Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 01

Subject: List of self-reported non-compliance to the FWO

Asked by: Senators Gallagher, Sheldon and O'Neill

(Page 42 of Hansard)

Senator SHELDON: Thank you very much, Ms Parker and your office; there's a massive task ahead of you. You mentioned there was 70 employers that you're inspecting. I take it they're large employers? Is that correct?

Ms Parker: Yes.

Senator SHELDON: How large are they?

Ms Parker: They vary. In terms of underpayment, they vary from hundreds of thousands to up to \$300 million. If you mean corporate size, you would be well aware of some of the very large ones, such as Woolworths and Qantas, and we've got banks and higher education institutions. All of them are pretty much on the public record.

Senator SHELDON: So there are some that are not on the public record. Are we able to get the list of 70?

Ms Parker: Yes, I am pretty confident I can give you the list.

Senator SHELDON: And the amounts of money that—

Ms Parker: These are self-reports; these are companies that have come to us and said that they have underpayments.

CHAIR: And they are all in the public domain? All of those documents are in the public domain? Is that correct?

Ms Parker: I will check that, and I will only provide those that are in the public domain.

CHAIR: Subject to that caveat, we would really appreciate that information.

Ms Parker: The reason there may be some that we won't hand over is that we actually have had a couple that have self-reported to us and have subsequently been found to not have errors. So we would rather not give you the list of those.

CHAIR: Okay, thank you.

Senator SHELDON: So, with all the ones that have reported and that do have problems, some of which may not be in the public domain, would those be available?

Ms Parker: I believe so. I would just need to check if there are any issues, but I'm fairly confident we can provide that information. Mr O'Sullivan, can you clarify that? I'm not trying to resist that.

Mr O'Sullivan: We will disclose what we can to the Senate, with this caveat: we would prefer not to disclose any information that might prejudice an investigation or any possible legal action that might follow. We will have a look at what we can provide, subject to that caveat. There shouldn't be any public interest concerns from our end.

(Page 50 of Hansard)

Senator O'NEILL: I'll also go to the matter of the spreadsheet that you've promised us. Mr O'Sullivan, as the Chief Counsel you should be well aware that public interest immunity claims would have to be very full for the committee not to actually receive that information. So I'll ask for a detailed spreadsheet of all 70.

Mr O'Sullivan: Yes.

Senator O'NEILL: If you do seek to redact the information about the ones that you've absolved, remember that anything that we need to receive we can and should receive in confidence without you cutting that information further. We want access to that, if possible.

Ms Parker: Yes, that's fine. I think it's around 70, but, yes, absolutely.

Answer:

The table below provides a list of entities <u>currently being investigated</u> that self-reported underpayments to the Fair Work Ombudsman (FWO), where knowledge of those underpayments is publicly available.

We have separately provided, a list of self-disclosures that, as far as we know, have only been disclosed to the FWO by the employer.

Notwithstanding that the FWO has not accepted these self-disclosures 'in-confidence', and noting that any litigated outcome or 'enforceable undertaking' (EU) accepted in accordance with s 715 of the Fair Work Act 2009 will become public at the earliest appropriate time (generally at the conclusion of our investigation, the filing of legal proceedings, or the acceptance and publication of an EU), we ask that the Committee exercise its discretion and keep the information in that schedule confidential at this time. We make this request so as to avoid discouraging resolution of these matters on the best possible terms (for the benefit of employees), and so as to avoid discouraging full cooperation and future self-disclosures from employers at the earliest opportunity.

Underpayment and contrition payment amounts are publicly available on the FWO website where an Enforceable Undertaking has been executed. Please refer to Question 8 for a table that provides a list of contrition payments.

Self-reports that relate solely to superannuation are referred to the Australian Taxation Office.

- 1. Ability Centre Australasia Pty Ltd
- 2. AP Eagers Limited (now Eagers Automotive Limited with 43 subsidiaries)
- 3. Australian Red Cross Society
- 4. Bank Of Queensland Limited
- 5. Carlton & United Breweries
 - a) CUB Pty Ltd
 - b) 4 Pines Brewing Company Pty Ltd
- 6. Coles Group Limited
 - a) Coles Supermarkets Australia Pty Ltd
 - b) Liquorland (Australia) Pty Ltd
- 7. Commonwealth Bank Group
 - a) Bankwest Pty Ltd
 - b) Colonial Services Pty Limited
 - c) Commonwealth Bank of Australia Limited
 - d) Commonwealth Insurance Limited
 - e) Commonwealth Securities Limited
- 8. Community Connection Inc.
- 9. Woolworths International (Australia) Pty Ltd (David Jones and Country Road Group)
- 10. Emirates Leisure Retail (Australia) Pty Ltd
 - (Entities include Hudson's Coffee, The Bistro by Wolfgang Puck, Coopers Alehouse, Glasshouse Bar, Aviation Pier Cafe & Bar, Penfolds wine bar & kitchen, Heineken House, Kitchen by Mike, the Crafty Swan, James Boags Upper Deck, Brisbane River Grill, the Juice and Bean Co, Wilderness, AFL Kitchen and Bar)
- 11. Goodyear & Dunlop Tyres (Aust) Pty Ltd, t/as Beaurepaires
- 12. Healius Limited (Formerly Primary Health Care Limited) (Idameneo (123) Pty Ltd) t/as Primary Health Care
- 13. Herbert Smith Freehills
- 14. Launch Recruitment Pty Ltd
- 15. Lush Australasia Retail Pty. Limited
- 16. Lush Australasia Manufacturing Pty Ltd
- 17. Michael Hill International Limited
 - a) Michael Hill Jewellers (Australia) Pty Ltd
 - b) Emma Roe Pty Ltd
- 18. National Australia Bank Ltd
- 19. Officeworks Ltd
- 20. Scope (Aust) Ltd
- 21. Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority t/as Seqwater
- 22. Spotless Group Holdings, including various subsidiaries of group
- 23. Suncorp Group
 - a) Suncorp Staff Pty Ltd
 - b) Suncorp Insurance Services Limited
 - c) Australian Associated Motor Insurers Limited
- 24. Super Retail Group Limited
 - a) Rebel Sports Limited
 - b) SRG Leisure Retail Pty Ltd
 - c) Supercheap Auto Pty Ltd
 - d) Goldcross Cycles Pty Ltd

- e) Macpac Retail Pty Ltd
- f) Workout World Pty Ltd
- 25. Target Australia Pty. Ltd.
- 26. The University Of Newcastle
- 27. University Of NSW
- 28. University Of Sydney
- 29. Wesfarmers Industrial and Safety Pty Ltd
- 30. Westpac Group
 - a) Westpac Banking Corporation
 - b) Asgard Wealth Solutions Ltd
 - c) BT Financial Group Pty Ltd
 - d) Westpac Financial Consultants Ltd
 - e) Westpac General Insurance Services Ltd
 - f) Qvalent Pty Ltd
- 31. WH Smith Australia Pty Ltd
- 32. Woolworths Group Limited including,
 - a) Endeavour Group Limited
 - b) Jimmy Brings Australia Pty Limited
 - c) Dan Murphy's
 - d) Australian Leisure and Hospitality Group Limited
 - e) BWS
 - f) Big W
 - g) Big W Optometry
- 33. World Vision Australia

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 02

Subject: Increase to FWO's operating budget since last year **Asked by:** Senator Tony Sheldon (Page 42-43 of Hansard)

Senator SHELDON: Good. I am looking forward to seeing those ones that haven't been in the public area and have self-reported. What is the current operating budget of the Fair Work Ombudsman?

Ms Parker: The 2020-21 appropriation is \$144.424 million.

Senator SHELDON: Has that increased since last year?

Ms Parker: We have had some increase. If you would like us to take you through that, we are happy to. Mr Scully might take us through that.

Senator SHELDON: No, that's okay. If you can give us the total figure, that will be fine, and a breakdown—can you take that on notice?

Ms Parker: Certainly.

Answer:

The FWO's 2020-21 budget increased by \$18.081 million from the 2019-20 budget (\$126.343 million). The increased funding measures related to:

COVID-19 Response	\$13.1m
National Labour Hire Registration Scheme	\$2.6m*
Increased uptake of workers in Pacific labour mobility	\$2.5m
Total	\$18.2m

^{*}Please note that as the National Labour Hire Registration is not yet in operation, pending enabling legislation, the relating funding is therefore quarantined.

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 03

Subject: Universities the FWO is investigating

Asked by: Senator Mehreen Faruqi (Page 47-48 of Hansard)

Senator FARUQI: It's been reported in the media that the ombudsman is currently investigating a few universities in respect to wage theft. Ms Parker, I think you said earlier on that, within those 70, there are a few higher education institutions. Could you tell me how many universities the Fair Work Ombudsman is investigating?

Ms Parker: Yes, we have two.

Senator FARUQI: Two?

Ms Parker: Actually, I think we have three.

Senator FARUQI: Could you tell me their names? You can take it on notice.

Ms Parker: I'll take it on notice if you don't mind, and I can include it in the list with the others if

that's okay.

Senator FARUQI: Yes, sure. These are all self-referrals—am I right?

Ms Parker: Again, I'd need to check. There's at least one that we read about in the newspaper, and

there are others that have actually told us. So some are self-reports and some are not.

Senator FARUQI: Could you provide that information as well, on notice?

Ms Parker: Yes, I believe we can.

Mr O'Sullivan: Subject to the caveat that it doesn't prejudice the investigation.

Senator FARUQI: Yes, sure. Please tell me broadly, if you can, what the nature of the wage theft you're investigating is. Is it all underpayment, or are there other things involved as well?

Ms Parker: Again, I'll take that on notice. A lot of the corporate and university underpayments are to do with, as I mentioned before, inadequate payroll systems. Our experience with the 70-odd that we have on hand, including the universities, is that a lot of it is not keeping up to date with payroll. There are inadequate payroll systems, so they've missed out on payments, and then usually someone questions them and asks about something, and then they do a bit of an audit and discover that it's actually a lot bigger and goes back a lot longer than they thought it did. So there are often

payroll errors. We're not implying that it's deliberate, but nevertheless it's unacceptable in our view.

Answer:

The FWO has received a total of five self-reports from universities that broadly relate to underpayments. Three investigations are currently ongoing:

- University of New South Wales
- University of Sydney
- The University of Newcastle

Two self-reports from universities have been finalised:

- University of New England
- James Cook University

Following media reports regarding allegations of wage underpayments, the FWO also wrote to the University of Melbourne and is currently investigating.

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 04

Subject: FWO investigations into sham contracting in higher education

Asked by: Senator Mehreen Faruqi (Page 48 of Hansard)

Senator FARUQI: Yes. We just heard from a previous witness who was relating her experience of sham contracting with a university. Have you ever investigated sham contracting in higher education?

Ms Parker: I'd need to take it on notice. I'm not aware of any examples of that, but that doesn't mean that we don't have them. We can check our systems and come back to you.

Answer:

In the past five years, the FWO has not completed any matters related to a breach of section 357 of the Fair Work Act 2009 regarding an employer in the ANZSIC class of Higher Education.

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 05

Subject: FWO targets and use of Compliance Notices

Asked by: Senator Mehreen Faruqi (Page 49 of Hansard)

Senator FARUQI: You said that there's a very low bar to issuing a compliance notice, but we heard experts like Dr Hardy have said they're still underutilised even though they have recently increased. I'm trying to find out the number of people who come with complaints of wage theft. They could be issued a compliance notice. Is the reason that it's not issued an issue of resources or is it because they haven't met that bar?

Ms Parker: When Professor Hardy talks about it, she's aware of the fact that we are increasing our use of compliance notices and will continue to increase them.

Senator FARUQI: She did say that.

Ms Parker: It requires an inspector to issue one. We've been training the inspectors to do so. We needed to get all our tools and resources. Each compliance notice has to be aligned to a particular award, so there's some work we had to do to train up our inspectors and monitor them to make sure the money is paid back. We're a work in progress in this area. We hope to be able to continue to come back to you and say, 'We will keep getting better, and we are getting better at this.'

Senator FARUQI: Do you have any targets that you've set in that sense?

Ms Parker: We have key performance indicators that are in our corporate plan. I'm not sure what the number is. Do you have it, Mr O'Sullivan?

Mr O'Sullivan: I don't have—

Senator FARUQI: You can provide it to me on notice.

Mr O'Sullivan: Sure.

Ms Parker: Certainly.

Senator FARUQI: What I was trying to get at is that, where you don't issue compliance notice, the repercussions are that a worker won't recover their wages.

Ms Parker: No, but we don't send them away. We certainly won't be sending them away if we believe they've been underpaid. It may not always be that they get a compliance notice. There's a range of things we do.

Senator FARUQI: Sure.

Answer:

Please see the below table for the FWO's current enforcement tool targets for 2020-21:

Enforcement Tool	2020-21 target
Compliance Notices issued	850
Infringement Notices issued	400
Enforceable Undertakings entered into	20
Litigations filed	40-50

It is important to note that these targets are based on the FWO's historical use of tools. The FWO's recent approach and streamlined processes means it expects to exceed these targets.

The FWO's KPIs are available in the Fair Work Ombudsman and Registered Organisations Commission Entity Corporate plan which is publicly available on the FWO's website at https://www.fairwork.gov.au/ArticleDocuments/1146/FWOROCE-Corporate-Plan-2020-21.pdf.aspx

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 06

Subject: FWO funding over next four years

Asked by: Senator Deborah O'Neill (Page 50 of Hansard)

Senator O'NEILL: What is the Fair Work Ombudsman's current total of revenue from the

government?

Ms Parker: The budget?

Senator O'NEILL: Yes.

Ms Parker: For the 2020-2021 financial year we have \$144.424 million.

Senator O'NEILL: And that's just for your purposes alone? You don't share that with anyone else?

Ms Parker: No. The Registered Organisations Commission is under our auspice but has a separate

\$5.3 million.

Senator O'NEILL: Thank you. Could you provide on notice the figures over the next four years for

that, please?

Ms Parker: Certainly—the future years?

Senator O'NEILL: Yes.

Ms Parker: Yes.

Answer:

The FWO's budget appropriations from 2020-21 - 2023-24 are as follows:

2020-21 Budget - FWOROCE appropriation	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	Current	Fwd Est	Fwd Est	Fwd Est
FWO's total appropriation (\$m)	144.424	148.890	125.385	126.180

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 07

Subject: Allocation of FWO funding by task and resource allocation (including migrant worker work)

Asked by: Senator Deborah O'Neill (Page 50 of Hansard)

Senator O'NEILL: Senator Sheldon was asking some specific questions about inspectors. I just wonder if I can have another crack at that? How many inspectors do you actually have working on business compliance with employment law? How many do you have out in the field on that?

Ms Parker: On corporate sector underpayments, do you mean, or on any business?

Senator O'NEILL: Yes, on corporate.

Ms Parker: I might ask Mr Scully to answer that.

Mr Scully: We'll take that question on notice. We have 195 inspectors in total, which Ms Parker alluded to previously. I just don't have the numbers at my disposal in respect of those who are focused on our corporate underpayments. We'll take that question on notice and come back to you.

Senator O'NEILL: Senator Sheldon was actually asking a line of questioning about who is doing what, and I was very frustrated by the response of 'Everybody's doing everything'. You must have a forward workplan with an allocation of duties. If it's distributed across the roles you still should be able to come up with some rough numbers of how many are allocated to each task. I'll ask you to provide that on notice.

Ms Parker: Yes, we're fine—we can do that. It's just not divided as neatly as it might look, but I'm very happy to tell you how we do it—

Senator O'NEILL: It doesn't have to be perfect, but indicative would be helpful because we want to get a sense of where the effort is going, where you're spending your current budget and what your priorities are.

Ms Parker: Absolutely, yes, that's fine.

Asked by: Senator Deborah O'Neill (Page 52 of Hansard)

Senator O'Neill: The last one I have goes to the response that you gave with regard to the supervision of migrant workers entitlements. I'm sorry, I can't remember the name of the gentleman who answered the question, but he said 'We have a number of people out doing overseas worker investigations.' The number actually matters to us. How many do you have?

Answer:

All Fair Work Inspectors investigate formal dispute matters on a case-by-case basis in conjunction with the FWO's Compliance and Enforcement Policy, regardless of how the matter was received or what it relates to. As one matter may involve multiple priority areas, matters are referred to the most appropriate team on a case-by-case basis. Over the course of a year, for example, it is likely that every Inspector would have some involvement in a matter involving visa holders. Similarly, the scale and complexity of investigations regarding large corporations means that work is divided across teams.

Inspectors are supported in their work by the Legal Group, which comprises 60 lawyers.

The table below outlines our Compliance and Enforcement Group with a breakdown of Inspectors by team. Due to the volume of self-reports received by the FWO and the complexity of investigating underpayments by large companies, each of the teams in the table below is involved in investigating these matters.

Team	Group	Inspector numbers
Enforcement Team 1	Enforcement Branch	26
Enforcement Team 2	Enforcement Branch	39
Enforcement Team 3	Enforcement Branch	25
Enforcement Team 4	Enforcement Branch	32
Proactive Compliance	Compliance Branch	38
Assisted Compliance	Compliance Branch	11
Knowledge	Compliance Branch	3
Corporate Assurance Taskforce	Legal Group	7
TOTAL		181

^{*}Please note that the total number of Inspectors in this table does not account for all Inspectors, as a small number may currently be allocated to alternative work.

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 08

Subject: Volume of contrition payments

Asked by: Senator Deborah O'Neill (Page 51 of Hansard)

Senator O'NEILL: I'll go to the contrition payments. What's the volume of those, again? How much

have you received?

Ms Parker: I think we have that.

Mr O'Sullivan: I might be able to—

Ms Parker: Let's just check with Mr Scully to see if he has that. Do you have that, Mr Scully?

Mr Scully: I don't have it at my fingertips, sorry, Ms Parker.

Senator O'NEILL: Could you give me an indicative figure and then take the real one on notice?

Ms Parker: I'll just see if anyone can find it. It's definitely on—

Mr O'Sullivan: I can certainly help with the last few—the most recent ones—if that will give you some indication? Just recently, on 11 March 2020, an EU—and enforceable undertaking—was entered into with Qantas. That included a two-part contrition payment, because we had to divvy it up between the underpayments known at the point in time and then we had a process for identifying a future contrition payment based on yet to be calculated underpayments. The part A, as I refer to it, is \$410,000, rounded up, plus, I think, seven per cent of any further underpayments identified by an independent assessment. The other one I would take you to would be one executed on 17 June 2020 with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. That included a \$600,000 payment. I should mention that all of these payments, exactly like any civil penalty, go directly into consolidated revenue.

Senator O'NEILL: That was my next question. So \$600,000 for ABC. Have they got a part B as well that they are yet to pay?

Mr O'Sullivan: No, we were able to do a high degree of fidelity—

Senator O'NEILL: That completes that matter?

Mr O'Sullivan: Yes.

Senator O'NEILL: So the money goes to consolidated revenue. What's the scale of these contrition payments since the commencement of the scheme, by year?

Mr O'Sullivan: That's one of those questions that I think we'll have to take on notice.

Ms Parker: We'll take it on notice.

Senator O'NEILL: Could you create a table for me so that I could get the sense of the scale of contrition—how sorry are you really?—in comparison to the level of wage theft involved? I'd like to read it side by side—this is how much workers missed out on, this is what the penalty was—so I can see that in proportion to what the scale of wage theft was.

Mr O'Sullivan: I think that's very doable. Indeed, we publish all of these EUs on our web page. But, again, I might just remind the committee that, under the Fair Work Act—as it is and has been, and under its predecessors—the value of the underpayment has next to nothing to do with the maximum penalty a court can impose. The idea of a contrition payment is to ensure that we get, frankly, as good a result as we can for the affected employees, and that often requires employers—they're willing, and this is probably one of the best indicators of how contrite they are, to back pay beyond the statutory limitation period that even a court could order.

Answer:

Entity	Underpayment amount	No. of employees underpaid	Contrition Payment amount	Date EU Entered into
Made Establishments Pty Ltd	\$7.84 m	524	\$200,000	17 July 2019
Thales Australia Limited	\$7.44 m	407	\$200,000	13 August 2019
Luxottica Retail Australia Pty Ltd trading as Sunglasses Hut	\$2.29 m	620	\$50,000	20 August 2019
Couriers Please Pty Ltd	\$382,000	245	\$50,000	28 November 2020
Qantas Airways Limited	\$7.35 m	638	\$410,601*	11 March 2020
Activ Foundation Inc. (charity organisation)	\$13.47m	1,694	\$20,000	17 March 2020
Australian Broadcasting Corporation	\$11.98 m	1,828	\$600,000	17 June 2020
BaptistCare NSW & ACT	\$1.279 m	2146	\$40,000	13 August 2020
Sunwater	\$2.3 m**	73	\$100,000^ (estimate only)**	27 August 2020
Western Power	\$8.29**	1,238	\$400,000** ^	3 September 2020
IBM Australia Ltd and IBM Global Financing Australia Limited	\$12.3m**	1647	TBC** ^	8 September 2020
		TOTAL	\$2,020,601 excluding payments yet to be calculated	

- *The contrition payment may increase if additional underpayments are identified under the terms of the enforceable undertaking.
- ** Total underpayments to be determined under the terms of the Enforceable Undertaking with the final contrition payment to be calculated accordingly.

^Contrition payment not yet received

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to questions taken on notice during the hearing

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 09

Subject: Payment of contrition payments to workers

Asked by: Senator Deborah O'Neill (Page 51-52 of Hansard)

Senator O'Neill: We know that victims who do get redress, finally, then receive a lump sum. We've heard evidence today that they are then penalised in the amount of tax they have to pay. Has any consideration been given to these contrition payments being properly allocated without penalty to the people who've actually lost their wages? I will leave that with you on notice.

My next question is same question really, but around superannuation that hasn't been paid and allocation of those funds, those contrition payments, to the superannuation of the workers rather than into the government's consolidated revenue. Have you provided any advice to government to that end? Are you aware of that operating in any jurisdictions? Do you believe it would be good policy? You may or may not be able to give me something on that.

Answer:

The FWO accepts Enforceable Undertakings where there is a demonstrated commitment to fully rectify underpayments (or where rectification has already occurred). As part of the terms of an Enforceable Undertaking, payments made to employees to rectify underpayments generally include interest and the payment of superannuation as required by superannuation legislation. Any rectification payments to employees required under an Enforceable Undertaking are separate and in addition to any contrition payment required by the FWO.

As outlined in FWO's publicly available Compliance and Enforcement Policy, the amount of any contrition payment will generally be comparable to a court-ordered penalty, with appropriate discounts for early disclosure and cooperation. Like any civil penalty awarded by a court following legal action by the FWO, the contrition payment will go into Consolidated Revenue for the benefit of the Australian community.

The FWO is not aware of any comparable jurisdictions where contrition payments agreed to as part of an Enforceable Undertaking are directed to third parties affected by a contravention or superannuation funds and has not provided advice to government on this issue. Any question regarding policy in this area should be directed to the Attorney General's Department.

Answers to Questions on Notice

Fair Work Ombudsman responses to spoken questions on notice

Hearing date: 18 September 2020

Question No: 10

Subject: FWO recoveries over last three years

Asked by: Senator Deborah O'Neill (Page 52 of Hansard)

Senator O'Neill: I'll ask three final questions on notice. You indicate in your report the recoveries of \$40 million for 18,000 workers, \$30 million for 13,000 workers and \$30 million for 17,000 workers. Could you give the breakdown of the recoveries over the last three years? What percentage of recoveries are from employees reporting issues and what percentage are from employees that you actually have identified? There will be more questions on notice like that. The last one I have goes to the response that you gave with regard to the supervision of migrant workers entitlements. I'm sorry, I can't remember the name of the gentleman who answered the question, but he said 'We have a number of people out doing overseas worker investigations.' The number actually matters to us. How many do you have?

Answer:

Over the last three financial years, the FWO has recovered over \$193 million in unpaid wages for workers through requests for assistance involving a workplace dispute, FWO initiated activities and large corporate companies self-reporting underpayments to us.

The breakdown of the recoveries are included in the table below:

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
FWO identified	\$29,679,387	\$40,204,976	\$32,870,993
Self-reported non-compliance	_*	_*	\$90,590,555
Total	\$29,679,387	\$40,204,976	\$123,461,548

^{*}Note: Prior to the 2019-20 financial year, the recoveries for self-reported non-compliance were included in the total FWO recoveries figure (for example, the MaDE Establishment recovery was included in the 2018-19 financial year total).

Regarding the second part of the question about overseas worker investigations, please see response to Question 7.