion incorrectly using the cards to 37.25% of the sample or 26.7% of all Canberra-based SES officers. The purchases incorrectly charged totalled \$1895.68 and, since they were made on government charge cards, reflected duty free prices.

While noting that there would be a loss of Commonwealth revenue associated with recovery of purchase costs at the duty-free rate, DFAT subsequently recovered the duty-free cost of the purchases from the officers concerned. One factor in this decision appears to have been a survey of practices adopted in other departments and agencies which found that SES officers in the Attorney-General's Department were permitted to use their petrol charge cards while on leave, subject to their later reimbursing the Department. Another was the difficulty of settling on any alternative recovery rate for numerous small purchases that would have attracted a wide range of full retail prices.

The audit detected other serious flaws in the management of private-plated cars. Bills from one oil company were insufficiently detailed to allow proper monitoring, the Pay and Conditions Section had not always received the advice of the issue date of cars required for the commencement of salary deductions, salary deductions had not always been backdated to the necessary extent, the Travel sub-section rarely received advice of leave approvals and the records of SES cars had not been properly maintained.

There was no indication on the files of any attempt by any officer of DFAT to hinder the investigation of the ORC claims or to prevent recovery of the cost of the incorrectly charged purchases. The investigation appeared to have been thorough, effective and completed in a reasonable time.

**Departmental response:** The Department informed the Committee that private-plated cars had only been an entitlement for SES Band 1 officers in the Public Service for just over a year when the ORC made its allegations. The Department had begun an audit review of its guidelines on the use of SES vehicles, including petrol card usage, five months before the claims were made. (It should be noted here that the Committee staff reviewed the file on this audit and found no indication that the Department was reviewing the main issue raised by the ORC prior to publication of the ORC allegation.) Revised guidelines for the use of SES cars, issued by DFAT in December 1991, include the statement:

Officers are required to meet fuel, oil and servicing costs whilst on recreation leave. TSG, Shell and Ampol cards are not to be used when on recreation leave, even on the proviso that the officer will reimburse the Department at a later date. Such action constitutes an offence under Section 64A of the Audit Act and is punishable upon conviction by a fine of \$20,000 or imprisonment for a period not exceeding 5 years or both.

#### CASE NO 22 - ALLEGED MISUSE OF PRIVATELY-PLATED CARS

**Claim:** It is alleged that a non-SES officer fraudulently issued a private-plated departmental car to him or herself for approximately one year. The fraud is said to have been proven by an internal audit investigation but the officer is said to have escaped with an admonishment after intervention by a named SES officer.

**File search:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The files show that a DFAT auditor investigated a similar claim in conjunction with the claim of misuse of SES

petrol charge cards which was made in an ORC newsletter in August 1990 (see claim 21). The newsletter accused an officer of having issued private plated cars to two other officers and claimed that the three had "regularly taken cars home in recent months". The investigation was undertaken promptly and at the direction of the named SES officer alleged to have intervened to minimise the punishment of one officer.

The officer accused of wrongly issuing the cars made a short written statement at the beginning of the August 1990 DFAT investigation admitting to having given permission for the other two persons to use SES cars after hours on occasions when they had worked late and otherwise would have been entitled to a Cabcharge voucher or transport by Comcar. The officer admitted also to making use "on occasion" of a private-plated car when he or she would otherwise have been entitled to a more expensive form of official transport home.

The auditor found that there was no approved procedure by which non-SES officers could take private-plated government vehicles home. Based on the admissions by the officer, he therefore found the ORC claim to be substantiated. No documentary records of usage of the relevant SES cars were located in the audit.

The audit report was submitted to the SES officer named by the DFAT Reform Group who responded that available private-plated cars should be used in lieu of Cabcharge or Comcar bookings if it was more economical to do so but that no officer should be able to authorise his or her own use of a car. Procedures were then established permitting the use of available SES cars in lieu of Cabcharge vouchers or Comcar transport subject to proper approval and documentation. The procedures preclude an officer authorising such use in his or her own case. The officer who had done so in the case raised by the ORC was counselled.

The DFAT Reform Group submission to this Committee differs from the original claim in stating that the officer issued him or herself a car for "approximately a year" and that the SES officer intervened to reduce the officer's punishment. The records of the original DFAT investigation, while sufficient to establish the veracity of the original claim do not permit a conclusion on whether the officer misused a car or cars for a lengthy period. There is no indication in the records of any intervention by the SES officer to prevent or reduce the punishment of the non-SES officer. The files contain at least one statement by the SES officer criticising the other officer's action.

**Responses:** In responding to the new claim, DFAT commented "records of SES car usage kept at that time are, regrettably, incomplete. They do not provide sufficient information to prove or disprove the allegation".

The Department claimed that detailed running sheets of SES car usage by other than the person to whom each car is assigned are now kept and audited. The Department defended the actions of the SES officer involved, stating that the officer had initiated the investigation of the original claims and had initiated the action that led to the non-SES officer being counselled.

DFAT reported that the non-SES officer had denied the new claim completely to the Department's Fraud Control and Discipline Section and had provided a statutory declaration to that effect.



The non-SES Officer, in a letter to the Committee "categorically den[ied] the allegation that I issued an SES car to myself for a period of one year". The SES officer rejected the claim that he had intervened in the disciplinary process and stated that he or she was instrumental in ensuring that follow-up action was taken, including the counselling of the non-SES officer.

#### CASE NO. 23: ALLEGED MISUSE OF SES CARS

**Claim:** It is alleged that the sons of two SES officers had been permitted by their parents to drive private-plated Commonwealth cars while unlicensed, contrary to the conditions on which the cars are issued, had three expensive accidents while doing so and that one of the accidents may have involved drink driving. This claim was previously made by the ORC, investigated and rejected by the DFAT Special Investigator and the Audit Office.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review found that the Special Investigator's file contains photocopies of documents indicating that the youths concerned held current drivers licences, had been properly nominated as alternative drivers, had reported their accidents to the Australian Federal Police and were not charged. The youths were involved in two accidents and the spouse of one of the officers in a third.

### DISCIPLINARY SYSTEM

#### CASE NO. 24: FINANCIAL MISMANAGEMENT AT A POST

**Claim:** It is alleged that a middle-ranking officer who succeeded in gaining promotion into DFAT from another department ahead of officers already in DFAT was, in retaliation, assigned to a post where financial problems were known to exist. It is further claimed that the financial problems worsened to the extent that the Chief Auditor recommended that two HsOM and the middle-ranking officer be charged but that DFAT sought legal advice calculated to exonerate the HsOM so that, in the event, only their junior was charged.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review showed that the officer was assigned to a post where financial problems had been identified and was advised of the problems prior to his or her posting. The posting occurred within six months of the officer commencing employment in DFAT and the officer did not complete the full financial management course offered before posting although he or she did pass the examination at the end of the course. The financial problems at the post continued and may have worsened during the posting and a member of the Audit Section, acting as an Authorised Officer (AO) under the Public Service Act and not as an auditor, investigated the problems and laid four charges of negligence against the officer.

The AO concluded that the two HsOM who had supervised the officer should face similar charges. However, the AO was aware of past legal advice to the Department that an anomaly in the Public Service Act prevented the laying of charges under that Act against ambassadors (because they are unattached officers) for anything short of improper conduct that brings the Public Service into disrepute. Believing that negligence might not be improper conduct of this kind, the AO sought legal opinions on the possibility of charging the HsOM. As two opinions suggested that charges were unlikely to succeed, the AO did not lay charges against the HsOM.

The AO also concluded that the Staffing Branch was at fault for posting an inexperienced officer as Senior Administrative Officer at the post in question and a financial management branch was at fault for not noticing and acting on obvious financial lapses.

One of four charges against the middle-ranking officer was upheld and he or she was counselled and required to undergo training as a result. The two HsOM were not charged but were counselled and required to undergo training. The records suggest that the counselling received by the HsOM was more severe than that received by the middle-ranking officer and that the Department considered stronger action than counselling in the case of one of the HsOM. Several mitigating factors were taken into account in the case of the middle-ranking officer, including Departmental management failures and the effects on him or her of the publicity accorded the case by a former colleague.

Counselling and, sometimes, additional financial training appear to have been the standard DFAT punishments for negligence leading to financial loss at posts. Officers of varying ranks, most if not all of them long-serving DFAT officers and some of them HsOM, have been dealt with in this way for this sort of negligence on several occasions since the mid-1980s.

**Responses:** The departmental response was consistent with the outline above and also reported that disciplinary action in the form of counselling was also taken against a fourth officer in relation to the case. The Department informed the Committee:

Current departmental policy encourages newly recruited officers to remain in Canberra for at least two years before being posted overseas. All officers are also required to undertake and pass the Finance Course and officers with financial delegations at the post are required to complete and pass the Commercial Accounting Program (CAP) course before proceeding on posting.

Committee staff were told by DFAT officers that the question of disciplinary action against unattached officers has been taken up by the Public Service Commissioner as part of a review of the Public Service Act that is currently underway.

#### CASE NO. 25: ALLEGED INADEQUATE DISCIPLINARY ACTION

**Claim:** It is alleged that a HOM, with the connivance of his or her spouse (a DFAT officer), defrauded the Commonwealth of a large amount of settling-in allowance and was recalled to Canberra following exposure by the ORC of his or her misbehaviour. It is further claimed that the HOM was permitted to resign with full entitlements while the spouse continues to work in the Department in Canberra.

**File Check:** Committee staff reviewed relevant files in this case. The review showed that the HOM was recalled for consultations at about the time of receipt in Canberra of at least one report of inappropriate behaviour by the HOM. The report came from an expatriate Australian in the country of posting and there is no indication on the file of any involvement of the ORC at that time. The first recorded ORC comment was made several months later when DFAT action in the case was well advanced, although that comment included a claim that DFAT management had acted in response to earlier, private ORC intervention.

Following the recall for consultations, the HOM asked for his or her appointment as HOM to be terminated for personal reasons. The Evaluation and Audit and the Fraud Prevention and Discipline Sections investigated several matters, including a possibly excessive claim for settling-in allowance. In relation to the settling-in allowance claim, the former HOM argued that his or her actions under investigation were legal. The former HOM also argued that he or she and the spouse (who had been recruited to DFAT to occupy the only Australia-based position at the post other than HOM) had only modest accounting experience relevant to management of a post and, due to time constraints, did not attend any overseas finance course prior to departing for the post.

At a late stage in the investigation, the former HOM ceased to attend for duty without applying for leave and, after the period specified in the Public Service Act, was deemed to have retired. No money was recovered from the former HOM in relation to the settling-in allowance but debit advice notes were raised in relation to other moneys which the Department considered to be owing by the former HOM.

DFAT referred a matter not related to the settling-in allowance claim to the DPP for advice on whether to prosecute and accepted the DPP's conclusion that prosecution would not be warranted in the public interest. The DPP raised the possibility of charges under the Public Service Act but such charges were not possible by that time as the former HOM was no longer a public servant.

The HOM and spouse had separated shortly before the HOM was recalled for consultations. The spouse subsequently faced a DFAT disciplinary investigation, was counselled in relation to certain matters and continues to work in DFAT.

**Responses:** DFAT informed the Committee on 4 June 1992 that no final payments have been made by the Department to the former HOM pending resolution of the debts the Department believes are owed to it. In relation to settling-in allowance, the Department concluded:

The fact that approval was not sought from the Secretary to continue receiving Settling In Allowance beyond the normal period of entitlement (6 weeks) does not detract from the fact that an entitlement existed. Had [the officer] sought approval to receive the allowance beyond the 6-week period, the Secretary would almost certainly have approved the request - it was on this basis that the Department did not pursue recovery action for these amounts.

The spouse of the former HOM responded to the DFAT Reform Group claim, providing evidence of difficulty in securing suitable permanent accommodation at the post at the time in question. The spouse informed the Committee that he or she had been told by the HOM that extension of the settling-in allowance had been sought and he or she had been left with the impression that indefinite approval existed. DFAT Canberra had processed the usual documentation and reports on the allowance for more than a year without drawing attention to the absence of approval. There had been extensive negotiations with the Overseas Property Group about permanent accommodation at the post and it could be presumed that DFAT Canberra would have been aware of this. The spouse rejected any suggestion of wrong-doing on his or her part.

#### CASE NO. 26: DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST AN OFFICER

**Claim:** It is alleged that a member of the DFAT Reform Group was charged with demanding higher duties allowance and was recommended for dismissal. This claim is made to contrast the treatment of the officer with the treatment of other officers charged with various forms of financial or other malpractice. In other parts of the submission, it is noted that the officer also faced charges other than those related to demanding higher duties allowance.

**File check:** Committee staff reviewed a summary of departmental disciplinary records with names deleted for privacy reasons. It was clear from the summary that the officer in question faced 8 charges. Three related to demanding promotion, higher duties allowance or transfer to another agency, four related to circulation of letters containing claims and information about departmental officers and management and one related to falsifying the authorisation to send a cable. The charges were heard by an Inquiry Officer appointed from a department other than DFAT who found all of them proven, found that the charges together comprised "a web of misconduct" and recommended in respect of all 8 charges that the officer be dismissed. The officer resigned prior to the end of the statutory appeal period.

**Responses:** The officer was not identified in the submission and no responses were sought in this case.

#### CASE NO. 27: MISCLASSIFICATION OF A CASE IN AN EARLIER INVESTIGATION

**Claim:** In the review of the 77 cases raised in 1989-90, the Department falsely identified a case as "previously investigated and devoid of evidence" when there was evidence.

**File Check:** Committee staff identified this case from a summary of disciplinary cases provided by the Department. It appears that the case in question would have been better classified as "previously investigated and action taken". An officer had been charged and punished under the Public Service Act for doing what the ORC said he or she had done (although the ORC appears to have had nothing to do with his or her detection or punishment).

A DFAT circular and Audit Report 15 of 1990-91 both grouped this case and, apparently, others like it with cases that were "previously investigated and devoid of evidence" and presented them together under the latter heading. Careful reading of the text of Audit Report 15 suggests that the appendix to the report groups two dissimilar types of case under the heading in question but a casual reader could easily infer that all the ORC claims in that category were without basis.

## DISCIPLINARY RECORDS

The Committee sought statistics on disciplinary action taken against DFAT officers in recent years. DFAT provided a folder of case summaries, with names deleted for privacy reasons, concerning disciplinary cases since 1979. The case files summarised in the folder appeared to be a recent compilation of records. Cases were numbered consecutively but it appears that they are not a full record of the Department's disciplinary experience.

One case reviewed by the Committee's staff (Committee's case 22) did not appear to be included and another was only recorded in part (Committee's case 25). Although DFAT advised the Committee that disciplinary action had been taken against four persons in the Committee's case 24, the summaries only recorded action in three cases. The omission of Committee's cases 22 and part of 24 from the folder could be explained in the adoption of inconsistent approaches to classifying counselling as disciplinary action. However, Committee staff are aware of other cases which do not appear to be included in the summaries supplied to the Committee.

The pattern of cases by year in which action was taken varies over time and may indicate differing attitudes to the taking of formal disciplinary action at different times or gaps in the record. Since time limits are often applied to the keeping of records of disciplinary action, it would not be surprising if there are gaps in the records of earlier years

### Nature of offences

The summaries recorded disciplinary action taken against 59 officers. Using the brief descriptions of cases in the summaries, Committee staff categorised the offences for which action was taken as follows:

<b>Nature of offence</b>	<b>No. of cases</b>
Misconduct aimed at personal gain	34
Negligence/incompetence leading to loss to the Commonwealth	15
Release or circulation of information without authority	3
Criminal activity outside employment	1
Other	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>59</b>

Of the 34 cases of misconduct aimed at personal gain, 21 were connected with the importation of motor vehicles into Indonesia under diplomatic privilege during the 1980s.

### Hierarchy of punishments

When punishments were correlated with categories of offence, the following pattern emerged:

**Misconduct aimed at personal gain:** 16 counselled, 1 admonished, 8 fined, 2 salary reduced, 4 transferred with salary reduction, 2 prosecuted, 1 resigned before action taken (the Indonesian car cases accounted for 12 counselled, 7 fined, 1 transferred with salary reduction and 1 who resigned).

**Negligence or incompetence leading to loss to the Commonwealth:** all 15 were counselled while some in more recent years were also required to undergo training in financial management.

**Release or circulation of information without authority:** 2 recommended for dismissal and 1 transferred with reduction in salary.

**Criminal activity outside employment:** 1 dismissed.

**Other:** 5 counselled, 1 transferred with reduction in salary.

### Numbers of punishments

Of the 59 officers disciplined, 36 were counselled, 1 was admonished, 8 were fined, 8 were transferred with a reduction in salary, 2 were prosecuted, 3 were recommended for dismissal and 1 resigned before action was taken. Two of the three officers recommended for dismissal resigned before the recommendations took effect. Both officers who were prosecuted resigned while disciplinary action was pending as did one officer who was recommended for transfer with reduction in salary. One officer retired with disciplinary action pending.

### Punishments by year and type

The disciplinary cases in the summary involved departmental action in the following years:

1979	2 cases of misconduct aimed at personal gain.
1982	1 case of misconduct aimed at personal gain.
1983	1 case of misconduct aimed at personal gain*.
1985	3 cases of negligence or incompetence leading to loss.
1986	1 case of releasing or circulating information.
1987	25 cases of misconduct aimed at personal gain (19 from the Indonesian car sales), 3 cases of negligence or incompetence leading to loss, 3 other cases.
1988	2 cases of misconduct aimed at personal gain** (1 from the Indonesian car sales), 4 cases of negligence or incompetence leading to loss.
1989	2 cases of misconduct aimed at personal gain, 2 cases of negligence or incompetence leading to loss, 1 case of criminal activity outside employment and 1 other case.
1990	1 case of releasing or circulating information without authority 1 other case.

1991            1 case of misconduct aimed at personal gain\*\*\*, 3 cases of negligence or incompetence leading to loss, 1 case of releasing or circulating information without authority+.

\*            Case also in "other category".

\*\*           One case partly in "other" category.

\*\*\*          Also involved "negligence/incompetence".

+            Case partly in "other" category.





## APPENDIX IV

### BACKGROUNDS OF SENIOR DFAT OFFICERS AND EXTENT OF LATERAL RECRUITMENT SUMMARY

The attached paper reports the results of a survey of biographical notes on senior members of the DFAT staff provided in a departmental publication. The survey showed that senior DFAT officers, as a group:

- . have less experience than SES officers in the Public Service as a whole of work outside their own department;
- . appear to have relatively little work experience outside the Public Service;
- . are older than the SES as a whole;
- . are less likely to have tertiary qualifications in economics, commerce or business than the SES as a whole;
  - and much less likely to be so qualified if former Trade officers are excluded.

Canberra-based SES officers, when compared to their counterparts at missions overseas, are more likely:

- . to be younger;
- . to have served in a minister's office;
- . to have recent service in a minister's office;
- . to have had fewer postings as head of mission or post (this is true even when the former Trade officers are excluded);
- . to have tertiary qualifications in economics or a related field (this is true even when the former Trade officers are excluded);
- . to have entered DFAT as a lateral recruit above base level in a policy stream or with the amalgamation of Trade and Foreign Affairs.

They are less likely to:

- . have entered DFA/DFAT as a diplomatic cadet or in the consular and administrative stream;
- . to have had public service experience outside DFA/DFAT.

The survey was based on information in a departmental publication giving biographical notes on DFAT officers. Entries in the publication are prepared by officers themselves and are not compulsory. Inconsistencies and omissions can be expected to have affected some of the results of the survey.

## The sample

Most DFAT officers supply brief biographical notes for inclusion in a departmental publication called *Statement of Service, Appointments and Biographies*, colloquially known as the Stud Book. Entries were surveyed for all officers listed in the December 1991 issue of the Commonwealth Government Directory as occupying a position of Head of Mission or Post or a Canberra-based SES position. In a few cases where the officers were not listed in the Statement of Service, details were sought from DFAT. The names of officers occupying SES positions below HOM/HOP level overseas were also obtained from DFAT and details on those officers were obtained from the 'Stud Book'. The final sample represents most of DFAT's SES and SES-equivalent officers.

The 'Stud Book' entries are completed by their subjects and officers are not required to submit an entry. It could be expected that different officers would adopt different approaches to reporting their career information, especially on such matters as work experience within or outside the public service, educational qualifications and higher duties experience. The absolute numbers reported in this paper should be read in that light. However, the aggregate picture presented by the paper is likely to be at least indicative of DFAT's senior staffing profile.

### Method of entering DFAT

Table 1 shows the way in which the current crop of senior DFAT officers entered the Department.

**Table 1**  
**Method of Entry to DFAT**

Method of Entry	Overseas (n = 96)		Australia (n=54)		Total (n = 150)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Diplomatic Cadet	67	70%	30	56%	97	65%
Consular & Admin.	9	9%	2	4%	11	7%
Other base-level entry to DFAT			1	2%	1	1%
Direct entry above base level	8*	8%	9	17%	17*	11%
Trade Amalgamation	12	13%	12	22%	24	16%

\* Includes one direct entrant to consular and administrative stream above base level.

The proportion of senior officers who entered the Department through the consular and administrative stream (8% of the whole sample) is larger than would be expected in the light of some of the 'elitist' claims that have been made about DFAT. Although many of these officers head what appear to be relatively minor missions or posts, one holds the quite senior position of High Commissioner to Malaysia. Relatively few hold SES positions in Canberra.

It is also notable that many senior officers acquired from the former Department of Trade following the 1987 amalgamation had moved into overseas postings by December 1991, representing 13% of the overseas SES officers by that time. Only five of these occupied HOM/HOP positions with the remainder holding subordinate SES positions at larger posts.

Sixteen of the senior officers in the survey entered DFA or DFAT above base level, other than in the consular/administrative stream. Three of these had been appointed directly to their current HOM/HOP position and three had been promoted or transferred to their current Canberra-based SES position from another Commonwealth department (Treasury, Finance and PM & C). Two others were and have remained specialists (ADP and historical documents). The remainder had been promoted or transferred to above-base foreign policy positions and subsequently promoted. Three of these were persons with a background in Defence or ONA, two were lawyers, initially appointed to legal specialist positions. Other sources of one appointee each were the Public Service Board, and the Bureau of Meteorology. One was a former ministerial staffer. The 16 outside appointments, the 12 former consular/administrative and the one other base level entry (as a graduate clerk) together account for 19% of the sample, compared to 65% who entered as diplomatic cadets and 16% who entered with the 1987 amalgamation.

#### Age distribution

The age distribution of the sample is shown in Table 2 with comparative data for the SES as a whole.

Table 2  
Age Distribution of Officers Surveyed

Age Group at 30.12.91	Overseas (n = 96)		Australia (n = 54)		Total (n = 150)		Whole SES* (n = 1735)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Not reported	-		1	2%	1	1%		
<35	-	-	-	-	-	-	51	3%
35-39	1	1%	4	7%	5	3%	221	13%
40-44	11	11%	7	13%	18	12%	520	30%
45-49	22	23%	30	56%	52	35%	478	27%
50-54	24	25%	4	7%	28	19%	289	17%
55-59	29	30%	7	13%	36	24%	153	9%
60-64	9	9%	1	2%	10	7%	38	2%

\* As at 30 June 1991.

The age profile of SES officers in Australia is markedly lower than of the SES officers overseas and, although more strongly peaked in the 40 to 45 age range, is not too dissimilar to the age profile of the SES as a whole. However, the age profile of DFAT SES and SES-equivalent officers overseas is markedly skewed towards the older age groups. As a result, the SES age profile for DFAT as a whole is older than for the full SES.

### No. and nature of previous postings

Tables 3 (a), (b) and (c) show the pattern of previous postings as HOM/HOP of the sample.

**Table 3 (a)**  
**Previous Postings as HOM/HOP (including periods as Charge)**

No. of Postings	Overseas (n = 96)		Australia (n = 54)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Nil	39	41%	26	48%
1	22	23%	17	31%
2	15	16%	9	17%
3	8	8%		
4	7	7%	1	2%
5	3	3%	1	2%
>5	2	2%		

SES officers currently overseas have more experience in heading missions overseas than do their counterparts located in Australia. However, Table 3(a) includes some relatively short periods of acting as Ambassador/High Commissioner or Charge and, as reporting practices may have varied in respect of these periods, they are removed in Table 3 (b).

**Table 3 (b)**  
**Previous Postings as HOM/HOP (excluding periods as Charge)**

No. of Postings	Overseas (n = 96)		Australia (n = 54)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Nil	43	45%	28	52%
1	24	25%	16	30%
2	16	17%	10	19%
3	9	9%		
4	3	3%		
5	1	1%		
>5				

When only longer periods as HOM/HOP are counted, it still remains the case that the SES group currently in Australia is less experienced in this area than the current group of SES officers overseas. Because former Trade officers might have had less opportunity to head missions or posts and because these officers are still concentrated in Canberra, it is interesting to compare the experience patterns of the two groups excluding former Trade officers. This is done in Table 3 (c).

**Table 3 (c)**  
**Previous Postings as HOM/HOP (excluding periods as Charge and**  
**excluding former Trade officers)**

No. of Postings	Overseas (n = 78)		Australia (n = 42)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Nil	31	40%	19	45%
1	21	27%	14	33%
2	15	19%	9	21%
3	7	9%		
4	3	4%		
5	1	1%		
>5				

Further disaggregation shows that the pattern still exists at the more senior level in Canberra. Of 12 officers at Deputy secretary and First Assistant Secretary for whom data was available, one had headed two DFA missions, one had headed one, two had each headed one Trade mission, one had spent one lengthy period as Charge at a DFA mission and had headed a DFA post while another had headed a DFA post. Six had no experience other than short periods in an acting capacity as head of any mission or post. Of the four former Trade officers in that group, two (50%) had headed a mission while 4 of the eight former DFA officers (50%) had the same experience.

#### Other public service experience

Table 4 (a) shows the levels of experience in other public service departments, as reported in the 'Stud Book', of the officers other than former Trade officers whose records were surveyed. It is likely that the 'Stud Book' significantly understates the true position in this regard but these figures are at least indicative.

**Table 4 (a)**  
**Work Experience in Other Australian Public Service Agencies**  
**(Excludes former Trade Officers and Service Prior to**  
**Joining DFA/DFAT at Base of C&A or Policy Streams**  
**as well as service in ministerial offices)**

Department	Overseas (n = 78)		Australia (n = 39)		Total (n = 117)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Office of National Assessments	6	8%	4	10%	10	9%
Public Service Board	9	12%			9	8%
Prime Minister and Cabinet	7	9%	2	5%	9	8%
Defence	1	1%	1	3%	2	2%
Other	9	12%	2	5%	11	9%

Thirteen of the 24 former Trade officers also had experience in other Australian Public Service agencies. The experience ranged across a broad range of agencies but in a large majority of the cases, at least some of the experience was in commercially or economically-oriented agencies. Eleven of the 12 officers who had entered DFA/DFAT in the consular and administrative stream had prior service, typically of several years, in a range of departments. Initial recruitment to the consular and administrative stream has long been to a level above the public service base so as to attract experienced and mature applicants.

There are no published statistics comparing the work experience of the SES cadres of various departments. This Committee, in its 1990 report *The Development of the Senior Executive Service*, published the results of a survey of data from the Department of Finance's Continuous Record of Personnel. These are presented in Table 4 (b) below with the comparable DFAT results.

**Table 4 (b)**  
**Australian Public Service Experience: DFAT Compared**  
**to the Service Average**  
**(Excludes Short Secondments)**

No. of Departments Served in (Former Trade)	Overseas No. % (n = 12)		Australia No. % (n = 10)		Total No. % (n = 22)		APS Average %
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1	7	58%	4	40%	11	50%	50%
2	3	25%	4	40%	7	32%	24%
3	2	17%			2	9%	17%
4							4%
5			1	10%	1	5%	3%
>5			1	10%	1	5%	2%
(Former C&A)	(n = 9)		(n = 2)		(n = 11)		
1	1	11%			1	9%	50%
2	4	44%			4	36%	24%
3	4	44%			4	36%	17%
4			1	50%	1	9%	4%
5			1	50%	1	9%	3%
>5							2%
(Other)	(n = 69)		(n = 37)		(n = 106)		
1	39	56%	28	76%	67	63%	50%
2	24	35%	5	14%	29	27%	24%
3	4	6%	3	8%	7	7%	17%
4	1	1%			1	1%	4%
5			1	3%	1	1%	3%
>5	1	1%			1	1%	2%

**(Total over page)**

(Total)	(n = 90)		(n = 49)		(n = 139)		
1	47	52%	32	65%	79	57%	50%
2	31	34%	9	18%	40	29%	24%
3	10	11%	3	6%	13	9%	17%
4	1	1%	1	2%	2	1%	4%
5			3	6%	3	2%	3%
>5	1	1%	1	2%	2	1%	2%

While the DFAT average on this indicator of staff mobility is well below the APS average, the departmental average is itself boosted by the above average mobility of former Trade and consular and administrative officers. In addition, the departmental average reflects seven cases where diplomatic cadets are counted as having worked in two departments because they worked in the APS other than in DFA/DFAT for a short period before being selected for diplomatic training. Classifying these cases as service in one department only would increase the proportion of DFAT senior staff with no experience in other departments from 57% to 62%, compared to the APS average on this indicator of 50%.

#### Other work experience

Table 5 categorises reported work experience outside the APS by type of experience. The 'Stud Book' entries are likely to significantly understate the extent of external work experience because of inconsistencies in the practices adopted by officers in compiling their entries. There is no way of knowing whether the entries summarised below are representative or not but the aggregation may be indicative.

**Table 5**  
**Work Experience Outside the Australian Public Service**  
**Former Trade Officers Included in Total but**  
**Separately Identified in Brackets**

Type of Employment	Overseas (n = 96)		Australia (n = 54)		Total (n = 150)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
University teaching	7 (1)	7%	6 (1)	11%	13	9%
School teaching	3 (1)	3%	7 (0)	13%	10	7%
Journalism	3 (0)	3%	5 (0)	9%	8	5%
Private sector	6 (1)	6%	3 (1)	6%	9	6%
Armed service	1 (0)	1%	3 (0)	6%	4	3%
State public service	4 (1)	4%	3 (2)	6%	7	5%
Law	2 (0)	2%	2 (0)	4%	4	3%
International Org.	1 (0)	1%	3 (1)	6%	4	3%
Foreign gov't	2 (0)	2%	2 (0)	4%	3	2%
Commonwealth stat. authority			3 (1)	6%	3	2%
Rural sector			2 (1)	4%	2	1%
Political party	1 (0)	1%	1 (0)	2%	2	1%

A significant number of the entries recorded periods of service in the offices of ministers or senior members of the opposition. These entries are summarised in Table 6.

**Table 6**  
**Work Experience in a Ministerial Office**

Prime Minister	Overseas (n = 96)		Australia (n = 54)		Total (n = 150)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Pre-Whitlam	4	4%	1	2%	5	3%
Whitlam	1	1%			1	1%
Fraser	2	2%	2	4%	4	3%
Opposition office in Fraser period	1	1%			1	1%
Fraser/Hawke			1	2%	1	1%
Hawke	2	2%	5	9%	7	5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13%</b>

Of the 7 officers who had served in minister's offices only during the Hawke Governments, five had entered DFA/DFAT as diplomatic cadets, as had the officer who worked in the office of an Opposition member during the Fraser period. One of the other ministerial staffers of the Hawke period had entered DFA as a Graduate Clerk and one was a lateral entrant to DFAT after serving in a ministerial office.

#### **Lateral recruitment**

A review of all entries in the Statement of Service book to identify cases where officers had entered DFA/DFAT above base level in any stream and subsequently moved to a policy or diplomatic position or where officers had switched between any of the streams identified a significant number of such cases. Information provided by DFAT on a few officers not listed in the 'Stud Book' identified a few additional cases. Tables 7 (a) and (b) summarise the 55 cases of lateral recruitment to policy or diplomatic positions by decade in which the recruitment occurred and the specialities or areas of background experience of the recruits:

**Table 7 (a)**  
**Lateral Recruitment to Policy or Diplomatic Positions**

Decade	No. of Lateral Recruits*
1960s	5
1970s	14
1980s	31
1990s	** 5

\* No information is available on the size of the cohorts of staff from each decade still serving in the department.

\*\* 'Stud Book' data was compiled in early 1991 so that this figure represents about one-tenth of the decade.



**Table 7 (b)**  
**Specialities/Backgrounds of Lateral Recruits**

Defence/intelligence	15	27%
Trade/economics	11	20%
Law	6	11%
Journalism	2	4%
Recruited to head Joint Foundation		
Australia and Another Country	2	4%
Foreign aid	2	4%
Other/unspecified	17	31%

There has thus been some movement into policy or diplomatic work by officers who have entered the Department other than as diplomatic cadets or in the consular administrative stream. This type of entry appears to have been more common and to have drawn on more diverse sources in recent years. Many of the direct entrants of earlier years came from the Defence Officer stream in the Department of Defence which matched the Foreign Affairs Officer structure in DFA, recruited graduates and dealt with work relevant to foreign policy. As far as a trend can be discerned in more recent lateral recruitment, it appears to favour recruits with a background in economics or commerce.

The survey also identified 15 cases where officers had entered DFA/DFAT in the consular and administrative stream and had subsequently transferred to policy or diplomatic work and three cases where officers had entered the Department in keyboard positions and had transferred to consular and administrative duties.

#### **Tertiary educational qualifications**

Tables 8 (a) and (b) show the pattern of tertiary qualifications in the sample of SES officers as shown in the 'Stud Book'. This information will be affected by inconsistent reporting practices and is no more than indicative.

**Table 8 (a)**  
**Tertiary Qualifications Held**

<b>Credential</b>	<b>Overseas</b>		<b>Australia</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
B.A.	65	68%	29	54%	94	63%
L.L.B.	14	15%	5	9%	19	13%
B. Ec.	8	8%	17	31%	25	17%
B. Com.	3	3%			3	2%
B.Sc.	2	2%	3	6%	5	3%
B. Eng.	1	1%			1	1%
B. Ed.			1	2%	1	1%
Service College	1	1%			1	1%
M.A.	8	8%	7	13%	15	10%
M. Ec.	3	3%	2	4%	5	3%
Grad. Dip. Ec.	1	1%			1	1%
Post. Grad. Management	1	1%	2	4%	3	2%
Dip Ed.	3	3%	4	7%	7	5%
M. Phil.	1	1%			1	1%

Credential	Overseas		Australia		Total	
Li. M.	2	2%			2	2%
Post-Grad Law Dip.	1	1%			1	1%
Post-Grad. Defence Studies	5	5%	2	4%	7	5%
M. Litt.			1	2%	1	1%
Doctorate	4	4%	2	4%	6	4%

(Percentages of whole population in each case; because many individuals hold more than one credential, the sum of the percentages exceeds 100%)

**Table 8 (b)**  
**Tertiary Qualifications Held in Selected Fields**  
**(Former Trade Included in Total and**  
**Shown Separately in Brackets)**

Field of Study	Overseas		Australia		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	(n = 96)		(n = 54)		(n = 150)	
Economics/business commerce	14 (7)	15%	18 (10)	33%	32	21%
Law	15 (2)	16%	4 (0)	3%	19	13%
Defence	4 (0)	5%	1 (0)	2%	6	4%

It is likely that at least some of the qualifications listed as being in arts or science would in fact be economics qualifications so that the figures in tables 2.3 (a) and (b) probably understate the true proportion of the department's staff so qualified. Even allowing for this factor, DFAT would have fewer senior staff with qualifications in economics or related fields than the public service average. Data supplied to the Committee from the Department of Finance's Continuous Record of Personnel in 1989 indicated that 37% of the SES at that time held such qualifications compared to the 18% for DFAT. A survey conducted in the mid-1980s by Dr Michael Pusey (whose sample identified economics majors in arts and other degrees as economics qualifications and drew heavily from economic departments) classified 54% of the SES as having had economics or business-oriented tertiary training (Pusey 1991, p. 59).

It is notable that there is currently some concentration of the DFAT officers with economics, business or commerce qualifications Canberra. Law graduates, in contrast, are more likely to be in the diplomatic role overseas than in the policy role in Canberra.

## Glossary of Acronyms

ADF	Australian Defence Force
AIDAB	Australian International Development Assistance Bureau
AFTA	Australian Federation of Travel Agents
AFP	Australian Federal Police
ANAO	Australian National Audit Office
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
APS	Australian Public Service
ASO	Administrative Service Officer
ATO	Australian Taxation Office
ATSI	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander
BSO	Building and Services Officer
CAO	Chief Accounting Officer
CFOCS	Consultative Forum on Overseas Conditions of Service
CP File	Confidential Personnel File
CPI	Consumer Price Index
DAS	Department of Administrative Services
DFA	Department of Foreign Affairs
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DILGEA	Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs
DIR	Department of Industrial Relations
DLV	Divisional Liaison Visit
DPP	Director of Public Prosecutions
DSS	Diplomatic Security Section
ECA	Employment Conditions Abroad Ltd
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
FATA	Foreign Affairs and Trade Association
FCDS	Fraud Control and Discipline Section
FSFA	Foreign Service Families Association
HOM/HOP	Head of Mission/Head of Post
HRSCBFPA	House of Representatives Standing Committee on Banking, Finance, and Public Administration
ID	Industrial Democracy
IDC	Interdepartmental Committee
JSC	Joint Selection Committee
LES	Locally Engaged Staff
MEAA	Media, Entertainment and the Arts Alliance
MPRA	Merit Protection and Review Agency
NESB	Non-English Speaking Background
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
OCCOS	Operational Committee on Conditions of Service
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OIB	Overseas Information Branch
OLA	Overseas Living Allowance
OOA	Overseas Operating Agency

OPG	Overseas Property Group
ORC	Officers' Revolutionary Council
OTAC	Overseas Transfers Advisory Committee
PAO	Public Affairs Officer
PCCOS	Policy Committee on Conditions of Service
PMM	Personnel Management Manual
PSU	Public Sector Union
PWD	Persons with Disabilities
RCAGA	Royal Commission into Australian Government Administration
RCAMI	Royal Commission into the Australian Meat Industry
SES	Senior Executive Service
SOG-B	Senior Officer Grade B
SSCFAD	Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence
SSCFPA	Senate Standing Committee on Finance and Public Administration
TFOTM	Trust Fund Other Trust Moneys