Policy costing request—during the caretaker period for a general election

Name of policy:	Ending compulsory income management		
Person requesting costing:	Senator Richard Di Natale		
Parliamentary party:	Australian Greens		
Date of request to cost the policy:	1 July 2016		
Note: This policy costing request and the response to this request will be made publicly available.			
Has a costing of this policy been requested under Section 29 of the Charter of Budget Honesty (ie from the Treasury or the Department of Finance)?	No		
Details of the public release of this policy (Date, by whom and a reference to that release):	Announced by Australian Greens Senator Rachel Siewert 24 June 2016: http://greens.org.au/content/media-releases/greens-announce-plans-reverse-income-management; http://greens.org.au/sites/greens.org.au/files/20160620%20Reversing%20income%20management.pdf		
Description of policy			
Summary of policy (as applicable, please attach copies of relevant policy documents):	The proposal would remove all forms of compulsory income management including: The cashless debit card, including not proceeding with the third trial site Other groups subject to income management under the following mechanisms: Case-by-case measures: Vulnerable welfare payment recipients measure Child protection measure Supporting people at risk measure Compulsory income management in Cape York Membership of a class measures: Vulnerable (youth triggers) Disengaged youth (NT) Long term welfare (NT) Infrastructure will be retained as needed for individuals currently voluntarily undertaking income management, while removing requirements for individuals who have not entered income management voluntarily.		

What is the purpose or	To remove compulsory income management.			
intention of the policy?	To remove compaisor, meaningement			
What are the key assumptions that have been made in the policy, including:				
Is the policy part of a package? If yes, list the components and interactions with proposed or existing policies.	Part of the broader inequality package – greens.org.au/inequality			
Where relevant, is funding for the policy to be demand driven or a capped amount? If a capped amount, are the costs of administering the policy to be included within the capped amount or additional to the capped amount?				
Will third parties (for instance the States/Territories) have a role in funding or delivering the policy?	-			
If yes, is the Australian Government contribution capped, with additional costs to be met by third parties, or is another funding formula envisaged?				
Are there associated savings, offsets or expenses? If yes, please provide details.	-			
Does the policy relate to a previous budget measure? If yes, which measure?	Includes reversal of the increased spending in the 2016-17 Budget measure Cashless Debit Card – third trial site			

If applicable, what are the estimated costs each year? If available, please provide details in the table below. Are these provided on an underlying cash balance or fiscal balance basis?

Estimated financial implications (outturn prices)^(a)

	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20
Underlying cash balance (\$m)	65	-	-	-
Fiscal balance (\$m)	65	-	-	-

(a) A positive number for the fiscal balance indicates an increase in revenue or a decrease in expenses or net capital investment in accrual terms. A positive number in the underlying cash balance indicates an increase in revenue or a decrease in expenses or net capital investment in cash terms.

What assumptions have been made in deriving the expected financial impact in the party costing (please provide information on the data sources used to develop the policy)?	
Has the policy been costed by a third party?	-
If yes, can you provide a copy of this costing and its assumptions?	

What is the expected community impact of the policy?	Individuals and communities will benefit from no longer having a punitive and ineffective policy imposed on them.
How many people will be affected by the policy?	
What is the likely take up?	
What is the basis for these impact assessments/assumpti ons?	
Administration of policy	· /:
Who will administer the policy (for example, Australian Government entity, the States, non-government organisation, etc)?	Commonwealth
Please specify whether any special administrative arrangements are proposed for the policy and whether these are expected to involve additional transactions/processin g (by service delivery agencies).	Eligibility assessments as for existing income management measures.
Intended date of implementation:	1 September 2016
Intended duration of policy:	Ongoing.
Are there transitional arrangements associated with policy implementation?	Yes – prior to 1 September 2016, there will be communication to ensure individuals are aware that compulsory income management is ceasing.
List major data sources utilised to develop policy (for example, ABS catalogue number 3201.0).	-

PBO Policy costing request—during the caretaker period for a general election

Are there any other	-
assumptions that need	
to be considered?	

NOTE:

Please note that:

The costing will be on the basis of information provided in this costing request.

The PBO is not bound to accept the assumptions provided by the requestor. If there is a material difference in the assumptions used by the PBO, the PBO will consult with the requestor in advance of the costing being completed.