

**Senate Standing Committee on Education Employment and Workplace  
Relations**

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE  
Budget Estimates 2013-2014**

**Agency - Fair Work Ombudsman**

**DEEWR Question No. EW0088\_14**

**Senator Abetz asked on 3 June 2013, Hansard page 26**

*Refers to previous DEEWR Question No EW0897\_13.*

**Question**

**FWO - Relates to EW0897\_13 (PayCheck Plus calculator)**

Senator ABETZ: ..... Let me move on to the PayCheck Plus calculator in which you kindly provided some information to question 0897\_13. We were told that the total amendments were, as I understand it, 223. Mr Campbell: That is correct. Senator ABETZ: Yes, for the period 1 July to 31 December 2012. Changes that were made as a result of Fair Work Commission variations, I think we can give that a tick as being appropriate. What I am really wanting to find out is other, human error. We have got the last classification 'other (human error not elsewhere classified)'. I am just wondering where else human error might be classified. Let's go to the second category—correction to or creation of phased rates of pay. When it is a correction to, is that potentially because of human error? If it is going to be a creation of phased rates of pay, one assumes that emerges out of the modern award or whatever that another date has been reached for another transitional provision to come into force which would be, if I might say, in the same category as amendments as a result of Fair Work Commission variations, or not? Mr Campbell: Yes. In my understanding that would be a new coupling of a classification under a pre-modern award and a modern award. I accept that the way that is coupled together with the correction to one of those couplings is different obviously from the creation of a new model. Senator ABETZ: Yes. When you are dealing with all these awards with all these transitional provisions it stands to reason that not everything will be 100 per cent correct, but I would have thought we would try to have a key performance indicator to minimise the human errors in these, and the figures that I have been provided do not necessarily tell me which ones are as a result of changes, Fair Work Commission ruling, or another transition coming in, and those that were actually occasioned by human error. Mr Campbell: Can we have another crack at providing you these responses on notice?

**Answer**

*The Fair Work Ombudsman has provided the following response.*

- There are currently over 135 000 individual base rates of pay included in the Fair Work Ombudsman's (FWO) pay tools.
- The FWO made 223 corrections to the pay tools during the period 1 July 2012 to 31 December 2012.

- Of those corrections, 110 were not attributable to an error made by the FWO. These corrections can be categorised as follows:

<b>Type of Correction</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>
Fair Work Commission variations	18
Additional Information added to the tools to enhance search results	17
Editorial changes to wording or descriptions within the tools	20
Amendments were made where ambiguities existed with respect to interpretation issues (often following discussion with industry parties).	55

- The remaining 113 corrections were attributable to errors made by FWO officers and can be split into the following categories:

<b>Type of Correction</b>	<b>Occurrence</b>
Correction to a phased rate of pay due to Award mapping	7
Officer input error correction	91
Amendment to a Pay and Conditions Guide	8
Other	7