



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

**HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FAMILY AND HUMAN SERVICES

**Reference: Balancing work and family**

WEDNESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2006

CANBERRA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



## **INTERNET**

The Proof and Official Hansard transcripts of Senate committee hearings, some House of Representatives committee hearings and some joint committee hearings are available on the Internet. Some House of Representatives committees and some joint committees make available only Official Hansard transcripts.

The Internet address is: **<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>**

To search the parliamentary database, go to:  
**<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>**

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**STANDING COMMITTEE ON FAMILY AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Wednesday, 11 October 2006**

**Members:** Mrs Bronwyn Bishop (*Chair*), Mrs Irwin (*Deputy Chair*), Mr Cadman, Ms Kate Ellis, Mrs Elson, Mr Fawcett, Ms George, Mrs Markus, Mr Quick and Mr Ticehurst

**Members in attendance:** Mr Cadman, Ms Kate Ellis, Mr Fawcett, Ms George, Mrs Irwin and Mrs Markus

**Terms of reference for the inquiry:**

To inquire into and report on:

How the Australian Government can better help families balance their work and family responsibilities. The committee is particularly interested in:

1. the financial, career and social disincentives to starting families;
2. making it easier for parents who so wish to return to the paid workforce; and
3. the impact of taxation and other matters on families in the choices they make in balancing work and family life.

**WITNESSES**

<b>CROME, Ms Philippa, Branch Manager, Human Resource Services, Department of Finance and Administration .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>HELDT, Mr Trevor, General Manager, People and Culture (People Services), Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>HUTSON, Mr Jonathan, General Manager, Corporate Group, Department of Finance and Administration .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>SMITH, Mr Warren Joseph, Executive Manager, Specialist Services, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>WILLIAMS, Ms Nikki Penelope (Penny), First Assistant Secretary, Corporate Management Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>WORTHAISSONG, Ms Lynda, Director, Recruitment and Workforce Planning Section, Staff Development and Post Issues Branch, Corporate Management Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.....</b>	<b>1</b>



**Committee met at 10.17 am**

**HELDT, Mr Trevor, General Manager, People and Culture (People Services), Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation**

**SMITH, Mr Warren Joseph, Executive Manager, Specialist Services, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation**

**CROME, Ms Philippa, Branch Manager, Human Resource Services, Department of Finance and Administration**

**HUTSON, Mr Jonathan, General Manager, Corporate Group, Department of Finance and Administration**

**WILLIAMS, Ms Nikki Penelope (Penny), First Assistant Secretary, Corporate Management Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade**

**WORTHAISSONG, Ms Lynda, Director, Recruitment and Workforce Planning Section, Staff Development and Post Issues Branch, Corporate Management Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade**

**ACTING CHAIR (Mrs Irwin)**—I declare open this public hearing of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Family and Human Services for its inquiry into balancing work and family. Today the committee will take evidence from three government agencies which offer their employees salary sacrifice for childcare costs. The committee is concerned that there is a lack of policy on the taxation of childcare expenses and that arrangements are being made in an ad hoc manner on an agency by agency basis. The committee has already taken some evidence on this matter from other agencies in a public briefing. This hearing will allow evidence to be placed on the public record. The transcript of what is said today will be posted on the committee's website.

I welcome the witnesses from the CSIRO, the Department of Finance and Administration and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. Does anyone have a comment to make on the capacity in which they are appearing today?

**Ms Worthaisong**—I am the contract manager for the Currawong Childcare Centre at Foreign Affairs and Trade.

*Witnesses were then sworn or affirmed—*

**ACTING CHAIR**—Would any of you like to make an introductory statement before we proceed to questions? CSIRO, would you like to start?

**Mr Heldt**—Thank you for the invitation to come and talk to you. CSIRO is a statutory body delivering science innovation solutions for industry, society and the environment, as you know, across Australia. We employ roughly 6½ thousand EFT across Australia on 56 locations. CSIRO recognises that people working at CSIRO have family responsibilities and we support them in a number of ways to help them balance these as best we can. We have a number of flexible work

practices that we have had in place for many years, one of which is the childcare centres on a number of locations. We also have parental leave, maternity leave, carers leave and some flexible work arrangements which are common in some workplaces but not common in others.

We opened four childcare centres in the early 1990s—in Canberra, Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney—and those centres continue to run for our staff located in those cities. The decision to establish the childcare centres was part of our equal opportunity program. The decision was made in 1988-89 and the centres were open for business in 1991-92. There was strong support for those centres and there continues to be strong support for those centres across the organisation. I can go further but that is the extent of our opening statement.

**Ms Williams**—We have around 2,000 staff of whom 500 are overseas. The majority are in Canberra but we also have staff in the states and territories. We have a childcare centre that was established in 1997 across the road in the RG Casey Building. It has 90 long day care spaces and is currently managed by Southside Community Services. We also have a range of practices to encourage work-life balance including the DFAT developed idea of working smarter but we also recognise that child care is a real challenge in the states and territories and also overseas. During our most recent collective agreement negotiations with staff we decided to establish a staff management working group on child care to look at other issues related to child care.

**Mr Hutson**—The Department of Finance and Administration has had a childcare centre located in the Treasury building within the Parliamentary Triangle since 2002. It is called the Abacus Childcare Centre. It currently has 79 places. We have around 1,400 staff, the vast majority of whom are located in Canberra.

**ACTING CHAIR**—Thank you. I have a question for the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. Your childcare centre is the Currawong Childcare Centre. Are there staff from other agencies using Currawong Childcare Centre, to your knowledge?

**Ms Williams**—We have an allocation policy, which I would be happy to table if that would help, that sets out exactly how we deal with those issues. Absolute priority is given to DFAT staff. I think currently about 90 per cent of people using the centre are DFAT staff, but there are some others who are from either other agencies or the community.

**ACTING CHAIR**—Are you aware of any waiting list?

**Ms Williams**—There is an internal waiting list for which I have the figures. On the internal waiting list, which is for DFAT staff, there are about eight babies, one toddler and two preschoolers. On the external waiting list, which is for non-DFAT people, there are 141 babies, 32 toddlers and 30 preschoolers. What that does not take account of, just to be clear, is that there are also people who have places within the centre—and I think you will find this with a range of centres—that might have two days but are waiting for a third or a fourth day. These are people just on the waiting lists.

**ACTING CHAIR**—How long have they been on the waiting lists?

**Ms Worthaisong**—It would depend. The other thing with that large external waiting list is that some people on it are waiting for a place in, say, 2007; they do not necessarily want a place now. That is why the numbers are quite large.

**Ms Williams**—The waiting list has been an issue for us in the past, and DFAT management has worked quite closely with the childcare centre to help them manage the waiting list and to give them—it sounds sort of patronising—in a sense the administrative skills to manage it. The other thing to make clear is that, because we have staff overseas, we also have staff who would put their name down six or 12 months in anticipation of returning from an overseas posting. The management of our centre's waiting list has that added complexity of churn, movement to and from posts, which is why we have had to work with the childcare centre a little bit more—to give them those skills in anticipating people coming and going.

**ACTING CHAIR**—This is a question to all of the agencies. Do you feel that there are low numbers of people that are salary sacrificing within your departments for child care? They do not seem as high compared to the numbers of people that are on staff. Do you think there would be more people that would want to salary sacrifice? Are they aware of the salary sacrifice?

**Ms Williams**—We have issued a number of administrative circulars and we draw it to the attention of staff. I think there is a great awareness of salary sacrificing amongst staff. I am quite confident that everybody who wants to is taking it up. Some people who only have one or two days just do not bother, and people on low incomes with childcare benefits may make the decision not to salary sacrifice but to stick with the access to the childcare benefit.

**Ms KATE ELLIS**—Across the board, can anybody indicate what sort of salary level the people that are salary sacrificing are on? Is there a clear pattern? Obviously you have to have the spare salary in order to take up that option. I am very conscious that we as a committee do not want to come up solely with answers that only affect a certain range of the workforce.

**Ms Williams**—We have not done that work, but I think it would be true to say that a large number of our staff would be at the APS6 level and above. We are talking relatively high incomes comparative to those of the general community.

**ACTING CHAIR**—Do you think that more employees would salary sacrifice if the tax ruling that applies to in-house child care was applied to off site child care?

**Ms Williams**—That is my opinion. We cannot establish sites in our state and territory offices—we are very small sites. I would imagine there would be interest on the part of those people who have access to Commonwealth agency childcare centres.

**ACTING CHAIR**—Would Finance like to comment on the question I have just asked?

**Mr Hutson**—I am essentially in the same boat as the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. It is not really a situation on which I have much comment that I can make. If you provide some additional benefits or additional facilities, would some people be interested in taking them up? I presume so, but beyond that there is not so much to comment.

**Ms GEORGE**—Do you feel it is an inequitable situation that some employees are able to benefit by way of salary sacrifice, which is in effect a tax deduction, because they happen to be located somewhere where they can access an on-site provision in conformity with a tax ruling, while 95 per cent of the balance of the employees might be denied that option? Does it create any concern at management level? Has there been any concern expressed by employees who are not able to avail themselves of that benefit? I can see people from CSIRO nodding their heads.

**Mr Smith**—That certainly is an issue for CSIRO. Our childcare centres were built and developed prior to the FBT issues coming into play, so it was not a consideration when we constructed the centres. Feedback from staff now is that the apparent inequity, the haves and the have-nots, in the ability to salary sacrifice without FBT implications is certainly coming through to us as an issue. It actually results in increased pressure on the organisation to establish further childcare centres at our sites as a way of responding to that.

I will go back to the issue of the number of staff who salary sacrifice. We allow staff who use our childcare centres, where there is no FBT payable, to salary sacrifice directly through payroll deduction. It is administratively efficient to allow them to salary sacrifice in the same way as we would for superannuation or the transfer of payments to financial institutions. Other staff who may want to salary sacrifice are required to use an external salary sacrifice provider where there are FBT implications. They use one of the external salary sacrifice providers that we have, so we do not really know how many staff use that for child care. It certainly does create pressures for the organisation.

**ACTING CHAIR**—I want to ask a question of the department of finance. I have some figures here. You have 53 people who are salary sacrificing, but there are 14 using the on-site facility who choose not to salary sacrifice. Is that because they are lower income earners and are better off using the childcare benefit? Are there any other reasons why they may not salary sacrifice? For example, does the department have a minimum level for salary sacrifice?

**Mr Hutson**—There is certainly no constraint on any staff member using the salary sacrifice system to pay for their childcare fees. As to the reasons why these particular people choose not to salary sacrifice, I am in the realm of guessing. Discussions concerning childcare benefit would of course be something to take into account. The inconvenience for some of them who are perhaps only using it for one or two days a week is possibly there as well. But I do not have any information on why those parents are choosing to pay their fees directly rather than through salary sacrifice.

**ACTING CHAIR**—I have one further question before I pass to some of my colleagues. I would like to hear from each one of you on this. What is the cost of operating an on-site childcare centre?

**Mr Hutson**—The way in which we manage our childcare centre is that we engage a provider, Communities@Work, which essentially provides the service on our behalf. It charges and collects the childcare fees. That provider was chosen by open tender and we will be going back to open tender in the near future because the contract is due for renewal. On top of that, the department of finance provides for the centre the premises in which the centre operates. We do that in two ways. In terms of our own accounts, we provide for the rent which we pay to the

landlord. We also provided the fit-out for the centre. The rent for the centre amounts to about \$292,000 per annum. In terms of the establishment, it cost nearly \$2 million.

**ACTING CHAIR**—Two million dollars for the establishment?

**Mr Hutson**—Yes.

**Ms Williams**—We cover the utility costs, including rent and fit-out, and that is \$418,000 a year. The childcare operator contributes \$14,000 and pays a \$1,000 licence fee. I do not have the costs of the establishment of the childcare centre itself because it was a new building and the centre was factored into the plans.

**ACTING CHAIR**—Can you take that on notice and get back to us.

**Ms Williams**—Yes, I will see whether we can get that. We expanded it last year—we expanded the number of places—and the cost of that might be of interest to the committee.

**Mr Heldt**—Our centres are run as non-profit incorporated associations by staff. That means the management of those centres apart from our initial set-up in the early nineties for the infrastructure was our initial investment. Since then, routine maintenance for the facility and the building is our ongoing cost, and the other costs are run by association staff who run the centres in each particular case. So we would struggle, given that it was 16 years ago, to get the actual cost to set up those centres originally. Our particular arrangement is slightly at arms-length but allows staff to run the centres in line with our policy and to meet their running costs themselves through their own fees that they set and charge to staff.

**Mr FAWCETT**—Some of the feedback we have had from a number of people around child care is that a significant expense for part-time workers is that they have to actually book a place for full time even though they only need it for part time. I am wondering how your departments manage that. Do you have many part-time workers and how do they manage to access child care? Do they have to pay for a full-time place?

**Mr Heldt**—The set-up of our centres means that the management committees make those decisions about their practice. We require that they give priority to CSIRO staff on that basis. Some of the centres, we are aware, have a mix of casual spots, part-time spots and full-time spots. Beyond that, the actual arrangement and how they manage that is up to the local management committee as they decide their allocation process.

**Ms Williams**—At DFAT we have 90 spaces but, because of the number of children who are part time, there are 117 children—79 are part time and 39 are full time. We find that the centre is able to flexibly manage women returning to work who might start off wanting to do two days a week for six months, then move to three days and then to four days—I think Lynda is one of those who have done that recently. So that is something that the department is able to accommodate in terms of part-time work, and normally we can match them up with the childcare centre as well. Occasionally you have people who are the other way around—they would like to return for three or four days a week and they can initially only get two days and therefore have to cover that off. But I am pretty comfortable that they are able to accommodate part time.

**Mr Hutson**—Our childcare centre does permit part-time places to be booked. In fact, the vast majority of children in our childcare centre are part time. We have something like 116 children in the centre of whom about 90 are part time. Anecdotally, there is stronger demand for some days than for others. It is not hard to imagine that for people who are returning to work part time or who wish to work part time there is a general preference to work in the middle of the week, and they do not like split weeks, if you understand that I mean—they like the days to be in a run. There is a bit of premium for Wednesdays: people are working either one end of the week or the other, and Wednesday is a particularly popular day.

**Mr FAWCETT**—I realise you may have no way of gauging a response to this question. If the ruling was changed such that you as an employer could still provide a salary sacrifice option to an employee—and I am thinking here particularly of your regional officers—to access a childcare centre which was not on your property or which you did not own or manage et cetera, do you think more people would (a) want to work for you or (b) take up that option of salary sacrificing?

**Mr Hutson**—Would more people want to work for us compared to working for others? If the same benefit was being offered to everybody, in one sense it would actually diminish our relative position in the marketplace because providing a childcare centre which is available on salary sacrifice benefits is something that relatively few employers in the Canberra market do. Foreign Affairs is one; CSIRO is another. But there are lots of others that do not. In one sense, we have made the investment in putting in a childcare centre and making it run as part of the overall proposition of making Finance an attractive place to work, in absolute terms but also in relative terms.

**Ms Williams**—I think that there are all sorts of reasons that people want to use our on-site child care and that the money part is only a small factor. I think a really big reason is women returning to work who are breastfeeding. I have kids aged from 17 to four and I know the difference between when we had off-site child care and when we had on-site child care. I do not think that you can pull the issues out and say that salary sacrificing is the main one. If you asked our staff what is the main thing I think they would say proximity—being able to balance the pressure of finishing their work and picking up their children because they do not have to drive far to do so. There are all sorts of things that make it attractive. What I am saying is that if people were able to salary sacrifice for other childcare centres in Canberra they might take that up because they want to have their kids close to home. There are all sorts of reasons that people would do it.

In states and territories we have very low numbers of staff. It would be attractive to some staff but, to be frank, and without sounding flippant, parking is more of an issue for our officers because of the demographics. For our overseas staff, child care is a big issue. That is a whole other complex thing that is quite agency specific. I think there are a whole lot of factors at play and I would not want to guess which is the main one.

**Mr Heldt**—I am not sure that we can add much to the comment that has already been made that it is a personal choice issue. Certainly in our regional centres, where we do not have any childcare centres and are unlikely to be able to establish any, other ways of providing benefits to people with family responsibilities would obviously be helpful.

**Ms GEORGE**—Pursuant to that, would you see benefit in the government making a policy decision that applied across the board rather than individual agencies relying on private rulings from the tax commissioner in terms of testing the limits of the existing narrow definition of ‘business premises’? In other words, would it be better if the government said that any Commonwealth employee could salary sacrifice providing the child care was related to the nature of their employment, be it on site or elsewhere, and it was an approved facility? At the moment we are finding variations in private tax ruling decisions. I think there is a bit of confusion about how one defines ‘business premises’. From the point of view of managers of significant Commonwealth agencies, do you think it would be better for the government to have an across-the-board approach that broadened the current fairly limited definitions applied by the tax commissioner?

**Mr Heldt**—CSIRO made the decision in the early nineties to do this, before FBT and these other matters were in place. I do not think the issues that we were trying to address at that stage have particularly changed. Would we close our centres if the rules changed and things were different? I do not believe so. There is still a need for us in spots to have centres available. Opening it up further is a difficult issue to address. In a community sense Australia needs child care provided. As an employer we can only go so far to meet some of that demand.

**Ms GEORGE**—But if it was a government decision to extend the FBT concession to places other than on-site childcare facilities, how would you see that from the perspective of managing your own employees?

**Mr Heldt**—We have a number of employees who are looking for childcare facilities. We are aware of that; it was raised with us through our enterprise bargaining process and through our staff representatives. They would clearly be more satisfied if there were more spots available and more benefits.

**Ms GEORGE**—Would it be a more equitable arrangement than currently exists?

**Mr Heldt**—I imagine staff who have not got spots would be saying that, especially in the centres where we do not have locations.

**Ms GEORGE**—What about DFAT?

**Ms Williams**—I think that question is asking for an opinion. I am not sure that I necessarily have an opinion on your question at the moment.

**ACTING CHAIR**—But you must have a waiting list.

**Ms Williams**—Yes, a reasonably short waiting list. There are eight babies, one toddler and two preschoolers. I think we have got a very manageable waiting list and, as I said, the pressures that we deal with are more about complex issues to do with childcare overseas than with pressures elsewhere, domestically. So I do not think it necessarily make very much difference to—

**Ms GEORGE**—Could it be the case that if that waiting list is for your own centre you may not have a reliable indication of the waiting list for community based or other forms of childcare arrangements out in Canberra and the wider—

**Ms Williams**—Sure, I am just looking at it from a DFAT perspective, in terms of our child care. I do not have a sense of the other issues that you have raised.

**Ms GEORGE**—That is not an issue employees have been raising with management?

**Ms Williams**—Not at all.

**Ms GEORGE**—What about Finance?

**Mr Hutson**—Our childcare centre is firmly located within the Treasury building, where we have quite a lot of staff. In terms of whether the private ruling thing is an issue for us, the answer is no. Annually we seek a private ruling to get the thing sorted, and it really is not much of a burden to do so. We are pretty comfortably inside whatever definition they have got of being within the business premises.

**Mr CADMAN**—I just wonder what sorts of conditions apply to people outside DFAT who use your centre. They cannot opt for salary sacrifice.

**Ms Williams**—My understanding—and somebody at the table may be able to help—is that if they worked for another Commonwealth agency they might be able to do it, but not through us. It has got nothing to do with us at all.

**Mr CADMAN**—I think the tax commissioner's rulings might indicate that ownership or lease capacity for the premises is a critical factor. So maybe that needs some clarification. Are all the external users Commonwealth employees?

**Ms Williams**—No, they are not. That is not something that we involve ourselves with, in terms of their arrangements and the way they pay the childcare centre. The only relationship they have with us is in the sense that we have an allocation policy, and that there are some people who are in there who are not DFAT employees.

**Mr CADMAN**—What do you mean by an allocation policy?

**Ms Williams**—I am happy to table it. We have set out—

**Mr CADMAN**—Yes, we need to see that, please, because I do not know how you choose the insiders and outsiders.

**Ms Williams**—Yes; that is exactly what that is about.

**Mr CADMAN**—Pursuing that a little further, how are the rates set, compared between insiders and outsiders?

**Ms Williams**—They are the same. The allocation policy has changed over time. Quite frankly, part of the reason we have some people in there at the moment who are non-DFAT staff is that there has been more demand. It is a demand issue. Three years ago perhaps there was not such a great demand for baby places so they took a few other families in. You cannot kick them out; that is just not the right thing to do to kids. So that is how it has ended up. Sometimes special needs children from within the local area—

**Mr CADMAN**—There should always be a proportion of those, I think.

**Ms Williams**—Yes.

**Ms KATE ELLIS**—I just have a random question. I was interested when you mentioned that this came up through enterprise bargaining, and I know in the DFAT submission you quote where it is in your certified agreement. I was curious about whether these arrangements all came up through the collective agreement negotiating process or whether there was another avenue— if anyone remembers back to that.

**Mr Heldt**—I think the remembering issue would be a difficult one for us to establish. I believe that it was entirely an affirmative action step, to try and attract and retain women scientists. It certainly came up in the enterprise agreement we entered into last year, in discussions about extending the number of centres we have to other locations, and we have made a commitment to staff as we expand on sites, redevelop sites or open new sites to explore the business case for investing in another centre. That is fresh as of 12 months ago, and discussions are ongoing.

**Ms KATE ELLIS**—One of the things we have been looking at is the evidence that a lot of new parents, mothers in particular, who would like to go back to the workforce are finding obstacles. We have been looking at how we can address some of those obstacles. Do you have anecdotal evidence that parents who would otherwise not have been able to re-enter the workforce or perhaps not be able to work full time or as many hours as they would like are being helped by having childcare facilities on site? Are there any cases of that encouraging people to re-enter the workforce who otherwise might not have? I know it will be relying on anecdotes.

**Mr Hutson**—In the Department of Finance and Administration there is not a formal arrangement but it is almost a symbiosis. A common thing is for women returning to the workforce after maternity leave to seek to work half time, for example. It is true that managers within the organisation, in agreeing hours or days of work, certainly understand if, for example, a Wednesday is simply not available at the moment because childcare spaces are not available. They accept it even though it is not convenient for the parent or the manager entirely. Is that formal? No. Anecdotally that certainly goes on. I have people coming to me and saying that they are coming back to work part time and they want to start off doing two or three days and it will be a split week because that is all the spaces they can get. That settles the discussion pretty quickly.

**ACTING CHAIR**—I have a question for Lynda. I think you have mentioned that you are working four days a week. Can you tell us a bit of your story? Did you find it more beneficial for you to have an on-site childcare centre than an off-site one?

**Ms Worthaisong**—I think everyone's case is different, and I am a strange case in that my partner is at home most of the time. The reason I am using child care part time and working part time is partly to give my daughter a bit of exposure to other kids. She is almost three. I love having the easy access to my daughter when she is in child care. It is very convenient to drop her off when I go to work. With kids it is always a rush getting to work and leaving again, so the convenience factor is the big plus for me personally. If I can speak anecdotally, I have a lot of friends in the department who have just had babies and pretty much all of them have come back to work when they have wanted to, whether it be three months, six months or 12 months afterwards, and have been able to get child care in the childcare centre for the relevant number of days that they have sought. They put the baby's name down for a place for the number of days they want. Anecdotally, that works really well. Certainly in my case, I am very happy.

**ACTING CHAIR**—I notice that CSIRO has 6,500 staff located over 57 sites but only 104 staff who salary sacrifice for their childcare fees. I know that Ms George has asked the question and we are hearing this from a number of other government agencies: they feel that more employees would salary sacrifice if the tax ruling that applies to in-house child care was applied to off-site child care. I am going to ask you this question because you have 6,500 employees but only 104 utilising salary sacrificing. If they could get their salary sacrificing for off-site child care, do you think they would utilise it?

**Mr Smith**—I will expand on the response I gave previously. There are 104 staff who can access direct salary sacrifice from our pay system. We do not know how many access salary sacrifice through the third-party providers that we use. Our response can only really be based on what pressure and feedback we are getting from staff generally about the perceptions of the different treatment of the staff who can use our childcare centres and staff who do not have access to them. Our response would probably have to be, based on that pressure and feedback, that we would expect that more staff would salary sacrifice if the rules were changed.

**Ms KATE ELLIS**—Particularly from the HR perspective, what sort of administrative burden does giving staff this option give you? Is it hard? Does it create much work?

**Mr Smith**—The salary sacrifice option?

**Ms KATE ELLIS**—Yes.

**Mr Smith**—We allow salary sacrifice directly from our pay system, and that is administratively efficient for us. In a sense, it is no different from allowing people to make deductions to a bank or anywhere that takes electronic funds transfers. So it is pretty efficient and it is not administratively burdensome for us.

**Ms Williams**—We are the same: salary sacrificing is not an administrative burden at all. In terms of the childcare centre, we have a staff member who has, as part of their responsibilities, the management of the contract and a liaison role with the childcare centre, but I would not consider it to be at all onerous. In fact, it is relatively easy. There is an issue in terms of being able to get staff back to work a little quicker, so it is an easy trade-off.

**Ms Crome**—It is seamless from our side. It is just one of the benefits that we offer for salary sacrificing, so there is no added burden for us at all.

**ACTING CHAIR**—There being no further questions, we will wrap this up. Thank you very much for appearing before us today.

Resolved (on motion by **Ms Kate Ellis**):

That this committee authorises publication, including publication on the parliamentary database, of the transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

**Committee adjourned at 10.57 am**