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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of policy:** | **Fairer Paid Parental Leave** |
| Person requesting costing: | Senator 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): | 30 June 2016 – Adam Bandt<http://greens.org.au/workplace>  |
| **Description of policy** |
| Summary of policy (as applicable, please attach copies of relevant policy documents): | * increasing PPL entitlement for the primary carer to 26 weeks paid at the carer’s replacement wage capped at $100,000;
* allowing two weeks of primary carer’s entitlement to be accessed by the partner at their replacement wage (thus reducing the primary carer’s entitlement to 24 weeks);
* If the parent is the nominated primary carer, they would be able to receive the lower of:
	+ their actual wage, or
	+ the higher of: the mother’s actual wage or the National Minimum Wage.
* including superannuation contributions on all Commonwealth PPL payments at the Superannuation Guaranteed (SG) rate;
* allowing Commonwealth, State and Territory public sector employees to choose to take either their negotiated workplace parental leave entitlement or the proposed PPL scheme (but not both);
* administering the payments through the Department of Human Services, rather than the employers of the recipients.
 |
| What is the purpose or intention of the policy? | To replace the current paid parental leave scheme with a fairer more comprehensive scheme. |
| **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. | No |
| 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? | Demand driven |
| 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? | No, however interaction with state public sector schemes. |
| Are there associated savings, offsets or expenses?If yes, please provide details. | No |
| Does the policy relate to a previous budget measure? If yes, which measure? | Yes, the current paid parental leave scheme and the existing Commonwealth and State public sector parental leave schemes. |
| If the proposal would change an existing measure, are savings expected from the departmental costs of implementing the program? | Associated departmental costs are expected to continue under the new scheme.  |
| Will the funding/program cost require indexation?If yes, list factors to be used. | No |
| **Expected impacts of the proposal** |
| 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) |   |   |   |   |
| Fiscal balance ($m) |   |   |   |   |
| 1. 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)? | See the PBO’s “Post-election report of election commitments – 2013 Election” |
| Has the policy been costed by a third party?If yes, can you provide a copy of this costing and its assumptions? | No |
| What is the expected community impact of the policy?How many people will be affected by the policy?What is the likely take up?What is the basis for these impact assessments/assumptions? | See the PBO’s “Post-election report of election commitments – 2013 Election” |
| **Administration of policy:** |
| Who will administer the policy (for example, Australian Government entity, the States, non‑government organisation, etc)? | The Australian Government through the Family Assistance Office. |
| Please specify whether any special administrative arrangements are proposed for the policy and whether these are expected to involve additional transactions/processing (by service delivery agencies). |   |
| Intended date of implementation: | 1 September 2016 |
| Intended duration of policy: | Ongoing |
| Are there transitional arrangements associated with policy implementation? |  No |
| List major data sources utilised to develop policy (for example, ABS catalogue number 3201.0). |   |
| 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.* |