Senate Committee: Education and Employment

QUESTION ON NOTICE Budget Estimates 2017 - 2018

Outcome: Skills and Training

Department of Education and Training Question No. SQ17-000590

Senator Cameron, Doug provided asked on 31 May 2017, Proof Hansard page 61

Also refer to previous hearing Question No. SQ17-000095 and SQ17-000211

Documentation in relation to Senate Order

Question

Senator CAMERON: You will provide details of why you provided \$235,000 and what the \$235,000 was given for?

Ms Hewlett: We can provide information on the first milestone.

Senator CAMERON: No, it is not the milestone I am asking about; I am asking why you would give that money without even a project plan being in place.

Ms Hewlett: There was a project proposal in place. On delivery of the plan the MBA got their first milestone payment.

.

Senator CAMERON: I have asked for copies of them. Can you provide them? Ms Hewlett: I will take that on notice.

.

Dr Bruniges: Right; that goes to your initial question about the total amount of documentation?

Senator CAMERON: Three times, and the Senate has asked for these as well.

Dr Bruniges: Again, let me take that on notice and we will duly follow-up with that. If there have been three Senate orders, then I need to, as you said, work through those to ensure that we have covered off on all those documentations.

Answer

Each of the five pilots received an initial payment of \$230,000 (GST exclusive) upon execution of the grant funding agreement.

It is typical for grants projects to receive an early payment to assist with upfront costs of establishing the project. An early payment assists the recipient in meeting the next milestone, which in the case of the alternative delivery pilots is the delivery of a project plan.

The project proposals are not provided as they are third party documents which contain commercially sensitive information. Each of the third parties agreed to release detailed summaries of the pilots which the department provided in SQ17-000095 and SQ17-000211 (from previous hearing).

Please also see response to SQ17-000583 concerning the response to the November 2016 Senate Order.