

**Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee
—Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing—October 2014**

Answers to Questions on Notice

Parliamentary departments, Department of Parliamentary Services

Topic: **Reviews**
Question: **210**
Written: **Senator Ludwig**

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 31 December 2014

Since Budget Estimates in June, 2014:

1. How many new reviews (defined as review, inter-departmental group, inquiry, internal review or similar activity) have been commenced? Please list them including:
 - a. the date they were ordered
 - b. the date they commenced
 - c. the minister responsible
 - d. the department responsible
 - e. the nature of the review
 - f. their terms of reference
 - g. the scope of the review
 - h. Who is conducting the review
 - i. the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review
 - j. the expected report date
 - k. the budgeted, projected or expected costs
 - l. If the report will be tabled in parliament or made public
2. For any review commenced or ordered since Budget Estimates in June, 2014, have any external people, companies or contractors being engaged to assist or conduct the review?
 - a. If so, please list them, including their name and/or trading name/s and any known alias or other trading names
 - b. If so, please list their managing director and the board of directors or equivalent
 - c. If yes, for each is the cost associated with their involvement, including a break down for each cost item
 - d. If yes, for each, what is the nature of their involvement
 - e. If yes, for each, are they on the lobbyist register, provide details.
 - f. If yes, for each, what contact has the Minister or their office had with them
 - g. If yes, for each, who selected them
 - h. If yes, for each, did the minister or their office have any involvement in selecting them,
 - i. If yes, please detail what involvement it was
 - ii. If yes, did they see or provided input to a short list
 - iii. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur
 - iv. If yes, did this involve any verbal discussions with the department
 - v. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur
3. Which reviews are on-going?
 - a. Please list them.
 - b. What is the current cost to date expended on the reviews?
4. Have any reviews been stopped, paused or ceased? Please list them.
5. Which reviews have concluded? Please list them.

6. How many reviews have been provided to Government? Please list them and the date they were provided.
7. When will the Government be responding to the respective reviews that have been completed?
8. What reviews are planned?
 - a. When will each planned review be commenced?
 - b. When will each of these reviews be concluded?
 - c. When will government respond to each review?
 - d. Will the government release each review?
 - e. If so, when? If not, why not?

Answer

1. Since Budget Estimates, the following reviews have commenced:
 - i. Review of the Annual Report
 - ii. Work Health and Safety Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment of the Hansard Work Environment
 - iii. Client Evaluation of the Parliamentary Library for the 44th Parliament
 - a. i. 19 July 2014.
 - ii. 22 September 2014
 - iii. 23 September 2014
 - b. i. 23 July 2014
 - ii. 26 September 2014.
 - iii. 3 November 2014.
 - c. Not applicable
 - d. DPS
 - e. i. The focus of the review was to respond to issues raised about DPS annual report by the Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee and to identify improvements.
 - ii. The focus of the review was to undertake an extensive work health and safety examination of the Hansard workplace to identify inherent risks and suggest mitigation strategies and to assist Hansard management to determine what constitutes reasonable productivity from a WHS perspective.
 - iii. The Parliamentary Library conducts a formal review of the needs of its clients once in every Parliament to assist it to: measure satisfaction levels with library and research services; gain insights into the use of services; and determine the direction of future information and service delivery.
 - f. i. DPS identified the need to engage external specialist advice to conduct a review of the annual report as previously committed to in responding to recommendation 16 of the 2012 Finance and Public Administration inquiry into DPS.
 - ii. The consultant will conduct a WHS hazard and identification and risk assessment of the working environment including:
 - workplace set up;
 - equipment and methods of production;
 - rostering and hours of work; and
 - productivity in sitting and non-sitting weeks.
 - iii. To undertake a client assessment to determine levels of satisfaction with Library services and make recommendations for future directions. While the focus of the evaluation will be on

the two hundred and twenty-six Senators and Members of the House of Representatives and their staff, the evaluation will also engage with staff of the parliamentary departments, particularly in committee offices.

- g. i. The consultant was asked:
 - To undertake a comprehensive review of form and content for the benefit of the 2013–14 and subsequent DPS annual reports. In doing so, to have regard to the specific consideration of issues raised by the Senate Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee and the DPS's response, including:
 - i. the requirement for a 'clear read' between the report and the Portfolio Budget Statements;
 - ii. consideration of other formats/forums for reporting information to the Parliament and the public, and how they might complement information provided in the annual report;
 - iii. the use of existing governance and reporting mechanisms, such as the Library Committee, the Joint House Committee and the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board, to report information that is less suitable for an annual report; and
 - iv. the need for timely, accurate and useful trend data.
 - To report on the background and issues raised.
 - To report on improvements made to respond to the issues raised.
 - To report on areas to be addressed in the 2013–14 and subsequent annual reports.
 - To provide advice on specific actions that can be taken to address those issues.
- ii. The consultant will:
 - undertake a research component including interacting with the Hansard team and observations of the workplace;
 - document the results of the Hansard hazard identification and risk assessment;
 - draft detailed written report of findings and recommendations for the elimination or reduction of the hazards identified; and
 - provide a final detailed written report of findings and recommendations.
- iii. To undertake a client assessment to determine levels of satisfaction with Library services and recommendations for future directions. The assessment will cover all aspects of the Library's services. The consultant will be required to:
 - develop and design the evaluation with a mix of qualitative and quantitative data
 - undertake the research and evaluation methods outlined and agreed in the design
 - analyse the findings and provide a full report including conclusions and recommendations
 - provide an evaluation tool that the Library can use in the subsequent two years to gauge ongoing satisfaction and highlight areas for improvement.
- h. i. Callida Consulting.
- ii. David Caple & Associates Pty Ltd
- iii. Uncommon Knowledge.
- i. i. One external Principal Consultant.
- ii. The consultant liaised with PSL 5 and PSL 6 Hansard officers across the course of two days (23 October and 31 October 2014).
- iii. Rob Mercer, Proprietor
Fiona McLean, Researcher
- j. i. 14 August 2014
- ii. 19 January 2015

- iii. 30 April 2015
 - k.
 - i. \$16,192 (incl GST).
 - ii. \$15,675 (incl GST)
 - iii. \$23,100 (incl GST)
 - l.
 - i. No.
 - ii. No.
 - iii. The report will be published on the Parliament of Australia website.
- 2. Yes. See h. above.
 - a.
 - i. Callida Consulting
 - ii. David Caple & Associates Pty Ltd.
 - iii. Uncommon Knowledge.
 - b.
 - i. The partners of Callida Consulting are Paul Allen, Timothy DeWan, Dominic Egan, John Lewis, Ian McShane, Paul Smith and Colin Thirkettle.
 - ii. Professor David Caple.
 - iii. Rob Mercer, Proprietor.
 - c. This information is commercial in confidence.
 - d. They will design, develop and implement the evaluation, and then analyse and report back on the results gathered.
 - e. No.
 - f. Not applicable.
 - g.
 - i. Chief Operating Officer.
 - ii. Assistant Secretary, Parliamentary Recording and Reporting Branch.
 - iii. An assessment panel, comprising the Assistant Secretary, Library Collections and Database Branch, Director, Statistics and Mapping Section (Parliamentary Library) and Director, Client Relations (Parliamentary Library), assessed the responses to the Request for Quotation and recommended Uncommon Knowledge as the preferred provider. The panel's recommendation was accepted by the delegate, the Parliamentary Librarian.
 - h. Not applicable.
- 3. The following reviews are ongoing:

| Review | Expenditure (as at 30 Sept 2014) |
|--|---|
| Work Health and Safety Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment of the Hansard Work Environment | Nil |
| Client Evaluation of the Parliamentary Library for the 44th Parliament | Nil |

- 4. No.
- 5. The following reviews have concluded:
 - Review of Parliament House Security Pass Policy

- Review of the Annual Report

6. No.
7. Not applicable.
8. There are no reviews currently planned.