



# **PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA**

## **TRANSCRIPT**

### **LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

### **ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B**

Hon. Madeleine Ogilvie MP

**Wednesday 7 June 2023**

### **MEMBERS**

Hon Rosemary Armitage MLC (Deputy Chair);

Hon Jane Howlett MLC;

Hon Tania Rattray MLC (Chair);

Hon Rob Valentine MLC; and

Hon Meg Webb MLC;

Hon Josh Willie MLC.



## **IN ATTENDANCE**

**Hon. Madeleine Ogilvie MP**, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Science and Technology, Minister for Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries, Minister for Racing, Minister for Heritage.

### **Ministerial Office**

Kathryn Newett	Acting Chief of Staff
Laura Searle	Senior Adviser
Kandace Gilligan	Adviser, Heritage
Tristan Bick	Senior Adviser

## **DEPARTMENT OF STATE GROWTH**

### **Small Business**

Kim Evans	Secretary, Department of State Growth
Mark Bowles	Deputy Secretary, Industry and Business Development
Jenna Cairney	Executive Director, Business Tasmania
Kate Mirowski	Director, Business Tasmania

### **Science and Technology**

Jenny Gale	Secretary, Department of Premier and Cabinet
Kim Evans	Secretary, Department of State Growth
Mark Bowles	Deputy Secretary, Business and Jobs
Lara Hendriks	Executive Director, Trade
Stan Corrigan	Director, Science and Technology
Justin Thurley	Chief Information Officer
Rob Williams	Deputy Secretary, Department of Premier and Cabinet
Malcolm Smith	Manager Cyber Security
Angela Conway	Acting Deputy Secretary, Business Services
Glen Dean	Director Finance
Travis Boucher	Manager Budget

### **Minister for Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries**

Kim Evans	Secretary
Mark Bowles	Deputy Secretary Business and Jobs
Steve Gilmore	Defence Advocate
Jenna Cairney	Executive Director, Business Tasmania
Dennis Hendriks	Senior Director Business Tasmania
Angela Conway	Acting Deputy Secretary, Business Services
Glen Dean	Director Finance
Travis Boucher	Manager Budget

## **DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT TASMANIA**

### **Office of Racing Integrity**

Jason Jacobi	Acting Secretary
Deirdre Wilson	Deputy Secretary
Justin Helmich	General Manager, Office of Racing Integrity

**Heritage**

Jason Jacobi

Sophie Muller

Andrew Roberts

Acting Secretary

Deputy Secretary

Director, Heritage Tasmania

# PUBLIC

**The Committee met at 8.59 a.m.**

**CHAIR** - Minister, welcome.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - I'd like to introduce to you members of the Estimates Committee B. We have the honourable Meg Webb, the honourable Jane Howlett, the honourable Rob Valentine, Tania Rattray, we have the honourable Rosemary Armitage and the honourable Josh Willie. Our Secretary of support is Simon Scott, and we have the wonderful Gay on Hansard.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, Gay. The most important role.

**CHAIR** - So that's our team for this day. We have you as the Minister for Racing.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Then we'll move into Minister for Heritage, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries, and your role as Minister for Science and Technology. We will be starting with Racing.

## **DIVISION 8**

(Department of natural Resources and Environment Tasmania)

**CHAIR** - Thank you, minister. It's in your hands.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you very much. Firstly, I'd just like to introduce the people I have at the table and thank them for their attendance. We have Jason Jacobi, who is Secretary of Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Tasmania; and Justin Helmich, who is the Director of Racing and General Manager of the Office of Racing Integrity, and if required, in the room also we have Russell Hunter, who is our Manager Business Operations and Support, Office of Racing Integrity.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. If there is a need to bring anyone to the table during the course of these hearings, then please just introduce them when they arrive at the table for Hansard. Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Yes, I will do that, because we're going to traverse, I think, a broad area of information. Thank you. Introductory remarks, if that's okay.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the Tasmanian Aboriginal People as the owners and continuing custodians of the land we are meeting on today and pay respect to Elders past, present, and Tasmanian People. I'm really pleased to be here today to be talking about racing, racing integrity, probity, and animal welfare. We know that probity and integrity are critically important to the racing industry, and they underpin confidence in racing across all three codes in our state, and we do not compromise on integrity and animal welfare.

That is why we have undertaken an independent review of the Racing Regulation Act and also announced an independent investigation into team driving, race fixing and animal welfare concerns in the harness racing industry and the management of those issues by the Office of Racing Integrity. Now, the Tasmanian racing industry generates more than \$185 million in economic activity for Tasmania, right across the state, particularly importantly in regional areas, and with more than 5800 people across the state directly or indirectly employed. There are currently 265 licensed harness racing participants, 478 thoroughbred, and 481 greyhound.

Now, our government has committed to introducing the most significant reforms to integrity in racing in decades. All recommendations in this Monteith Review of the Racing Regulation Act 2004 securing the integrity of the Tasmanian racing industry have been accepted in full or in principle by our government. The new model will create a Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner with powers to set integrity and animal welfare standards and with comprehensive audit compliance and investigatory functions.

Governance within Tasracing will be enhanced with the racing body to become operationally responsible for all three codes of racing and pre-race day and race day management, including stewards and daily animal welfare. Now, importantly, the RSPCA will have an advisory role relating to animal welfare to the new Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner and will retain the power for independent investigation of animal welfare matters. Implementation of these important reforms will require changes to legislation, which we are progressing. I am pleased that the community will have an opportunity to provide comments on a draft bill later this year.

When it comes to all forms of racing, the Tasmanian government is committed to ensuring the welfare of animals before, during, and after their racing life. One way we have done this is through a \$200 000 grant to the RSPCA for animal welfare initiatives to support animal welfare inspectors, and this was recent. Part of this grant will go towards analysis of options for lifetime traceability for greyhound and adoption processes. I know this is something people have wanted for some time, so it was well received.

I would also note that the government acted swiftly following allegations in March about team driving, race fixing, and in relation to animal welfare concerns relating to the harness racing industry, to announce an independent investigation. Submissions to racing and national integrity expert, Mr Ray Murrihy, closed on 2 May and the investigation is continuing. I'll have more to say on that, obviously, when the findings are handed down.

But before we get started, I would also like to note a couple of things. I'd like to acknowledge that freedom of speech is by far the most important privilege afforded members, and I in no way wish to limit that, and I know we've had conversations around this in the past. However, I would just like to note that the existence of this privilege also comes with a responsibility to use it wisely, which is what I will intend to do, and to use that privilege judiciously, again which is what I will intend to do. If I need to refer to our staff members to ask a question, to find out more information, or to find the best way or the best information I can get to answer a question, I will do that.

I want to also be careful about individual reputations. I note that, and if anybody has a concern about that, please do raise it. The community rightly expects that questions will be asked in a respectful way and be answered in a respectful way, which is my intention, and we

## PUBLIC

are here to give you as much information as we possibly can. I would now close out that section and say I welcome those questions and I look forward to providing you with whatever answers we can.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, and I'd just like to address the minister's remarks there. Whenever I have been Chair of this committee, there is always respect.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

**CHAIR** - I just want to make that point.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Good.

**CHAIR** - And that's on behalf of my members as well.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

**CHAIR** - We have an overview question from Mr Willie.

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you, Chair. I'd just like to ask you, minister, about the secretary's comments to this committee in regards to Janet Ainscow. The secretary told this committee in a previous hearing that, 'I'm aware of various accounts on social media that allege to Ms Ainscow, who has been stood down because of her criticism of the Yole Operation.' To be clear though, this is not the case, and Ms Ainscow has not been suspended or stood down.

I have here an email from the Director of Racing to Ms Ainscow that says:

'Last year, I discussed with you some social media posts made by you in relation to the Yole Racing stable. At that time, I encouraged you to desist in engaging in social media commentary and attended your premises to view your concerns firsthand. At the time, I advised that I instructed you to be redeployed from your duties within harness racing, in line with the scope of the casual employment contract, to other duties within thoroughbred racing and greyhound racing in line with the conditions of your casual employment contract. You declined to participate in greyhound racing stewarding.'

Now, I raise this; isn't it clear that Mrs Ainscow has been stood down from harness racing and her duties as a steward? I ask for your comment on the secretary's statement at a previous hearing.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. You raise an issue which I can give you some information on, but I note also again it's operational in nature, and I have been at pains to lay the foundation here for the issues that sit within the ministerial purview and those at operational level. But I am very happy to give you some broad comments, but I think also you really have directed a question to that level, which I perhaps will as the secretary to also comment upon.

In relation to Ms Ainscow, it is obviously not appropriate, as I've said, for me to comment on individual HR matters, being operational in nature, particularly in relation to ORI staff that we do have ORI at the table. I am aware that there's been various accounts on social media. I do get very concerned about social media use within the industry, and everywhere. It can go too far and I know it's something that we're grappling with as a community and a society.

## PUBLIC

The comments on social media, as I understand you have stated, are that Ms Ainscow's been stood down because of her criticism of Mr Yole's business. I understand that that's not the case and that Ms Ainscow's has not been suspended or stood down. That is the advice I have been provided. But I would ask the secretary, and perhaps through you, to provide a little more information to you.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through you, minister. I thank the member for the question. No, that's correct. Ms Ainscow has not been stood down.

**Mr WILLIE** - But it's very clear here, minister, that she has been stood down from harness racing stewardship, and has been redirected to other areas, so she has been stood down from harness racing.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Again, I'll ask the secretary. It is an operation matter.

**Mr JACOBI** - Yes, thank you. Through the minister, Ms Ainscow has not been stood down. Any changes to her rosters have been in agreement with Ms Ainscow, and I will not comment any further on the personal issues and employment matters of an employee of the department.

**Mr WILLIE** - I mean, these have been raised publicly, so -

**Ms OGILVIE** - And social media.

**Mr WILLIE** - Well, in the media as well, mainstream media. It's very clear here there's a different version of events.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Would you like to comment, secretary?

**Mr WILLIE** - Ms Ainscow is no longer a harness racing steward, and she's been stood down from that position.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What you are asserting doesn't seem to gel with what the operational side of our business is saying, and I would ask the secretary to comment again.

**Mr JACOBI** - Yes, through the minister, it really is inappropriate to be discussing the personal employment matters of an individual staff member at this table and in a public forum. I won't go into those details because they are of very personal nature, and they are an employment matter between the department and the individual. I'll just reiterate, it's not appropriate to be discussing these matters at this table. Ms Ainscow has not been stood down, and if Ms Ainscow has any grievances or complaint to make, she has many avenues through which to make that.

**Mr WILLIE** - It's not like this isn't in the public domain already, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's okay to ask the question. I think we've answered it.

**Mr WILLIE** - I'm just making sure that the information presented to the committee is accurate.



## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - And again, would you like to comment?

**Mr JACOBI** - Through you, minister. I can't be any more accurate than to say that Ms Ainscow has not been stood down. There is nothing more to say.

**Mr WILLIE** - The Director of Racing has emailed Ms Ainscow and said that she will be redeployed in other areas. She has been stood down as a harness racing steward.

**Mr JACOBI** - Through you, minister. Ms Ainscow has not been stood down. She continues to remain an employee, an active employee, as a casual steward in the industry on behalf of the Office of Racing Integrity. She has not been stood down, and she remains employed.

**Mr WILLIE** - Not in the area she was employed originally.

**Mr JACOBI** - Through you, minister. It's just not appropriate to go into the specifics of discussions that have been held between Ms Ainscow and the department.

**Ms WEBB** - Supplementary, if I may.

**CHAIR** - Supplementary, Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I ask whether there's any other employees, and not the specifics of those employees but just broadly, minister, any other employees who have had the scope of their role redirected as a result or consequent to making publicly critical comments?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Again, that's an operational matter. Are you happy for me to refer it, which I will?

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, thank you.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through you, minister. I thank the member for the question. To be clear, I have a zero tolerance around bullying as the secretary of the department. I am absolutely committed to any employee at any point in time being able to speak about any matter that concerns them. There are multiple avenues available to every employee to do that, and for their concerns to be heard independently. That may be through the ombudsman or the Integrity Commissioner or other sources. It would be highly unusual for any employee to be redirected from their employment without it doing so at their request.

Often, employees make requests to have their duties amended, and when they do, I give consideration to that. I give consideration to it in the interests of their wellbeing foremost. It would be true to suggest that if an employee comes to me and says, 'I would like to have my duties amended, either for a period of time or permanently,' I would seek advice, and I would seek evidence, and I would ask them for reasons why they would need to have those duties amended. If the reasons are sound, and in the interests of the employee, I would absolutely consider them.

**Ms WEBB** - Minister, can I clarify, though, the actual question I asked, and if there's a specific answer to that. I hear what the secretary has said about responding to requests for

## PUBLIC

changes to roles. My question was around whether there had been any instances or how many instances there had been of employees having their role redirected by the secretary as a result of public criticism that was felt to be inappropriate to parts of their role.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's a very specific question. It goes to HR and operational matters. I will ask the secretary to comment.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through, you minister, and thank you member for the question. I'm not aware of any employee who would have had their duties changed or amended due to speaking out.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Ms Armitage.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you, Chair. Still to the overview, you mentioned the inquiry with Mr Murrihy.

**CHAIR** - Mr Murrihy. The pronunciation is very Irish.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you. In 2018, Mr Ray Murrihy was employed to investigate instances of suspect betting activities and driving tactics of the racing - of a racing team and the associated bookmaker. However, the evidence was not conclusive enough to have the trainer charged. Given Mr Murrihy has been employed to conduct a further independent inquiry into a similar racing scenario, are you confident that he'll be able to deliver a conclusive result.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Yes, I am confident. Mr Murrihy is one of Australia's foremost integrity experts, and to be frank with you, we were very pleased he took on this role. I know he's been working hard through the period from his appointment to this moment in time, and I think - you raise a question that has been raised before, so I would like to just put some information on the record, and if you have further queries through the statement, please raise.

As I said in my opening, of course, probity and integrity really do matter. They're critically important for racing. Not just for participants, but for everybody who is engaged in racing. It underpins confidence right across the sector in the business of racing, across all of the three codes. We will not compromise, as I've said, and I'll repeat it, as I do, on animal welfare and integrity issues.

Now, the independent review needed to be independent, obviously, because we'd had some issues raised in the media - mainly in the media, but others had been speaking of it, and we announced that Mr Murrihy was the independent reviewer. He is our foremost national integrity expert. He has had a long and distinguished career in integrity matters, providing expert advice to governments, sporting codes, and law enforcement bodies. As the committee would be aware, we finalised the terms of reference and will release those on Saturday 1 April. His review will probe allegations of team driving, which you've raised in your question, race fixing, and animal welfare concerns, and the Tasmanian harness in the Tasmanian Harness Racing industry, and the management of those issues by the Office of Racing Integrity.

## PUBLIC

You raised the question about his previous engagement with Tasmanian racing. His past inquiry, again, we were very pleased to have him undertake that inquiry for us. I must say, at a personal level, I have been quite disappointed at the criticisms levelled by some of the choice of Mr Murrehy as the independent investigator. I think it stands to reason that we know we've got the right person. Mr Murrehy is a highly regarded racing and national integrity expert. As a previous chairman of the national chairman of stewards group, which is an advisory sub-committee to Racing Australia on integrity and safety matters, his experience includes working as a manager of integrity for Racing New South Wales. He's suitably qualified to lead this important review.

He has an understanding, as I've said, of the Tasmanian racing industry, and has also undertaken specific integrity investigations for us, and that Mr Murrehy undertook an investigation into harness betting activities five years ago in 2018 does not preclude him from undertaking this investigation. It means he will be able to take any learnings that he has, particularly around the context of his investigation, from that investigation, and apply them and provide recommendations for improvements if required. I think that answers your question, but I'm happy to discuss more if you would like to.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Have you got an estimated time frame for the completion of that review?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, we do. Would you like me to give you an overview of that?

**CHAIR** - Thank you, while you've got that page out.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, just a moment. I do. I think we've got that on page - we'll just find that for you. Yes, the investigation has commenced, as I've said, and is planned to be completed by 30 June. Submissions closed at 5 p.m. on 2 May 2023, and that is where it's at.

**CHAIR** - So, about 3 weeks.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Well, we look forward to having some information.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Mr Willie? And then I'll go back up the table.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, sure.

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you, Chair. I just want to clarify, minister, what the Secretary is saying because -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure.

**Mr WILLIE** - From what I just heard then it was, it seems like that Ms Ainscow has requested to be redeployed. Is that what the Secretary was saying? Because this email here

## PUBLIC

from the Director of Racing to Ms Ainscow says, 'At the time, I was advised that I instructed you to be redeployed from your duties within harness racing'.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Redeployed.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What, you were asking about being stood down? Is that different? I don't -

**Mr WILLIE** - Stood down from harness racing stewardship.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I just don't have a copy of this. I don't know what email you're referring to there. I don't have a copy of it.

**Mr WILLIE** - I'm referring to an email from the Director of Racing to Mrs Ainscow.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Right.

**Mr WILLIE** - But I'm just trying to clarify what the Secretary is saying here. It sounds like -

**Ms OGILVIE** - I understand your question.

**Mr WILLIE** - Ms Ainscow has requested to be redeployed. Is that what the Secretary is saying?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Through me, obviously, because I don't have a copy of the email. Secretary, would you like to comment?

**Mr JACOBI** - Through you, minister, thank you. Thank you for the question. All stewards are tri-code, so they work across thoroughbred, harness and greyhound. Ms Ainscow is currently operating in other codes, not the harness racing code, at this point in time.

**Mr WILLIE** - Because she's been stood down from harness racing.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Let me just ask again. Secretary, do you have a comment?

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through you, minister, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss the conversations that have been held between the department and Ms Ainscow in relation to the work that she undertakes.

**Mr WILLIE** - Well, I'm just trying to clarify here because earlier I said that - earlier I heard you say that it was a negotiated redeployment. But this email says something very different.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Secretary, would you like to comment? I don't have the email, so let me be clear, I'm not sure what's in the language.

**Mr WILLIE** - Well, I'm reading you the email.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Could I also just ask if Ms Ainscow has approved her being raised in - yes, okay. I just want to make sure. That's my concern about these issues. Secretary?

**Mr WILLIE** - She's talked about it publicly, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, no. But we have to take care. Secretary?

**Mr JACOBI** - Through you, minister, I'm aware of conversations that have been held with Mrs Ainscow in relation to the codes that she works in and operates in, and I believe it would be entirely inappropriate for me to discuss these matters in a public forum.

**Ms OGILVIE** - As an HR matter. All right. Thank you. It sounds like we -

**CHAIR** - So, the clarification that the honourable Member is seeking is whether it is always a negotiated arrangement or, in this case, has it been a direction. That's the simple question through you, minister, is my understanding.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay. All right. We'll see if we can find information on that for you.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Certainly that follows on from the question I asked, which is -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Thank you. Yes, thank you. I think what we might do is refer that to Justin to speak via his role in ORI.

**Mr HELMICH** - Certainly. Thanks.

**CHAIR** - So, the Director of Racing.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Director of Racing formally, yes. Thank you.

**Mr HELMICH** - Thank you. Through you, minister, so, we've got a number of stewards who participate in certain kinds of racing, but not other codes of racing. I'll speak generally rather than speak about a particular employee. We have stewards who have relationships with particular codes of racing and therefore, discussions that we have with those people. We avoid putting them within those codes to ensure that there is no perceived conflict of interest with their participation within the code. And we have quite a number of stewards - three or four stewards that I can think of off the top of my head - who we avoid putting them on particular codes.

**CHAIR** - All right. So, minister, I can take from that, and the member will make up his own mind what he takes from it, that it is always a negotiated arrangement when a person who works for the department in their duties. It's a negotiated arrangement.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Would you like to comment through me, Mr Secretary?

**Mr JACOBI** - Yes. Through you, minister, just to be clear, Chair, unless it was a disciplinary matter.

**CHAIR** - Right. So, the member might have input now, seeing I've taken over.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes. Thank you, Chair.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That's all right. Happy to be flexible.

**Mr WILLIE** - I just want to go to the minister's comments about Mr Murrihy. We've never been critical of Mr Murrihy. We've been critical of the terms of reference being too narrow in scope, and that he's not an expert in workplace safety tax evasion and wage theft. He's an excellent steward. So, I just want to clarify the minister's comments there.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Is that a question? No.

**Mr WILLIE** - No. I do have a question, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay.

**CHAIR** - There's always a question.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, waiting for it.

**Mr WILLIE** - Which is why was your initial response to cruelty and bullying in the racing industry for the Office of Racing Integrity to investigate itself? That was your initial response.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry. I just want to be specific. Specifically in relation to the ABC report?

**Mr WILLIE** - You came out and said that ORI would investigate itself.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. I need to refer things to the department and through to ORI when matters arise.

**Mr WILLIE** - And then that changed.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, no. That still stands. And then we also employed Mr Murrihy to do an investigation.

**Mr WILLIE** - Subsequent to your first announcement.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Over the same period of 48 hours.

**Mr WILLIE** - What conversations did you have with the Premier in the lead up to that announcement? It seems like he went out in the morning and made an announcement about an independent review, and then in the afternoon you were out announcing that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So the Premier and I work closely together. We have a very strong and good working relationship, and I work with him to make sure that he receives the advice from his minister that he needs in a timely way, and we work together on that. I was very pleased that he was in agreement with me about an independent review being a good step to take, and

## PUBLIC

I was pleased he announced it. I announced it as well. So, I'm not quite sure where you're going with that, Mr Willie.

**Mr WILLIE** - I'm just interested in whether it was his call or your call.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What do you mean, 'call'? Just, what do you mean?

**Mr WILLIE** - As in commissioning the independent review.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, it was my recommendation as minister.

**Mr WILLIE** - Okay. Thanks for the clarification.

**CHAIR** - Supplementary, Ms Armitage, and then I'm going up the table.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Along the same lines and also to do with the investigations. So, the allegations raised by an investigation by the ABC in 2023 and the right to information documents showed that the state's integrity office have known about the complaints of team driving and animal welfare concern for years. So, why was no action taken? And had the ABC not investigated, would there have been an inquiry by ORI? Why was an independent investigation undertaken when the ABC made public the seriousness of concerns within the industry, yet complaints from within the industry fell on deaf ears?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you for the question. I think it's probably incorrect to say that things have been falling on deaf ears. But let me -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Well, there was no investigation until obviously the ABC raised it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, no, no. Well, let me say firstly, I have a deep respect for our journalists and what the media do. It's very important work. And the ABC report, of course, was well noted by everybody. Now, all matters raised in the ABC report relating to team racing or race fixing and complaints management by ORI come within the terms of reference of the Murrihy report and the animal welfare matters raised. So, BOTRA, which stands for Breeding, Owners, Trainers and Reinspersons, Tasmania; they've had concerns relating to specific racers and complaints management by the Office of Race Integrity, and the terms of the investigation, obviously, covered those. That investigation does probe those allegations of team driving, race fixing and animal welfare concerns in the Tasmanian harness racing industry, and the management of those issues by the Office of Racing Integrity.

I would like to just pause at this moment and really reiterate that these are allegations. They're not proven. They are allegations until such time as we've got findings about them. Now, probity and integrity, as I have said, are very important in the racing industry because of the confidence issue. And it's been really quite upsetting for a lot of people. Remember, 98 per cent of people in the racing industry do the right thing. It's really important. It's a state-wide industry. People love their animals. They love their racing, and it is important to the state. So, to raise some -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Would you agree, minister, that 2 per cent is 2 per cent too many that are not doing the right thing?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Indeed. That is why we have our regulatory overview. That's why we have an Act. That's why we have Office of Racing Integrity. And that is why I have spent a year as a minister, despite some resistance, in bringing forward change. And change is hard and not everybody wants change. But I'm determined to deliver the new Act, and determined to deliver this change, which will be a step change to provide a contemporary integrity approach and model to the state of Tasmania. And this is a good thing.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - And bearing in mind our questions come from the racing industry.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Understand that, absolutely. Absolutely. Certainly, I'm alive to those questions and concerns. Now, just to get back to the core of your question, I'm very happy by way of inter-exchange to have a conversation about it.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - No, that's fine.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Is that all right? Yes. So, those allegations. It was aired on 26 March, regarding team driving, race fixing and animal welfare concerns. And as I've said, we acted to implement the Murrphy report. So, I note also the comments of the Tasmanian Trotting Club Chief Executive Officer, as reported in the *Mercury* on 7 April, that the club fully supports the independent review into the Tasmanian harness racing industry. I think that goes to your point, Ms Armitage, that the industry wants a contemporary and good model, and the industry does not brook bad behaviour either. Certainly, those issues that are brought forward, we are alive to those.

In relation to TASRIC it will remain independent. The new integrity model sits underneath that, and our Tasmanian Racing Integrity Commissioner - it will be the TASRIC Commissioner - will have powers to set integrity and animal welfare standards and comprehensive audit, compliance and investigatory function.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - My question was why no action had been taken earlier, but I am assuming that concerns had been raised previously.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. I will refer to the section.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes. It would just be good to know why -

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, I'm happy to go deeper.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Nothing had come earlier.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, that's right. So all complaints - I just will refer it to the Secretary - but all complaints are referred through appropriate channels through the Department to ORI and they are investigated. But these complaints I understand had new information, and so they were fresh complaints that the ABC broadcast. I will ask the Secretary to go a bit deeper on how complaints are managed at that operational level.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through you, minister, all the complaints that are received by the Department -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - And concerns. Not just complaints, but sometimes concerns.



**Ms OGILVIE** - That's right.

**Mr JACOBI** - Concerns, yes, that's right. Thank you, they're not all complaints. All complaints or concerns that are raised with the Department follow a due process, and depending on the nature of the complaint, it will determine a particular avenue in which that complaint is directed. For purely operational matters they are normally referred to the Director of Racing, and I am confident that - and the Director assures me - that in relation to many of the issues that were raised in the ABC report the Director had in fact reviewed those issues.

There were newer issues that were brought to our attention through the ABC report, and as the minister has outlined, they are now subject to the Murrihy Review. If you have a specific inquiry to make about a particular race or a particular concern that was raised I am happy to take that question or to refer to the Director for advice.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Ms Webb?

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Just a couple of quick overview questions I have been asking each department that comes to us. So we will just run through them for the sake of consistency. The Efficiency Dividend announced in this budget, is there an understanding about an approach that will be taken within this Department that we are relating to here around how that is going to be approached?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So are you talking about at the implementation level?

**Ms WEBB** - That's right. When it is to be implemented, in 2024-25.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. I'll ask the secretary to speak to that.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you, through the minister. I thank the member for the question. We have made no determination yet of how the efficiency dividend will be applied, but we will be turning our mind to that over the next 12 months.

**Ms WEBB** - Is it expected that it would be applied to entities like ORI and the like in this space?

**Mr JACOBI** - Sorry, I missed your -

**Ms WEBB** - Is it expected it would be applied to the government funded entities in this space, in racing?

**Mr JACOBI** - It will be applied to all areas of the Department where it is appropriate.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Another overarching question, I am interested in from each department is about the use of consultants. So in this area, within the Department, has there been any use of consultants during the financial year we're in, and if so can you provide an outline of those projects and the timelines and the amounts?

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Again, that is an operational issue. I will ask the Secretary. Thank you, the Director of Racing might respond to that one.

**Mr HELMICH** - We have engaged one consultant over the period that relates to consultancy for the acting regulatory veterinarian. I have got details in relation to how much - sorry, through you, minister - for how much that is. I can find it in a moment, but there is only one consultancy that the Office of Racing Integrity has had during the period.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, and if you could provide those details at your convenience that would be good. I have one other overview question - I'm not sure if it belongs in overview, but in your opening remarks, minister, you spoke about the economic contribution of the industry to the state. And I am just interested in how that was arrived at.

I know that the 2016 Joint Select Committee on Greyhound Racing had recommended one of their recommendations - 25, I think it was - was that the government undertake independent cost-benefit analysis of the Tasmanian Racing Codes to inform a review of the current funding model for the industry. So the figure gave around economic contribution, is that the result of an independent cost-benefit analysis as per that recommendation from the Joint Committee?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Good question, and I have read all of those recommendations and we have been working through those. I think we have spoken in this place before about tracking where we are at with those to date. That figure, I believe, has come from - I'm just seeking some information here - the economic value of the industry.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm asking how it was arrived at, was it a result of an independent cost-benefit analysis?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll just seek the information about how they have arrived at the figure. We'd have to take that on notice.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. We will put through to your notice.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We're very happy to have that. Unless, of course, we're able to get it quickly, but yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Sure. I'm interested to know the basis of the figure that you provided, and if you could share that fully with us.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Mr Valentine.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you. So just a couple of questions. Firstly, the FTE level at the moment, but probably compared with last year. So if you can provide information on that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Is there anything about staff movements?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes, staff levels, both headcount and -

**Ms OGILVIE** - And hours, FTEs, yes. Certainly that, again, is one for the Department.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VALENTINE** - No, I can understand that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Thank you. Just give them a moment, they have quite a lot of information there. Thank you. I do have the information but I am also very happy for the Secretary to add additional information if you need.

So headcount by roles. Stewards: Casuals, 17; full-time, 11; giving us a total of 28. Cadet stewards: We don't have any casuals; full-time, 3; giving us a total of 3. Operations and support: Casuals, we have 1; and we have 10 full-time; giving us a total of 11. So overall that means we have a total of 18 casual, 24 full-time and 42 in total.

In relation to vacancies ORI currently has 4 vacancies, 2 stipendiary stewards full-time, 1 regulatory veterinarian and 1 operations and support officer. Of the 4 vacancies 2 positions have been recruited, with the successful candidates due to commence within the next couple of weeks, and that will be 1 stipendiary steward, 1 operations and support officer.

The duties of the regulatory veterinarian role are currently conducted by an experienced veterinary contractor, and staffing chief steward harness has been filled. The former substantive member, Mr Steven Shinn, has formally resigned his position and that role has been filled as well. Is that enough information?

**Mr VALENTINE** - And so compared to last year?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, that is something I will actually ask the Secretary, if he has got that information.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I'm basically trying to find out what the movement has been.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, staff movements. Well, we will get it for you if we don't have it at hand. Yes, so we will get that information for you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So that is on notice?

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, hopefully we will have it for you in the session.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay. My other question is in relation to staff welfare. So what processes have you got in place to provide staff with an opportunity to go and talk to somebody if they are having a really difficult time, like you might call it a health and wellbeing sort of circumstance.

**Ms OGILVIE** - A people and culture issue.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So can you give us some understanding as to exactly what you have got in place for that? And the numbers of people - obviously we're not after individual names, of course - but the numbers of people that have accessed that, numbers of staff that have accessed that over the last - perhaps the comparison, you know, two years. So last year and this current year.

**Ms OGILVIE** - An important question. Again, at that HR and operational level I will ask the Secretary to comment. The Director of Racing will provide an answer.

**Mr HELMICH** - Through you, minister. The main program that the staff are able to access is our EAP program, the Employee Assistance Program, and that's available to all staff whether they are full-time permanent staff or casuals, all the way through. In addition to that, we have done a large amount of cultural work over the last couple of years to build the cultural and value strength of the division. Certainly, ensuring that the division is a supportive one and people are able to access and feel comfortable accessing those sorts of supports is at the forefront of what we do. Certainly, the stewards do a difficult role. They do see injured animals and those types of things, and that can be confronting and certainly ensuring that the managers are engaged with the staff throughout - or when those things are occurring, or very shortly thereafter, is one of our main focal points.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay, can you give me numbers of people that would have accessed that avenue? The last financial year and this year to date.

**Mr JACOBI** - Through you, minister, if I may.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, please.

**Mr JACOBI** - I thank the member for the question. I'm just cautious about getting down into specific details by branch or by division about who has access, but.

**Mr VALENTINE** - No, I don't want it to be identifying information. Certainly don't want that. I just want numbers.

**Mr JACOBI** - We would have to take that as a question on notice. Through you, minister. I can report though that, as of 31 March, so for the period between 1 July 2022 and 31 March 2023, we have one compensation claim in the Office of Racing Integrity in relation to psychosocial injury.

**Mr VALENTINE** - One compensation claim.

**Mr JACOBI** - One compensation claim.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes. You'll give me the other detail on notice and the compensation claim for last year, are you able to talk about the numbers there?

**Mr JACOBI** - Just give me one moment. Yes, I can report back for the 2020-21 year, we had one claim in ORI for psychosocial injury. In the 2021-22 year, we had one. I referred to one before, we have one for this year.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Access to that service is totally confidential, so a staff member doesn't have to go through a superior officer, if I can put it that way, or report to access that service. It's totally, you know -

**Ms OGILVIE** - My understanding is it's completely confidential.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Confidential.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - And I also understand - I'm happy to refer to the secretary - but it's a similar one that we have here. So you have direct access, you make the phone call and you can speak directly to an independent person who will assist.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that.

**CHAIR** - A couple of questions before I go to Ms Howlett. Is there a gender split for the workforce, just for the record, thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, I think we may have that information. We'll just retrieve -

**CHAIR** - Minister, while that number's being found, you mentioned, obviously, a couple of times, the welfare of animals and when I was driving home last week, I heard an interview with the long-term equine vet, Longford based, who is retiring, and he raised the question through the interview about the support for the racing industry. I'm interested in whether you have an understanding of the impact of that particular specialised service not being available to the racing industry.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, and so I would just take one question at a time so we're not overlapping. I have this information for you but the vet issue is incredibly important.

**CHAIR** - I don't mind which one you do first.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, well, we'll do it in order, I think. Let's deal with the gender split information first and then we can do a deep dive on the concerns around vets, which is very real and very important. So we have a gender split by business unit for racing integrity. March 2023, we have 15 female, 22 male, which gives you a percentage of 41 per cent female in the workforce there.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Now in relation to vets. Now I am aware that we have a nationwide shortage of vets and it's a difficult issue.

**CHAIR** - You listened to the same interview I did.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, I've just been living it for a year as the minister. We are doing all that we can to make sure that we can engage with, and we've been recruiting for a vet. We've really got our finger on the pulse of this. I've been to the Longford race track. It's the most beautiful track. I was up there hearing more about the program of redevelopment that's happening and I was pleased to see that progressing.

In relation to vet care, we've made commitments around making sure that - particularly through Tas Racing, who are not here today - that there is a vet available at all times. Now these issues are deeply important not just for animal welfare concerns but they go to the confidence of the racing sector. As the minister, can't control what a private sector vet may want to do about retirement, et cetera, but I am very concerned to make sure that all of our communities have access to all of the services they need. I think your question is absolutely on the mark and concerning.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - But this is a vet who provides services to the racing industry. My question is, is there a concern that that welfare of animals won't be as high as what it should be if there's not the availability of a specialised equine veterinarian.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I absolute agree with you and the basis of your question. We are always concerned about exactly that. I will ask the Director of Racing who does have, probably, his finger on the pulse in relation to the coverage of vets in the state to add to the answer.

**CHAIR** - He probably knows the vet personally.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, we don't want anyone retiring ever but it does happen.

**Mr HELMICH** - Through you, minister. Look, certainly I am aware that - and it's well acknowledged that the number of veterinary surgeons within Tasmania is not as - it is challenging to get veterinary staff, certainly to undertake activities at race meetings as well. However, as the minister has alluded to, there is always a veterinary surgeon at every single race meeting and they are available.

I think in terms of your question around whether or not the care provided to the animals is sufficient, at each and every race meeting, each and every animal is inspected by the veterinary surgeon. I suppose that does provide a fairly high level of care. They probably are amongst the most inspected animals in Tasmania. That would happen each time they come through a race meeting. In regard to the racing industry, I think the risks of animal welfare falling down the rung as the result of the availability of veterinary surgeons is probably a lot lower than other places.

**CHAIR** - Interesting.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Ms Howlett.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Thank you, Chair. Minister, the Tasmanian racing industry is vitally important to the state, particularly regional Tasmania. The cadet stewardship program was extremely successful. Can you please tell me, moving forward, how we're going to continue to encourage younger people into this program?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, and I'd like to acknowledge you as a former minister for racing and somebody who has deep knowledge of this area, Ms Howlett. The cadet stewardship program, of course, these people are the ones that are refreshing and renewing our organisations, and we can't go forward without them. We spend a lot of time and energy making sure that we are able to deliver a racing sector that delivers for all Tasmanians, and this is one of our priorities.

So the successful Cadet Stipendiary Steward program will continue to provide important career pathways for young Tasmanians wanting to work in the racing industry with permanent funding secured for three positions. Stewards are responsible for the conduct of race meetings throughout the state across all three codes of racing and are entrusted with wide-ranging powers to control and to regulate the respective racing codes. Now they do ensure the rules of racing

## PUBLIC

are adhered to and investigate, determine and, where necessary, penalise any breaches of the rules.

The Tasmanian government has committed \$241 000 per annum to fund three cadets to learn the trade under direction of highly qualified and experienced stewards and the Director of Racing to set them up for what we hope will be long and fulling, and enjoyable careers.

Tasmania's racing industry is vital and it's a vital part of Tasmania's social and economic fabric. And I don't think we talk enough about the social fabric. I know the Chair is fully engaged with that, when we think about Longford, the social fabric of the connection around these clubs and these tracks and how people very much enjoy a day out at the races.

Now, providing a clear future pathway to encourage stewards to consider the racing industry as a long-term career option is a focus of these contracts and the program has been well received since its inception. I'm very pleased to report that cadets have participated in the program, and they've been promoted within ORI to other roles. By way of example one cadet gained a position as a stipendiary steward and another a permanent role as operations and support officer undertaking harness, handicapping, greyhound grading and licensing activities. It's quite a sophisticated job.

This is an excellent outcome which demonstrates the program is having the desired effect and I look forward to hearing the success of additional stewards in years to come. So three new cadet stewards were appointed in 2022-23 and as part of the cadetship program, cadet stewards develop skills and experience in the various roles associated with race and non-race day activities under the guidance of highly qualified and experienced stewards.

Given the success of the cadet stewards program in providing career pathways for cadets to undertake other roles within the Office of Racing Integrity our formal cadetship program training plan is currently being developed to map training requirements to ensure a consistent, accurate and current approach and so in summary we are working on that succession plan to make sure that we have a good program of people coming through to ensure the security of racing going forward. Thank you, Ms Howlett.

**CHAIR** - Thank you Ms Howlett. Ms Armitage.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you, Chair and I ask you to bear in mind that the questions we ask do come from members of the racing community.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Absolutely. No, no that's fine.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - So I am advised one of the issues the Breeders Owners Trainers Reinspersons Association raised was the Director of Racing's interview in an ABC Morning interview where he said he had no knowledge of the Burnie race nine betting plunge. I'm told a letter states that in fact a member of BOTRA executive and another from the Launceston Racing Club had met with the Director of Racing to raise these exact concerns. Can this be explained?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will give a little overview and then as we have people at the same, I think - yes.

## PUBLIC

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes, absolutely. As I said the question were asked of me to ask and it's important to get the answers.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Fantastic. Yes, thank you very much. So, just to reiterate obviously the matters raised in the ABC report in relation to team driving are being investigated by Mr Murrihy and that is the appropriate step to take. In relation to complaints procedures and processes within the department and Tas Racing that is an operational matter and so I will ask the people at this table to refer to that. In relation to the query regarding specific complaints; again we need to take care with those just to make sure that we are not going too far in relation to individual people.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Absolutely. The secretary did invite us to bring up any specific issues.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Indeed. Absolutely.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - And this was asked of me to ask.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, I fully agree, and I'm really pleased that people are bringing these questions forward. I do just want to be careful as a minister not to identify individuals if they don't particularly want to be.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Better to clarify things rather than have rumour and innuendo.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Indeed. I agree, thank you very much.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Because that will support the confident of the industry.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Yes, and I agree with you on that and thank you for that. So, I will ask perhaps the Director of Racing to make some comments in relation to that matter.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Okay.

**Mr HELMICH** - I'm happy to do that thanks, through you, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Of course.

**Mr HELMICH** - Could I just get you to clarify exactly the question that you would like answered because I think that's fairly important.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes, well I will just read the question that was asked of me. Okay, so one of the issues raised was that BOTRA raised was the Director of Racing's interview in an ABC Morning interview where he said he had no knowledge of the Burnie race nine betting plunge. I'm told a letter states that in fact a member of the BOTRA executive and another from the Launceston Pacing Club had met with the Director of Racing to raise those exact concerns.

**Mr HELMICH** - So what I can provide to the committee is that I did have a meeting with two members of - I expect the two members that you're talking about - a member of the Launceston -



## PUBLIC

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I don't know their names, sorry.

**Mr HELMICH** - The Launceston Pacing Club. I had a meeting with them. In terms of the specific issue that the -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - The question is -

**Mr HELMICH** - Is whether I had knowledge of the betting plunge. My response on the ABC was accurate. We did not have knowledge of the betting plunge. That was not raised as a part of the discussion. Certainly the race that the betting plunge related to was discussed.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Race nine.

**Mr HELMICH** - But the betting plunge specifically was not discussed therefore the information that I provided on the ABC article was accurate.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you. No, it's good to clarify. And if could just - they have asked another question.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, that's all right.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Minister, it's awkward asking questions when people are at the table, but as I said they're from -

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, it's fine. We're here to answer.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I know. They're from members of the racing community.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's a big sector and there's a lot of conversations going on.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - It is. So do you consider it appropriate that the Director of Racing saw the contents of a letter that contained specific allegations about his own conduct? What confidence do you consider it gives anyone in the future coming forward with a complaint?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Look we have traversed this issue, in fact in this forum.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes, I understand that, but I've been asked to ask the question.

**Ms OGILVIE** - But we're very happy to do it again and look there is a complaints process and I'm a process follower. I'm cautious about that because it's very important that the minister does not reach into operational matters, and we have information that flows in from multiple sources. So I know we had some discussion about this previously.

So complaints management in ORI is important. I will actually ask the Secretary to give an overview and I know he has spoken of this before but again for those who are watching and to answer the specific question.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you. That's right and I think that was the main thing -

**Ms OGILVIE** - I understand.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Is we actually show the person complained about the letter of complaint.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay, thank you.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Whether it gives others confidence to come forward in the future.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure. Thank you.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you, through the minister. Thank you, member, for the question. I recognise that there have been concerns raised recently about certain aspects of the way in which ORI manages complaints, particularly with harness racing and that's why that particular matter is being addressed by the independent expert, Ray Murrihy.

It's my understanding that although complaints may be addressed by ORI in the first instances the department also has an external complaints and handling process and that applies to ORI staff and the director in his general manager role. In line with that policy external complaints are managed by the department's strategic projects and policy branch which is separated from ORI. Participants or other interested parties can raise a complaint at any time via this process and I would note that the information about making a complaint is available on the NRE Tas website.

If allegations of inappropriate conduct are raised appropriate action is taken consistent with relevant policies and employment directions and it's not appropriate for me to comment on any specific employment matters relating to ORI staff.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - No, I'm not asking you to. Simply asking whether you think it's appropriate for the person complained about to see the letter.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER** - That's the question that the minister, we think, should be answering.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes and that's the answer I haven't received yet.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We have conversations in many forums. Social media inputs. All sorts of emails etc. So the process is through my office we refer those to the department and to ORI. Sometimes issues that are raised come with a range of other issues and as a document that flows through. I think that when it comes to being process improvement oriented, I will point to the fact that we are doing a fundamental restructure of the regulation of the industry, and I know there's concerns -people want an independent channel.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - But I guess my question is do you consider it appropriate?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I consider it appropriate to follow the process that we have in place and I'm not saying they're perfect.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - No, but you haven't answered the question I asked.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I did just answer it then.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - No you haven't because it says, do you consider it appropriate that the Director of Racing saw the content of a letter that contained specific allegations about his own conduct? So it might be anyone. It might not be the Director of Racing. It could be someone else, but do you consider that appropriate, that the person complained about actually sees that letter? I'm just asking whether you consider it appropriate and that's the answer I want.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I understand. So I'll give the answer.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes or no would do.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll give the answer that I've got for you. So that particular letter contained a series of complaints, not just one complaint and there was a range of matters that related to the department and ORI and a range of issues. Some of those issues I am advised related to staffing in relation to ORI. Some of them related to other service matters so when you have a complaint that has a range of issues in it, and I have spoken to -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Were some redacted?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I don't redact anything as the minister. I certainly would never redact somebody's complaint before it was sent to the department. Absolutely not. So, no.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - No, you're missing the question. I really don't think you're answering my question. I'm saying, you were saying there were a range of complaints in that letter, that's why someone may have seen it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, yes.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - So I'm asking if the part about that person was redacted so they wouldn't see about their own complaint.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Secretary, what's the process with - I'm sorry, I have to ask -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Is there any other process available -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, I know where you're going.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - given that you are a process-driven person.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I try to follow the processes. It's hard.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - for something like that instance.

**CHAIR** - But I'd love an answer to the question; whether you think it's appropriate.

**Mr JACOBI** - Through the minister. That particular letter was a difficult matter to determine how it should be addressed, because it contained - and I mentioned this at the Short Inquiry - it contained a whole range of concerns, allegations, comments that related to both the director and ORI, but also that related to particular races and to the department, and trying to

## PUBLIC

separate those issues in the first instances that it was received was difficult. We have since tightened up our procedures and our approach to how we deal with those particular letters that contain multitudes of information.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - So that shouldn't happen again.

**Mr JACOBI** - I'm confident that it shouldn't happen again.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you. So the process wasn't appropriate.

**CHAIR** - I think it's the best answer you're going to get.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - But it's been changed.

**CHAIR** - Or you'd make it a bit more -

**Mr JACOBI** - I wouldn't agree that the process wasn't appropriate. Sorry, through you, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No. Thank you, please do.

**Mr JACOBI** - I just think it was - the way in which it was handled meant that it went to certain parties when it probably should have been dealt with differently and that it's no fault of anybody's. It was an administrative matter that was very difficult to separate at the time.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - It's been a learning curve, you might say.

**Mr JACOBI** - I think we've learnt from the process and we have now adopted avenues to prevent it from happening again.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We can always improve.

**CHAIR** - Mr Willie.

**Mr WILLIE** - That's good to hear, minister, but it was your office that passed that information on.

**Ms OGILVIE** - A lot of information comes through my office.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - And I pass it all on.

**Mr WILLIE** - You effectively outed the whistleblowers.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Was that a question?

**Mr WILLIE** - I'm just saying that it was your office that passed that on and it's sounds like there was a breakdown in procedure, but it was your office that initiated that passing of information.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Question?

**Mr WILLIE** - To the person that was subject to the allegations.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What's your question?

**Mr WILLIE** - My question; I will ask a question, seeing as we were talking about BOTRA earlier. BOTRA passed a no confidence motion in the Director of Racing. What do you say to the Breeders, Owners, Trainers, Reinspersons Association, and what engagement have you had with them since they passed that motion?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I've met with them and we've had a good conversation. I've met with two delegates of BOTRA and I've spoken to others. In relation to the handling of complaints, I think we've just heard that everybody agrees things can always be improved. And also, I was able to talk through and walk through the reforms that we are making relation to the Independent Integrity Commissioner. Now, all of this conversation we're having leads to reform, which is what I'm trying to drive at the ministerial level. So we'll speak to that first, and then we can also speak to other issues.

So the change that we're making is we are implementing an independent commissioner model which will really assist with some of these concerns about a department handling issues where it might be complex, or it might range across a number of issues. When we have the TASRIC in place, it will be that independent channel which should again, as I've said, improve integrity and confidence across the sector. So we're underway in that and the draft bill is being created at the moment.

So in relation to BOTRA's response, I have also recommended or suggested that we have regular meetings at the ministerial level. They seem to think that that's a good idea. I think it's a good idea. I do that regularly with other representative organisations and groups, and I think that would be appropriate to do. So I'm looking forward to that. A lot of this stuff in racing, because it is so big and broad and wide across the state, is about communications. Now, we have an organisation that is tasked with running those race day - and that's Tasracing and you'll have an opportunity in GBEs to speak with them, and we have a department as well that is managing how we deal with complaints at the moment.

I don't believe that we will have a concern going forward. I note that I have been at the races since those issues were raised. I was certainly at a harness racing - I was at the Pink Cup, which is fantastic as well. Racing continues on well and the confidence is there. People are going to the races and those events are being well managed. So I just wanted to say that as well. I will refer to the secretary in relation to BOTRA, and perhaps even the Director of Racing might to speak.

**Mr WILLIE** - I'd appreciate you to address my question, which is specifically about the no confidence motion in the director.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr WILLIE** - What do you have to say to BOTRA in regards to that?

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, I've met with BOTRA.

**Mr WILLIE** - You've met with them.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes. And how are you going to reconcile the differences between the director and BOTRA?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay. I will ask the secretary and the director to speak to that.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through the minister. I thank the member for the question. I will take this opportunity to say that the Director of Racing, in my opinion, is an extremely experienced regulator. He is a highly respect public servant, longstanding public servant, with many years of experience regulating and administering law. And he is a person of incredibly high integrity. In relation to BOTRA's concerns or requests to stand down the Director of Racing, the independent review will specifically consider allegations raised at complaints management by ORI as appropriate.

The Director of Racing continues to provide critical and important leadership to his team, and I will take this opportunity to remind everyone that the department is bound by the State Service Act 2000 and the employment directions that exist. And there is currently no evidence to suggest that the director should be suspended from duty or stood down. And unless evidence is presented that would provide reasonable grounds to believe that a breach of the State Service Code of Conduct or Rules of Racing may have occurred, it is appropriate that the review be allowed to be undertaken and a final report received before any required next steps are considered.

**Mr WILLIE** - Minister, my question is how are you going reconcile the differences between BOTRA, who have passed this motion of no confidence, and - between them and the director, moving forward?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Right. Well, I -

**CHAIR** - Or have you?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Have you done that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Has that been achieved with your meeting?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So I've met with - and I'm sure they won't mind me saying - with Mr Rattray and Ms Hills. We had a good discussion and I think these things are all about communication and all about how we move forward from here. And I'm very happy to do more, to seek to improve the relationship and the understanding on both sides about what the issues are.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILLIE** - Have they changed their position?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I haven't -

**Mr WILLIE** - Have they indicated that to you at all?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I haven't asked them. Yes, thank you. There might be some more information from the Director of Racing about communications he's had.

**Mr HELMICH** - Thank you. Through you, minister. I've had a number of discussions with the acting president of BOTRA, two discussions as I recall since that time in relation to adjacent matters. I have recently had my office write to the secretary of BOTRA to get a full list of who the executive of BOTRA is. It has, as I understand, recently changed. The president has changed and there's now, as I understand, two acting presidents.

I've recently written to Mr Rattray as the acting president of BOTRA seeking to engage with him again. I have had a history since September last year; I've been trying to engage more readily with BOTRA, and indeed, I had a meeting with BOTRA in early March to discuss issues that were of concern to them, and my correspondence to them recently was seeking to reengage in that approach.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Anything to add?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will. But Mr Valentine, I have the answer for you that we were seeking - good enough to get that for you. In relation to the EAP service, two individuals have accessed it since March 2022. Thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Since March 2022?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Two individuals.

**Mr VALENTINE** - To the present day?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - And the previous year?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I would have to seek that. I think you only asked this year, but that's fine.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I asked for two years.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Two years, okay.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I thought I did.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, no, that's all right. We can certainly find that for you. No problem.

**CHAIR** - Whoever got that information might be able to go back and get the previous year.

**Ms OGILVIE** - They will, absolutely. We're here to help.

**Ms WEBB** - I had a supplementary to an earlier one. We moved on a bit from it, but perhaps it's just worth checking. I'll track back. It's in relation to the complaint letter that came in and then went to somebody who was actually in - referred to in the letter. From the answer provided earlier from the secretary, my understanding is there's really acknowledgement that that wasn't appropriate, and the process has now been changed so that that wouldn't happen again, given a similar circumstance in future. Correct me if I misinterpreted that.

But I'm interested to know what, then, having decided or determined that that was not an appropriate thing to have occurred, and to the extent that it changed the process, what then was done to communicate back to the people who put that complaint in, in some sort of way to make an apology? Or to make some sort of clarity for them that that wouldn't be something that others would be subjected to if they were to take a similar course of action.

**Ms OGILVIE** - The process changed since within that operational layer, but I can speak a little bit about my personal view on things. I think, as I've said, process improvement's vital. We need to make sure that everybody has that confidence layer. We've got that regulatory reform happening and that is out there, publicly available, the communication on the Monteith Review is deep and wide and broad. What I can do at the ministerial layer is make sure that in the meetings I'm in, and when I'm - there's so many meetings in racing, whether I'm at the races, at an event, or in meetings, to communication to people that we are going through a process of reform which includes an independent complaints channel under the TASRIC model. That's at that ministerial level.

In relation to that specific letter, which I understand was quite lengthy, I have spoken to the author of that letter personally, and I don't want to raise names in this forum, but have walked through those issues as well. We have taken action in relation to those concerns. At the operational level, I will ask the secretary to speak to that because it sits within the department.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through the minister, I don't think it's fair to consider that as a fault or an error. It was passed on through administrative processes. It was quickly identified, actually by the director, that this should be handled in a particular way, and it was immediately referred back. Much of the content in those letters, and I have read those letters, was interwoven and conflated is a good term to use, minister.

**CHAIR** - What was that one?

**Mr JACOBI** - Conflated.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Interwoven and conflated. So the issues were quite entwined.

**Mr JACOBI** - I have read the letter, and it would be, in my view, very difficult to separate those issues because many of the matters were operational, they were for the purview, and they were actually the responsibility under the regulatory functions of the director to address. As I mentioned before, some of the matters were departmental. Both the director and the then secretary at the time responded directly to BOTRA and addressed the concerns. As I mentioned before, they were both handled separately, so the processes were separate. If an



apology is required, I'm happy to make an apology, but I do believe that the director's letter and the then secretary's letter at the time fully addressed the concerns that were raised.

**Ms WEBB** - It was not so much concerns, but the content of the letter that I was talking about. The change of process as an acknowledgement that what had occurred, in terms of passing through, effectively, as the member for Elwick phrased it, outing whistle-blowers - pointing that through to the director. I was just interested in the response to the change of process and whether that was communicated back, potentially with an apology that occurred.

**CHAIR** - Or how it's been communicated back to the industry.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I just want to also - and I know we've spoken about this at this table previously as well, but there is a range of seriousness of complaints. We see a lot of operational level ones come through, and I see them, you see them on social media, lots of communication. There is an administrative process that that all goes through. In relation to the severity of complaints, I think my personal view is we need to just take a little bit of caution around characterising some things as whistle-blowing or service level complaints. When we put labels on them, it may not allow us to manage those in the plenary way they need to be done.

I know we've spoken about that whistle-blowing concern here previously, and I take that very seriously, which is why I make comment of it now because we are going through that process of reform to make sure there is that independent commissioner. We will have our bill table soon, and you'll have an opportunity in the legislative council to review that and provide comments on that. I understand the tenure of your question, and the improvement of how we go about managing those complaints and separating out what are really service level or daily operational complaints or concerns, whether it be licencing matters or race day matters from issues that are of a more serious nature, that is very important to us and a point to review, and what we're doing in relation to that. I just thought it's worth giving you additional information.

**Mr WILLIE** - It sounds like you're dismissing the seriousness of the complaints.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, I don't dismiss the seriousness of complaints.

**Mr WILLIE** - It sounds like you're downplaying it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, I'm talking about process improvement.

**Mr WILLIE** - The people concerned would be alarmed to hear that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, I'm not doing that at all.

**Mr WILLIE** - Minister, I guess the supplementary question here is will your office be subject to the investigation?

**Ms OGILVIE** - The terms of reference are published. All information that goes into Mr Murrhy's investigation are subject to that terms of reference. I understand that that letter probably has been provided to him. But again, I don't direct nor involve myself in the independent investigations for obvious reasons.

**Mr WILLIE** - It's a pretty simply question.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I answered it. Did I not answer it?

**Mr WILLIE** - No.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What more would you like to -

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes, or no. Will your office be subject to the investigation? You can talk about the letter, but I'm talking about your office more broadly.

**CHAIR** - The process, the inquiry process.

**Ms OGILVIE** - The terms of reference are as published. The inquiry process can look into whatever Mr Murrihy thinks he ought to look into, but I do understand that letter has been provided to Mr Murrihy.

**CHAIR** - We're not talking about the letter.

**Mr WILLIE** - My question, minister, is more broadly about your office and how you handle matters. Will that be subject to the investigation?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I haven't had anybody say that, so probably, at this stage, I -

**Mr WILLIE** - We've got a clear example here where there was a breakdown in process, and you have changed procedures.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, I don't think there was a breakdown in process, Mr Willie. What we've had is an administrative process that has been followed in relation to Mr Murrihy's review. It is independent, and I certainly won't be reaching into that. But I have answered your question because I have said, and if you follow it through logically, that letter that we've been discussing, I understand it has been provided to Mr Murrihy, or at least it is open for him to look at that, and any processes surrounding it, and that it is in his purview, not my purview to manage.

**Mr WILLIE** - But you will cooperate with Mr Murrihy.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Of course.

**Mr WILLIE** - If he wants to broaden that out.

**Ms OGILVIE** - He can absolutely do whatever he wishes to investigate.

**Mr WILLIE** - Okay. We got there in the end, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No. I take offence at that. Mr Murrihy, again, I will say, is an independent investigator. I do not seek, as a minister, to fetter his operations at all. He has terms of reference, he has the power to do what he needs to do, and he will do that. I'm certain that anybody who's approached by Mr Murrihy on whatever level would cooperate with him.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Ms Armitage.

## PUBLIC

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you. I'm going to go to a totally different area. That funding.

**CHAIR** - Funding, money, everyone loves money. Right?

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes. Mine is about the Tasmanian Turf Club funding.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry, the which? Tasmanian -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Turf Club.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Turf Club funding.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes. Night racing, it's a little bit of a preamble.

**CHAIR** - Night racing.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Night racing at Launceston's successful despite low crowd attendances. However, there were two Friday night meetings held in Launceston in October 2022 that coincided with the Manikato Stakes at Moonee Valley, and produced a turnover of \$10.8 million. Significant increase on the previous year, narrowly bettered by the Launceston Cup, with an average turnover of \$7.2 million per meeting. They are one of few meetings that's on a Wednesday night in Australia, which is very valuable to Sky Racing, as we appreciate.

The question the club has, is there any likelihood that clubs could be funded on a pro rata basis by Tasracing to enable them to have independence to adequately staff and function on an annual basis, rather than relying on interim grants and handouts from Tasracing. The fact that the money that's generated despite the low crowd attendances, it makes it very difficult for them to plan going forward when you're forever having to go cap in hand. So I comment on -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I thought you might like a little light relief.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, very much so. Obviously, it's a Tasracing question.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Nonetheless, I am concerned to make sure that all of our clubs are in the best financial position they can be in. Look, I have some background in this through being SFL president in the football community, and we did do some good work in taking forward new ideas about how we could get that sustainability piece happening for clubs in particular. I am really aware that these clubs are run with volunteers and they are great people. You know, I have met a lot of them and they are salts of the earth. So whilst it is a Tasracing question -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - And I appreciate that, but you're still the minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, that's right, that's why I am answering it.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It is a Tasracing question. I am very happy to have more conversations with Tasracing around that, and perhaps even to look at what models we could adopt from other codes that might help centralise some of the administrative functions as we did in football land, to take some of the financial off clubs. No promises, but I am happy to have those conversations.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - And so the consumption tax -

**Ms OGILVIE** - The point of consumption tax?

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes. Where does that fit with the -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, that is a very good question and again that is a funding question through Tasracing. The point of consumption tax, which is set at 15 per cent, goes into consolidated revenues and then funds Tasracing and stakes and other elements of the industry. Tasracing makes determinations on its own PNL sheet about who it funds and how.

**CHAIR** - I think we have wandered into grants and subsidies before our time.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry, my apologies. I was just trying to help.

**CHAIR** - You have no control over members' questions.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I was giving the minister a bit of light relief.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think I was giving a fulsome answer on financial arrangements. Look, the long and the short of it is I want our clubs to be well positioned to not only survive but thrive going forward. Whilst it is a Tasracing question I am happy to speak with them about it.

**CHAIR** - Well, it is a grants and subsidies question, really. So it does belong here. Just not quite yet.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay. Well, we might come to it. Too early, was it?

**CHAIR** - That's fine. So, Mr Valentine?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you. I just want to go to a couple of areas, operationally. So with regard to registration of trial tracks, training tracks and bullrings I want to know whether any illegal tracks have been detected over the last three years. I think that would be a fair period of time to look at, so can you give me an indication as to whether there have been any illegal tracks detected over the last three years?

There's obviously more particularly greyhounds we would be talking about, but tracks of any description for any code. We could actually extend that by asking the number that have been delivered a suspension or disqualification or have gone to appeal.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay. So in relation to illegal tracks I am advised that we haven't detected any, but I would actually like the Director of Racing to just confirm his understanding.

**Mr HELMICH** - Through you, minister. So Pool E relates to our kennel inspection process. So the stewards conduct kennel inspections and inspections of properties related to greyhounds in particular throughout the year, and, as indeed, when properties become licensed. So new entrants into the industry, we inspect those in the first case before they are able to be utilised, and that is an inspection of kennels, an inspection of fencing, and indeed if there are bullrings that do exist on properties then those bullrings are inspected and those bullrings are registered.

It is a requirement on the licencing and registration documentation that is provided within the greyhound racing applications for trainer that they do identify if there is a bullring on the property and those bullrings are inspected. In terms of illegal bullrings I think it is probably going back in the other direction. What we are finding is that a lot of bullrings are actually being dismantled or are not being utilised by trainers rather than bullrings being created, which we don't know about.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Perhaps you might further, for those who might be listening, explain what a bullring is.

**Mr HELMICH** - So a bullring is, effectively, a round or pseudo-round fenced off area. It has an arm to which a lure is attached. The greyhound is then sought to chase the lure around the bullring, and as a part of the training program that the greyhound might be put through by the trainer.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So the number of those detected - not just bullrings, but the others that I talked about as well - the numbers of those that were detected that were illegal over the last three years?

**Mr HELMICH** - I don't believe that there have been any. As I say bullrings are able to be utilised by trainers in my understanding, but there haven't been any, that I am aware of, that have been detected which we are not aware of.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you. I just wanted to get that clearly stated. With respect to animals that are euthanised.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry, coming through me.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Sorry, through you, minister, of course.

**Ms OGILVIE** - If you are changing questions.

**Mr VALENTINE** - You will direct it, of course, from there.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will, yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - But animals euthanised by code, I noticed that in our performance indicators in the budget - sorry, in your performance indicators, that doesn't seem to be recorded and yet this highly - it's of high interest, I imagine. So why is that not in the performance

## PUBLIC

indicators in terms of the number of euthanised by code? Why is that not in there, and can it be considered for future years?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, everything can be considered and thank you for raising that. I will actually ask the Secretary to talk about the performance indicators.

**CHAIR** - I have a fair idea of what he is going to say.

**Ms OGILVIE** - And then perhaps I will add some commentary around -

**CHAIR** - It's in the annual report.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What we can do going forward going forward, that's it.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Well, it might be in the annual report.

**Ms OGILVIE** - But it is a slightly different question.

**Mr JACOBI** - Through you, minister, I thank the member for the question. In relation to whether it can be addressed in performance measures, there is no reason why it couldn't be. We could make a recommendation for it to be a measure, and I will ask the Director of Racing to comment on your other question.

**CHAIR** - Can I add to that request that it be in numbers, not percentage? Because I don't know what the percentage is if I don't know what the number is.

**Mr VALENTINE** - That's a good point.

**CHAIR** - So a number, not a percentage.

**Mr VALENTINE** - And by code.

**CHAIR** - Did the member have a question?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes, I do.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - The number of unannounced inspections, that's something that doesn't seem to be in the performance indicators either. So can we have an indication of the number of unannounced inspections that have been undertaken in the 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23 to date financial years?

**CHAIR** - The last three.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. I'll just see if we have that information here before we take that on notice.

**CHAIR** - Is that information available, minister?

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - All information is available, it's just a matter of where we can extract it and how quickly. Let's see if we can get that for you. I am advised that the vast majority of inspections are unannounced, and that the detail of that and the split-up between announced and unannounced would require some work to provide, and the Department is happy to do that for you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Take it on notice?

**Ms OGILVIE** - And it would be on notice, if we could -

**Mr VALENTINE** - So the number of -

**Ms OGILVIE** - So we just have the specific question. Just make sure I get it right, so could you-

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes. The number of - as you point out, the number of announced and unannounced inspections for the previous three financial years: 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 to date. Well, financial years. We'll send it to you.

**CHAIR** - Will that come in letter form.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, okay. I just wanted to clarify. So I was just seeking some information about how hard it is to extract that information. My understanding is that each inspection file note, effectively, would need to be looked out to work out whether it was announced or unannounced.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I realise it is a fair bit of work.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It is, yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - But I am not denying that, so I can appreciate that. But it does give a good overview as to how we undertake that process and the number involved.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. So, if I may -

**Mr VALENTINE** - So, if I can get it, that would be appreciated.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. And before we move on to try to address your issue a little bit further, I do have inspection numbers, which I'll just get on the record, if that's okay. I will also ask the Director of Racing to comment. He might be able to help you with the unannounced announced question. So, inspections: 2020-21 for thoroughbred, there were - this is the overarching number - 125; harness, 111; greyhound, 90. For 2021-22 for thoroughbred, there were 7; harness, 85; greyhound, 133. And the year to date, 2022-23, there were: thoroughbred, 80; harness, 19; greyhound, 126. It doesn't give you the split that you're looking for but I will ask the Director of Racing to comment further.

**CHAIR** - Is there one that was 7 only on that list?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, there was. Thoroughbred 2021-22.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - That seems quite low compared to the other figures.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. We'll ask the director. Yes, that's the Director of Racing if they'd like to comment.

**CHAIR** - Just some explanation would be useful.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, absolutely.

**Mr HELMICH** - Certainly. Through you, minister. So, just in relation to the question about unannounced versus announced inspections, I'm not sure I'm going to be able to provide that data in arrears that we would have. There may be some comments within the OzChase database in relation to how the inspection was conducted, whether it was simply a walk-up inspection. But there may also not be. So, any clarity around definitive numbers there, that might be difficult to provide in arrears.

What I will, I suppose, allude to is we've just done a lot of work within the office in introducing a new audit database for inspections, which is called SafetyCulture iAuditor. In that system, we can actually create our own markers, effectively, and we can actually create one for unannounced versus announced inspections moving forward. I expect it would be difficult for me to provide you a definitive number in relation to that, if it was to be put on notice.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I understand. What you're really telling me is that the information I get won't be complete.

**Mr HELMICH** - Correct. Yes, I don't believe I'd be able to provide that with any level of certainty. I'd be able to provide an indication. But what I can indicate the table is - sorry, through you, minister - what I can indicate at the table is that the vast majority of inspections are unannounced. But there are some inspections which do need to be announced because some trainers have day jobs and those types of things. They're not always at their properties, not always at their farms. We do have to actually schedule inspections, and indeed, sometimes we schedule inspections on weekends to allow that to occur.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Doesn't that sort of negate the real reason for doing an inspection? An unannounced inspection. It just provides warning to those that are operating such facilities, and really negates the whole purpose, isn't it, of inspections?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Perhaps through me, Mr Valentine, and I will ask the Director of Racing with a supplementary question. My understanding is there a range of the reasons for inspections, and that the processes we have in place traverse those. Director of Racing, would you like to explain?

**Mr HELMICH** - Certainly. Through you, minister. So, we certainly try to make sure that each property is inspected at least once a year on an unannounced basis, but sometimes if we do need to get to one of our larger - because we do risk manage our assessments of the larger operators or the operators who have more risk involved in their operation from a profiling perspective, we do try to inspect them on a more regular basis. But to make sure that that can occur, if those people do have other jobs and the like, to make sure that we can actually get



## PUBLIC

there when it is convenient and appropriate operationally. But sometimes those matters do need to be announced.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay. Well, it's on the record.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Mr Valentine, I think though, just at the ministerial level, I am quite taken with your proposition that we should keep records in relation to that, and it sounds like we have the technology now to do so, and I'll take that up with the department.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It would be good to see them in the performance indicators. If you're going to record it anyway, why not publish it?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will have that conversation with the department.

**Mr VALENTINE** - That would be good. The other thing is in relation to lifetime bans for live baiting. So, can you tell me - and not everything makes the papers. Can you tell me how many occasions of live baiting have been detected over the last three years? It's simply that. What action was taken as a result?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. It's such an important issue and it has been the subject of discussion in the House of Assembly in Question Time, and I want to -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Well, we don't get to hear that too much.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No. So, I -

**Mr VALENTINE** - I mean, we get to read about it, but it's a long time after.

**Ms OGILVIE** - And, you know, you get an interpretation rather than being in the room.

**Mr VALENTINE** - We're doing our own sessions upstairs half the time.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Indeed. So, let me be very clear. Animal cruelty is never acceptable, and live baiting is abhorrent. It is also illegal under the Animal Welfare Act, which is administered by the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania, and considerable penalties -

**CHAIR** - We only need the answer, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - apply to individuals who have -

**CHAIR** - We don't need a preamble.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think this is important. It's a regulatory landscape that we're dealing with, and considerable penalties apply to individuals who are found guilty, with a maximum fine of \$26 000 and imprisonment for five years. So, I really want to just get that on the record. Lifetime bans, under the Tasmanian Greyhound Racing rules; they apply to anybody who's found to have used or attempted to use any live animal as bait, quarry or lure in connection with greyhound training or greyhound racing.

## PUBLIC

Now, you've asked a specific question in relation to instances of that. Allegations have been recently raised, but no evidence had been put forward. I have sought that from the member that raised them and still we have not been able to extract that information. So, I will ask the Director of Racing to speak to any instances of which he is aware.

**Mr HELMICH** - Through you, minister, I don't believe the last three years there has been one. There is one former participant who is registered and has been warned off for life on the Office of Racing Integrity website. But as I understand, there are no other participants who have been charged with live baiting in the last three years.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you. Appreciate that. My final question is Greyhound Adoption Program. Can you please tell us what circumstance is there in terms of rehoming of greyhounds, and the number that have been put through that course, if you like, and the number that have been rehomed? Do you have the last three years on that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, absolutely. GAP is such a success story. Everybody is very pleased with the efforts that everybody -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Well, I don't think it's entirely a success story though, is it? I think that's half the problem.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, the efforts that everybody is making to rehome greyhounds is a very important element of what we do, and you would have seen recently, of course, we've had more sponsors and people come on board who want to support the GAP rehoming efforts that we have. But obviously GAP is a Tasracing controlled entity, and whilst it should be raised with GBE and Tasracing, I am happy to talk about it because it matters to everybody how we handle these issues. It's very important.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Well, it's in a sense, an integrity issue if there's a program set up to deliver and maybe it's not delivering. I mean, you need to keep your eyes on it, I'm sure, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, no, that's right. I do. I do, and, as an animal lover, I am also very, very concerned to make sure we're doing everything that we can do in this area. So, I do have some key statistics here that I can share with you. The GAP facility currently houses, on average, 25 greyhounds. The current average wait list for greyhounds wishing to enter the program is 57 dogs.

When the new kennels are completed, GAP's holding capacity for greyhounds will double. So that's good news. This higher kennel capacity together with sustained increased throughput efficiency will help to reduce waiting periods. GAP is being funded to \$713 000 in 2022-23 through Tasracing's budget, plus a further \$122 000 from Greyhound Code Funding. I do have some details on the rehoming efforts: Greyhounds, retired and entered into GAP, 2018-19, 73; 2019-20, 96; 2020-21 was 72 greyhounds; 2021-22 was 58 greyhounds.

**Mr VALENTINE** - This is exiting we're talking about?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Retired and entered into GAP. I'll give you the rehoming.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Sorry. Entering into GAP.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, going in. I've got the -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Just double checking.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, that's right. So, I've got the two sets of figures for you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - 2022-23 was 56. Then greyhounds rehomed through GAP, which is the output figure: 2018-19, there were 89; 2019-20, 138; 2020-21, 98; 2021-22, 72; and 2022-23, were 62.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Can you tell me how many dogs that entered that program were euthanised?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - And not exit - well, it's an exit I suppose, but -

**CHAIR** - Not rehomed.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Not rehomed.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, not rehomed.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I'm not sure what the term is, but anyway.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, thank you, I'll just see if I have that information for you. As I've again said, it is a Tasracing question so the granular details sit with them.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I'll have the three years if we can get it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We'll just see if we can get that information. Because it's a Tasracing issue, I don't have that information to hand. Would you like us to seek that for you?

**CHAIR** - The member could put it on the notice paper.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I'll put it on notice, but it would be of interest to your office, I'm sure, to know how many are actually not exiting through adoption.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Ms Howlett, then Ms Webb, then I'm coming back up the table and then it will be nearly time for a cup of tea. Let's see how we go.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Thank you, Chair. Just a bit of a segue to that in relation to animal welfare. There's been a lot of discussion recently about equine welfare. I was just wondering if you could update the committee on what the government is going to do in relation to equine welfare.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you very much for the question. As you're aware, the Tasmanian

**CHAIR** - As brief as possible, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - As you're aware, the Tasmanian government regards the welfare of animals, and I regard the welfare of animals, as critically important and I am aware that the majority of racing industry participants provide good care to their animals. I cannot underscore that enough. We hear the stories of concern but remember, the vast majority of participants love their animals, love racing, love a day out and are doing the right thing.

Now Tasracing and the Office of Racing Integrity have been proactive in relation to horse welfare and following a review of industry rules relating to equine welfare, the Director of Racing recommended that Tasracing develop an enforceable code of practice for equine welfare and management. This is a good step forward. Tasracing has produced draft documents in consultation with the Office of Racing Integrity and the draft code of practice has now been distributed for targeted consultation with relevant experts and bodies, including the Tasmanian Chief Veterinary Officer. It's expected that broad industry consultation will occur shortly through appropriate forms. So I raise that for the attention of those who might be listening in that this work is happening.

Tasmanian Chief Veterinary and Animal Welfare Officer, Dr Martin Lenz, is leading this work. ORI is supporting and advising Tasracing's efforts in this area and ORI is supplying animal welfare regulatory expertise to this effort. The Tasracing code of practice for equine welfare and management, once approved, will set minimum standards for the care of both thoroughbred and harness racehorses. Indeed, any horse participating in the racing industry in Tasmania. The code of practice will be linked to the rules of racing and, therefore, will be enforceable.

Mr Ray Murrihy, through his independent investigation, has also been asked to provide advice on any matters that could be included in the proposed Tasracing code of practice for equine welfare and management, and any other opportunities to improve horse welfare. Mr Murrihy has the opportunity to consult widely with experts in this field, including with RSPCA Tasmania, the Chief Veterinary and Animal Welfare Officer at Tasracing, and the Chief Veterinary Officer in the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania.

Now the outcome will be a code of practice based on sound contemporary expertise that will help our industry to continue to meet community expectations in relation to animal welfare. I understand this type of approach is the first of its kind across racing jurisdictions in Australia. We're very proud of the work. I'm looking forward to this work being completed. I thank Tasracing and the director for their leadership in this space.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Through the Chair. Minister, I won't need that last question on notice because I've been shown where I can actually acquire that. So I have it already.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay. I appreciate that, thank you very much.

**CHAIR** - We might show the minister where she can find it.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Look, I only have the documents that I have on the table.

**CHAIR** - Yes, I know.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's okay.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So it's an unfair gibe.

**CHAIR** - We've got very forensic committee members here.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That's good.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Before we move on, I do have - yes, so in relation to a question from Mr Valentine, I have some additional information. Previous reporting period 1 July 21 to March 22. So you asked about the two years.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Three staff accessed the EAP services and EAP is obviously the employment assistance services.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, so hopefully that addressed that.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, and also the secretary has some other additional information he needs to share.

**Mr JACOBI** - Yes, thank you. Through the minister, I'd just like to correct the record on two matters. The first one is in relation to Race 9 at Burnie, and I'll call on the Director of Racing to address that matter.

**Mr HELMICH** - Thank you. Through you, minister. In terms of the question in relation to Race 9, which I understand was Ms Armitage's question, it's not so much a matter of correcting the record but I just wanted to augment my response there.

**CHAIR** - No, that's fine.

**Mr HELMICH** - In terms of that, I was very definitive in terms of my recollection of the discussion, and that's certainly not to suggest that anybody else on the other side of that discussion is not telling the truth, but certainly my notes and my conversation with my principle stipendiary steward, who was also present at that meeting, did not have any recollection that the wagering issue was raised at that meeting. Certainly, there was a discussion into Race 9 but nothing in relation to wagering and that came as a surprise to me when I heard about it.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - All right, thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you for that clarification.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, and the second is?

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through the minister, I'd also like to augment a comment I made before and add to the issue in relation to the BOTRA concerns. I can confirm that the then president of BOTRA in December was advised by the department secretary at the time that should he be unsatisfied with the investigation and the response provided to his complaint that he may wish to make a further complaint to the Ombudsman and he was provided with the link to the Ombudsman's website to do this.

I just wanted to confirm also in relation to my comment to Ms Webb about the administrative process. We haven't changed the administrative process per se but rather learnt from it; that it was an administrative error that we have learnt from and we are now more acutely aware of how to deal with complaints that contain conflated information. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Right, it's a little bit of six of one, half a dozen of the other there. You've changed the way you'll deal with complaints of that sort, sounds like a change of processing in some sense but thank you for the further clarification, or at least. This probably follows on, actually, back to the welfare matters that the member for Prosser was asking about. I just wanted to follow - and also the greyhound matters that the member for Hobart was following up.

I wanted to ask in relation to issues around welfare, whether it's equine or whether it's greyhounds, presumably it's highly important to have vets present at every race meet. I'm just wondering about difficulties in ensuring that and are there any difficulties ensuring that that occurs, in regard to recruiting and having available vets? I understand that there may be some exits from the industry, potentially, upcoming. Did we address that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Ms Armitage raised it, but I'm happy to talk it through.

**CHAIR** - Actually, the Chair.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry.

**CHAIR** - That's all right. I was listening to the wireless on my way home.

**Ms OGILVIE** - The wireless. I like the wireless.

**Ms WEBB** - If we've covered it, we don't need to spend time on it. I might have not just picked up the detail around it. So we can move on.

**CHAIR** - There was an undertaken given that there was a veterinary person on site at every race meet.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Services are accessible either on site or close by is my understanding.

**CHAIR** - I need some clarification on that then.

**Ms OGILVY** - Yes, let's just check that. Let's get that correct. Thank you. We'll make sure.

**Mr HELMICH** - Through you, minister. In relation to any race meeting, an actual one where horses or greyhounds actually go around the track in a race, there will be a veterinary surgeon - the on track vet must be present. It cannot occur without an on track vet. In relation to trial events in the thoroughbred code, there is also an on track vet must be present. In relation to greyhounds, the recommendation that I made in the Tah Bernard report related to - that there needed to be, as I recall it the wording, a vet accessible within 15 minutes to be able to attend to an injured animal. And as I understand, that is in place at both Elwick and Launceston.

**CHAIR** - What about harness?

**Mr HELMICH** - In relation to trials, I would - I'm not certain. That's why I didn't go down that track. I would think that there would need to be a vet present.

**CHAIR** - But for trial day?

**Mr HELMICH** - For trials, but I can't be certain.

**CHAIR** - Right. But there's not a vet required when they're training.

**Mr HELMICH** - Not when they're training. Through you, minister.

**CHAIR** - Is that clear enough, honourable member?

**Ms WEBB** - I was just wondering about whether you have a full complement then, to cover, or whether you have to send vets from course to course to cover these meets, or is there one allocated to each course?

**Ms OGILVIE** - How does it work? Is that the question?

**Ms WEBB** - Whether there's sufficient to deploy.

**Ms OGILVIE** - To deploy the resources. Yes, thank you. I will ask the Director of Racing to answer that, but I think, also, I wanted to support your line of questioning. We do want more vets in the state. We are in the same position as the rest of Australia, where we just don't have enough vets. That is something that, as a minister, I'm very concerned about generally, and it goes to the query about Longford and what happens there. I just wanted to reiterate that. Perhaps the Director of Racing would like to add some information?

**Mr HELMICH** - Thanks. Through you, minister. It's specifically a Tasracing issue, the procurement of the vets. There can be no race meeting occur without a vet present. Certainly, there are difficulties in attracting vets across the country, as I understand, but that is specifically a question for Tasracing because they are the ones who organised the vets for the race meetings at this point.

**Ms WEBB** - Is there potentially, then, the risk that if there's vets that exit the industry or are no longer available to the industry, that there could be cancellations or impacts on racing events?

**Ms OGILVIE** - That resource deployment for racing events is one that Tasracing manages, and those risk specifically. So you raise the risk appropriately, and that is one for Tasracing.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. I'll move onto another one around transparency. I know there are issues raised around transparency relating to deaths of racing greyhounds and the definition of deaths on track, and whether there should be an expansion of that to include any dog that dies or is euthanised within 48 hours of racing or of track training. So where the death could be distinctly linked to the racing or the training. Is there something the government is doing to increase the transparency in respect to deaths of racing greyhounds in that way?

**Ms OGILVIE** - In relation to euthanasia rates, obviously, it is in all of our interests as good and lovely human beings who care about animals to make sure they are as low as they can go, and we've seen a trajectory of reduction of euthanasia rates over time. Your question goes to what is included in the calculation specifically, and how that is managed. I do have some information in front of me, and if it doesn't get exactly to the point, then I will ask the Director of Racing.

**Ms WEBB** - It's a fairly clear point. It's about the definition and whether it includes the 48 hours period of time when the deaths can be distinctly linked to racing or track training, and whether that's included, then, in terms of data around deaths of racing greyhounds, deaths on track.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will ask the Director of Racing just to pick up on that because it's specific to the data that they keep. Then if we need more, we can go there.

**Mr HELMICH** - Certainly. Through you, minister. The data that's collected in relation to greyhound injuries is consistent data nationwide. The data that is reported by Tasracing does not include animals that are euthanised off track afterwards. What I can say is that I've recently had discussions with the Chief Veterinary Officer a couple of weeks ago, the Chief Veterinary Officer and Animal Welfare Officer of Tasracing, and he has agreed that they should report on another statistic. That being that any animal that is euthanised within 14 days of receiving an injury on track will also be reported within that.

I would note that currently, greyhounds that are euthanised after - sorry, not on track, but after receiving an injury on track are included within greyhound euthanasia numbers more generally, but I take the point that the member is raising, minister, and that is certainly something that we've had a recent discussion with Tasracing and they have agreed to provide that information on a quarterly basis.

**Ms WEBB** - Excellent. That's really good to hear that that's going to be provided as data, even if it's not required data at this point in time. Will that start from first quarter of 2023-24, or when will that data collection start, minister?



## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - As it's a Tasracing matter, I would just want to ensure that the Director of Racing has an opportunity to speak directly to Tasracing about that, unless you already have an agreement and no issue of that.

**Ms WEBB** - If there's an indication of when it begins, then that's useful. If that can't be given now, that's fine.

**Ms OGILVIE** - If you would like to speak.

**Mr HELMICH** - Through you, minister. I've got a meeting with the Chief Veterinary and Animal Welfare Officer next week in relation to working out how the information can best be collected, and we can certainly map that out. I haven't discussed a timeframe with Tasracing as yet.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. It sounds like it's progressing anyway.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think so. It is in progress. Just before we move on, I do have some information you asked for before. There was a question on notice in relation to the numbers of roles for the 2021-22 year, and I can indicate that for the 2021-22 year, stewards, there were - just make sure I get my lines right, that's four, and a total of four cadets and stewards, casual none, full-time none. I've got a better piece here. So the role of stewards, there were 13 casual, 12 full-time, with a total of 25. Cadet stewards, there were four casual, no full time, and a total of four. In relation to operations and support, there were no casual, nine full-time, and nine in total. I think that gives you the second year.

**Mr VALENTINE** - And what year was - that was -

**Ms OGILVIE** - That was the 2021-22 year.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So that's the other outstanding year.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - I just want to advise everyone that we will be finishing this racing output group at 11.15am. So we need to smarten up our questions and smarten up our answers. There will be no time past 11.15am, and I still have members questions. Thank you, Ms Webb. We'll be breaking at 11.15am.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Can I perhaps suggest that some people might need a comfort break? I'm sorry to say. Yes. I'm hearing support from the other end of the table as well.

**CHAIR** - All right.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Is that okay?

**CHAIR** - Well, we'll break now.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - We'll break now, and we'll come back.

**Ms OGILVIE** - All right.

**CHAIR** - We will have a 15-minute break, and we will have 15 minutes more only on racing, and then we need to get to heritage. Thank you. We shall stop the broadcast. Overruled, again.

**The Committee suspended from 10.57 a.m. to 11.11 a.m.**

**CHAIR** - We are back online, and I'd like to go straight to Ms Webb, and the minister can give her answer after Ms Webb's question. Thank you.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Staying with the area of greyhounds which I was on before, and following on from the member for Elwick's questions, I'm interested to know that in addition to GAP, the Tasracing GAP program, we know there's also other accredited greyhound re-homing programs such as the RSPCA, the Dogs Home of Tasmania at Brightside, Ellora, and Grey Tea Pet Life Prep, I believe are the list of them. I'm interested to know when the Government's going to recognise that the costs in re-homing greyhounds is extending by extending funding to those accredited programs to the same extent that is provided to Tasracing then through to GAP. So that we know that everybody who's doing that similar role is being funded appropriately to do it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, thank you and I'm seeking some information, and I do have some information on that for you. We've said a number of times, of course we are committed to improving animal welfare outcomes, and we work with organisations that seek to do that, and you've mentioned a few of those in your question, and we're investing more money than we ever have before in relation to greyhound and horse welfare.

We've announced some additional funding for RSPCA, which I was very pleased to announce fairly recently; to analyse for lifetime traceability for greyhounds and adoption processes and linkages to local government, and as I've stated earlier today, that we know that the greyhound industry is minimising euthanasia of suitable greyhounds by proactively supporting adoption programs that re-home greyhounds as pets. We know that owners must now also make every effort to find their greyhound a suitable long-term home and record evidence of their endeavours, and to ensure transparency regarding animal welfare. Tasracing compiles greyhound retirement and re-homing statistics for its annual report.

Now, to the nub of your question, which is about funding for not just GAP but others, greyhounds can be re-homed in Tasmania via the industry-run GAP program and other adoption programs or by the owner. So those sort of three sets. The industry funded GAP program will remain the primary avenue for re-homing retired greyhounds, and I've been able to table some information this morning about how much that costs. It's a very expensive operation, and more needs to be done, obviously. Tasracing also supports privately run greyhound re-homing agencies in a number of ways.

Tasracing funds the de-sexing of all greyhounds retired from racing in Tasmania. Tasracing is currently incorporating the funding of dentals for all greyhounds retired from racing in Tasmania, so that's across all of the organisations, and these combined schemes are

## PUBLIC

estimated to save private greyhound re-homers on average a minimum of \$500 per greyhound re-homed.

Now, they are also, I understand and I'm advised, planning to extend support for private greyhound re-homing organisations as part of its soon to be established Racing Animal Welfare Grants Scheme. The RAW grants scheme will provide funding for eligible not-for-profit entities that align with Tasracing's animal welfare objectives.

**Ms WEBB** - But presumably that would mean accredited programs would fit the bill for that. That grant program.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, I haven't seen the grant funding program in detail, but one would assume.

**Ms WEBB** - Is it your expectation then, minister, that all those groups who are doing re-homing in the exact role that GAP are doing would be funded adequately to the extent that GAP are funded to do it?

**Ms OGILVIE** - My expectation is that GAP will remain the primary provider.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes but knowing that GAP cannot meet the need that's there even when the extension is completed. The kennel expansion still won't meet the need that's there so there is a need for other providers and yet they're not funded to the same extent. Would it not be your expectation as a minister that they would get the same support to do the same job to meet the need that's there.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Look it's my expectation that Tasracing will work with those providers to make sure that they have what they need but it is a whole of community expectation that we manage these things carefully and well. The grant program that has been announced, the RAW grants scheme, is something that Tasracing delivers. I don't have the detail of that and I am certainly able to seek more information on that. I reiterate again that GAP will remain the primary function that is funded through Tasracing, but I could also say that budget submissions -

**Ms WEBB** - When you say that minister, you mean GAP will remain the only one that is funded appropriately to deliver the service and even though we rely on the others to deliver the service we won't be funding them appropriately.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well I actually just think I've said the opposite of that.

**Ms WEBB** - No, I don't believe you have actually.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well I'll read it again. So Tasracing also supports privately run greyhound re-homing agencies in multiple ways.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, you don't have to repeat what you just read out. There are ways that they are supported but they are certainly not supported financially to the extent that GAP is to actually undertake the core function of re-homing.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - So we underfund some agencies we rely on, and we fund one to the extent that's required.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well that's why I said it will remain the prime re-homing facility and we fund that appropriately.

**Ms WEBB** - Can you define prime then, other than as I've described it the only one adequately funded to do the job? How would you define prime?

**Ms OGILVIE** - GAP is a funded primary source for re-homing and managing the greyhound adoption process and as I've said we are instituting or Tasracing is instituting a new grants program. I hope that the organisations of which you mentioned today will participate in that and of course anybody who wishes, and any organisation wishes to do more it is always open to them to approach government for budget funding or other sort of funding and I'm very alive to this conversation. But I am aware that organisations have a range of activities that they do. The GAP program is the one that we run, and we run it with a sole focus on greyhounds.

**Ms WEBB** - Knowing that it doesn't meet the need.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. We have 12 minutes left in this area. Mr Willie then Ms Armitage then Mr Valentine.

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you, Chair. Minister, your Government oversaw the closure of the Devonport race tracks for harness and greyhounds. You then had a proposal for Palmers Road which you had to abandon.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr WILLIE** - It's now my understanding that you're proposing to build a track near the Devonport airport. What is the total funding commitment from your government towards the project?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I do have that for you. Let me just get the correct line. Tasracing is building that track, but I do want to see if I have the information for you in relation to the costing. Do you have that to hand? No, because it's Tasracing.

**Mr WILLIE** - Well the Government's contributing towards the track too.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Our contribution, yes, just bear with me one moment. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - It usually happens, minister. Paper flies from behind.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Just as you found it then I found it here as well. Okay. So a short preamble. We're obviously committed to both -

**CHAIR** - No, no short preambles. Just stick to the answer.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We are committed to both harness and greyhound tracks, and I know there's been some dialogue around that. We remain committed to that. The Tasmanian

## PUBLIC

government has committed \$8 million to build the new harness and greyhound racetracks and northwest participants are being provided with travel subsidies to minimise the financial impacts with travelling to other racing and training facilities. A development application has been submitted with the Latrobe Council for the new site and we know that this is a pivotal piece of infrastructure for racing.

**Mr WILLIE** - Minister, what is your latest advice about the total cost of building the new facility, including both harness and greyhounds tracks? You are committed to both, so what's the latest advice on doing that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - We are committed to both. My understanding is Tasracing is contributing \$10 million to funding the project, and that's in addition to our \$8 million. I also understand that the staging of the track development has been chunked down into pieces and that conversations are happening with industry around that. But what I have in front of me is \$10 million to the funding of the project, \$8 million from us. If there is a need to consider how the scope of the project fits with funding, I'm sure that will happen.

**Mr WILLIE** - You're talking about a staging process now. Is that because your latest advice says that if you want to build harness and greyhound racing - a racing track, it will be \$40 million, and there's a shortfall.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I am certain that we will build both tracks. So this pre-emptive statement that somehow there's not going to be both tracks is not correct. In relation to funding -

**Mr WILLIE** - Well, you're talking about staging now.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry?

**Mr WILLIE** - You're talking about a staging process now.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. In relation to the overarching project, my advice from Tasracing is that's it's going ahead and that they are working to make sure that they can deliver it. If there is a need to talk about further funding, I'm sure that will occur.

**Mr WILLIE** - There appears to be a funding shortfall here, minister, to build a harness racing and greyhound track.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We are building a harness racing and greyhound track, and if there's a concern around funding or scope of the build, or any of those operational matters that they are delivering through Tasracing, I'm certainly happy to have those conversations.

**Mr WILLIE** - Could you answer my question? What's your latest advice on the total cost of that project?

**Ms OGILVIE** - My advice that I have before me right now is that the -

**Mr WILLIE** - Not before you. What's the latest advice that's been provided to you?

**Ms OGILVIE** - No. That's my latest advice. I have it at the table. So that's what the advice is. \$8 million from us. \$10 million from Tasracing. But, look, there's projects if - can

## PUBLIC

be broad or narrow in scope. Those conversations, I understand, are underway. As I've said, we will be delivering a greyhound and harness track, and if there's conversations that need to be had around scope, timing, delivery, any of those issues, I'm very happy to have them.

**Mr WILLIE** - It sounds like there's a funding shortfall and the minister is scrambling.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That's a comment, not a question.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - My question is just regarding the 2016 inquiry into the greyhound racing. I'm wondering how many of 31 recommendations have been progressed by the government? Perhaps you could tell me which ones haven't.

**Ms OGILVIE** - By exception. Right. We do have that information. At the table. It's an extensive table. How would you like to deal with that?

**CHAIR** - Would the minister like to table that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll just confirm. The update was published today on the website. So that information is available immediately, and I can give you just the top level line, if you like, which will be very fast.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - It would just be interesting know how - can you tell me how many of the 31 recommendations -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, I can. Thirty-one recommendations have either been addressed in full or are ongoing actions. Recent improvements include the development of a new local rule in greyhound racing that provides for higher retirement standards and the creation of additional licence categories that are line with the life stages of the greyhound.

Tasracing funded desexing of all retiring greyhounds and the establishment of a Greyhound Recovery Rebate Scheme to assist in rehabilitation of injured greyhounds. Updates including each select committee recommendation is made available to the general public on the Office of Racing Integrity website, and that should be there now, is my understanding.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - So the whole 31 have been addressed, and either addressed or -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Either in full or in part.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I have two questions, and one is a follow up. But with respect to straight tracks for greyhounds, we go to this a little bit each year, I think.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, we do.

**Mr VALENTINE** - If we go back. It's really an integrity issue in a way in terms of animal welfare and making sure that we have animals that are in that greyhound racing industry that are not being unnecessarily put in danger of injury. What steps have been taken since we last dealt with this issue in this chamber - is it chamber? At this table to progress that consideration of straight tracks.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. The query around the straight tracks and curved tracks has been around for some time, and I understand that the academic results on what is more beneficial and safer for animals has changed over a period of time. I do know that improving track safety is something that is on the minds of everybody. Not just the owners and participants, but everybody involved in racing. The new track that we're delivering and developing right now is an opportunity to have the latest thinking on that. That is a process, I understand, that Tasracing is going through at the moment and we would want that to be -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Which track are we talking about?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll get to that, I think. We want it to be state-of-the-art for safety and security. Now, all greyhound racing tracks across the nation, including ours, have been reviewed by national consultants to ensure best practice in maintenance and preparation of the racing surface. I am advised that the results of this review placed the three Tasmanian tracks in the top seven safest tracks in Australia, and Tasracing is continuing that review.

Now, when it comes to the one we're building, Tasracing is planning to build that new racetrack for both harness and greyhounds with that \$8 million contribution, and we have engaged Professor David Egger to assist in the planning and design of the new greyhound racetrack to ensure the new tracks meet best practice animal welfare standards. It's Tasracing's responsibility to examine all options to improve animal welfare. Any design, which I presume is underway as we speak, will be in line with best practice for track design. Particularly, the North West greyhound track is our opportunity to lead on this.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Let's hope that that best practice design comes from experience where animals haven't died as a result of using it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Absolutely.

**Mr VALENTINE** - My last question is with regard to an equity issue again, and it follows up on what the member for Nelson was raising. With regard to the grants for rehoming, in the interests of equity, will you make sure that that process of the grants being provided, that the submissions will be published on the website, along with the outcomes published, stating why the recipients have been chosen. Because of the integrity of this process, to make sure that we're getting the best people to do the rehoming that that will be transparent on the website and that GAP, along with any other service provider in that area, have to go through that grants process.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I hear where you're coming from, so that sort of making sure the priorities are set. Grant making processes are subject to very strict probity requirements. So I will actually ask the secretary to speak to that, in general about probity and how grant making happens.

**CHAIR** - We don't have time for that. We just need an answer, that's all.

**Ms OGILVIE** - The answer is that it will comply with probity requirements. But I appreciate you're wanting to -

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's just that everyone is on a level playing field. That's all I'm after.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure. But specifically in relation to probity, we also need to be really careful about making sure that those who apply for grants and are going to have their information published, that we're not breaching any confidentiality requirements. So I can't just say a complete yes. We would have to manage things carefully to ensure that - there might be some who don't want their business details published.

**Mr VALENTINE** - There might be. But if they were approached to ask, they might not worry.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That's right. Exactly. It's what I'm saying. So if their process is appropriate.

**CHAIR** - Would you like to -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, but we take that on board, Mr Valentine. The transparency argument also resonates with me.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So is it highly likely that they will be published?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will make those enquiries.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - My pleasure.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Not going to get any further with that.

**CHAIR** - My last question is in the grants and subsidies area, before we leave this.

### **Grants and Subsidies**

**CHAIR** - There is a slight decrease in the current budget from last year from \$33.277 million to \$32.977 million. I'm just interested in why that is, and then secondly, what discussions have commenced with the industry regarding that deed of agreement to provide the industry grant into the future.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll just seek some information. Can I just confirm which line item that you're looking at?

**CHAIR** - It's on page 176.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Got it, okay. I'm advised that it relates to the efficiency dividend that was brought in in 2019-20 being applied. That's what the decrease is, it relates to that earlier efficiency dividend.



## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - An efficiency dividend from -

**Ms OGILVIE** - I might ask the secretary to speak to this.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through the minister, I will ask Vanessa Pinto, Chief Operating Officer to come to the table.

**CHAIR** - That doesn't make sense to me. An efficiency dividend from 2019?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Let's just clarify. We have Vanessa Pinto.

**CHAIR** - Welcome, Vanessa.

**Ms PINTO** - Thank you, minister. Through you, minister. Back in 2019-20, the government announced an efficiency dividend. As a part of that initiative across a number of independent authorities or government business enterprises, such as Tasracing, there were allocated efficiency dividends. Tasracing was allocated a \$300 000 per annum efficiency dividend that ended in this financial year. Hence why you've got that difference of it dropping from last financial year to this financial 2023-24 that's reported in the -

**CHAIR** - Then the forward Estimates as well go down by \$500 000.

**Ms PINTO** - Yes. Then the \$500 000 that is - sorry, excuse me, through you, minister. My apologies.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I would jump in if I thought we were going off track, thank you.

**Ms PINTO** - Thank you. Excuse me.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Please, go ahead.

**Ms PINTO** - Chair, the question that you answered was in relation to the 2024-25 year of \$32 977, that then dropped to \$32 477 in 2025-26. That is in relation to funding that Tasracing had for the Thoroughbred training that was being provided through Tas TAFE. So that was an initiative, a government initiative, and that's purely dropping off as an initiative in that year.

**CHAIR** - All right. So that finishes as well.

**Ms PINTO** - Does that make sense?

**CHAIR** - Thank you. That's an explanation. I'm not sure that it makes sense, but it's an explanation. Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - You had a second part of your question in relation to the deed.

**CHAIR** - The second part was what negotiations have commenced in regard to the cessation of the deed?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Which is some time away, I'd just like to explain.

**CHAIR** - It's not that far away.

**Ms OGILVIE** - The deed has a funding term of 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2029, but obviously, conversations are being had, and I am discussing the renewal of the deed with the relevant stakeholders. It is actually, though, a matter for Tasracing to formally initiate negotiations. I won't say that we have done that. I would expect that to - for them to approach me on that soon.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Just interested in showing we're across. Thank you. We will leave racing and we will head to Heritage with your hat on as the minister for Heritage, so -

## **Output Group 6 Heritage**

### **6.1 Historic Heritage**

**Ms OGILVIE** - Can we just take a moment to just sort it at the table? Is that all right?

**CHAIR** - We might just suspend for a couple of minutes. Thank you, Gay.

**The Committee suspended from 11.34 a.m. to 11.37 a.m.**

**CHAIR** - Thank you, and welcome back, minister. You have a change of team at the table with your responsibility as Minister for Heritage.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We do.

**CHAIR** - I feel sure that you'll have a brief overview for us in this important area.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We're swapping over quickly, just bear with me one moment.

**CHAIR** - You will introduce your support team at the table.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will do that.

**CHAIR** - I'll invite you to.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - I won't direct you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Firstly, it's appropriate to acknowledge the Tasmanian Aboriginal people as the original owners and continuing custodians of the land on which we meet today, and I pay my respects, as we all do, to elders past, present, and emerging. Tasmania has a rich cultural heritage -

**CHAIR** - Introductions, please.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We have Jason Jacobi.

**Ms MULLER** - Sophie Muller, Deputy Secretary.

**CHAIR** - Sophie, thank you very much for joining us.

**Mr FLETCHER** - Stewart Fletcher, General Manager, Heritage Tasmania.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Standing in for Andrea. Thank you, Stewart. They're all wonderful people, and we share a passion for heritage, which is wonderful. As I was saying, Tasmania has a rich cultural heritage and iconic built heritage assets are an important contributor to the Tasmanian brand and our economy. These places drive visitation to the state and help us set it apart from other tourism destinations. The Tasmanian government is committed to telling our unique stories through supporting our valued heritage sector. Earlier this year, we released the back to the future situational analysis of the historical heritage eco-system in Tasmania as a report, and it was at the highly successful heritage summit.

The report highlighted key opportunities for the sector and will serve as a foundation for identifying opportunities to preserve and showcase our heritage assets. We're establishing a number of cross-sector groups following the summit. These groups will progress the activities identified across the key areas of funding and investment, building community engagement and support, and sector leadership strategy and collaboration. In 2024, we will hold a second heritage summit to bring the sector together again and report back on progress. I'm very excited about this, as a minister, to have established their summits is a good thing.

At the summit, I committed to investing \$4.5 million over three years to further strengthen our heritage sector. These funds have now been allocated in the 2023-24 Budget. These funds will support the National Trust, with an allocation to support essential maintenance in the 2023-24 year and will provide for a grants program for owners of heritage-listed places.

Small grants of up to \$20 000 will be available for conservation works on state heritage-listed properties, and grants of up to \$200 000 will support a built heritage activation program. I expect this new grant program will open in around September of this year.

There are more than 5000 national and state heritage-listed buildings and places in Tasmania, and many more recognised by local government and communities. I'm pleased to share that the addition of the Tasmanian Heritage Register to the LIST, the Land Information System Tasmania, about a year ago has been very successful with lots of visits. Information about our heritage-listed places is now more accessible, and this has resulted in an average of 2733 views per month. So, it's really been marvellous. That's in this financial year using the Heritage Register layer in the LIST. I encourage everybody to take a look at this wonderful innovation and information available about our state's past, and why it is important we continue to invest in protecting our heritage.

Another way we're working to protect our heritage is through the development of an archaeological strategy. We recognise the important role of archaeological resources and research in improving our understanding of Tasmania's history. And taking a considered approach in how we apply archaeological investigative techniques is central to developing and interpreting this information, and will improve the identification and long-term management and protection of these significant archaeological resources. This work has been coordinated

through the Archaeological Advisory Panel to the Tasmanian Heritage Council, and the panel will soon start consulting with stakeholders on a draft strategy.

Our government is also delivering on its commitment to heritage through developing a convict memorial hub. This is a marvellous project. This \$1.25 million investment will grow Tasmania's convict heritage tourism and story by connecting visitors to the Penitentiary Chapel in Hobart and to the stories of more than 75 000 convicts through a virtual memorial. The Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority is assisting the National Trust to develop the hub, which is expected to be completed later this year, and has the potential to encourage regional visitation to sites where convict ancestors lived and worked.

Tasmania has some of the country's oldest and best-preserved heritage places, and we will continue to invest in these places. I'm very happy to answer any questions on any of the above and any other matters you may wish to raise.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. And I'm going to move straight up to the left, my left. Ms Webb, thank you.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, Chair. Just as an overview question to begin with. One that I'm picking up for each area is around their use of consultants. I'm just trying to get a picture of - over the past year, any LIST projects that have been done by consultants, what they are and what their cost was?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Certainly. At an operational level, I'll ask the department if they could perhaps provide that information through the Secretary.

**Mr JACOBI** - Sure. Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Happy to do that.

**Ms WEBB** - If it's lengthy, we can always take it in the form of a table, a document.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr JACOBI** - Through the minister, I thank the member for the question. Payments to consultants. During this period, in addition to the awarded contracts, the department expended \$346 072 across 19 separate projects for consultancy services. Fourteen of these consultancy projects were awarded to Tasmanian businesses, for a combined value of \$256 058.

**CHAIR** - That might be able to be tabled.

**Mr JACOBI** - I can probably table - I'll read this through the minister. I'll read this this out.

**Ms WEBB** - You don't need to read all 19.

**CHAIR** - No. We're happy to have it tabled.

**Mr JACOBI** - Just the one consultancy. So, the one I read before was, I think, payments to consultants between \$10 000 and \$50 000. Sorry, I was reading for the whole department.

Sorry, Ms Webb. For heritage, is only one consultant, SGS Economics and Planning, a study into the economic, social and brand contribution of built heritage in Tasmania for \$19 976.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, appreciate it. I'll move on to another question then. You mentioned, minister, your Archaeological Advisory Panel in your opening remarks and the plans for the strategy that's coming along. Apparently, the Macquarie Point Development Corporation commissioned some time ago - I'm not sure of the exact year. You might be able to help me. Two archaeological studies of the Macquarie Point area, and they were presented to Hobart City Council at that time. I'm wondering, are you aware of those studies? Have you been briefed on their content regarding any findings of potential cultural or convict historic sites identified at Macquarie Point?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I do have some information and I had hopefully - I have two briefs on that. So, probably between the two sets, I'll be able to answer your question. Now, currently there are no places listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register that fall within the Macquarie Point Development site, so that's probably the top-level outcome of the question you are asking. But we do know that they've been, in 2021, archaeological surveys on the development site that you've referred to. Those findings have not resulted in any new sites being entered in the Tasmanian Heritage Register.

There are a number of places, however, adjacent to or near the Macquarie Point Development site that are listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register, and these include the Cenotaph, and of course, the beautiful Royal Engineers building. The Railway Goods Shed, which is within the Macquarie Point site, is not listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register, however it is listed by the Hobart City Council, and therefore is afforded heritage protection through their planning scheme.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. I'm interested to follow up on a couple of things that you've mentioned there then. Are you aware of any assessments or are you aware of any nominations around the Goods Shed in terms of heritage listing, or of any assessments that have been made either by the department, or commissioned by the department or by others?

**Ms OGILVIE** - In relation to that question, I do have some information, particularly around the Railway Goods Shed at 10 Evans Street, Hobart, which, as I've said, is situated within the Macquarie Point Development site. Now, as I've stated, the shed is not currently entered in the Tasmanian Heritage Register, but the city of Hobart has the shed listed as a heritage place, which affords it protection under the local planning scheme. So, the Railway Goods Shed is identified as a place of local cultural significance in the Sullivans Cove Planning Scheme 1997 and as such, it is afforded heritage protection through this planning scheme, which is administered by the Hobart City Council.

Under a declaration of Project of State Significance, the Tasmanian Planning Commission will undertake an integrated assessment, including the impact on the local heritage value of the Macquarie Point Railway Goods Shed under the applicable planning scheme. The local planning authority can participate in the process via referral process by giving a submission setting out its views to the Commission under section 21 of the State Policies and Project Act 1993. The Railway Goods Shed has been nominated for entry in the Tasmanian Heritage Register. Heritage Tasmania is currently undertaking a preliminary assessment of heritage values in order to determine whether the building has the potential to meet the criteria for entering the register. An update will be presented to the Heritage Council on 21 June 2023.

**Ms WEBB** - An update on that assessment is being undertaken related to the nomination?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Can you guarantee then that there's not the perception even of political pressure for that nomination to go one way or another in terms of its assessment?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Look, it's a completely independent process. But I will perhaps give you a little bit more information on what they would be looking at whilst they assess it. For a place to be entered in the Tasmanian Heritage Register, the place must meet one or more of the criteria found in section 16 at the Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995. So, after reviewing the preliminary assessments, the Heritage Council may decide to proceed with an entry in the register. The registration process would involve a thorough assessment by Heritage Tasmania staff, owner consultation, and opportunity for public input, which I think we'll all be interested in, and appeal provisions in accordance with sections 17 to 21 of the Act.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. In relation to Macquarie Point, are you able to provide a list of all heritage-related or heritage values-related reports that have been either undertaken or commissioned by the department in relation to Macquarie Point over the past decade, that that has been a site that has been used for development?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Right. That is at operational level. I will seek some input from the department on that. We haven't undertaken any, is the advice I have. So the Macquarie Point Development Corporation undertook surveys but not the department. Am I right in that? Yes, I'm getting that advice.

**Ms WEBB** - So that information would be sought through Macquarie Point Development Corporation?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - You don't have a list of what may have been looked at in terms of heritage values of that site. The department hasn't interacted with Macquarie Point Development Corporation.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Only what I've just read out to you in that last answer.

**Mr WILLIE** - Austral Tasmania did reports in 2013 and 2015. I'm just interested whether they've been provided to you as heritage minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Who did, Austral? The shipping company?

**Mr WILLIE** - Austral Tasmania on behalf of Macquarie Point Corporation.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, I think it's an important issue. I might ask Andrew to join us at the table. Andrew, are you happy to do that? Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Andrew's full title? Full name and title.

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROBERTS** - Andrew Roberts, Director, Heritage Tasmania.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much and welcome.

**Mr OGILVIE** - Thank you, Andrew. Would you be able to add some information to this question?

**Mr ROBERTS** - Yes, Macquarie Point is the managing authority for the site. No element of the site is encompassed in the Tasmanian Heritage Register so therefore there's no obligation for Macquarie Point to provide any report to Heritage Tasmania, Heritage Council or the minister. But there have been some site visits. We got to see - as officers, we got to see the dig and what was there. There are reports coming through but, as I say, it's not a requirement that they come to the heritage minister because the state heritage doesn't have a jurisdiction in that area.

**Ms WEBB** - You might need to lean closer to your microphone.

**CHAIR** - Yes, they do like you close.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I just clarify there, though, while I accept that there may not be an obligation, are you saying that they haven't been provided?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Just through me, if you wouldn't mind.

**Ms WEBB** - Through you, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, thank you.

**Ms WEBB** - Are you saying that they haven't been provided.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So there have been surveys on the site but they have not been done by the department.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, I'm asking if they've been provided to the department, noting that they're not obliged to provide them, but have they been provided?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Secretary, are you happy for me to ask Andrew to? Andrew, if you wouldn't mind.

**Mr ROBERTS** - I can't say unequivocally whether we have them or not because they wouldn't have been an official record. We have archaeology advisers on our department who interact but that's at the level that's been understood, so I couldn't say one way or the other whether we have a report because it's an unofficial record.

**CHAIR** - So the site visits that have been undertaken by officers of the department, would there be some record of that in the department? You said you've had a site visit and looked at some of the digs.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Certainly.

**Mr ROBERTS** - No, it was purely a professional courtesy, it wasn't official capacity.

**Ms WEBB** - So because we shouldn't have to turn around and do an RTI to have you check the records to see if those reports have been provided to somebody in the department, minister, can I give it to you as a question on notice for you to get back to us once there's been a check done about whether those reports have been in fact provided to the department in some form?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So I just want to be specific about the question. Which reports? The Macquarie Point ones?

**Ms WEBB** - The one's that the member for Elwick referred to which were the Austral reports.

**Mr WILLIE** - Macquarie Point commissioned Austral Tasmania to examine heritage values at Mac Point in 2013 and 2015. Have they have been provided to the department, can we have what they cost?

**Ms WEBB** - They probably won't have that detail.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, Macquarie Point would have paid for them so I don't think I'd have that information.

**Mr WILLIE** - Okay.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So it's a separate legal entity, is the problem I've got.

**Mr WILLIE** - That's fine.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It might be something that you could ask Macquarie Point.

**Mr WILLIE** - If the department does have them, can the committee have a copy?

**Ms OGILVIE** - It will depend on the basis on which we have them if we do have them.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes, that's why I premised the question that way.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'm happy to make the enquiries, where we're going, yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Essentially, I'd like to just establish, in the first instance, has the department been provided with them. Thank you. Send that through.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay, we'll see if we can.

**CHAIR** - Feel free to stay with us Andrew. There might be more questions yet.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Andrew's central to heritage. Thank you.



## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - May I keep moving on?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Just a supplementary.

**CHAIR** - Supplementary, Mr Valentine.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Just with respect to communication with the Hobart City Council and Heritage Tasmania in relation to the Macquarie Point site, have there been any communications with the council in relation to that document that Mr Willie is talking about and/or the Macquarie Point site itself? In relation to the Hobart City Council's planning for that site.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay. With the Heritage Council?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I don't have that information to hand. I will ask the secretary about that.

**Mr JACOBI** - Thank you. Through the minister, I defer to Sophie Muller, deputy secretary.

**Ms MULLER** - So yes, I certainly don't have that information to hand either. I wonder whether Andrew is able to shed any more light. I guess we, you know, in the absence of a nomination, you know, that engagement hasn't occurred.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you minister, again, there's no jurisdiction of Heritage Tasmania on that site so any interaction hasn't been on an official basis. Obviously, the Heritage Council has kept interest on the basis of this rounding sites on the perimeter but until anything proceeds, there's no official or obligation.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Then I guess the question is, has there been communication with the Hobart City Council at all in relation to the Macquarie Point site and Heritage Tas? I know there's no listed component but has there been any communication in relation enquiries by the Hobart City Council to the Heritage -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Perhaps if I could address that. There is a process for engagement between the Heritage Council and local government, and those who wish to nominate areas. It is quite a well-regulated process and it goes to the question of if a heritage nomination has been put forward. If your question is whether there's been any sort of sounding outs before that process starts, as I think Andrew said, probably at the operational, they are people talking with each other. But in relation to that formal process, that would be, you know, under the regulations how the Heritage Council addresses that in a formal way.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Minister, I'd just be interested to know whether there's been formal communication between the Hobart City Council and the Heritage Council in relation to Macquarie Point. So can you provide that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. We can perhaps seek some information. We might even be able to do that now.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Question, Mr Secretary. Is that covered? Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry, just to finish on Mr Valentine's question. There is a query around the nomination of the whole of the Macquarie Point site and we have received another nomination, on 30 May 2023 for the whole site, which is currently administered by the Macquarie Point Development Corporation. Heritage Tasmania will undertake a preliminary assessment of this nomination and provide an update to the Tasmanian Heritage Council. So that's broader than a specific building, that is site specific.

**CHAIR** - The whole precinct.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I just clarify then. There's currently a nomination which is being assessed in relation to the goods shed.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - And that's expected to be - I think you mentioned 21 June as the date in relation to that being determined.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'd have to just check that again. Yes, if I said it, that would - sorry.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm not sure if it was - yes, I just wanted to clarify what that timeline was in terms of resolving that nomination.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Andrew.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister. When a nomination or an application to entry, which is officially the name, there's a preliminary assessment, triage if you like. That's what's going to the Heritage Council on 21 June, is, okay, is there any likelihood that this would get up if considered on a more detailed basis. Then it's up to the Heritage Council to decide whether there is such a subsequent more detailed basis assessment.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay, and then - so the Heritage Council get it on 21 June, the council will decide whether to progress further with a more in-depth assessment.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - How long does that assessment process take?

**Ms OGILVIE** - My understanding is that the assessment processes can, in general, take longer or shorter time depending on the complexity of the assessment that needs to be undertaken. But Andrew would have specific experience with that journey and perhaps give some oversight to that.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister. To be listed on the register, there's initially a provisional listing. When the assessments are done, there's an opportunity for public comment. Then it goes through for further assessment after that, and then it goes back to the council again

## PUBLIC

for final approval. There're statutory periods of notifications through all of that. You're probably looking at at least six months and that would be a fast one.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. A fast process from 21 June would be end of year, would be a fast process to complete that. In addition to the goods shed nomination that's currently there, we've just been informed there's a nomination for the whole site. When would that initial assessment then go to the Heritage Council for that nomination?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Back to Andrew. At the meeting on the 21st they will be getting an update on the nomination.

**Ms WEBB** - On the whole site nomination also at that same date?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. And then in relation to the Cenotaph which is listed, similar to the questions that the Member for Hobart was asking, what interactions - actually, no, it's not similar. Sorry, let me rephrase that. I am interested to know in relation to the Cenotaph, as a listed site, what assessments have been done by Heritage Tasmania so far in relation to the impact of the proposed stadium.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That is at the operational level, so we will refer to the department.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister, at this point no formal assessment because there is nothing formal on the table. The Heritage Council only assesses things officially when they come through the development approval process. Oftentimes we are involved with engagement beforehand of what might be likely to get through heritage guidelines and the Heritage Council, but I am not aware of that proceeding so far, yet.

**Ms WEBB** - Right. I am just interested to understand not about a formal assessment that might have been taking place, but about, for example, was there some initial notification to the Heritage Council or Heritage Tasmania about the proposed stadium, when that might have been - has there been a discussion within the Council in any formal way or as part of their proceedings around the proposed stadium at Macquarie Point? I'm just interested in those sorts of contacts, interactions for any engagements that have been had?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Through me, if that's okay. Look, I think the information that you are seeking is a pretty broad question in relation to consultations that happen before the formal processes start. I am happy to refer it to Andrew, but you might need to be a bit more specific about exactly what it is you're seeking.

**Ms WEBB** - Well sure, I can repeat what I have just said. Was there some form of communication to Heritage Tasmania, to the Heritage Council about the proposed stadium at a certain point? Was there a piece of communication?

**Ms OGILVIE** - From?

**Ms WEBB** - From whoever. From the government, I would have thought. I thought the government probably would have been interested to - considering the Cenotaph's historic values and heritage values, would have been interested to interact with the department, with

## PUBLIC

the Heritage Council as the body responsible for that around it. Might have notified them about a planned intention to put a great big stadium right next door. I am interested in any communications.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I understand the question. Yes, thank you. I have just been advised that we have nothing formal, but they would need to check whether there has been any conversation at an officer level.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. I will put that through as something to follow up.

**CHAIR** - A supplementary on this, and then Ms Howlett.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes. So just in relation to the Cenotaph, has there been any communication by either the Department or the Heritage Council with RSL Tasmania in relation to that particular site. Whether it is in relation to the Macquarie Point stadium or not, I suppose, is of interest most definitely. If you can give me an indication of that, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Can I just confirm, Mr Valentine, are you referring specifically in relation to the stadium project or more broadly with the site?

**Mr VALENTINE** - I am talking about - it is in relation to the stadium project, but it is specifically to do with the Cenotaph and curtilages in relation to the stadium.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, we would need to take that on notice.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you, and I would really appreciate a response. I can only speak for myself, I suppose, but the reason we're asking these things is we're going to have to consider this in Parliament at some point in time, so we need all the information we can get and this is a very important interaction here today.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Absolutely, I agree. I'm listening.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's not setting sail on it.

**Mr WILLIE** - Chair, before we move off this topic can I just ask a supplementary?

**CHAIR** - A supplementary. I'm glad I didn't take you off the list.

**Mr WILLIE** - When was The Goods Shed nominated for heritage listing?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Through me?

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Let me check that and see if I can find the date for you. I'll just see if I can find that information for you.

**CHAIR** - But the whole of site was nominated on 31 May.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, we have the whole of site date. I will just see if we can -

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILLIE** - Do we know who nominated the whole of site?

**Ms OGILVIE** - The Goods Shed is not heritage listed, but it does have a - is that what you are asking, about the Hobart City Council date?

**Mr WILLIE** - I'm asking when they nominated.

**CHAIR** - No, for the heritage listing.

**Mr WILLIE** - For the heritage listing. When the nomination came in. I am just trying to understand how long it has taken to get to an assessment point, that's all.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay. Let's just see if I can get that. I might have to ask our team to seek that information and bring it back to the table.

**CHAIR** - Okay. Someone will be tapping away quickly.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Scurrying away to find that.

**Mr WILLIE** - Can we have who nominated the whole site and also The Goods Shed?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So is that a question on notice or?

**CHAIR** - Is that available, that information?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll just confirm. They don't normally make available the name of the nominee.

**Mr WILLIE** - Okay.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I guess there's confidentiality issues. But let's see what we can find and we will bring it back to the table.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Ms Howlett?

**Ms HOWLETT** - Thank you, Chair. Minister, can you please provide details of the Online Digital Heritage Register, please?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, quite popular. Thank you for the question, and I will say I love the confluence of the digital sector with heritage, and it is a very modern approach of bringing these two capacities together to provide a better service to the people of Tasmania, and to protect and look after our heritage in new and appropriate ways.

I am really pleased to say that we have provided that new to discover and learn the stories behind Tasmania's historic heritage places through our online digital register. Online access to information held in the register will increase appreciation for Tasmania's iconic heritage places, which obviously play a key role in Tasmania's lifestyle and brand. Importantly, the online register will help raise awareness of the importance of protecting these places which are so special to our beautiful state.

One of the most frequent questions the Tasmanian Heritage Council receives is whether a property is heritage listed and why. Now everyone has access to the location, boundary and historical details of each register entry along with a statement of significance. Increasing understanding of the significance of these places is a key to encouraging owners, prospective owners, developers and the community to learn more about how best to manage our historic and cultural heritage.

There are more than 5000 individual places entered in the Tasmanian heritage register and each has a story to tell, and collectively they are part of the rich complexity of Tasmania's history. I encourage everyone to delve into the register and explore the historic cultural heritage significance of these places. The Tasmanian heritage register can be searched at LISTmap - Land Information System Tasmania - and I think you all have the website. It's easy to Google, I encourage you to get online and to have a look.

**Ms HOWLETT** - I wonder if my house is on there.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, that's why people are interested to see. Thank you for the question.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you, Chair. How many properties are on the current list, if you could tell me? I will just give you the whole question, if you like, so you get it?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - So how many properties are on there, how many properties have come on the list, by region - north, northwest, and south - and how many new properties have gone on in probably the last 12 months.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay. Let me see if I can find that specific information for you.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - For two years, if it can be done.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Two years? All right.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - The member for Hobart would like two years, so let's go two years.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Great, thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So I will just see if I can specifically find those numbers for you. We are obviously going through the process of updating the register and we have been consolidating. I think before I ask for the Department to help I do have some key statistics. But I just wanted to touch on the consolidation question.

Because the numbers, the overarching numbers of the register, change we have scenarios in which, for example, the Cornelian Bay boat sheds, where 34 boat sheds had separate heritage register entries, and they have been removed and replaced with a single entry for Cornelian Bay. There is a little bit of nuance to it.

In relation to key statistics, there are 5000 permanent Tasmanian Heritage Register entries as at 31 March 2023, and that has reduced in number from 5030 in 2020, and the

## PUBLIC

reduction is that consolidation piece that I've just given you the example of Cornelian Bay. I think Salamanca has a similar process under way.

This number will reduce further during 2023 following the recent approval of other consolidated entries for numerous conjoined places, and a collection of warehouses specifically in the Salamanca's precinct. The removal of pre-existing individual entries is still progressing through a statutory process, and the implementation of these changes will be announced in due course.

**CHAIR** - Have any gone on, and any come off?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. There has been changes.

**CHAIR** - Other than the consolidation of the boat sheds.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, thank you, in Salamanca. I will ask, with your approval, secretary, departmental people if they could add some additional information.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister. We can't give you the regional breakdown at the table, but we can definitely give it to you very quickly afterwards.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. We'll bring it to the table.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I must add the heritage list on this is not easy to navigate. I'm just trying to find a property that I know is heritage, and it's sending me to the actual list map, and when I go to the list map, I put the address in, it just comes up with -

**Ms OGILVIE** - A bit of feedback.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Which tells me nothing. I haven't had any success yet. Just feedback for you.

**CHAIR** - The member for Launceston is very handy with the iPad.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I am quite computer literate.

**CHAIR** - Unlike myself.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I'm having difficulty finding a property that I know is heritage listed.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I am always happy to take user feedback and process improvement suggestions.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I know the member for Hobart would be able to help me here, but it should be simple. It should be easy.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I am getting some additional information. The list map includes a state listed heritage properties. If it's local listed, LGA level, it won't be on there. We're dealing with the state heritage listed. Andrew would like to help. Yes, Andrew.

## PUBLIC

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Here to help.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Please do.

**Mr ROBERTS** - It's so easy. The best way to go through is to go to the Heritage Tasmania website. In there, it says 'search the register.' Down a bit -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I've gone to heritage listed places. Search the Tasmanian heritage register.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Search the Tasmanian register, and that preloads the heritage layer in a list for you.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Right.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Then you go to anything that's coloured blue, and that's listed.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Actually, I have to say they're not because some of those that are listed blue included my house, which I know is not listed. There you go. Anyway, I'll have the discussion at lunchtime with you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - User feedback noted, thank you. Always happy to improve processes if we can.

**CHAIR** - Did we have an update on how many have gone off the register?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Sorry, we were turning to that, thank you. Would you be able to shed any light on that, Andrew?

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister.

**CHAIR** - Other than the consolidation of the boat sheds.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, and Salamanca.

**Mr ROBERTS** - I think it's best to table that after it, because it - otherwise we'll get caught up in clarity issues of what's on and what's a refinement, what's a - because quite a few of them are actually amended, and then the old one was taken off. Two separate processes. So it can show up looking like a double action, but it's actually one.

**CHAIR** - That's fine. We're happy to take it. The committee seeks information. Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, Andrew.



## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - I know Mr Valentine's got another question, and then I'm back up the left-hand side of the table.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Back in 2016, we had a built heritage tourism inquiry. Are you aware of that inquiry, and are you aware of the recommendations of that inquiry?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, broadly aware of the inquiry. Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Can you give me an indication as to whether any of the recommendations that are in that inquiry have actually been actioned? I'm very interested to know whether there's been any credence given to them. If you have to take that on notice, that's fine. I'll let you answer first.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, thank you. We do have information in relation to that. I don't have it in front of me, but I'm certain that it has provided good inputs to the work that we've been doing across, in particular the reports we've released recently at the heritage summit. But we can provide more information. Is there a specific one?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes, there are some specific ones I can talk to.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, that would be helpful.

**Mr VALENTINE** - But if you can give me the broader response on each of the recommendations, I'd really appreciate that. But that can be on notice, I don't have a problem with that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think we should be able to do that.

**Mr VALENTINE** - In particular, I'm interested to know about PAHSMA, the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, and the recommendation that was made in relation to Darlington and the Eaglehawk Neck officer's quarters being brought in under the umbrella of PAHSMA, and PAHSMA being provided with funding accordingly. Has any further consideration been given to that, given the significance of both of those sites? I know that Eaglehawk Neck officer's quarters to some might seem to be less valuable, but I think it's very valuable, given its location and possibility of it being a gateway, really.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. I've certainly been brought into these discussions at a broad level, and the secretary, I think, has some information they could share.

**Mr JACOBI** - Through the minister. I thank you, member, for the question. The possible transfer of Darlington precinct on Maria Island, and the Eaglehawk Neck officer's quarters was identified and raised with the PAHSMA. My staff met with senior officers at PAHSMA to talk through the practicalities and the likely costs associated with transferring that asset, and I'm advised that PAHSMA at the time - and this was probably pre-COVID around - I'm going off memory - 2019, PAHSMA was not inclined to take over responsibility for those two assets and that time.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Would that have been because they simply didn't have the funding to be able to do that? Or was it they saw some other logistical issues or problems?

## PUBLIC

**Mr JACOBI** - My understanding is that they were very focused on the new visitor centre and all of the investments and the operational logistics of managing the PAHSMA site. But to take on something of the scale of Darlington on Maria Island was a significant both investment, but also an operational cost. We have had subsequent conversations with them about the officer's quarters because that was a much smaller scale site. I can certainly recall what the department was very interested in PAHSMA taking on responsibility for those assets, but again, and I'm not sure of the exact reasons, there was not a strong desire to do that at that time.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay. Another question was on recommendation 5. That recommendation, quite long but important, the government conduct comprehensive evaluation of Tasmania's built heritage assets in collaboration with Heritage Tasmania, local government, and the private sector. The evaluation should include identification and the level of vulnerability of built heritage assets as well as an assessment of their future value for tourism purposes. This evaluation should include industrial heritage. Quite clearly, significant recommendation and a lot of industrial heritage in Tasmania that may well disappear if we don't consider it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That is a recommendation which has certainly been taken very seriously and acted upon. In late 2021, we commissioned a report to provide an understanding of the eco-system of historic heritage management in Tasmania and then our completed report provided a high level situational analysis of the management of historic heritage, it's stakeholders, and their respective roles. We've made that report public. Hopefully you have it, Mr Valentine. If not, it's available online.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I probably haven't, but anyway.

**CHAIR** - We know it's there now.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's an important piece of work. It's been published and we launched it at the historic heritage summit.

**CHAIR** - Who got an invitation? I didn't. Anyone here?

**Mr VALENTINE** - I don't think I did.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - No. It'd be nice, sometimes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - To salve your hurt feelings, it wasn't -

**Mr VALENTINE** - We're not hurt.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It wasn't a political launch. It was a launch with the leaders in the historic heritage sector, including peaks of churches and other interested parties. I'm very happy to do more, though, and I will always take on board particularly those who want to support heritage. We'll see what we do next year. This report, which is where I think you were headed, Mr Valentine, is really a pivotal report for heritage in Tasmania. We used the consultants Stenning & Associates, and they interviewed - did broad interviews across leaders and key stakeholders in the sector. It goes to that question about the economics of our heritage, particularly when we're trying to manage and ensure the protection of our cultural heritage, both built and otherwise.

We're specifically looking at the value question. How do we ensure that we have the funds and the ability to manage and look after and reinterpret our heritage and have that renewal of uses that heritage buildings and places need whilst also making sure that as the backdrop to our tourism industry, we are integrating that conversation? So we've done that. Participants at the summit, and I take on board your - I note your desire to be more deeply engaged, and I'm happy to do that. Three priority areas: sector leadership, building community engagement and support, and importantly, funding and investment. We have planning underway for a future Summit where we will actually make sure that we report back on the actions that have come out of that Summit.

But to just answer the philosophical point you are making in your question, which is how do we ensure that we are valuing appropriately our heritage assets in a contemporary and modern way that will go to making sure we're protecting them.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Including moveable heritage, I might add.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Absolutely. As somebody who has studied archaeology and worked in cultural heritage internationally, I completely agree with you. Shipwrecks also. That issue is something that we are tackling, and we've tackled this year. I'm very, very proud of the work that we've done.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you. One other question is in relation to the Salamanca Arts Centre. Now, I have received a request from the Salamanca Arts Centre in relation to the maintenance of those historic warehouses?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Has any funding for that facility been included in this year's budget, bearing in mind that they are government buildings.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - They're not owned by the Salamanca Arts Centre. I have no connection with them in terms of being on a board or anything like that. But quite clearly, it's a very significant set of buildings.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Absolutely.

**Mr VALENTINE** - They're asking for \$275 000 plus GST for the ongoing maintenance, basically, an upkeep of that particular building. Can you give us some encouraging news there?

**CHAIR** - Have you got an announcement? That's the question.

**Ms OGILVIE** - You've asked a question that has a number of questions, so I'll deal with each one as we go through. So the first one is, yes, I have received a request for support and, from recollection, I believe it was a letter addressed to Parks as the owner of that building.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I think three.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, absolutely. Secondly, I want to be really clear; I believe I probably should disclose a conflict of interest. So in the past, I was on the board of Salamanca Arts Centre.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So too was I years and years ago.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, right. So I just want to be really careful about that.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It was the mid-1990s, I think.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I have also been on the Arts Advisory Board where we've granted funding to Salamanca Arts Centre and its organisation. So I want to be very open about that, as I always try to be. We identified \$4.5 million funding over the forward estimates, and there will be a grant process going through that.

**CHAIR** - There you go.

**Ms OGILVIE** - But \$275 000 I believe - my recollection from the old days was the roof, in particular.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Plus GST.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So that issue, perhaps you have more to add? No. Yes. Other than it does sit within Parks. I don't want to dodge the question, because it's really pivotal, and it's such a -

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's a heritage issue, in effect.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - We do have Parks tomorrow.

**Mr VALENTINE** - No, I know, and I plan to put it to Parks too.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - But it's just that it's specifically a heritage building.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I know.

**Mr VALENTINE** - And that's why I raise it here.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Indeed, indeed. As Hobart girl, I completely understand the resonance it has in our city.

**Mr VALENTINE** - And of course, what it adds to tourism and all the rest of it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - All of it. It's just beautiful. Which really is at the heart of the Stennings Report. I'll make sure that you get a hard copy of that report. I will influence good outcomes where I can.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I just wanted to know whether it's on your radar.

**Ms OGILVIE** - On my radar.

**Mr VALENTINE** - And hopefully get a good outcome.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Ms Howlett, then Ms Webb.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Minister, could you please provide an overview of the legislative changes that the government is making to strengthen Tasmanians heritage?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Here's an announcement, hopefully. Well, it's on the record. There are more than 5000 national and state heritage listed buildings.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Yes. We've already heard that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We've mentioned that, and places in the state with many more recognised by local government communities. So there's layers to it. Last week, I was very pleased to release a draft bill to amend the Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995 for consultation. The bill is aimed at providing greater protection to historic places and improving administrative processes. Most of the amendments have arisen from legal advice and were foreseen as part of the last suite of amendments that came into effect in 2019.

The bill will enable the Tasmanian Heritage Council to assess development applications that include some unauthorised work elements retrospectively, consistent with current local government practice under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act. The bill also proposes a new approval pathway to manage moveable objects, such as pews in a church on an honour board in a community hall, that contribute to the heritage significance of a place.

Other proposed changes, such as processes and timeframes to register or remove a place are aimed at improving efficiencies and further supports the Tasmanian Heritage Council's work to evolve the Tasmanian Heritage Register into an accurate, reliable and accessible resource. And we've had some feedback on that. Preliminary consultation on the draft bill has been undertaken with key stakeholders such as the State Planning Office, the Local Government Association of Tasmania, and the Heritage Council, with no major issues being raised.

As I mentioned, the draft bill is now out for public consultation, and this is open until 5 pm on Monday, 10 July 2023. More information on the draft bill, or how to make a submission, is available on the Heritage Tasmania website, and I encourage members to take this opportunity to review the draft bill, and I'm really looking forward to tabling the bill in Parliament later this year, something I think we all have a deep interest in.

**CHAIR** - As long as it comes to the Legislative Council before about April next year so the member for Hobart can have the appropriate input. Just flagging that. Because his expertise will be appreciated.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Indeed. I should say, your input is welcome now as well, as part of the public submission process.

**Mr VALENTINE** - My final Estimates is this year, you see.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Is it?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes, it is.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you for the information there around the bill. There were a couple of questions that I had that I think you covered with that. Let me move to another one. In relation to the Summit that you've mentioned today which was held a short while back, I'm just interested to understand who attended the Summit and how those invitations were deemed, or selected.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Absolutely. The Historic Heritage Summit and the Heritage Ecosystem Report. In late 2021, as I said, we commissioned the report, the now completed report. It provides that situational analysis and it is publicly available at the Historic Heritage - made publicly available at a Historic Heritage Sector Summit held on 24 February. I released the report there. It was available at the launch.

**Ms WEBB** - My question is about the Summit, not the report. I'm interested in who attend the Summit and how they those attendees were selected.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, absolutely. I'm going to that. My very next words coming out of my mouth were, participants at the Heritage Summit identified three priority themes, as I've said. We've got planning underway for the next Summit and the event will include progress on initiatives. Now, I would also say that the department would like to speak to the list, but I do have a full list here. It's quite long.

**Ms WEBB** - You could table it for us.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure. But I believe it's actually publicly available as well.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So I'm not sure we need to table it, but very happy to, obviously.

**CHAIR** - It's just easier for members.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Is it? Yes.

**CHAIR** - We don't have much time.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I have no problem with that. You'll see that it was really industry-based selection list, but I think it may be helpful, if the secretary is okay, if I indeed ask Andrew and Stuart, the architects of the Summit, to speak to the list. Would you like that back?

**CHAIR** - Who would like to go first?

**Ms WEBB** - Just to be clear, the question is around how were people selected to attend the Summit?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister. The Summit was put together with a fixed capacity room. We found the best we could in Oatlands in our heritage linked site, which was looking at about 50 to 70 people capacity. So that set our constraint to start with. The stakeholders that were invited started from those that were identified through the Stennings Report in the consultations, the ones that they discovered. Then the idea was to invite representatives of bodies that are already directly related to historic heritage. We started with the well-known ones, like Port Arthur and convict sites and all that sort of thing.

Others came out of the woodwork as we got closer to the process like the Historic Gardens Association and bodies like that. It got to the point where later in the piece when the word got out the summit was on it was a hot ticket, as the minister knows.

**Ms OLGILVIE** - It was a hot ticket, yes.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Next year's summit, minister, is already requested to be an open invitation rather than specific.

**Ms WEBB** - In some acknowledgement, minister, that some people missed out who may have wished to be at that summit this year and weren't able to be included just because the venue was presumably too small by the sound of it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well indeed and to be very personal about it, it was a new initiative, so it was something that I wanted to drive. I thought a gathering, the heart of Tasmania of people who have that deep interest was a good way to go. So, look I'm absolutely delighted it was such a hot ticket and a huge success and I certainly want to do more to engage more so we will look at that concern. I too had lots of phone calls from people who wanted to be there, and we couldn't accommodate it.

**Ms WEBB** - It sounds like you've made a commitment though, minister, which is positive that the next summit that's held will be an open invitation and there won't be the same restrictions necessarily?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, look there will always be a question of how many invitations you can send. It's like a wedding isn't it. How many people can be there. But it's something I'm acutely aware of and I'll work with the department very carefully on it and my desire is to include as many people as we can in the Heritage Summit and also just in the love of our heritage and history in Tasmania.

**Ms WEBB** - Did you maintain a waiting list as it were for the summit for people who missed out last time who can be particularly invited to the next one to make sure they don't miss out again?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well please feel free anybody who wants to come to contact me directly and we'll certainly be very happy to take all of that onboard.

**Ms WEBB** - May I go to another question, Chair or not?

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Minister, can you detail any -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry, just before you go on can I table that which is the whole document including the invitation list.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, that would be good. Okay, sorry Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - That's okay. Thank you, minister.

**CHAIR** - Thanks, our secretary will distribute to our members at a time of your convenience, Mr Secretary. Thank you, Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Did see mentioned in the 2021-22 annual report comments around collaborative discussions undertaken with the Aboriginal Heritage Council.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - To identify and explore areas of common interest. So I'm just interested to hear about details of any progress being made on that front. For example what areas of common interest have been identified and how are the two heritage councils intending to continue to engage with each other and over what type of matters.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, it's a very good question. It's a question I asked when I came onboard as a minister as well wanting to make sure that we walk together on this journey of history and cultural heritage. I will ask - are you happy for me to refer to Andrew about the process of all that engagement which is so important for all of us.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Yes, the Heritage Council, particularly with the leadership of Brett Torossi has been pushing hard for this to happen as well. Most recently about less than a month ago there was a meeting of the chairs of the Heritage Council and the Aboriginal Heritage Council. Brett Torossi and one of our staff members went to their council meeting to talk through collaborative work.

Preceding that, the Heritage Council had already established in February that they approved a policy, which is the endorsement of the Dhawura Ngilan principles, which is a national initiative that sets out the guidelines of how Aboriginal stories are integrated in the broader historical story. So those principles now are something that guides Heritage Tasmania's work and they also - Heritage Council agreed that future data sheets of heritage sites would include identification of the local Aboriginal community of that site, what the significance of that site is and any truth telling story that is available for telling.

Part of the Dhawura Ngilan principles is it recognises the Aboriginal communities - it's their story to tell in the way they want to tell it when they want to tell it and we are required to be - we make a commitment to be a part of that respect.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Thank you for that response.



## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Before we move on, I actually have some other answers we sought for you. Is now a good time to give them.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Yes, now is fine.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It was a question from Ms Webb. What discussions and roughly when did the department have discussions with Heritage Tas about Macquarie Point? The answer is there have been no formal discussions occur as Heritage Tasmania has yet to receive an application. Heritage Tasmania has no authority to consult or discuss it until an application is received but there's been some very informal discussions so Heritage Tasmania can understand the proposals as it proceeds but Heritage Tasmania must wait for an application before it can be assessed. Should someone nominate something within the development precinct for heritage listing it would need to be assessed. Mr Rob Valentine had a question - engagement with RSL Tas in relation to the Cenotaph issue regarding Macquarie Point.

As above the Heritage Council has no authority to consult with the RSL because there's nothing registered within the development zone as heritage. The Heritage Council is monitoring the situation as it is aware that there is a lot of heritage listed properties around the boundary. However until there is a formal development plan nothing further can be done, and the department is still chasing the date that the shed nomination was submitted.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So can I just query the response there, Chair?

**CHAIR** - Yes, please.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So just with respect to - my question was in respect to any communication that's occurred let's say in writing because that's the only way we can get a firm position. So any communication that's occurred between those organisations. HCC and RSL Tasmania in relation to Macquarie Point. Not whether they've put in a formal submission for listing or whatever. It's just what communications. So it'd be good to know that and I'm happy to keep that on notice and if you can respond accordingly.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, yes, I think we'll keep that on notice then.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm just going to follow-up on the answer to mine as well because it - thank you for the beginning of that answer. The informal communication that you've referred to that did occur in order to inform the department.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm interested to have the date or dates of those communications and if there was information in the form of documents provided at that time in those communications.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I am not certain that the communications were at that level. I understand it's at officer level. I don't think we could - I don't know if those things exist so we'll just have to -

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - Well, I would appreciate it if we leave it on -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Just let me ask Andrew, so we have him at the table. We're happy to look for you but I think you might be disappointed with any documentation.

**Ms WEBB** - That's fine. I'll re-jig the question on notice to do a drill down.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, more specific is helpful.

**Ms WEBB** - To see the dates and any information including documents provided. Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - If any.

**Ms WEBB** - Indeed. Yes, good then.

**CHAIR** - We've got a question from Ms Armitage, and I'm mindful that we do have one line item left and we will be breaking at 1 o'clock.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - You'll be pleased I actually now have the right overlay.

**CHAIR** - Did you find it?

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I have got the right overlay now but I've still got a question with the right overlay. I noticed on Boland Street in Launceston. I notice there's 8, 10, 12 Boland Street all covered in blue which includes the Centrelink building which is a brand-new building which is a bit interesting why that's listed as heritage. I'm assuming it's a heritage block. But the property I'm interested in is the one next door, 4-6 Boland Street and you may need to take it on notice. When that came off the register? Because I noticed it has now been purchased by Housing Tasmania.

**CHAIR** - We're going to get some information around what's come on and off on so that hopefully won't be one of -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I specifically want to know about 4-6 Boland Street because it was a heritage property in the past and you might recall there was a lot of discussion about it with Launceston City Council. Two old buildings on it that had been partly burnt.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I want to be really clear, the question you're asking is the date it came off the register?

**Ms ARMITAGE** - The date it came off the register, yes and also the query with regard to particularly 8 Boland Street which is the new Centrelink building. I'm just interested -

**CHAIR** - When it went on -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - The whole block is on. So is it a heritage block as opposed and if that's the case then why isn't four to six still a heritage block.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's a very specific question. There's no problem to answer it if you're happy for us to bring that back to you.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - I'm very happy to put it in writing.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'm just pleased it wasn't your house I thought you were going to say you found it.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - No, I was very pleased to see that I did have the wrong overlay, and I was very pleased to say that one of my neighbours are - mine isn't, so I've found the right overlay now.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well it was accurate finally. So we will try and get that information for you.

**CHAIR** - Mr Valentine.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So I'm interested in exploring Aboriginal heritage a little. Now I know it's moved to the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, it's not my area unfortunately.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Is there any connection at all between Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania and Heritage Tasmania? Can explain that for the record that would be really good.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, and it is a question that I asked when I came on board as a minister. How do we make sure that we walk this journey side by side, particularly around built heritage where it traverses or touches Aboriginal issues.

So I think the best way to do that is through Andrew's explanation of how those two councils interact, and I will note also that we did invite members to come to the Heritage Summit. I am not sure that we actually got them there in the end, but that invitation is always there. Andrew, would you describe how the two councils interact?

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister, it is a cooperative relationship, as I mentioned in my previous response. We did invite them to the Heritage Summit. The only reason they weren't there is that that was the exact same day as their monthly board meeting, so they weren't able to be there. They were in a different part of the state. But they did profess that they would wish to be there. Yes, so we have an ongoing - we share a floor of, Heritage Tasmania and Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania, but we don't have - they are separate departments. They are not actually departmental partners.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So if a heritage issue - it is your - may I ask?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Please go ahead.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It hits your desk, and you believe that there may be some chance of the issues encompassing Aboriginal heritage in any way, do you then just directly contact the Chair of Aboriginal Heritage Tas to make sure nothing falls through the cracks, is what I am trying to get at here.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister. First, the conversation would have probably already been had in the tearoom between offices. There is a good relationship, with anything like that there is already chatter going on, checking at each other's registers to see what the story is.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Things that are often aren't registered, but there is a known issue. The relationship is very cooperative for that, even though we are still in our separate departments.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I mean, you could be doing an archaeological dig on a site, maybe, you know. If certain items are found and those sorts of things, you would communicate directly.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister. Each officer is very fully aware of the protocols of anticipated discoveries and who to inform and when to stop and start work. There is actually a very strong respect for that amongst the archaeological community as well.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Are there any other burning questions that we have in this area?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes, one, and that is the Burra Charter. How significant is the Burra Charter to Heritage Tasmania, and is there an active - is it actively pursued or followed with anything that Heritage Tasmania does in relation to buildings.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, and I will ask if Andrew is prepared to answer this one? Thank you.

**Mr ROBERTS** - Through you, minister. That is the backbone to how all these policies, systems and processes are set up. All the requirements to get on the heritage register, you will see most of those are sourced from the Burra Charter in the first place.

So, yes, if there is a strong industry network that shares information as things change over time with that - and the most recent or impending, there is a World Congress in Sydney in September, which is the first time it has been held in the southern part of the world, I think. So yes, there are staff members going to that. So the Burra Charter continues to be the backbone to the heritage theory and practice.

**Mr VALENTINE** - In fact I think that World Congress might have been in Burra Burra when it was originally termed the Burra Charter. Anyway, I won't go into that, except to say that Burra didn't even realise that's how it was named. But anyway.

### **Grants and Subsidies**

**CHAIR** - One question in Grants and Subsidies: Is it possible to obtain a list of the grants that have been provided in this output group of \$4.283 million from the past previous budget. Because you won't have a list of the new ones, because they won't have been granted yet, I doubt. Can that be provided.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We might have it here, let's see what we've got for you.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - I'm pretty sure it's not in the budget papers. Well, what that consists of -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. I might have some information for you, let's see.

**CHAIR** - I expect there's a list.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Let's see if we can get some detailed information for you. We'll just see if we can locate it.

**CHAIR** - That's fine, no problem.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Is this in relation to the forward estimations?

**CHAIR** - No, I haven't dealt with that.

**Mr VALENTINE** - No, it's grant and subsidies.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So it's only PAHSMA, is what I am being told.

**CHAIR** - It's all for PAHSMA?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Not the entire allocation? Thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So that's on the grants and subsidies?

**CHAIR** - Yes, so that's all for PAHSMA. So thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay. I was just interested to know in the last three budget cycles has there been a trend appearing in relation to grants and subsidies, and it seems to be the trend is accelerating into the out years of the forward estimates.

**CHAIR** - So it's the PAHSMA.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So it's all for PAHSMA.

**CHAIR** - When they take over the officer's quarters.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Fair enough. It would be nice to think that that would happen, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well maybe somebody might propose it.

**CHAIR** - Minister, we might have a quick change if that is required at the table.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure.

# **PUBLIC**

**CHAIR** - Because you have a portfolio area of Minister for Small Business. So thank you, Andrew, thank you, Stewart.

**Ms OGILVIE** - You're certainly putting me through my paces. Thank you.

**The Committee suspended from 12.46 p.m. to 12.48 p.m.**

## **DIVISION 11 (Department of State Growth)**

### **Output Group 90 COVID-19 Response and Recovery 90.24 Small Business Sustainability and Recovery Assistance Package**

**CHAIR** - Minister, you might introduce the team support that you have at the table in your area of Minister for Small Business.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Certainly.

**CHAIR** - I expect that we will run a tad over 1 o'clock, so thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I am certainly happy to do that. So we have Mr Mark Bowles who is Deputy Secretary of Business and Jobs; we have Jenna Cairney, Executive Director of Business Tasmania; and we have Kate Mirowski, Director of Business Tasmania. Thank you for joining us.

**CHAIR** - Are you happy to have an overview?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll be as efficient as possible.

**CHAIR** - Key points.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Good afternoon. I would like to take this opportunity to make a brief opening statement. Tasmania's 42 000 small businesses are the engine room of our economy, life blood of our state right across regional Tasmania. Now, powered by the determination and hard work of very proud Tasmanians, many of whom have built their businesses to reflect their interests and passions or to fill a service and product gap, our small businesses are important to our economy. They foster innovation, and as we have seen over the past few challenging years, our business operators continue to demonstrate their resilience, their adaptability and entrepreneurship in the face of adversity.

As a sector of great diversity, representing a range of people, communities and covering a spectrum of ideas and industries, small businesses are key elements of Tasmania's rich commercial tapestry. Now, each business invigorates their respective and combined communities, adding charm and vibrancy, to the towns across Tasmania. Many sell products and provide services that speak to our state and the uniqueness of what we do. Like all of my colleagues in government, we are very proud to be steadfast in our commitment to supporting the Tasmanian small business sector. So whether you're wanting to start a small business, a

new small business or you're well established, you can be assured that this liberal government, our liberal government, has your back.

The success of our small business sector can be seen across our economy and, for instance, the CommSec May 2023 State of the States' economic performance report once again ranking Tasmania as the country's economic leader and best performing economy. So, no matter where you sit, our booming economy, particularly against the backdrop of the global economic tumult, is something we can all celebrate. We owe this, at least in part, to our small businesses - well done, everyone - making up 97 per cent of all of our businesses. To deliver the best support to our small businesses, we need to know what challenges they face and how they want us to address them. That's why earlier this year we launched the Tasmanian Small Business Growth Strategy 2026, and I have copies of that here for those who may not have it already.

This was based on extensive consultation with the sector, and it's given us a true insight into the needs of our small businesses and establishes a number of objectives that both the government and the private sector can do to ensure our small businesses can thrive. The communities' feedback directly informed the four themes, which are highlighted, being people and connections, place, enabling business, and technology. From these themes and consultations, we've already identified the first of the implementation plans that show what we will be doing against those objectives of the strategy. I'm very aware that many small business owners and lots of people will be watching this session today and be very interested in this work we're doing. I would like to highlight that document. It acts as the cornerstone for our small business agenda going forward.

Along with the strategy, we will continue to provide support, grants and funding to eligible businesses and operators. Earlier this year, for example, I launched the Small Business Growth Strategy, which provided between \$10 000 and \$50 000 to fund projects in alignment with the strategy and its themes. I was delighted to announce successful recipients of these grants earlier this week.

We have also seen enormous success come from our small business incubator and accelerator grant program, and round two of this program opened earlier this year, and on 27 May, I formally announced the successful recipients. We look forward to seeing how the successful applicants support our Tasmanian businesses to implement innovative business ideas and accelerate the growth of others. The Business Tasmania information line, either over the phone or email, in its range of events of seminars is well regarded, all of which are designed to facilitate success and inter-sector connections and networks.

So from idea evaluation to moving your business to our island to IP protection, which is close to my heart on the old legal side of things, and guidance on maximising your digital reach, Business Tasmania connects a number of services to our business community. Thank you, and congratulations to the whole team. We've worked really hard together on this, and it's been a big success.

Our small business sector deserves our unwavering support and appreciation, and I just think that people in small business represent the traits and values that we all as Tasmanians hold dear: resilience, an entrepreneurial mindset, rich culture, sense of community. I was at a small business event last night where we saw that in abundance. The opportunity to be small business minister, which is one I take very seriously, and as former small business owner

## PUBLIC

myself and proud fifth generation Tasmanian, it is my pleasure to support homegrown businesses as both the minister and a local patron, and I support the locals with my shopping. Let's keep supporting our businesses, ensure we can continue to see economic success while keeping Tasmania the best place and the best state to live, work and raise a family.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, minister. Can we have some overarching numbers around staffing for this area?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Certainly.

**CHAIR** - Obviously it's elsewhere, because it's not in this line item which has \$130 000 in it, which is only the COVID-19 response and recovery. So, can we have some numbers?

**Ms OGILVIE** - On staffing numbers, who's the best to answer that? I'll ask Kate. Jenna Cairney, thank you.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - There are 14.6 FTE .

**CHAIR** - Fourteen?

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Fourteen. Excuse the accent. Yes, one, four.

**CHAIR** - One, four.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Point 6. So, that's eight in the small business team, FTE, and 6.6 working on Business Tasmania. The wages of the operational budget, \$1.5 million.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - As Mr Bowles was just explaining, of course, they second people in when they need to flex up if there's certain issues, such as pandemic or other issues.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Hence the -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, additional -

**CHAIR** - Additional funds. So, can we have a list of the businesses which have received support in the previous budget?

**Ms OGILVIE** - The pandemic support or more general? No, I think we've actually discussed this. We have a confidentiality concern around that.

**CHAIR** - They've been made available in previous times.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So, I don't think - not the pandemic ones. I just would need to confirm that. Open grant processes, by all means, but I think the pandemic ones are quite specific. So, just let me check that.

**CHAIR** - All right.



## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Hardship grants, yes. So, no, hardship grants, we're careful about that.

**CHAIR** - Okay. Are there any other grants which have been provided?

**Ms WEBB** - These aren't hardship grants, are they?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Pandemic grants are hardship grants.

**Ms WEBB** - These are sustainability and recovery assistance package.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, recovery assistance could be a hardship grant. So, let me just confirm.

**Ms WEBB** - The way we know if their hardship is if they had to demonstrate a certain level of loss of income to get them. If you didn't have to do that, then they're not hardship grants. They're just business support grants.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We're just confirming, but yes, sustainability and recovery grants would fall within that concern. But I'll ask Kate to -

**Ms MIROWSKI** - Please, minister, can I just ask, is this in relation to the COVID sustainability? The \$20 million?

**Ms WEBB** - We're looking at the line item.

**CHAIR** - Yes, there's \$130 000. It says, 'Small business sustainability and recovery assistance package'.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER** - Is it an admin cost or something? I don't reckon it'd be a grant program at that funding level.

**CHAIR** - That's the question. I don't know.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, to Mark Bowles, please.

**Mr BOWLES** - Through the minister. So, the line item 'Output Group 90, the COVID-19 response and recovery package'. So, that was funding that was allocated during COVID-19 over a number of years. So, you've got the final year tailed out there in 2023-24, so that didn't cover just one single grant program. It was a whole suite of COVID response initiatives which were captured in that. So that's just the tail of that funding.

Now, for 2022-23 and 2023-24, there's no direct COVID grants remaining payable or COVID programs remaining payable. So, these funds have been reallocated into other new programs such as the small business growth grants program. Going forward, all of the small business portfolio funding will sit under Output Group 1.2.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So, does that detail get published at some point, how they're allocated?

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - I mean, is there some availability of information of support that's provided to small business in Tasmania from your very generous government?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, there is. Yes, yes, absolutely. Outside of the hardship issue, which I think we all understand that. Yes, we understand that.

**CHAIR** - No, well, we've taken that on board.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So, we have released a series of grants, and we've made quite a few announcements of those, and even just yesterday, I announced another round of grant funding and that's publicly available. So, businesses that are at that innovation stage in growing - for example, yesterday evening, I think it was, I was with Naked Carrot in Mount Nelson, who'd received a grant to improve their business through our business growth grant funds. That is publicly available and published on the Business Tasmania websites is my understanding, as are all of those nature of grants outside of that hardship issue. Is that where you're getting to, right?

**CHAIR** - So, the question is, can we be provided with a list of -

**Ms OGILVIE** - We can print that out.

**CHAIR** - - Those people who have received funds, whether it be - I'm not asking for the hardship. We've taken the message.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Yes, right. Exactly. Yes, that's fine.

**CHAIR** - Those people who have received funds to support their business.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, thank you. No, absolutely, we can compile that for you. It's all publicly available but we're very happy to compile it. Happy to do it.

**CHAIR** - Well, as you know -

**Ms OGILVIE** - I know. We're happy -

**CHAIR** - We have one staffer.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I know.

**CHAIR** - We don't have a mountain of staff.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I understand.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Will that include the 130?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So I have some here which I can provide, and I also appreciate your resourcing comment, which is absolutely real. There's the list plus, also, I do have here - which I think Mr Valentine might be particularly interested in - not just the business growth strategy but the implementation plan that sits under it, which shows the work that we're doing, not just

## PUBLIC

in small business, but in partnerships and across a range of issues. If you'd like to provide that to everyone, very happy to do that.

**CHAIR** - So my next question is, how are those businesses - do they just contact - I think the branch of the small business.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Then they are put in touch with someone who supports them.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Then they get an opportunity to apply for a grant.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Is that what -

**Ms OGILVIE** - That's a good question, because we want to make sure, and I'm really keen to make sure, that everybody across Tasmania no matter where they are gets the opportunity to apply, and sometimes getting that information out and the communication that grant processes are open, or rounds are open, can be hard.

**CHAIR** - But if you've got 14 people in a department, I'd expect that it's pretty easy to get the information out.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, they do a lot of work for us and a number of people in the resourcing as well.

**CHAIR** - Well, I'm sure they do, but I wasn't aware that there were any small business grants available. I'm not sure how much other information members have.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure, if it's okay, I will ask Ms Cairney just to talk about how we do that communication and, again, if you have suggestions and recommendations for a broader net, I'm always open to those.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Through you, minister. So any time we launch a growth program or, sorry, a small business grant program, we do have a communications plan that accompanies it. That includes often press releases and events through the minister. But also, we reach out to all of our small business peak organisations, as an example, and they distribute it through their networks. We publish it on the Business Tasmania network website and we also have a - and Business Tasmania newsletter that goes out regularly, and that also promotes our grant programs. I'll just check the number of people signed up to the small business - 12 and a half thousand businesses that it goes out to as well as the peak organisations, and they obviously amplify those messages with their members as well.

**CHAIR** - It'd be a lot of southern based businesses, I think. So Ms Webb, and then I'll go to Ms Howlett.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Just to talk about the issue of funding for the business enterprise centres that we have, and hubs. What is the sustainability of that. You'd be well aware, I think, that those hubs have lost federal funding through the source that they had previously had as of 1 July, I think, this year. I did see in your quarterly ministerial diary disclosure that you visited the Break O'Day Business Enterprise Centre. I'm sure you're well aware of the support they provide to local small businesses and how invaluable that is, particularly in regional areas.

Minister, I'm just interested to understand - I think that there was a review - the review of Tasmanian government independent business advisory services, and I wonder was that a review of the business enterprise centres? I think it was last year. Did that determine a new funding model or business model for those centres? Can you tell me whether those centres are secure in being funded from the state government in some way under the Tasmanian business advice service model going forwards?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you for the question, and you're quite right, we have been providing free and independent business advice through the Tas government's support to the small business sector for approximately 30 years, through the Enterprise Centres Tasmania program. Between 1 July 22 and 26 April 23, 852 people have accessed ECT services across all business types. During the same period last year, 1 July 21 to 22 989 accessed services. The decrease, we believe, can be attributed to businesses getting back on track and having more confidence than they did 12 years ago.

Now, given a significantly changed operating landscape for Tasmanian businesses resulting from recent global events, an independent review of the current ECT program was undertaken last year with the objective of assessing the alignment of the service offering with current and projected needs of small businesses in Tasmania. The updated service model to be implemented through a staged approach in the new financial year takes into considerations all findings and recommendations of the review and also in relation to the budget.

The updated service will be known as the Tasmanian Business Advice Service, or TBAS, and will provide up to five hours of free and independent business advice per eligible business from qualified and experienced business advisers located in four regions, each separated as two subregions to ensure full statewide coverage. The new distribution of regions and subregions is closely aligned to the regional jobs hub network to streamline and increase accessibility of government support to Tasmanian businesses and to people. Small businesses can access advice to assist with all aspects of managing a business, from planning, budgeting and cashflow management through to marketing, diversification and risk management strategies.

Now importantly, businesses will no longer be restricted to accessing the adviser located in its own region. It can access the adviser of its choice through an online service provision if that is their preference. Another significant change is that support for those intending to start a business and new businesses that have been in operation for less than 12 months will now be provided, through a dedicated and standalone package, the new business support pilot program. We're separating startups from existing businesses and that will better service all businesses and, importantly, ensure that in tenders, new businesses and existing businesses are provided with the best opportunity to access the support they need.

Now further, I understand that the department is undertaking a thorough assessment process to appoint the new business advisers and this is to ensure that the right people with the right qualifications are made available to our small businesses to ensure they get the advice and

support they need when they need it. I also understand that an independent probity adviser is overseeing the entire process.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank you very much for your hard work and the department to get the best outcomes for our businesses through TBAS as all small businesses across the state will have an equal opportunity access support with a primary focus on how best to service the needs of Tasmanian businesses in the current and future operating environment.

And through the consultation process, as part of the review of the ECT program, businesses told us that they wanted more choice on how they accessed advisory services and that is what we are delivering with the new Tasmanian Business Advice Service.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Can I just ask a couple of questions on that then?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure.

**Ms WEBB** - In relation to the existing business enterprise centres that are there, out in the community in various regions, including in my electorate, what's expected to become of them? Are they likely to be picked up by your TBAS model or are we actually looking at those shutting down, and then a new model being put in around them? Or instead of them, I should say.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, no, I understand, and I certainly am very alive to the question and concern that you raised. I would actually like Jenna Cairney and Kate Mirowski to talk specifically about, firstly the process that they're going through - I want to be careful because it is a process that's on foot, so there's a probity requirement, so I will ask them to refer to that and then I'm happy to speak specifically about, I think you raised, Break O'Day.

**Ms WEBB** - No, I mentioned Break O'Day as somewhere you visited. The one in my electorate is the Kingborough & Huon Business Enterprise Centre. There's a number of them, I'm not picking any particular one out. Rather than hear more about the new model, I'm mostly interested to know what's expected to happen to the existing enterprise centres.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Appreciate that, but we are going through a process that is governed by probative considerations so it is important, I think, I ask the department to tackle that question and then I'm happy to go forward from there. Thank you.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Thanks. Through you, minister. As the minister outlined, there is currently a process under way. Any potential applicants were invited to apply against those criteria and that process is still underway. In regard to what would happen to previous providers, they would obviously be able to apply for that process and then that will be considered and announced in due course.

**Ms WEBB** - What's the timeline on that, minister?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, and perhaps if I just then pick up as well. Because you raise a very legitimate question about existing providers, so, as we've heard, it's an independent review and, like the rest of Australia, we're looking to provide the most contemporary service. The updated model has a different model and a different franchise map.

## PUBLIC

Applications have been sought, we have a process which is underway, and I do acknowledge that the change in the service model has caused some consternation for some applicants, and I have recognised that from the feedback received. I have been contacted, as some others have been, to ensure that while the assessment process continues current providers are given some clarity, so I do appreciate that.

I have instructed or asked my department to provide a three month extension to current providers. This ensures no provider is without clarity about the continuation of their services while assessment continues. And I understand providers have been or are being contacted by Business Tasmania to advise that step.

**Ms WEBB** - As we speak are they being contacted?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - So that hasn't occurred already?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will just check for you.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Through you, minister. I think we have contacted everyone and talked to everyone but one, who we are just waiting for a call back from.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. I ask just one other thing about the model, the new model that is coming on board, because the way you described it, as I understood it, is that there will still be some regional location of sites, but also a centralised online facility for people who might prefer to do that not necessarily in person. You described a separate arrangement for emerging or new first 12 months businesses, will that support be able to be received in person in regional areas, or is that only an online component?

**Ms OGILVIE** - That is a very good question, actually I am not sure and I will ask - that second part of your question I will refer to the Department. But the first part of your question - just to be clear - that the online component could be distributed as well. It may not be a centralised effort. So there might be somebody who has particular specialist skills on the northwest coast that somebody on the south wants to get some advice from. So it is a more of a distributive model with more access to specialist consultation that can be provided online. But certainly I, like everybody else, recognise face to face is also very important. In relation to the second part of the question, perhaps I will ask Jenna to respond.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Yes. Through you, minister. So as part of the tenders and new business program. There will be services provided for face to face contact in regions as well as online, and really the change and the program is about trying to make sure that businesses can access the advice and support how they want it, where they want it, and that is really a priority for the department to make sure that we maintain that face to face contact. As well we want to provide for those who wish to access those online digital services they can make through, say, Skype or Teams or whatever the platform that the provider uses.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Mr Willie?

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you, Chair. As Minister for Small Business do you have any concerns around the fairness and the way in which your government administers grants and the

impact on competition and trade? There is a much talked about grant for a distillery that has been the topic of discussion this week. Have you got any comment on the fairness of that? I mean, most - in fact all distilleries have had to self-fund their own upgrades. Why is one more important than the others?

**Ms OGILVIE** - It is not my area, Mr Willie.

**Mr WILLIE** - No, I'm just asking as Small Business Minister, do you have a concern about the way your government administers grants?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, let me think about that. My concern is to make sure that everything in my portfolio areas is managed as well as we can manage that and probity is very, very important. You have heard me today even having to sort of be careful about that and the probity of how we go about administering grants.

We have scenarios, for example, I was thinking of the announcement I made yesterday of the funding for our small business growth grant round where we were hugely oversubscribed. It was very, very popular. Now, that tells me that we are doing something in our communications with stakeholders and understanding what businesses want, and I think in particular the business in tenders or the new ideas that are coming through and how we kickstart those, that's an area where we have to be really scrupulous. I think we do that very well through our department, and certainly I made some announcements yesterday.

Personally I am always open to improving the way we do things, in areas that I control and processes that sit within my department or our departments. In relation to procurement processes more generally I think that the government has a very good weather eye on those, and certainly if there is information about how we deal with those things that come through, I'm certain people are listening.

**Mr WILLIE** - My question, minister, is as Small Business Minister do you have a concern? I mean, we're talking to distilleries who are furious that one distillery has been, I guess, the recipient -

**CHAIR** - They picked a winner.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes. We know that State Growth has grant funds in Advanced Manufacturing. Distilleries have been told that that is unavailable to them because it will preference one over the other, so this appears to go against State Growth's own ruling. Do you have concerns about the impact on competition and trade?

**Ms OGILVIE** - You might need to ask that question in State Growth. Again, I say it is not my area, but I am very concerned to make sure that everything we do in our area - and I think we have done that well - is done with complete probity.

**Mr WILLIE** - You have got no concern about this particular grant and the impact on competition and trade?

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's not in my area, Mr Willie.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILLIE** - I'm asking you as Small Business Minister. Surely you have an interest in it?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I have an interest in all small businesses, and in particular those who wish to grow and we have got our growth strategy there. What I can say, just more broadly on competition issues, that is a matter that is built into the fundamentals of procurement processes, and something I know that those processes are alive to. In relation to specific grants, I can't comment.

**Mr WILLIE** - I am sure if there are any distilleries listening they would be alarmed that you don't have any concerns about competition and trade in that sector.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's not actually what I -

**Ms WEBB** - Or any of those businesses that miss out on the grants. How disappointing for them to know that it's being picked as a winner if you potentially knew the right avenues to go down.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Was that a question?

**Ms WEBB** - I support the question from the member for Elwick, which you haven't answered: As Small Business Minister are you concerned on behalf of small businesses that they might put in for grants, have them be oversubscribed and see someone else picked as a winner.

**CHAIR** - Let's let the minister answer. Minister?

**Mr WILLIE** - This didn't go through a grant process. It was a clear picking of a winner.

**Ms WEBB** - Even more galling.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Right. So I have just said I am very concerned to make sure probity is adhered to, and in particular I am very concerned when we have issues, as we did yesterday, where I announced a number of grant recipients who are all worthy and we were hugely oversubscribed for that grant round. So in my area what I try to do is rely on my department and their sage triaging of those applications and the work that they do with small businesses to make sure that we select the ones that we think will do well from the grant process.

Having said that, I have in the past been on many - on the other side of the table, and I piggyback to the - I think, Mr Valentine and I spoke about the Salamanca Arts Centre days. It's very difficult when you miss out on grants. It is very, very hard and I am very alive to that issue. When we have a grant process that is hugely oversubscribed as I have with the growth strategy it tells me that we're hitting the mark with our strategy and that our implementation plan is spot on. So that's what I can say from my portfolio area.

**Mr WILLIE** - As Small Business Minister, what do you say to the distilleries that are concerned about the fairness of this particular grant.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I don't believe that I have personally heard from any of them, but the distillery area, and that sector of our economy is very important.



**Ms WEBB** - Can I just check, minister, what was the size of the grant program that you announced yesterday?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry, the size?

**Ms WEBB** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It is a \$1 million grant program that sits under the growth strategy. I have the details here.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. So the \$1.2 million given to this distillery could have more than doubled the size of that grant program. You could have given it to twice as many businesses, that's a shame.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - The distillery could have applied through that grant program and got some of it themselves. How sad.

**CHAIR** - Ms Howlett, question?

**Ms HOWLETT** - Thank you, Chair. Minister, I was just wondering if you could please update the Committee on the Small Business Growth Strategy 2022-26 and the associated implementation plan?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll keep it short. Thank you very much, and I am very happy to do that. I have spoken at length. Could I hand these out?

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think this will help build some confidence around what we're here to do today. It is a topic I'm really passionate about. We have done some incredible work there, and it is the first time that we have had a small business growth strategy. We have had a business growth strategy, but we are really focused on small business and this is just a core for Tasmania and so many families.

So many families who get up at the crack of dawn and get their businesses open, from the bakeries to the hairdressers, to those in the racing sector and distilleries and everywhere else. I just want to really reiterate that we, as a government, are there for small business and we've got your back.

In that document you'll see you've received two documents. The first one is the small business growth plan which was heavily consulted and towards the back of it, just note I think on the last page you will see the industry associations that we've worked with and the implementation which shows how we're integrating what we're doing across the sector with partners, regional communities and other organisations.

So I don't particularly think it's going to be beneficial if I read out what I wanted to say on this because we have traversed it a bit just in the last conversation but really, we're wanting

to build on a strong business investment and consumer spending in recent years to seize those emerging opportunities and as we've seen business intenders and new ideas for businesses are being supported and to identify the positive elements of our business sectors works over the past years. And we want to collaborate so we're collaborating across sectors. We're doing work in very many different sectors connecting people, connecting organisations, working on issues such as digital connectivity, online retail and marketing. Those sorts of things we've had to deal with during the pandemic and taking the learnings of that and seeing what more we can do.

So in the attached implementation plan you'll see there's over 100 things we're working on and connecting into, and it really focusses on Tasmania as a place to do business right across the state and I would like to point out as well that the recent grant recipients which I announced come from right round Tasmania. I'm very aware of the need to be agnostic as to geography but it is good to see that we have innovation and IP development and business development happening right across our beautiful state.

So the grant funding, as I have said, we've put out between \$10 000 and \$50 000 under the Small Business Growth Strategy Grant program. Further support for our business community is occurring through the new T-BAS model and of course we have an ongoing between \$750 and \$1500 amount of money for any business that would like specialist advice. I think I'll close very quickly because we are short of time but I just want to say a callout to every single small business owner in Tasmania to thank you for what you do. To thank you, to say that we can't do what we need to do as a government to support you without your engagement and your engagement has been huge with this process of developing the business strategy.

We've had hiccups along the way, and I say this in all of my portfolios. There will always be challenges. But we are here to help. We're doing all that we can to boost and bolster this sector and we are keen to work together with you.

**CHAIR** - Some time to digest some of those. Yes, especially ones that are truism focussed. I would've thought there was a bucket of money elsewhere for those but anyway let's see if we've got any more questions up or -

**Mr VALENTINE** - I've got a question on some of the information that's just been handed out and it's in relation to a Develop an Aboriginal Business Community Engagement program. Can you give us a bit of an update about what's happening in that space?

**Ms OGILVIE** - What number is it there, Mr Valentine?

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's number 1.2.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you just make sure we've got the right reference. Yes, we have some information on that.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Yes, through you minister, that will be primarily worked through in the tourism and hospitality unit which is just a different output area from here and that will be part of the T30 strategy moving forward so in state growth we work quite closely across different units and very much with this implementation plan the Business Tasmania with Director Kate Mirowski and her team have done a really good job of trying to join the dots in different units

that exist within state growth to ensure that any activity that we do contribute towards the business growth strategy so there's a little bit more information available but that's in the tourism and hospitality unit.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I know there's 1.1.4 as well looks at plan and deliver phase and long-term strategic actions to support Tasmanian Aboriginal Tourism. Do they get access to certain resources that you have or, you know how is that intended to be delivered to those organisations?

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Through you, minister, if I may -

**Mr VALENTINE** - I mean any for that matter I suppose but it's there particularly in Aboriginal tourism.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - It is a different output area but I'm happy to give a little bit of context and examples if the minister would just -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes of course. I hope you can appreciate how difficult this is for us.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Yes, if you give me a really quick minute, I do have a couple of examples of things we have already achieved in that space through the tourism and hospitality unit as it does sit within -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Are we talking about Kowino Walk, those sorts of things?

**Ms CAIRNEY** - Well, Kowino Walk is one example, minister, but what we did do this financial year was a grant program was provided. Just as an example of how programs that gave one off \$3500 grants per person and has went to 11 Tasmanian Aboriginal people to go towards the cost of attending the World Indigenous Summit. That was held in Perth, WA in March.

**Mr VOSS** - So that's \$3500 each to support their attendance.

**Ms CAIRNEY** - To support their attendance. Then through the T30 strategy, there'll be further plans developed to see how we can deliver on that target in that area.

**CHAIR** - That's not a business initiative, is it? Is that a business initiative?

**Ms OLGILVIE** - Yes, it is.

**CHAIR** - That's a business initiative?

**Mr VALENTINE** - The communication with the Small Business Council of Tasmania. Are they are integrally involved in all of those sorts of communications?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, so that's probably one for me. I work directly with the Small Business Council of Tasmania, and again, that's noted in the growth strategy, which we are all agreed it was supported by the Small Business Council as well. So that document sits at the top and the implementation plan supports those activities. When it comes to specific projects then there may be more dialogue around that project level work.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay, thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Minister, we will certainly review our allocation times for the next round of budget estimates so these have been completely out the window today so that'll be something that the committee will discuss at a later time, but we very much thank everyone who has -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you so much.

**CHAIR** - Put to together what we've received thus far, and we will now suspend for a lunch break and be back ready to proceed with our afternoon session at 2.15. Thank you.

**The Committee suspended from 1.27 p.m. to 2.16 p.m.**

**Minister for Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries**

**CHAIR** - I declare this next session of our scrutiny, and this one, minister, is in your area as the Minister for Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries. It is always interesting, there is actually no output item. It is gobbled up in the State Development, Construction and Housing, which was Monday. But obviously this is your area of portfolio responsibility and we always look forward to an opportunity to talk about this area. I know that you will have an overview. Will introduce your team at the table.

But for those at the table, we do have a new member of Committee B and that is the honourable Meg Webb. We are delighted to have Meg come across from the other committee, and the honourable Jane Howlett, the honourable Rob Valentine, and this will be his last estimates. So he is going to take the opportunity to retire, we have no idea why. Tanya Rattray, the honourable Rosemary Armitage, and the honourable Josh Willie.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I am happy to do so. I am joined at the table by Mr Kim Evans, secretary; Mr Mark Bowles, Deputy Secretary Business and Jobs; Mr Steve Gilmore, our defence advocate; we don't have Jenna, we have Jenna in the room; we have Dennis Hendricks, who is the Senior Director Business Tasmania. We have others in the room who can be brought forward as needed: Angela Conway, Glen Dean, and Travis Boucher.

**CHAIR** - Welcome everyone.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Are you happy for now to just plough on?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Absolutely.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I am very pleased to be before this Committee for the second time as Advanced Manufacturing and Defence Industries Minister, what a great portfolio. It is part of Tasmania's business and employment landscape, and it continues to inspire with me its future potential, a success story indeed.

These sectors have been experiencing significant success over the past seven years, and since we released Tasmania's first Advanced Manufacturing Action Plan in 2016 we have seen manufacturing generate more than \$2.5 billion per year for our state. All actions under AMAP are either completed or underway, and in particular we have supported more than 20 Tasmanian food manufacturers with grant program support since 2021.

Between 2020-21 and 2021-22 alone we have seen the contribution manufacturing makes to our gross state product increase by 8.3 per cent. Significantly Tasmanian companies have been awarded more than \$160 million in defence related contracts since we released our Defence Industry Strategy. Since the establishment of the Industry Capability Network in Tasmania which is known as ICN Tasmania, they have published over \$1.3 billion worth of projects with expressions of interest for these projects promoted to Tasmanian suppliers.

1600 Tasmanian business capabilities have been linked to project opportunities and our support for these sectors remains unwavering, and we continue to support Tasmania's advanced manufacturers and defence industries through the 2023-24 state budget. To support sector growth and the significant investment that manufacturing and defence contracts can attract, this year's budget provides \$5 million to Elphinstone towards its \$25 million factory upgrade and expansion. It will deliver nation leading machining capability right here in Tasmania and set the company up to effectively deliver on its existing Land 8116 program, and immediately commenced production of components for Australia's new armoured vehicle fleet if a favourable decision is made by the Australian government. This new capability will also open up opportunities beyond defence market and into commercial sectors.

Noting the value to industry of the Tasmanian defence advocate, this year's budget continues to support this role for a further three years so local companies can continue to access this extensive expertise and advice in chasing more defence supply contracts. As global investment in defence continues to grow and considering the role that advance manufacturing plays in this sector, this support is a wise investment in our future economic strength. While Tasmanian businesses engaging in these sectors quietly pursue excellence, their achievements and reputation for innovations, expertise and quality continues to gain recognition internationally. I applaud the leaders and the workforces in these sectors, and I reiterate that they have a great supporter in the Tasmanian Government. Thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much, and it's my opportunity to lead the questions. So, I'll start. Minister, in last year's budget Estimates process, we were given a list of your 2021-22 election commitments, and they were quite extensive at the time. So, I'm really interested in an update on where some of those significant amounts of money, and how the performance of those allocation of funds has actually been assessed, and how far they are through. I expect that some of them may well be ongoing. So, we had the Advanced Manufacturing Accelerating Growth grants.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Then we had the action plan and the - well, let's start with the Accelerating Growth grants, and give us some idea of, you know, how they were assessed and their success or otherwise and where they are at what stage. Thank you.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Certainly. I'll just seek the information for you, and I have the Advanced Manufacturing action plan as well here. So, what I might do is I'll give you some granular detail on that. I think it's probably worthwhile doing. We also have sort of two pieces to it. There're the election commitments more generally that if you would like me to specifically speak about the -

**CHAIR** - Well, there was a total of \$2 393 000.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Okay. Yes. So, I'll answer it this way I think. So, yes, we've made specific election commitments to support advanced manufacturing and defence industries. Our Tasmanian Advanced Manufacturing Plan was launched in 2020 and it received a funding commitment of \$10.4 million to support the delivery of 20 actions over four years, which I think is the basis of your question. \$3 000 000 was committed over two years for the Advanced Manufacturing Accelerating Growth grants program to encourage Tasmanian manufacturers to invest in innovative equipment to become more competitive, resilient and be able to scale up for global markets. So, I can let you know that the four rounds of this program saw 28 applicants awarded over \$3 000 000, and this is forecast to generate approximately \$8.2 million in investment and an extra 212 manufacturing jobs in the state.

**CHAIR** - Are those businesses details able to be tabled? Those grant recipients?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Who's received those grants? Let me just confirm. Yes, we can do that. If you're happy for us to do that.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. That's always of interest.

**Ms OGILVIE** - All right. Thank you. I think you asked about - did you want to know about the Advanced Manufacturing Tender Incentive grant program?

**CHAIR** - Yes. Well, last year that's \$460 000.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So the Advanced Manufacturing Tender Incentive grant program. \$600 000 has been committed over two years for the Advanced Manufacturing Tender Incentive grant program. Is that tallying? I just want to make sure I'm on the right output.

**CHAIR** - It's a different number than what we were provided. Because the other one, we had 2393. For the first one, you gave 3. So, maybe it two straight lines, 3 for the first one we gave three So maybe they've all gone up a bit.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, all right. So, seven grants have been approved for that with a total value of over \$200 000, and then in 2023, approval was given to extend this program into a third year to utilise uncommitted funds. The total estimated value of tenders identified by approved applicants in this financial year is \$190 million.

**CHAIR** - Can we have some understanding of the success or otherwise of where those funds went to and what programs? Is that something that the department assesses? Well, I'd expect they'd assess.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, so more descriptive? How would you like to handle that? We might ask Mr Hendriks to talk a little bit about the projects.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Give him a moment to find the relevant paper.

**CHAIR** - Yes, that's fine.

**Mr HENDRIKS** - So, under the Advanced Manufacturing Tender Incentive program. The program opened on 3 August 2021. So far, we've had seven applications with seven approved, but this year, there's only been two applications under the program. One was CBG Systems. In fact, both were for CBG Systems, and both in relation to quite large defence tenders. With the Tender Incentive program, what we've found is that defence industry companies are the predominant applicant, and I think that's largely due to the complexity of the activity that they're undertaking.

**CHAIR** - Specialised area. Technical.

**Mr HENDRIKS** - Absolutely. They require that expertise to enable them to do it. But they're also very large tenders. But they do take time, so at this point in time, most of those tenders are still on foot, and actually live and open. There are some sensitivities around that program that probably doesn't exist in relation to a lot of our other programs. Just in terms of how much detail that those companies are comfortable with us providing.

**CHAIR** - No, well, we don't want to divulge any national secrets here.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No. No, there won't be any of those divulged.

**CHAIR** - So, we will take that, minister, as a response.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - So, can I have some understanding then, the Tasmanian Minerals, Manufacturing and Energy Council industry advancement of \$300 000, what did that achieve?

**Ms OGILVIE** - TMEC? Is that what we are talking about? So, just specifically in relation to that project, I think it's worthwhile asking the Secretary to respond, and perhaps Mr Bowles, in relation to TMEC at the project level.

**Mr BOWLES** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. I can give an overview while he's finding the detailed information. So, obviously an election commitment was made to provide grant funding of \$500 000 over four years to TMEC to support Industry 4.0.

**CHAIR** - Did you say \$500 000?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I've got \$500 000 over four years.

**CHAIR** - None of the figures that we've received last year seemed to be adding up. Everything seems to be a significant increase, so. Anyway, keep going. \$500 000.

**Ms OGILVIE** - All right. \$500 000.

**CHAIR** - Over five years. Four years. Four years, thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Four years, I've got. Does that - that looks like it tallies better. To TMEC to support Industry 4.0 in the Advanced Manufacturing sector, and the Department of State Growth works with TMEC to administer the grant in annual payments. Activities include, and this is the interesting part, demonstration of Industry 4.0 in businesses, training for businesses, the delivery of the Bitlink program for participating schools in Burnie, regional insight tours, and upgrading TMEC welding simulators and real welders to better capture and analyse data to improve training outcomes. Interesting project. Yes, perhaps a bit more from the Secretary. Thank you.

**Mr EVANS** - So I was going to just ask Dennis Hendriks, Mr Hendriks, to speak to this one. He's managing this particular grant and has some detail.

**Mr HENDRIKS** - Through the minister, - TMEC's been working but all of their activities are very industry driven. I work very closely with their industry participants, but they've done some really interesting things. They've run a number of seminars across the state in relation to utilisation of cobots, and some of that has seen some of those industry participants actually then go on further to actually buy some of that technology for their own industrial uses. They've also undertaken the Bitlink project, for instance, has actually been getting in schools and teaching students around IoT and the utilisation of industry.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, it's exciting.

**Mr HENDRIKS** - And that's sort of been flowing through to industry. So, some of that is also about industry attraction.

**CHAIR** - Is that across the state in schools, or is it predominantly north west-based?

**Mr HENDRIKS** - So, the pilot was north west-based, but the program is now intended to be run right across. They undertook the program. I think everybody was pretty happy with the way that that rolled. So now the intention is to take it state-wide.

**CHAIR** - Can we expect that there will some feedback from that state-wide rollout of that pilot program next year, minister?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'm just checking the timeframes. Yes.

**Mr HENDRIKS** - That would be the expectation.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Good. Last year there was some information regarding the fact that the Rear Admiral, the minister, and Mr Evans had been to the Indo Pacific Trade Fair where Tasmanian companies won three of about nine major innovation awards. Any awards received in more recent times? Or is that only every two years that they do an Indo Pacific Trade Fair?

**Mr HENDRIKS** - Every two years.



**CHAIR** - So next year we'll pick up a few.

**Ms OGILVIE** - If we keep working at this rate, we will.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. I'll open it up to other questions across the floor. Thank you. Ms Howlett, we'll go there first, and then I'll come back to Mr Willie. Thank you.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Thank you, Chair. Minister, can you update the committee on the defence industry strategy is delivering for Tasmanian businesses?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Very happy to. And I know you're very interested in this and you have a great interest in business, so thank you for the question. Our Defence Industry Strategy has delivered really great successes for Tasmanian businesses and our Tasmanian economy, and it's showing significant results with Tasmanian companies, including new entrants being awarded defence contracts and our industries' capabilities being recognised across the defence industry market. Through the support provided in the Strategy, Tasmanians are participating to make a contribution to the wider Australian defence sector, and we're seeing that in jobs growth locally.

Through the Strategy, we committed to attract \$50 million in defence investment, and this figure has not only been met, but it has been exceeded. The Tasmanian companies have been awarded over \$160 million in defence related contracts over the last four years. It's a big success. In the last year alone, more than 80 defence supply contracts were awarded to Tasmanian companies with a value of more than \$30 million. The Tasmanian government is supporting local industry to pursue Australian and international defence industry opportunities through the Tasmanian Defence Industry Strategy 2023.

Due to the government driven investment in this market, there is a significant role for government in identifying opportunities and supporting local business to make connections across the defence industry market. I would also like to note my personal thanks particularly to our Defence Advocate, who works tirelessly in this area. Thank you for the question.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Mr Willie.

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you, Chair. You may have to take this on notice, and I'm okay with that, minister. But in the six years since the appointment of the Tasmanian Defence Advocate, how many Tasmanian businesses now have contracts for defence work that hadn't previously had work in the defence sector?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So what is the growth of -

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes, in new businesses receiving contracts.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We may not have to take it on notice. Let's see if the Defence Advocate has some information.

## PUBLIC

**Mr GILMORE** - Thanks, minister. I can't give you the exact number. We've doubled the number of companies that are on the defence playing field, to put it that way.

**CHAIR** - It's fairly topical, playing fields in Tasmania at the moment, so we can go with that.

**Mr GILMORE** - Perhaps I won't put it that way. But we've got about 50 companies now that are involved, and many of those have received their first contracts. An example is the past 12 months where 10 additional companies have gone through the process to position to be defence ready, as it's referred to. Two of those companies have now achieved their first contracts.

**Mr WILLIE** - So we've got 50 companies now. I'm just interested in what the state of play was six years ago, if that's possible?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So you're looking for the growth trajectory?

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes. And we've heard there's been \$160 million investment over four years.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, it's good.

**Mr WILLIE** - It would be good to understand.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. \$160 million.

**Mr WILLIE** - Six years ago, yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Of contracts landed. Yes, which is better than investment. But, yes, good question. Let's just see if -

**Mr GILMORE** - Minister, we can certainly break it down to that number. It's many.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes.

**Mr GILMORE** - As I said, there were 26 companies, I think, when we first chronicled or articulated those that sought to be or were already in the defence space, either domestically or internationally. That number, as I just mentioned, is about 52, now.

**Mr WILLIE** - With contracts?

**Mr GILMORE** - Not all. About eight. Eight, maybe 10, haven't yet secured their first contract, or they're in the tender evaluation stage.

**Mr WILLIE** - Maybe, minister, if there needs to be some more work done, you'll take it on notice? If we can go back six years. I'm interested in the number of businesses that had contracts to now.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. I think we can get that information for you. I'm just a little bit reluctant to try and do it on the fly because -

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - You don't want to miss anyone off.

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, and also the defence realms are changing. We've got a review that's landed as well, and so the sector is just expanding.

**Mr WILLIE** - And another question, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr WILLIE** - It's been a day of awkward questions with people at the table.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We don't mind.

**Mr WILLIE** - What's the total cost of the Defence Advocate position, including staff that support his role, the travel costs and entertainment?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I will ask the department to respond with the details. Yes. Thank you, Mr Bowles.

**Mr BOWLES** - Through the minister. The allocation for the Defence Advocate and support in the budget is \$300 000 per year. So that covers salaries, and also potential travel and accommodation expenses. In terms of other staff, so for the 2023-24 financial year, the team salaries, including the Defence Advocate, was \$2.5 million. Now, you wouldn't characterise all of those staff as supporting the Defence Advocate.

**Mr WILLIE** - Solely supporting, yes.

**Mr BOWLES** - So that includes staff that work in other parts advanced manufacturing, not only defence. It also includes a small unit that does the industry capability network. So there's a wide range of functions that that team does, supporting both defence and non-defence activity.

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. I'll go down here. Thank you, Ms Webb, and then I'll come back to Mr Valentine, and then here to Ms Armitage.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to ask some questions around the Elphinstone international defence infrastructure item that's in the budget, the \$5 million. Noting the description that's in the budget, I'm just aware that in February last year, Elphinstone was awarded a share of a federal defence contract, which was apparently in the vicinity of \$1 billion, that defence contract. Elphinstone had a slice of it. I'm just wondering then, on the basis of that, given that Elphinstone was already a successful recipient of that funding, that investment from the federal government, why an additional \$5 million was needed from the state government to contribute into that similar space.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - We're happy to take the answer without disclosing any national secrets.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We will ensure that no secrets are disclosed. Thank you, Chair. I will ask Mr Mark Bowles to provide a response.

**Mr BOWLES** - Through the minister. It's correct that the Elphinstone group already had a contract for the LAND 8116, phase 1 program. The trigger, I guess, for the awarding of this grant was it was part of the company's and associated supply chains efforts to tender in for the LAND 400 (Infantry Fighting Vehicles). So it's to assist them and their supply chain to upscale for that new tender, which is a very substantial tender, notwithstanding that the volume of Infantry Fighting Vehicles has been cut back as part of the defence strategic review. It would still be a huge contract for the North West. So it's there to support that.

I would also add too that the work being undertaken as part of that investment is to support - it's specifically Elphinstone's Wynyard facility, which had previously been where it was undertaking the Metro bus contract, which has now come to an end. So it was about providing for a transition to new opportunities, including the LAND 400. But also, potentially, other export opportunities that they would have in partnership with Hanwha.

**Ms WEBB** - Minister, can I just clarify then, given that this is an incredibly successful business. Incredibly successful business. That has a lot of capacity to do its own preparation to gain more business, yes, more business from government contracts. I would like to know two things. One, did the company approach the government in order to secure this grant, and given that the grant - I believe it's \$5 million of a project that is a \$25 million project, one-fifth. Government funding to provide one-fifth of that project to a private business. Is that warranted? Is that something we would expect any other private business to come to government with a hand out to get?

**Ms OGILVIE** - When it comes to developing our advanced manufacturing sector, particularly companies that have specific and specialised skill sets that dovetail in with defence industries that are quite bespoke, I think it's absolutely reasonable to make sure we, as a state government, stand with and alongside these businesses that do that work. We really do want to make sure that our advanced manufacturing sector is well placed to pick up these defence contracts and, in particular, the Hanwha deal is a very big one and we have been waiting some time for the defence review to come down, and that, as Mr Bowles has said, has trimmed the contract value.

But I think a commitment from the state government to support a company which is putting in 25 million of its own revenues to expand its operation is really aligned with the sort of projects that we should be supporting. The capability and the jobs that will be delivered if we are able to land this deal will flood through the Tasmanian ecosystem more generally. So the skills and training, and the subcontractors and the small businesses that will develop in and around these major projects will be, I think, really quite a remarkable thing. When it comes to the discussion about funding and how we can support businesses, I will ask the Department, who has those conversations, to reflect on that.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I just clarify whether they'll be answering the question that I put to you, minister, or whether you'd like to answer that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Which question?

**Ms WEBB** - There were two parts to the question. The first one was who approached who?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, they will be answering that one.

**Ms WEBB** - Right. Then the second question was on what basis is it warranted to spend - now, is it 25 million all together, this 5 million is part of that, therefore 20 million of their own money. Or is to 25 of their own money, as you just said, plus this 5. But either way, it's a large proportion coming from government. How on earth is that warranted to one private business that's incredibly successful already, and could well have leveraged that money of its own accord without government assistance?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So I will ask the secretary to speak to the second part of your question, and we can return if we need to.

**Mr EVANS** - So it's my understanding that the initial approach by the Elphinstone Group came directly to the premier who asked us to engage with Elphinstone and assess the merits of their proposal. I go back to your comment, minister, that this is \$5 million investment. It's not small but it's \$20 million of Elphinstone Group's investment privately to enable this facility to be established which will have far broader through supply chain and other small business benefits. So we see this as, really, an investment into a piece of critical infrastructure that will support the expansion of advanced manufacturing on the north west coast and, for that matter, create opportunities elsewhere.

**Ms WEBB** - So this was arrived at by somebody personally approaching the premier and the premier then asking the department to look into it and help them out. I find that quite appalling, minister, that yet again we're seeing another example where somebody, because they know the right people and can go and knock on the door or pick up the phone, and ask for a bit of help. This is corporate welfare, plain and simple. How is this not corporate welfare, minister?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, I don't agree. So the Defence Industry Strategy has set out exactly what we're aiming to do at that strategic layer, and the Hanwha deal and the negotiations, which have been underway some time, have had some delays caused to them by an incoming federal government. So I think it is incumbent upon us, as good Tasmanians and sensible people, to look at situations like this, where things get delayed or there are other challenges as part of the process, to see what we can do to help our companies to expand, thrive and survive.

When it comes to the infrastructure level, which is, I think, what we're talking about here, the business that will be built here, if we are successful in winning this deal, will be multigenerational work and skills development for the north west coast. It is really structural and foundational for what we do there. It expands the capacity of those business, not just the one that we're working with, being Elphinstone, but those businesses around it. The more you talk to minerals company, as in advanced manufacturing companies, the more you understand that it is an ecosystem and that people move in between those organisations, that the skills development, the workforce development in all of those areas we need to do, sit right across this layer.

Now I'm very aware that we're dealing in an economic development argument here and that is something, I think, the department is quite specialised in doing. But I would also say, people approach government and companies approach government all the time on very many levels, but we do have a defence advocate and this deal fits within the strategy, and it's something that we've been working on for some time. So I would also like the defence advocate to add to that.

**CHAIR** - But minister, grants usually go through a competitive process.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, if I could follow up with a question there.

**CHAIR** - A competitive process.

**Ms WEBB** - Having said that, we do have expertise here.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, we do, that's right.

**Ms WEBB** - So I'd like to know two very clear things, in terms of this corporate welfare for mates, I would like to know in terms of this -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, I wouldn't characterise it like that. Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - In terms of this, on what basis was the cost benefit determined? So I would like to understand that a cost benefit analysis was done. That's one side. What it showed. So perhaps you could provide the detail of that to the committee. But more importantly, I would like to see the assessment that was made for need. How was need demonstrated here, with a company that could very well leverage this money all on its own without the government having to step in? On what basis was need alongside cost benefit, because it's all very well to say we can gain broader benefit from this investment.

We can gain broader benefit from investment anywhere we put the money, almost, and I can point out, for example, if we look at this corporate welfare alongside the community services sector who got \$2.1 million in indexation this year. That went to some of the sector. The rest of the sector missed out. There's jobs in that sector. There's economic benefit to be had from caring for people in our caring sector. This was more than double the indexation provided to the community services sector.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, the minister has a question. Thank you, member.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. So I've got the two parts to your question. Do you want to speak to either of those or shall I? Perhaps I'll ask the defence advocate to kick off and then I'll come in if we need to.

**Mr GILMORE** - I think it's worth tabling the scale of this project and what this contribution will bring to the state if Hanwha Defence is successful in the project LAND-400 Phase 3. This will be the largest investment by defence into Tasmania to this point, and probably in the foreseeable future. It's a significant project, even after accommodating the scaling down of the infantry fighting vehicle project.

What was very evident right from the start was that the Hanwha Defence Australia bid to defence in response to the tender was inclusive of a very significant strategic advantage for our country and, therefore, for this state, and that is that all export variants of the two vehicles, that will be largely assembled at Elphinstone, will be generated from within Australia. So it's very difficult to understand the scale other than to say its significant over the next 10 to 20 years. Those two types of vehicles to be provided globally by Hanwha will be significant. I can't tell you how many. It's probably in the many hundreds if not beyond that figure. That then amplifies the return on the investment.

**Ms WEBB** - My main question isn't about the validity of this exercise; it's about is it warranted to give public money to a corporate entity that could have leveraged that on their own. It's that decision that I'm questioning here, which is why I not only want to know about cost benefit to the public by also why it's warranted to give public money, a corporate welfare gift, to a company that could well have gotten that on their own. Was there ever a doubt that this would have gone ahead if Elphinstone had had to find that \$5 million themselves? Was there ever a doubt?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think Mr Bowles has something to contribute.

**Mr BOWLES** - Through the minister. So I just want to be mindful of what I say, because I am just conscious that Elphinstone is in a tender process right now with the Australian government, a very competitive tender process. But what I can say is that this particular project, like, I think, all land-related defence projects, did have a degree of uncertainty over them at the time of the Defence Strategic Review and the Defence Advocate might be able to add more context to that.

But all of those land projects did have a substantial degree of risk that meant that potentially, without a degree of support from government that the project would be at risk. I would note, too, a fair degree of support that other state governments do provide their defence industries in similar situations.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm not scrutinising other state governments, minister, I am scrutinising this one, and the allocation of \$5 million of public money to a corporate entity who I cannot believe couldn't find \$5 million of its own, or leverage \$5 million of its own, to shore up certainty around a contract. Is that what you're telling me, that this business couldn't do that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - You have had some information from the Department. I do have a bit more information here, but I just do want to underscore that what we are doing is developing a unique capability in Tasmania on the north east coast that will deliver intergenerational benefits to our advanced manufacturing sector and jobs for our kids.

**Ms WEBB** - It would have happened anyway.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No. It's a really important issue. The Hanwha arrangements - Hanwha is bidding, and again, they are in a competitive tender environment. They are bidding, and the overarching landscape is that there is a Victorian and a Tasmanian element to this. The Tasmanian element has been hard fought to get us to the table. It has been years in the making, and we will do what we need to do to make sure we are best placed to win this deal, and we are always happy to work with the private sector in the best way that we can.

Now, the Defence Strategic Review did delay the government's decision making around the awarding of contracts, and that has been hard for businesses. Both Hanwha and also Elphinstone. So if you think about a business needing to - it's like, you know, you've got to project forward what you're going to need and when you're going to need it. To create and build some of the manufacturing capacity that they have takes a long time, and the delay causes problems with that forward planning is my understanding.

I would like both Hanwha and the Australian government to know that Tasmania will stand shoulder to shoulder with its industry to make sure that if and when we secure these contracts we will deliver and we will be a strong partner delivering good outcomes not just for the defence of Australia but also our fighting forces, who deserve the best equipment we can provide.

**Ms WEBB** - At the same time our community sector workers will be using their jobs because indexation wasn't provided there and this could have tripled the indexation provided in that sector instead of going to a corporate welfare source.

**CHAIR** - That's a statement, and we are having questions, sorry, but thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I've got a follow-up on that.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Mr Valentine.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So first of all, I don't know a lot about Hanwha. Maybe you can describe what Hanwha is and provide us with that in the first instance. So could you do that?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Hanwha is a South Korean organisation, I have met with them. They are bidding. There are two key bidders in this contract phase, Rheinmetall is the other one. And they are well positioned -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Rhine?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Rheinmetall. What you find in the defence industries and advanced manufacturing sector is that you have organisations that are so big they are called primes - and you would understand this from, I think, your IT background.

What we look to do is position not as primes in that contract negotiation phase, but as effectively subbies for the piece of work that we can do and deliver. So we have been working with the Victorian government as well in relation to the Hanwha scope. If they are successful and we are aligned with that win, Tasmania and Victoria will be working together to deliver those outcomes.

So that is Hanwha. They are a South Korean entity, they are global in operation, I understand they have manufacturing sites and opportunities to manufacture elsewhere, including Europe. We are in a competitive environment to even get into their ecosystem. So it is really important that the confidence that we show in this regard is there for all to see.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So it is a significant arrangement that you have got with that company. Would you say it is a key initiative for the state?



## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Absolutely, absolutely.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So can you tell me why it's not in the budget paper 1. I don't seem to see it there, if you could point me to it I'd be really pleased to see it, because quite clearly the government thinks it has got a -

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's very important to me in my area.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's so important, but I don't read it here. It's not in the key initiatives.

**CHAIR** - That we could find. So we may -

**Mr VALENTINE** - That we could find. You might be able to point me to it somewhere else in the budget papers, but there's no mention here of either the \$25 million or the \$5 billion in relation to -

**Ms OGILVIE** - The project specific, is that what you're saying?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Well, any information about that project.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, the \$5 billion is in that budget paper?

**Mr VALENTINE** - \$5billion?

**CHAIR** - \$5 million.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Show me where.

**Ms WEBB** - It is in 1.2, I think. In the industry development. You will see in the footnote.

**Ms OGILVIE** - But I take your point.

**Mr VALENTINE** - But it's not in there as a key initiative, and I would have thought that this would have been something that the Premier would have been singing and dancing about, almost, if that's, you know, considered -

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, I would like to.

**Mr VALENTINE** - No, but is there a reason it's not.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I don't so. So, I just had a comment there.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, we have been pointed to it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. The comment that I have been just advised, of course we are in a live procurement phase as well. So that could have impacts and part of the reason, I suspect.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VALENTINE** - You know, you've got to, I suppose, understand what the people out there in the community think when they see something like this, and they see something like the \$1 million to a risky distillery that we talked about in our last session, and, you know, it really needs to be transparent and I don't think it's transparent enough, to be honest. It doesn't seem to be.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure.

**CHAIR** - You need a question.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure. But could I just -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Well, it's the reason why I asked why it's not actually in the key -

**Ms WEBB** - I did ask before to have the cost-benefit analysis and the analysis of why it was warranted that the business couldn't leverage it themselves. I did ask for that information before, I would like to have it provided.

**CHAIR** - The question is, is that available?

**Ms OGILVIE** - So two things. Firstly, I will answer Mr Valentine's question about transparency.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Then secondly, I will ask the Department what they can do to provide some information. So on the transparency piece, Mr Valentine, I think part of the battle that we are grappling with now is that for quite some time defence industries and advanced manufacturing has been a bit of a sleeping giant in relation to the work that we've been doing. We're now seeing a renewed focus on that with what's happening globally and also with the defence review now coming down. So it is coming to a sharper focus.

In relation to specific projects, I like to shout them from the rooftops, but it is very hard to get attention in relation to those. We are in a live procurement phase, and I think it is important to note that, and we do need to tread a little bit carefully.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I understand that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We don't want to ruin our chances by being too overt in communication.

**Mr VALENTINE** - No, I understand. I understand we're you coming from with that. But it is a commitment from the Tasmanian government and we do have to scrutinise the budget.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, absolutely. Yes, absolutely.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So I understand that there are sensitivities, but I mean, just - for whatever reason we're here at this point and this project is something that is before us. So we can't resolve that from a question.

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, no, no. I'm glad for the interest.

**CHAIR** - It makes the role of the Committee very challenging when we are trying to reconcile what is in those papers and what is being put forward, so that is a statement from the Chair.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I appreciate that.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So if we can get some -

**Ms OGILVIE** - So I will ask the department to see what they can bring forward, yes. Absolutely.

**CHAIR** - And those couple of questions, thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Another question on the \$160 million that was being talked about, Tasmania's two main companies in defence industries. Can we just have a little bit more detail about who has received those funds?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, so what the landscape looks like?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Well, I want to know what type of industry received it and full details, if I can get it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. If it's okay with everybody, I might ask the Defence Advocate. He probably has an ability to give an overview of that.

**Mr GILMORE** - I can certainly give an overview. If the committee would like to have a line by line which companies and how many contracts, we can put that together as best - and the information that they give us varies depending on commercial and confidence aspects of it.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's just accounting for the state government's money.

**Mr GILMORE** - Yes. No, fully understood.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's not necessarily accounting for, you know, the full cost of what they're involved in, but we just need to know where our money's going, and indeed, how we're measuring the success of that money being placed in.

**CHAIR** - The success measure is important.

**Mr GILMORE** - It is across the full sector or sub-sector of defence industry. A number of maritime contracts, a lateral manoeuvre craft for the Royal New Zealand Navy by PFG group, CBG systems providing insulation systems and separately antennae systems to the Royal Australian Navy and some international navies, Pivot Maritime providing simulation and portable simulation system to the Royal New Zealand Navy and most recently the Royal Australian Navy, and they're in negotiation with the US Navy at present.

Lightning Protection International providing those protection systems to a number of international organisations and entities, including the Indonesian military, and Jayen in a

different sector, non-maritime sector, an engineering company in Cooee that are now building the launch and recovery systems for the Australian Army's tactical uninhabited aerial systems, project 129.

**Mr VALENTINE** - What about the Maritime College? Are they a recipient?

**Mr GILMORE** - Yes, indeed. Yes. They have received contracts over this past 12 months to develop a specific sensor system for autonomous surface vessels and just very recently, to continue for another 12 months that all autonomous underwater systems training to the Royal Australian Navy. That's a several million-dollar contract.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you. Obviously, you've got a lot of examples there and you're giving us that. Can we get a full list of those?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think we can. I have quite an extensive list, yes. I think that's quite possible.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I don't need them read in, but I just - it'd be good for us to have that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We'll just be careful around confidentiality issues.

**Mr GILMORE** - When we seek to quantify the figures that we're given as a collective, we do highlight to the companies that we won't specify the exact quantities because they're often in some sort of commercial in confidence arrangement.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's our funds, and as I say, it's how we can account for how that's spent, and how we measure the success of it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I agree.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I bring to you my last question, and that is we don't have a line item here. Is there a way of us being able to get a line item for this, which has got a lot of money behind it, and performance indicators as to how effective it's been?

**Ms OGILVIE** - That's a great question, and of course, I would like to expand the remit of this area. In relation to line items and how that works, that is something perhaps that we'd need to ask the secretary and or the Treasurer.

**Mr EVANS** - That's a little difficult because within this output group, there are a number of ministers and portfolios including the minister for trade, the minister for those manufacturing.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It points to a problem with the system, really. Doesn't it?

**CHAIR** - Don't start.

**Mr EVANS** - The output structure is something that's worked through with Treasury, so I can't commit to changing the output structure to align to ministerial portfolios, and ministerial portfolios change.

## PUBLIC

**Mr VALENTINE** - We just need more information. I understand. I understand there's some complexities with it, but there must be some way of being able to better shine a lot on this.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I Agree with you, and maybe for those who haven't had it, just what we could achieve today. We do have some documents there that might be helpful and give you an overview of what we're doing with particular companies, and we have, effectively, a map of company capabilities state-wide in Tasmania, giving the sorts of ideas of what we're doing and who we're working with.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I'm sure there's lots of activity. I just think we need some transparency about how many - what dollars are being spent, and how we're measuring the success of that investment.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, and I always want to celebrate success and I have to say, this is an area in which there is a great deal of success. Could I just also, by way of wrapping that up, because we're talking about particular projects. I do also just want to talk about an area I think, Mr Valentine, you're interested in as well that's in the tech and IT side of defence and advanced manufacturing.

**CHAIR** - We're not there yet.

**Mr VALENTINE** - That comes next.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, it's actually one of the projects.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Sorry. One of the projects.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think you'll be interested in it. It's a company called Fortifyedge which is doing a project in the artificial intelligence and tiny machine learning with Pivot Maritime, which has come out of the AMC, and Handbuilt Creative. It's in the augmented reality. They're being recognised for partnerships which were then formerly across defence industry and with major technology companies. I just wanted to highlight the highly integrated nature of what the eco-system is doing.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I'm sure a lot of its digital tech related, but we have a section on that. I'm sure they'll come out.

**Ms WEBB** - Should I put a question on notice requesting the documents that relate to the cost benefit analysis?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, please, honourable Member.

**Ms WEBB** - And when that was done, and the analysis or assessment of demonstrated need. I'll put that on notice.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. That'll be fine. Ms Howlett, any questions?

**Ms HOWLETT** - Yes. Minister, can you outline the Accelerating Growth grants program has grown our advanced manufacturing sector, please?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you very much. I'm very pleased, as I said, to be Minister for Advanced Manufacturing. It's a great, great role and because of the wonderful successes we're having, there's always some good things to talk about. We're committed to supporting and growing the success and recognition of our advanced manufacturers. It's my pleasure to update the committee on the success of our important advanced manufacturing accelerating grant program.

The program has enabled businesses to grow, to build resilience, and to adapt to rapid technological changes. With the fourth and final successful round of this grants program, we've seen over \$12 million of investment generated. This is a great outcome and shows the growth in strength confidence and agility of our sector. Importantly, it is a return on investment of almost four dollars for every dollar we have put in. That's four dollars for every dollar we have put in.

We have seen through the program, Tasmania's innovative advanced manufacturers build confidence to invest in equipment to support growth into new markets or expand current ones both nationally and internationally. The program has supported 34 businesses in total involved in a wide range of activities, like food production, engineering, equipment manufacturing, and precision machining.

The successful recipients of the program traverse the entire state, as I have mentioned before, very important, and many of them are located in regional areas which is very positive, as we know that investment in regional areas grows and supports our regional communities. Over the four rounds of the program, we have seen Tasmanian businesses receive over \$3 million in funding, and we anticipate well over 170 jobs created. Thank you.

**Ms HOWLETT** - 117?

**Ms OGILVIE** - 170. One seven zero.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you for the question.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Minister, last year we were informed that there would be a study done by the Department of State Growth into the Tasmanian Defence Industry Strategy, and I was told last year that it would be available for public information. Can we just have some understanding if that has been made available?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll just seek some information, Chair.

**CHAIR** - I can ask the same questions as I did last year, but I don't want to repeat myself.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We don't mind. I'll just get the information for you.

**Mr BOWLES** - Through the minister, the CSG Economics Report, I believe, that you're referring to is online.

**CHAIR** - It's online.

**Mr BOWLES** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Was there anything that needed to be redacted? That was a question that - or was it the full?

**Mr HENDRIKS** - I think there was a very little bit that sort of wasn't on there, but I think you'll find it's pretty comprehensive, what's on there.

**CHAIR** - Was that correct? It was a cost of \$750 000.

**Mr HENDRIKS** - No.

**CHAIR** - No. I didn't think so. Wrong information. Thank you. If there are no further questions, we thank those people at the table that are perhaps leaving us, and we will now move into your area of responsibility, minister, as the Minister for Science and Technology.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We'll just check who we need at the table. One moment.

**CHAIR** - Can we just suspend, thank you, Gay, while we just reorganise the table?

**The Committee suspended from 3.10 p.m. to 3.13 p.m.**

## **DIVISION 10**

**(Department of Premier and Cabinet)**

### **Output Group 3**

#### **Electronic Services for Government Agencies and the Community**

#### **3.1 Information, Technology and Digital Services Strategy and Policy Development**

##### **Capital Investment Program**

**CHAIR** - We have had a change at the table with some remaining. Mr Bowles and Mr Evans, of course, and then some new support people so please introduce them, and this is under your responsibility of Minister for Science and Technology, and I expect that you will have an overview as well.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, another fantastic area. We have had a change at the table so we have a few people here because we traverse a couple of areas. I will just read everybody in, I think it is the simplest way: Mr Kim Evans, Secretary Department of State Growth; Mr Mark Bowles, who is Deputy Secretary of Business and Jobs; we don't have Lara, we don't have Stan; we have Mr Justin Thurley, down the end, if you haven't met Justin before. He is our Chief Information Officer.

**CHAIR** - Information? Does that mean he knows everything?

**Ms OGILVIE** - CIO. It's a very senior -

**CHAIR** - Finance?

**Ms OGILVIE** - IT. Mr Rob Williams, Deputy Secretary, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

**CHAIR** - Who we know well.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Great. Mr Malcolm Smith, he is important, Manager Cyber Security. And do we have Angela Conway? No. Glen Dean.

**CHAIR** - We have Mr Craig Limkin.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We have Mr Craig Limkin. I've got him as Deputy Secretary.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Associate.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Associate Secretary, thank you very much.

**CHAIR** - So since when have we had Associate Secretaries?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Now we do. Now we do.

**Mr WILLIE** - They're in a few departments now.

**CHAIR** - All right. Thank you, minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, my pleasure. So I thank the Committee again for taking the time to closely examine the advancements we continue to make in the very important areas of science and technology, and it is, of course, a very, very broad field. Whether it is the closing of digital infrastructure gaps, supporting the use of computer technology amongst small business, in learning at home or, as we are seeing emerge, ensuring Tasmania participates in cutting edge new sectors such as space, it is all based in science and technology.

It may surprise some that science and tech is so prominent in Tasmania, but our sectors employ approximately 8000 people and contribute over \$1 billion in gross state products. It's a lot. To break it down, the science sector generates some \$330 million for our economy each year, and supports 4000 jobs locally. The ICT sector is worth some \$700 million a year and directly employs some 4000 Tasmanians.

Now, we know that supporting these sectors will help create a bright future for current and future generations of Tasmanians. And we focus this support on the five key areas: Digital and science research infrastructure, the development of Tasmania's information and communications sector (the ICT sector), the growth of emerging industries such as space, the digital transformation of small business, which is close to my heart, engaging Tasmanians in STEM skills and careers. So that is the inspiration and the aspiration piece.

We remain committed to improving digital connectivity for all Tasmanians, and whilst advancing our technological capabilities and creating new opportunities for knowledge-driven industries. Excitingly, to enhance digital resilience, this year's budget is investing \$1.5 million to identify additional sub-sea cabling opportunities across Bass Strait. Very exciting work.



**CHAIR** - Be careful about that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - This work aims to reduce the risks of future cable failures and outages. In addition \$615 000 will be invested in partnership with the Australian government and Telstra to support four new telecommunications-based stations. These will be a Deddington, Royal George, Lake Leake, and Pelham to improve mobile phone coverage for local communities.

But of course, the benefits of strong IT infrastructure go far beyond the IT sector. To boost Tasmania's emerging space and technology sector, \$250 000 in this budget will go to key projects and partnerships that strengthen and promote our capacity in space science and technology. This adds to the more than \$900 000 we are already investing in Tasmania's space research infrastructure and accelerating the growth of a commercial space industry, such as through the Tasmanian Space Technology Seed Fund.

The Fund is supporting innovative local technology companies such as Handbuilt Creative, which I have mentioned before, Pivot Maritime, Firmus, and Geoneon to adapt their technologies and position themselves in the fast-growing global space economy. These are just three examples of where the budget is targeting our support. They build on existing initiatives that our helping our state and are tailored from helping individuals out in the community right through to supporting industries and sectors.

So to close on that positive note, I am happy to report that our Digital Ready for Business program has now assisted more than 10 000 Tasmanian small business. And adding to that, since it began in 2019, our Digital Ready for Daily Life program has worked with numerous community partner organisations to deliver small group sessions and assistance to individuals on demand. So that is looking at the digital divide challenge. These include organisations such as the Council of the Aging, the Smith Family, Impact Communities and various neighbourhood houses: Dress For Success Hobart, Hamlet Hub, Tasmanian Men's Sheds, Clubs Tasmania, and importantly one of my favourites, the University for the Third Age.

Support was delivered to communities around the state, such as Bridgewater, Brighton, Burnie and Chigwell, Glenorchy and George Town, Rocherlea and Ravenswood, and St Helens and Wynyard, just to name a few. By supporting individuals, enabling communities and uplifting businesses, we are confident that we are helping more Tasmanians to connect, to strengthen businesses, and allowing industry to do what it needs to grow and thrive. Thank you very much.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. I will invite the member for Hobart.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you very much.

**CHAIR** - Who has a keen interest in this area, to commence the questioning. Thank you.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I've got an interest, but there are plenty of others that have the same interest. But I am interested in - well, you've got your performance information on page 221.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Page 221 of the budget papers?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes. Table 9.5 it's in. Have got percentages here of 100 per cent - actual being achieved in targets. Can you just outline the key digital policies which you are

## PUBLIC

referring to there in those performance indicators, that indeed are being adopted by departments?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It's easy to say, but it'd be good to have some detail.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What's actually going on, the project level. I do have information here as well, but I think probably the best is to ask the department. I will ask CIO to speak to the projects. Thank you, Justin.

**Mr THURLEY** - Yes. No, happy to talk about that. The mainstream policies are - we have the cyber -

**CHAIR** - If you might just pull that microphone around a little bit, Justin? They like you to really look at them.

**Mr THURLEY** - No dramas. We have the cyber security policy, which is across the whole of the government. We also have a -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Sorry, could you just repeat that first bit?

**Mr THURLEY** - Cyber security policy.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Cyber security, yes.

**Mr THURLEY** - We also have the cloud policy for the government which looks at the way we manage ICT solutions within government services. We also have a range of - well, there's an open data policy which looks at, you know, how we handle data. That needs to be open to the public, which has been around for a while. I was just thinking if there's a third one or not, but they'd be the main ones, yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - That's three but there could be another.

**Mr THURLEY** - There may be a fourth one. I'll just check.

**Mr VALENTINE** - How are you measuring success on this? Obviously there'd be various departments that are in different stages of implementing these sorts of things. Or are they all to speed? Because according to this, it's 100 per cent. So I'm just -

**Mr THURLEY** - Yes, that's correct. Each policy implements a range of principles and requirements and if there are standard associated, whether we say - if the standards are then complied with. That's effectively saying that they're all 100 per cent compliant with what we've asked them to do from a principle point of view. I'll use an example, the cyber security policy. We ask them to manage risk within their agencies, they have their own policies and standards and guidelines within their agencies, and if they are able to tick those boxes, then they've complied with that policy.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Do you have a - through you, minister - committee made up of all the different secretaries of the department? Has that actually come together to look at this holistically across government?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I might ask Mr Williams to answer that.

**Mr WILLIAMS** - Through you, minister. After the state service review, the Board of Secretaries was established, and that has a couple of sub-committees. One of them is the Digital and Data Sub-Committee, which I chair, and that report's back through to the board of secretaries. That includes all the chief information officers of all of the agencies.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay. So they feed information back up the tree to be able to report on these sorts of performance indicators.

**Mr WILLIAMS** - That's where it will get to. It's fairly early days for this committee. It's only been around for about a year, and is still developing policies, it's still developing a digital roadmap to deliver the government's IT strategy. They come together to bring consistency, as far as we can, to the delivery of ICT services. As Dr Thurley said, we have policies and are trying to get consistency is an important part of our job.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay. Now, I know you won't be able to go to the full extent and talk about cyber security down to the nitty gritty, in some circumstances.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Indeed.

**Mr VALENTINE** - It is noted that the four-year program to fund a centralised uplift in cyber security capacity's coming to an end in 2023-24. That's this financial year coming, the one that we're looking at today. Can you advise the outcomes of the uplifting capacity, particularly in either of the recent cyber security breaches? There might be something that you can share with the community through this meeting here today to give some comfort as to how much we're paying attention to this space.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. I've been looking for an opportunity to do exactly that, and I think cyber security, like some of the other areas of operations, has also been somewhat - hasn't been at the forefront. We've seen recently, of course, that it's come to the forefront and become front of mind for Tasmanians and front of mind for businesses, not just across Australia but internationally as well. We know that across the world, cyber attacks have been increasing in frequency, sophistication, impact, and possibly severity. Cyber risk, we're now hearing it being talked about everywhere, from small business to at home when you get that text message and you don't know if it's a scam, if your kid really has lost the credit card and wants you to transfer money or it's somebody trying to scam you.

It is something that we're highly focused on. We're very fortunate to have an incredible group of IT experts led ably by Dr Thurley, and across our organisations is really quite remarkable. Now, cyber interest incidents have the capacity to severely disrupt also critical services, to cause individual and company and private loss, and also for governments about data protection issues, and create regulatory compliance issues. We all know that we are living in a digital world. We are living in a digital economy, and I think, also, post pandemic, when's the last time you had cash in your wallet? Everything is digital now.

**CHAIR** - I don't leave home without any.

**Ms OGILVIE** - You're old school. Okay, very good. Very good for you. I can tell you, the next generation just don't deal in cash. Everything is tap, tap, tap. The potential consequences of cyber breaches can be huge. I've done a bit of research, and the Australian Cyber Security Centre, with whom we work closely, and we'll hear more about that in a moment, published its annual threat report citing a 13 per cent increase in the number of reported cybercrime incidences in the last financial year. It's just going upwards, and it's happening offshore as well, which makes it very hard to regulate and attack.

Last year, the Tasmanian government cyber team, who you have here, responded to 210 incidents, and this is an increase of over 180 per cent from last year, or the previous year. Whilst we know it's not just governments being targeted, it is important for the people of Tasmania to know that governments, we understand. We are custodians of sensitive data and information and services that deliver sometimes life-saving services to the community, and we take our responsibility to protect those very seriously indeed.

We know there was a recent breach of a third-party provider that did cause grief to a government organisation, but I really would like to acknowledge the work undertaken by all of our state service and its partners, both within the industry and academia, and our service providers to reduce the potential harm that could've been caused by the incident. In particular, to acknowledge the hard work and vigilance of the cyber security specialists in government agencies, and the central cyber safety team in the Department of Premier and Cabinet. These dedicated experts, some of whom we have at the table, worked and do work long hours and unusual hours, and in this scenario, right through Easter, to help keep Tasmania's information and infrastructure safe.

I would like to reassure everyone that the Tasmanian government is fully committed to protecting its systems and information from malicious cyber-attacks. We are increasing our investment in cyber security, building on the current four-year \$4.9 million program, when we're committing a further \$3.3 million to bolster these defences. I would like also to say, Mr Valentine, it might be helpful, yes, to actually ask Mr Thurley to - and Mr Williams - just to give you a sense of what we're actually doing on the frontline within government to address those issues, and to sketch out a little bit around the cyber hub's approach.

**Mr THURLEY** - Through you, minister. With the cyber hub's approach, as the minister rightly pointed out, we're looking to build on the capabilities that we have developed through the current cyber security program, and we're trying to bring together - well, we're putting funding to consolidate capabilities, and to build - help the other agencies with the consistency and operational components of delivering cyber security across government.

Through this process, we will hope to improve the way that we respond to incidents, have a consistent approach across government, and provide extra resources for those departments to be able to handle cyber security incidents into the future. We're looking to provide leadership in that space, but also to provide additional capability as we build into developing through those hubs over time.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So that \$3.3 million allocation which you're talking about for cybersecurity, that's obviously under a different line item to this one; is that right?

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - \$3.3 million for cybersecurity. I'll just check the line item.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Because there is only \$2.5 million, or \$2.932 million in the 2023-24 Budget. I'm presuming that the \$3.3 million is elsewhere.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. The \$3.3 million is funded from the Digital Transformation Priority Expenditure Program within Finance-General.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Will that leverage capabilities developed as part of the existing government cybersecurity program. So you're right.

**Mr VALENTINE** - No, I just needed to clarify that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Because clearly this budget, this line item doesn't deal with that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, thank you.

**CHAIR** - I have a supplementary, if the member doesn't mind.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. No, of course.

**CHAIR** - You probably could put your small business hat back on when you think about the response to this. Recently, I've had occasion to work with a small business who had been hacked.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. I'm so sorry.

**CHAIR** - That had a payment to them, significant payment to a small business. It's from someone Queensland based, and the issue has been looked after by - or New South Wales based, looked after by the Brisbane Water Police. What arrangements have you got in place with other states to support our own Tasmanian businesses when something like that happens. They're tearing their hair out because the other states, to be honest, couldn't give a rat's backside. Thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. As I said, and I'll talk a little bit about small business and cybersecurity, because I think it's something that is so relevant -

**CHAIR** - No. I'm asking about the relationship with other states.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I understand. So cybersecurity and cybercrime is a borderless crime, and that means it can be perpetrated from -

**CHAIR** - It can be overseas, I know.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Eastern Europe into the Tasmanian government through third party providers. So every permutation of legal regulation you could think of comes into play. So

internationally, our agencies work with organisations such as Interpol. We have our own security organisations as well that we work with. At an Australian level, any crime that's perpetrated over the telecommunications network falls within crimes under the Telecommunications Act as well.

So the responses are there. It's a question of how we operationalise a proper response. The situation that you've identified has interjurisdictional issues at that state level, and that's really, really difficult. What I can tell you, and it won't be a lot of comfort to the small business you're dealing with - I'll turn to that in a moment - is that in our Data and Digital Ministers Meeting, this issue of making sure that we are working in a collaborative way across states, as opposed to just at a federal level, is starting to emerge. I note that there has been an emerging conversation around needing to do more at a federal level to ensure that jurisdictional layers across states and territories is managed.

Now, that doesn't give your particular person much comfort, because they're just dealing with a horrible thing that has happened. Very hard to activate people in other states and territories. But I'm very alive to this question of what we do around cybersecurity for small businesses, and I've been out and about talking to our regional chambers of commerce about this, and I'm very keen to work with them and small businesses on this.

**CHAIR** - They had all the safety nets in place.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's terrible, and I'm very sorry for the problems they've had. So small business is a really challenging area because we know people in small businesses are so busy doing the business of business, they don't have time to go off and do other courses and get the sort of specialist skills, or develop them themselves. So what we've done is I've reached out through the regional chambers of commerce to those small businesses and said, 'What can we do more and what can we do better as a government?'. So the first stage about that is elevating and understanding what cybersecurity for small business looks like, and you would've seen we've put some communications out on that.

The second thing which I would like to get to, and we're going to lean into this, is what can we do to take everybody in Tasmania from our current state of understanding of cybersecurity to a next level. So within government, within small business, within the community sector, the digital divide conversation which is also unfolding at the same time, and we're supporting that, that work needs to happen. I'm very keen on making sure that happens. So the Digital Data and Ministers Meeting, as I said, is spearheading that national conversation. We are always at that table, and Mr Thurley represents us beautifully when I am unable to attend in person.

**CHAIR** - So can my people ring Mr Thurley?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'm not sure that he'll be able to fix your legal problem, which is a probably a phone call to the police, is the best.

**CHAIR** - Who don't care.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think they probably do care, but it's very hard to tackle this one.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - I was just asking about what relationship you had with other states when it is within Australia.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. No, thank you. I totally appreciate

**CHAIR** - At this point in time, it's next to none.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No. That's not accurate.

**CHAIR** - Well, there's no reciprocal arrangements.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, there is. My understanding is the police forces in each state do have those reciprocal arrangements, how they deal with each other.

**CHAIR** - Not according to Tasmania Police, they don't.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, we may need to assist with the conversation. But there are processes and protocols.

**CHAIR** - Have you got something else?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think Mr William has. Do you want to add a comment?

**CHAIR** - Apologies. I thought you had your answer.

**Mr VALENTINE** - No, you're right. I thought they were doing something for you.

**Mr WILLIAMS** - Through you, minister. The minister talked about the Digital and Data Ministers. We work every day in our cybersecurity team with the Australian government. We talk to them every day. And for the people that you're talking about in small business, they should report any of this sort of cyber -

**CHAIR** - They've done all that. Know where it's come from. Know who took the money. Police not interested.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That might be a separate conversation.

**Mr WILLIAMS** - That's where we would recommend people go, because that's where we've seen the activity, in terms of that's where people should go. They liaise back with state and federal police.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. I'm really sorry that's happened to your friends.

**Mr VALENTINE** - My next question is in relation to digital inclusion.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes.

**Mr VALENTINE** - There's no question that we as a state lag in respect to digital inclusion. In fact, according to the Australian Digital Inclusion Index, Tasmania continues to have the worst digital inclusion in the country. There are peak community sector organisations

which made a joint statement about that, on digital inclusion, prior to the 2021 election, pointing to the significant attention needed in this space. Can you tell us why we are now waiting until 2024-25 for action to address digital inclusion, and what outcomes are expected from the limited funding being provided?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. We're not waiting, is the answer, and work is already underway. Quite a lot of work is actually happening already. I would just -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Perhaps you could expand on that.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. No, I'm happy to expand on it. I had the great benefit - and perhaps it's almost a conflict I need to declare - of being a former Telstra employee at the time when the original Digital Inclusion Index was formed, and I have been working on this very hard for a very long time since before anybody even understood what it was. Now, there is so much more work to do. The very fact that we have a Digital Inclusion Index helps us, because we can measure success and measure our trajectory.

We know that an individual's digital capability is significantly influenced by their literacy, educational attainment levels, income levels - because you need access to data - as well as, importantly, and this is a big thing for Tasmania, the availability of adequate telecommunications infrastructure. So if we think about digital inclusion, it's not just for the social sector. It's across our school groups, it's across our older people, and it is at that infrastructure layer, which is why I'm really focused on the cable issue. I want to make sure that Tasmania, at a national level, is cutting with the rest of the nation from a digital economy perspective.

**Mr VALENTINE** - That's okay from the infrastructure perspective.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We need it. Otherwise we -

**Mr VALENTINE** - But we're talking about people getting onto the net, in the first instance.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It's both, yes. No, it's both. So there are a range of issues with digital inclusion, and it is about access and connection. It's also about affordability, ability to use it, fear about using it. Perhaps older people not as excited as well.

**Mr VALENTINE** - They need the skills and the confidence to use it.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So we all appreciate that that's a broad ranging problem. Now, we had Digital Ready for Daily Life program, which we've been, as I spoke about before, running out through Neighbourhood Houses. It was a pilot undertaken with 26TEN, and part of the Communities Local Literacy for Work and Life program. Discussions, you'll be pleased to know, are well progressed between the Department of State Growth and the Department of Education, children and young people, via an MOU formalised in 2019, and sessions are expected to start in June or July. We're doing that work. Examples of that, which I think you might be interested in -

**Mr VALENTINE** - I'm interested in the dollars being spent in that space.



## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, sure. I do have that as well, but perhaps if I just quickly give you a couple of examples for those who are watching and are interested, fortnightly community computer clubs for small group sessions that cover hot topics chosen by the participants. So it's really intended to be very hands-on, very accessible and easy to get into. Perhaps even regular one on one intensive tech help sessions which focus on each individual's needs, you know, how does my phone work, how do I get on Facebook, how do I zoom my grandma in wherever she may happen to be. So it's really important we do that.

**CHAIR** - Is there anything to do with how you get a mobile service? On that list?

**Ms OGILVIE** - If somebody wanted help with that, that's certainly something that they would be able to help with. So sessions around this have been included and rolled out statewide.

**CHAIR** - I meant access to the network.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Do you mean how to buy a phone.

**CHAIR** - No. How you actually get access to the network when you've got no mobile phone service?

**Ms OGILVIE** - When you've got no coverage?

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That's where I wanted to talk about infrastructure layer work. So that is really important. The cable conversation is essential and I know we're all, because we're good people, really working hard to make sure that everybody is included online as much as possible. I've been personally working with some young people myself who can't do their homework because they cannot afford data, so I've bought them data.

This stuff, it's a whole of community response. Unless we're able to address things like black spots, cable infrastructure that takes us into that hyper speeds we need for our university and the next level digital economy - we can address all of these social issues but we are not addressing the lift we need to take Tasmania to digital economy. Let's call it digital economy 2.0.

Starlink, I'm hearing, is providing great access for residential and personal users. We know Tasmanian typography makes it difficult to have cable everywhere. So we're just not going to dig up the whole state and cable everything. But as satellite technology, space technology, communications technology improves then that access is improving. But it doesn't fix the money problem.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So what communication are you having with education, for instance, in this space and, you know, it'd be really good if we could have a performance indicator line that is developed and reported in future budget papers, along with an internal task force to oversee it, perhaps. I mean, can you give us some comfort that it's being taken seriously, really, is what I'm saying.

**Ms OGILVIE** - A hundred per cent being taken seriously. I agree with you and we are already working towards a couple of those elements. At our Digital and Data Minister's Meeting, I would just like to underscore for Tasmania that Tasmania in that forum brought to the table and was successful in having as a standing item digital inclusion. We are at the forefront of this argument and we are driving this agenda nationally with that forum with all of those ministers. Part of the reason we need to do that is wealthier states and territories don't have the problems and challenges that we have. So that's at that level. That then flows down. RCIO is at that forum regularly.

Our digital divide strategy and the work - because I've met with TasCOSS and others after the PESRAC report, bring them into the conversation. We've put \$200 000 into the digital strategy which will help us invigorate the conversation within government and to reach out to partners across industry and the tech sector to do more. That is to give you a sense of where we're headed, but I do like your idea.

**CHAIR** - Can we start to get to the nub of the question a bit.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry, we can but I was just trying to respond to Rob. I do like your suggestion that we elevate the conversation, vis-a-vis, a line item and that's certainly something I'd be happy to take on board.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Okay, so the budget spend in general. There doesn't seem to be a cogent and strategic ICT plan across the budget. So what is the government's plan to basically embed ICT as one of the drivers of the economy and modernisation within the state budget? Rather than allowing departments to turn up their ICT spend, is it time to have a whole of government plan for innovation and tech uplift? I know you've got experts.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Mr Valentine, I think we've spoken about this before.

**Mr VALENTINE** - I know you've got experts and I appreciate their level of expertise in fact, because I come across them quite often. It has to be driven from the minister's chair, if I can put it that way, for a whole of government approach to be embedded. Can you give us some comfort that you're pointing in that direction?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, I will give you comfort that we have a well organised program, as you would understand it, program of work across all the departments and the structure underneath RCIO is very effective. When it comes to be budgetary side of things, that does sit - and perhaps I could ask -

**Mr VALENTINE** - That's largely implementation though, isn't it? I can appreciate that they're looking at the implementation side. I'm talking about the Tasmanian government ICT strategic action plan. When you look at that, it hasn't been updated for three years. Now is there another document that I'm missing?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I don't think there is but I think I will ask Justin Thurley, who is on the frontline with this, to contribute.

**Mr THURLEY** - Through you, minister. Yes, thanks for the question. So there's a number of different aspects to this, Mr Valentine, that I'll take you through. The first one, yes, you're aware that there is the Our Digital Future strategy.

**Mr VALENTINE** - That's right.

**Mr THURLEY** - Which you've called out that there's an action plan. Those action plans are still relevant and there has been progress, and they are progressing and some of them have come close to ending.

**CHAIR** - So no, there's not a new one.

**Mr THURLEY** - Yes, there is a new plan.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So it's still current.

**CHAIR** - Is there a new one.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Online.

**Mr THURLEY** - I'll continue through you, minister. So a second part of this process. Since we've had this plan developed, we also had the state service review emerge which actually identified a range of reforms for digitalisation across the state service, including building capabilities and data sharing as well as digital services, and the role that Service Tas would play in those digital services. We have since then progressed with the governance model that Mr Williams alluded to before, which is having a data and digital committee for the whole of government.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes, we talked about that earlier.

**Mr THURLEY** - Yes. The whole of government, that committee has been working on a component which I think you're referring to, which is a digital roadmap and strategy for government digitalisation or, we like to call it, a roadmap for digital capabilities.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Technology roadmap, if you like.

**Mr THURLEY** - Yes. It's a work in progress at the moment but we do have a broad level of coverage with a workplan that's actually dealing with developing out the key capabilities for government. So you can imagine that that includes the likes of digital services and you've got projects that are emerging in Service Tas with the digital portal, for an example. We also have the common systems and platforms which is about pulling common systems across government together so that we are dealing with either one or the same type of system for particular functions.

We also have areas in cybersecurity and - well, I should say cyber risk and resilience, which you are aware of the programs that are occurring there. We also have programs around data and information management which we're very busy at the moment in developing out a framework and program future strategy for data sharing in Tasmanian government. We also have the last one which was looking at the digital workforce and the capabilities of our workforce, and the future workforce and how we obtain that sort of talent and those capabilities into government. So we have a program that we are working towards which has a range of enabling initiatives, which are either developing strategies or implementing programs at the moment.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you for that good overview. And someone needs -

**CHAIR** - I'm going to go elsewhere.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes, no, that's cool. Someone needs to get the message across to Intermedium, because Intermediums have digital government readiness and maturity indicator, and they show we're lagging the rest of the nation.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Indeed.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So clearly there's a lot of work happening but the message is not getting through.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It is partly about communication and just to reiterate that we spend \$297.2 million, which is the Tasmanian government's digital transformation program. So I know there's been some concerns about what the figures are. We are well on the way with this.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you for your indulgence, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. The member for Launceston, then I'm going to the member for Elwick. Let's make our questions short and sharp, and the answers the same.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - My question will be short. I hope my answers will be short.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I'll try to be, it's such a good area though.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Thank you. Minister, mine's really just ending on a little bit to the member for Hobart and some of the answers we had. The new work that we're doing in IT with the cloud - and I know that I've personally have had problems.

**Ms OGILVIE** - At home?

**Ms ARMITAGE** - No, here. But obviously Apple doesn't like the changes that we're doing and all of a sudden, I've lost everything, and then lost all of my phone numbers, everything goes and I try to find them. I can get them back here, but I need help. They tell me it's our new system that we're putting in so what's the benefit of our new system? The reason behind it and what are we actually doing, minister, so.

**CHAIR** - All that money and we can't get access. It's just like Apple apparently.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Can I just ask are you talking about the parliamentary system?

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Yes.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So the parliamentary system is run separately from -

**Ms ARMITAGE** - We did mention Cloud that was all, and I assume that was part of the?

## PUBLIC

**Ms OGILVIE** - Cloud is important but I think everybody is doing their best but if Justin would like to comment on Cloud broadly and I think you may.

**CHAIR** - Just keep in mind that the IT people will be listening upstairs.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well we should invite them in the room so they can answer their own questions. Would you like us to call the help desk.

**CHAIR** - No, they helped me enough. They were very good people. They were great.

**Ms OGILVIE** - So the Cloud. Yes, just a quick comment on Cloud.

**Mr THURLEY** - My quick comment would be, yes, it is a matter for DPAC itself and not part of you know the Science and Tech.

**CHAIR** - Not part of your IT.

**Mr THURLEY** - I would say in relation to the Cloud, it's an operating model that is actually dominant now in technology. It's very difficult to avoid it and there's a range of inter-operability issues that you'll probably experience in time no matter what systems you're using, and I just feel it's a matter of getting the support and help that you need to implement those systems and to run those systems.

**Ms ARMITAGE** - Well we are very fortunate here to have help I must say.

**CHAIR** - So the whole-of-government system is not in place as yet? Thank you, Mr Willie.

**Mr WILLIE** - Thank you, Chair. Obviously, tens of thousands of Tasmanians were impacted earlier in the year with the data breach, minister. I'm interested in whether the, I think Russian hacking group called CLOP has communicated with the government at all? The risk hasn't gone away.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, we're still in it. So you just want to know? Not that I'm aware of and I will check that though because my understanding is it can happen at any time and no, we have not had -

**Mr WILLIE** - There has been no ransom asked in the following months?

**Ms OGILVIE** - No. I'm getting advice that, no, we still have no contact.

**Mr WILLIE** - No contact. Okay. That's good to know.

**Ms OGILVIE** - That is good to know but it doesn't mean the risk has evaporated.

**Mr WILLIE** - No. Terms of procurement of goods and services for cyber-security and it's my understanding DPACs the responsible agency and we've got them at the table here with you as technology minister. So was a tender process undertaken for the procurement of GoAnywhere MFT software and can you provide information to the tender process.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. I think I might ask Mr Williams to speak to that.

**Mr WILLIAMS** - The GoAnywhere contract was let some time ago and Dr Thurley might have a bit more detail of that. But it was done through Treasury as part of the overall finance system. It's a sub-component of that system and they, as far as I'm aware, did a formal tender process and a risk assessment around the use of that particular infrastructure because it was seen as critical infrastructure and as Dr Thurley said, we now have a Treasury policy which says that we should use the cloud if it's value for money and delivers what we need so it is the sort of dominant way of doing business and creating mobility and flexibility and things and in that case our advice from Treasury was through the tender process they did a risk assessment on that.

**Mr WILLIE** - When global alerts were circulated, minister, in early February 2023 advising of GoAnywhere MFT software compromised was a documented risk assessment undertaken as a whole-of-government?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, I do have some information for you on that and we have the CIO here who undoubtedly will be able to add some additional information. Now I'll just - sorry we'll just sort of try and pick the eyes out of it. So we have a risk assessment process that the government goes through before it starts using products, but I think your question went to whether we did a whole-of-government survey?

**Mr WILLIE** - When there was a security alert, a global alert in February for GoAnywhere MFT software compromise, whether a whole-of-government risk assessment was done. A documented one at that time.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, certainly and I have a list of the steps that were taken but to get specifically to that I think Dr Thurley, I think it might be helpful if you talk about the process of responding and management of these sorts of - you'll obviously be careful about how you answer the questions - but answer the question in relation to whole-of-government alerts because I think it's done through CIO channels so whilst it still goes broadly it is contained within specifically organised channels if that makes sense. So, Dr Thurley are you happy to perhaps answer some questions on that. Thank you.

**Dr THURLEY** - Through you, minister, I'll keep it pretty precise. Hopefully it gets to answer your question. Look when we were aware of the vulnerability exposed from GoAnywhere we circulated to government through our internal processes with our cyber-security people and our CIOs a warning about the existence of the vulnerability and that agencies work to undertake certain checks and do risk assessments at the time. We don't document the risk assessment process first. We just tell all the others to look at your risks and assess what is going on and that goes through to the department, and they go through a process of looking at the vulnerabilities to see if they're exposed to any of those vulnerabilities.

Now, the actual scenario for that is actually quite broader than just looking at those vulnerabilities because it was a zero-day vulnerability so obviously it's occurred before anyone really knew about it so I just want to emphasise that the third party would've already been compromised at that stage.

## PUBLIC

**Mr WILLIE** - And to the - probably a hard question to answer because there's other departments but do the other departments document that risk assessment that they work to undertake after the fact?

**Ms OGILVIE** - I think Dr Hurley probably can answer that.

**Dr THURLEY** - I can through you, Minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Please do.

**Dr THURLEY** - Yes so, the process is really - it's part of a patching vulnerability process which is a routine process that's undertaken in government. You know this occurs for many pieces of software that have-to-have updates because of vulnerabilities etc. Sometimes the consequences of those vulnerabilities are not that serious, but you know were taken to a reasonable step but in this instance, yes, obviously it was a fairly high risk.

It is a part of a process. So each department would have well-documented, I suspect processes for, you know, those types of procedures for dealing with patching and vulnerability management and I do know, you know, that that is the case in most instances.

**Mr WILLIE** - Minister, when was the patch software purchased and applied to the GoAnywhere software in other agencies?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, no, I don't think it works like that. So, Mr Williams?

**Mr WILLIE** - Yes, I'm not an IT expert by any means.

**Ms OGILVIE** - No, no that's all right. You're close but I'm still understanding how as well. I suspect it's patched centrally but I'm not sure. Yes, Dr Thurley will be able to assist us with that.

**Dr THURLEY** - In relation to patching the way that we deploy the GoAnywhere instance in Tas government is different for education than it is for all the other agencies that use it and in that instance the agencies that - most agencies host it on-premise in their own environments. Not their own environments, or on our Cloud infrastructure internally. They were provided with the patching requirements etc and the patches for that system as part of a process with GoAnywhere. That's part of the service.

**Mr WILLIE** - What date did that happen? Through the minister.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, that's fine if you'd like to go on. Just looking at.

**Mr THURLEY** - Yes, could I just take it on notice. Here we go.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Is this the specific date?

**Mr THURLEY** - All right. Thanks. Yes, thank you I'm just trying to find it. Thank you. So on 6 February we were informed about the software vulnerability within the system, and we took appropriate remediation actions with all actions being completed on 7 February. Thanks.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr WILLIE** - Just a couple of more questions, please, Chair.

**CHAIR** - One more.

**Mr WILLIE** - Minister, obviously GoAnywhere MFT is an international company that provides this type of software and obviously things happen. I'm just wondering whether you and the government have learnt in terms of communication. I mean cyber-security breaches are part of the environment these days, but whether communication strategies have changed at all in terms of dealing with cyber-security breaches.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. So, it's a good question, and it's such a movable feast, isn't it? Because we're learning as we go and technology is changing at times, and cyber security issues arise in different ways at different times in different organisations. When it comes to how we communicate via - yes, I am looking at you, Craig. Craig is my comms expert in this area. I will ask Craig to speak to it and then I'll talk a little bit more about what we think we can do going forward.

**CHAIR** - Sharp response.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Well, this is important, I think.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Thank you, Mr Willie.

**CHAIR** - Well, they're all important but we've got more questions.

**Mr LIMKIN** - Under the Tasmanian Emergency Management arrangements, we have the public information arrangements and there are a variety of policies and procedures in there. Part of any event, we review each one of those arrangements to make sure we learn and improve and take on feedback on that. As part of that, the Secretary of DPAC is determined to do a specific media policy document for cyber security events, which will be given to work through over the next couple of months and then considered by the State Emergency Management Committee and then finally the state controller to ensure that we are able to reflect and modify this.

I do want to say while we have plans in place, they are guidelines, because every event is different. If I reflect on my experience during COVID, while I have a state recovery plan in place, I used the principles out of that and then had to reflect on the situation, so it will be a guidebook to help us manage those situations in the future. Thank you, minister.

**Mr WILLIE** - Well, that's good to hear, minister, because one of the major issues with the communications plan in the community. So, it's good to hear that the government is reviewing that and potentially changing our future practices.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sorry. Which communications plan are you talking about?

**Mr WILLIE** - The way that this was communicated to the public at the time was a major issue to people impacted that were reaching out to me at the time.



**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure. I think it's fair to say that it was a big thing for Tasmania. I think it's also fair to say that we always put Tasmanians' safety and security first, including data security, and I know there was some criticism of timeliness of information flow, but I will also say that - and look, I have this in front of me. I have the Office of the Australian Information and Commissioner road map about the appropriate way and most contemporary way of dealing with these issues. First and foremost, is to make sure that when an issue arises, we ring fence and take care of people's personal data first and foremost, before going out loudly into the marketplace.

So, the reason you do that is you don't want to feed information to the malicious actors. So, it's very important that we do that. So, we go through the steps, we find a suspected or known data breach. We try to seek to contain it. We assess its impact, what level is it at; is it minor, is it major? We take remedial action, we patch it. Then we notify, but we make sure if serious harm is likely, that we reach out first and foremost to vulnerable people, and make sure that we are ring fencing as much as we can to contain impacts.

So whilst I accept that we can always have learnings, things that we can do better, but at the same time, we are dealing with a very sensitive and challenging crime. And as you quite quickly pointed out in your opening, Mr Willie, this is a crime that is actually still on foot. So, it's a different nature of criminal activity and we do need to work carefully with our security agencies, which we do. We take advice. I act on advice. But, yes, it's a challenging area.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. The member for Prosser, and then I'm going to Ms Webb. Thank you.

**Ms HOWLETT** - Thank you, Chair. I think the minister has answered my question, so thank you.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Mr Valentine?

**Mr VALENTINE** - Yes, I've got a question on generative AI.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Great. I love AI.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Is generative AI a threat, or an opportunity for Tasmanians? Will it be banned in the Tasmanian public service or used as a tool? Very simple.

**Ms OGILVIE** - We want to ChatGPT. AI is remarkable. What a remarkable invention, and I was recently -

**Mr VALENTINE** - Well, if it's used for good, it could be.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, well, it's just a remarkable invention. I was recently able to do a deep dive in relation to ChatGPT, and with some Stanford Business School professors and learn more about that, and the opportunities. Now, the nature of work is changing generally. We've seen that through pandemic. AI is a huge opportunity for us to do things more efficiently, more effectively, I think. But we also need to take care. We need to, I think, also

focus on the ethics of AI and new technology when we're pushing these boundaries. That is my mindset, but I have seen a national conversation at -

**Mr VALENTINE** - What's happening inside the State Service is the question, and we just need to focus on that if we can.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure. Sure. I ask Dr Thurley to speak a little bit about that. But at a ministerial layered, it's absolutely a live discussion in relation to regulation in relation to states and territories on the federal level, because it will impact all areas of everybody's life. Dr Thurley is the right person to talk a bit about AI. Yes, thank you. Great question.

**Dr THURLEY** - Thank you, minister. Yes, through you, minister. So, the Tasmanian Government utilises advanced forms of machine learning that's bundled into a lot of the software and services that we use, often by third party providers at the moment. We are contemplating how that gets used, et cetera, of course. Now, clearly it has become quite an outward community concern and around the responsible and ethical use of artificial intelligence, as we'll say. The Tasmanian Government doesn't currently have a policy that directly addresses the responsible or ethical use of AI.

**Mr VALENTINE** - But we're going to work one up, are we?

**Dr THURLEY** - Yes, the matter is currently being reviewed - seriously reviewed. We have the context of the terms of national developments which are occurring at the moment. In particular, obviously, we have relationships with the federal government, and they are hot on this topic. The Australian government had actually identified AI as a critical technology and in the national interest that it actually be developed and also be potentially legislated with as well. The Data and Digital Ministers Meeting is currently considering a nationally consistent approach to AI matters in the initial discussions we've had, based on work that's been done in New South Wales, which is pretty comprehensive, and that's on a framework for what we call AI assurance.

Also, on 1 June, just the other day, the Department of Industry, Science and Resources invited some comments on a paper they've written in relation to the safe and responsible use of AI in Australia. The paper suggests that a risk-based approach is taken to AI, and that regulation and use should focus on governance mechanisms to ensure that AI is developed in a safe and responsible manner in Australia. This includes mechanisms for regulation, standards, tools, frameworks, as you could imagine.

Yes, so, we're obviously on board with this. We're able to be involved in these discussions, and we also think there are opportunities with AI, as you pointed out. It's a lot and I've been involved in myself. It's a very interesting area of development at the moment because it's been in the news because of what the role that ChatGPT played. But we've certainly got some context there across government and we're looking at that as well.

I just want to point out that we do have some guidance and some work that has been done in state government, in particular with the Department of Children and Young people. They've provided guidelines for use in schools, et cetera.

**Mr VALENTINE** - If so, if I can suggest that maybe a little bit of a brief happen in the budget papers with respect to what's happening in that space. Because it's up to the minute.

## PUBLIC

Who knows, the next budget papers might be developed by such a thing. It'd be interesting to see what they came out with.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Sure. Well, by the robots.

**Mr VALENTINE** - Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you, I appreciate your support.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Chair, sorry, I do have an update for something from this morning. Could I just quickly update the committee? It's important. It's in relation to racing. So, it's in addition to a question and response I gave - a racing hearing - in respect of staffing vacancies. So, it's an additional piece of information. All vacancy data provided was relevant at 31/03/23, and then I would just like to add that this data does not include roles whereby somebody is acting in the role.

So, this is just for clarity. One such role is the Chairman of Stewards, thoroughbred code, which is currently the subject of a selection process following the promotion of the previous occupant. It was not counted as a vacancy as it had a capable staff member acting in the position. But I acknowledged that it was a key position which the committee may have had a specific interest in. So, I'm sorry we missed that one, but I just wanted to make sure we get that on the table.

**Mr VALENTINE** - So, vacancy means absolutely vacant.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, that's right. Yes, I think that's the answer. Sorry about that.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Thank you very much. Minister, that concludes our scrutiny for today.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - CIP, yes. We can put that on the notice paper. So, thank you very much, minister, for the support that you've - thank you, and we certainly appreciate the time and effort that goes into these things. You might have noticed that IT goes over the head of me, particularly.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Not at all. You asked great questions.

**CHAIR** - I expect that we'll be able to ask about online access centre support in education tomorrow through libraries.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes. Yes. That's right.

**CHAIR** - So, thank you. I'll save that one for tomorrow and somebody can do some homework and be ready.

**Ms OGILVIE** - Okay, thank you. I appreciate that.

# **PUBLIC**

**CHAIR** - We will conclude.

**The Committee adjourned at 4.10 p.m.**