

**SENATE COMMUNITY AFFAIRS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
BUDGET ESTIMATES – 31 MAY 2018
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
1	SQ18-000063	Telephony – abandoned calls	Watt	<p>a) Senator WATT: So are the 14 million answered a subset of the 23.379 million successful? Ms Brill: Yes, they are. Senator WATT: And the four million 'abandoned' are not included in 'successful'? Ms Brill: Correct. I could take on notice the abandoned and get you an answer while we're here just to make sure we're absolutely correct. <i>[page 68]</i></p> <p>b) Senator WATT: So it's possible that that 23.3 million successful does include some abandoned calls? Ms Leon: This means they got through. Senator WATT: They got through the electronic system. Ms Brill: Successful means that they were answered by a customer service officer or they completed an activity in the IVR. So they did something within the IVR and completed their business and then hung up. Senator WATT: So they pressed a button or something like that? Ms Brill: That's right. Senator WATT: And the way you monitor that someone successfully completed an activity through the IVR, the electronic system, is because you press 1 for this, 2 for that and 3 for that? Ms Brill: We can extrapolate the data of the activities that occur in the IVR. Senator WATT: You actually follow them all the way through to ensure that they did complete what they set out to do? Ms Brill: Correct. But there will be some that may abandon within the IVR. I will get an absolute definition on those abandons, because we get a combination of those abandoning before they even start an IVR transaction potentially if they get an info message. There are those who may abandon within the IVR. I will get that exact definition for you. <i>[page 69]</i></p>
2	SQ18-000065	Telephony – abandoned call case studies	Siewert	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Have you interrogated the link between the abandoned calls and the wait times? I would argue that 21 minutes and 12 seconds is also a long time to wait before you get your call answered. Ms Brill: As the secretary answered, there actually isn't a direct correlation. I would be happy to provide a case study and some examples of abandons to provide senators with some more information. We could take that on notice. Senator SIEWERT: That would be useful. <i>[pages 70-71]</i></p>
3	SQ18-000067	Telephony – answered calls in	Watt	<p>a) Senator WATT: In the year to date, the figure for the number of calls answered is 14</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
		2016-17		<p>million. That's what the table tells us.</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Do we have a comparable figure up to 31 March 2017?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: No. We would have to take that on notice. [page 72]</p> <p>b) Senator WATT: Can we step through each category? Stick with the average speed of answer. In fact, we might go to the average speed of answer and the busy signals on this chart. I would be interested in getting the comparable figures for 31 March 2017 for each of these categories, if you have them, so we can track where things are improving or getting worse.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I am sorry. We have figures for the full financial year of 2016-17 but we haven't got the figure as at 31 March 2017. We can certainly get that on notice. It's just that we haven't brought that with us for this estimates. [page 73]</p>
4	SQ18-000069	Telephony – income reporting	Siewert	<p>a) Senator SIEWERT: What are the details for earnings reporting?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Details, as in what does it mean?</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Are you able to provide the number of successful calls, answered, abandoned and average speed of answer?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: We'll have to take that on notice. [page 77]</p> <p>b) Senator SIEWERT: I want to ask whether you could take on notice all those details for the myGov online support process.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Certainly. [page 77]</p>
5	SQ18-000072	Sex and Gender Recognition Guidelines	Rice	<p>Senator RICE: I have a few questions to ask about the implementation of the government guidelines on recognition of sex and gender. How has the department implemented them?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay. I want an update as to what you've done to implement the guidelines in terms of both the combination of databases and forms for ensuring that people's gender identity is able to be accurately and appropriately recorded and what training and other support you have rolled out within the agency.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator RICE: Are there any other agencies, then, within your portfolio?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Australian Hearing is the only portfolio agency. I don't think they are appearing this estimates.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Do you know whether they are compliant with the guidelines?</p> <p>Ms Leon: We don't have that information immediately to hand. We are just seeing if we can find out while we're at the table. [pages 77-79]</p>
6	SQ18-000073	Call Centre Enhancement Pilot - evaluation	Siewert	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Can you describe to me the outcomes from that evaluation? You're committing public money to new call centres outside Centrelink that are separate to Centrelink on an evaluation of a trial that no-one is allowed to see.</p> <p>Ms Leon: The pilot had two aims. The first was to see whether increasing capacity through a</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>provider but using the Department's systems and processes was possible—whether it would work and whether we could do it. The second was to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the model. The independent evaluation concluded that both those aims were achieved.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: What criteria did you use?</p> <p>Ms Leon: So the measures assessed—I think I covered some of these at earlier estimates—were things like costs, productivity, customer satisfaction, call transfers. It was a range of measures of both effectiveness of the calls and efficiency of the service.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Surely that data could be made publicly available for us all to be able to make our own judgements?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Well, it has gone to cabinet. In accordance with usual protocols, it's not usual to release cabinet-in-confidence material.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Is the raw data available? You don't have to give us commentary on the report.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I have to take that on notice. I don't have that with me. <i>[page 79]</i></p>
7	SQ18-000076	Call Centre Enhancement Pilot – transferred calls	Siewert	<p>a) Senator SIEWERT: Do you have data, then, on the number of calls transferred from the Serco centre to Centrelink staff?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: We do have data, but we don't have it with us at the moment. As we touched on before, the Serco staff are part of our workforce. We just report on the productivity of that moving forward, with the paper beside this. As part of the input into that holistic data, I'm pretty sure we can provide you some greater granularity on the calls, as you asked for before, to those particular lines that Serco are doing. We can add in some additional criteria.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: So additional criteria is how many were transferred over the period of the trial.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: We should be able to do that. <i>[page 80]</i></p> <p>b) Senator SIEWERT: I'm trying to find out, once they are answered and if they were transferred, how long it took for them to be dealt with.</p> <p>Ms Leon: We probably will be able to extract some of that. <i>[page 80]</i></p> <p>c) Mr Jackson: So putting it back to the issue of transfers that are within their control and transfers that are not within their control.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Sorry?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: It comes to the point of identifying transfers that are in Serco's control and transfers that are not within their control.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: If you can take that up for those three lines, that would be appreciated. <i>[page 80]</i></p>
8	SQ18-000078	Call Centre Enhancement Pilot - KPMG evaluation	Patrick	<p>a) Senator PATRICK: Can you please provide to the committee a copy of the contract [to KPMG] and, in particular, the area where you pointed out to KPMG that its dominant purpose was for submission to cabinet or any other documentation that would support your</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>claim, please?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I think it's unlikely we would have put that in a public tender. Usually we don't reveal in public tenders what we need to take to cabinet.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Yes. But you might have put it in the—</p> <p>Ms Leon: I'm happy to take on notice what the documentation is, but I would say it's unlikely we would have put that on a public tender document.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: No. I'm talking about the contract to KPMG. [page 80]</p> <p>b) Senator PATRICK: Can you provide some evidence that the report was in fact intended at birth for the purpose of submission for cabinet?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I'll take it on notice. Of course, sometimes the commissioning of reports occurs as a result of a cabinet decision, in which case the very commissioning of it might be cabinet-in-confidence as well. But I'll take it on notice and see what I can find. [page 81]</p> <p>c) Senator PATRICK: You would be aware that the cabinet handbook anticipates this sort of situation, which is why it normally requires, when you commission something, to state that it is for the purpose of cabinet. You will be aware, hopefully, that just because a report goes to cabinet doesn't make it cabinet-in-confidence. It really centres around the dominant purpose test. Can you please re-examine the report to make sure that it wasn't simply attached to a cabinet submission?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes. [page 81]</p>
9	SQ18-000081	Telephony – call wait times	Watt	<p>a) Senator WATT: What is the longest waiting time for a call in the year to date?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I think we provided that in answer to a question on notice. I will see if I can find it. [page 83]</p> <p>b) Senator WATT: Do you have current figures for the number of calls taking longer than 30 minutes to answer?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Longer than 30 or longer than 60?</p> <p>Senator WATT: That is longer than 60, I think. What I am after now is longer than 30 or 30 and longer.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: We can take it on notice. We don't have it.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Can you take it on notice? Can you come back to me on notice with a breakdown by payment type of those year to date figures?</p> <p>Ms Leon: It probably won't be by payment type. It will be by line.</p> <p>Senator WATT: What I mean is the categories.</p> <p>Ms Leon: Those lines. Those categories. [page 84]</p> <p>c) Senator WATT: Could you please provide details of the monthly average call waiting time for the period from 1 January 2018? When will you have figures up until 31 May?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: We will have to wait until 31 May, which is today.</p> <p>...</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>Senator WATT: Could you please come back with figures on the monthly average waiting time?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WATT: I think by that I mean broken down by month.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Between 1 January 2018 until 31 May 2018 by payment type, smart centre and master program. <i>[page 84]</i></p>
10	SQ18-000083	Telephony – Cleveland Report	Watt	<p>Senator WATT: You mentioned earlier that some of the changes you've been making are based on a report from a US consultant, Mr Brad Cleveland. Could you table a copy of his report, please?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I will take it on notice. I know the government is still considering parts of it and hasn't decided about the release of the report. I'll take it on notice and see what we can do. <i>[page 85]</i></p>
11	SQ18-000085	Call Centre Enhancement Pilot - options	Watt	<p>Senator WATT: What I'm really interested in is whether options were presented to government, including outsourcing and employing staff internally? Do you know the answer to that?</p> <p>Ms Leon: No. I don't know. I am pretty certain that this was the result of a cabinet deliberation, so I may be limited in how much I can get back to you about.</p> <p>Senator WATT: I'm sure the—</p> <p>Ms Leon: If it was a cabinet deliberation, I'm sure you know that when you go to cabinet, you usually do set out the pros and cons of a range of options. I imagine that that would have occurred.</p> <p>Senator WATT: I'm sure that the end decision was probably a decision of cabinet. What I'm interested in knowing is whether effectively ministers said, 'We think we need to outsource some work'; whether the department undertook some policy work to deal with the problems you had around call waiting times et cetera and flagged that you could go this way or that way and the government chose this way; or whether that was not even done and the one decision was made.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I'll take it on notice. It's not always as black and white as that either, I might say. <i>[page 86]</i></p>
12	SQ18-000087	Call Centre Enhancement Pilot - staff	Watt	<p>a) Senator WATT: What KPIs are staff in the Serco pilot held to?</p> <p>Mr Horsley: The same KPIs as us.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Exactly the same as your own?</p> <p>Mr Horsley: They do exactly the same training as our staff. They have the same policies and same processes and work to the same KPIs.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Without going through them one by one, is there somewhere I can refer to see what those KPIs are?</p> <p>Mr Horsley: They are the ones mentioned earlier around quality—</p> <p>Ms Leon: Customer satisfaction, adherence to schedule, transfer rates.</p> <p>Mr Horsley: Unscheduled leave.</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>Ms Leon: Unscheduled leave.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Can you table for us the performance against those KPIs in the pilot to date?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I should say that when we say KPIs, they are not budget KPIs in that sense. They are just internal data measurements, yes.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Yes. So just as you expect your staff to answer calls within a certain amount of time or customer satisfaction or whatever quality—</p> <p>Ms Leon: We measure it in any event, yes. The only actual KPI is the 16 minutes average speed of answer. That's a KPI that we staff to.</p> <p>Senator WATT: You call them standards.</p> <p>Mr Horsley: Performance criteria is the way we describe it.</p> <p>Ms Leon: Performance criteria, yes.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Okay. So the same performance criteria apply to Serco staff as to your internal staff?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Yes. I think I've taken on notice for Senator Siewert the performance against those standards. <i>[pages 87-88]</i></p> <p>b) Senator WATT: What would be the comparable cost of employing those 250 on an internal basis?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I think I did go through this at a previous estimates to say that we can tell you what our staffing costs are. But to tell you what the comparable total cost would be would require a level of attribution that I don't think we could easily do.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms Leon: I will take on notice the attribution. The Department of Finance provides guides about how much of your overheads you can attribute to staff. We may be able to get back to you with a figure that won't be precise but will give you a degree of—</p> <p>Senator WATT: I think it's a reasonable question to try to work out whether it's a cost effective project or not.</p> <p>Ms Leon: It will give you a degree of comparison, yes. <i>[page 89]</i></p> <p>c) Senator WATT: But there will be 1,000 additional operators engaged throughout outsourcing. Did the Department undertake policy work prior to the announcement that led to that decision?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator WATT: Did the advice provide alternatives to government, one of which was outsourcing? There may have been other alternatives as well.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I'll have to probably take that on notice together with the earlier one. It may be that the answer to the earlier question deals with that issue. If we had already canvassed a range of options in the earlier advice to government, we may not have needed to canvass them again in coming back to it.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Ultimately, it was the decision of government. Did the government consider</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>alternatives to outsourcing prior to settling on outsourcing? Ms Leon: I will take that on notice. Senator WATT: You are taking that on notice? Ms Leon: I think those two questions are intrinsically connected and I may need to answer them together. <i>[page 91]</i></p> <p>d) Senator WATT: Have you got any figures about the attrition rates or retention rates of the Serco staff and how they compare to in-house staff? <i>[page 96]</i></p>
13	SQ18-000088	Call Centre Enhancement Pilot - KPMG Evaluation	Siewert	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Did KPMG engage in any further work on the evaluation of the existing pilot or this process? Mr Horsley: KPMG have been engaged with advisers but not to do any more evaluations. They are to advise us on things like the procurement process. Senator SIEWERT: And how much is that? Mr Horsley: I would have to take that on notice. Senator SIEWERT: Can you take that on notice? Ms Leon: We have provided that at a previous estimates. Senator SIEWERT: So it is that same contract? Mr Horsley: It would be an extension of the contract. Ms Leon: So we probably haven't given the answer to the extension. Senator SIEWERT: So you've basically extended their contract to cover this procurement process. Is that correct? Mr Horsley: As advisers, yes. Senator SIEWERT: Can you tell me when their contract is to? Mr Horsley: I would prefer to come back on notice. I could give it to you, but I may not be exactly accurate. <i>[page 93]</i></p>
14	SQ18-000086	Departmental staffing – ASL cap	Watt	<p>a) Senator WATT: In the policy work that has been undertaken that led to these decisions to outsource, has the ASL cap and the constraints that that provides been a factor? ... Senator Watt: Is it fair to say that the reduction in the ASL is at least one factor that has caused the Department to look to outsourcing as a way of delivering services? Ms Leon: I would have to take on notice the extent to which that was part of the consideration. <i>[page 97-98]</i></p> <p>b) Senator WATT: Agencies are under significant financial pressure as their ASL cap and their staff numbers are continually reduced. The way they're getting around it to meet the demand for services is turning to outsourcing, labour hire, contracting and other forms of insecure work. What is the benefit to the public? Leave aside the impact on the workers, which I have serious concerns about. What is the benefit to the public in continuing to pay for people to meet service demands but choosing a less secure and oftentimes more</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>expensive way to deliver those services? Senator Fierravanti-Wells: I'm happy to take that on notice. This is a question— Senator WATT: I've been hearing that a lot today. Senator Fierravanti-Wells: I'm happy to do that. Insofar as Secretary Leon has indicated, human services delivers services on behalf of other departments. They are tasked with delivering a whole range of different budget measures throughout the budget. They respond accordingly. Insofar as this department is concerned, that is my response to your question. In relation to the broader question, I'm happy to take that on notice. Certainly insofar as Minister Keenan has to add to it, I'm happy to augment that with further information. <i>[page 98]</i></p>
15	SQ18-000084	Debt recovery – Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention)	Siewert	<p>a) Senator SIEWERT: In terms of the recoupment of debts under OCI, do you have any line of sight on the number of people who have had their tax garnished for repayment—those that have come off income support? Ms Harfield: We don't have separate figures for tax garnisheed in relation to particular measures. I will just see if I have garnishee figures at all. If not, I will take it on notice. Senator SIEWERT: What I'm after is, how many people have and what's the average value of that? And how many are having their wages garnished? <i>[page 101]</i></p> <p>b) Senator SIEWERT: In terms of the 2017-18 MYEFO measures, there was \$580 million reduction in savings from not proceeding with components of the strengthening the integrity of the welfare system and better management of social welfare system. What are those components? Mr McNamara: We'd have to take that on notice. Senator SIEWERT: Could you take that on notice? Mr McNamara: Yes. Senator SIEWERT: And if there's more than one component, can you break down how much comes from each one? The components and their value, I suppose is your way of putting that. Mr McNamara: We're happy to do that. <i>[page 102]</i></p> <p>c) Senator SIEWERT: Do you keep records of the gender breakdown of the debts that are raised—in other words, how many men and women there have been? Mr Storen: We do have gender breakdown information. I recall we may have provided some of that previously. I don't have it with me at the moment, but we can take it on notice. Senator SIEWERT: Could you take it on notice in terms of the numbers and the average debt? Mr Storen: We can definitely do the former, because we have done that before. Depending on the constraints around data, we'll try and do the second part for you. <i>[page 102]</i></p>
16	SQ18-000082	Departmental staffing	Pratt	<p>Senator PRATT: I want to ask about staff reductions. In terms of the ASL cap, we've covered some of these and you have talked about your natural attrition rate. As we understand it, the government has identified staff reductions for DHS of about 1,280 staff. Will they be targeted or</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>will they be by natural attrition or a mixture or both?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Ordinarily we lose about 1,800 to 2,000 staff by natural attrition anyway.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: But do you lose those in particular areas?</p> <p>Ms Leon: That would be our first port of call. Secondly, ASL numbers include ongoing as well as non-ongoing staff, so amongst the options we have is to consider whether to extend non-ongoing contracts when they cease. A third option we have is to increase or decrease the rate of casual usage, because our casuals count as ASL as well. Which of those it's likely to be will depend upon the particular area once we've allocated the ASL and the budget to the groups within the department, because each of them have different workforce needs and drivers. So once each of the deputy secretaries gets their allocation of both budget and ASL, which I anticipate will occur before the end of the financial year so they know what they're starting the new year with, each of them will have to look at their existing workforce and what their best workforce mix is, and then make decisions about whether natural attrition or non-extension of temporary contracts is going to be sufficient to meet the target. That's pretty normal. We do that every year.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: This is a bit out of scope in terms of the time for answering questions on notice, but I don't know if on indulgence it's possible for you to report what that looks like back to the committee at the time that it happens?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Chair, do we know what the date will be for the return of questions on notice? Has that been set?</p> <p>CHAIR: Questions should be provided by 8 June, and answers need to come back on 16 July.</p> <p>Ms Leon: We should have allocated the budget by then. If you ask that question on notice we can get back to you within the notice period.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: We'd like to know where you've applied your ASL and where there are any staff reductions.</p> <p>Ms Leon: We'll answer to the best of our knowledge at that point. <i>[page 103]</i></p>
17	SQ18-000080	Child Care support	Pratt	<p>a) Senator PRATT: That's right; it will be all means tested. How will you go about means testing dual incomes within two households where they don't currently have an interaction with the department? I can see how you can means test it for the purposes of lower income households, which were therefore eligible for the greater of the two levels of subsidies we currently have. Because in order to qualify for a Family Tax Benefit or whatever, you've got to have both incomes through the system. But, if you don't qualify for that, how are you means testing in shared care?</p> <p>Ms Leon: In order to qualify for it at all, every household that wants to receive the new childcare subsidy has to go online and fill in the means test.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: No. For example, I have to put in my childcare assessment. I'm a co-parent, but I currently pay all the childcare bill, and my co-parent just repays me. But I was asked for my income and my income only.</p> <p>Ms Rule: It's proportioned based on the amount of care that each parent has.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: That's right. You didn't ask me what proportion of care I have when I</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>completed that online form.</p> <p>Ms Rule: I can't speculate, obviously, on individual circumstances. We're happy to take on notice and give you the detailed policy on how those decisions are made. <i>[page 107]</i></p> <p>b) Senator PRATT: How would you know the shared-care arrangements of any person that's filling out that form if they're over your current income thresholds for family tax benefit?</p> <p>Ms Rule: As with all our payments, the obligation is on the recipient to give us that information that we need to make a decision.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: When I filled out this form, nowhere was there any expression of an obligation to me to explain what my household arrangements were for shared care. I responded to the letter from Centrelink, from the Department of Human Services, asking me to disclose my income. I disclosed my income and my income only, because that's all I was asked to do. Nowhere was I notified that I might be applying for something that I'm not eligible for, because previously my whole family was eligible for the rebate at the previous rate. So how are you going to fix this problem? ... How are you going to implement it to make sure that someone like me doesn't over claim?</p> <p>Ms Leon: We've built the system to implement the policy of DSS, so we may need to take on notice and, between us and DSS, work out how to answer that question, because it sounds like it's partly a policy question. <i>[page 108]</i></p> <p>c) Senator PRATT: But how do you know who's paying the bill? How do you know whether the people paying the bill are all in the same household and with one family income, or whether there are family incomes across more than one household paying for that bill?</p> <p>Ms Rule: As I said, I'm happy to take it on notice and give you the detail of how we are making determinations across households where there's shared care.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: What advice are you currently giving someone like myself in this situation?</p> <p>Ms Rule: Again, I'm happy to take it on notice and give you the information that we've given to our staff who are operating the phones and the information that's on our website and stuff about that issue. <i>[page 109]</i></p>
18	SQ18-000079	Debt – appeals to the AAT	Siewert	<p>a) Mr Storen: From 1 July 2016 to 31 March 2018, 450 customers with a debt raised through the online system have appealed to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal's first review, or what we call AAT1.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Have there been any on the second?</p> <p>Mr Storen: Yes. For the same time period, July 2016 to March 2018, 49 customers have further appealed their AAT1 decision to the second review.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: What were the 49 cases then?</p> <p>Mr Storen: They're the 49 customers who went to the second review. I don't have a number of those that have been finalised ...</p> <p>...</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>Senator SIEWERT: So, of the 49, it looks like only one has been finalised.</p> <p>Ms Cross: No, we don't have the number that were finalised.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Okay. So all you know about is that one. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Storen: No. The subset of the 49 that were finalised—of which I don't have that number—</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: What's been the outcome for that unknown number?</p> <p>Mr Storen: The unknown number—I don't have any clarity on the precise outcomes, but we will give them to you—</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Could you take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Storen: and give you a feel for what the outcomes look like. <i>[page 110]</i></p> <p>b) Senator SIEWERT: Thank you. Obviously you're involved in providing information to the AAT. Are you able to provide the information that identifies the types of debts so they could have this on their system?</p> <p>Ms Cross: In terms of whether they're OCI?</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Cross: We could find a breakdown of the type of debts that are going to the AAT, I suspect. We're only telling you about the OCI ones at the moment.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: My broader question is: could you provide a breakdown against all of the appeals to the AAT over debt? I can't get that from the AAT. My further question is: is there a way you can—</p> <p>Ms Cross: We'll certainly have a look.</p> <p>Mr Storen: I think that can be quite complicated because an appeal can go to the AAT for a variety of matters which a customer is appealing, of which a component may be a debt. In a data management sense, we can try. Because of the nature of the online compliance ones, we've been able to identify them, but for the broader set of data, we will face the same challenges that the AAT face.</p> <p>Ms Cross: We'll see what we can find for you. <i>[page 111]</i></p> <p>c) Senator SIEWERT: For example, I've got a constituent who's contacted me and said they actually informed Centrelink of their change of circumstances, but it wasn't properly recorded. They got paid at the same rate and the payments weren't changed. Centrelink finally made the change, so then they had a debt. This was a debt which they've repaid, but it was through no fault of their own</p> <p>...</p> <p>SENATOR SIEWERT: What is the breakdown of the number of debts that are raised that are actually not caused by the recipient? In other words, where Centrelink's failed to record something or something's—</p> <p>Ms Cross: We have statistics on payment accuracy and payment correctness which tell us that it's a very small percentage where there are administrative errors. We certainly could</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				give you that sort of data. Whether we can then pull that out of the debt data is a separate question. I think with payment accuracy, we achieve about 98 per cent. With payment correctness, it's around 95 per cent. <i>[page 111]</i>
19	SQ18-000077	Community Engagement Officers	Siewert	<p>Senator SIEWERT: I have in fact visited a couple of homeless services where you've actually had a Centrelink officer in there on a once-a-week basis or something like that. How many places around Australia do you extend that to?</p> <p>Ms Leon: I'd have to take that on notice, but we do have community engagement officers throughout the service delivery network. ... I can take on notice both the number of those officers that we have and, if we've got it centrally collected, the number of places that they visit. <i>[page 112]</i></p>
20	SQ18-000075	Child Care support	Pratt	<p>Senator PRATT: Can you provide the percentage of parents who receive Childcare Rebate and Childcare Benefit who have provided an update of their details?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms Ryan: Of the families that have transitioned, as of this morning it was just over 708,000 families.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator PRATT: In terms of the proportion of those that have, are you able to do a breakdown via the Childcare Rebate and Childcare Benefit?</p> <p>Ms Rule: We'd have to take that on notice. We don't have the detailed data on that with us. It's also changing. We're getting about 20,000 people a day transitioning at the moment, which is why we're giving you figures from this morning. <i>[pages 115-116]</i></p>
21	SQ18-000074	Payment claim processing times	Watt	<p>a) Senator WATT: What I'm looking for is how many applications, from the time of the first submission of an application being lodged and the approval of a payment or rejection of an application, have taken more than 26 weeks, broken down by payment type? Do you have those figures?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: No, we'd have to take it on notice. <i>[page 119]</i></p> <p>b) Senator WATT: Do you have any way of assessing the longer claims? If you don't have it by 26 weeks, is there some measure you do have figures here for?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Not at the level of granularity I think you're looking for. We do have an overall timeliness. Our KPI for processing as part of the portfolio budget statements is that 82 per cent of all claims, which is the cumulative effect of all the claims coming together, are processed within 82 per cent. We then have subcategories or key performance metrics with our policy agencies about the timeliness of each individual category, so I do have data that can tell you the number of claims processed within the timeliness KPMs. I could give you that.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Sorry, say again what you have.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Our overall target within the portfolio budget statement is 82 per cent of all claims processed in accordance with the agreed timeliness standard. Each individual claim has a different key performance metric as to what percentage of claims we have to deal</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<p>with in how many days. They are quite seriously pretty much all different.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Yes, okay.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: I could give you that.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Why don't you, for the moment, provide that on notice? <i>[page 119]</i></p> <p>c) Senator WATT: Please provide details of the KPIs for timeliness of processing the claims for each payment type from 1 January until, as I've got here, 31 May.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: The key performance metric is standard one. It's year-on-year. The standard is there, but we can provide you with timeliness as at 31 March. There are probably a few cases—in most cases, we can actually do the previous year as well.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Again, for the moment, if you can take that on notice, and we'll come back to you if we do need that tonight. <i>[pages 119-120]</i></p>
22	SQ18-000071	Departmental customer data	Pratt	<p>a) Senator PRATT: I'd like to ask: broken down by payment type, how many client queries or interactions has Centrelink received in person or at a shopfront for the year to date—say, to 30 April this year?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: We'd have to take that on notice. There's a lot of work involved in that.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: Okay. Can you include in that, broken down by payment type, how many client queries or interactions Centrelink's received over the phone for the year to date, to 30 April?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: We'll endeavour to do that as well, yes.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: And, broken down by payment type, how many client queries or interactions has Centrelink received online through the myGov website for the year to date?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Yes, we'll do that—bearing in mind that we do have over 700 million interactions—</p> <p>Senator PRATT: Well, good! That's part of the answer. But clearly you quantify that—well, you have to be able to quantify that stuff already.</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Hence it may take some time to do it, but we'll take it on notice. <i>[pages 120-121]</i></p> <p>b) Senator PRATT: In reference to Centrelink clients who attend Centrelink shopfronts in person, what is the median wait time for a Centrelink client to speak with a Centrelink representative?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Jackson: Again, this is year-to-date as at 31 March 2018: for the face-to-face wait time across all of our 364, or whatever it is, sites—346 I think it is now—it is 13 minutes and 47 seconds.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: How many of those clients are then directed to use phones at a Centrelink shopfront in order to speak with a Centrelink representative?</p> <p>Mr Jackson: I'd have to take that one on notice. Should there be a situation where someone is directed to a phone, it is normally for the PST lines—participation support lines. That's because they have had a failure or something along those lines. That direction would</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				occur very, very quickly, but we'll have to take that on notice to get that information back to you. <i>[page 121]</i>
23	SQ18-000070	Aged Care Asset Test	Watt	<p>a) Senator WATT: I take it then that, to the best of your knowledge, there are no older Australians who are currently in a residential aged-care facility and who are undertaking some sort of a process to address an incorrect means test with Centrelink.</p> <p>Ms Leon: This wasn't about means-testing. This was about the lifetime and annual caps.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Sorry; it's a separate issue. Are you aware of any older Australians who are currently in a residential aged-care facility and are undertaking a process to address any incorrect means test with Centrelink?</p> <p>Mr Creech: That's a different question. The reality is that aged care isn't that different to a lot of our programs, and you've got self-funded retirees whose income does change from time to time and they request to update their income with the department. Are there people out there who are going through a process to update their income with us? I would say there are always people out there going through a process to update their income with us.</p> <p>Senator WATT: Do you have any figures around that?</p> <p>Mr Creech: I'd have to take that on notice. <i>[page 124]</i></p> <p>b) Senator WATT: I suppose I'm looking for a point in time around about now. How many older Australians have reached their annual cap this year, and what was the number for last year? What I'm asking for is annual cap, and the next question is going to be lifetime cap.</p> <p>Mr Creech: I'm probably going to have to take that on notice too.</p> <p>Ms Cattermole: I think we'll have to take that on notice. <i>[page 124]</i></p>
24	SQ18-000068	Departmental ICT outages – Deloitte Review	Pratt	<p>Senator PRATT: When is the Deloitte review of the outage that took place due to be completed and made public?</p> <p>Ms Bridger: The Deloitte review is actually an assessment of the Pluto system. It was not an assessment of the outage.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: When is that due to be made public?</p> <p>Ms Bridger: The report has been finalised. We're considering it at the moment. I'll probably need to take advice on when that's made available.</p> <p>Senator PRATT: Could I ask for a copy of that report on notice, please.</p> <p>Ms Bridger: I will take it on notice. <i>[page 129]</i></p>
25	SQ18-000066	Child Support ICT Systems	Patrick	<p>Senator PATRICK: The question I asked was: for each year, how much of this was spent on the system both internally and externally? And the answer was externally nothing, and I understand that side of the ledger. But for the internal budget the department said they can't tell me.</p> <p>Mr Jenkin: There was additional money that would have been allocated.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: What I'm trying to get to is how much of that money, since the \$102 million has been expended, has now been spent on the system.</p> <p>Ms Leon: We can take it on notice, but you've got to understand that the work's being done by people who are already on salary within our department. <i>[page 132]</i></p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
26	SQ18-000064	Air Travel	Patrick	<p>a) Senator PATRICK: Figures provided to me by the Minister for Finance in relation to a question on notice in the Senate show a massive disparity in government officials' use of Qantas and Virgin. Just to give you a general overview, in 2016-17, \$201 million was spent on Qantas and only \$61 million on Virgin. You'd be aware that there's a lowest practical fare policy across government. In general, the Virgin flights, if you divide the numbers through, are reasonably cheaper than the Qantas flights. In my own experience, I don't select which airline I fly on. It's a lottery based on the lowest fare</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms Leon: Sure. So we do run best fare of the day as a policy that all the people booking travel have to utilise.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: With those numbers, you're the first secretary I've come across—I've spoken to 10 or 15 of them in the last seven days—that hasn't at least been a little bit surprised by the disparity.</p> <p>Ms Leon: I haven't surveyed everyone in the department but I know from my own travel patterns that when I'm asked to look at the flights that are available, I end up, quite often, on Qantas because it's going where and when I want. It's not because of any sort of preferencing.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: You're probably in an unusual circumstance, however, being a secretary. Your time is extremely valuable. Other people in the Department may well be able to work within a policy that says if it's within an hour's time frame—there is no choice about time. I wonder if you could take it on notice, to have a look at it?</p> <p>Ms Leon: Sure. <i>[pages 133-134]</i></p> <p>b) Senator PATRICK: How many people in your Department have, because of their official position, been offered and have accepted a Qantas Chairman's Lounge or a Virgin The Club membership? I have no criticism of that; I'm just wondering how many there are. I'm happy if you want to take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Hutson: To be honest, we probably don't know. There's no charge for either of those. We understand that the airlines offer them to the secretary and deputy secretaries. We don't keep records.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I'm sure you could ask.</p> <p>Mr Hutson: We could certainly ask the airlines.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Could I ask you to do that, just to find out the numbers?</p> <p>Ms Leon: In terms of the numbers that would ordinarily be offered, in our department there's one secretary and eight deputy secretaries. So if the normal pattern of offering has occurred, then I expect they would have been offered to those.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I'm not directing any criticism. It's just leading to the last question. In circumstances where your secretary or one of your deputy secretaries only has one—they may have both—can you please provide their airline flight split? I don't want the name of the person.</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				Mr Hutson: We can ask the secretary and deputy secretaries, yes. Ms Leon: We can ask them.
27	SQ18-000089	Telephony	Siewert	Since 28 February 2018 how many calls have taken more than an hour to answer?
28	SQ18-000092	Provision of information - repetition	Siewert	If a recipient uses online services to send a letter to Centrelink, are they required to phone Centrelink with the same information? If so, why?
29	SQ18-000093	Provision of Information - consent	Siewert	Does Centrelink require phone consent to send recipients details of their provisional income review?
30	SQ18-000094	Debts – Debt Collection Agencies	Siewert	a) How many debts are currently with external debt collection agencies? b) Please name the debt recovery agencies that currently have contracts with the Department. c) Please provide the number of debts with each agency.
31	SQ18-000095	Debt - types	Siewert	Please provide a breakdown of Centrelink debt cases that are deliberate cases of fraud, cases that result from a mistake by the income support recipient and cases that are a result of Centrelink error.
32	SQ18-000096	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) – debts and reviews	Siewert	a) How many alleged debts issued by the OCI have been calculated using averaging of ATO data? b) What is the average amount of debts calculated this way? c) How many have people request a review for these debts? d) How many of these reviews have resulted in a reduced debt? e) How many of these reviews have resulted in no debt?
33	SQ18-0000104	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) - legality	Siewert	Has the Department given any consideration to Terry Carney AO's article regarding the legality of the OCI?
34	SQ18-0000107	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) - settlement	Siewert	a) How many debts have been settled for an amount less than originally raised under the OCI? b) What is the total original value of these debts and the settled amount?
35	SQ18-0000109	Advice – 'model litigant'	Siewert	Has the Department sought advice as to whether or not it is operating as a 'model litigant' within the definition of Shord v Commissioner of Taxation [2017] FCAFC 167?
36	SQ18-0000110	Debts raised by labour hire staff	Siewert	a) Do contracted workers such as those provided by Serco or other labour hire firms used by the Department have the legal power to raise and/or alter a debt? b) What section of the Social Security (Administration Act) 1999 (Cth) grants this power? c) How many OCI debts have been raised/alterd/wiped by contracted labour hire workers?
37	SQ18-0000111	Data-matching	Siewert	In response to HS 53 (SQ18-000054) the Department stated that it has achieved \$865 million in savings and recovered \$279 million for data-matching activities. a) What amount of these figures is from the OCI?

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				b) How much of the \$865 million is 'prevented' debt?
39	SQ18-0000113	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) – debts by gender	Siewert	Between 1 July 2016 and now under the OCI: a) What is the gender breakdown for all debts raised? b) What is the average debt size for each gender?
40	SQ18-0000114	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) – debt repayment	Siewert	Between 1 July 2016 and now under the OCI: a) How many debts have been repaid in full? b) What is the average size of fully repaid debts? c) How many debts have been repaid in full without yet seeking reassessment, review, or appeal? d) How many debts are currently being repaid without yet seeking reassessment, review, or appeal? e) How much money has been returned to people who have made payment on a debt that has subsequently changed? f) What is the average size of identified debts?
41	SQ18-0000	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) – completion timing	Siewert	Between 1 July 2016 and now under the OCI: a) What is the average time between an ARO review being initiated and completed? b) What is the average time between a reassessment being initiated and completed? c) What is the average time between an initiating OCI letter and a debt being finalised?
42	SQ18-000108	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) - telephony	Siewert	For the 2017-18 financial year (to date) regarding the compliance phone line now provided in OCI letters: a) How many phone calls have been received relating to the OCI? b) What is the average wait time? c) What is the average call length? d) How many calls have been missed?
43	SQ18-000106	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) – Minister's office	Siewert	Between 1 July 2016 and now under the OCI: a) How many debts have received intervention by the (past and present) Minister's office? b) How many of these debts have subsequently been reduced and by how much? c) How many of these debts have increased?
44	SQ18-000105	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) – deceased people	Siewert	Between 1 July 2016 and now under the OCI: a) How many people have become deceased after an accounts payable notice was sent? b) How many people have become deceased after an initiating OCI letter was sent? c) Siewert For each person who became deceased after receiving any OCI letter, what is the length of time between the most recent OCI related letter sent prior to death and their death?

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				d) How many people became deceased after seeking reassessment? e) How many people became deceased after making a debt repayment? f) How many were deceased prior to receiving a letter under the OCI? g) How many estates have been considered sufficient and insufficient?
45	SQ18-000103	Employment Income Confirmation (Online Compliance Intervention) - statistics	Siewert	Between 1 July 2016 and now: a) How many OCI letters have been sent? b) How many have resulted in debts raised? c) How many reassessments have been initiated? d) How many of these reassessments have been completed? e) How many formal reviews have been requested/completed? f) How many appeals (AAT) have been requested/completed? g) How many debts have been reduced? h) How many debts have been wiped? i) How many debts have been written off?
46	SQ18-000102	Crisis Payments - claims	Siewert	For the year 2016-17 (broken down by number and percentage): a) How many claims were made? b) How many claims were rejected? c) How many claims were successful?
47	SQ18-000101	Crisis Payments - recipients	Siewert	Provide a breakdown of Crisis Payment recipients for 2016-17 by: a) Payment type; b) Age; c) Gender; d) Indigenous/non-Indigenous status; e) State and Territory; f) Crisis Payment recipient by reason for grant; g) Total amount paid to Crisis Payment recipients.
48	SQ18-000100	Liquid Assets Waiting Period	Siewert	For the periods 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date: a) How many Liquid Assets Waiting Periods were applied? b) Provide a breakdown by age, gender and payment type. c) Provide a breakdown on the duration of the waiting periods in (a). d) What was the average waiting periods that applied for the above time-frames?
49	SQ18-000099	Review and appeals - Indigenous and non-Indigenous recipients	Siewert	For the financial year 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date, provide review and appeals data by level of appeal and outcome of appeal, by Indigenous and non-Indigenous recipients
50	SQ18-000098	Centrelink complaints –	Siewert	Provide a breakdown by the number and percentage of Centrelink complaints by Indigenous

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
		Indigenous and non-Indigenous status		and non-Indigenous recipients for the financial year 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date
51	SQ18-000091	Member of a Couple	Siewert	<p>a) For Member of a Couple appeals for the year 2016-17 and 1 July 2017 to date, provide a breakdown of the outcome of appeals, by level of appeal.</p> <p>b) For Member of a Couple overpayments for the year 2016-17, please provide a breakdown by amount of debt: under \$2000; \$2001- \$5000; \$5001-\$10,000; \$10,001 to \$20,000; \$20,001 to \$50,000; \$50,001 to \$100,000; \$100,001- \$150,000; \$150,001 - \$200,000; over \$200,000.</p> <p>c) How many reviews, investigations, and serious non-compliance reviews were undertaken in 2016-17 and 2017 to date?</p> <p>d) For 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date, how many 'Member of a Couple' cases were prosecuted by the Commonwealth Department of Public Prosecutions?</p>
52	SQ18-000090	Centrepay	Siewert	<p>a) Provide the total value of all administration fees paid to the Department of Human Services by businesses providing consumer leases in 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date?</p> <p>b) How many complaints have been made about Centrepay in 2015-16, 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date?</p>
53	SQ18-0000116	FIS Officers	Watt	<p>a) How many FIS officers are currently employed?</p> <p>b) Are all people filling this role APS staff?</p> <p>c) For each year, over the past four years, how many FIS officers have been employed?</p>
54	SQ18-0000117	Aged Care - fees	Polley	<p>a) What support does Centrelink provide to people when entering a residential aged care facility?</p> <p>b) Can the Department confirm if there have been any instances of older Australians in residential or home care who have reached an annual or lifetime cap who were still being asked to pay a contribution because Centrelink had not advised the provider they had reached the cap?</p> <p>c) Please provide the number of older Australians for this year and last year in this situation.</p> <p>d) Can the Department provide its process when there has been an incorrect means test for an older Australian entering residential aged care?</p> <p>e) Can the Department provide the number of older Australians who are currently in a residential aged care facility and are undertaking to address an incorrect means test with Centrelink?</p> <p>f) How many older Australians have reached their annual cap this year and last year?</p> <p>g) How many older Australians have reached their lifetime cap this year and last year?</p>
55	SQ18-0000118	Aged Care – unspent funds	Polley	The Department of Health has confirmed that in the 12 months to 28 February 2018, the average amount of the Commonwealth proportion of unspent funds reported by providers to DHS was \$4,383 per care recipient who had exited care and where there were unspent funds.

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is that correct? b) Can the Department confirm why it does not collect data on unspent consumer contributions?
56	SQ18-0000119	Child Support	Watt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In percentage terms, what functions of Cuba have been replicated by Pluto? b) Are these asymmetrics in the information displayed by Pluto and Cuba? c) How has prioritising inbound calls negatively impacted on the customer facing services or functions in the agency? d) What are the respective average/median call times for CSA for the years 2016, 2017 and 2018 (year to date)?
57	SQ18-0000120	Complaints	Watt	Broken down by agency, what is the total number of complaints received by Department of Human Services? Please provide in table or chart from showing relevant percentages. Can you supply this for: 2016; 2017; and 2018 (year to date)?
58	SQ18-0000121	Child Support – ICT outage	Watt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is being done to ensure that the Child Support Agency outage in March 2018 does not happen again? b) Why was WAN optimization tool introduced without checking its perceived performance (or otherwise) impact on the network and other systems? c) Why did it take four days to track down as the cause?
59	SQ18-0000122	Translation Services	Watt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) How many in-house positions that were once used for language translation have been outsourced? b) Where have these jobs been outsourced to? c) What specific training is provided to companies who may take on the role of translation and communications? d) Where calls are still taken by a DHS employee, what is the practice internally for an employee who may not speak the language of the person calling, is the employee expected to use an online tool like "google translate"?
60	SQ18-0000123	Medicare compensation recovery	Watt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What data is relied upon to validate the repayment? b) What data could a claimant rely upon in calculating the amount to repay? c) Is there an assumed amount of medical costs in all settlements, regardless of the type of claim? d) One option for claimants who have reached settlement is for 10% of their compensation payment to be paid in advance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) what percentage of claimants use this option? ii) what percentage of claimants would need to repay above the 10%? iii) what percentage of claimants would need to repay less than the 10% and how is that reimbursed and how long would that reimbursement take to process?
62	SQ18-0000125	Age Pension	Polley	When assessing aged pension applications, does the department have a process of prioritising

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
				applications based on current assets (bank account balances) of applicants?
63	SQ18-000126	Child Support	Watt	<p>a) Please provide the number of child support payees and child support payers that have not submitted an income tax return for the 2016-17 financial year and each of the previous five years. Do these figures include both private and agency collect arrangements?</p> <p>b) Of child support payers who did not submit a tax return in the 2016-17 financial year, how many were also in arrears of child support?</p> <p>c) What is the total amount of child support arrears owed? What is the average amount of arrears owed per recipient?</p> <p>d) In 2016-17, how many child support recipients requested to move from private collect to agency collect? What reasons were given for this?</p> <p>e) Recommendation 1 of the House Standing Committee Inquiry in to Child Support in 2015 was that "the Australian Government take steps to collect comprehensive demographic information on all clients of the Child Support Program." Has that work been completed, and is it available?</p>
65	SQ18-000128	Community Development Programme – Comprehensive Compliance Assessments	McCarthy	Looking at the quarter ending September 2017 can you please give reasons why Indigenous job seekers referred to a Comprehensive Compliance Assessment were substantially more likely to be assessed as 'persistently non-compliant' than non-Indigenous job seekers?
66	SQ18-000129	Community Development Programme - reapplying	McCarthy	<p>I understand that once job seekers have received a 4 week penalty under the new system they will have to re-apply for benefits.</p> <p>a) Can you describe that process?</p> <p>b) How will it work in remote communities, especially those without a Centrelink agent?</p> <p>c) What risks has the Department identified that some people who are eligible will find it difficult to get back on?</p>
67	SQ18-000130	Community Development Programme – capability review	McCarthy	<p>Under the new job seeker compliance framework DHS will conduct a capability review at the point at which a job seeker enters the 'penalty zone'.</p> <p>a) How is this different, if at all, from the current Comprehensive Compliance Assessment process?</p> <p>b) What arrangements will be made to ensure these assessments are conducted in a way that takes into account the needs of remote Indigenous participants, including their lack of access to local medical and/or other health services, and need for culturally sensitive assessments.</p>
68	SQ18-000132	Income Management - data	Siewert	Provide a breakdown by: number, age, gender, Indigenous / non-Indigenous status, payment type and disability, of those who have been subject to Income Management since it was first rolled out / introduced in the Northern Territory.
69	SQ18-000134	Income Management - appeals	Siewert	<p>a) How many appeals in 2015-16, 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date related to income management?</p> <p>b) What is the outcome of the appeal, by level of appeal?</p>

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
70	SQ18-000137	Income Management - type	Siewert	By Indigenous/non-Indigenous status, by gender, and by payment type: a) How many people are under Income Management in total? b) How many people are under Compulsory Income Management? c) How many people are under Voluntary Income Management?
71	SQ18-000139	Income Management - exemptions	Siewert	Provide a breakdown (number and percentages) by categories of exemptions for income management, by type of exemption, by Indigenous and non-Indigenous status for the periods 2015-16, 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date.
72	SQ18-000141	Disability Support Pension – applications	Watt	By each primary disability, how many applications from DSP were accepted and rejected each year?
73	SQ18-000142	Disability Support Pension - claims	Siewert	In the period 1 July 2017 to date: a) How many DSP claims have been made? b) How many and what percentage of claims have been successful? c) Provide a breakdown by the number and percentage of Indigenous / non-Indigenous claimants. d) What is the average time taken for a claim to be successful? e) Provide a breakdown of the time (i.e. number of weeks/months) taken to process DSP claims from 1 July 2017 to date.
74	SQ18-000140	Disability Support Pension – processing times	Siewert	Have any DSP claims have taken 12 months (or longer) to process? If yes, how many?
75	SQ18-000138	Disability Support Pension - appeals	Siewert	With regard to DSP appeals when claims are rejected, in the period 1 July 2017 to date: a) Provide a breakdown of appeals regarding DSP claims, highlighting the number and percentage of appeals at each level and the outcome of the appeal. b) Provide the number and percentage of Indigenous / non-Indigenous recipients that appeal against DSP rejections, indicating level of appeal and outcome.
76	SQ18-000136	Disability Support Pension - reviews	Siewert	a) How many medical reviews have been undertaken in 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 to date? b) How many of these reviews have led to payment cancellations? c) How many have sought a review, at which level, and what has been the outcome of the review?
77	SQ18-000135	Disability Support Pension – suspension provisions	Siewert	a) How many people have utilised the '2 year suspension rules' in 2015-16, 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date? b) Describe what steps the Department has taken to inform DSP recipients about the suspension provisions? c) Provide a breakdown of the use of these provisions by Indigenous and non-Indigenous recipients.
78	SQ18-000133	Disability Support Pension –	Siewert	How many DSP claims are waiting to be initiated?

HS No.	PDR	Broad topic	Senator	Question
		claims waiting		
79	SQ18-000143	Social Security Prosecutions	Siewert	<p>For the financial year 2016-17 and from 1 July 2017 to date:</p> <p>a) How many people have been referred to the Commonwealth Department of Public Prosecutions (CDPP)?</p> <p>b) How many people (and what percentage) were considered for referral, but were not referred to the CDPP?</p> <p>c) How many people (and what percentage) were prosecuted for social security fraud by the CDPP?</p> <p>d) Provide a breakdown of (c) by:</p> <p>i) payment type,</p> <p>ii) age,</p> <p>iii) gender,</p> <p>iv) Indigenous/non-Indigenous status, and</p> <p>v) state and territory.</p>
80	SQ18-000144	Income Management – Vulnerable Welfare Recipient category	Siewert	In the Northern Territory, how many people are under the Vulnerable Welfare Recipient Category: in total; by payment type; and by Indigenous-non-Indigenous status?
81	SQ18-000145	IT Infrastructure for the NDIS	Brown	In 2014/15 Federal Budget, over \$100m was allocated to DHS for the first payment of the IT infrastructure for the NDIS. According to the Budget Papers this initial allocation of money included resources for the development of an eMarket and a virtual assistant. How much of this was spent, were the funds insufficient?
82	SQ18-000146	Child Support – Online Message Services	Patrick	<p>a) For how long has a Child Support customer been unable to communicate with officials via the online messaging system?</p> <p>b) What is the target date to restore this capability?</p> <p>c) It is understood that the interim measure for customers is to send an email to a particular email where it is then loaded into the system and a case officer is subsequently advised of the incoming correspondence. How secure is this approach?</p>