If the PAC is to fully comprehend the exponential growth in expenditure on consultancies, it is crucial that the Committee seek data on Redundancy Retirements from the APS over the last 25 years. The loss of expertise in the APS is of course the direct cause of this Inquiry.

The data should be compiled as follows:

- By year
- Agency
- Chief Executive
- Number of Senior Executives departed
- Redundancy package cost
- Which of those Senior Executives has since re-entered the APS
- Which of those Senior Executives is now employed by the Consulting firm engaged to provide that expertise back to the APS.
- And form a view about any self-interest evident

The PAC should then attempt to compare the costs of doing business in-house assuming expertise had not been shown the door, as compared to the cost of the engagement of consultants for each parcel of work. The plain silliness of ‘Efficiency Dividends’ year after year, when salary budgets are cut each time, and then spending an even greater amount of money rebranded ‘consultancies’, must be exposed.

Perhaps it is the size of the APS that governments are worried about. And consequently everybody is happier with the sleight of hand involved when skiting about the reduction in APS numbers, while maintaining a silence on these other forms of engagement and hiding the extra cost.

It would be a great pity if the PAC limited itself to only looking at the effectiveness of contract management, and ignored the much greater issues involved in the neutering of the APS.
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