

Community Affairs Committee

Examination of Additional Estimates 2006-2007

Additional Information Received

CONSOLIDATED VOLUME 3

**FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND
INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO**

FaCSIA Outcomes: Cross Outcome, Outcomes 1 & 2

MAY 2007

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATING TO THE EXAMINATION OF ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE FOR 2006-2007

Included in this volume are answers to written and oral questions taken on notice and tabled papers relating to the additional estimates hearing on 12 February 2007

* Please note that the tabling date of 14 June 2007 is the proposed tabling date

FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

Senator	Quest. No.	Cross outcome	Vol. 3 Page No.	Date tabled in the Senate*
	T1 tabled at hearing	Departmental instructions relating to credit cards	1-2	10.05.07
McLucas	5	Cyclone Larry	3	10.05.07
Stephens	6	Corporate credit cards number and use by OIPC	4	10.05.07
Moore	9	Indigenous staffing	5	10.05.07
Wong	15	Opinion polls/market research	6	10.05.07
Wong	19	Advertising campaigns	7	10.05.07
Wong	22, 25	Monitoring use of water in Departments and Agencies	8-9	10.05.07
Crossin	36	NT State Office staffing	10	10.05.07
Crossin	66	Indigenous Land Fund – revised estimate of revenue	11	10.05.07
Crossin	67, 68	Indigenous Land Fund revenue	12-13	10.05.07
Crossin	73, 74	Outsourcing investment advisory services	14-15	10.05.07
Stephens	180	Staffing model	16-17	10.05.07
Stephens	2	Operating deficits	18	10.05.07
Hogg	7	Internal audit of corporate credit cards	19	10.05.07
Wong	11	Recruitment agencies spending	30-33	10.05.07
Wong	21	Advertising campaigns	23	14.06.07
Stephens	1	PBS – FaCSIA budget deficit	24	14.06.07
Ludwig	10	Department program and grant information	25	14.06.07
Outcome 1: Output group 1.1– Whole-of-government coordination of policy development and service delivery for Indigenous Australians [contd]				
Crossin	29, 31-33	Aboriginals Benefit Account	26-29	10.05.07
Crossin	41	Taskforce Consultative Group in Alice Springs	30	10.05.07
Crossin	38	SRA with Daguragu Community	31	10.05.07
Crossin	39	SRA's	32	10.05.07
Crossin	26	Wadeye	33	14.06.07
Crossin	30	Aboriginals Benefit Account	34	14.06.07
Crossin	35	Wadeye	35	14.06.07
Crossin	28, 37	Shared responsibility agreements	36-41	14.06.07
Siewert	43	COAG working group	42	14.06.07
Siewert	44-47, 50, 48, 49	Legal and Constitutional Committee's stolen wages inquiry	43-49	14.06.07
Crossin	40	Strategic Interventions Taskforce Performance Management Framework	50	14.06.07
Crossin	42	Mutitjulu	51	14.06.07

Senator	Quest. No.	Outcome 1: Output group 1.2 – Services for Indigenous Australians	Vol. 3 Page No.	Date tabled in the Senate*
Crossin	27	Wadeye	52	14.06.07
Crossin	34	Wadeye	53	10.05.07
Crossin	51, 53	Indigenous home ownership	54-55	10.05.07
Crossin	56, 57	COAG trials in Wadeye	56-57	10.05.07
Siewert	59	Native Title	58-60	10.05.07
Crossin	60	Indigenous home ownership	61	10.05.07
Crossin	61-63	99 year lease agreements	62-64	10.05.07
Siewert	64	Tiwi Land Council	65	10.05.07
Crossin	52	Indigenous home ownership	66	10.05.07
Crossin	55	COAG trials in Wadeye	67	10.05.07
Siewert	65	Building a better future – Indigenous housing to 2010 mid-term review	68	10.05.07
Heffernan	187	CHINS report data	69	14.06.07
Crossin	58	COAG trials in Wadeye	70	14.06.07
Crossin	54	Indigenous home ownership	71	14.06.07
Outcome 1: Output group 1.3 – Incorporation, regulation and capacity building of Indigenous corporations				
Crossin	76	Mutitjulu	72	10.05.07
Crossin	81-87	Aboriginal Hostels Limited	73-79	10.05.07
Crossin	69-72, 75	Indigenous Land Corporation	80-84	14.06.07
Crossin	77, 78	Mutitjulu	85-86	14.06.07
Crossin	79, 80	Aboriginal Hostels Limited	87-88	14.06.07
Aboriginal Hostels Limited Agency				
		Letter from Senator Crossin to Committee Secretariat dated 16 Feb 07 relating to evidence given by Mr Keith Clarke at the estimates hearing on 12 Feb 07	89	10.05.07
		Letter from Mr Keith Clarke to the Committee Secretariat dated 21 Feb 07 in response to Senator Crossin's letter dated 16 Feb 07	90	10.05.07
Outcome 2: Output group 2.1 – Support for the Aged				
Hogg	181	Assets test	91	10.05.07
Siewert	106-112	Personal helpers and mentors	92-98	10.05.07
Stephens	88	Assets test	99	14.06.07
Outcome 2: Output group 2.2 – Support for People with Disabilities				
	T2 tabled at hearing	National Disability Advocacy Program: funded organisations, types of advocacy provided and organisations which are statewide	100-104	10.05.07
	T3 tabled at hearing	National Disability Advocacy Program Reference Group	105	10.05.07
	T4 tabled at hearing	Private provisions	106	10.05.07
	T5 tabled at hearing	Assistance for Carers – respite and information services for young carers	107	10.05.07
McLucas	96-103	Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review	108-115	10.05.07
McLucas	91	ANAO-CSTDA	116	10.05.07
McLucas	92	ANAO	117	10.05.07

Senator	Quest. No.	Outcome 2: Output group 2.2 – Support for People with Disabilities [contd]	Vol. 3 Page No.	Date tabled in the Senate*
McLucas	93	Commonwealth State Territory Disability Agreement (CSTDA)	118	10.05.07
McLucas	94	CSTDA	119	10.05.07
Allison	90	Young people in nursing homes	120-147	14.06.07
McLucas	95	Commonwealth State Territory Disability Agreement (CSTDA)	148	14.06.07
McLucas	113-119	Young people with disability in residential aged care	149-155	14.06.07
Outcome 2: Output group 2.3 – Support for Carers				
McLucas	105	Special Disability Trust	156	10.05.07
McLucas	121	Special Disability Trust	157	10.05.07
McLucas	120	Special Disability Trust	158	14.06.07
Outcome 2: Output group 2.4 – Support for Youth				
Moore	122	National youth week	159	10.05.07
Moore	185, 186	National youth roundtable	160-161	10.05.07
Outcome 2: Output group 2.5 – Support for Women				
Moore	20	Active campaigns within the Minister's portfolio – Violence Against Women. Australia Says No. campaign	162	10.05.07
Moore	123	National Women's Safety Taskforce	163	10.05.07
Moore	124	Women's Emergency Services Network & the National Association of Services Against Sexual Violence	164	14.06.07

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Officials involved in the collection of public money and payment of accounts must ensure the relevant exchange rate is quoted on the accounting forms where foreign exchange transaction is necessary.

2.7 Credit Cards

The CFO is responsible for overseeing the management of the contractual arrangement with the department's Credit Card provider.

Officials issued with a credit card are to ensure its safekeeping, and are to note that:

- (a) a credit card is a payment mechanism;
- (b) the rules regarding procurement of property or services apply to the use of a credit card; and
- (c) they are required to maintain records of transactions sufficient to enable acquittal of accounts.

2.8 Capital Projects

An Approver must not approve capital expenditure unless the project has been approved. Expenditure must be consistent with the project approval as advised by the CFO.

Note: "Capital projects" are those that involve expenditure to create a non-current asset or to increase the life, value or extent of use of such an asset. Capital projects require an allocation of capital funds.

2.9 Sponsorships

Designated officials responsible for sponsorship arrangements must evaluate all sponsorship proposals to ensure they do not conflict with the department's goals, objectives and responsibilities, represent value for money and provide a quantifiable benefit to the department.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

2.10 Official Travel

Travel arrangement should be made in such a way as to achieve the optimum departmental outcome for the cost incurred.

The departmental Credit Card should be used whenever possible for payment of costs associated with travel, including ground transport, accommodation, incidentals and business related expenses.

All airfares are to be booked through the department's travel service provider prior to the date of travel.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 005

Topic: Cyclone Larry

Hansard Page: CA 6

Senator McLucas asked:

Am I right in my recollection that the allocation for Cyclone Larry was \$44 million originally?

Answer:

The original allocation for Cyclone Larry in the FaCSIA portfolio was \$97.2 million for 2005-06 and \$40.1 million for 2006-07 as listed at page 12 of the 2005-06 Portfolio Supplementary Additional Estimates Statements.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 006

Topic: Corporate Credit cards number and use by OIPC

Hansard Page: CA 10

Senator Stephens asked:

Can you tell us first of all how many corporate credit cards are used by the OIPC? and what they are typically used for ?

Answer:

Following the integration of the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination in May 2006, 445 credit cards were issued to former OIPC officers. Since the initial issue, the former OIPC has been incorporated into FaCSIA and issue of credit cards are recorded on a whole of department basis.

Within FaCSIA corporate credit cards may be used for purchasing accommodation, taxi fares, short-term vehicle hire, hospitality (with prior approval by a delegate), assets (with a value of less than \$2,000) and fuel (where a fuel card is not accepted by the service provider).

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 009

Topic: Indigenous Staffing

Hansard Page: CA 14

Senator Moore asked:

In terms of figures we have had previously about staff who work in the Indigenous area, in particular in the allocation of resources from other areas of the department to that area, I would like to know whether that counts for most of it or whether it is new programs?

Answer:

The increase in Outcome 1 ASL is attributable to the effect of the new attribution model as well as the additional resources being directed towards Indigenous activity.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 015

Topic: Opinion Polls/Market Research

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Wong asked:

What sum was spent on opinion polls, focus groups or market research in 2006 by each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? Will the Ministers provide a list of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research agencies what are used by department and agencies in the Ministers' portfolio? How much of the opinion polls, focus groups or market research expenditure of agencies or departments was conducted at the request of the Minister's office? What benefit-cost assessments have been done which assess the returns from opinion polls, focus groups or market research?

Answer:

Expenditure on market research (including focus groups) by the Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaCSIA) in the 2005-2006 financial year can be found on page 339 of the FaCSIA Annual Report 2005-2006. FaCSIA spent \$102,080 on market research (including focus groups) from 1 July 2006 to 31 December 2006. The Indigenous Land Council spent \$33,950 on focus group consultations in 2006.

The department and its agencies have not carried out opinion polls.

FaCSIA has a panel arrangement for procuring market research services. The market research agencies on the panel are Colmar Brunton Research, DBM Consultants, Dr Fasil Pedic and Associates, i-View Pty Ltd, Orima Research, TNS Social Research, Urbis Keys Young and Di Marzio Research.

No opinion polls, focus groups or market research were conducted by the department or its agencies at the request of the Minister's office.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 019

Topic: Advertising Campaigns

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Wong asked:

For advertising campaigns in each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the: a) cost; b) frequency; and c) type of advertising campaigns this financial year?

Answer:

The Australian Government Office for Women is currently conducting the national *Violence Against Women. Australia Says No* campaign. Expenditure for the period 1 July 2006 to 31 January 2007 associated with the campaign is \$5.31 million. In 2007, the campaign will appear on television during March/April, August/September and November, and will be complemented by advertising in magazines, washrooms, radio, cinema, rural newspapers, and Indigenous and ethnic press.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

..... Question No: 022

Topic: Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Wong asked:

Is there any requirement to provide details of how much water is used and how much water is saved in the annual reports of each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio? Is water usage monitored for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio?

What is the water usage for each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio?

Answer:

There is no requirement to provide water usage and water savings details in the Annual Report but my department voluntarily produces a Sustainability Report (Triple Bottom Line Report) each year. Details of water consumption and savings for 2004/05 for those sites where that information is available can be accessed at <http://www.facsia.gov.au/triplebottomline/2005/toc.html> . The 2005/06 Sustainability Report is expected to be available at that site from June 2007.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 025

Topic: Monitoring Use of Water in Departments and Agencies

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Wong asked:

For each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, can information be provided on whether dual flush toilets are in place in the buildings they occupy?

Answer:

My department does not routinely collect information on dual flush toilets in buildings it occupies. In relation to new building construction, refurbishment of existing tenancies and new lease negotiations, my department works in accordance with Government direction to ensure Lessor compliance with Building Code of Australia requirements and Australian Standards AS3500.1-2003 Clause 10.3 which govern the installation of toilets and cisterns.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 036

Topic: NT State Office Staffing

Hansard Page: CA 103

Senator Crossin asked:

How many jobs (other than SES Band 2) are there in the Darwin Office?

Answer:

There are currently 62 FaCSIA employees (other than SES Band 2) in the Darwin office.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 066

Topic: Indigenous Land Fund – Revised Estimate of Revenue

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

On page 25 of the PAES, it states that \$101, 229 was estimated that FaCSIA would receive a bit more than \$101million from the Indigenous Land Fund for 2006-07. The revised estimates are nearly \$76 million. That's a 25% drop in expected revenue from the land fund. What are the reasons for this decrease?

Answer:

The previous estimate of \$101.3 million was determined by the Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. This estimate was not updated by FaCSIA for the May 2006 Budget but has since been re-assessed for the 2006 Additional Estimates process.

The estimate of \$75.9 million is based on an estimated average rate of return of around 5%. This was reflective of the lower end of the range of interest rate prevalent at the time for the investments in which the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Account is authorised to invest.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 067

Topic: Indigenous Land Fund Revenue

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

If FaCSIA is receiving \$76 million from the Land Fund, why is the ILC's revenue from the Land Fund only \$25 million? Do you know where the rest goes?

Answer:

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Account is administered by FaCSIA under the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Act 2005 (ATSI Act)*. The payment to the Indigenous Land Corporation (ILC) is determined by a formula set out in the *ATSI Act*. The *ATSI Act* requires a payment to be made to the ILC that is equal to the 'realised real return' on the investments of the Land Account. As the Act provides no definition of the 'realised real return', advice has been sought from legal and accounting advisers regarding the correct interpretation. That portion of the Land Account's revenue that is not paid out to the ILC is retained within the Land Account to maintain the real value of the Land Account's investments.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 068

Topic: Indigenous Land Fund Revenue

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Can you confirm that your annual allocation from the Indigenous Land Fund has decreased significantly since the new formula was introduced in 2004-05?

Answer:

The Indigenous Land Corporation ('ILC') receives its funding under the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Act 2005 (ATSI Act)*. For the 10 years from its establishment in 1995 (referred to in the ATSI Act as Category A years), appropriations were made to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Account ('the Land Account') to fund the ILC and to build up an investment base from which to generate future revenue.

Payments to the ILC for subsequent years (referred to as Category B years) are made from the return on the Land Fund and not by way of an appropriation. The *ATSI Act* provides a formula which determines the amount of this payment from the Land Account. Under this formula, the ILC has received \$9.3 million in relation to 2004-05 and \$43.0 million in relation to 2005-06. Funding in 2003-04, the last year of Budget funding, was \$52.9 million.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 073

Topic: Outsourcing Investment Advisory Services

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Is it the case or will it be the case that the Consultative Forum outsource the investment advisory services, investment management and custodial services through open tender?

Answer:

The *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Act 2005 (ATSI Act)* provides for a Consultative Forum for the purposes of discussing the Investment policy of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Account. The activities supporting the management of the investments of the Land Account are managed by FaCSIA under the *ATSI Act*. FaCSIA will be outsourcing portions of the investment advisory, management and custodial services required to support the Land Account's investments, subject to appropriate risk management and value for money considerations.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 074

Topic: Outsourcing Investment Advisory Services

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Have any tenders been requested yet? If so, can you please provide a list of the services that have won contracts under this open tender?

Answer:

Tenders were released by the then Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs prior to this function transferring to FaCSIA. After consideration, this process was terminated. After consultation on the most appropriate outsourcing model, FaCSIA intends to approach the market for the provision of a range of investment management, advisory and custodial services. A tender has been awarded for the provision of advisory services to provide specialist assistance in the selection of investment advisory, management and custodial services. This tender was won by Mercer Investment Consultancy.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 180

Topic: Staffing Model

Hansard Page: CA 7

Senator Stephens asked:

Is it possible for the committee to get a copy of the new staffing model?

Answer:

(The answer to this question is based on the understanding that there was agreement to providing the broad rationale and the differences relating to the new output attribution model.)

The output attribution model generates an estimate of the breakdown of FaCSIA's departmental appropriation by output group. The appropriation is made up of a number of distinct components or sources. Each component is attributed across the outcomes and output groups to reflect the actual utilisation of resources. The components include:

- FaCSIA – operating expenditure for the department (approximately 33% of appropriation);
- Centrelink – payments made to Centrelink as a primary service provider (approximately 64% of appropriation);
- other agencies such as the Australian Taxation Office and the Department of Veterans' Affairs – payments to these agencies as service providers (approximately 2% of appropriation); and
- other receipts – non tax revenues and section 31 transfers from other departments (approximately 1% of appropriation).

The model has a user-friendly, icon-driven interface and generates the required output by performing a step-by-step process which allows for:

- departmental restructuring;
- any revision to outcomes or outputs;
- changes to apportionment by outcome or output; and
- updating of the amount of appropriation.

A similar exercise is also undertaken for departmental appropriations relating to Centrelink, other agencies and other receipts. The output from the model includes tables that feed directly into the Portfolio Budget Statements and Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

The new model requires individual branch and state/territory office (STO) managers to provide estimates of the average staffing level (ASL) required for each output to which their branch contributes. These estimates also take into account likely recruitment activity for the remainder on the financial year. This input is then used to apportion each branch's and STO's departmental funding allocation by output group. The ASL estimates are quality assured by comparing with actual full-time equivalent staffing levels and also with employee expense data.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 002

Topic: Operating deficits

Hansard Page: CA5

Senator Stephens asked:

Can you tell me for how many years the department has been operating in deficit?

Answer:

The department has operated in deficit for two of the last five financial years in 2005-06 and 2002-03. This information has been published in the Annual Reports.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 007

Topic: Internal audit of corporate credit cards

Hansard Page: CA 11

Senator Hogg asked:

Did the internal audit done on the use of credit cards pick up any of the deficiencies that the ANAO picked up? If not why not?

Answer:

The last departmental internal audit report of regulatory compliance which included credit card usage was presented in 2003.

This audit did not pick up any of the deficiencies because the timing of the ANAO audit was different to that of the internal audit.

The FaCSIA internal work programme for 2006-07 includes an internal audit of credit cards which commenced in February 2007.

Credit cards have not been included in recent internal audit work plans because they were examined by the ANAO in 2005-06.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 011

Topic: Recruitment Agencies Spending

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Wong asked:

What sum was spent on recruitment agencies by each department and agency in the Minister's Portfolio? Will the Minister provide a list of the recruitment agencies which were used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio in 2006?
What functions do recruitment agencies perform for departments and what would be the likely impact from reduction in recruitment spending on external agencies?
What benefit-cost assessments have been done which benchmark internal recruitment processes and/or on utilising on line recruitment portals?

Answer:

The following is the sum spent on recruitment agencies in 2006 by the department and each agency:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| • FaCSIA | \$468,924 |
| • Social Security Appeals Tribunal | \$270,880 |
| • Aboriginal Hostels Limited | \$565,655 |
| • Australian Institute of Family Studies | \$5,824 |

The following agencies were used by the department and agencies in the Minister's portfolio in 2006.

Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs

About Work	Manpower Services (Australia)
ADECCO Australia Pty Ltd	Maxnetwork Pty Ltd
Aquarius Communications	MJL People Dynamics
Avant Personnel Pty Ltd	Mogues Enterprises Pty Ltd
Careers Unlimited	On Time Typing
Catalyst Recruitment Systems	Organisational Architect
Commerce Management	Paper Shuffle Pty Ltd
Coopers Recruitment	Precruitment Pty Ltd
Drake Australia Pty Ltd	Professional Careers Australia
Effective People	Quadrat Solutions
Geoffrey Blunden	R&M Consultants Pty Ltd
Hays Personnel Services	Ready Workforce
Hudson Global Resources	Recruitment Management Company
IPA Personnel Pty Ltd	Regent Recruitment
James Phillip Kelly	Ron Hogan & Associates
Joshaymee Pty Ltd	Ross Human Directions Limited
Julia Ross Recruitment Pty Ltd	Scribbly Scribe & Minute

Senate Community Affairs Committee

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Searson Buck Pty Ltd
Shelley Patricia Beard
SOS Recruitment
The Green & Green Group
The Public Affairs Recruitment
Company
The Select Group
Therese Traves

Tonvia Pty Ltd
Trevor Whitton
Verrossity Pty Ltd
Wizard Personnel
Wordworth Writing
Workzone Recruitment

Social Security Appeals Tribunal

Inter Staffing
Select Write
Select Australasia

One Umbrella
Drake

Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Cash Resources
Select Care Personnel
Frontier Group
Recruitment Management Agency
Wizard Personnel

Firstwater
Celtric Care Nursing Placements
Best Practice Skills

**Australian Institute of Family
Studies**

Drake Personnel
HJB Pty Ltd

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

In 2006 the functions performed by recruitment agencies on behalf of the Minister's portfolio included: search; short listing support; scribing; selection report preparation; provision of temporary staff; administrative support; and the sourcing and screening of non-ongoing employees. Generally within FaCSIA recruitment services are used for specialist recruitment needs such as temporary staff, Compass program (graduates, cadetships and trainees), senior executive positions, and professional roles such as lawyers, accountants and information technology experts.

Staff recruitment would be less efficient and less effective if recruitment spending were curtailed. It would be more difficult to attract staff in fields where there are skill shortages and a competitive labour market.

FaCSIA is participating in the benchmarking of corporate support functions across the APS and recruitment processes are audited as part of the department and agencies regular performance auditing. It is also currently tendering panel arrangements for some services, hence retesting the value for money offered by the market.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 021

Topic: Advertising Campaigns

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Wong:

At the Budget Estimates in May 2006, the Budget Papers listed the following Pending Campaigns (from Budget Papers: period up to 4 years)

Campaign	\$M
Smart Card	47.3
Child Support Reform	36.1
Promote Private Health Cover	52.1
Medicare direct mail	17.5
New family law arrangements	19.9
Independent contractors	<15
Pensions real estate/assets test	5.9 (at least, over 2 years)
Smart Traveller	13.1
Alcohol abuse	25.2
Citizenship	4
Disease risk factors	
Child care rebate	
Family Law arrangements	
Illicit drugs and mental illness	
Living in Harmony Initiative	

For those campaigns which are relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio, what is the:

- (a) planning progress for campaigns;
- (b) likely start dates; and
- (c) media spend.

Answer:

The pension real estate/assets test campaign funding is for a multi-year campaign with most of the expenditure after 2006-07. The preliminary activity that commenced in May 2006 includes developmental market research with age pension recipients and the refinement of an existing Centrelink fact sheet for use in a Centrelink mail out targeting age pension recipients with recorded real estate assets.

There has been a nil media spend.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: Cross

... Question No: 001

Topic: PBS – FACSIA Budget Deficit

Hansard Page: CA4-5

Senator Stephens asked:

From the portfolio budget statement, you forecasted an estimated deficit in 2005-06 of \$43 million, and the additional estimates show an actual deficit of \$15.8 million. Can you talk us through what the budget deficit actually is and the differences?

Answer:

The actual operating deficit for the department in 2005-06 was \$15.9 million.

The major differences between the budgeted deficit of \$43.1 million and the actual deficit of \$15.9 million are:

- The originally approved deficit included \$22.0 million of a prepayment to Centrelink in 2004-05 that was expensed during 2005-06. This amount was offset by additional \$23 million prepayment identified at the end of 2005-06;
- The More Help for Families programme spent \$3.0 million in 2005-06 from their approved carryover of \$13.4 million; and
- The originally approved deficit included an approved deficit of \$4.7 million for the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination (OIPC). The actual deficit for OIPC was \$2.2 million.

There were also a number of small increases in areas such as depreciation and Information Technology that offset some of the underspends detailed above.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: Cross

Question No: 010

Topic: Department Program and Grant Information

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Ludwig asked:

With regard to all grants allocated by the department/agency from 1 January 2002, could a table detailing the following information be provided:

- a) the name of the grant program;
- b) the name of the grant recipient;
- c) the ABN of the grant recipient (where available);
- d) the value of the grant awarded;
- e) the date the grant was awarded;
- f) the state of the grant recipient; and
- g) the postcode of the grant recipient.

Answer:

Much of the information sought is provided annually by the department in its response to Senate Order 192 and is therefore already available. Beyond this, the question would require detailed compilation or research beyond that routinely required by the department to meet the needs of Government. This would require a redirection of departmental resources from core tasks, which the Minister considers is not warranted.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 029

Topic: Aboriginals Benefit Account

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Page 25 of the PAES shows that nearly \$61.5 million of revenue was expected from the ABA for 2006-07. The revised estimates show that nearly \$86.5 million of revenue will be available. Can you please explain this increase of \$25 million?

Answer:

The receipts into the Aboriginals Benefit Account are derived from royalties paid by mining companies for mining activities on Aboriginal land in the Northern Territory.

Estimated receipts have increased primarily due to increasing prices for resources which results in higher estimated royalty payments.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 031

Topic: Aboriginals Benefit Account

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

How much money is there currently in the ABA?

Answer:

The balance of the Aboriginals Benefit Account at 31 January 2007 is \$156.5 million.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 032

Topic: Aboriginals Benefit Account

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

How is annual revenue from the ABA determined since the amendments to the Aboriginal Lands Right Act?

Answer:

Annual revenue is derived from royalties paid by mining companies for mining activities on Aboriginal land in the Northern Territory. The amendments to the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act* in 2006 do not alter the basis for deriving the ABA's revenue.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 033

Topic: Aboriginals Benefit Account

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

What is the total value of economic development proposals that have been granted by the Minister from the ABA since the 2004 election? Does this figure include money allocated for housing or home ownership projects? What is the figure excluding housing or home ownership projects?

Answer:

In 2004-05, economic development proposals totalling \$10,030,287 were approved by the Minister. There were no housing or home ownership projects approved in 2004-05.

In 2005-06, economic development proposals totalling \$4,520,000 were approved by the Minister. This includes housing or home ownership projects totalling \$1,372,000.

In 2006-07, economic development proposals totalling \$9,734,530 were approved by the Minister to date. There have been no housing or home ownership projects approved in 2006-07 to date.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 041

Topic: Taskforce Consultative Group in Alice Springs

Hansard Page: CA112

Senator Crossin asked:

Could you please provide a list of the Indigenous people within the taskforce group that the Northern Territory Government established in Alice Springs

Answer:

The Alice Springs Task Force, which was announced by the Northern Territory Government on 1 December 2005, includes representation from the following groups:

- NT Department of the Chief Minister;
- NT Department of Local Government, Housing and Sport;
- Alice Springs Town Council;
- Tangentyere Council;
- Lhere Artepe Aboriginal Corporation; and
- Australian Government Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

The Implementation Steering Committee, which is responsible for implementing the Task Force's recommendations, includes representatives from all of the above organisations as well as the NT Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Services.

Tangentyere Council and Lhere Artepe Aboriginal Corporation are both Indigenous organisations. Representatives from other organisations may or may not be Indigenous.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 038

Topic: SRA with Daguragu Community

Hansard Page: CA 109

Senator Crossin asked:

Can you provide me with an update of where the negotiation of the SRA with Daguragu community is at?

Answer:

Earlier this year, negotiations with the Daguragu community around the SRA had stalled.

Following further negotiations some minor changes to the SRA were mutually agreed and the SRA is moving to approval stage.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 039

Topic: SRA's

Hansard Page: CA 109

Senator Crossin asked: How many SRA's require people in communities to pick up the rubbish or clean up around the house?

Answer:

Where communities commit to the collection of rubbish or clean up of their community, this is identified in an SRA as part of the community mutual obligation. Currently over 200 SRAs have been signed and rubbish collection or clean up activities as part of a suite of activities are identified in ten.

Signed Shared Responsibility Agreements can be accessed at www.Indigenous.gov.au.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

Question No: 026

Topic: Wadeye

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

What steps have been taken to develop and enact a youth strategy in Wadeye, as promised under the COAG whole-of-government trial?

Answer:

FaCSIA has already provided the following support:

- Two Sport and Recreation officers (one male, one female) to deliver programs from January to June 2007; and
- A vacation care program for the 2006/07 Christmas holiday period.

The department is also working with other agencies and stakeholders to:

- Expand the existing Norforce cadet program; and
- Establish local football and softball competitions with the AFL and NTAFL.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

Question No: 030

Topic: Aboriginals Benefit Account

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Does FaCSIA intend to spend that \$86.5 million this financial year? Can you provide a breakdown of that expenditure?

Answer:

FaCSIA estimates that \$71.6 million will be spent from the Aboriginals Benefit Account (ABA) during 2006-07.

\$40.3 million is estimated to be paid to four Northern Territory Land Councils. This money will be used to meet their administrative costs as well as being distributed to Aboriginal organisations in areas affected by mining operations.

It is estimated that \$31.1 million will be paid as grants for projects that benefit Aboriginal people living in the Northern Territory.

\$0.2 million is estimated to be paid to meet the expenses of administering the ABA

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

Question No: 035

Topic: Wadeye

Hansard Page: CA 103

Senator Crossin asked:

Can you provide a duty statement that the Wadeye based FaCSIA officer is working to?

Answer:

The officer you are referring to is the FaCSIA Senior Officer based at Wadeye.

Duties include:

- strengthening the relationship between the Australian Government and communities in the Wadeye region;
- supporting the whole of Government co-ordination role of the Strategic Interventions Taskforce on the ground;
- informing the Australian Government of developments in the Wadeye region and the views of local residents to ensure an agreed approach;
- forming a cooperative working relationship with Northern Territory Government officers, for example the Development Coordinator (jointly funded by both Governments); and
- supporting the implementation of key regional projects of the Australian Government that should provide better outcomes for the region such as the house painting project and support for families relocated to identified homelands.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 028

Topic: Shared Responsibility Agreements

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Please list the SRAs that have been reviewed, and for each one please provide:

- a) the cost of the consultancy to complete the review
- b) the amount of Commonwealth expenditure under the SRA

Answer:

Attachment A lists the SRAs that have been reviewed and the associated cost.

Attachment B provides details on the level of committed Australian Government funding for the lifetime of each of these SRAs.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Attachment A

Shared Responsibility Agreements that have been reviewed and the total cost for each consultancy:

Consultant	SRA	Community	ICC/State	Total Cost
Peter Baran & Associates	Young Women Go To Summer School.	NPY Women's Council	Alice Springs/NT	\$9,183
	Better Food, Better Living	Bonya	Alice Springs/NT	
	Building Community Capacity	Gapuwiyak	Nhulunbuy/NT	
Westwood Spice	A Bush Museum	Cape Leveque	Broome/WA	\$9,760
	Sporting Activities	Bidyadanga	Broome/WA	
Colmar Brunton Social Research	The Baddagun Performers	Innisfail	Cairns/Qld	\$12,537
	Building The Community	Doomadgee	Mt. Isa/Qld	
	Traditional Owners Plan For The Future	Girringun	Townsville/Qld	
Andrew H. West & Associates	A Safer Community	Yalata	Ceduna/SA	\$9,670
	Leadership Skills For Young People	Aroona	Port Augusta/SA	
	Getting Kids Back To School	Cooper Pedy	Port Augusta/SA	
Integrated Management Specialists	Better Facilities For The Neighbourhood Centre	Barkuma (Kurri Kurri)	Coffs Harbour/NSW	\$9,760
	Hot Wheels	Muswellbrook	Tamworth/NSW	
Kate Sullivan & Associates	Developing A Mud Crab Business	Kulaluk	Darwin/NT	\$15,125
	Keeping Young People Healthy And Active	Palmerston Indigenous Village	Darwin/NT	

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Consultant	SRA	Community	ICC/State	Total Cost
	New Community Store	Minjilang	Darwin/NT	
Cultural Perspectives (CIRCA)	Working Towards Self Sufficiency	Emu Point	Darwin/NT	\$12,816
	A Safer Community Through Elders	Tennant Creek	Tennant Creek/NT	
	Community Centre And Internet Cafe	Alpurrurulam	Tennent Creek/NT	
SGS Economics and Planning	Building A Sense Of Community	Bayulu	Derby/WA	\$14,197
	Health And Hygiene Facilities	Yungngora	Derby/WA	
	Improving Sport And Recreation	Kupartiya	Derby/WA	
Langfords	Men's Service	Derby	Derby/WA	\$13,067
	Strengthening Families-Family And Community Safety	Derby	Derby/WA	
	Connecting Youth To Education	Narrandera	Wagga Wagga/NSW	
	Bila Park Cultural Heritage Project	Tumut	Wagga Wagga/NSW	
MLCS Corporation	Building The Community	Barrow Creek	Tennant Creek/NT	\$8,414
	Better Health And Education	Wilora	Tennant Creek/NT	
TOTAL				\$114,529

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Attachment B

Australian Government funding committed for each of the 28 SRAs that have been reviewed:

SRA	Community	ICC/State	Committed funding
Young Women Go To Summer School.	NPY Women's Council	Alice Springs/NT	\$41,430
Better Food, Better Living	Bonya	Alice Springs/NT	\$165,000
Building Community Capacity	Gapuwiyak	Nhulunbuy/NT	\$160,000
A Bush Museum	Cape Leveque	Broome/WA	\$60,000
Sporting Activities	Bidyadanga	Broome/WA	\$150,000
The Baddagun Performers	Innisfail	Cairns/Qld	\$168,707
Building The Community	Doomadgee	Mt. Isa/Qld	\$250,000
Traditional Owners Plan For The Future	Girringun	Townsville/Qld	\$64,996
A Safer Community	Yalata	Ceduna/SA	\$72,000
Leadership Skills For Young People	Aroona	Port Augusta/SA	\$5,000
Getting Kids Back To School	Cooper Pedy	Port Augusta/SA	\$10,000
Better Facilities For The Neighbourhood Centre	Barkuma (Kurri Kurri)	Coffs Harbour/NSW	\$50,000
Hot Wheels	Muswellbrook	Tamworth/NSW	\$90,000
Developing A Mud Crab Business	Kulaluk	Darwin/NT	\$609,264
Keeping Young People Healthy And Active	Palmerston Indigenous Village	Darwin/NT	\$179,163
New Community Store	Minjilang	Darwin/NT	\$1,190,000

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

SRA	Community	ICC/State	Committed funding
Working Towards Self Sufficiency	Emu Point	Darwin/NT	\$205,000
A Safer Community Through Elders	Tennant Creek	Tennant Creek/NT	\$363,300
Community Centre And Internet Cafe	Alpurrurulam	Tennent Creek/NT	\$15,000
Building A Sense Of Community	Bayulu	Derby/WA	\$208,500
Health And Hygiene Facilities	Yungngora	Derby/WA	\$146,757
Improving Sport And Recreation	Kupartiya	Derby/WA	\$125,390
Men's Service	Derby	Derby/WA	\$57,400
Strengthening Families-Family And Community Safety	Derby	Derby/WA	\$60,000
Connecting Youth To Education	Narrandera	Wagga Wagga/NSW	\$128,500
Bila Park Cultural Heritage Project	Tumut	Wagga Wagga/NSW	\$65,000
Building The Community	Barrow Creek	Tennant Creek/NT	\$285,000
Better Health And Education	Wilora	Tennant Creek/NT	\$45,000
TOTAL			\$4,970,407

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 037

Topic: Shared Responsibility Agreements

Hansard Page: CA109

Senator Crossin asked:

Can you provide any variation to the table previously given (QoN 028, November 2006) on the list of the 28 SRA's that you have reviewed and the list of the 50 that you expect to do? And the cost of the consultancy for each one?

Answer:

There are no variations. See response to QoN 028 on cost of the consultancies.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 043

Topic: COAG Working Group

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

When was the working group established? Who is on it? What are the terms of reference for the working group? What is the final reporting date for the working group? Will the group be consulting stakeholders? Will their report be publicly available?

Answer:

The COAG meeting of 14 July 2006 agreed to establish the working group and comprises the Commonwealth, all States and Territories and the Australian Local Government Association.

COAG agreed that the working group will:

- develop a detailed proposal for generational change including specific, practical proposals for reform which reflect the diversity of circumstances in Australia; and
- consider how to build clearer links between the Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage framework, the National Framework of Principles for Delivering Services to Indigenous Australians, the COAG Reconciliation Framework and the bilateral agreements between the Commonwealth and State and Territory Governments.

The working group's report was considered by COAG at its last meeting. COAG determines what stakeholders are consulted and what reports are made public.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 044

Topic: Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry

Hansard Reference: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

Evidence provided by ALSWA from the archive files of the WA Department of Indigenous Affairs to the Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry clearly show that in 1959 on the eve of the introduction of benefits, the Commonwealth Director General of Social Services explicitly instructed the State government to pay pensions and maternity allowances directly to Mission headquarters and station managers, and provided explicit recommendations for exactly how much pocket money should be paid. For the majority of these cases the recommended rate of pocket money is 10 shillings out of 4 pounds 15 shillings. This was less than ten percent of the value of the pension.

I am raising this issue with the Department because it not only demonstrates that the Commonwealth knew that a significant proportion of these pension funds and maternity allowances were being 'diverted' by missions and station managers, but that this was the expressed policy of the Director General of the time. There was also archival evidence presented to the Senate Committee of an inquiry commissioned by Commonwealth Department of Social Services in 1965 into allegations that station managers and mission warrantees misappropriated old age pensions payments intended for Aboriginal people.

This investigation and another investigation the next year (1966) undertaken by the WA Native Welfare Department both found evidence of widespread and systematic abuse across the Kimberley region. Having found that there was widespread abuse the Commonwealth failed to act to prevent this from occurring, failed to prosecute any of the people responsible for the misappropriation of these benefits, and in fact continued to administer a system which it knew was being widely rorted.

This evidence was obtained, with much reluctance and delay, from the historic archives of the WA Government. It is clear that much of this information and much other information pertinent to the administration of Commonwealth benefits to Aboriginal Australians should also reside in the Commonwealth's own archives.

Now that this evidence has come to light do you believe that the department has a duty to look into this issue further?

Answer:

The Senate referred the Inquiry into Stolen Wages to the Legal and Constitutional References Committee (the Committee) on 13 June 2006. The Committee released its report – titled 'Unfinished business: Indigenous stolen wages' – on 7 December 2006. The Committee made six recommendations, including the fourth recommendation that relates to stolen wages issues in Western Australia. The Government is currently considering the recommendations of the Inquiry.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 045

Topic: Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry

Hansard Reference: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

Evidence provided by ALSWA from the archive files of the WA Department of Indigenous Affairs to the Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry clearly show that in 1959 on the eve of the introduction of benefits, the Commonwealth Director General of Social Services explicitly instructed the State government to pay pensions and maternity allowances directly to Mission headquarters and station managers, and provided explicit recommendations for exactly how much pocket money should be paid. For the majority of these cases the recommended rate of pocket money is 10 shillings out of 4 pounds 15 shillings. This was less than ten percent of the value of the pension.

I am raising this issue with the Department because it not only demonstrates that the Commonwealth knew that a significant proportion of these pension funds and maternity allowances were being 'diverted' by missions and station managers, but that this was the expressed policy of the Director General of the time. There was also archival evidence presented to the Senate Committee of an inquiry commissioned by Commonwealth Department of Social Services in 1965 into allegations that station managers and mission warrantees misappropriated old age pensions payments intended for Aboriginal people.

This investigation and another investigation the next year (1966) undertaken by the WA Native Welfare Department both found evidence of widespread and systematic abuse across the Kimberley region. Having found that there was widespread abuse the Commonwealth failed to act to prevent this from occurring, failed to prosecute any of the people responsible for the misappropriation of these benefits, and in fact continued to administer a system which it knew was being widely rorted.

This evidence was obtained, with much reluctance and delay, from the historic archives of the WA Government. It is clear that much of this information and much other information pertinent to the administration of Commonwealth benefits to Aboriginal Australians should also reside in the Commonwealth's own archives.

Does the department intend to carry its own investigation out into its own records?

Answer:

Refer to Question On Notice No. 044.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 046

Topic: Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry

Hansard Reference: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

Evidence provided by ALSWA from the archive files of the WA Department of Indigenous Affairs to the Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry clearly show that in 1959 on the eve of the introduction of benefits, the Commonwealth Director General of Social Services explicitly instructed the State government to pay pensions and maternity allowances directly to Mission headquarters and station managers, and provided explicit recommendations for exactly how much pocket money should be paid. For the majority of these cases the recommended rate of pocket money is 10 shillings out of 4 pounds 15 shillings. This was less than ten percent of the value of the pension.

I am raising this issue with the Department because it not only demonstrates that the Commonwealth knew that a significant proportion of these pension funds and maternity allowances were being 'diverted' by missions and station managers, but that this was the expressed policy of the Director General of the time. There was also archival evidence presented to the Senate Committee of an inquiry commissioned by Commonwealth Department of Social Services in 1965 into allegations that station managers and mission warrantees misappropriated old age pensions payments intended for Aboriginal people.

This investigation and another investigation the next year (1966) undertaken by the WA Native Welfare Department both found evidence of widespread and systematic abuse across the Kimberley region. Having found that there was widespread abuse the Commonwealth failed to act to prevent this from occurring, failed to prosecute any of the people responsible for the misappropriation of these benefits, and in fact continued to administer a system which it knew was being widely rorted.

This evidence was obtained, with much reluctance and delay, from the historic archives of the WA Government. It is clear that much of this information and much other information pertinent to the administration of Commonwealth benefits to Aboriginal Australians should also reside in the Commonwealth's own archives.

Does the department intend to assist Aboriginal Australians directly affected by these measures, their legal representatives and their dependents to gain access to their records in the Commonwealth archives?

Answer:

Refer to Question On Notice No. 044.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 047

Topic: Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry

Hansard Reference: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

Evidence provided by ALSWA from the archive files of the WA Department of Indigenous Affairs to the Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry clearly show that in 1959 on the eve of the introduction of benefits, the Commonwealth Director General of Social Services explicitly instructed the State government to pay pensions and maternity allowances directly to Mission headquarters and station managers, and provided explicit recommendations for exactly how much pocket money should be paid. For the majority of these cases the recommended rate of pocket money is 10 shillings out of 4 pounds 15 shillings. This was less than ten percent of the value of the pension.

I am raising this issue with the Department because it not only demonstrates that the Commonwealth knew that a significant proportion of these pension funds and maternity allowances were being 'diverted' by missions and station managers, but that this was the expressed policy of the Director General of the time. There was also archival evidence presented to the Senate Committee of an inquiry commissioned by Commonwealth Department of Social Services in 1965 into allegations that station managers and mission warrantees misappropriated old age pensions payments intended for Aboriginal people.

This investigation and another investigation the next year (1966) undertaken by the WA Native Welfare Department both found evidence of widespread and systematic abuse across the Kimberley region. Having found that there was widespread abuse the Commonwealth failed to act to prevent this from occurring, failed to prosecute any of the people responsible for the misappropriation of these benefits, and in fact continued to administer a system which it knew was being widely rorted.

This evidence was obtained, with much reluctance and delay, from the historic archives of the WA Government. It is clear that much of this information and much other information pertinent to the administration of Commonwealth benefits to Aboriginal Australians should also reside in the Commonwealth's own archives.

What measures does the department intend to put in place to assist this people to uncover the truth?

Answer:

Refer to Question On Notice No. 044.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 050

Topic: Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry

Hansard Reference: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

Evidence provided by ALSWA from the archive files of the WA Department of Indigenous Affairs to the Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry clearly show that in 1959 on the eve of the introduction of benefits, the Commonwealth Director General of Social Services explicitly instructed the State government to pay pensions and maternity allowances directly to Mission headquarters and station managers, and provided explicit recommendations for exactly how much pocket money should be paid. For the majority of these cases the recommended rate of pocket money is 10 shillings out of 4 pounds 15 shillings. This was less than ten percent of the value of the pension.

I am raising this issue with the Department because it not only demonstrates that the Commonwealth knew that a significant proportion of these pension funds and maternity allowances were being 'diverted' by missions and station managers, but that this was the expressed policy of the Director General of the time. There was also archival evidence presented to the Senate Committee of an inquiry commissioned by Commonwealth Department of Social Services in 1965 into allegations that station managers and mission warrantees misappropriated old age pensions payments intended for Aboriginal people.

This investigation and another investigation the next year (1966) undertaken by the WA Native Welfare Department both found evidence of widespread and systematic abuse across the Kimberley region. Having found that there was widespread abuse the Commonwealth failed to act to prevent this from occurring, failed to prosecute any of the people responsible for the misappropriation of these benefits, and in fact continued to administer a system which it knew was being widely rorted.

This evidence was obtained, with much reluctance and delay, from the historic archives of the WA Government. It is clear that much of this information and much other information pertinent to the administration of Commonwealth benefits to Aboriginal Australians should also reside in the Commonwealth's own archives.

What is the opportunity cost for Aboriginal families of being unable to own their own home and unable to save money to improve their standard of living or invest in economic development as a result of the wages and income support being withheld?

Answer:

The information necessary to attempt an opportunity cost estimate of the type sought in the question is not available

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 048

Topic: Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry

Hansard Reference: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

Evidence provided by ALSWA from the archive files of the WA Department of Indigenous Affairs to the Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry clearly show that in 1959 on the eve of the introduction of benefits, the Commonwealth Director General of Social Services explicitly instructed the State government to pay pensions and maternity allowances directly to Mission headquarters and station managers, and provided explicit recommendations for exactly how much pocket money should be paid. For the majority of these cases the recommended rate of pocket money is 10 shillings out of 4 pounds 15 shillings. This was less than ten percent of the value of the pension.

I am raising this issue with the Department because it not only demonstrates that the Commonwealth knew that a significant proportion of these pension funds and maternity allowances were being 'diverted' by missions and station managers, but that this was the expressed policy of the Director General of the time. There was also archival evidence presented to the Senate Committee of an inquiry commissioned by Commonwealth Department of Social Services in 1965 into allegations that station managers and mission warrantees misappropriated old age pensions payments intended for Aboriginal people.

This investigation and another investigation the next year (1966) undertaken by the WA Native Welfare Department both found evidence of widespread and systematic abuse across the Kimberley region. Having found that there was widespread abuse the Commonwealth failed to act to prevent this from occurring, failed to prosecute any of the people responsible for the misappropriation of these benefits, and in fact continued to administer a system which it knew was being widely rorted.

This evidence was obtained, with much reluctance and delay, from the historic archives of the WA Government. It is clear that much of this information and much other information pertinent to the administration of Commonwealth benefits to Aboriginal Australians should also reside in the Commonwealth's own archives.

How much was paid in pensions and child endowments to Aboriginal people in the period up until citizenship? What is the estimated proportion of this that actually reached its intended recipients

Answer:

The information requested is not comprehensively available.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 049

Topic: Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry

Hansard Reference: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

Evidence provided by ALSWA from the archive files of the WA Department of Indigenous Affairs to the Legal and Constitutional Committee's Stolen Wages inquiry clearly show that in 1959 on the eve of the introduction of benefits, the Commonwealth Director General of Social Services explicitly instructed the State government to pay pensions and maternity allowances directly to Mission headquarters and station managers, and provided explicit recommendations for exactly how much pocket money should be paid. For the majority of these cases the recommended rate of pocket money is 10 shillings out of 4 pounds 15 shillings. This was less than ten percent of the value of the pension.

I am raising this issue with the Department because it not only demonstrates that the Commonwealth knew that a significant proportion of these pension funds and maternity allowances were being 'diverted' by missions and station managers, but that this was the expressed policy of the Director General of the time. There was also archival evidence presented to the Senate Committee of an inquiry commissioned by Commonwealth Department of Social Services in 1965 into allegations that station managers and mission warrantees misappropriated old age pensions payments intended for Aboriginal people.

This investigation and another investigation the next year (1966) undertaken by the WA Native Welfare Department both found evidence of widespread and systematic abuse across the Kimberley region. Having found that there was widespread abuse the Commonwealth failed to act to prevent this from occurring, failed to prosecute any of the people responsible for the misappropriation of these benefits, and in fact continued to administer a system which it knew was being widely rorted.

This evidence was obtained, with much reluctance and delay, from the historic archives of the WA Government. It is clear that much of this information and much other information pertinent to the administration of Commonwealth benefits to Aboriginal Australians should also reside in the Commonwealth's own archives.

What do you estimate the cost of the total monies paid by the Commonwealth to missions and pastoral stations was? What is the equivalent value of that in today's terms for all these payment?

Answer:

The information requested is not available.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

... Question No: 040

Topic: Strategic Interventions Taskforce Performance Management Framework

Hansard Page: CA111

Senator Crossin asked:

What sort of baseline data are you trying to achieve and will that go to average weekly income or occupancy of house?

Answer:

The baseline data that FaCSIA is collecting aim to establish comprehensive profiles of communities as a reference point for subsequent evaluations of interventions. The qualitative and quantitative data cover the areas of demographics, government funding and services, environment, health, early childhood and education, as well as other relevant community information. The information collected will include median weekly individual income and the number of houses with an average of more than two people per bedroom.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.1

Question No: 42

Topic: Mutitjulu

Hansard Page: CA 121

Senator Crossin asked:

Did your department provide any information to the AFP or the Crime Prevention Unit regarding the raid of the former CEO of the Mutitjulu Aboriginal Corporation?

Answer:

The Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs is not aware of a “raid” as alleged in Senator Crossin’s question, “Is your Department aware at all that the former CEO of the Mutitjulu Aboriginal Corporation was recently raided by the national crime prevention unit?”. (*Hansard* CA 121). The person who was the former Chief Executive Officer of the Mutitjulu Aboriginal Corporation has informed the Department that she had not been “raided” as alleged or at all.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 027

Topic: Wadeye

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

What steps have been taken to enact the recommendations of Bill Gray's independent and damning evaluation of the Wadeye COAG trial?

Answer:

FaCSIA and the Northern Territory Government have advised the community that the COAG trial phase has now been concluded.

FaCSIA has also been working with the Northern Territory Government to better coordinate investment and efforts by both Governments. A senior APS officer is on the ground at Wadeye and increased departmental resources and support are now in place in the Northern Territory State Office and the National Office taskforce. Discussions are underway with the Thamarrurr Regional Council and the community to develop an appropriate engagement framework for the next stages of work.

Negotiations between the community, the Northern Territory Government and the Australian Government have resulted in a significantly increased police presence from two to eight officers.

Housing is also been a priority with intensive strategies implemented to construct new houses and repair existing houses.

The above is complemented with work on other intensive strategies in the areas of youth diversion through sport and recreation activities, community safety initiatives and children's services, as well as money management and tenancy skills in selected outstations

These steps are in line with some of the recommendations from Bill Gray's report. The department is working directly with the community rather than pursuing recommendations relating to a trial project that has now ceased.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 034

Topic: Wadeye

Hansard Page: CA 103

Senator Crossin asked:

What was the cost of building the house that the Wadeye based Centrelink officer is living in?
What was the cost of the new vehicle provided?

Answer:

The office accommodation and housing complex (2x2 bedroom units) in Wadeye were established at a total cost of \$550,000, with an additional \$25,000 for furnishings. Each unit contains living area and office space.

One unit is currently occupied on a temporary basis by the Centrelink Manager and the other by a FaCSIA Senior Officer. This accommodation is also used by visiting Australian Government officers.

The vehicle being used by a FaCSIA Senior Officer is part of the FaCSIA NT State Office fleet. It is leased under normal public sector leasing arrangements. No additional costs have been incurred as a result of this arrangement.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 051

Topic: Indigenous Home Ownership

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

How many staff does FaCSIA have working on Indigenous Home Ownership policies or projects?

Answer:

Please refer to answer provided to Question on Notice 60.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 053

Topic: Indigenous Home Ownership

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Has your department commissioned any consultant work on this policy area? If so, please name the consultants, the time period and cost of the consultancy?

Answer:

Yes, SGS Economics and Planning was commissioned in 2006 to provide a report on *Alternative Models for Housing Provision on Indigenous Communal Title Lands*.

The consultancy commenced in March 2006 and the final report was delivered in September 2006.

The cost of this consultancy was \$130,900 (GST inclusive).

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 056

Topic: COAG Trials in Wadeye

Hansard Page: CA 100&101

Senator Crossin asked:

Can you please table the letter written by Wadeye traditional owners to the Minister stating “We acknowledge the very proactive role you took in relation to law and order and the positive impact created by additional police presence. We can see your commitment to the future. We are getting more feedback in a similar vein”

Answer:

The Minister has asked that the Senator request a copy of the letter from the Thamarrurr Regional Council.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

... Question No: 057

Topic: COAG Trials in Wadeye

Hansard Page: CA101

Senator Crossin asked:

Are Wild Geese Builders and Faith Homes a Northern Territory company? Under what conditions did Wild Geese Builders and Faith Homes get the contract rather than a Northern Territory company?

Answer:

The companies contracted by Indigenous Business Australia are Wild Geese Building and Maintenance Group Pty Ltd and Faith Constructions NT Pty Ltd. These businesses are separate legal entities and not a single company. Wild Geese Building and Maintenance Group Pty Ltd has its principal place of business and registered office listed as Winnellie in the Northern Territory. Faith Constructions NT Pty Ltd has its principal place of business listed as Larrakeyah in the Northern Territory with their registered office listed as Darwin in the Northern Territory.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

... Question No: 059

Topic: Native Title

Hansard Page: CA116

Senator Siewert asked:

Provide the letter, written by Mr Roche, to the Chief Executive Officers of the Native Title Representative Bodies (NTRB) advising them of the criteria for recognising native title bodies?

Answer:

The following letter was sent to Chief Executive Officers of the Native Title Representative Bodies (NTRB) by Greg Roche, Branch Manager, Land Branch on 5 February 2007 via email.

Dear NTRB CEO,

As you know a Bill is currently in the Parliament to amend the *Native Title Act 1993* (NTA) to, among other things, introduce fixed terms of recognition for native title representative bodies (NTRBs) from 1 July 2007.

The Minister has decided that in determining the recognition periods, within the overall objectives of the Act, he will have regard to the following:

- the extent to which the NTRB satisfactorily performs its functions under the NTA including as indicated by
 - its record in satisfactorily completing activities related to its various functions as identified in its operational plan
 - the stability of its personnel and governing committee
- the extent to which the NTRB complies with financial and accountability requirements under the NTA, its incorporation statute and its funding agreement with FaCSIA
- projected workloads in each area.

We will be providing briefing to the Minister to assist him in his assessments. As a result of the reporting requirements under the PFA, we hold extensive information on NTRBs' operational and financial performance which will inform our briefing. This includes your funding submissions and regular financial and performance reports, as well as auditors' reports and our own analyses, which include a comparative assessment of NTRBs. You should however anticipate that the Native Title Officer (NTO) from this Branch allocated to your organisation

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

will be coming to you for additional information over the next few weeks. I do not expect that this will involve a lot of work on your part, and I would ask that you cooperate fully and promptly with any such requests.

We do not expect that any of the background information we use in preparing our briefing to the Minister will not also be known to you, but in the event that we turn up information that may be adverse to you, and of which you may not be aware, we will of course give you an opportunity to comment.

We shall also be consulting the register of complaints lodged with us or with the Minister about NTRBs. We routinely discuss any such complaints with you, so you will already be aware of them (note that we have not had complaints about all NTRBs) but if you have any concerns, please discuss them with your NTO.

While the history of each organisation is relevant, and we will be examining publicly available statistical information on claims and agreements, our major focus will be on the previous two and a half financial years. In this context you should note that the Minister has further decided that as a matter of policy, NTRBs to which either of the following apply, will be recognised for a one year period:

- an Administrator or Funding Controller was in place at any time since 1 July 2005
- the NTRB failed to satisfactorily acquit its Native Title Program funds for 2004-05 or 2005-06.

This is a general rather than a prescriptive policy, and each case will be considered on its merits, but NTRBs in these categories should anticipate a minimum term. This should not be considered as the beginning of the end, but rather an opportunity to demonstrate significantly improved performance with a view to a longer recognition period at the end of the transition. We will work very closely with relevant NTRBs over this time to assist in enhancing capacity and outcomes. The Minister will also issue a one year invitation to any NTRB which indicates that it does not wish to be recognised beyond that time.

As noted earlier, the Minister will have regard to the projected workload for each area. Some NTRBs have only a small number of claims remaining to be finalised, and it would be appropriate to factor this in to the consideration of the term required to complete that work.

As you would be aware from briefings at CEO forums, no submission is required from you. The aim was to keep to a minimum the paperwork required from NTRBs as part of this process. That does not however preclude you from providing any comments or information which you believe are relevant to the Minister's consideration of the term of recognition. Any relevant information provided (that is, information which relates to the criteria the Minister has specified) will be taken into account. It should be provided by.....(two weeks from date of letter). It is important to note that this is entirely optional. There is no disadvantage to an NTRB in not providing comments.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

In terms of timing, assuming the legislation passes as drafted, we anticipate it coming into effect by mid-April, with the Minister issuing invitations by the end of April. As you will have seen from the Bill, you will have 28 days to respond to the Minister's invitation. Your current recognition will expire on 30 June, and assuming you accept your invitation, your new recognition period will begin on 1 July.

I am happy to discuss any queries or concerns you may have about the re-recognition process. Yvonne Fetherston (61214506), Rebecca Bigg-Wither (61214729) or your NTO are also able to assist.

Yours sincerely

Greg Roche
Assistant Secretary
Land
5 February 2007

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 060

Topic: Indigenous Home Ownership

Hansard Page: CA 124

Senator Crossin asked:

How many staff does FaCSIA have working on Indigenous Home Ownership policies or projects area? Does this group receive the highest amount of departmental funding?

Answer:

In 2006-07, FaCSIA has four staff working on Indigenous Home Ownership policies or projects.

No.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

... Question No: 061

Topic: 99 Year Lease Agreements

Hansard Page: CA125

Senator Crossin asked:

Which departmental officer attended the meeting with Tiwi Land Council on the islands on 6 February?

Answer:

The following departmental officers attended the meeting on 6 February:

- Ms Caroline Edwards (FaCSIA Deputy State Manager, Northern Territory);
- Mr Robert Orr (Deputy General Counsel – Australian Government Solicitor); and
- Ms Kelly Faehrmann (FaCSIA – secretariat for negotiation).

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 062

Topic: 99 Year Lease Agreement

Hansard Page: CA126

Senator Crossin asked:

Who were the members of the Tiwi negotiating team when you last met?

Answer:

The Tiwi Land Council has formally nominated the following people as the negotiating team

Mr Bill Gray AM (lead negotiator)
Mr Ernie Chin (development consultant)
Mr Greg Orsto (land owner)
Ms Jennifer Clancy (land owner)
Ms Berna Timaeapatua (land owner)
Ms Mavis Kerinaia (land owner)
Mr Michael Long (land owner)
Mr Brian Clancy (Manager, Tiwi Training Board)
(Supported by Middletons Lawyers)

The following people were in attendance on 6 February 2007

Mr Bill Gray AM (lead negotiator)
Mr Walter Kerinaia (senior land owner)
Mr Walter Kerinaia Jnr (land owner)
Ms Jennifer Clancy (land owner)
Ms Berna Timaeapatua (land owner)
Mr Greg Orsto (land owner)
Mr Brian Clancy (Manager, Tiwi Training Board)

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

... Question No: 063

Topic: 99 Year Lease Agreements

Hansard Page: CA126

Senator Crossin asked:

In communities where there will be multiple traditional owners, do they all have to agree to sign the headlease for it to be legal, or are you just looking for a majority decision?

Answer:

The nature of how traditional owner group consent is determined is set out in section 77A of the *Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976*. Where traditional owners are required to have consented, as a group, *“the consent shall be taken to have been given if:*

- (a) in a case where there is a particular process of decision making that, under the Aboriginal tradition of those traditional Aboriginal owners or of the group to which they belong, must be complied with in relation to decisions of that kind—the decision was made in accordance with that process; or*
- (b) in a case where there is no such process of decision making—the decision was made in accordance with a process of decision making agreed to and adopted by those traditional Aboriginal owners in relation to the decision or in relation to decisions of that kind.”*

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

... Question No: 064

Topic: Tiwi Land Council

Hansard Page: CA128

Senator Siewert asked:

Are you reviewing the effectiveness of the spending of your resources for that Land Council and the outcomes for traditional owners in respect to this decision?

Answer:

FaCSIA continues to monitor the activities of the Tiwi Land Council, as it does other Northern Territory Land Councils.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

... Question No: 052

Topic: Indigenous Home Ownership

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Are there any regions in particular that are being focussed on as part of this policy or project development? Please name them.

Answer:

Yes, in the implementation of the Home Ownership on Indigenous Land (HOIL) initiative, the Australian Government is focussing on regions in Western Australia (WA), Northern Territory, Queensland and New South Wales. The specific sites within each region are currently the subject of negotiations with the relevant state and territory governments. Potential sites in other jurisdictions will also be considered.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

... Question No: 055

Topic: COAG Trials in Wadeye

Hansard Page: CA98

Senator Crossin asked:

Could you please advise who bears the costs when contractors building outstations near Wadeye get equipment bogged or damage public roads?

Answer:

No contractors are engaged in building new outstations on behalf of the Australian Government. However, in relation to home building activities undertaken by Indigenous Building Australia, any costs relating to vehicles being bogged or causing damage to public roads that are found to be the fault of a contractor are the liability of the contractor.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

... Question No: 065

Topic: Building a Better Future – Indigenous Housing to 2010 Mid-Term Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

Has the review of this program been completed? If so, has the report been publicly released? If so, can a copy be provided? If not, when will the report be released?

Answer:

The Mid-Term Review report of *Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010* has been completed by the consultant and was presented to the Housing Ministers' Advisory Committee (HMAC) for consideration at its meeting in September 2006.

The Housing Ministers' Advisory Committee (HMAC) tasked the Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing (SCIH) with reviewing the report and providing an analysis. The SCIH's analysis was considered by HMAC at its meeting on 22 March 2007. The Housing Ministers' Conference will consider the report, including whether it should be publicly released, and if so, when.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 187

Topic: CHINS report data

Hansard Page: CA119

Senator Heffernan asked:

Please provide an update of data for a database of population across the north.

Answer:

The information is available in the public domain as follows:

The first link is for the ABS website for the Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey (CHINS) 2001 data; this includes a map which shows the location of all Discrete Indigenous Communities and their usual population, (the ranges are: less than 50, 50–199, 200–499, greater than 500).

<http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4710.0Main+Features12001?OpenDocument>

The second link is for the ABS website for the Census 2001 data; this includes a table showing the usual residential Indigenous population by Indigenous Area and ATSI Region.

<http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/ProductsbyCatalogue/14E7A4A075D53A6CCA2569450007E46C?OpenDocument>

Both of the above sources of information (CHINS 2001 & Census 2001) will be updated by the ABS when they publish new versions of the data in 2007, from their 2006 collections.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 058

Topic: COAG Trials in Wadeye

Hansard Page: CA102

Senator Crossin asked:

How many local Indigenous people have been working on the construction of these houses as trainers or trainees or builders? Are they being employed by these companies or are they on CDEP? Are the people who are currently involved undertaking any formal training?

Answer:

There are three local Indigenous people working on the construction of houses on selected outstations in the Wadeye region.

These are Community Development Employment Program (CDEP) workers whose CDEP payments are being topped up by the contractor.

Local Workers are receiving on the job training but are not currently linked to an accredited course. An assessment of their skills will be undertaken at the end of construction to identify opportunities and linkages to related training courses.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.2

Question No: 054

Topic: Indigenous Home Ownership

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Is your department doing any work with the Cape York Institute in relation to home ownership in the Cape York? If so,

(a) when did your department begin this discussion/ or work with the Institute?

(b) to what extent has the Qld Government been involved with this discussion/ work?

(c) is this for home ownership on Aboriginal land or other type of land?

Answer:

A proposal was received in December 2006, covering options for home ownership on both freehold and Aboriginal land. The department has had several discussions with Queensland Government officials on opportunities for home ownership by Indigenous people on indigenous land and associated land tenure issues.

In relation to home ownership on freehold land an agreement was recently signed that includes options for home ownership on freehold land at Hope Vale.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 076

Topic: Mutitjulu

Hansard Page: CA130

Senator Crossin asked:

Could you please provide an update (November 2006 QoNs 142 & 143) of the cost of the administrator, the cost to date on the appointment of the administrator, both in terms of legal costs and money paid direct to the administrator for services rendered?

Answer:

The cost of appointing the administrator to Mutitjulu Council Aboriginal Corporation, as at 23 February 2007, is \$261,376.49, including both legal costs incurred by the Administrator (\$96,691.17) and money paid to the administrator for services rendered. (The Registrar's legal costs for the legal proceedings are \$240,876.74.)

On 17 December 2006, the Federal Court dismissed the application and ordered that the member pay the costs of the Registrar and the administrator in these proceedings. However, the matter is now under appeal by the applicant, which will incur more costs by the Administrator and the Registrar.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 081

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Was there any comparative document supplied to employees, showing how the AWA would change their current conditions? Where we are talking about complicated, lengthy documents, do you feel such a document should have been supplied?

Answer:

No comparative document was issued to all employees but employees were provided with information statements on the Australian Workplace Agreement (AWA) and Aboriginal Hostels Limited (AHL) Executive met with staff to discuss AWA issues, concerns and comparisons.

AHL has a dedicated AWA officer in place to discuss with individual employees any questions on the AWA process, including a dedicated 1800 contact number and e-mail address.

The AWA officer has provided individuals with comparisons if requested and all employees have the option of having a comparison completed by the Office of Employment Advocate.

No, the information statement provided a simple summary of new conditions and changes to existing conditions such as leave.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 082

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

What kind of consultation process was undertaken in developing the AWA's? Did AHL talk to employees or the union?

Answer:

Aboriginal Hostels Limited's (AHL) Australian Workplace Agreements (AWAs) were developed in consultation with regional managers and other senior managers. All managers had received feedback from various employees in the lead up to developing the AWAs and this feedback was incorporated/considered.

AHL has been in contact with the employees since 10 August 2006 regarding the process, and with the Liquor Hospitality Miscellaneous Union since the 21 August 2006.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 083

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Have AHL made any provision for the negotiation of conditions with individual employees? If so why are all AWA's identical within each classification?

Answer:

All Employee's of Aboriginal Hostels Limited (AHL) have the right to negotiate conditions within their Australian Workplace Agreement (AWA). AHL Employee's receive an AWA offer, the employee then has the option of negotiating their AWA or appointing a bargaining agent to negotiate on their behalf.

AWAs are identical dependent on their position within AHL eg Hostel Manager, Administrative Officer. Individuals then have the opportunity to negotiate changes to AWA conditions with AHL management.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 084

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Are there any guaranteed pay rises in the 2nd and 3rd years of the agreement? Do the employees get any say in the setting of the performance appraisal criteria that will determine if they receive any pay rise?

Answer:

Pay rises of 4 per cent after 12 and 24 months from the lodgement date of the Australian Workplace Agreement (AWA) are based on satisfactory performance, these are not guaranteed.

Individual employees can negotiate their performance indicators as they are part of the AWA and it is negotiable.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 085

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Why does the AWA not contain a classification structure? Is there any rationale for removing the opportunity for employees to increase their wages by advancing up levels in the structure?

Answer:

The Australian Workplace Agreement contains a pay range for each classification. Classifications still exist.

Advancement of level increments under the old structure was based on performance, as this is now linked directly to pay increases there is no longer a need for incremental increases. Employees can still move within the salary range of their classification.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 086

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

What is the rationale for cutting employees maternity leave by two weeks? What is the rationale for cutting employees base annual leave by two weeks, as well as their leave loading?

Answer:

Maternity leave is in line with the *Maternity Leave Act 1973*, which provides 12 weeks full pay or 24 weeks half pay.

Annual leave is in line with the APS standard and the *Workplace Relations Act 1996*. Aboriginal Hostels Limited (AHL) staff had 4 weeks leave prior to the 1998 Certified Agreement. However, employees in remote localities will receive 5 weeks leave a year. Employees who regularly work Sundays as part of their roster will also receive an additional weeks leave. Employees on annual leave still receive 50 per cent of all penalties that their rostered hours attract while on leave. Leave loading provisions in Australian Workplace Agreements are the same as the Certified Agreement.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 087

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

If the majority of the workforce wants their collective agreement re-negotiated, why is AHL denying this request? Is this fair?

Answer:

There was no indication or request from the majority of the workforce for a collective agreement.

The Australian Workplace Agreements offer a fair payrise and good conditions.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

... Question No: 069

Topic: Indigenous Land Corporation

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Does the ILC accept the Department of Finance's interpretation of the new formula "realised real return"?

Answer:

As far as the ILC is aware the Department of Finance has not provided an interpretation of the "realised real return".

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

... Question No: 070

Topic: Indigenous Land Corporation

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

If there has been a dispute about DoFA's application of this formula, how is this dispute being resolved or has it been resolved? What was the outcome of the ANAO audit [referred to above]?

Answer:

As far as the ILC is aware the Department of Finance has not provided an interpretation of the "realised real return". Refer to QoN 069.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

... Question No: 071

Topic: Indigenous Land Corporation

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

How has this reduced budget affected your land acquisition and management programs? Which programs have been scaled back and by how much?

Answer:

The decreased annual allocation that the ILC has received since the new formula came into effect in 2004-05 has not, at this stage, affected the ILC's land acquisition and land management programs.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

... Question No: 072

Topic: Indigenous Land Corporation

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Has the number of property acquisitions decreased? Have you sold any properties as a result?

Answer:

The decreased annual allocation that the ILC has received since the new formula came into effect in 2004-05 has not caused the number of property acquisitions to decrease and the ILC has not sold any properties as a result.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

... Question No: 075

Topic: Indigenous Land Corporation

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Is it common practice for caretakers of ILC properties sign a lease over that property? Has this always been the practice? Are there any caretakers of ILC properties who do not hold a lease over the property?

Answer:

Caretakers on ILC properties are employed directly by the ILC for the express purpose of protecting the property and its assets. Caretakers do not have a lease over the property.

It is assumed that this question pertains to the lease entered into by the ILC with the property's potential title holding body, as part of the ILC's strategy to ultimately grant title of the property to the group. The ILC enters into such a lease, with an associated work plan, for a period of up to three years to allow the group to demonstrate that it has the capacity and commitment to take responsibility for the property and manage it sustainably. The ILC provides appropriate support to the group during this period, monitors progress against the work plan and grants the title once the group has satisfied all requirements.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 077

Topic: Mutitjulu

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Could you please provide an update (November 2006 QoN 145) of the Federal Government funding that has flowed into the Mutitjulu community since the appointment of an administrator?

Answer:

The table below sets out as at 21 May 2007 the Federal Government funding received by the Mutitjulu Community Aboriginal Corporation since the date of the Administrator's appointment:

Date of Offer	Agency	Project	Amount Offered (Excl GST) \$	Term of Offer	Amount Released \$	Note
2 August 2006	FaCSIA	Municipal Services	203,500	9 August 2006 to 31 December 2006	203,500.00	
1 May 2007	FaCSIA	Operational Funding	212,500	1 Jan 07 to 30 June 07	212,500.00	
29 May 2006	Centrelink	Centrelink Agent Services	36,650	1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007	33,058.40	
12 September 2006	FaCSIA	Capital Funding	130,200	One-off	Nil	1
25 September 2006	FaCSIA	Child Care Centre	123,553	1 October 2006 to 30 June 2007	Nil	2
25 August 2006	DCITA	Youth and Recreation	7,645	One-off	Nil	3

Notes

1 Capital Funding

The revised funding agreement for the final capital payment has been executed. The Northern Territory Government has been requested to release the funds it is holding in trust so that final payments can be made. It is expected that the funds will be released in the next 1-2 weeks.

A Notice of Practical Completion of the Child Care Centre was issued by the Project Manager on 17 May 2007.

2 Child Care Centre operations

FaCSIA is conducting a select tender to engage a service provider to operate the long day care service. It is expected that the long day care service will be operational in 2007.

3 Youth & Recreation

The Administrator has advised he is negotiating for the release of these funds and that he is advised by DCITA that the release is imminent.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 078

Topic: Mutitjulu

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Has funding that the administrator was negotiating for long day care and outside school care been finalised and will the programs commence in 2007? Have the trade creditors been paid yet?

Answer:

Capital Funding – Child Care Centre

A revised funding agreement for the final capital payment has been executed. The Northern Territory Government has been requested to release the funds it is holding in trust so that final payments can be made. It is expected that the funds will be released in the next 1-2 weeks.

A Notice of Practical Completion of the Child Care Centre was issued by the Project Manager on 17 May 2007.

Construction of a security fence around the child care centre is required before the centre can be operational. A quote for the work has been obtained and a funding agreement for the Administrator's consideration is in preparation

Operational Funding – Child Care Centre

FaCSIA is conducting a select tender to engage a service provider to operate the long day care service.

It is expected that the long day care service will be operational in 2007.

Outside School Hours Care

FaCSIA has signed a funding agreement with the Central Australian Youth Link Up Service (CAYLUS) to operate the OSHC service until 30 June 2007. The service is operational.

Pre Appointment Trade Creditors

The Administrator advises that he has written to all parties that provided funding to the Mutitjulu Community Aboriginal Corporation (MCAC) in 2005-06, requesting approval to use the funds remaining on hand as at the date of his appointment in payment of MCAC's pre-appointment trade creditors. To date parties have advised that they are not prepared to consent to his using these funds to meet outstanding pre-appointment creditors. FaCSIA is further considering the matter. None of these funding bodies have any legal liability in regard to paying these creditors.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 079

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Can you confirm in a letter to the LHMU dated 5 September 2006, Mr Keith Clarke wrote: 'Aboriginal Hostels Limited (AHL) has decided to offer Australian Workplace Agreements (AWA's) to all eligible employees rather than a collective agreement. This decision is in line with current government Policy?

Answer:

Yes

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 1.3

Question No: 080

Topic: Aboriginal Hostels Limited

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Crossin asked:

Can you also confirm that in a letter to the LHMU dated 9 November 2006, Ms Elaine McKeon, Chairperson of the AHL Board wrote: ‘the issue of implementing Australian Workplace Agreements for all AHL staff is a decision that has been made by AHL management in accordance with Australian Government policy’? Considering these remarks, would you now like to redress your comments made in Senate Estimates on 14 February regarding the influence of the Australian Government on your decision to offer AWAs?

Answer:

AHL’s decision to offer AWAs was in line with the policy parameters for agreement making in the Australian Public Service.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006



PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA - THE SENATE

SENATOR TRISH CROSSIN
LABOR SENATOR FOR THE NORTHERN TERRITORY



Elton Humphery
Committee Secretary
Community Affairs Committee
Department of the Senate
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Elton,

I am writing to request that the Committee seek a correction to the record of information provided to us in an answer from Mr Clarke, from Aboriginal Hostels Limited, on Monday 12th February.

I asked Mr Clarke "Has the Australian Government issued a directive to the management of Aboriginal Hostels Ltd regarding the bargaining for the new collective agreement" (see Hansard transcript page 131).

In reply Mr Clarke replied "The Government did not give us any direction..."

I then asked "So there has been no demand put on you to insist on AWA's rather than a collective agreement?"

Mr Clarke replied "No demand whatever..."

However, I have a copy of a letter sent on 5th September by Mr Keith Clarke, to Mr Tim Ferrari of the LHMWU (the relevant union for AHL workers) in which he states clearly that AWA's will be offered to eligible employees, saying further that "This decision is in line with current Government Policy."

This indicates to me that there most definitely was strong government direction if not direct pressure on AHL to offer AWA's.

A collective agreement could just as well have been offered and negotiated but has not been.

What Mr Clarke told the Committee was therefore not strictly accurate, and needs some clarification for the record.

Yours sincerely,

Senator Trish Crossin

16.2.07

Electorate Office:	PO Box 946	Palmerston NT 0831	tel. 08 8931 0830	fax. 08 8931 0513
Canberra Office:	Parliament House	Canberra ACT 2600	tel. 02 6277 3777	fax. 02 6277 3661
email:	senator.crossin@aph.gov.au		website: www.trishcrossin.com.au	

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006



Australian Government
Aboriginal Hostels Limited

GENERAL MANAGER

Elton Humphery
Committee Secretary
Community Affairs Committee
Department of the Senate
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600



Dear Mr Humphery

In response to Senator Trish Crossin's letter to you dated 16 February 2007 I would like to provide the following clarification.

In my letter of 5 September 2006 to Tim Ferrari of the Liquor Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union I stated: "*Aboriginal Hostels Limited (AHL) has decided to offer Australian Workplace Agreements (AWAs) to all eligible employees rather than a collective agreement. This decision is in line with the current Government Policy.*"

In no way did I mean this to imply that AHL had received any directives or pressure from the Australian Government to offer AWAs rather than a collective agreement. I simply meant that AHL's choice of opting for AWAs was in keeping with or 'in line' with the policy parameters for agreement making in the Australian Public Service.

The decision to offer AWAs was a decision made by AHL's management because AWAs offer more flexibility for the 24 hour 7 day a week operations of our company.

Therefore, my response to the Community Affairs Committee on Monday 12 February in relation to Senator Crossin's question was correct.

Yours sincerely

Keith Clarke
21 February 2007

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

...Question No: 181

Topic: Assets Test

Hansard Page: CA19

Senator Hogg asked:

Are there provisions in the Social Security Act that can currently assist customers who have reached the end of the 12 month assets test exemption for the proceeds of the sale of their former principal residence?

Answer:

The Pension Loan Scheme may assist in circumstances where a person is of age pension age and has been affected by the sale proceeds being assessed as an asset.

Under this scheme, an age pensioner who owns real estate may be able to obtain a loan that will bring their fortnightly payments up to the maximum pension rate. Repayments can be made at any time or the debt can be left, including accrued interest, to be recovered from the customer's estate. The loan is secured against the value of real estate the customer owns and the debt accrues at a low market-related interest rate.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

... Question No: 106

Topic: Personal Helpers and Mentors

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

I note that applications for this program close on Friday 2 March 2007 thus allowing only 27 days for service providers to prepare an application of 30 pages for the first round of competitive selection valued at almost \$44 million of funding across 35 sites. I am concerned that the short time frame from advertisement of funding to close of applications to opening doors will not allow agencies time to find suitable premises, recruit staff, and have in place specific structures for such a program. a) What is the timeframe for applications and establishment of services based on? b) Does FaCSIA believe that this is a realistic timeframe for service providers to be able to undertake the required activity?

Answer:

Timeframes for the first open competitive selection process were based on the commitment to implement the programme in a timely manner. The first funding round of the Personal Helpers and Mentors Programme Demonstration Teams are being specifically sought from applicants that have existing infrastructure in the site, are currently operating and have the capacity to undertake the required activities from May 2007. The selection criteria and agreements with state and territory jurisdictions for demonstration sites prescribe existing capacity.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

... Question No: 107

Topic: Personal Helpers and Mentors

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

I also note that the recruitment of staff in rural and remote areas of Australia is very difficult, and with the development of the Family Relationship Centres appropriate staff have become less available.

- a) Where are the staff likely to come from at such short notice to fill these places?
- b) Are you concerned that PHMP will face difficulties in recruiting appropriately skilled and qualified staff in rural and remote areas?
- c) What measures is FaCSIA taking to address this issue?

Answer:

FaCSIA is aware that it may be difficult to recruit appropriately skilled and qualified staff in some rural and remote areas. Demonstration sites were selected in consultation with all state and territory government as being capable of addressing a range of issues including resourcing. Service providers applying to be Demonstration sites in the first funding round will need to demonstrate how they are going to attract and recruit suitable staff.

FaCSIA has made provision in the programme guidelines to allow service providers in non-metropolitan areas to allocate a proportion of their funding for staff training and development purposes. Other non-FaCSIA Mental Health measures directly address workforce capacity.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

... Question No: 108

Topic: Personal Helpers and Mentors

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

The tender documents state that tendering agencies need to be able to “hit the ground running from May 2007”. Is FaCSIA concerned that this timeframe effectively rules out any new players that may wish to come into the market?

Answer:

The second and future selection process will allow for new players and greater flexibility as the Demonstration site round focuses on sites and providers which are able to “hit the ground running”.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

Question No: 109

Topic: Personal Helpers and Mentors

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

I understand that the next round of applications for the Personal Helpers and Mentors Programme is in late 2007. a) Are these demonstration sites intended to inform enhancements to the model? b) Do you believe that there will have been enough time for substantial data to be collected to flow through to the next round of competitive selection?

Answer:

Demonstration sites are intended to inform the operation of the second round sites. Each round of implementation will inform subsequent rounds. This is an ongoing iterative process.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

... Question No: 110

Topic: Personal Helpers and Mentors

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

I have been informed that FaCSIA have allocated an extra \$125,500 over three years for non metropolitan areas. While this acknowledges differences in costs between metro and non metro sites, I am concerned that it still will not allow for the distances of travel, the reduced likelihood of service availability and of the need to pay higher salaries to attract new staff. a) Does FaCSIA believe that this amount is sufficient to cover the distances of travel, the reduced likelihood of service availability, and of the likely need to pay higher salaries to attract new staff to these areas? b) On what basis were these figures reached?

Answer:

FaCSIA considers funding provided to the Demonstration sites is sufficient. The funding model used for the Demonstrations sites will be monitored on an ongoing basis.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

... Question No: 111

Topic: Personal Helpers and Mentors

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

I have been informed that the locations of the first 35 Demonstration Centres and the areas where clients are to be drawn from (identified by postcode) have been named. a) What research has been done in identifying these postcodes? b) Is FaCSIA aware that some service providers believe these postcodes are not the areas of the highest need areas for their community? c) Is FaCSIA aware of the poverty postcodes work done by Tony Vinson and has FaCSIA consulted with on the identification and selection of suitable target areas?

Answer:

The location of the Demonstration sites is based on a balance of the level of need/demand, including the availability of sufficient state/territory funded support services to enable the Personal Helpers and Mentors Demonstration sites to work successfully.

FaCSIA is aware of the work of Tony Vinson.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

... Question No: 112

Topic: Personal Helpers and Mentors

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Siewert asked:

As part of the tendering process a question and answer website has been created on the FaCSIA website, however I have been informed that this potentially useful initiative it is only being updated every Thursday. a) Is this true? b) Given the extremely short timeframe for the preparation of applications, does FaCSIA believe that this level of response latency is appropriate? c) What measures will FaCSIA undertake to ensure that tenderers are able to access important information and have their questions answered in a more timely manner?

Answer:

FaCSIA considers our responsiveness to questions has been appropriate and timely. The department has committed to update the website every Thursday. Often questions asked require legal, probity or other advice. While it is important to respond quickly, it is critical that the advice is accurate. The website has been updated more frequently where significant numbers of questions were received or a response to a question would be necessary before an organisation could commence an application (such as clarification about whether a particular type of organisation is eligible to apply). Most questions after the first major wave were variations on the initial set and as such were answered in the first week.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Output Group: 2.1

Question No: 088

Topic: Assets Test

Hansard Page: CA16

Senator Stephens asked:

Could you please provide a breakdown by state (excluding WA) of the age pensioners who had reached the end of the 12 month period without completing a new home and had the sale proceeds assessed as an asset for the purpose of the assets test?

Answer:

16 age pensioners in New South Wales, 14 age pensioners in Queensland, 11 age pensioners in Victoria and 9 age pensioners in South Australia reached the end of the 12 month period without completing a new home and had the sale proceeds assessed as an asset in the 12 month period up to October 2006.

The Government introduced amending legislation into Parliament on 29 March 2007 that will extend the assets test exemption period for principal home sale proceeds from 12 months to up to 24 months. Subject to the passage of legislation, the extension will be available, from 1 July 2007, to pensioners who have made reasonable attempts, within a reasonable timeframe, to purchase or construct a new home and have experienced delays beyond their control.

To benefit from the extended assets test exemption period, from 1 July 2007, Centrelink will need to assess a pensioner's circumstances for qualification.

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

Attachment A
Question No: 200

National Disability Advocacy Program

Funded organisations, types of advocacy provided and organisations which are statewide.

	Individual	Self	Citizen	Systemic	Parent/Family	State wide
New South Wales						
Ability Incorporated	X	X		X	X	
Brain Injury Assoc of NSW Inc	X					X
Citizen Advocacy Eastside Assoc Inc	X		X		X	
Advocacy Northwest Inc	X					
Citizen Advocacy Ryde/Hunters Hill Inc	X		X			
Disability Advocacy Network Inc	X	X		X		
Disability Advocacy Service Hunter	X			X		
Illawarra Citizen Advocacy Inc			X			
Intellectual Disability Rights Service Inc	X			X		X
Multicultural Disability Advocacy Assoc Inc (MDAA)	X			X		X
Newell Advocacy Inc	X	X	X	X	X	
People With Disability Australia Inc	X			X		X
Self Advocacy Sydney Inc	X	X		X		
Spinal Cord Injuries Australia Ltd	X			X		
Sydney Regional Aboriginal Corporation Legal Service (IDAS)	X	X		X		
Institute for Family Advocacy and Leadership Development Association	X			X		X
Victoria						
Action on Disability within Ethnic	X			X		X

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

	Individual	Self	Citizen	Systemic	Parent/Family	State wide
Communities						
AMIDA	X	X		X		X
Citizen Advocacy - Sunbury and Districts Inc			X			
Disability Advocacy and Information Service Inc	X			X		
Disability Employment Action Centre (DEAC)	X			X		X
Disability Justice Advocacy Inc	X			X		
Disability Rights and Advocacy Service Barwon Region	X			X		
Gippsland Citizen Advocacy Inc	X	X	X	X	X	
Gippsland Disability Resource Council Inc	X			X		
Grampians disAbility Advocacy Association Inc	X			X		
Headway Victoria	X			X		X
North East Citizen Advocacy Inc			X			
Regional Information & Advocacy Council Inc	X	X		X	X	
Southern Citizen Advocacy Inc	X		X			
Southwest Advocacy Association Inc	X			X		
Villamanta Legal Service Inc	X			X		
Westernport Speaking Out Inc		X				
Victorian Mental Illness Awareness Council Inc (Group Advocacy Service)	X	X		X		
Action for Community Living	X			X		X
Citizen Advocacy Inner East	X		X			
Colac Citizen Advocacy Program	X			X	X	

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

	Individual	Self	Citizen	Systemic	Parent/Family	State wide
Queensland						
Citizen Advocacy South-West Brisbane Incorporated			X			
Independent Advocacy in the Tropics Inc	X			X		
North West Advocacy	X			X		
Queensland Advocacy Incorporated	X			X		X
Queensland Parents for People with a Disability Inc	X			X		X
Rights In Action Incorporated	X			X		
Speaking Up For You (Group) Inc	X					
Sunshine Coast Citizen Advocacy Programme Inc			X			
Western Australia						
Advocacy South West (Inc)	X		X			
Citizen Advocacy Perth West Inc			X			
Citizen Advocacy South Metropolitan Inc	X		X			
Disabled Workers Union	X			X		X
Ethnic Disability Advocacy Centre Inc	X			X		
MIDLAS Inc	X	X		X	X	
People With Disabilities (WA)	X			X		X
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Perth	X					
Individual Disability Advocacy Service	X	X				
Australian Capital Territory						
ACT Disability, Aged and Carer Advocacy Service (ADACAS)	X			X		X

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

	Individual	Self	Citizen	Systemic	Parent/Family	State wide
Advocacy for Inclusion Inc	X	X		X	X	X
Northern Territory						
Disability Advocacy Service	X			X		
NPY Disability Advocacy Project	X			X		
Disability Rights	X			X		

Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Supplementary Estimates, November 2006

South Australia						
Brain Injury Network of South Australia Inc	x	x		x		x
Citizen Advocacy South Australia Incorporated			x			
Disability Advocacy and Complaints Service of SA Inc	x	x		x		x
Family Advocacy Inc				x	x	
Independent Advocacy SA Incorporated	x					x
MALSSA Inc.	x			x		
Tasmania						
Advocacy Tasmania Inc	x			x		x
Citizen Advocacy Launceston Region Inc			x			
Speak Out Assoc of Tasmania (Speak Out)	x	x		x	x	x

Correct as at 12 February 2007

FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

NATIONAL DISABILITY ADVOCACY PROGRAM REFERENCE GROUP

The proposed changes to the National Disability Advocacy Program will be further developed in consultation with stakeholders. To assist the department target and progress the reforms a reference group and consultation committee has been established. They will meet regularly over the coming months and the department will continue to consult more broadly about particular aspects of the reforms as they are being developed.

The reference group has been chosen to represent a wide range of stakeholders but has been kept relatively small to be workable. The eight participants include representatives from several specialist services (both on the basis of disability types and cultural background), different types of advocacy providers (citizen, individual, systemic), a peak body, a disability service provider, a state government, a parent of a person with a disability, and a person with a disability. Metropolitan and rural services are represented.

The representatives are:

- Chris Allison - parent of a person with a disability – Toowoomba
- Mark Greirson – Disability Advocacy Service Hunter – Newcastle
- Lyndall Grimshaw - Brain Injury Australia – Melbourne
- Peta Kierath – Advocacy South West – Bunbury (30% citizen advocacy)
- Linda Maidens – Newell Advocacy – Narrabri/Moree
- Alison Crisp – NSW Department of Ageing, Disability and Home Care – Sydney
- Diana Qian – National Ethnic Disability Alliance – Sydney
- Tom Worsnop - Melbourne City Mission - (not a current advocacy provider but a disability service provider)

A second consultative group has also been established as an additional forum to provide additional input on issues. While this group will not meet face to face it will be invited to comment on the outputs from the main group, and essentially be used as a second sounding board for ideas. This group is comprised of:

- Andrea Gray – Disability Advocacy Network – Wagga Wagga
- Joanne Scott – Indigenous Disability Advocacy Service –
- David Craig – Action for Community Living – Melbourne
- Luke Garswood – People With Disabilities WA – Perth
- Matthew Bowden – People With Disability Australia – Redfern
- Denise Beer – Sussex Street Community Law Service – Perth
- Judith Chernysh – Disability Services Commission – Perth
- Donna Graham – Disability & Aged Information and Advocacy Service - Lismore

The reference group meetings are scheduled for 9 February, 9 March and 4 May 2007. Further meetings will be scheduled if necessary.

FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

PRIVATE PROVISIONS**Disability Support - Future Care Planning Information Package ('Planning for the future: people with disabilities' booklet)**

Funding allocated 2005-06 Supplementary Budget Estimates

	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	Total
Departmental	0.000	2.413	1.062	1.084	4.559
Administered	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total	0.000	2.413	1.062	1.084	4.559

Disability Support - Further consultation and research

Funding allocated 2005-06 Supplementary Budget Estimates

	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	Total
Departmental	0.000	1.063	0.121	0.000	1.197
Administered	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total	0.000	1.063	0.134	0.000	1.197

Disability Support – Assistance for establishing private care arrangements for future care (Mediation and Counselling)

Funding allocated 2005-06 Supplementary Budget Estimates

	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	Total
Departmental	0.016	0.481	0.127	0.379	1.003
Administered	0.000	1.073	1.609	1.807	4.489
Total	0.016	1.554	1.736	2.186	5.492

Disability Support – Trusts and Gifting exemption from assets test (Special Disability Trusts)

Funding allocated 2005-06 Supplementary Budget Estimates (FaCSIA)

	05/06 \$m	06/07 \$m	07/08 \$m	08/09 \$m	Total \$m
Departmental	0.896	5.881	2.519	2.722	12.018
Administered	0.000	19.296	69.560	103.943	192.799
Total	0.896	25.177	72.079	106.665	204.817

Funding allocated 2005-06 Supplementary Budget Estimates (DVA)

	05/06 \$m	06/07 \$m	07/08 \$m	08/09 \$m	Total \$m
Departmental	0.109	0.395	0.154	0.147	0.805
Administered	0.000	1.231	4.440	6.635	12.306
Total	0.109	1.626	4.594	6.782	13.111

FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Assistance for Carers Respite and Information Services for Young Carers

Funding announced in 2004-05 Budget

	04/05 \$m	05/06 \$m	06/07 \$m	07/08 \$m	Total \$m
Departmental	0.214	0.102	0.144	0.108	0.568
Administered – respite	3.255	6.728	6.896	7.068	23.947
Administered – info	0.512	0.525	0.538	0.552	2.127
Total	3.981	7.355	7.578	7.728	26.642

Expenditure

	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	Total
Administered					
<i>Allocated*</i>	3.751	7.127	7.333	7.472	25.683
<i>Spent+</i>	3.735	6.147			9,882

* revised funding following indexation adjustments (Wage Cost Index 2)

+ lower expenditure mainly due to unspent funding returned from the Commonwealth Carer Respite Centres – 06/07 expenditure not available

The 2004-05 Budget provided funding of around \$26.6 million over four years to establish respite and information services for young carers. The package aims to support young carers in managing the challenges they face as part of their caring role.

Young Carers 'at risk' Respite

Funding of \$24.5 million over four years was allocated for the provision of respite services to young carers from 1 January 2005. Funding agreements have been negotiated with the organisations that auspice the 54 Commonwealth Carer Respite Centres.

Information services for Young Carers

Funding of around \$2.1 million over four years has been provided, to implement a number of initiatives such as information, referral and advice services including counselling services specifically targeted at young carers available through the Commonwealth Carer Resource Centre .

Carers Australia has been funded each year to provide the information services for young carers. The Department negotiates with Carers Australia to each year on projects that will be delivered within the funding available. To date this has included a young carer website, primary school education kit, young carer information kit and information products. It is anticipated that a high school education kit will be available shortly.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 096

Topic: Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

What is the department doing to address the recommendations of the Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review to increase access to employment in the Australian Public Service for people with disabilities?

Answer:

Advice is being prepared for the Minister.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 097

Topic: Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Is the department intending to revise the current CDS Performance Reporting Framework for reporting progress in relation to the CDS' objectives to place greater emphasis on the achievement of outcomes as recommended by the Review?

Answer:

Please refer to answer provided to Question on Notice 96.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 098

Topic: Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Is the department going to introduce a monitoring and feedback role within Government to assist departments develop action plans and meet their obligations in terms of reporting progress as recommended by the Review?

Answer:

Please refer to answer provided to Question on Notice 96.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 099

Topic: Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Will the department extend the scope of the CDS to all Australian Government departments, authorities, instrumentalities and trading enterprises to be responsive to the principles of the CDS as recommended by the Review?

Answer:

Please refer to answer provided to Question on Notice 96.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 100

Topic: Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Is the department intending to implement an educative process that informs APS employees, managers and contractors of their roles and responsibilities and obligations in relation to the achievement of the CDS objectives as recommended by the Review?

Answer:

Please refer to answer provided to Question on Notice 96.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 101

Topic: Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Will the department encourage all Australian Government departments to ensure that their disability action planning, recruitment action and workforce modifications identify and take account of the specific needs of people with disabilities, in particular, those from a non-English speaking background, those with multiple/complex disabilities and those with episodic psychiatric disabilities as recommended by the Review?

Answer:

Please refer to answer provided to Question on Notice 96.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 102

Topic: Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Will the department be identifying those departments not complying with the CDS? How will this occur?

Answer:

Please refer to answer provided to Question on Notice 96.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 103

Topic: Commonwealth Disability Strategy Review

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

- a) How does the department monitor agencies for compliance with the CDS?
- b) What will the department do to ensure agencies comply with the CDS?
- c) How does the department deal with complaints of non-compliance?
- d) How will the department continue to promote the CDS?

Answer:

Please refer to answer provided to Question on Notice 96.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 091

Topic: ANAO-CSTDA

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

What measures is the department undertaking to address the recommendations of the Audit of the CSTDA by the Australian National Audit Office?

Answer:

The recommendations of the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) underpin the Australian Government's requirements for the next CSTDA.

The Australian Government has advised states and territories that, as a condition of funding under CSTDA 4, it will require their commitment to: substantial improvement in the transparency and accountability of financial and performance reporting (ANAO Recommendations 1, 2 and 4); a more rigorous and consistent measure of unmet need (ANAO Recommendation 1); and implementation of appropriate quality assurance systems (ANAO Recommendation 5).

Under the current CSTDA, the Australian Government has shown leadership by making substantial efforts to improve the accountability, quality, efficiency and effectiveness of the specialist disability employment services for which it is responsible. This includes the progressive implementation of individualised, case-based funding and the introduction of a legislated quality assurance system.

Improvements to whole-of-government communication have been facilitated through Inter Departmental Committee (IDC) meetings to discuss significant issues regarding the CSTDA (Recommendation 3) on a semi-regular basis.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 092

Topic: ANAO

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

What measures is the department undertaking to measure unmet need for disability services on a national level?

Answer:

The Australian Government has advised states and territories that, as a condition of funding under CSTDA 4, it will require their commitment to develop and report against a more robust and nationally consistent measure of unmet need under CSTDA 4. This work will be carried out in consultation with the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW).

The Australian Government strongly advocated for the Disability Policy Research Working Group to commission further research updating the AIHW's 2002 report on unmet need, *Demand for Disability support services in Australia: size, cost and growth*. The updated report is expected to be finalised in the first half of 2007.

Efforts by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare to measure unmet demand for disability support services to date have been impeded by poor response rates by states and territories, and the lack of comparability between jurisdictions' data. Similar concerns have been reiterated by the Productivity Commission in its 2007 *Report on Government Services*.

The absence of accurate data on unmet need has made it difficult to effectively plan and respond to unmet need in a strategic and coordinated manner. It has also made it difficult to establish the impact of Australian Government's injection of \$700 million to assist states and territories address unmet need in their own areas of responsibility.

The Australian Government has taken the lead in its own areas of responsibility, implementing substantial reform and providing additional funding for both open employment and business services.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 093

Topic: Commonwealth State Territory Disability Agreement (CSTDA)

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

What measures has the department taken to develop a coordinating role so FACSIA “could contribute to disseminating better practices in demand management and quality assurance”?

Answer:

The Australian Government has sought to promote better approaches to managing unmet demand for the disability services funded under the current CSTDA. Most recently it has jointly funded an update of the 2002 AIHW report *Unmet Need for disability services – effectiveness of funding and remaining shortfalls*, which is due to be finalised in the first half of 2007.

As a condition of funding under CSTDA 4, the Australian Government will require a commitment from states and territories to:

- Implement rigorous and consistent quality assurance systems; and
- Develop and report against a nationally-consistent measure of unmet need.

The Australian Government has taken the lead with all its funded disability employment assistance organisations achieving certification against the disability services standards by 31 December 2004 (with organisations’ compliance continuing to be monitored) and through the introduction of individualised, case-based funding to more closely match the support needs of people with disability in employment services.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

...Question No: 094

Topic: CSTDA

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Please provide details of the proposed timetable of the negotiations of the fourth CSTDA?

Answer:

The Minister wrote to his state and territory counterparts to outline the Australian Government requirements for the fourth CSTDA on 13 September 2006.

State and Territory Ministers were not able to accommodate proposed earlier dates for a special meeting of Ministers. As the Minister did not want to delay negotiations, he authorised FaCSIA officials to outline the Australian Government requirements and funding offer at the Disability Policy Research Working Group meeting of 8-9 February 2007 in Adelaide.

A Special Meeting of Disability Ministers was held on 3 April 2007 in Brisbane to discuss the fourth CSTDA. At this meeting, the Minister invited states and territories to evaluate their unmet need and submit the results to the Australian Government for consideration of a plan to address this need on a dollar-for-dollar funding basis. This offer was in addition to the offer already made to provide an extra \$400 million under a new CSTDA multilateral agreement.

After hearing this offer, state and territory Ministers caucused, returned to the meeting and read from a written statement rejecting the proposal. They then closed the meeting.

The Minister has written to his state and territory counterparts, urging them to reconsider his proposal, and to submit their state and territory plans as soon as possible. The Australian Government will continue to work toward having a new agreement in place before the expiry of the current agreement.

Negotiations are continuing at officer level.

ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 090

Topic: Young People in Nursing Homes

Hansard Page: CA 31 & 33

Senator Allison asked:

How many places have been agreed to in the bilateral agreement with the states on moving young people out of nursing homes and into alternative accommodation? Could you also provide a copy of the whole agreement?

Answer:

Targets for achievements across the three objectives of the COAG Younger People with Disability in Residential Aged Care Program have been agreed between the Australian Government and the states and territories.

In total, the program will assist between 853 and 977 younger people with disability across all jurisdictions over five years. This total comprises:

- between 398 and 442 younger people with disability currently in residential aged care, who will be moved into alternative accommodation;
- between 245 and 288 younger people with disability who will be diverted from inappropriate admission to residential aged care; and
- between 210 and 247 younger people with disability for whom residential aged care remains the only available suitable supported accommodation option, who will be provided with enhanced specialist disability services.

Targets are subject to review after 12 months of the program's operation (that is, from July 2007).

A copy of the generic bilateral agreement is attached.

BILATERAL AGREEMENT

BILATERAL AGREEMENT IN RELATION TO HELPING YOUNGER PEOPLE
WITH DISABILITY IN RESIDENTIAL AGED CARE

The Commonwealth of Australia

and

The State of <<state/territory>>

CONTENTS

1.	Interpretation	124
1.1.	Definitions	124
1.2.	Interpretation	127
2.	Overview of the Agreement	127
2.2.	Duration of this Agreement	128
3.	Objectives and Principles of the Programme	128
3.1.	Objectives for the Programme	128
3.2.	Priorities of the Programme	128
3.3.	Principles for implementation of the Programme	129
4.	Responsibilities	130
4.1.	Cooperative responsibilities	130
4.2.	Role of the Commonwealth	130
4.3.	Role of <<state/territory>>	131
5.	National coordination and advisory arrangements	132
5.1.	National coordination arrangements	132
5.2.	Information sharing and media protocol	133
6.	Accountability, evaluation, performance reporting and review	133
6.1.	Accountability	133
6.2.	Overview of national components	134
6.3.	Performance reporting	134
6.4.	Mid term evaluation	135
6.5.	Final evaluation	135
7.	Financial arrangements	135
7.1.	Funding	135
7.2.	Sanctions	136
7.3.	Exemptions	137
7.4.	Repayment of funding assistance and rollover of funds	137
7.5.	Agreement not in place	137
8.	General provisions	137
8.1.	Agreement Managers	137
8.2.	Liaison	138
8.3.	Disputes and non-compliance	138
8.4.	Termination	138
8.5.	Effect of termination	138
8.6.	Extension or variation of this Agreement	138
8.7.	Notice	138
	Schedule 1. National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework	141
	Schedule 2. Financial Arrangements	143
	Attachment 1 to Schedule 2. Financial Acquittal and Guidelines	144
	Schedule 3. <<STATE/TERRITORY>> Implementation of PRogramme	147

BILATERAL AGREEMENT

BILATERAL AGREEMENT IN RELATION TO HELPING YOUNGER PEOPLE WITH DISABILITY IN RESIDENTIAL AGED CARE

Date

This Agreement is dated the day of 2006.

Parties

This Agreement is made between the following parties:

1. The Commonwealth of Australia as represented by the Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (the **Commonwealth**)
2. The <<State of <<state>>/<<Territory>> as represented by the Minister for <<portfolio>> (<<**state/territory**>>)

Preamble

This Agreement is made in the following context:

- A. A new five-year programme (the **Programme**) will begin in July 2006, with funding of up to \$122 million from the Commonwealth and up to \$122 million from States and Territories, and will be implemented in close consultation with younger people, their families and carers. The Programme will be carried out through individual bilateral agreements between the Commonwealth and each State and Territory using the same structure and broadly the same content.
- B. The Programme will include:
 - a. offering younger people with disability in residential aged care facilities a care needs assessment;
 - b. negotiating and providing appropriate alternative long-term care options, where it can be made available and this is what clients choose;
 - c. developing and establishing new services and care options, including improved services within residential aged care facilities; and
 - d. reducing future admissions of younger people with disability into residential aged care facilities.
- C. The aim of the Programme is to create a broader and more flexible approach which has benefits for the Commonwealth and all State and Territory jurisdictions to deliver sustained reductions in the number of younger people with disability in residential aged care. Each bilateral agreement includes reference to agreed targets for reductions in younger people with disability in residential aged care.

- D. The Programme will be managed on a day to day basis by each State and Territory and includes offering younger people with disability in residential aged care:
- a. an assessment of care needs;
 - b. alternative long term care options, subject to client choice; and
 - c. Advocacy Support both at the time of assessment and to negotiate and transition to alternative arrangements.
- E. It is the intention of the Commonwealth, States and Territories, that assuming satisfactory achievement of performance targets in the bilateral agreements, and assuming that a final evaluation of the programme demonstrates the overall success and cost effectiveness of the programme, ongoing funding at the conclusion of the five-year term of this Programme will be rolled into a future funding arrangement.

Operative provisions

In consideration of the provisions contained in this Agreement, the parties agree as follows:

1. Interpretation

1.1. Definitions

1.1.1. Unless the contrary intention appears a term in bold type has the meaning shown opposite it:

ACAT	Means an Aged Care Assessment Team.
AHMAC	Means the Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council.
AHMC	Means the Australian Health Ministers' Conference.
Accommodation Support Services	Means services which provide accommodation to people with disability, and services which provide the support needed to enable a person with disability to remain in their existing accommodation.
Advocacy Support	Means families, carers or advocates who provide support to enable younger people with disability to increase the control they have over their lives through the representation of their interests and views in the community.

Agreement	Means this bilateral agreement.
Agreement Manager	Means an officer nominated by a party as having responsibility for day-to-day management of that party's role under this Agreement.
Business Day	In relation to the doing of any action in a place, means a weekday other than a public holiday in that place.
CDSMC	Community and Disability Services Ministers' Conference.
clients	Means younger people with disability under the age of 65 years.
COAG	Means the Council of Australian Governments.
Commonwealth	Means the Commonwealth of Australia.
Department	Means the department responsible for this Programme in a particular jurisdiction.
DoHA data	Means data from the Commonwealth data cube "Residents" as supplied by the Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing from time to time.
Implementation Plan	Means the plan for detailing expected Programme outcomes in <<state/territory>>, attached as Schedule 3 to this Agreement.
jurisdiction	Where the context permits, means the area of responsibility of the Commonwealth, States, Territories or any of them.
Minister	Means the Minister of a party to this Agreement who is responsible for the administration of the Programme in their jurisdiction. Where appropriate, a reference to Minister may also include a delegate of that Minister.
National Disability Administrators	Means the committee comprised of heads of Departments involved in the administration of the Programme in their jurisdiction, or any successor committee.
National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework	Means the framework set out in Schedule 1 to be finalised by 30 September 2006 in accordance with clause 6.1.4. and

	Implementation Plan.
National Standards or National Standards for Disability Services	Means the National Standards for Disability Services developed by the Disability Service Standards Working Party as amended from time to time.
Objectives	Means the strategic objectives of the Programme as set out in clause 3.1.
parties	Means the Commonwealth as well as the State or Territory that is party to this Agreement.
people with disability	Means people with disabilities attributable to an intellectual, psychiatric, sensory, physical or neurological impairment or acquired brain injury (or some combination of these) which is likely to be permanent and results in substantially reduced capacity in at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. self care/management; b. mobility; or c. communication, requiring significant ongoing and /or long term episodic support and which manifests itself before the age of 65.
Personal Information	Has the same meaning as in the <i>Privacy Act 1988</i> of the Commonwealth.
Principles	Means the principles for implementation of the Programme as set out in clause 3.3.
Specialist Disability Services	Means services or initiatives specifically designed from time to time to meet the needs of people with disability.
State	Means a State of the Commonwealth of Australia.
Territory	Means the Australian Capital Territory or the Northern Territory.
Year	Means a financial year beginning July 1 and finishing the following June 30. “Year 1” means the first Year of this agreement beginning on the commencement date and

finishing on 30 June 2007. Years 2, 3, 4 and 5 refer to subsequent Years over which this Agreement runs.

1.2. Interpretation

1.2.1. In this Agreement, unless the contrary intention appears:

- a. words importing a gender include any other gender;
- b. words in the singular include the plural and words in the plural include the singular;
- c. clause headings are for convenient reference only and have no effect in limiting or extending the language of provisions to which they refer;
- d. words importing a person includes a partnership and a body whether corporate or otherwise;
- e. a reference to dollars is a reference to Australian dollars;
- f. a reference to any legislation or legislative provision includes any statutory modification, substitution or re-enactment of that legislation or legislative provision;
- g. if any word or phrase is given a defined meaning, any other part of speech or other grammatical form of that word or phrase has a corresponding meaning;
- h. a reference to an Item of a Schedule is a reference to an Item in either Schedule 1, 2, or 3 (as appropriate);
- i. the Schedules and attachments form part of this Agreement;
- j. if any conflict arises between the terms and conditions contained in the clauses of this Agreement and any part of a Schedule (or attachment), the terms and conditions of the clauses prevail;
- k. if any conflict arises between any part of a Schedule and any part of an attachment, the Schedule prevails;
- l. a reference to a Schedule (or an attachment) is a reference to either Schedule 1, 2, or 3 (as appropriate) (or an attachment) to this Agreement, including as amended or replaced from time to time by agreement in writing between the parties; and
- m. a reference to writing is a reference to any representation of words, figures or symbols.

2. Overview of the Agreement

2.1.1. This Agreement deals with:

- a. nationally agreed Objectives and Principles for the Programme;

- b. responsibilities of the parties;
- c. planning, coordination and advisory arrangements;
- d. qualitative and quantitative evaluation activities required to support the evaluation of the Programme;
- e. performance management and reporting including a National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework;
- f. development of a performance reporting data set;
- g. arrangements for funding to be provided by the Commonwealth and <<state/territory>> to assist the achievement of Programme Objectives and priorities;
- h. details of the specific implementation environment in <<state/territory>> including the Objectives and priorities of <<state/territory>>.

2.2. Duration of this Agreement

- 2.2.1. This Agreement will commence operation on execution by the Commonwealth and conclude on 30 June 2011, unless earlier terminated or extended in accordance with clause 8.

3. Objectives and Principles of the Programme

3.1. Objectives for the Programme

- 3.1.1. The parties are to focus on three strategic Objectives over the life of this Agreement. These are to:
 - a. move younger people with disability currently accommodated in residential aged care into appropriate supported disability accommodation where it can be made available and if this is what clients choose;
 - b. divert future admission of younger people with disability who are at risk of admission to residential aged care into more appropriate forms of accommodation; and
 - c. enhance the delivery of Specialist Disability Services to those younger people with disability who choose to remain in residential aged care or for whom residential aged care remains the only available suitable supported accommodation option.

3.2. Priorities of the Programme

- 3.2.1. The initial priority of the Programme is to achieve the Objectives in relation to those people with disability aged less than 50 years but should not be limited to this group. Where possible the parties will seek to extend the Objectives to those people with disability aged less than 65 years.

3.3. Principles for implementation of the Programme

3.3.1. The principles adopted by the parties for implementation of the Programme are:

a. *Shared commitment*

Commitment to achieving Programme outcomes is shared between the Commonwealth and all State and Territory governments. It relies on agreed funding, a shared commitment to performance monitoring and evaluation, and a shared commitment to collaboration between jurisdictions.

b. *Service accessibility*

Access to the Programme will not exclude clients from participating in existing complementary Programmes.

c. *Client rights and dignities protected and promoted*

The Programme supports effective charters for younger people with disability including access to appropriate avenues of dispute resolution. These are reflected in the National Standards for Disability Services.

d. *Voluntary client participation*

The Programme will provide appropriate long term care options where they can be made available and this is what the client chooses.

e. *A service system that is efficient and flexible*

Within available resources the Programme will be implemented in a robust and sustainable manner and be able to reform to meet emerging and changing needs without jeopardising existing successes.

f. *Prioritise services*

Programme services should be targeted at prioritising access for younger people with disability in residential aged care who are the most inappropriately housed.

g. *Provision of services within quality frameworks*

Programme services should be provided within all applicable quality frameworks, including the National Standards for Disability Services, by services meeting all relevant quality assurance requirements.

h. *Provision of services in regional, rural and remote areas*

The Programme will consider the most appropriate options within available resources that can be adopted in regional, rural and remote areas of <<state/territory>>.

4. Responsibilities

4.1. Cooperative responsibilities

- 4.1.1. The parties will work to realise the Objectives, Principles and other provisions set out in this Agreement in collaboration with each other and relevant government and non-government stakeholders.
- 4.1.2. This cooperative relationship is guided by:
- a. clear delineation of roles and responsibilities;
 - b. a robust accountability framework requiring achievement of performance outcomes set out in the National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework and the Implementation Plan including a net reduction target for younger people under 50 years with disability in residential aged care in <<state/territory>> over the life of this Agreement; and targets of those to be assisted across the three main Objectives of the Programme over the life of the Programme; and
 - c. policy development that is informed by collaboration and consultation with the Commonwealth, individual younger people with disability in residential aged care and their families, carers or advocates.
- 4.1.3. The parties will work with each other to:
- a. provide leadership for the Programme in their respective jurisdictions;
 - b. ensure transparency and accountability of funding;
 - c. promote the Programme as equitable, efficient and effective and ensure that it complements other programmes assisting younger people with disability;
 - d. encourage reform of the existing system in accordance with the Objectives;
 - e. develop any mutually agreed additional performance measures and targets that may be required from time to time;
 - f. manage, monitor, evaluate and report on the performance of the Programme; and
 - g. disseminate Programme achievements to the public.

4.2. Role of the Commonwealth

- 4.2.1. The Commonwealth's responsibilities under this Agreement are to:
- a. provide a funding contribution to <<state/territory>> for the Programme as set out in this Agreement subject to:
 - i) appropriation of relevant funds by the Commonwealth Parliament and the availability of those funds for the Programme; and

- ii) matching funding from <<state/territory>>.
- b. coordinate national reporting;
- c. review performance information and reporting provided by <<state/territory>> to determine level of progress towards meeting Agreement Objectives;
- d. coordinate a mid term and final evaluation of the Programme in collaboration with <<state/territory>>; and
- e. coordinate with and report to States and Territories on the total amount of funding made available and expended by the Commonwealth under this Agreement.

4.3. Role of <<state/territory>>

4.3.1. The general role of <<state/territory>> under this Agreement is to:

- a. provide a funding contribution to the Programme as set out in this Agreement subject to:
 - i) appropriation of relevant funds by the <<relevant state/territory Parliament>> and the availability of those funds for the Programme; and
 - ii) matching funding from the Commonwealth;
- b. identify policy and strategic priorities consistent with the Objectives, Principles and priorities outlined in this Agreement;
- c. apply the National Standards for Disability Services as the core standards applicable to all services receiving funding under this Agreement and work towards continuous improvement in services. This does not limit application of <<state/territory>>' quality standards and requirements over and above the National Standards for Disability Services;
- d. report on performance under this Agreement to enable monitoring and assessment by the Commonwealth;
- e. report to the Commonwealth on the total amount of funding made available and expended under this Agreement;
- f. ensure contractual arrangements require that Programme services are provided in accordance with the Objectives, the Principles (particularly the National Standards for Disability Services), all relevant Commonwealth and <<state/territory>> disability legislation and are responsive to local needs and circumstances;
- g. maintain existing efforts and Programmes in relation to people with disability to the greatest extent possible;

- h. ensure that all Programme services are provided in accordance with applicable quality frameworks by people meeting all relevant quality assurance requirements; and
- i. develop responses in collaboration with clients, families, carers and advocates for younger people with disability in residential aged care and use their best endeavours to meet performance requirements set out in this Agreement.

4.3.2. The specific role of <<state/territory>> under this Agreement is to:

- a. implement the Programme on a day to day basis through the relevant government and non government disability agencies;
- b. offer an assessment of care needs to younger people with disability who are permanent residents of residential aged care;
- c. carry out assessments of younger people with disability currently in, or at risk of entering, residential aged care;
- d. negotiate and provide appropriate alternative long term care options, within the context of client choice and Programme parameters;
- e. develop and establish new services and care options where suitable long term care options or services are not suitable or available;
- f. arrange and support the transition of younger people to the new care options;
- g. ensure the management of the ongoing care of younger people in the new care options;
- h. monitor Programme outcomes and report these to the Commonwealth;
- i. share information with other jurisdictions and the disability sector on the performance of new models of care;
- j. liaise with key stakeholder groups including representatives of younger people with disability in residential aged care, their families and carers during the implementation of the Programme; and
- k. develop appropriate linkages between Specialist Disability Services and other specialist or generic service systems that are important to the quality of life of people with disability.

5. National coordination and advisory arrangements

5.1. National coordination arrangements

5.1.1. The Commonwealth is responsible for coordinating the national aspects of the Programme. To assist the Commonwealth in this role, the National Disability Administrators will provide annual performance reports to the Commonwealth for discussion at the CDSMC.

- 5.1.2. The National Disability Administrators will provide a report to the AHMAC for integration into consolidated reporting by AHMC to COAG on the health reform package announced on 10 February 2006.

5.2. Information sharing and media protocol

- 5.2.1. In relation to significant Programme developments including new services and pilots where appropriate, the parties agree that announcements, including media releases, will be made jointly.
- 5.2.2. The Minister of each party may decline involvement in an announcement in which case the remaining party may make the announcement on their own behalf.
- 5.2.3. In addition, each party will:
- a. acknowledge the financial and other support received from the other party in all publications, promotional materials and promotional activities relating to this Agreement; and
 - b. respond to requests for information and advice from the other party's Agreement Manager. In relation to such a request, the party in receipt of the request will make its best efforts to respond within 10 Business Days or such other time as may be negotiated.

6. Accountability, evaluation, performance reporting and review

6.1. Accountability

- 6.1.1. The Programme will operate within the National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework of agreed national outcomes and performance indicators at Schedule 1 and through the Implementation Plan in Schedule 3.
- 6.1.2. The National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework and Implementation Plan provide the basis for reporting and evaluation for the Programme. <<state/territory>> commits to report against these. The parties acknowledge that the National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework and Implementation Plan are part of an overall strategy designed to more effectively measure progress towards results sought and report on outcomes accomplished.
- 6.1.3. The parties will report from the first Year of this Agreement against the nationally consistent set of indicators identified in Schedule 1.
- 6.1.4. The final National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework will be developed by the Commonwealth on the basis of the framework issues set out in Schedule 1. This will be refined in collaboration with each State and Territory to agree a final National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework for

incorporation in Schedule 1 in each bilateral agreement. The parties will work to ensure that the final National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework is agreed by 30 September 2006.

- 6.1.5. The parties acknowledge that performance indicators and measures used under this Agreement are evolving and dynamic and agree to work on the development of additional performance indicators and measures throughout the life of this Agreement where it is agreed that they are necessary. In particular, the parties will review performance targets as set out in clause 6.3.2.

6.2. Overview of national components

- 6.2.1. The national components comprise:
- a. annual reporting against agreed milestones and targets set out in the National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework at Schedule 1;
 - b. a mid term evaluation commenced by 30 June 2008 and completed by 31 December 2008; and
 - c. a final evaluation to be commenced in January 2010 and completed by 31 October 2010.
- 6.2.2. The Commonwealth will coordinate the mid term and final evaluations in collaboration with <<state/territory>>.
- 6.2.3. The focus of the evaluations is to demonstrate linkages between Programme activities and reductions in the number of younger people with disability in residential aged care.

6.3. Performance reporting

- 6.3.1. The following timetable identifies the reports to be provided by <<state/territory>> to the Commonwealth and the dates by which these reports are to be provided.

Performance Reporting Timetable

Date	Annual Reporting	Additional notation
1 July (2007-2010)	Provide an updated workplan (see Schedule 3).	The first workplan is due at the date of commencement. This is to be updated annually
31 August (2007-2011)	Report on the implementation of the Programme in an annual report	Separate line item reporting for this Programme
31 August (2007-2011)	Provide implementation plan progress reports.	
31 October (2007-2011)	Provide data on Programme outcomes.	Based on mutually agreed data collection

31 December (2007-2011)	Submit financial acquittal for the Programme.	Schedule 2
Commencing 2008	Provide input into the mid term evaluation.	
Commencing 2010	Provide input into the final evaluation.	
January-March (2007-2012)	Release of a national report to Ministers and a national public report.	

6.3.2. Performance targets as set out in the National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework and Implementation Plan will be reviewed by the Commonwealth in collaboration with <<state/territory>> at the end of Year 1. Revised targets where necessary will be agreed between the parties and included in the National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework and Implementation Plan by 31 December 2007.

6.4. Mid term evaluation

6.4.1. An initial assessment of the Programme will be undertaken by the Commonwealth in collaboration with <<state/territory>> in the mid term evaluation. This evaluation will assess whether the Programme is achieving the outcomes of this Agreement including in respect of the:

- a. Objectives;
- b. agreed interim performance targets; and
- c. State/Territory specific issues in each bilateral agreement.

6.5. Final evaluation

6.5.1. A final evaluation will be undertaken by the Commonwealth in collaboration with <<state/territory>> by 31 October 2010 to advise on the way forward for funding of the Programme beyond the 2010-2011 Year. The final evaluation will focus on how well the States and Territories have achieved a net reduction in the number of younger people with disability in residential aged care, and the numbers of younger people with disability assisted under the three Objectives of the Programme, over the life of the Programme. The evaluation will also include consideration of the overall success and cost effectiveness of the Programme, the impact on quality of life for clients participating in the Programme and the achievement of performance targets by each State and Territory.

7. Financial arrangements

7.1. Funding

7.1.1. The Commonwealth will, subject to Parliamentary appropriation of funding for this purpose, and in accordance with the terms of this Agreement, make payments of funding to <<state/territory>> as set out in Schedule 2.

- 7.1.2. Subject to the <<relevant state/territory Parliament>> appropriation of funding for this purpose, and in accordance with the terms of this Agreement, <<state/territory>> will provide funding for the Programme as set out in Schedule 2.
- 7.1.3. The Commonwealth will make payments of funding in equal monthly amounts in advance, or as otherwise agreed between the relevant Ministers. Monthly payments will be made in the last week of each month for the following month (for example, funding for October will be made in the last week of September) except for the payment for July, which will be made in the first week of July.
- 7.1.4. The parties may, subject to the agreement of the relevant Ministers, add to their respective funding of the Programme by the inclusion of an additional amount of funding. This additional amount is not required to be matched by the Commonwealth (if made by <<state/territory>>) or by <<state/territory>> (if made by the Commonwealth).
- 7.1.5. <<state/territory>> will only use Commonwealth funding under this Agreement for the purposes of the Programme and in accordance with all requirements of this Agreement.
- 7.1.6. <<state/territory>> will not commit any part of the Commonwealth's funding for expenditure under this Agreement, where that expenditure is likely to occur after the end of the term of this Agreement unless prior approval from the Commonwealth Minister has been granted.

7.2. Sanctions

- 7.2.1. Where the reporting by <<state/territory>> does not meet the requirements of this Agreement, the Commonwealth may impose financial sanctions on <<state/territory>>.
- 7.2.2. In particular, financial sanctions may be imposed for:
- a. failure by <<state/territory>> to demonstrate reasonable relevance, accuracy and completeness in relation to administrative, performance and financial information required under this Agreement; and
 - b. failure by <<state/territory>> to report agreed administrative, performance and financial information in a timely manner as required in this Agreement, as may be determined at the discretion of the Commonwealth Minister.
- 7.2.3. Sanctions will take the form of a reduction of Commonwealth funding to <<state/territory>> by up to 5 per cent of the Commonwealth's Programme funding allocation for <<state/territory>> for the Year in which the failure occurred. The final amount of the sanction, up to the maximum allowed, will be determined at the discretion of the Commonwealth Minister.

7.2.4. <<state/territory>> will be notified if any sanctions are to be applied by the Commonwealth. In such a case, the amount of the sanction will be deducted from the Commonwealth funding available in the Year after the conduct which triggers the sanction.

7.3. Exemptions

7.3.1. The Commonwealth may grant an exemption on a case by case basis regarding late submissions of reports or information required under this Agreement. Any request for extension will be provided by <<state/territory>> to the Commonwealth with reasonable time for consideration by the Commonwealth Minister. A decision on whether to grant an exemption will be made by the Commonwealth Minister at the Commonwealth Minister's discretion.

7.4. Repayment of funding assistance and rollover of funds

7.4.1. Where Commonwealth funding assistance provided under this Agreement remains uncommitted at the end of this Agreement, <<state/territory>> will repay to the Commonwealth so much of that amount as the Commonwealth Minister advises in writing to the Minister of <<state/territory>>. Alternatively, a rollover of funds to the following Year where the Programme continues may be agreed at the discretion of the Commonwealth Minister.

7.4.2. Where in the reasonable opinion of the Commonwealth, funding assistance provided under this Agreement has been spent other than for the purposes of this Agreement, <<state/territory>> will repay to the Commonwealth so much of that amount as the Commonwealth Minister advises in writing to the Minister of <<state/territory>>.

7.5. Agreement not in place

7.5.1. Where no agreement is reached between the Commonwealth and <<state/territory>> for the provision of funding after the expiry of this Agreement, the parties will not be required to continue the provision of funding. As part of this process, the parties will cooperate to negotiate relevant transition arrangements.

8. General provisions

8.1. Agreement Managers

8.1.1. The Agreement Managers for each party are set out in the Implementation Plan at Schedule 3. Where the details of a party's Agreement Manager changes, that party will advise the other party of the change.

8.2. Liaison

8.2.1. The Agreement Managers will liaise in relation to the performance and reporting requirements of this Agreement. The parties agree to provide, in a timely manner, administrative, financial and performance information as may reasonably be required in connection with this Agreement.

8.3. Disputes and non-compliance

8.3.1. The parties will use their best endeavours to resolve any dispute that arises in the cooperative spirit of the Agreement and in an expeditious manner.

8.3.2. Agreement Managers will attempt to resolve any disputes under this Agreement by negotiation, including escalation of any dispute as necessary to senior management and then Ministerial level if the dispute cannot be resolved. The relevant Ministers involved in resolving the dispute will consult together with a view to resolving the matter amicably between them.

8.3.3. Where the relevant Ministers are unable to resolve the dispute, and where one party is of the opinion that the other party has not complied with any one or more of its obligations under this Agreement, then that party may, at its discretion terminate its involvement in this Agreement with notice in writing to the other party.

8.4. Termination

8.4.1. Either party, may on provision of twelve calendar months prior written notice to the other, terminate this Agreement. During the notice period, the parties will cooperate to negotiate relevant transition arrangements.

8.5. Effect of termination

8.5.1. From the date of termination, the Commonwealth is not required to make any further payments including any remaining payments for the Year in which the Agreement is terminated.

8.6. Extension or variation of this Agreement

8.6.1. This Agreement may be extended or otherwise varied by agreement in writing between the parties.

8.7. Notice

8.7.1. A notice under this Agreement is only effective if it is in writing, and addressed to the relevant Agreement Manager as specified in Schedule 3.

8.7.2. A notice is to be:

- a. signed by the person giving the notice and delivered by hand; or

- b. signed by the person giving the notice and sent by pre-paid post; or
- c. transmitted by the person giving the notice by electronic mail or facsimile transmission.

8.7.3. A notice is deemed to be effected:

- a. *if delivered by hand* – upon delivery to the relevant address; or
- b. *if sent by post* – upon delivery to the relevant address; or
- c. *if transmitted electronically* – upon actual receipt by the addressee.

8.7.4. A notice received after 5.00 pm, or on a day that is not a Business Day, is deemed to be effected on the next Business Day.

SIGNATURES

SIGNED for and on behalf of the)
COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA)
by the Minister for Families, Community)
Services and Indigenous Affairs in the)
presence of)_____

Witness

Date: _____

SIGNED for and on behalf of)
THE <<STATE OF <<state>>/<<territory>>))
by the Minister for <<relevant portfolio>>)
in the presence of)_____

Witness

Date: _____

As outlined in clause 6.1.4. of the terms and conditions, the final National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework for the Programme will be developed by the Commonwealth and refined in collaboration with all States and Territories by 30 September 2006 for inclusion in Schedule 1. The National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework will be based on the framework issues set out below.

The National Evaluation and Performance Reporting Framework will determine performance indicators and measures, source and methods of collection of performance information, timing and regularity of reporting information to support the performance reporting framework, including but not limited to outcome and quantitative reporting across activities relating to the three Objectives of the programme as defined at Clause 3.1. including services to individual younger people with disability, systemic service planning and development, and Programme monitoring. Data collection processes would provide input to and support:

- a. the mid term evaluation;
- b. the final evaluation;
- c. administrative and public reporting;
- d. input to the Productivity Commission's Report on Government Services;
- e. Reporting against Programme implementation targets and activities as outlined in the Implementation Plan at Schedule 3.

Performance reporting will be drawn from state and territory case management records, assessment records, DoHA data, client surveys, service data, financial acquittals and Implementation Plan progress reports.

Collection of service data to support performance reporting for the Productivity Report on Government Services and other agreed purposes will be based where possible on National Minimum Data Set service types as defined in the Commonwealth State Territory Disability Agreement National Minimum Data Set Collection (CSTDA NMDS Collection). The collection of service data relating to this Programme will be developed in collaboration with all States and Territories and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and in accordance with an agreed framework for protecting the privacy of any Personal Information involved.

Service type performance data would include the following:

- Number of consumers vs numbers of services
- Average cost per unit of service
- Average cost per service user
 - Proportion of total <service type> users by
 - Primary disability
 - Location
 - Cultural and Linguistic Diversity (CALD)
 - Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI)
 - Age
- Total <service type> user numbers/time
 - Proportion per 1000 of total jurisdiction population/location
 - Proportion of total jurisdictional target group population/location.

Evaluation and performance reporting will include measures and indicators of effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness of the programme against performance outcomes, processes, outputs, inputs and targets across the three Objectives of the Programme.

Financial Arrangements

Subject to appropriation of funds by the Commonwealth Parliament and the <<relevant state/territory Parliament>>, the following amounts will be made available by each party:

Annual YPIRAC Funding Split 2006-2011

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Total
	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual	Annual	2006-2011
Commonwealth	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<<state/territory>>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Attachment 1 to Schedule 2. Financial Acquittal and Guidelines

Financial Acquittal Guidelines for Preparing Financial Information

Expenditure

Expenditure relating to the Programme should be based on the Financial Data Collection Manual Version 2.2 (Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision – Disability Services Working Group, July 2001) or subsequent updates and other provisions including those specified as part of the Australian Accounting Standards.

That is:

- a. Expenditure should be reported on an accrual basis;
- b. Expenditure should be categorized into recurrent funding for accommodation support, community support, community access, respite, other support services and capital expenditure.
- c. Administration costs should be identified for each area of expenditure, consistent with the Financial Data Collection Manual Version 2.2 definitions of the above categories.
- d. Administration expenditure should be based on central and regional office administration and policy and Programme support costs relating to disability services only. It should not include administration expenditure of Government or non-Government disability service providers (this should be included in service-related expenditure); and
- e. Expenditure should include non-cash items, including superannuation, workers compensation, payroll tax, long service leave entitlements and depreciation.
- f. Where expenditure information relating to the Programme cannot be provided on a comparable basis across jurisdictions (and is not consistent with the Financial Data Collection Manual Version 2.2 or subsequent updates), then jurisdictions should work together to ensure that expenditure information is comparable by the conclusion of this Agreement.

Revenue

State/Territory and Commonwealth contributions should be reported on an accrual basis.

Where State/Territory appropriations are made on a cash basis, then State/Territory contributions should be adjusted to include non-cash items (such as depreciation) to arrive at an approximate accrual amount.

Each State and Territory jurisdiction should report the amount of indexation funding provided separately.

'Other revenue' should be reported in a manner consistent with the Financial Data Collection Manual Version 2.2, that is:

should include client contributions to Government service providers, and client contributions to non-Government service providers that are in turn paid to Government; and

should not include proceeds from the sale of fixed assets, client contributions or other revenue (for example, from fundraising) that is retained by non-Government service providers to offset the cost of service provision.

Auditing

Financial information relating to the Programme is to be based on audited financial statements of the respective agencies. Note that information relating to the Programme does not need to be audited separately.

Reporting

Financial acquittals relating to the Programme should be forwarded to the Commonwealth within six months of the end of each financial year.

Where the funding is expended by more than one State or Territory Government Department, then separate auditing by the State auditors-general is required.

*FOR THE JURISDICTION OF []
FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE [200x]*

Revenue **(\$000s)**

Australian Government Contribution:

 YPIRAC Base Funding

 Bilateral Funding

State/Territory Contribution:

 YPIRAC Base Funding

 Bilateral Funding

 Indexation and supplementation adjustment

Funding carried forward (from previous years)

Total Government

Other Revenue – specify

Total Revenue

Expenditure **(\$000s)**

Capital expenditure

Accommodation Support

Community Support

Community Access

Respite

Other Support Services – specify

Administration

Total Expenditure

Surplus/Deficit

Certification

I certify that:

- the revenue and expenditure outlined above represents a true and fair view of the financial position; and
- the funds were provided in accordance with the Agreement.

[signed by Delegated

Officer].....

<<STATE/TERRITORY>> Implementation of PProgramme

Schedule 3

Implementation Plan : <<state/territory>> Younger People with Disability in Residential Aged Care Programme

Implementation arrangements reflect the individual circumstances in each jurisdiction. For further information, contact the disability services agency/ies in the jurisdiction(s) of interest to you.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 95

Topic: Commonwealth State Territory Disability Agreement (CSTDA)

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Can the department provide the Commonwealth's contribution to the CSTDA and the contribution of each of the States and Territories for the financial years 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004, 2004/2005, 2006/2007 ?

Answer:

Contributions to the CSTDA by the Commonwealth for each of the years requested are as follows:

2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (estimated)
693,654,321	790,409,949	825,519,193	909,550,863	974,926,878	1,045,301,440	1,090,762,000

Contributions to the CSTDA by state and territory governments for each of the years requested are as follows:

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
	\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (actual)	\$ (estimated)	\$ (estimated)
NSW	566,987,000	637,898,000	730,358,881	810,448,778	879,370,505	736,600,000	812,100,000
VIC	588,470,000	621,873,000	731,758,427	791,638,205	887,559,846	774,036,000	791,065,000
QLD	192,324,000	209,004,000	238,548,271	276,466,893	329,269,549	422,939,000	467,832,000
SA	110,689,000	117,963,000	124,421,702	137,178,086	161,973,604	163,124,000	151,560,000
WA	167,095,000	184,753,000	199,701,780	215,873,552	234,186,929	252,914,000	271,118,000
TAS	47,956,000	55,517,000	59,432,453	63,572,851	71,897,316	77,500,000	79,900,000
NT	9,900,000	12,000,000	17,336,186	18,792,302	22,833,322	18,869,250	19,227,766
ACT	24,688,000	30,716,000	39,853,753	44,580,548	49,388,663	50,165,000	51,465,000
TOTAL	1,708,109,000	1,869,724,000	2,141,411,453	2,358,551,215	2,636,479,734	2,496,147,250	2,644,267,766

In all instances, information for the financial years 2000-01 to 2004-05 represents actual expenditures by each jurisdiction, as acquitted annually in accordance with reporting requirements under the Commonwealth State Disability Agreement (CSDA) for 2000-01 and 2001-02, and the CSTDA (2002-03 to 2004-05). Information for the 2005-06 financial year is as above for the Australian Government, but is based on the agreed commitments from states and territories, as final acquittals have not been received from all jurisdictions. Information for 2006-07 represents estimates of expenditure based on the agreed commitments of each jurisdiction under the provisions of the CSTDA.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 113

Topic: Young People with Disability in Residential Aged Care

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

How much funding has been allocated to each state and territory through the COAG YPINH program?

Answer:

The total amounts committed over five years by the Australian Government under the bilateral agreements establishing the COAG Younger People with Disability in Residential Aged Care Program are as follows:

Jurisdiction	Total \$ Amt
New South Wales	\$40,638,871
Victoria	\$30,126,251
Queensland	\$23,866,328
South Australia	\$9,202,265
Western Australia	\$12,108,870
Tasmania	\$2,900,649
Northern Territory	\$1,215,056
Australian Capital Territory	\$1,941,708

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 114

Topic: Young People with Disability in Residential Aged Care

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

What is each state and territory planning to do with the funding? How many YPINH will be accommodated away from residential aged care as a result?

Answer:

COAG agreed that the Younger People with Disability in Residential Aged Care Program would be implemented on a day to day basis by state and territory governments from July 2006, subject to the terms of a bilateral agreement between the Australian Government and each state and territory government.

Bilateral agreements reflect the three elements of the program, as agreed at COAG. These are:

- move younger people with disability currently accommodated in residential aged care into appropriate supported disability accommodation where it can be made available and if this is what the clients choose;
- divert future admission of younger people with disability who are at risk of admission to residential aged care into more appropriate forms of accommodation; and
- enhance the delivery of specialist disability services to those younger people with disability for whom residential aged care remains the only available supported accommodation option.

Targets for achievements across the three objectives of the COAG Younger People with Disability in Residential Aged Care Program have been agreed between the Australian Government and the states and territories.

In total, the program will assist between 853 and 977 younger people with disability across all jurisdictions over five years. This total comprises:

- between 398 and 442 younger people with disability currently in residential aged care, who will be moved into alternative accommodation;
- between 245 and 288 younger people with disability who will be diverted from inappropriate admission to residential aged care; and
- between 210 and 247 younger people with disability for whom residential aged care remains the only available suitable supported accommodation option, who will be provided with enhanced specialist disability services.

Targets are subject to review after 12 months of the program's operation (that is, from July 2007).

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 115

Topic: Young People with Disability in Residential Aged Care

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

What is the timetable for implementation in each of the states and territories?

Answer:

COAG agreed that the Younger People with Disability in Residential Aged Care Program would be implemented on a day to day basis by state and territory governments from July 2006, subject to the terms of a bilateral agreement between the Australian Government and each state and territory government.

All states and territories have now signed a bilateral agreement, signifying that implementation of the Program has commenced in all jurisdictions.

COAG determined that the Program would operate for a period of five years, ending on 30 June 2011.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 116

Topic: Young People in Residential Aged Care

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Has the survey undertaken by Australian Healthcare Associates been completed? If so, what are the main findings, and a copy be provided? If it is not completed, when is it expected to be completed?

Answer:

The project referred to is expected to be completed in the near future.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 117

Topic: Young People in Residential Aged Care

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

Please provide a copy of the National Disability Administrators' research project "Younger People with High Clinical Needs".

Answer:

The project referred to is expected to be completed in the near future.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 118

Topic: Young People with Disability in Residential Aged Care

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

What interagency protocols have been developed between the departments of Health and Ageing (DoHA), Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaCSIA) and Commonwealth Carers concerning the implementation of the COAG YPINH initiative? Is the interdepartmental collaboration underway?

Answer:

This question was asked at Supplementary Estimates in November 2006 (Questions on Notice 216), with an answer detailing interdepartmental collaboration around this initiative.

The information provided at that time remains relevant.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.2

Question No: 119

Topic: Young People with Disability in Residential Aged Care

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

What policy and planning activities are currently underway that will prevent young people being accommodated in residential aged care in the future?

Answer:

The COAG Younger People with Disability in Residential Aged Care Program represents a significant commitment by both levels of government to address this issue.

A major element of the Program, agreed with all state and territory governments, is diverting future admission of younger people with disability who are at risk of admission to residential aged care into more appropriate forms of accommodation.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.3

Question No: 105

Topic: Special Disability Trust

Hansard Page: CA 44

Senator McLucas asked:

What is the average cost of administering a trust of this nature?

Answer:

It is not possible to determine an average cost as this information is not available. Charges vary between states, public and private trustees and for individual trusts as a result of a number of factors including the value of the trust, the type of assets and investments involved and the extent of legal/tax/financial planning involved.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.3

... Question No: 121

Topic: Special Disability Trust

Hansard Page: Written

Senator McLucas asked:

How many Special Disability Trusts have been established since the announcement of the \$230 million measure in October 2005?

Answer:

As at mid January 2007, two Special Disability Trusts have been established. The government does not have a target for the number of trusts to be established as take-up of the trust option is dependent on individual and family circumstances.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.3

Question No: 120

Topic: Special Disability Trust

Hansard Page: written

Senator McLucas asked:

Can the Department detail the funding that has been expended on the Special Disability Trust to date?

Answer:

The total cost of the Special Disability Trusts includes the additional costs to a range of special appropriations. The total amount of these costs will be dependent on each individual's circumstances, including considerations such as the final nature of the trust, the amounts gifted to the trust, and the effect of any exemption on individual circumstances. It is therefore not possible to provide meaningful data on costs to date.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.4

Question No: 122

Topic: National Youth Week

Hansard Page: CA 48

Senator Moore asked:

Can you please provide the last 5 years expenditure for the National Youth Week? Are there any ways of looking at where the expenditure went?

Answer:

National Youth Week became a Department of Families Community Services and Indigenous Affairs portfolio responsibility in 2002–03. As a consequence of this we are only able to provide information for the previous four financial years.

Table 1
Total expenditure by item (figures are GST inclusive).

	AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE	PAYMENTS TO STATE AND TERRITORY GOVERNMENTS
2002–03	\$429,600	\$245,300
2003–04	\$583,800	\$242,000
2004–05	\$554,800	\$249,400
2005–06	\$475,827	\$265,658

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.4

Question No: 185

Topic: National Youth Roundtable

Hansard Page: CA48

Senator Moore asked:

Please provide a list of consultancies that the department has let do work in the Youth Area for, and on behalf of the Youth Bureau?

Answer:

Details of consultancies (value over \$10,000) undertaken by the department that relate to its youth responsibilities are published annually in the Appendices section of the Annual Report.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.4

Question No: 186

Topic: National Youth Roundtable

Hansard Page: CA45

Senator Moore asked:

Is there any data available about where the applications for National Youth Roundtable come from, whether or not there is a preponderance from one area or not?

Answer:

2001 ABS Census data indicates that the percentage of applicants for National Youth Roundtable (Roundtable) 2007 from each state/territory broadly reflects the total percentage of young people, aged 15 to 24 years, in each state/territory population (see table below).

State	2007	National Population Demographics (15-24)
NSW	32%	33%
VIC	19%	25%
QLD	19%	19%
SA	11%	8%
WA	10%	10%
TAS	4%	2%
ACT	3%	2%
NT	2%	1%

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.5

Question No: 020

Topic: Active campaigns within the Minister's portfolio – Violence Against Women. Australia Says No. campaign.

Hansard Page: Written

Senator Moore asked:

In attachment A – a list of active campaigns that were tabled in on 30 October 2006 at Senate Estimates, what were the actual costs for those which have been completed as relevant to each department and agency in the Minister's portfolio?

Answer:

The Violence Against Women. Australia Says No. campaign commenced in 2004 and is still running.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.5

... Question No: 123

Topic: National Women's Safety Taskforce

Hansard Page: CA 51

Senator Moore asked:

Is the Indigenous Women's gathering paper a public document?

Answer:

The paper prepared for the National Indigenous Women's Gathering was a background document for participants and has not been released.

Senate Community Affairs Committee
ANSWERS TO ESTIMATES QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
FAMILIES, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
2006-07 Additional Estimates, February 2007

Output Group: 2.5

Question No: 124

Topic: Women's Emergency Services Network & the National Association of Services Against Sexual Violence

Hansard Page: CA 51 & 52

Senator Moore asked:

Please provide the former funding arrangements (prior to FaCSIA) for the Women's Services Network and the National Association of Services Against Sexual Violence.

Answer:

These organisations were funded under Partnerships Against Domestic Violence (\$50m from 1997-98 to 2004-05) and the National Initiative to Combat Sexual Assault (\$23.2m from 2001-02 to 2004-05). These two programs were rolled into the Women's Safety Agenda which is funded for \$75.7m over four years from 2005-06 to 2008-09.