

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN CUSTOMS SERVICE

Question No. 210

Senator Ludwig asked the following question at the hearing on 31 October 2005:

For each recommendation of the ANAO CEF Report, please indicate:

- a) Was any money paid to external consultants or other external agencies for work on implementing these recommendations? If so, please indicate:
- (i) How much was paid, and to whom?
 - (ii) Was a tender process used? If so...
 - (iii) Was it open or closed? If it was closed, why was it closed and who was invited to tender?
 - (iv) Was it advertised?
 - (v) Who was on the selection committee?
 - (vi) Had the winning tender been engaged by the government to work on any other projects?
 - (vii) If a tender process was not used...
 - (viii) Why not?
 - (ix) Which company was selected to perform the work, and why?
 - (x) How much were they paid?
- b) How much was originally allocated to the implementation of each recommendation?
- (i) Whether any further funds have been requested for allocation to the implementation of that recommendation, and the date of the request.
 - (ii) Whether those funds were granted, and the date on which the request was granted.
 - (iii) Have any funds been diverted from the development of this system to another area of Customs?
 - (iv) If so, how much has been diverted from the development of this system, and where has it been diverted to?
 - (v) When was it diverted?
 - (vi) On whose authority was it diverted?
- c) Is the implementation of that recommendation complete?
- d) Is there a timeframe for the implementation of that recommendation?
- (i) Could you provide a copy of the timeframe?
 - (ii) Have all key dates been met so far?
 - (iii) If not, which ones have not been met and why?
 - (iv) If not, what is the expected date of completion?
 - (v) What was the original expected date of completion?
- e) How many staff were allocated to implement each recommendation?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) An external consultant was paid to implement recommendation 1 and 8. No money was paid to consultants or external agencies to implement recommendations 2,3,4,5,6 and 7.

Recommendation 1

- (i) Lange Consulting and Software Pty Ltd and APIS Consulting Group Pty Ltd (through an Australian Public Service Commission Panel) were paid \$67,124.27 for the implementation of recommendation 1.

- (ii) No.
- (iii) Not applicable.
- (iv) Not applicable.
- (v) Not applicable.
- (vi) Not applicable.
- (vii) A tender process was not used.
- (viii) Due to the value of the contracts Customs approached the Australian Public Service Commission (APSC) to identify a suitable and qualified consultant in a timely and cost-effective manner.
- (ix) Lange Consulting and Software Pty Ltd and APIS Consulting Group Pty Ltd were identified as suitably qualified from the APSC consultants list and were therefore hired to perform the work.
- (x) Lange Consulting and Software Pty Ltd was paid \$28,710.00 and APIS Consulting Group Pty Ltd were paid \$38,414.27 to perform the services.

Recommendation 8

- (i) Grosvenor Consulting Pty Ltd was paid \$56,757.00 for the implementation of recommendation 8.
 - (ii) Grosvenor were selected from an existing Customs panel for the provision of financial services. This Panel was established in 2004 through an Open Tender process. A tender process for the selection of Grosvenor from the Customs panel was used.
 - (iii) The tender process for the selection of Grosvenor was closed. The process was available to the members of Customs panel for financial services.
 - (iv) No.
 - (v) Not applicable.
 - (vi) Not applicable.
 - (vii) Not applicable.
 - (viii) Not applicable.
 - (ix) Not applicable.
 - (x) Grosvenor Consulting Pty Ltd was paid \$56,757.00 to perform the services.
- (b) No specific funding was applied for or received to implement the recommendations. Costs were met out of existing supplier expenses.
- (i) No further funds have been requested.
 - (ii) Not applicable.
 - (iii) No funds have been diverted from the implementation of the recommendations to another area of Customs.
 - (iv) Not applicable.
 - (v) Not applicable.
 - (vi) Not applicable.

(c) All recommendations have been implemented except recommendation 1 and 2

(d) There is a timeframe for implementation of Recommendation 1.

(i) Implementation dates for Recommendation 1 were dependent on the implementation of ICS and therefore moved with that schedule. Part (a) of Recommendation 1 has been implemented now that ICS is implemented. Parts (b) and (c) were dependent on the implementation of Part (a) and are in the process of being implemented. They are due for completion by 31 December 2005.

(ii) Yes. See response to (d)(i) above.

(iii) Not applicable.

(iv) Not applicable.

(v) See response to (d)(i) above.

Recommendation 2

(d) This work is ongoing, and so does not have a set timeframe for completion. A national project is currently underway to support match evaluation and profile development with reference material regarding patterns of trade. This is complemented by specific work undertaken in each of the regions. Mechanisms for review and updating of the data are included in the project.

Implementation of recommendation 2 has begun. Completion of the initial work is on track for May 2006, following which a program of regular review will be implemented.

(e) The implementation of the ANAO recommendations was undertaken by a number of Customs staff working across different areas of Customs. Two Customs staff members and two consultants were involved in the development of the system for recommendation 1.