



Ms Lyn Beverley
Secretary
Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Ms Beverley

Additional Estimates February 2016—Clarification of evidence

I am writing to clarify evidence provided to the Committee on 8 February 2016.

At page 50 of the Hansard for Monday 8 February 2016, the transcript reads:

Ms Croke: There is an obligation on DPS employees to declare any potential conflict of interest, perceived or otherwise.

CHAIR: But that did not happen in that case.

Ms Croke: It did not happen in that case, and it should have. But there is that obligation on staff. That is something we can reinforce with staff, and I am happy to say we will put something out and remind staff of those obligations. There is also an obligation on staff, if they are undertaking any form of outside employment, to seek approval for that outside employment.

I would like to clarify that under DPS' conflict of interest policy, a declaration of a conflict of interest is required in writing only in certain circumstances. In this case, while the person in question did not complete a written conflict of interest declaration prior to or since their employment with DPS, I am advised that the work the individual had previously undertaken with CPM Reviews was known to his DPS managers at the time he was recruited. So, in effect, the conflict was advised as required by the policy.

At page 70 of the Hansard, the transcript reads:

Mr Barnes: A redacted version of the report was made available to specific members of the press gallery.

Senator WONG: Right—including those who were involved in the incident?

Mr Barnes: Yes.

Senator WONG: Okay. Who has been able to review the whole report, if there was a redacted version?

Mr Barnes: To my knowledge, no-one outside of DPS.

Senator WONG: So who makes the decision about what is redacted? Who made that decision?

Ms Croke: DPS made that decision, but I think since then there has been a series of discussions, with the media individual concerned.

I note that Mr Barnes has provided a correction to his evidence to indicate that relevant extracts of the report rather than a redacted copy of the report were provided to specific members of the Press Gallery. I would also like to clarify that my comments in relation to who made the decision, were about DPS' role in identifying the relevant extracts for release.

At pages 52 and 53 of the Hansard, Senator Wong asked about who was responsible for booking of rooms. While all the questions asked during the hearing were answered, for the sake of complete clarity I have attached a table that lists all rooms available for booking by Senators and Members, with information about who manages the bookings for each space.

Yours sincerely

Myra Croke
Chief Operating Officer

24 March 2016

Area/room	Location	Who manages the bookings	Contact for bookings
Main Committee Room		Dept. of the Senate and the Dept. of HoR	ext. 3500 or ext. 4889
Committee Rooms/Senate-	1S1 – 1S6, 2S1-2S3	Dept. of the Senate	ext. 3500
Committee Rooms/Reps-	1R1- 1R6 2R1-2R3	Dept. of HoR	ext. 4889
Conference Room/Television Studio-	Ground Floor		ext. 4889
Ministerial Wing – meetings rooms within office suites	Various Senior Ministerial offices	The relevant Minister's office	The relevant Minister's office
Meeting spaces in MinWing	MG.63	Prime Minister's office	Prime Minister's office
Monkey Pod Room	C1.MPOD	Dept. of HoR	ext. 4889
Members' Club	Level 2	IHG (under contract from DPS)	ext. 5131 / 5132
Members and Guests Dining room, terrace			
Great Hall (including marble foyer area)	Ground Floor	IHG (under contract from DPS)	IHG x 5379
Theatre and Theatre Foyer	Level 1,		
Mural Hall	Level 2		
Senate Alcove	Level 2		
House of Representatives Alcove	Level 2		
Private Dining Rooms 1-5	Level 2		