QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 25-27 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(226) Output 1.3:   Enforcement of Immigration Law

Senator Ludwig asked:

(1) When a person is detected working illegally, do you make an assessment of their original application to come to Australia?

(2) If not, why not?

(3) If yes, what action is taken if you discover false or misleading information?

(4) What do you do if you find false documents or information contained in that original application?

(5) Do you ever make assessments as to the decision made by DIMIA staff in the Overseas Post? i.e Has there been a pattern of any particular Post, and if so, what action has been taken?

Answer:

(1)-(3) A person found 'working illegally' would normally be found to be in breach of their visa conditions. Unless there is evidence of fraud, it is not standard practice for compliance officers to make any assessment of the original application.

(4) Action that may be taken in these circumstances may include administrative action such as visa cancellation, investigation including such bodies as the Migration Agents Task Force (MATF), and possible prosecution. If the matter is a minor one and a person is leaving the country, systems would be updated to reflect the situation in the event of a further application by that person.

(5) The Department provides to the Overseas Compliance network information concerning those people located 'working illegally'. This information is then analysed including the original decision process. The Overseas Compliance network makes use of the analysis to assist visa decision makers in identifying future visa applicants who may have similar characteristic or are 'connected to' the person located 'working illegally' in Australia.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 25-27 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO
(227) Output 1.3:   Enforcement of Immigration Law

Senator Ludwig asked:

1. What is the Department currently doing to combat illegal workers?
2. What advice does the Department have in relation to illegal workers in the Paintless Dent Removal (PDR) industries?
3. How many people were detected as working illegally in the PDR industries?
4. What country of origin did they come from?
5. Were these people deported? If not, why not?
6. Were any of their employers prosecuted? If not, why not?

Answer:

1. The Department has an ongoing active Employer Awareness Campaign and provides assistance to employers through telephone and faxback services. Illegal Worker Warning Notices are issued to employers employing illegal workers.

There have been a number of further initiatives over the last two years. The Entitlements Verification Online System, introduced in 2004, allows registered users, mainly employers but also education and other institutions, to check the status of potential employees or people accessing benefits or study. Checks on the immigration status of employees are becoming more widespread eg in the NSW Security industry, which had previously been dogged by illegal working, and in respect of obtaining NSW taxi licences. Checking the immigration status of people working at airports and seaports is done in the context of the issuance of the security cards. A Migration Agents Task Force was established within DIMIA in June 2003 to target migration agents acting unlawfully, particularly in submitting spurious applications for visitors to secure work rights. The Government also introduced the $20m sex trafficking package in 2003.

2. As at 17 June 2005 13 pieces of community information have been received this calendar year in NSW in respect of potential illegal workers employed in the Paintless Dent Removal industry in NSW. This information was received from 6 different sources within the community and resulted in visits to 7 business premises.

3. As a result of the 7 visits conducted 8 persons were located working illegally.

4. Of the 8 located 5 were from the United States, 2 from Canada and 1 from the People's Republic of China.

5. All 8 persons located have departed Australia.

6. All employers were issued with Illegal Worker Warning Notices in respect of each person found working illegally. A prosecution of the employers was not pursued as there was insufficient evidence to substantiate an offence under the Crimes Act. A bill relating to employer sanctions is on the Government's agenda.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 25-27 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(228) Output 1.3:   Enforcement of Immigration Law

Senator Ludwig asked:

1. Why has the finish date for the construction of the $300 million detention facility been delayed by so long?

2. How do you account for these delays?

3. What is the finish date for this project now?

4. What does the Department have to say about suggestions that this is Australia's answer to Guantanemo Bay?

5. When it is finished, is it planned to move all detainees in detention centres to this centre?

Answer:

1. The Department of Finance and Administration is responsible for the delivery of the facility and therefore this question should be directed to them.

2. The Department of Finance and Administration is responsible for the delivery of the facility and therefore this question should be directed to them.

3. The Department of Finance and Administration is responsible for the delivery of the facility and therefore this question should be directed to them.

4. It bears no relationship.

5. No.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 25-27 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(229) Output 1.3:   Enforcement of Immigration Law

Senator Ludwig asked:

1.   Are all the criminal detainees in Detention Centres detained in the same areas/compound as Immigration detainees?

2.   If so, please provide a breakdown for the reason of detention for each criminal detainee, the name of the detention centre, and the period of detention in the same area as Immigration detainees?

Answer:

1.   No person is placed in an immigration detention facility while completing a custodial sentence. People who have completed criminal sentences or been released on parole through the criminal justice process may in some circumstances be taken into immigration detention while their immigration matters are finalised and/or removal is effected. People with criminal histories are only held in immigration detention for administrative, not punitive, purposes, as with all immigration detainees.

In placing any person in immigration detention consideration is given to the most appropriate place for that detention. In particular, people with criminal histories are placed with consideration for a number of factors, including but not limited to their gender, their behaviour while in custody, the nature of their offences, health issues, immediate family in the community, expected period of detention, risk of escape and the safety and well being of other immigration detainees.

2.   The Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs does not have this information readily available and to collate this information would involve a manual examination of individual files, which is an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(230) Output 1.4:   Safe Haven

Senator Bartlett (L&C 110) asked:

When were the Ambonese first granted the subclass 449 temporary safe haven visas?

Answer:

7 April 2000.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(231) Output 1.4:   Safe Haven

Senator Bartlett (L&C 111) asked:

What was the original arrival date for the Ambonese?

Answer:

23 January 2000.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(232) Output 1.4:   Safe Haven

Senator Bartlett (L&C 111) asked:

I am thinking of the Kosovo people who originally came I think in 1999. The majority of those have of course long returned. There are a small number who are still here but they have been transferred across onto other sorts of visas. Do you have detail or are you able to provide how many of those that originally came on safe haven are still in a pending phase? Include which visas they are on.

Answer:

The vast majority of the group of 4,000 Kosovars who were evacuated to Australia under temporary safe haven arrangements in 1999 departed when it was safe to return home. A small number, around 500, were permitted to remain and to make visa applications to test their claims against normal visa criteria. Those who remained have been through fair and transparent visas processes, including access to merits review of adverse decisions. Some have been granted permanent residence and some are now Australian Citizens.

As of 21 June 2005, there are 85 Kosovars who entered Australia under temporary safe haven arrangements who have not had their cases finally resolved. Six of these people are awaiting primary decisions by the Department.

The majority, seventy nine persons, have had their visa applications refused at both primary and review stages and are seeking Ministerial Intervention under sections 351 and 417 of the *Migration Act 1958*.

All 85 persons have been granted bridging visas with access to work rights while requests for Ministerial intervention are considered.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 25-27 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(233) Output 1.5:   Offshore Asylum Seeker Management

Senator Bartlett asked:

Nauru
a.   When the camp closes, where will the medical records of IOM be stored?
b.   Are they property of the Commonwealth?
c.   Do records go on an asylum seeker's personal DIMIA file?
d.   Are they given a copy of their medical file?
e.   In relation to the banned drug Vioxx, how long a period had detainees been prescribed Vioxx?
f.   How many detainees have been prescribed Vioxx?
g.   Have any of them showed signs of side effects?
h.   Have any been in need of serious medical attention due to the prescription of Vioxx?

Answer:

a. Prior to 2004, all medical records for persons resettled from the IOM operated Offshore Processing Centres (in PNG and Nauru) were given to the individual on their departure from the centre. This enabled the individual to pass on their medical record to appropriate medical professionals in their country of resettlement or return.   IOM did not keep copies of medical records for persons who were no longer resident in the processing centre. Since 2004 individuals have been provided with a comprehensive medical report, and their medical records have been retained by IOM.

b. No.

c. No IOM medical records are held on DIMIA files where a person is granted an Australian visa without a health undertaking. A medical assessment, required as part of the visa application process and sometimes undertaken by an IOM doctor, is filed on an individual's file. Some medical records are also filed in relation to cases where individuals are granted Australian visas subject to a health undertaking. This, together with procedures managed by Health Assessment Services in DIMIA, ensures appropriate follow-up treatment on arrival in Australia.

d. See (a) above.

e.&f.   DIMIA does not have this information. This information is not available. VIOXX ceased to be prescribed by IOM in Nauru in September 2004, one month before the drug was banned in Australia.

g.&h.   IOM has advised that no side effects were evident during the period VIOXX was prescribed by IOM doctors.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 25-27 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(234) Output 1.5:   Offshore Asylum Seeker Management

Senator Ludwig asked:

1. Are there any detainees on Manus Island?
2. If there is no one in detention, is the facility still being run?
3. How much is it costing at the moment to keep the Detention Centre running at Manus Island?
4. What is the Department's long term plan for Manus Island?

Answer:

1. There are currently no residents in the Offshore Processing Centre in Manus Province, PNG.
2. The facility is being maintained in a ready state in case it is required again for the processing of people seeking to arrive unlawfully in Australia.
3. The estimated monthly cost of maintaining the Processing Centre in Manus Province is around $AUS150,000.
4. Australia has approached PNG proposing a further MOU which would provide for future access to the centre to continue.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 25-27 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(235) Output 1.5:   Offshore Asylum Seeker Management

Senator Ludwig asked:

Since the Government's agreement with Nauru finishes this year, what does the Department plan to do with the detainees currently on Nauru?

Answer:

An MOU between the Government of Nauru and Australia expired on 30 June 2005. An extension of that MOU is currently in place until 31 August 2005 or until the next MOU is signed, whichever is the shorter period. The next MOU being negotiated with Nauru includes provision for future access to the OPCs there. There are currently no plans to close the OPCs.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(236) Output 2.1: Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig (L&C 9) asked:

Provide a disaggregation of the entire IHSS budget and focus specifically on the counselling and medical components.

Answer:

Details of payments made under IHSS contracts to IHSS Service Providers from 1 July 2004 to 31 May 2005 are provided below. Contract expenditure for the full 2004-05 financial year is not yet available. Non-contract full year expenditure including pre-embarkation, systems, salaries and overheads is estimated at $7.50m.

Early Health Assessment and Intervention [Note 1]	$5.63m
Initial Information and Orientation Assistance & Proposer Support [Note 2]	$7.42m
Service Provider Support	$0.60m
Accommodation Support & Household Formation	$19.50m
Total Payments to IHSS Contractors as at 31 May 2005	$33.15m

Note 1:   Of this amount, $4.78m is attributable to Torture and Trauma counselling. The balance is expended on information to entrants and community awareness.

Note 2:   IIOA contracts provide for $105 per entrant for immediate health checks. Payments for this service are not accounted for separately.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(237) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig (L&C 11) asked:

In relation to the settlement grants program written submissions, are they going to be published or made available on the web? Can they be provided to the Committee?

Answer:

At the time written submissions were called for, no indication was given that they would be released, or used by anyone other than the Minister and the Settlement Branch of the Department.

For this reason the written submissions will not be published or made available on the web. The issues raised in the written submissions and at community consultations will inform the development of the final policy for the new program. A final policy paper will be released and posted on DIMIA's website in August 2005. A detailed question and answer document, which will address in greater detail the issues raised in the submissions and consultations, will also be provided on the website.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(238) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig asked:

On the website, it states that…
An improvement plan for the settlement database has also been developed (recommendation 23), and reporting facilities for settlement data have been upgraded. Other work to improve the settlement database is ongoing.

(a)   Has the discussion paper on the new needs-based planning framework been developed (it's not on the web)? If so, please provide.
(b)   If not, is there an expected date for its completion and circulation?
(c)   Could you provide a copy of the improvement plan for the settlement database?
(d)   When was this plan developed?
(e)   Is it currently being implemented?
(f)   To what extent has it been implemented?
(g)   Does the plan include a timeframe for the upgrade of the database?
(h)   If so, what is the timeframe?
(i)   How many of the dates in the timeframe have been met? If they have not been met, how far off are they and why weren't they met?
(j)   If not, why not?
(k)   Was it done in-house or externally?
(l)   If externally, how was the tender delivered and who was the successful tenderer?
(m)   If in-house, how much resources have been put into the upgrade?
(n)   Have any personnel been either hired or reassigned to the upgrade of the database?
(o)   What other work is being done to improve the settlement database?
(p)   Could you indicate what exactly about the reporting facilities for settlement data has been upgraded?
(q)   Was it done in-house or externally?
(r)   If in-house, how much resources have been put into the upgrade?
(s)   Have any personnel been either hired or reassigned to the upgrade of the database?

Answer:

a)   A discussion paper on the new needs-based planning framework has not been developed.

b)   It was originally envisaged that a discussion paper on the needs-based planning framework would be developed. However, it was decided that

relevant aspects of settlement planning would be incorporated into the discussion paper on the new Settlement Grants Program. That discussion paper was released in April 2005. Community input on settlement planning aspects of the discussion paper, received through the consultation process and written submissions, is currently being considered and will inform the Settlement Grants Program policy paper, due to be released in August 2005.

c)   The Settlement Database Improvement Plan is an internal working document and is not for external distribution.

d)   October 2003.

e)   Yes.

f)   Four of the seven major milestones identified in the Plan have been completed.

g)   Yes.

h)   The broad project timeframe included in the Settlement Database Improvement Plan is:

Task	Timeframe
Develop IT Systems Proposal	July 2003
Develop Settlement Datamart	July – October 2003
Develop external access in accordance with e-business architecture	July – December 2003
Develop Reports	July – October 2003
Change Management issues – Training and education	September – December 2003
Assessment of reports for needs based planning	January – March 2004
Future of SDB investigation	March – June 2004

i)   There has been slippage in meeting the target dates. However, four tasks are now complete and the remaining three tasks will be progressively completed through to June 2006.

Task	Revised Timeframe
Develop IT Systems Proposal	Completed September 2003
Develop Settlement Datamart	Completed June 2004
Develop external access in accordance with e-business architecture	Completed July 2004
Develop Reports	Completed June 2005
Change Management issues – Training and education	Late August 2005
Assessment of reports for needs based planning	Ongoing 2005-2006
Future of SDB investigation	June 2006

Explanation of slippage in original target dates:

- Develop IT Systems Proposal - the lack of appropriate technical resources delayed the commencement of the IT development proposal.
- Develop Settlement Datamart - lack of appropriate technical resources delayed the commencement of the project for six months.
- Develop external access in accordance with e-business architecture - other competing work demands in the Settlement Branch delayed this project.
- Develop Reports - resources were not available on a full-time basis for this project, there were also other dedicated tasks to be undertaken.

Tasks in progress (not yet completed):
- Change Management Issues – Training and education - training material has been developed and training is scheduled to commence in all State and Territory settlement offices commencing on 27 June 2005. (It is expected that approximately 150 DIMIA staff will be trained.)
- Assessment of reports for needs based planning - Development of assessment reports for needs based planning is dependent on completion of other tasks.
- Future of SDB investigation – this part of the plan has not commenced as resources are currently unavailable to undertake this task.

j)   The dates in the broad project timeframe in the Settlement Database Implementation Plan were not met mainly due to the unavailability of appropriate technical resources and conflicting work priorities.

k)   The implementation of the Settlement Database Improvement Plan is being completed in-house.

l)   Not applicable; refer to previous answer.

m)   In-house resource usage to date for the implementation of the Settlement Database Improvement Plan includes both the upgrade and development of the internal and external reporting systems.

It has been calculated that a total of 1570 work days have been put into the project from September 2003 to June 2005 across the three resource areas comprising:
- Business Intelligence and Reporting System resources (BIRS) – 200 work days from Sept 2003 to June 2004.
- E-business resources – 250 work days from September 2003 to June 2004.
- Settlement Planning and Information Section resources – 1120 work days.

n)   The Settlement Planning and Information Section has hired four non-ongoing contractors and one person in the Section has been internally reassigned to this project.

o)   Other work being undertaken to improve the Settlement Database includes:

- Upgrading the reference data using the Department's Common Reference Tables (CRT).
- Adjusting reports to reflect changes to visa processing.
- System enhancements in response to feedback from external and internal system users.
- Improving the accessibility and distribution of settlement data to assist with settlement planning.

p)   The exact upgrades to the reporting facilities for the settlement database have been:
- Improved external interface – web based.
- User-friendly reporting system for external and internal users.
- More robust data system.
- Simplified process for producing electronic reports.
- Ability to provide statistics on system use by internal users.
- The settlement reporting facility is accessible via the internet and provides limited access to the settlement database reports for external users.

q)   The implementation of the Settlement Database Improvement Plan has been completed in-house.

r)   Refer to response to part (m).

s)   Refer to response to part (n).

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(239) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig asked:

- Did the OECD working group meet with DIMIA to discuss these issues?
  - If so, what were the dates of the meetings, and who attended?
  - Are there any minutes of those meetings available?
- Has the OECD finished its review? If so, please provide a copy.
- Could you provide the committee with the itinerary of the OECD working group's trip? What did they look at?
- Were any reports, reviews, discussion papers released as a result of
- Did the OECD issue any written recommendations or feedback? If so, please provide.
- What continuing contact is the department having with the OECD?

Answer:

In late January and early February 2005, an OECD delegation from the Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs spent nine days visiting a variety of service providers, academics and representatives of several Government Departments, (State and Commonwealth), in four different Australian cities. Details of their visit can be found in the attached document. Given the meetings were to inform the OECD Working Group, DIMIA did not take minutes at any of the meetings.

To our knowledge, the Review has not yet been completed. DIMIA expects a copy of the Report to be provided in the second half of 2005.

The itinerary of the OECD delegation is attached.

No reports, reviews or discussion papers have been released as a result of this visit. However, DIMIA anticipates that the OECD will release a report in the second half of 2005.

The OECD has not issued any written recommendations or feedback to date.

Neither the Settlement Branch, which facilitated the delegation's visit, nor the International Section maintains ongoing dialogue with the OECD. However, DIMIA represents Australia on the Working Party on Migration (WPM), which works under the auspices of the Division of Education, Employment, Labour and Social Affairs of the OECD, meeting once a year around June.

The First Assistant Secretary of Migration and Temporary Entry Division of the Department is the Australian correspondent for SOPEMI (which stands for the Continuous Reporting System on Migration). A report on Australia's migration policies and programs is provided around November each year to the OECD. That report and the reports of other countries are discussed at a SOPEMI meeting in December. Those reports are drawn on for the annual report of SOPEMI which is published as Trends in International Migration during the following year.

For the last 6 years, DIMIA has also participated in an annual workshop on International Migration and Labour Markets in Asia. This is hosted jointly by the OECD and the Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training (JILPT).

In addition to these regular meetings, DIMIA officers will sometimes participate during the year in seminars and conferences on migration issues held from time to time by the OECD.

OCED Integration Project
<u>Working Party Visit to Australia</u>
24 January to 2 February 2005

Monday, 24 January 2005 - Canberra
Meetings with DIMIA personnel from variety of divisions to gain overview of Australian migration and settlement programs, and academics Dr Siew-Ean Khoo (ANU) and Prof. Graeme Hugo (Uni of Adelaide).

Tuesday, 25 January 2005 - Canberra
Meetings with: representatives of DEWR, DEST and Centrelink to discuss labour market and education programs aimed at migrants and refugees; academics Dr Bob Birrell (Monash Uni) and Prof Glen Withers (ANU); and the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs.

Wednesday, 26 January 2005 - Sydney
Attendance at Citizenship Ceremony, Homebush and lunch with Sydney-based members of the Refugee Resettlement Advisory Council.

Thursday, 27 January 2005 - Sydney
Visit to the May Murray Neighbourhood Centre, Marrickville; Settlement Services International, Ashfield; and the Blacktown Migrant Resource Centre.

Friday, 28 January 2005 - Sydney
Visit to the Fairfield Centrelink Customer Service Centre, the Cabramatta Centrelink Customer Service Centre, the DEWR Job Network Office, Cabramatta, and the Sydney Institute, Ultimo. Meeting with academic Dr Christine Inglis

Sunday, 30 January 2005 - Shepparton
Visit to migrant-owned local industries and businesses. Dinner with community representatives including Local Government.

Monday, 31 January 2005 – Shepparton
Meeting with representatives of the Ethnic Council of Shepparton and a visit to the Goulburn-Ovens Institute of TAFE.

Tuesday, 1 February 2005 – Melbourne
Visit to the City and Brunswick offices of the Adult Multicultural Education Services; the Centre for Multicultural Youth Issues, Carlton; and the National Centre for Translating (an AMEP provider) and Interpreting Service (DIMIA). Meeting with representatives of the Department for Victorian Communities on skilled and regional migration initiatives (State Government).

Wednesday, 2 February 2005 – Sydney
Debriefing with DIMIA personnel

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(240) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig asked:

(1) On page 10 of the Discussion Paper it states that the process of identification of the settlement needs aims to 'reduce gaps in service delivery'. Could DIMIA indicate what gaps exactly there are, where they exist, and how it has identified them? Is there anything being done to address the gaps in the interim, before the program comes into effect?

(2) With regards to the item in the paper that the provision of migration advice will not be one of the activities funded….

- What is the rationale behind this? The provision of these services is one of the larger functions of the MRCs and MSAs.
- Isn't this likely to make clients seek immigration advice from staff at those offices?
- What is the rationale behind making the Translating and interpreting national services no longer operate on a fee-free basis?

(3) Regarding the risk assessment and management tool that DIMIA is developing:

- is this being developed in-house or by an external company?
- if by an external company, which company and how much is it being paid?
- if in-house, what sort of resources are allocated to its creation?
- are you able to give a cost breakdown?

Answer:

(1) A key recommendation of the May 2003 *Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants* (the Review) was that DIMIA develop and implement a more proactive, thorough, consistent, transparent, consultative and regional needs-based planning process for its own services and to inform the planning of mainstream agencies (recommendation 24).

DIMIA is currently developing needs-based planning arrangements that will identify priority settlement needs of newly-arrived migrants and humanitarian program entrants on a regional basis.

A large part of the planning process will involve consultation with relevant stakeholders, including community organisations, settlement service providers and

key government service delivery agencies, to gather information about the key needs of these clients.

This information will be used to develop funding priorities and inform the advertising of DIMIA's Settlement Grants Program in October 2005, and identify and address any gaps in service delivery and coordination between DIMIA-funded settlement services and those provided by other agencies.

Outcomes of the needs-based planning process, including identification of any gaps in service delivery, will not be known until current processes to collect and analyse information about settlement needs is complete. This information is likely to be available in October 2005.

(2) Provision of migration advice has never been listed as a separate funded service type for MRCs and MSAs or the Community Settlement Services Scheme (CSSS). The fact that it has become a significant part of the work of some of these organisations in some States appears to be largely historical.

This issue was raised during the Australia-wide community consultations undertaken by DIMIA in April and May. It also featured in a number of written submissions on the paper. The matter will be given careful consideration when the final parameters of the new program are decided.

With regard to TIS fee-free services, the discussion paper proposes that under the new settlement grants program, organisations incorporate a budget for their interpreting needs into their application.

This is in accord with:

• TIS policy statement (June 1993 and July 2004) which requires community-based organisations with an on-going need for interpreting services to include the need in their funding applications;

• all Commonwealth and State/Territory Governments' commitment to the principles of Access and Equity and the Charter of Public Service in a Culturally Diverse Society, which requires providing holistic funding to organisations so that they can meet any language service needs;

• the Resolution passed by the Ministerial Council of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (MCIMA) in 1998 which endorsed the need to include funding for interpreting services as part of the core funding for all government-funded community-based organisations.

Ongoing access to TIS fee-free interpreting services was raised during the community consultations and in a number of written submissions. The matter will be given careful consideration when the final parameters of the new program are decided.

(3) The risk assessment and management tool is currently under development internally by the Department. The tool has been developed as an Excel

spreadsheet.

Initial advice was sought from DIMIA's auditors, Ernst & Young, in November 2004 at a total cost of $1,193.50.

Development of the current tool has been underway since September 2004.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(241) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig asked:

1.   The funded organisations will be required to submit progress reports three
        times a year, including an annual report.
        (a)   Will these be publicly available? If not, why not?
        (b)   What sort of information will they contain?

2.   Regarding the fact that funded organisations will be required to submit
        standardised and simplified client statistical reports.
        (a)   How many organisations have the capacity to collect these sorts of
                 statistics?
        (b)   What will DIMIA be doing to ensure that all funded organisations have
                 the capacity to collect these statistics?
        (c)   Is there a standard computer program that DIMIA wants organisations
                 to use?

Answer:

1.   The discussion paper on the new Settlement Grants Program proposes that
        funded organisations will be required to submit three progress reports
        annually, including 'reviews' at the end of the first and third quarters and a
        comprehensive annual report at the end of the year.

        (a)   DIMIA does not intend to make the proposed reports from individual
                 agencies publicly available as they may contain confidential
                 information.

        (b)   The proposed progress reports will detail the delivery of the services
                 set out in the Approved Work Program and reflect the performance of
                 the organisation. They will also provide information on any new and/or
                 emerging needs for the organisations' target group.

2.   (a)   DIMIA is in the process of designing a national client statistical
                 reporting process, to be used by DIMIA and organisations funded
                 under the proposed Settlement Grants Program (SGP), that is able to
                 collect and report on aggregated data based around the SGP Work
                 Program. Funded organisations across all Government grant
                 programs are obliged to report on their funded outputs.

(b)   In order to assist in the development of consistent data types, and ensure that all SGP-funded organisations have the capacity to collect these client statistics, DIMIA is establishing a representative reference group to facilitate consultation with the sector on these issues.

Membership of the reference group will include current migrant community services providers, including MRCs/MSAs and CSSS-funded organisations. The reference group is due to meet in July 2005. Organisations will be provided with appropriate support during implementation of the new system.

(c)   The process for collecting client statistics is yet to be finalised.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(242) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig asked:

(1)   In regard to question on notice 143 relating to MRCs that have had their funding ceased over the last couple of years, could you elaborate on the reason given (which was 'performance of the management committee')?

(2)   Who makes the decision regarding the performance of a management committee, and what are the processes in that decision-making process?

(3)   How many members of the old committee are sitting on the new committee?

Answer:

(1)   Two MRCs had their funding ceased in 2003 due to the poor performance of the management committee.

In both of these cases, the Department became aware of management performance issues relating to the respective committees including poor decision-making capacity, poor comprehension of priorities, a lack of ability to guide the organisation strategically, poor understanding of proper process for the conduct of AGMs and other meetings, poor administrative management and poor employment practices.

(2)   On operational matters, the relevant DIMIA State Director makes the final decision regarding the performance of a management committee in the respective State (or Territory). The Minister makes the final decision on funding matters.

The process of decision making relating to the performance of a management committee is that:

➢   Departmental officers actively monitor management committee performance as part of the overall grant management and reporting framework;

➢   Any identified issues are discussed with the management committee in the first instance; and

➢   Unresolved issues that are critical to the funded agency's delivery of agreed outputs are reported to the DIMIA State Director in the respective state (or territory), who after seeking appropriate advice, will make a decision on the future operation of the grant. If it is anticipated that funding to the agency will be affected adversely, recommendations and advice will be provided to the Minister, who will make the final decision.

(3)   DIMIA has not had any contact with the Northern Metropolitan MRC in Victoria since core funding was withdrawn, and cannot comment. In WA, core-funding for the Northern Suburbs MRC was merged with the core- funding for the South Metropolitan MRC and is provided to the new entity, the Metropolitan Migrant Resource Centre. Three members from the Northern Suburbs MRC committee are now members of the new committee for the Metropolitan Migrant Resource Centre.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(243) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig asked:

(1) Please define what is meant by 'civic values' referred to in the review of settlement services.

(2) What funds for independent funded research has the Department provided for Settlement Services in the last five years? Can you provide a breakdown?

(3) What impact does the review of DIMIA's worldwide business process have on funding for the settlement services budget?

Answer:

(1) The term 'civic values' is used on page 31 of the *Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants*. The term is used in a discussion of the evolution of multicultural policy in Australia. The Government's multicultural policy statement, *Multicultural Australia: United in Diversity* 2003, states that the freedom of all Australians to express and share their cultural values is dependent on their abiding by our common civic values. These civic values include loyalty to Australia and its people, and respect for the basic structures and principles underwriting our democratic society – the Constitution, Parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as the national language, the rule of law, acceptance and equality.

(2) Funding provided by the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs for research conducted by an independent contractor into settlement services in the last five years is detailed in the table below.

NAME OF CONTRACTOR	CONTRACT LIMIT/VALUE (incl. GST)
Australian National University – Australian Centre for Population Research	$32,313
Urbis Keys Young	$69,234
Macquarie and La Trobe Universities	$7,250,000
Macquarie and La Trobe Universities	$10,000,000
AC Nielsen	Approx. $154,000 (total funding for LSIA 2 $1.4m. Research into settlement services represented approx. 11%)
Adult Migrant English Program Research Centre	$46,200
Adult Migrant English Program Research Centre	$33,990
Research One	$8,206

(3) DIMIA sought clarification from Senator Ludwig as to the review referred to in this question. Senator Ludwig's office advised that the review referred to in the question is the 2003 *Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants* (the Review)*.* The response below has been framed accordingly.

The Review had a positive impact on the settlement services budget.

$83.6m was provided to DIMIA in the 2004-05 Budget to fund initiatives to enhance settlement services arising from the Review. These included:

- additional hours of English language tuition under the Special Preparatory Program (SPP) in response to Recommendation 49. This has enabled humanitarian entrants aged 16-24 with low levels of schooling to be offered up to 400 hours of tuition under the SPP, and supplemented existing hours offered to those over 24 years;
- increased assistance for Special Humanitarian Program entrants and proposers in response to Recommendation 36, including:
    - resources to meet the cost of pre-departure medical checks;
    - a no-interest loan scheme to assist proposers to meet the cost of airfares;
    - assistance in linking entrants to essential mainstream services, such as Centrelink, Medicare, torture and trauma counselling, or English language classes through Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS); and

- increased accommodation assistance for those new entrants who have the greatest difficulty in locating appropriate and affordable accommodation through the Accommodation Support Program of the IHSS.
- improved case coordination under the IHSS in response to Recommendation 28;
- strengthening the role of volunteers within humanitarian settlement arrangements in response to Recommendation 35; and
- additional grants funding to community organisations working with migrants and humanitarian entrants in response to Recommendation 40.

In addition, the 2005-06 Budget provided $1m in funding for DIMIA to establish a national skills recognition web portal to help new arrivals and potential skilled migrants have their overseas skills and qualifications recognised in Australia in response to Recommendations 11, 12 and 13.

Further enhancements have also been made to the IHSS and other services as a result of the Review, including:

- an increase in the value of the Household Formation Package (Rec. 33);
- the introduction of a tenancy training program (Rec. 32);
- increased assistance for humanitarian entrants to move into longer-term accommodation (Rec. 31);
- introduction of the pre-embarkation cultural orientation program (Rec. 30);
- the abolition of the 5 year time limit on English language tuition under the Adult Migrant English Program (Rec. 48); and
- clarification that Initial Information and Orientation providers meet any immediate health needs of humanitarian entrants through linkages to local health services, up to the time that the Early Health Assessment and Intervention providers conduct the physical health screening and referral (Rec. 34).

The new IHSS contract arrangements will come into effect on 1 October 2005, incorporating the full package of IHSS enhancements.

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(244) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludwig asked:

Regarding the longitudinal survey of immigrants (LSIA) to Australia (review of settlement services)…

(1) Can the Department update us on the progress of this study and what the latest results, if any, are?

(2) Is it still the case that outcomes for humanitarian entrants are poorer than that of other migrants?

(3) In the 2003 Review, it was noted that the LSIA outcomes for humanitarian entrants have deteriorated for recent years and this appears to be largely as a consequence of changes in source countries for the humanitarian program. Given that the problems seem to be dependent on source country, what culturally specific strategies have you implemented in targeting humanitarian entrants from these individual source countries?

(4) In regards to LSIA Cohort 2, are their results in labour-force participation still substantially lower than the LSIA Cohort 1?

(5) In regards to LSIA Cohort 2, are their results in English language proficiency still substantially lower than the LSIA Cohort 1?

Answer:

(1) The first Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA) surveyed migrants arriving in Australia from September 1993 to August 1995 (Cohort 1) and the second LSIA surveyed migrants arriving in Australia from September 1999 to August 2000 (Cohort 2). Migrants from both Cohorts were interviewed about six months after arrival and further interviews were conducted 18 months after arrival. Cohort 1 migrants were also interviewed again 42 months after arrival.

The Department is currently commissioning research into the settlement experiences of newly-arrived humanitarian entrants as recommended by the *Report of the Review of Settlement Services for Migrants and Humanitarian Entrants* (Recommendation 2). The objective of the research is to gain an understanding of recent humanitarian entrants' positive and negative settlement experiences and to compare their settlement experiences with those of earlier waves of humanitarian entrants from LSIA 1 and 2. The Request for Tender was released in March 2005

and tenders are currently being evaluated.

The Department has also commissioned a new longitudinal survey – The Survey of Recent Migrants to Australia, to look at the settlement experiences and economic outcomes of newly-arrived Skilled and Family Stream Migrants. Although not as detailed as the LSIA, this survey will provide valuable information on reasons for migrating, satisfaction with Australian life, English language ability, community participation, labour force status and income. Results from the Survey of Recent Migrants to Australia will be comparable with the LSIA. The tender process has been completed and the successful contractor is currently conducting the pilot study.

(2) Data from LSIA 1 and 2 indicated that humanitarian entrants generally have poorer outcomes against the settlement indicators for economic participation and physical wellbeing, compared to Skilled and Family stream migrants. However, the outcomes for humanitarian entrants on social indicators such as levels of satisfaction with life in Australia and citizenship intentions were the highest for any group of migrants. The findings of the two research projects listed above – research into the settlement experiences of humanitarian entrants and the Survey of Recent Migrants to Australia – will enable further comparison of the settlement outcomes of humanitarian entrants and Skilled and Family stream migrants.

(3) LSIA outcomes are affected by a range of factors. The Humanitarian Program is targeted towards refugees and others in the greatest need of resettlement. International resettlement priorities change depending on refugee situations and needs. Current humanitarian entrants come from a range of different circumstances. Current international resettlement priorities are focused on refugees from Africa, who in general terms have greater needs than people from some previous source regions (such as Europe). These include higher levels of poverty, larger families, lower levels of education and English proficiency, higher incidence of health issues, longer periods spent in refugee camps, little experience of urban environments and higher rates of torture and trauma. These needs do not per se relate to cultural factors but rather to an entrant's specific experiences.

Settlement and other services are targeted to address the circumstances of current humanitarian entrants as they change. Services targeted to address specific needs and new and emerging communities include:
- the pre-embarkation cultural orientation program. The curriculum of the pre-embarkation cultural orientation program is adapted to the needs and circumstances of the participants, taking into account source country and region amongst other factors, such as literacy level, family composition, and urban environment;
- recent enhancements to the Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy (IHSS), which are available to all eligible humanitarian entrants on a needs basis. These include improved case coordination; the introduction of a tenancy training program; an increase in the value of the Household Formation Package; increased assistance for humanitarian entrants to move into longer-term accommodation; and increased assistance to link Special Humanitarian Program (SHP) entrants to essential mainstream services such as Centrelink, Medicare, Torture and Trauma Counselling, and the Adult Migrant English Program;
- introduction of International Organisation for Migration escorts to accompany

groups of refugees arriving from Africa from long term refugee camp situations;

- piloting of pre-departure health screening. This is to more quickly link refugees with appropriate mainstream health services on arrival where they have specific needs arising from their circumstances;
- increased support to SHP entrants to ease the financial and other burdens on proposers and communities, who do not have the resources of previous well established communities. These include full government funding of health assessment costs and the provision of $2.5 million to the International Organisation for Migration to boost its national interest free loans scheme to make it easier and cheaper for proposers of SHP entrants to meet the cost of airfares; and
- Community Settlement Services Scheme (CSSS). Some organisations funded under the CSSS and through the Migrant Resource Centre (MRC)/Migrant Service Agency (MSA) network specifically target humanitarian entrants and migrants of a particular ethnicity.

(4) LSIA Cohort 2 humanitarian entrants had lower rates of employment both six months and 18 months after arrival compared to humanitarian entrants from Cohort 1. Six months after arrival, only four per cent of Cohort 2 humanitarian entrants were employed, compared to six per cent from Cohort 1. 18 months after arrival, 16 per cent of Cohort 2 humanitarian entrants were employed, compared to 26 per cent from Cohort 1.

No further surveys of either Cohort have been conducted since those detailed in response to part (1).

(5) Humanitarian entrants in LSIA Cohort 1 and LSIA Cohort 2 had similar levels of English language proficiency. Six months after arrival, 20% of humanitarian entrants in LSIA Cohort 1 spoke English well, compared with 19% from Cohort 2. Eighteen months after arrival, 37% of humanitarian entrants from both Cohorts spoke English well.

No further surveys of either Cohort have been conducted since those detailed in response to part (1).

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

(245) Output 2.1:   Settlement Services

Senator Ludgwig asked:

IHSS

(1)   How many organisations applied for the recent tender round?

(2)   What is the criteria for assessing the tender?

(3)   Has this criteria changed since the last round of tenders?

(4)   How much money is available under the tender?

(5)   Please provide a list of the successful organisations, how much they received and postcode.

Answer:

(1)   49 Tender responses from 33 organisations were submitted in response to Request for Tender (RFT) 04/24 for the Provision of Services for the Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy.

(2)   The evaluation of Tenders followed the process outlined in the Request for Tender and was fully compliant with Commonwealth procurement guidelines.

(3)   The evaluation criteria used in the current IHSS Tender built on the evaluation criteria used in the previous IHSS Tender. Details are provided at Attachment A.

(4)   The full cost implications of the IHSS tender will not be known until contract negotiations with the Preferred Tenders across all Contract Regions are completed.

(5)   It would be contrary to the probity requirements which govern tender processes for the Department to advise, at this stage, the names of either the Preferred Tenderers or the other parties who submitted Tender Responses. Until a formal written agreement acceptable to both parties is signed, there is no contract or agreement between the Department and the Preferred Tenderer. The Department may negotiate with another Tenderer should negotiations with the Preferred Tenderer not result in an executed agreement within a reasonable time. The names of the successful Tenderers will be published in the Commonwealth of Australia Purchasing and Disposals Gazette once agreements for all Contract Regions are signed.

Attachment A

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Extract from Request for Proposals (No 99/025) for the Provision of Settlement Services [1999 IHSS Tender process]

Proposals will be assessed to determine whether they are a conforming bid in accordance with section 3.12.5 of the RFP and will be evaluated against the criteria specified at section 3.13 of the RFP and further detailed at Part 5 of each of the Annexes for the specific service types.

3.13.1 Proposals are to be assessed on the basis of best value for money consistent with the Commonwealth's purchasing policies. Neither the lowest priced proposal, nor any proposal, will necessarily be accepted by the Commonwealth.

3.13 For the purposes of evaluation the following criteria will be applied. These criteria are not in any order of importance:

- Scope of proposal;

- Quality of the proposal including the Respondent's proven performance and the extent to which the proposal meets the requirements of the IHSS principles; and

- Price (whilst this RFP provides for a fixed price per household unit for the provision of Household Formation Services, proposals will still be evaluated against value for money criteria.)

3.13.3 Detailed information about each of these criteria as they apply to the relevant IHSS service type is provided in Part 5 of each of the Annexes to section 4 of this RFP.

Extract from Request for Tender (No 04/24) for the Provision of Services for the Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Strategy [current IHSS Tender process]

Proposals will be assessed in terms of its Technical Worth, Financial Assessment and Best Value for Money for the Commonwealth.

4.3.6 The financial assessment of Tenders will be based on the Tenderer's responses to the Information Requirements 12 to 14, their financial viability and the financial viability of their proposal.

4.4.1 The following criteria will be considered during the evaluation of Technical Worth:

- The extent to which the Tender demonstrates that the Tenderer has the technical capability, capacity and resources to provide the Required Services in a timely way;

- The Tenderer's experience in delivering similar services to the Required Services;

- The extent to which the Tender complies with and demonstrates an understanding of the SOR;

- The extent to which the Tenderer proposes an efficient and effective approach to managing and delivering the Services to the required standards described in Attachment E;

- The extent to which the Tender demonstrates the Tenderer's understanding of IHSS principles and observes them in the proposed approach to delivery of the Services to Entrants;

- The Tenderer's ability to effect a smooth implementation and transition of the Required Services by the proposed commencement date of 1 October 2005; and

- Comments from the Tenderer's referees.

4.4.2 Evaluation criteria are not listed in any particular order of importance. Tenders shall be assessed on a balance of all criteria, against specific tender evaluation team considerations for each criterion identified above.