



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Hon. Madeleine Ogilvie MP

Wednesday 25 September 2024

MEMBERS

Hon Rosemary Armitage MLC (Deputy Chair)

Hon Luke Edmunds MLC

Hon Mike Gaffney MLC

Hon Cassy O'Connor MLC

Hon Tania Rattray MLC (Chair)

Hon Meg Webb MLC

IN ATTENDANCE

HON. MADELEINE OGILVIE MP

Minister for Science and Technology, Minister for Corrections and Rehabilitation, Minister for Arts (including Heritage), Minister for Women and the Prevention of Family Violence

Rod Wise

Deputy Secretary, Corrective Services, Department of Justice

Colin Shepherd

Deputy Secretary, Strategy, Governance and Major Projects, Department of Justice

Christopher Carney

Executive Director, Community Corrections, Department of Justice

Gavin Wailes

Director, Finance, Department of Justice

Jenna Cairney

Deputy Secretary, Business and Jobs, Department of State Growth

Brett Stewart

Deputy Secretary Culture Arts and Sport

Alex Sangston

Executive Manager, Screen Tasmania

Dave Sudmalis

Director Arts Tasmania

Melissa Ford

Director, Heritage Tasmania

Micheal Guidici

A/GM, Surveyor General

Melissa Gray

Reform Lead - Keeping Children Safe, Policy and Delivery

PUBLIC

The Committee met at 8.59 a.m.

CHAIR - Welcome, minister Ogilvie. The committee is very pleased to have you before us for the best part of today.

DIVISION 5

(Department of Justice)

Output Group 3

Corrections, Rehabilitation and Enforcement

CHAIR - I welcome the Minister for Corrections and Rehabilitation, which includes prison services and community corrective services. Then Science and Technology, Arts and the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Family Violence. They are very important areas, so thank you for joining us. I would like to introduce the team at the table on this side, and then I'll invite you to introduce those that you have with you.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you.

CHAIR - To my right, I have the member for Mersey, Mike Gaffney; the member for Nelson, Meg Webb; the member for Launceston, Rosemary Armitage; Tania Rattray, the member for McIntyre; the member for Pembroke, Luke Edmunds; and the member for Hobart, Cassy O'Connor.

Ms OGILVIE - In any context.

CHAIR - First time for the Legislative Council.

Ms OGILVIE - We're old friends. That's good.

CHAIR - We have two new committee members as well. We have Mr Gaffney and Mr Edmunds who have joined us from the other committee.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, that's good. Welcome.

CHAIR - I think we could say we've seen the light. That's exactly right. Our secretariat support, Craig and Julie, and we have Gaye from Hansard.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you.

CHAIR - Over to you, minister. The minister usually has a brief overview. We don't want to take up too much time.

Ms OGILVIE - I understand. I do have an overview. I will introduce the people that I have here at the table.

CHAIR - Thank you.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - So we have Kristy Bourne, who's acting secretary, Department of Justice; Rod Wise, deputy secretary, Corrective Services; Colin Shepherd's in the room, deputy secretary Strategy, Governance and Major Projects; we have Gavin Wailes, director of Finance; Bruce Paterson, director Strategic Legislation and Policy; David Jackson, acting director of Prisons; and Chris Carney, executive director of Community Corrections, together with my staff as well. I understand, having done this process a few times, that time is always of the essence.

CHAIR - It is.

Ms OGILVIE - It is a huge area, and I am aware that there has been a lot of interest in this area, particularly by way of investigations that have been undertaken through the Legislative Council and other areas, so I'm expecting to be in a position to do some deep dives with you all on areas of interest. I will give you our opening statement, and I will try to keep it as succinct as possible so we can turn to the detail of the information.

We are in budget Estimates. In 2024-25, the state Budget continues our government's track record of responsible investment in corrections and rehabilitation which supports our commitment to improving community safety and offender rehabilitation.

As part of the funding allocated to the commission of inquiry, \$4 million has been provided over four years to deliver treatment programs for both offenders and others at risk of sexual offending, which includes the establishment of a preventative group and one-on-one counselling treatment programs for people who identify themselves as being at risk of such offending and those who are no longer under correctional orders but require ongoing treatment to prevent risk escalation. Following my announcement last month, the Budget discontinues funding for the construction of the northern correctional facility. However, the government will continue to invest in expanding and upgrading our correctional facilities to ensure we provide a physical environment which aligns with our operational approach.

To this end, the Budget provides \$15.9 million in additional funding for capital services over three years for the Risdon Prison construction program, and this program will include construction of the new Risdon kitchen, building improvements to facilitate an expansion of drug and alcohol programs and the delivery of more rehabilitation programs to prisoners, investment in prisoner self-service technology as well as co-funding the purchase of a property to accommodate northwest based female prisoners following their release from custody.

Capital investment is supported by a further allocation of \$4.1 million over four years for the Tasmanian Prison Service to improve intervention and rehabilitation services across the state as part of a correctional improvement program that runs parallel to the capital works. An additional \$1 million per annum has been provided to expand community corrections successful, home detention and electronic monitoring services to support the objectives of Changing lives, creating futures, a Strategic Plan for Corrections in Tasmania 2023.

In recognising the natural variations in project progress, some capital funds have been rolled over from the last financial year to enable a range of capital works projects to continue in 2024-25 year, and these include the new Risdon Prison kitchen, the additional maximum security accommodation unit within the Risdon Prison complex, the electronic security system and mobile duress alarm system replacement, and Risdon Prison critical infrastructure maintenance.

While not exclusively within the Corrections and Rehabilitation portfolio, the Budget also provides \$25.4 million across the next four years for ongoing operational costs of the justice connect, which is known as the Astria system - it's a very important project - and the provision of operational support for users of the system once it goes live. Once implemented, Astria will significantly improve information management across both the justice and corrections systems. Staff in the Tasmanian prison service and community corrections are expected to have access to the system in the first half of 2025.

We recognise that our correctional staff are central to achieving our rehabilitation outcomes, and I would very much like to place on the record my personal and our government's appreciation for the work that staff across our Tasmanian prison service and community corrections undertake. The 2024-25 Budget provides funding for two key initiatives to support our workforce, both in the Corrections and Rehabilitation portfolio and across the Department of Justice more broadly. The first of these is an allocation of \$3.5 million per annum to provide support to injured correctional officers and state service employees who have a workers compensation claim. This is very important.

Further, \$800,000 in annual ongoing operational funding is provided for the department's wellbeing support program, which provides all departmental employees, including those in the TPS and community corrections, with a range of services and support. This includes physical health and wellbeing checks, mental health awareness checks, incident support, case management services and education and training programs.

To conclude, the government has a sustained focus on improving outcomes for both individuals and the community and has delivered a program of investment in rehabilitation programs, staff recruitment, importantly, and infrastructure across the Corrections and Rehabilitation portfolio, which our 2024-25 Budget continues.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - My pleasure.

CHAIR - Are there any overview questions?

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you. Minister, I wanted to talk to you about the National Preventative Mechanism, which does impact on your portfolio responsibilities obviously. Given the serious concerns raised by the Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmania Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings, how does the government you're part of, and you as minister who are part of approving the Budget, justify the decision to not adequately fund the National Preventative Mechanism, an essential body for upholding human rights in institutional environments such as the corrections system you oversee?

Ms OGILVIE - I do have some information here I can provide you on that. I'm just confirming that the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture, which is known as OPCAT, we were the first jurisdiction to pass a comprehensive OPCAT statutory framework, and the OPCAT Implementation Act commenced on 20 January 2022. That gave effect in Tasmania to the protocols. Now, this provides a two-part system for inspecting places of detention, including allowing periodic visits by the United Nations subcommittee on the

PUBLIC

prevention of torture and establishing a domestic national preventative mechanism to which you refer, Ms O'Connor.

Ms O'CONNOR - Minister, can I just interrupt you there briefly. Today's not going to be so productive if when you're asked a question you just read from a brief. The question related to the funding decision made by the government you are part of to underfund the National Preventative Mechanism to the extent that they can't perform their statutory obligation according to the Ombudsman who holds that role himself.

Ms OGILVIE - I do have some information that addresses that which I was just about to get to, so if I could continue. I think you will find that the information you seek is forthcoming. The Ombudsman and Custodial Inspector, Mr Richard Connock, was appointed, as you have noted, as Tasmania's NPM, and they have released a comprehensive implementation report. We know that we committed to funding the implementation of OPCAT in Tasmania's NPM. The 2024 state Budget provides \$500,000 for that implementation of the Tasmanian National Preventative Mechanism and increased monitoring of Ashley Youth Detention Centre, which is important and align NPM's recommendations and the commission of inquiry recommendations which is also obviously very important.

We have key figures that I can provide you, Ms O'Connor, which I think you wanted to get to. As at 30 June 2024, the implementation of OPCAT in Tasmania has cost in the vicinity of \$1.2 million. The Commonwealth government has provided a small contribution only of \$155,000 to the implementation of OPCAT in Tasmania, and we are continuing to engage with the Commonwealth to seek ongoing funding of the NPM. The 2024 state Budget provides, and I think this is important for the record -

Ms O'CONNOR - \$4 million for a chocolate fountain, and you can't fund the NPM.

Ms OGILVIE - In 2024-25, \$200,000 for increased monitoring of Ashley Youth Detention Centre.

Ms WEBB - It's not NPM, though. Is it?

Ms OGILVIE - Which I think we would all appreciate is important.

Ms WEBB - Custodial inspector money.

Ms OGILVIE - \$300,000 for the implementation of the Tasmanian National Preventative Mechanism.

Ms WEBB - The additional Ashley money isn't NPM.

Ms OGILVIE - In 2025-26, \$200,000 for increased monitoring of AYDC and \$300,000 for the implementation of the Tasmanian National Preventative Mechanism. In 2026-27, \$300,000 for the Tasmanian National Preventative Mechanism, noting that the government's commitment to close Ashley prior to that financial year, and in 2027-28, \$300,000 for the NPM mechanism.

Ms O'CONNOR - Minister, I remind you that the NPM, the Ombudsman made a Budget submission making it clear to government that \$2.8 million was required, and so this paltry

sum has been allocated in the Budget. Can you explain, given that the NPM has not been able to undertake any visits to places where people have their liberty deprived, how the government you are part of plans to ensure Tasmanians in institutional settings where they're deprived of their freedom, such as youth detention centres, mental health facilities, aged care homes, are protected from abuse and ill treatment when the NPM is not receiving the necessary resources to function effectively. Do you agree there is risk here now because the NPM can't perform its statutory functions?

Ms OGILVIE - I am aware of the request for additional funding. I would just like to sketch out for those who are watching and also the people at this table that we as a government care deeply about the management of people that are in our facilities, whether they're in a child setting, whether they're in an adult setting. No matter where they are, we are concerned about that, which is why we have supported the establishment of this function. We have funded and we have increased funding through the budgetary measures that I have just spoken about, but it's important to recognise that the work of the ombudsman in particular does go across a range of functions. Therefore, it is important to -

Ms O'CONNOR - To fund him properly.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. It's important to recognise that, whilst corrective services, which is this output portfolio of which I am personally responsible as minister, primarily manages adults in custody, there is a need to work right across our justice system. We have contact with children. There are people who come through the system, particularly I know we will get to this in watch houses who are young people. The mother and baby program is also another place where I think oversight is welcome, and we do welcome that.

Ms O'CONNOR - The question related to risk that comes about, risk to people in these settings, if the NPM is not able to do its job, do you -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. What's your question?

Ms O'CONNOR - Do you accept that? Because the Ombudsman, the National Preventative Mechanism, is not funded enough to do the visits. There is risk.

Ms OGILVIE - I am really aware that our government has a duty of care to everybody that we have in a custodial setting. It's really important. We have established this function. I mean, ongoing conversation with the custodial inspector and the NPM specifically in my areas of purview, but I do want to also say that it's important that that occurs right across our justice system, and we know with the commission of inquiry work that there is so much work to be done. I recognise also this is a hard Budget. That, you know, it's not easy for many organisations and decisions need to be made.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, they've got a stadium instead.

Ms OGILVIE - But I also have a great deal of faith in our prison service, in our employees, and the people that we have in justice and on the front line who are managing what is a longstanding system that we are seeking to improve across a range of fronts. Project Astria is a part of that as well. Having the information, we need to be able to determine a more contemporary model is really important. I take your perspective on funding. I understand that. But the Budget has made allocation, and we will continue to work together.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Supplementary, Ms Webb.

Ms WEBB - Yes, thank you. Let's talk about facts on funding, not just perspective, because the fact is that the custodial - sorry, the NPM, so Mr Connock in his capacity as Tasmania's NPM clearly made it a fact that with the funding provided in this Budget, not one visit will be able to be conducted. Not one visit.

Ms OGILVIE - I was sad to hear that. Yes, it was \$500,000.

Ms WEBB - They will be establishing the role. I haven't asked a question yet, minister. I will just keep going with my question.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I was noting to Kristy.

Ms WEBB - They will be able to permanently put somebody in the role, and there will be no ability to actually undertake the statutory function of visits. While you might be patting ourselves on the back for going as the first in the nation to put this in place, which was, as you say, a really exceptional thing for us to do.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, absolutely. Yes. There's more work to be done, yes.

Ms WEBB - In this Budget, not one visit will be undertaken. Is that acceptable to you that the facilities you're in charge of, as minister, will not get one visit from the NPM?

Ms OGILVIE - It is not acceptable that we are establishing an organisation that needs more resources to do its funding. That is something that I am concerned about, and as I have said, I am in dialogue with the organisation about that. However, again, we are creating a new model. We have established it would be first in the nation. We have funded it. We have uplifted the funding in the Budget, and I appreciate -

Ms WEBB - We haven't uplifted it. Have we? We haven't uplifted it.

Ms OGILVIE - I appreciate the concern, and I, too, am concerned and want to see a good model.

Ms WEBB - What did we fund last year for the NPM function?

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, is this another question?

Ms WEBB - Yes. I'm just challenging your assertion with uplifted funding to the NPM. What was funded in last year's Budget for the NPM compared to this year's?

Ms OGILVIE - I would have to check last year's Budget. Just let me confirm.

Ms ARMITAGE - With respect, minister, it's almost like building capital works but having no staff for it. You know, we can cut the ribbon, but we actually can't put anyone in it.

Ms OGILVIE - I understand.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - It's a *Yes, Minister* hospital. Isn't it? *Yes, Prime Minister* hospital. It's even more consequential, because this is about human rights and protecting human rights. Pretending to do that is appalling.

Ms OGILVIE - We're not pretending to do anything. I'm just trying to answer the question. Are you ready for me to do that? I've just sought some advice on the specifics. We initially invested that \$1.2 million. I am advised that \$300,000 will allow the commissioner to appoint a permanent senior officer to do the work that will plan and work out the resourcing requirements and the ability to make those visits. I just want to be a little bit -

Ms WEBB - They've already done that. They've developed the framework, minister. Have they not? That's what they spent the last 18 months doing.

Ms OGILVIE - So a senior officer has now been appointed to do that implementation work, and if you would like further details, I am very happy to refer to Kristy, who would be able to provide some additional information.

Ms WEBB - We got details from Mr Connock as the NPM on what's possible to do in the funding that your government has provided.

Ms OGILVIE - Sure, and that included the permanent officer details.

Ms WEBB - They have. Absolutely, we know that. I said it in my question to you. They can appointment someone. That person won't be able to undertake the function of the statutory function of visiting facilities. That was why my question focused on - you're in charge of our key places of detention in this state, being the prisons.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, one of them, yes, and we had the youth detention, which is why I was talking about the need to go across both of those.

Ms WEBB - Yes, being our prisons. That's right. But our key place of detention, our prison, is your responsibility.

Ms OGILVIE - That's right.

Ms WEBB - Not one visit will occur. That's why the focus of the question was whether you found that acceptable, and I think you have indicated that you didn't necessarily find it acceptable.

Ms OGILVIE - I don't find it acceptable that visits will not occur, and that is something that we need to talk about. I am in dialogue on that. But I do think that the appointment of a permanent senior staffer to manage this is a step forward, and so that is an important piece of -

Ms WEBB - Well, I think it is a faux step forward, but sure.

Ms OGILVIE - No, I think you need people to deliver the outcomes. There is nothing 'faux' about a senior person -

Ms WEBB - Minister, there's nothing appropriate about not funding the role to do the job. There is nothing appropriate about that. I am happy to move onto another question. I think we have thoroughly established how unacceptable that is.

CHAIR - Okay. We will move to our output groups, and so we have 3.1, which is prison services, and I will invite Ms Webb to commence the questioning. Thank you.

3.1 Prison Service

Ms WEBB - I'll just start with some data areas, if that is all right, just so we can build on things that have been asked in previous years to extend our understanding of them. We know an area of concern is often around lockdown, and of course the Custodian Inspector in his report highlights that as a real sensitivity and with real impacts on health and wellbeing of inmates. To build on questions from last year can we have essentially the lockdown data to the most recent time available. We might even have 2023-24 data, given that this is a late budget.

I am particularly interested, I think, in the average hours out of cell, which could be potentially broken down across various units, perhaps, because I understand circumstances would be different across units. The most granularity you can provide please for that as a comparison, perhaps, from the last couple of years through to the most recent data.

Ms OGILVIE - Sure. I am able to provide that information. The Hobart Reception Prison in 2019-20 - and let me just get the average. This is the average out of cell hours per prisoner per day broken down by facility, which I think is what you have asked.

Ms WEBB - Yes, thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - These figures that I will give you exclude prisoners accommodated at external facilities not under control of the TPS. So, for example, the Wilfred Lopes Centre and public hospitals, which you would appreciate people need to attend. The Hobart Reception Prison, 2019-20, 4.5; 2020-21, 5.5; 2021-22, 5.7; 2022-23, 7.2; 2023-24, 6.7; which is a reduction in this year. The Launceston Reception Prison 2019-20 is a 6.1; 2020-21, 6.9; 2021-22, 5.1; 2022-23, 7.0; 2023-24, 7.70. The Mary Hutchinsons Women's Prison: 2019-20 is 8.5; 2020-21, 8.2; 2021-22, 7.1; 2022-23, 8.4; 2023-24, 8, again a slight reduction which is welcome.

The Risdon Prison Complex: 2019-20 is 5.0; 2020-21, 4.5; 2021-22, 3.7; 2022-23, 2.2; 2023-24, 2.5. The Southern Remand Centre, which commences in 2022-23, 4.5 and 2023-24 is 4.5. The Ron Barwick Prison: 2019-20 was 10; 2020-21, 12.71; 2021-22, 13.9; 2022-23, 15.5; 2023-24 is 15.4. O'Hara Cottages: 2019-20 is 16.5; 2020-21, 16.5; 2021-22, 15.5; 2022-23 is 17; and 2023-24, is 16.9.

In past years, Tasmania's average out of cell hours have been lower than the national average. We are working on that. Factors contributing to that lower than average out of cell hours include factors such as a smaller open custody prisoner population than other jurisdictions, colder average annual temperatures and less daylight hours in winter months than other jurisdictions.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Some of those numbers are quite disturbing, particularly the Risdon numbers. 2.5, 2.2 in 2022-23, and 2.5 in 2023-24. Does that meet the Mandela Rules for time out of cells?

Ms OGILVIE - I would need to refer that question, I think, is that all right?

Mr WISE - Through you, minister, they comply with our rules and indeed the out of cell hours under section 29 of The Corrections Act requires prisoners to have one hour in the open air every day. But we understand that the average out of cell hours at the Risdon Prison Complex are far from where we would like them to be. There is a tension between getting prisoners out of cell and providing a safe environment, and we are continuing to work with staff to try and maximise the number of hours that prisoners can be out of cell.

Ms WEBB - Two and a half hours seem shockingly low. Can I follow on with some other data which aligns with what you have just said and aligns with this topic, and this is around recruitment because we know a key aspect of this is going to be having a sufficient workforce to be on site to allow for whatever maximum amount of time out of cells, but also access to services, can be managed. In last year's estimates we heard that since 2016 there had been 308 recruits into the prison service staffing.

What I am interested in is some up to date recruitment figures, and I am interested in recruitment figures, say, for the last few years, but also what that has meant in terms of net gain in staffing. Because we know that while we are recruiting on the one hand, we are also potentially having staff step away as well. I am interested in the last three years of recruitment figures, but also the net gain figures for staffing.

Ms OGILVIE - I am very happy to provide that. From 2016 to 1 August 2024, recruitment and attrition rates I believe is what you are asking for?

Ms WEBB - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - I can give you the detail. In 2016 new recruit courses, three were run. New officer commencements, 38. Interstate officer commencements, or bridging, was 2. Total new correctional officers are 40, attrition was 17. So 2016, the net increase was 23. 2017, those figures are new recruit courses, 1; new officer commencements, 18; no interstate officer commencements or bridging; 18 new correctional officers, 15 attrition, net increase 3. 2018, one course run, 23 new officers, no bridging or interstate: 23 new officers, attrition 17, net increase 6. 2019, two courses run, 39 new officers commenced, no interstate or bridging, the total new officers were 39 therefore, attrition 20, net increase 19.

In 2020 three courses were run, 79 new officer commencements; 4 interstate or bridging commencements; therefore 83 new correctional officers, 21 attrition, net increase 62. 2021, two courses were offered, 37 new officer commencements, 3 interstate transfers, 40 new correctional officers, 22 attrition, net increase 18. In the year 2022 four courses were run, 72 new officer commencement, 4 interstate or bridging commencements, 76 new correctional officers, attrition was 25, the net increase was 51.

2023 there were two courses run, 3[sic] new officer commencements, 4 interstate or bridging, 37 new correctional officers started, attrition was 32, the net increase was 5. And in 2024 to 1 August, being part year, two new recruit courses have been, 13 new commencements,

PUBLIC

3 interstate or bridging officers, 16 new officers commenced, the attrition was 16, net increase zero.

Ms WEBB - Thank you for those figures.

Ms OGILVIE - My pleasure.

Ms WEBB - There was some good years in there.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, there's some ups and downs.

Ms WEBB - Not so much 23 and this year, in terms of net gains. It seems to be low. Is there an explanation around that?

Ms OGILVIE - I would actually seek some advice on that. This goes to the issue of retention. Would I be able to refer that to you for some views on that?

Mr WISE - Through you, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Thank you.

Mr WISE - Our vacancy number is fairly low at the moment and we do have two people graduating this week and another eight staff starting next week, and that will virtually top us up in terms of the positions available. So our attrition rate has dropped, as you would've heard the minister say. I think 32 last year and only 16 so far this year. So our retention is not so bad. As you've probably heard from other people who've been sitting on this side of the table in the last few days, it's a tight market, and we would like to recruit more people.

But the important thing for us is that we recruit the right people, and there are plenty of people putting their hand up to become correctional officers, but we want to make sure that the people that we select are temperamentally suited to the job and that they're resilient enough to do the job and that we don't lose them as soon as they start. So from hundreds of applicants we narrow it down to a small number that we believe is suitable and we are working to recruit those and to get them on the floor as quickly as possible.

Ms WEBB - Are there any patterns in terms of the attrition when people are stepping away? Are there any patterns that you have discerned in terms of is it more likely that people are stepping away in their first year, for example, than when they've been there for a longer period of time or what have you got that your data tells you in that space, minister?

Ms OGILVIE - So very happy for you to respond.

Mr WISE - Through you, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you.

Mr WISE - It's one of the interesting things. When correctional systems nationwide recruited people decades ago they were very often people from armed services and those sorts of things. As prison systems have changed we're looking for people with communication skills and other transferrable skills, and we find that some people are joining the prison service and

then using their transferrable skills to find other jobs elsewhere. It's clearly not a job for everyone and some people will be there for life, which is fantastic, and some people will opt out. It's an important thing that people do opt out if they believe that it's taking a toll on them and their families and those sorts of things. Some of the people that we lose, we lose for the right reasons, I think. And it's an -

Ms WEBB - Sure. I wasn't asking the question with any pejorative intent behind it.

Mr WISE - Yes.

Ms WEBB - From what you're saying it sounds like there is a reasonable proportion of attrition that occurs probably at an early stage of employment after people have been recruited, which, as you say, could have lots of good reasons to it and may be appropriate to occur.

Mr WISE - Yes.

Ms WEBB - I presume that you built that in, then, minister, to the recruitment programs, that you've got an expectation about. What would be your, I guess, sitting assumption behind, well, if we recruit, say, 10 people, how - what proportion of the 10 might we still expect to be there a year in?

Ms OGILVIE - Operationally that's a matter for the department. But I do want to just add to the conversation. The people that we're recruiting, I've gone out and I've met with them. I'm really always happy to meet the staff who come across and I'm always quite profoundly amazed by the range and diversity of people that we get. Part of my vision for what we need to do in the corrections space is around improving the rehabilitation piece. You've seen some of those decisions being made to create the space for that.

So that work then flows down to who we need to be on the front line in the prisons. The people we get, particularly those who come into the service as a career change are always very, very welcome. They bring additional skills and capacity to those who we might perhaps in days gone past be focused on. Doesn't mean that everybody wants to stay, and I think we've just heard a little bit about how those decisions people make as individuals - but the recruitment and retention piece is really important. I want us to be very much focused on being a human-centric organisation, which I think we do well in the TPS and also the Community Corrections where we're dealing daily with individuals. So it's very much a people-first culture that we're endeavouring to build, particularly within the Risdon Prison site, which is our largest facility.

Ms WEBB - I appreciate that editorial, minister. But the question I had - and perhaps you can - if it's operational it can be passed through. The question was around what's the standing assumptions that we build in to our recruitment planning in terms of the retention rate after the first year. So if we recruit 10 people, how many do we expect to be there in a year's time?

Mr WISE - Through you, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Feel free to answer that if you wish to.

Mr WISE - Our hope would be that those 10 people would still be there.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - Great. Of course that would be all our hopes, yes.

Mr WISE - Indeed. And we have about 450-odd staff in the custodial ranks. As you heard, last year we had 32 separations, so that's considerably less than 10 per cent. If we extrapolated that across the whole of the recruits we might expect to lose one. But most people will work for more than a year. Some people will bow out early. But the people that we lose are very often people at the end of their careers that are retiring at the end of their careers.

Ms WEBB - Sure. That was where I was trying to get a bit of detail. Also perhaps if you have that detail I would quite like to have it. Do we have - based on recent years when we've been doing this considerable recruitment, do we have the retention rate after a year for the recent recruitments across these recent years?

Mr WISE - Through you, minister. I don't have that with me, I'm afraid.

Ms WEBB - Perhaps that's something I can ask you to take on notice, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Just specify exactly what it is you want.

Ms WEBB - The retention rate after a year across, say, the years that we've just been discussing from 2016 onwards in the recruitment programs.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I've given you that, the retention rate. Was there something more?

Ms WEBB - No, the retention rate after a year. I'm trying to figure out how many are still there a year later -

Ms OGILVIE - Do you mean from new recruits?

Ms WEBB - From new -

Ms OGILVIE - Specific to new recruits.

Ms WEBB - From new recruits.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms WEBB - That's right.

Ms OGILVIE - Right. But I do - let me just take some advice, because I do think I just gave that to you. Would it be any different from that, those numbers?

Ms WEBB - I think your attrition would've included people who are -

Ms OGILVIE - I'm very happy - is that information that you're able to find easily?

Mr WISE - We can dig it out, yes.

Ms OGILVIE - Okay. Do you think you'll be able to - is that something that we need some time to find or is it something that can be provided?

PUBLIC

CHAIR - You normally have about a week if we put something on notice.

Ms OGILVIE - No, I'm just wondering if we can get - no, I'd just rather not put it on notice if we could get it more quickly. It would help the member.

CHAIR - We're getting a 'yes' in the back.

Ms WEBB - If it comes back later in the session that's great, too.

CHAIR - That's great. Okay.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, hang on. Just want to make sure we know what we're doing. So, yes, you'll find it in this session for me. Thank you.

CHAIR - Okay. Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - And nods from the back come through me.

CHAIR - Right. Thank you.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thanks, Chair. Thanks, minister. Just a couple of detailed ones, please, if that's okay. I'd just like to know how many inmates are currently within correctional facilities in Tasmania by men and women.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. The overarching numbers. We do have that. This is the great source of information.

CHAIR - This is the one where we all need to be sitting down for it. That's it.

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, which bit?

CHAIR - We all need - the numbers. We need to be sitting down for them.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, we are sitting. Yes, well called.

CHAIR - I know.

Ms OGILVIE - But, no, I don't know that that's the case. But certainly it is a difficult, you know, remit, this area. On prisoner numbers of males we have at the moment - I'll just make sure I'm reading this correctly - 418 sentenced, 299 on remand, giving us a total of 717. Females we have 28 sentenced, 36 on remand, giving us a total of 64. Please understand, the numbers are fluid depending on who's coming in and -

Mr EDMUNDS - Sorry, could I just get that women number again?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, certainly. Sentenced, 28.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. Thank you.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - On remand, 36. Total of 64.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you very much. Do you know what is the real net operating expenditure per inmate per day from 2022-23?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, we have that. I think from looking on here it was \$472.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you. What is the current number of open workers compensation claims and what is the percentage of the TPS workforce, please?

Ms OGILVIE - Sure. Let me see if I can just get that information for you.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - I think I do have that here. So we do have the information you seek on workers compensation claim, and we should have from 1 July 23 to 30 June 24, 122 workers compensation claims were received from employees of the TPS. That represents an increase from the 106 claims in 2022-23 but there has been a downward trend in the number of claims made in the first couple of months of 2023-24. Does that answer your question?

Mr EDMUNDS - What was the total number again, sorry?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, total number from 1 July 23 to 30 June 24, 122 workers comp claims were received from employees of the TPS. That represents an increase from the 106 claims in 2022-23, but that however there has been a downward trend in the number of claims made in the first couple of months of 2023-24.

CHAIR - Do we have the number of how many have been settled?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me see. I'll just see if I can get that information. I don't think we have that figure. We can get that today.

CHAIR - Thank you. We'll make a note of it for now and if it comes back during the day that's fine.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I'll endeavour to get the information you want while we're all at the table. I think it's the best way to go.

CHAIR - Yes. Thank you.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Chair. Minister, I have a question regarding the handling of a medical officer as described in the Custodial Inspector's Report. The report claims a medical officer was banned from entering the prison as a result of their decision that a patient who'd swallowed a razor blade should remain at the Royal for a few more days against the wishes of the TPS. I note that the director of prisons responded that this was in fact the result of a series of decisions made by this doctor.

Minister, through you, it is the case though, isn't it, that the decision to ban entry was a direct response to this particular clinical decision or advice from the doctor that the inmate should spend more time in the Royal because they'd swallowed a razor blade. The timing of

this ban makes it pretty clear that while your director of prisons might've said there's a range of reasons they banned that medical officer from prison it was a response to her advice that this inmate should spend more time in the Royal. The doctor provided clinical advice. Minister, why did TPS management think they knew better?

Ms OGILVIE - That is a question that I would like to refer. I understand there was some response to the report that you have referenced, and the department did have a look at that. Thank you.

Mr WISE - Thank you, minister, through you. I think, Ms O'Connor, the depiction of the issue is probably not as balanced as I think the TPS would like to see. Indeed Ian Thomas, the director of prisons submitted a response in the Custodial Inspector's Report. It wasn't a ban in the first instance. The matter was dealt with fairly clumsily, I think everyone would concede. But the doctor as she was entering the prison was asked to not go to her normal place of duty but to go to a meeting where a number of issues were going to be discussed. That was handled poorly, I think.

Ms O'CONNOR - By prison management?

Mr WISE - Well the communication between prison management and the people at the gatehouse, I think was substandard and indeed it caused some consternation. That consternation I must say was sorted out fairly quickly with the doctor in question and there is a very very good working relationship with that doctor. Things were sorted out, discussed, settled and people have moved on. It certainly wasn't the case that the Tasmanian Prison Service was questioning the clinical judgment of the doctor. There were a number of issues that were of concern to prison management at the time involving the safety of staff and others and those matters were addressed and addressed absolutely satisfactorily.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you. I'm a bit surprised to hear that there's a view that the custodial inspector may have been wrong about the treatment of this medical officer on site. Can you explain to the committee, and through you, minister, how a decision for the patient to remain in the Royal Hobart Hospital for a few days for monitoring created a potential risk to the safety of staff, which we've just had referenced including the doctor herself, from prisoners?

Ms OGILVIE - I'm very happy to answer that.

Mr WISE - Through you, minister. That wasn't the issue that was potentially going to create the issue around the safety of staff. The clinical issue though is a tricky one as many of these are. We do have inpatient facilities at Risdon prison complex for the observation of people who are ill. When we take people to the Royal Hobart Hospital we need staff on them, and if we've got two or three staff managing a person in a hospital doing a bedsit at the hospital that means that those staff can't be deployed in the prison getting people out of cells for example. Or alternatively it means that another person who might benefit from being taken to the Royal is unable to be conveyed there.

There is always an interest from the TPSs perspective in trying to clear people from that hospital environment where they can be placed in a safe environment with nursing staff providing that supervision in the inpatients area, and to free up staff to do custodial jobs and get people out of cells and so on, or to take other people to the Royal. There is legitimately, I think, some dialogue between the TPS and medical staff about can this be safely done.

Ms O'CONNOR - I guess that goes to the next obvious question. When there is clinical advice being presented where does the balance lie between a doctor saying, 'I believe this in the best interests of the patient', and TPS imperatives around staff management? I would've thought clinical advice trumps management worries.

Ms OGILVIE - I can see you're ready to answer that. I'm very happy for that and then perhaps I'll make a comment on the way back through.

Mr WISE - Through you, minister. Indeed, that is the case, Ms O'Connor. The clinical judgment is the one that prevails. The TPS will ask whether the matter can be dealt with in another way but if the medical advice is, 'this person needs to stay in hospital', that person stays in hospital.

Ms O'CONNOR - So what happened in that instance in terms of making sure that we're not having these issues again and has there been any engagement with the director of prisons, for example, just to reinforce that when clinical advice is provided it really has to take priority in terms of decision-making?

Mr WISE - Through you, minister. That dialogue was not required with the director of prisons. The director of prisons fully understood that that was the case and continues to be.

Ms O'CONNOR - Through you, minister, it was the gatehouse staff, was it? Is that where the problem laid?

Mr WISE - No. They were separate issues. Through you, minister. They were separate issues. There were a number of issues. The clinical judgment in relation to that one prisoner was just one of them.

Ms O'CONNOR - I just want to get to the bottom of what is an apparent contradiction between what's in the custodial inspector's report about this medical officer being effectively banned from the site and what I'm hearing here at the table today. What exactly happened with this medical officer who was providing this clinical advice in relation to this inmate? If it wasn't a ban or a prevention from this doctor entering the site, what was it? How could the custodial inspector get this wrong, apparently?

Mr WISE - That's a very very good question.

Ms O'CONNOR - So, you think they got it wrong?

Mr WISE - I think they got it wrong. There were a number of issues that the TPS management wanted to discuss with this particular doctor. She wasn't banned from entering the position. The intention was to get her into a meeting where some of these issues could be discussed. The custodial inspector's team was entering the gatehouse at exactly the same time as -

Ms O'CONNOR - Serendipity.

Mr WISE - Serendipity maybe, and so witnessed something and I think got the wrong end of the stick and -

PUBLIC

Ms O'CONNOR - But that wasn't clarified between the department and the custodial inspector?

Mr WISE - I can assure you that there were many discussions with the custodial inspector about his team's interpretation of what happened and what the TPS believed was the case.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms O'CONNOR - So just to be really clear, just one more. Sorry, Chair. The custodial inspector describes it as a ban that relates to a clinical decision that was made by the doctor in relation to an inmate. On those two grounds I am hearing that the prison service thinks the custodial inspector got it wrong.

Mr WISE - Through you, minister, I think that the commentary in the custodial inspector's report is absolutely contested.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, and just to add a couple of comments - and thank you very much, both, for what I think was a helpful dialogue, but I do want to also note for the record that the report itself does note that the good working relationship exists between the correctional primary health service and also the prison service. Whilst maintaining that the actions were necessary, TPS has conceded - and I think you said this originally - that the matter was handled or managed 'clumsily' and they have apologised. I just thought it was worth making sure that we wrap that up at the tail end.

CHAIR - Thank you, minister.

Ms ARMITAGE - Thank you, Chair. I noticed, minister, that in previous media utterances you have reported a 5 per cent decrease in the prison population. Are there any double-ups in cells? I know in the past that there actually had been double-ups, and -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. You are asking a question around bed utilisation? You mean double-bunking?

Ms ARMITAGE - Well, beds and, yes, more beds than - and I guess it also goes back in some ways to the custodial inspector when we have had these questions of more beds than should be in a cell, mattresses in the past on the floor. Is that still occurring?

Ms OGILVIE - No, no mattresses on the floor. We do have - perhaps if I just quickly run through the capacity stuff for you? In bed utilisation, the capacity of Risdon is 880, occupancy is at 87 per cent. Occupancy of the RPC Max is 102 per cent. That means there are some double bunks. I will just - if we need further information on double bunking, I can get that. Double bunks, there are eight to 14.

Ms ARMITAGE - Right. I was reading your previous media of 30 August when, to quote, it says the strategic decision not to build a \$270 million northern correctional facility was supported by a five per cent decrease in the prisoner population from its peak. So you believe that double ups are okay in the prisons in Hobart, so it is no longer necessary, when previously my understanding was the reason for a northern correctional facility was to allow prisoners to be closer to their families, because a high percentage comes from the north.

I think if we look at the annual report of police we will see that northern Tasmania features very prominently, or probably at least twice as bad as the south in their crime figures. Can you give me an understanding of - is it purely saving money for your budget to take the northern correctional facility out and upgrade other facilities when we have still got some double up in cells? Obviously there is not an improvement, really, in the prisons.

Ms OGILVIE - So you have raised a few issues which are not all in the same bundle.

Ms ARMITAGE - Yes, that's fine.

Ms OGILVIE - But I will try to deal with them as we go through. In relation to double bunking, that is an operational matter and I will refer that. In relation to the decision to not progress the northern correctional facility, and the question you have - which is a legitimate one - around prisoners and prisoners' families being close to be able to visit, I will deal with that second. First let's deal with the double bunking issue, if that is all right, as operational level.

Mr WISE - Through you, minister. We don't set out to have people in double bunks if we can avoid it. It depends a little bit on what the classification of prisoners coming through the doors is and if we need to temporarily put people in double bunks then we will do so, with the goal to get them into single cells as soon as possible. As the minister said, we have got the system of 880 and we are not close to that at the moment. Our peak was 826 back in June of this year, and so we have had, from the figures that the minister gave you before, a more than 5 per cent decrease since that 826. We are travelling much better than we were a couple of months ago. And -

Ms ARMITAGE - So are there any at the moment, though, any double bunking?

Mr WISE - There are some double bunks, but there are only about four of them in the maximum area at the moment, in the Risdon Prison Complex. As the minister indicated, we have got a reasonably large number of women in custody at the moment, and so there are some double bunks in use in the women's prison and there are at the Hobart Reception Prison as well. But it might - it fluctuates from day to day. So as soon as we have people in double bunks we try and classify them into an area where they can get into a single cell, and so they might be lodged in a double bunk only for a day.

Ms ARMITAGE - So just trying to be clear, on that one before we go to the next one, minister, so 880 is not individual cells.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms ARMITAGE - It's 880 prisoners, which could include double bunking.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Mr WISE - It could include double bunking, yes.

Ms ARMITAGE - At the end of the day it is not necessarily 880 in their own cell, so how many individual cells? I mean, how many - what is the number - I am just wondering, what is the number of prisoners that you could actually have? It is all right to say you have a 5 per cent decrease, but you have only got a 5 per cent increase if you are double bunking some of them. You know, how many prisoners actually can you have -

Ms OGILVIE - No, a 5 per cent decrease in the total number of prisoners.

Ms ARMITAGE - Over the number, I understand that.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms ARMITAGE - They're saying you have 880 of capacity, that is not in an individual cell, that is some double bunking, isn't it? Because you have double bunking now and you are down to 87 per cent.

Ms OGILVIE - I will refer this question.

Ms ARMITAGE - Yes, I am just wondering how many -

Ms OGILVIE - Before I do, just to make sure I understand we are - everybody here is aware that the Risdon Prison Complex is like a campus? It has different buildings for different environments.

Ms ARMITAGE - Yes. We are very aware of prisons at the moment, having a committee on foot.

Ms OGILVIE - I understand that, so I am just wanting to make sure that we are on the same page. I don't know if you have had a chance to visit Risdon, but different buildings catering for different needs. And for example - that's why I wanted to interject - we talked about mattresses on the floor, but I am not aware of any at the moment. I have noted in my notes that the disability cells that we have had the capacity to be able to put a mattress on the floor if needed for those reasons. I think it is important. At night, for example, it is important to note that. I have given you all the information I can.

Ms ARMITAGE - I was just trying to make -

Ms OGILVIE - So that would be a last resort.

Ms ARMITAGE - Do you want me to make mine really clear? I understand that in the units, there may be - if people are living in a house they may have a couple of beds in a room. I am more referring to cells and capacity. I understand we have 880.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

PUBLIC

Ms ARMITAGE - I wondered what would your number be if you didn't do double bunking in cells, not in the units. If it's too difficult, don't worry.

Ms OGILVIE - No, that's all right. We'll try it.

Mr WISE - We could extract that information, I suspect.

Ms ARMITAGE - No, no, I don't -

Mr WISE - But double bunking is not uncommon. I think your committee went to South Australia for example, and they had at one time almost 100 per cent of their prison population in shared cells. We have a very, very small percentage of our prisoners in double bunks. In the Southern Remand Centre we have cells that are built for two. Indeed, what we find is that some people would prefer to be sharing a cell with others. They might have a family member, they might have a good friend, a lover, a parent, they might have language difficulties and be placed in a cell with somebody who shares that language, because watching TV is not going to be an option for them, because they don't understand it. There are a number of people who seek out shared accommodation. We have built that capacity not in bunks in the Southern Remand Centre. There are some double bunks in units which we use as surge capacity.

As I said before, if we can avoid using them, then we will. One of those key areas is in the Apsley Unit, for example, in Risdon Prison Complex, which is a protection unit. If we have more protection prisoners of that security classification coming through, then we will use the double bunks rather than put them in a single cell in a mainstream environment where they are likely to get abused and yelled at through the night and those sorts of things. Sometimes it is for the better management of the prisoner population, some of it is to deal with the ups and downs of the prisoner numbers.

Ms ARMITAGE - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - We have the new maximum-security accommodation as well, so that is something, I think, that will alleviate pressure.

Mr WISE - Indeed. Through you, minister. The new 52-bed unit that we're about to build at the Risdon complex will allow us to move a lot of those people who are in shared accommodation into single cell accommodation, give us some capacity.

Ms OGILVIE - We're building - yes.

Ms ARMITAGE - You did mention South Australia, but the minister would do very well to have a look at what they've got in South Australia because it's absolutely magnificent, some of their rebuilds. But anyway, you had part 2.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. So part 2 - and I couldn't agree with you more. We're working with the system we've got to improve both across infrastructure and also in relation to rehabilitation opportunities. I'm very keenly aware - and it was a very big decision to change tack on the northern correctional facilities project, which lines up again with prudent and proper use of existing assets. We know the Ashley Youth Detention Centre land and facility is there for a while until they're able to close that. That is something that I think we -

Ms O'CONNOR - It should have been closed by now.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I knew I'd get some chirping when I raised that. It is something that we, as a corrections system, have an eye to, what that might look like. There are multi factors involved in making a decision to not progress.

Ms O'CONNOR - Possibility of a farm prison at Ashley as we saw in South Australia?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, there is always an opportunity to do that sort of low-risk offender type setting. I want to be really clear and careful about this. That is something that I would want to do in collaboration with the local community. My personal view is that these sorts of projects, to land them well, need good consultation, we need all hands to the pump to do that.

Ms ARMITAGE - Everyone going in the same direction.

Ms OGILVIE - We do. I have met with a number of people who had concerns about the northern correction facilities, and did not have concerns about the Ashley facility. There's a space there that I think we can negotiate outcomes.

Ms ARMITAGE - Well, that depended on where they lived.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, it might do. In all genuineness, people do want to have a system that works. Certainly, our department wants to run a system that is good and proper and sensible and provides those opportunities. One of the things that's weighed on my mind is the opportunity particularly for women to have a better leaving prison experience, particularly in the north and northwest. We do need to address that and we've put some funds into place to provide some stepdown facilities going forward for women. In relation -

CHAIR - At the Ashley Youth Detention Centre?

Ms OGILVIE - No, no. Separately. So -

Ms ARMITAGE - Because we're still on prisons.

CHAIR - Yes, but at the site.

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry. At the end of the tenure of the Ashley Youth Detention Centre, we will look to that property to see if it could be repurposed for something. What I'm suggesting is that that is best developed in close consultation with the community. My firm understanding is that the community is open to doing something, but it would need to be a jointly agreed strategy and program. So that's on that.

You asked a really important question though about families and their ability to connect to prisoners, and I've read the statistics as well about the better outcomes you get once prisoners are released if they're able to continue that connection particularly with families. It's not the kids' fault, is it? We've done some work on that and specifically looked at other prison environments. In particular, I've been looking at New South Wales in relation to the use of technology to improve communications as well, and I've put some of that in the press release.

Ms ARMITAGE - In cell videos?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Well, it's not just in cell videos, but it's in cell equipment. Think of it like a little tablet. It's being used really effectively in New Zealand and New South Wales. It allows a range of further programs to be provided to prisoners who are in cell, from education through to communication through to the justice system, connection with family and friends. That, to me, is something we can do straight away, so we've already started to have a look at that. We'll need to have a look at the telecommunications capacity of Risdon wi-fi systems, et cetera, to be able to do that.

But my and our support of in-cell technology, expanding that video calling capability in particular with kids and family, we believe will help prisoners to remain more closely connected and help defray some of that distance problem and, importantly, improve access hopefully between prisoners and their legal representatives, because I'm very tuned into some of the defence lawyers letting us know that that could be improved.

And of course, on the education front, we have people who have a range of abilities, not just with writing but with digital technology. There's a digital divide issue which is heavily centred around our prison population, so I'm very keen to see what we can do to help with that. So that's the move we're making. I hope that's explained it. I think there is a great deal of genuine effort that is going into all fronts on this to make the best decisions we can make with the assets that we've got and with the resources we have to deploy.

CHAIR - Can I just follow up -

Ms OGILVIE - I have the workers compensation settled claims number.

CHAIR - We'll get that in a minute.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you.

CHAIR - Can I follow up on the member for Launceston's question. Am I to understand from what you've said about the north/north-west female prisoner release program that there'll be a separate facility?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. We're looking to do an apartment. There is some joint investment with the Vanessa Goodwin funds that we will - I think it's matching funds - and we will provide ability for women prisoners to have a release place to go that will be an improvement.

CHAIR - Right, but an apartment where? Where are you thinking you might place an apartment? Somewhere where there are services?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

CHAIR - Or somewhere a little bit more rural or remote?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me just ask if we've made that determination.

CHAIR - Well, you're the minister.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Well, I'm just going to ask. That's what a minister does. North-west is as far as we've got with that. We've announced the funding and the apartment is to be determined. Yes. North-west.

CHAIR - So north-west - I need to have some understanding -

Ms OGILVIE - We'll find an appropriate place.

CHAIR - Burnie, Devonport, Smithton?

Ms OGILVIE - We'll find an appropriate apartment. We'll need to buy one.

CHAIR - So you'll buy an apartment block?

Ms OGILVIE - No, there'll be an -

CHAIR - Or you'll build an apartment block?

Ms OGILVIE - No, no. We're not going to build. We're going to buy an apartment jointly funded between the Vanessa Goodwin bequest and funds that we're bringing to the table to provide an apartment - or small house or apartment - for women leaving Risdon who need to return to the north-west. In our view, that is the area of greatest need on the women's release side.

CHAIR - So something like an eight-unit type of thing? What's your thinking around that?

Ms OGILVIE - Well, it depends on the funds. Yes, I imagine it would be smaller than that. It's not a huge amount of money. I did release, I think, the figures. Let me just see if I can get those.

CHAIR - Release to who?

Ms WEBB - They're here in the budget paper. Can I ask some follow-up questions?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, it's there.

Ms WEBB - Can I ask a follow-up question on that? That's described as being part of what's listed here as an initiative as correctional improvement program, which contains a range of things including the northwest support for women who are leaving prison transitioning back to the community. Now, the funding for that in this financial year is \$830,000, and then in the two subsequent years \$1.18 million, and then back to \$920 in the fourth year of the forward Estimates. What proportion of that funding that's there in the Budget under that initiative is related to this north-west women's transition initiative? What proportion of it? Given that the description lists other things too.

Ms OGILVIE - In relation to specifically the apartment?

Ms WEBB - Yes. And which year is it expected to be expended in?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - I'll just get that information for you. Yes, I do have that information for you. It's an indicative figure, and we have got - and I can give you the figures from 2024-25 through to 2027-28. The northwest facility, the operating cost is \$20,000, \$20,000, \$20,000, \$20,000 and then a total of \$80,000. It's \$20,000 across each of 2024-25, 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 years.

Ms WEBB - Can I just clarify then, that \$20 000 a year across four years is to purchase a property. Will that be funding -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. We have the capital cost as well.

Ms WEBB - Right. Is the capital cost is separate.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. The capital cost is \$500,000.

Ms WEBB - So \$500,000 from you, something from the Vanessa Goodwin bequest also to purchase a property.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms WEBB - And the \$20,000 there then, is that to -

Ms OGILVIE - The operating expenses.

Ms WEBB - Right. Does that include some form of staffing support too, and who will be undertaking that role.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. That's a very good question, and when prisoners are released when they've completed their sentences there's a different model to those who might be under a correctional order.

Ms WEBB - So what maybe I'm thinking about for example.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, give me an example.

Ms WEBB - Here in the south we have nine beds at Bethlehem House that are put aside for men who are exiting prison to go into, something of a transition back into the community, and there's funding provided to Beth House, I believe to assist in that. Or maybe there isn't actually. Could you clarify that?

Ms OGILVIE - Because they're actually fixing Bethlehem - it's becoming a different model is my understanding. It will have a women's program.

Ms WEBB - Sure. But I'm not sure if the men's model is changing or whether that will change the fact that there were allocated beds for men who were exiting prison. But if it's that sort of model obviously here in Bethlehem House in the south for those men who are transitioning out of prison there's quite intensive support then that's wrapped around them by Vinnies in Beth House, because there's workers there who assist them with all sorts of reintegration issues. Will you have that in place in this model?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I understand what you're asking, I think. Just to reiterate there are the broad spectrum of inmates who leave prison. There are some who need that kind of service and that kind of very intensive wraparound service and there are others who complete their sentence, and we don't hear from them again. It is a matter of making sure that the services that are provided are fit for purpose. There will be some who need those sorts of wraparound services and who reject them as well. There's great diversity in that.

The proposition we've got for the north west apartment facility, in my mind and it's yet to be completely scoped is that it would be a couple of beds. It would be a unit on the north-west, to facilitate women who are leaving prison who need to return to those communities who don't otherwise have anywhere to go. I imagine and I will confirm this with the department that that individual on leaving prison would have some sort of assessment around what sort of services they might need and that could be provided. It will have to be very much and individually-based model. I can see you nodding. Would you like to add anything to that?

Ms WEBB - I'm just checking what the \$20,000 a-year is going to be expected to cover then for operational?

CHAIR - Probably the rates and the power at these rates.

Ms WEBB - That's what I'm thinking. Once you've paid for rates and power -

Ms OGILVIE - That's what I'm saying. Yes. That's right. It's an apartment.

Ms WEBB - So we're not funding any sort of support in that sense?

Ms OGILVIE - Nothing in addition to the services that we are -

Ms WEBB - We're not going to broker in with that or anything like that from community-based services?

Ms OGILVIE - So we have community corrections which has responsibility at that handover point and those services would be assessed and provided through community corrections. But it's not a Bethlehem House model. It's not provided by an external provider with, you know, in-house services.

CHAIR - So we've got back to the fact that this opportunity is possibly for about two persons?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, is my view.

CHAIR - So I got a bit excited with eight.

Ms OGILVIE - Well you did, but I didn't want to burst your bubble.

CHAIR - Well, you have.

Ms OGILVIE - Two is a step in the right direction and it is yet to be scoped though. I just want to be really clear. Take all of this onboard as well. It's not a complete solution but it is a step in the right direction, and we will endeavour to make sure we make it work.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - I agree that it's a positive step. Sure.

CHAIR - Nobody's denying that.

Ms WEBB - No. Trying hard.

CHAIR - It was the just number, and before I move to Mr Gaffney, can I ask for the costs that have been spent on progressing a northern correctional facility to date.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I do have that information for you.

CHAIR - That includes all those hours that have been put in by those who have attended community events, engaged with community, the whole box and dice.

Ms OGILVIE - I can't cost any third party's engagement costs but -

CHAIR - But they hired facilities. Facilities were hired to have community engagement.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, the costs we've incurred I can provide you. No, if somebody's had some other cost to attend something I'd obviously won't have line of sight across that.

CHAIR - No, I mean the cost entirely so -

Ms OGILVIE - So the northern correctional facility expenditure to 31 August 2024 is \$7.212 million, and I can give you a little bit more information on that. Total expenditure on the NCF project was approximately \$7.212 million but noting that is across the three sites that were considered for the location of the facility. You're aware of course it's had a long history prior to my time. The total expenditure on consultancies for the NCF project which is probably your next question as of 31 August was approximately \$950,000.

CHAIR - That's additional to the seven – or it was included in?

Ms OGILVIE - Inclusive. So that's a little bit more detail for you.

CHAIR - Okay.

Ms OGILVIE - The remaining expenditure to date has covered project costs associated with project management, project planning and approvals and legal costs across the three sites, and that is it, I think. Thank you.

CHAIR - Okay. Thank you.

Mr GAFFNEY - Yes, just a quick one on that, minister, and I like that initiative.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. Look forward to your support.

Mr GAFFNEY - One of the issues we have on the north west coast is that we don't have the support networks for people who are coming out of prison. Male or female. If this is successful for the women's in assessment is there a possibility of a similar model for men?

PUBLIC

Because I'm aware of a number of males from the north west coast who are coming out of Risdon. They can't get accommodation so therefore they're not actually eligible for parole in some situations.

So that's a real concern for me and so we talk about relocating and we've got some people from the north west coast or the north of the state that are even worse off than those coming out of the south. I'd like to think if there was an assessment of this program initially if you're trialling with women that something could be done for the men who are also disenfranchised from their families and their friends and relatives and whatever.

Ms OGILVIE - And their kids.

Mr GAFFNEY - Is there a thinking that, because men make up a greater percentage of inmates than the female, that a similar model could be considered for men in both the north and north west.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. My mind is absolutely open to doing more across a range of fronts. Things that we can do. The opportunity to deal with that small step in the right direction for the women just presented itself. We decided to grab that and run with it. Certainly, I think it would be a good model and if successful would strengthen the argument to do more for the men as well.

I would agree with you around the challenge on the north west coast and the north generally. My understanding is we've got approximately 47 per cent of prisoners who originate from the north or north-west of Tasmania. It is a large cohort, and it is a challenge. I don't want to dodge the question, but I do think that when we get to the community corrections piece there are initiatives there that actually might make you feel good about steps that are being taken in that direction as well, specifically around enabling different models of monitoring. So perhaps not everything needs to be in incarceration.

We need to have a more contemporary system. I'm trying very hard to use technology to do that as well; ankle bracelets and monitoring et cetera in addition to the current status that we've got with our infrastructure challenges, and we all know what they are. The answer is, yes, very open-minded to that and very aware of the challenge on the north west.

Mr GAFFNEY - Just a quick one on that then - you mentioned that the opportunity arose because of the relationship of a shared arrangement with Vanessa Goodwin. So, if there was a similar funding body or group available that had men as its focus then would the government be open to some discussions around that?

Ms OGILVIE - I'm always open to all of those discussions and I think we see models - I mean we've heard a bit more about Bethlehem House this morning. That's undergoing some change as well. But we are engaged with many of these community service organisations. This one with the women's apartment accommodation is an unusual one because it was a bequest from Vanessa Goodwin, but we've stepped up to try and work with that. I'm always trying very hard to work with what we've got to do more and do better; and I see your mind turning to the challenge. Certainly, happy to have a conversation with you if you have some ideas around what you think might be a good step in that direction.

Mr GAFFNEY - Thank you.

CHAIR - Everybody's lined up.

Ms WEBB - Following on from Mr Gaffney's questions there, do we still have rapid rehousing options that are quarantined for prisoners exiting?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me find the right tab. Thank you.

Ms WEBB - Where are they? What is the balance of those in the different regions of the state?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, sure. I will see if I can get that information for you. As I have said we are turning our minds to it broadly and we are committed to doing more with what we have got. The Department of Justice and Salvation Army do have an agreement for ongoing delivery of a specialist throughcare reintegration program called Beyond the Wire, which offers multi-partner throughcare service for high complex needs individuals, some of whom probably have gone through Bethlehem House. They are people who are leaving custody and have chronic accommodation and/or support needs, and this cohort of prisoners is more likely to have a history of prior convictions and relapse sadly.

Ms WEBB - But housing doesn't come with that program.

Ms OGILVIE - Often returning to prison following release into the community. So as part of our funding commitment we also have introduced a prisoner rapid rehousing program which we think is a really valuable initiative which provides for those leaving the TPS with transitional accommodation. Tenants of prisoner rapid-rehousing properties are also provided with support through Beyond the Wire, as I have just articulated, to transition back into the community, and to access and maintain long-term stable accommodation and to seek to address some of the issues that might lead to reoffending.

These programs are delivered through collaboration between several non-government organisations. For statewide access as well, Mr Gaffney, to the services, and they are Anglicare Tasmania, CatholicCare, Colony 47, Hobart City Mission and the Salvation Army Tasmania. We also have Housing Connect, where prisoners can request a housing needs assessment up to 30 weeks before their anticipated release date. You asked for figures, let's see if I have those for you here: from 1 July 23 until 30 June 24, there were 14 new participants in the program, and as at 26 July 24 there were a total of 46 prisoners receiving support via Beyond the Wire.

Prisoner rapid rehousing aims to create a pool of 12 dedicated properties, either private rentals or community-owned. As at 30 June 24, nine properties are tenanted through the rapid rehousing program to Beyond the Wire participants. Six prisoners were released from the TPS into rapid rehousing since January 24. Of the remaining three properties, two are currently unsuitable for tenancies due to owners deciding to sell, and the remaining property is only to be assigned to a prisoner over 60 years of age. We think we have a candidate flagged for that property soon.

Ms WEBB - The ones that are no longer suitable because they are going to be sold by the owners, is there an intention to maintain the number by seeking other properties to replace them?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - That would be a question - I will have to refer that, because that would go to a deed of engagement. The answer is yes.

Ms WEBB - What is the length of tenancy that people are - that is made available for people who are in those properties?

Ms OGILVIE - These properties are considered transitional properties, which means the lease operates for one year before each client is assisted to transition to alternative ongoing accommodation of our CentaCare Evolve Housing.

Ms WEBB - Do you have a line of sight in terms of the transition, where they are transitioned into, what tenure of housing?

Ms OGILVIE - I don't.

Ms WEBB - Or do I have to ask that under the housing thing?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I'm afraid so.

Ms WEBB - I'll ask it then.

CHAIR - Tomorrow.

Ms WEBB - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - I don't think we have that information.

Ms WEBB - That's fine. That's out of your hands by that stage.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - And it's a subsidised rent as well.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Madam Chair. Minister, I want to take you back to the custodial inspector's report: Adult Healthcare Inspection Report 2023, to page 200 and 201. We have just been told at the table that what the custodial inspector reports about a ban on a medical officer who was a member of the corrections primary health service was not a ban. On page 201 it says that, and now we know the inspection team was there at the time that this medical officer was, according to this report, told by a junior correctional officer that they were 'banned from entering the premises' with no explanation given. But the report states that the decision to ban this medical professional had been made by the Director of Prisons the day before.

We have been told at this table that this medical officer was not banned. It is stated here in black and white by the custodial inspector that the Director of Prisons did make that decision the day before, obviously had not conveyed it to the medical officer. I mean, I am baffled here, that we are being told black is not black. The question is, did the Director of Prisons, the day before this incident, make a decision not to allow this medical professional to enter Risdon Prison?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you for the question. It goes to those operational matters, so with the approval of the Chair I would ask to refer that for further detail if you have it.

Mr WISE - Yes. Through you, minister, as I have previously said, the issue was not one of a ban. There was an instruction given by the Director of Prisons that, when the doctor attended, that she was to be taken to another part of the prison, not her normal workplace, to have a discussion with the General Manager of the prison, and so the decision was made. I dispute that it was a ban. It was 'do not allow the doctor to go to her normal workplace, but instead let's have a meeting with her'. That is where I indicated everyone concedes it was handled really clumsily, but it wasn't a ban, and - notwithstanding the custodial inspector who has indicated in his report.

Ms O'CONNOR - I will point to what an email from the Director of Prisons to the Correctional Primary Health Service in his own words said to management, and this is on p200. 'If a professional from another agency cannot work constructively with us, I see little value in them having access, and indeed such behaviour causes greater risk of unrest for us all'. That is pretty clear, don't you think, that the Director of Prisons had told this medical officer's management that this person - that there was little value in them having access?

Mr WISE - Through you, minister, the meeting that was arranged was actually inside the prison. It can hardly be said that the doctor was banned from entering the prison. The arranged meeting was inside the prison. It was accessed through the normal workplace, and it was hoped that the matters would be resolved.

Ms O'CONNOR - Actually, I will need to correct you there, with respect. They were prevented from entering her normal workplace at the prison and diverted to a meeting room, as a result of a directive of the Director of Prisons.

Mr WISE - Through you, minister, that was the intention: to have that meeting and resolve the issues.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay. So -

CHAIR - Final question on this, because we need to move on.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay, Madam Chair. It is really important that we get some clarity here.

CHAIR - It is important, but we also need to move on.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes. What the custodial inspector says is that this event illustrates a number of issues about the pervasive culture at the prison. It also references a senior member of staff who was there at the time, minister, who said they were disgusted by what had happened and were ashamed to be wearing their uniform today. They said they were not surprised as 'they do this sort of thing'. And presumably - actually clearly, 'they' in this instance is prison management. What is your response to that observation about the culture at the prison, both from the custodial inspector and a senior staff member?

Ms OGILVIE - Are you happy to?

PUBLIC

Mr WISE - Through you, minister -

CHAIR - I think the question was to the minister, though. Your response, minister, not to the -

Ms OGILVIE - Well, let's would you like a response from both of us? I am happy for both of us to respond.

CHAIR - Was that correct, honourable member?

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, there is a shared responsibility for culture which has come in for some damning criticism in this custodial inspector's report. I am happy for the minister to make some observations about what she is doing to deal with this culture where apparently sort of arbitrary decisions are made, but also to refer it to -

Ms OGILVIE - I think both, an answer from both is helpful. Because I agree with you: there is shared responsibility. It is my expectation and desire and I'm putting personal energy into ensuring that our TPS service is respected, the people who work for the service are valued. I do that personally and I love to come and meet the people who are new recruits. I go to the graduations. The effort that we make with the people piece really matters, and I know that the senior management of the prison also feels that.

Ms O'CONNOR - Have you read this report, minister?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I have -

Ms O'CONNOR - The adult healthcare inspection report.

Ms OGILVIE - Also just to complete my sentence. I have read the report. The issue that you're discussing, and I also agree it is important and it is a serious question, but I do feel that the statement that the services made that the situation was managed clumsily is an accurate one and I know an apology has been made -

Ms O'CONNOR - Disrespectfully to that medical officer too, I would suggest.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, and I think an apology has been made. I think that's the appropriate step to take. It's very unfortunate that it happened, and I think, then I perhaps would ask you to speak a little bit more to the cultural piece which I know you're working on and take very seriously.

Mr WISE - Thank you, minister. Through you. I don't accept that there is a cultural issue in relation to this. But by the same token, I do accept that there were learnings for senior management out of the way that this matter was handled, and I think that the senior management team has taken all of those learnings on board.

Ms O'CONNOR - It won't happen again?

Mr WISE - It shouldn't ever happen again.

CHAIR - Thank you.

PUBLIC

Mr EDMUNDS - Thanks, minister. You told us earlier that the cost of the prison spent so far was \$7.212 million and you did provide the figure. I think it was about \$900,000 on consultants. Are you able to provide a further breakdown of that \$7.2 million?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me see what we can do.

CHAIR - Can that be tabled? Is it possible to have that tabled once you've read it of course.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Let's just read it and then see if you need more information. I can give you a bit more detail. Let's just see if this gives you what you need otherwise, we can do more if we need to. So as I said NCF project \$7.212 million across the three sites. So this was the entirety of the project. Total expenditure on consultancies up to 31 August was approximately \$950,000. Then by site, I think this is perhaps helpful. We have 135 Birralee Road from 2018-19, \$241,473 and then the 2019-20 year \$1,289,024, bringing us a total for that site of \$1,530,497. Then we have Brushy Creek 2020-21 the figure there is \$1,597,675 and the -

Mr EDMUNDS - Is that one million?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes \$1,597,675. Sorry, I was trying to break it down and make it easier for you to write.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes, thanks.

Ms OGILVIE - Then the 2021-22 year \$1,720,082. So for that site brings you to a total of \$3,317,758. Then the AYDC site 2022-23, \$1,355,518 and 2023-24, \$1,008,225 with a total of \$2,363,744. So that gives you site by site breakdown. Is that helpful? Hopefully that's helpful.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes, so those figures plus the \$900,000 on consultants should equal, bear with me, should equal that \$7.2 million? Or is there any other costs such as -

Ms OGILVIE - So I'm advised here that the total cost, your three figures that you have across those three sites should equal \$7.212 million with you -

Mr EDMUNDS - Right and with the consultancies embedded in those three?

Ms OGILVIE - With your - part embedded - architecture designs, lawyers, planning et cetera.

Mr EDMUNDS - And things like advertising as well? Is that included in that?

Ms OGILVIE - I think that's total cost. I could seek specifically if you need me to check that.

Mr EDMUNDS - A breakdown of the consultants might be helpful for the committee if it's able to be provided.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Can I just check how hard that is? I might be able to provide it now.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. You can come back later today even, if you want.

Ms OGILVIE - It might be helpful if I ask Colin Shepherd to come to the table, who has the information. Perhaps it's his moment in the spotlight to assist us. He might be able to help you with a bit more -

CHAIR - Welcome, Colin, thank you for joining us. Not sure if you'll ever get those years back in your life but anyway let's have a go.

Mr SHEPHERD - Through you, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you, Colin. Yes.

Mr SHEPHERD - Yes, I mean we will be able to provide those to the committee because we've got all of those figures. I probably will just say that part of the costs have obviously been around the project management. So we've had a small team within our strategic infrastructure projects group which have been responsible for delivery of this project. But as the minister's already alluded to, we've got the project management costs, we've got the consultants fees and then we've got legal fees. It is an all-inclusive figure so it's effectively everything that's been spent on that project.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Thank you.

Mr EDMUNDS - And that's fine if it takes a bit. We can always table it later -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. We're trying to get things to you today to make this the most effective use of time.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you. If that works for you it works for me.

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, I think Colin had one last comment.

Mr SHEPHERD - I was just going to say, through you, minister, we might just need a little bit more time than that. I mean because we'll have to go back a little bit in time just to pull out some of the figures.

Ms OGILVIE - Perhaps on notice then. Thank you.

CHAIR - Can I ask, minister, is there any of that \$7.2 million that's been spent, pretty much wasted to be perfectly frank -

Ms OGILVIE - I don't think wasted is the right phrase.

CHAIR - I think most people would argue the other but that's a point that we'll leave. Is there any of that \$7.2 million of the work that's been undertaken that will have any positive impact on rehabilitation services or something to address the northern aspect of those who require correction or rehabilitation facilities in the future? Is there any aspect of that?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Colin, may I ask you to make a comment?

Mr SHEPHERD - Through you, minister. I guess what I would say is, as the minister has already spoken about at a time when the Ashley site is vacated there is an opportunity that we would like to consider to go back to that site and look at repurposing the facility.

Ms O'CONNOR - That was a Greens' suggestion from a few years ago. I'm glad it's being looked at, Mr Shepherd.

Ms WEBB - The commission of inquiry explicitly said not to do that.

CHAIR - For an adult facility?

Ms WEBB - Yes.

Mr SHEPHERD - As I say that's something that we would certainly like to be able to do so therefore I would suggest -

Ms O'CONNOR - Better than the Westbury reserve -

Mr SHEPHERD - That all of the information that we've gathered on the Ashley site will be important. The other point that I'd make is we have found some information on the Ashley site in terms of some of the values that are there at the moment which would be quite important for the current managers to understand. We did an Aboriginal heritage survey where we identified some values, and that's resulted in an exclusion zone. From my perspective knowing that those values are there and knowing that they need to be avoided for any future works that are undertaken over the next few years by DSIP is a worthwhile exercise.

CHAIR - So possibly something out of the \$2.3 million cost but nothing out of the other five million at the other two sites will ever be of relevance to anyone anywhere anytime. Fair comment?

Ms OGILVIE - That's a very big statement.

CHAIR - Happy to be proven wrong.

Ms OGILVIE - Well let's hope. I like you very much but let's hope that the work that's been done is an iterative process and it provides better understanding, deeper understanding of what we can and need to do in the north. As I've said we are working very hard with what we've got and the resources we have to deploy with a legacy system that is old and with a great team doing our very best.

CHAIR - I know that you certainly weren't part of the original decision, but would you agree that kneejerk reactions coming out with possible projects just don't work. You need to have a very thorough thought process behind a particular announcement. I think that's really clear. Would you agree?

Ms OGILVIE - I, as a now quite experienced person in infrastructure land - I've been kicking around the private sector for quite a long time - have a view that projects are best landed when you have all stakeholders on board. That would be what I would lean into going forward.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - I think you agree with me.

Mr EDMUNDS - Just a question about another topic you were talking about earlier, the in-cell tablets. Could you just point us to where that is in the Budget papers, please?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. It's in a global figure, but I do have some granular detail I can give you. I'll ask Colin Shepherd perhaps if he could detail some of that for us.

Mr SHEPHERD - Yes. It's in the Budget under the Risdon Prison construction program. So as -

CHAIR - Capital investment.

Mr SHEPHERD - As the minister's alluded to. It's a global figure, so there's \$5,730,000 in the first year, \$9,160,000 in the second year and a million in the third year. So within that budget line, there's a number of projects that'll be rolled out including the in cell technology.

Mr EDMUNDS - Appreciate the answer. Thank you.

CHAIR - Another question, Ms Webb, on 3.1 and then we'll move to community corrections. Minister, I think it's pretty clear that we won't get that completed before the morning tea break, so we will come back and do some more community corrections and perhaps condense some of the others.

Ms OGILVIE - I'm in your hands.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms WEBB - Thank you, Chair. I had two questions on the areas covered but again touching to the custodial inspector space. One is around the report that came out in August this year, the inhumane treatment in dry cells review report, which you'd be well aware of, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I am.

Ms WEBB - That was initiated after a TPS staff member raised concerns with the custodial inspector's office, which is an excellent demonstration that staff feel that they can raise concerns through that avenue.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, good culture.

Ms WEBB - It's an important avenue. Minister, I think you would, I would assume, agree with me that the custodial inspector's review found that conditions in the dry cells breached the first of the Nelson Mandela rules. That's pretty clear from the report. I also note that these matters tie back to issues we've been talking about since the 91 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody which had recommendations about similar necessity to put prisoners only in areas where they can raise alarms in cases of emergency. The questions are, will you be implementing all the recommendations made in the report and can you please

provide an update of implementation progress as well as a timeframe for any that are not yet completed?

Ms OGILVIE - Very happy to provide that information to you. I just want to be clear that it's absolutely my strong expectation that safety and security as well as strong human rights protections must both be achieved. We absolutely have to get this right, we have to get the balance right. I've made this very clear to our TPS and I am advised that they've commenced work on implementing the recommendations to which you refer that have been made in the latest report. Just for those who might be watching or those who don't know dry cells.

So dry cell management involves the isolation and observation of a prisoner suspected of internally concealing items, specifically contraband usually such as drugs, mobile phones and weapons. This is an issue that corrective services worldwide wrestle with, how do you recover secreted contraband but at the same time do this humanely and safely.

One of the greatest risks to the operation of safe and secure facilities is the introduction of movement of contraband, which you would understand. If it was a weapon, of course, we don't want that. It would pose a danger not just to staff but also to other prisoners, so it's a serious issue. Ingesting, inserting or otherwise concealing items on or in the body -

Ms WEBB - Minister, I'm mindful of time. Chair, I'm not sure if we can just get to the question.

Ms OGILVIE - It's an established method of getting contraband into -

Ms WEBB - Actually we don't really need an editorial about the topic.

Ms OGILVIE - I'm just trying to answer your question.

Ms WEBB - No, you're not answering our question, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, I am trying to answer your question.

Ms WEBB - If you don't mind, could you answer the question?

Ms OGILVIE - Well, I'm trying to. So to ensure -

Ms WEBB - No, you're just describing the report.

Ms OGILVIE - No. I've answered your question. I could just stop. The answer is -

Ms WEBB - I did ask for an implementation progress on the recommendations and any

-

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, we're working through those recommendations.

Ms WEBB - timeframe for any partially implemented.

Ms OGILVIE - What is the final part of your question? The timeframe for?

Ms WEBB - Progress on implementing the recommendations, and that means not just a vague statement that they're being implemented but an indication about which ones have been and point to specifics. Any that are not yet completed, a timeframe for their completion.

Ms OGILVIE - Sure. I'll answer the first part of that question and then I will ask for the timeframe for completion piece by way of referral, just to give you notice. I did want to also just say in relation to the reason we have dry cells and the human rights challenge that we're dealing with, and I do know and appreciate that you're concerned about this human rights aspect, as am I as a former defence lawyer.

We now have body scanners which have improved the situation. They are able to detect objects on or inside a person's body and clothing without the need to remove items of clothing or make physical contact with the person being searched. These, I believe, are up and running and are being used successfully. So at that point, perhaps I would ask for an update on the -

Ms WEBB - Some timeframes.

Ms OGILVIE - When the recommendations timeframes and then perhaps whatever other comments you think would be helpful.

Mr WISE - Thank you, minister. Through you. Some of the recommended changes have already been implemented. So things such as the lights being on 24 hours, we were able to stop that immediately. We've tried to remove people from those dry cells and put them into other cells where they can be closely observed, so the same outcome but in a different cell. And then there are some capital works that need to be done for things such as installing emergency call -

Ms WEBB - A way to raise alarm, yes.

Mr WISE - And so on, which might take some time. But we hope that we'd be able to do that within the next six months. But we do have some other options in different parts of the prison where we can place prisoners who are suspected of secreting contraband and to observe them appropriately. The difficulty will be if we have a large number of those people, how to spread them across the site in appropriate facilities where they can't pass the contraband or the suspected contraband onto other people.

Ms WEBB - Do those other options that you've got - through you, minister - do those other options have ways that people can raise alarm if necessary and are they observed more frequently, which were two of the key issues, I think, with the dry cells.

Mr WISE - Through you, minister. Yes, they have intercoms and they are more closely observed.

Ms WEBB - Has the recommendation that dry cells are not effective treatment for female prisoners been implemented and how many female inmates are placed in dry cells, say, over the last two years?

Ms OGILVIE - I don't know if we'd have that information at hand.

Mr WISE - Through you, minister. I don't have that information. But it is one of those issues that the custodial inspector doesn't turn his mind to about what the appropriate management of somebody who is detected as having something secreted within them, how to best do that if you don't use a dry cell or a dry cell equivalent. We'd be very happy if someone had access to water and flushed the contraband down the toilet.

But if somebody persists in not surrendering the contraband, we are left with the concern about do you take that person out of that restrictive environment and let them into the general population where, if they share the drugs, we could get somebody conceivably dying from an overdose, or do you maintain them in a restrictive environment. They're things that that report doesn't turn its mind to. It's stuff that we're still grappling with. As we detect more contraband that is internally secreted through the use of body scanners, it's likely to be an issue that we encounter more frequently.

Ms WEBB - So in terms of female inmates, have women been placed in dry cells across the last two years and can you give me the data on that?

Mr WISE - Through you, minister. I don't have that data. What I can tell you is that we identified a female prisoner coming through the Hobart Reception Prison just the other day with some contraband secreted, and we managed her in a way that that contraband was surrendered or disposed of, and when we retested her she no longer had that contraband on her. So the body scanners have already proved their value, I think, through that process.

Ms WEBB - I'm interested in some data on them. May I put that as a question on notice to you?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Let's keep it very specific. What do you want?

Ms WEBB - I am interested in the use of dry cells essentially over the last two years, particularly for female inmates, but also I would like to collect it for male inmates as well.

Ms OGILVIE - For what, how many people have been in dry cells?

Ms WEBB - Yes, how often has it been used.

CHAIR - Thank you. Before I go to Ms O'Connor, which is the last question in this area, can we have the up-to-date costs per prisoner per day? The target was \$470, so I am interested in whether - what were the actual -

Ms OGILVIE - That is our actual figure, \$472.

CHAIR - \$472?

Ms OGILVIE - That's what I'm advised, yes.

CHAIR - Okay.

Mr EDMUNDS - Just quickly on that, does that include health costs?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - I would need to check that, but health is provided through the Health Department.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay, so it does. Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - So yes.

Mr EDMUNDS - No worries.

CHAIR - Okay. Thank you.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Chair. Minister, I have some questions about the TPS response to questions regarding historic non-application of the transgender prisoner policy. An ABC article of May 7 this year questions whether the TPS has implemented adequately their 2009 transgender prisoner policy. The TPS responded to that article by saying its policy had been implemented in 2009 because prisoners were able to self-identify as transgender during intake interviews, but the TPS did not respond to a question about whether inmates were asked their gender or sex or if they had to raise it proactively. We would like this question answered. I would also like to know why there was a refusal to answer this question when it was put by journalists, and were people informed of the existence of this policy as well as their rights under it?

Ms OGILVIE - So three questions. Firstly, has the policy been implemented? And secondly -

Ms O'CONNOR - Implemented. Why didn't the TPS answer the journalist's questions about whether people were informed of their rights and given some choices. And are people told of the existence of this policy and their rights under it?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, okay. I am very happy to - if that's okay we will refer that and then we will pick it up as we go through. The first question, I think, was has the policy been implemented.

Ms O'CONNOR - Fully implemented.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, and perhaps a description of how the policy works from the process side, yes.

Mr WISE - Sorry, yes, and through you, minister. The policy is clear: it has been publicly available for some time, but it is under review. And we are going through a process of working through a committee to examine the current policy, and I think that where we will get to with that is in the first instance the establishment of a panel which includes some gender diverse people.

Ms O'CONNOR - Great.

Mr WISE - To have a look at individual cases. Because the cases invariably are challenging from one perspective or another in terms of the safety of the individual person or others housed in the prison in which they seek to be managed. They are complex issues,

generally. They are very, very rarely straightforward and a panel, I think, will assist us in resolving those issues.

Ms O'CONNOR - I'm sorry, with respect and through you, minister, are you saying that a panel would make those decisions on the application of the policy, or the panel is there to review the policy so that it is more responsive, if you like, to the needs of transgender inmates?

Mr WISE - Through you, minister, it would be considering applications or cases to provide advice to the TPS.

Ms O'CONNOR - I see.

Mr WISE - In accordance with the policy.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay. You would have people presumably with the necessary expertise as well as lived experience on a panel like that?

Ms OGILVIE - I can help just with that bit, because I thought you might be going there. Just to give you a little update, that the policy which is under review is being done in close consultation with the Department of Justice LGBTQI+ reference group, with whom you would be familiar, and we will be retitled the Transgender and Gender-Diverse Prisoners Policy when finalised.

Ms O'CONNOR - When will that be?

Ms OGILVIE - I don't have that information. Do we know when it will be final? Yes, please, can I ask Kristy to make some comments?

Ms BOURNE - Thanks, minister, through you. So as the minister noted, this has been a key priority of our gender-diverse - sorry, the gender-diverse prisoner policy has been a key priority of our LGBTQIA+ reference group, and I put on the record the time and commitment that those community members have made to informing the current draft. I feel that we are very, very close. We are just consolidating some further feedback from our reference group. I think we are up to about draft 16 of that policy before it goes - well, before it is formally handed over to the TPS to implement.

Noting that the undertaking I have given to our reference group is that as it is implemented, there is a point of reference back to that group, in the event that any further refinements need to be made to that policy. I would really like to be able to hand over the policy, so to speak, from the reference group to the TPS before the end of this calendar year.

CHAIR - Thank you. We will have 10 minutes of Community Corrective Services and then we will have a 12-minute break.

3.2 Community Correction Services

Ms ARMITAGE - Community Correction Services. Minister, I notice on page 168 of our budget book, table 5.10, Community Correction next year has a substantial increase, which I understand, looking at the footnote - so funding for [inaudible], but also funding for an increase in programs for offenders, nonoffenders, and the Community Correction electronic

PUBLIC

monitoring expansion. So electronic monitoring expansion: how many do we have now, and how many shall we have in the future? I see that there is a \$1 million increase in the next couple of budgets until we get to 2027-28 when we go backwards.

Ms OGILVIE - Would it be acceptable to the table if I brought Chris Carney into the table, because I think we're moving into the next power point. Thank you, Chris Carney will be able to be quite specific about these issues. Thank you for joining us.

CHAIR - Thank you, Chris. That's great.

Ms OGILVIE - I will just have Chris here, because there is some amazing work that is happening. I will see what I can do to answer your question but I think also it's helpful to hear from the frontline. Community Corrections. Now just to be clear about your question, was it how many ankle bracelets we have?

Ms ARMITAGE - How many electronic devices do we have currently? And I notice, as it says in the footnote, that part of the increase - not all of the increase, but part of the increase, is to increase the electronic monitoring program.

Ms OGILVIE - The monitoring program, yes.

Ms ARMITAGE - Expansion. I am just wondering what we are actually increasing to, that's the first part of my question.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, happy to do that. From my perspective it is a world-leading program. I am really proud of the work that Community Corrections does. Good technology, good deployment of technology, and we want and need to do more. I will ask Chris, perhaps, if he would like to talk about the details of what that looks like specifically around what we are currently doing, how many we have, what the remit is across the state and where to from here. Together with a little commentary around other jurisdictions that are coming to learn from us. Thank you, Chris.

Mr CARNEY - Sure. Through you, minister, so we currently have this - as of this morning it was 233 devices which are currently fitted to people. The majority of those are on perpetrators, but included in that is 54 devices that are given to -

Ms ARMITAGE - Family violence people, is it?

Mr CARNEY - Family violence victims.

Ms ARMITAGE - Victims, yes, that's what I was thinking, yes.

Mr CARNEY - I actually have devices if you want to have a look at them, because I have brought a little bit of show and tell. I thought that this could be fun.

CHAIR - Which members can have a look at during the break.

Mr CARNEY - Yes, yes. So there's a couple of things with it. About 65 per cent of our parolees, at least in the commencement of their orders, and then the Parole Board works to transition them through the need for those devices to continue. We also have 43 family

violence perpetrators. So you will notice there that we have more victims than perpetrators who have devices issued. There is a couple of reasons for that. To begin with we have a couple of victims who have been independently identified as high-risk victims by the police, who the police would want to respond to if they raise an issue. There are also victim devices that can be issued to extended family members of a protected person.

Ms ARMITAGE - Okay. It might just not be a victim; it might be a victim and a child. Or a family member.

Mr CARNEY - Yes, but we certainly provide those. And then we have our home detention numbers as well. We have about 50 of them at the moment and we have high-risk offender orders that some of them contain electronic monitoring. The courts have determined that others don't need to. The courts have determined that others don't need to. So there's a bit of a mix in there. I suppose one of the questions that was asked was around how does that look to expand. One of the things we've recently done is had a look at the home detention monitoring model that we have in place.

The program's been in place for about five years, just over five years now. It's been really successful. We've done lots of good things. The court's very happy. They continue to make orders, but the orders have been coming down recently. One of the issues that we have found with home detention is that we only offer a single door to the courts, or until very recently we've only really offered a single door around what a home detention model can look like. The legislation that was passed is actually quite progressive in that courts can tailor these orders.

Ms ARMITAGE - What do you mean by a single door?

Mr CARNEY - So the courts can tailor these orders to meet the risks and the needs of the person but until very very recently community corrections has been managing a model that just looked like a 24/7 lockdown at home and if you ever needed to leave home you needed an approval from a probation officer and it had to be for a very defined number of reasons to be able to leave home. So that was 24/7. The challenge that comes with that from our perspective, and, sorry, you had to give us a week in advance notice around where you were going to be and what your life looked like. I find it tough to figure out where I'm going to be in a weeks' time. A lot of people on orders find that really difficult.

It also made it quite challenging for people who have different kinds of employment activities. As a good example a taxi driver would find it difficult to tell me where they're going to be in a weeks' time so that I can plan ahead, and we can make the arrangements on our system for that. So that made it difficult and the other challenge that we had with it is that there's certain lifestyle factors that people have that made it really challenging for them to be on this order. The easy one I try and tell people about with that is a single parent with childcare responsibilities. It can be really difficult to kind of get ahead of all of the commitments and keeping those people in this very strict lockdown model in some ways puts their children on the order as well which is not what we're hoping to do.

Ms ARMITAGE - Can I just ask - so that's the model we've always had in Tasmania? Because as has been mentioned about South Australia before, a very different model in my understanding in other areas and I would've thought that this could be the same in Tasmania, that if you have a device and you have home detention there is an area, not necessarily having to advise, that they can actually look – the people in that room that can dial up and see - they

can see where you are. You're in your geographic area that you can stay. So we don't have a model like that, that geographically people can stay within the northern region, for example?

Ms OGILVIE - We do, and I'll get Chris to pick up on that again. I think where he was headed was that -

Ms ARMITAGE - It's a very strict model this particular one.

Ms OGILVIE - Well sort of, and I'll get Chris to talk about the geographic monitoring issue. But what I think he was about to lean into was a more contemporary approach that we've been designing and the opportunities that are now available through the use of different types of technology to have a better approach that has more agility to it.

Mr CARNEY - Yes, through you, minister, and I think there were a couple of things there. So this is a model of home detention. The model that you're talking about where we have exclusion zones and people are allowed to travel within broad areas and all of that – we managed different kinds of orders under that model. So parole orders for instance may have very limited requirements around where they're supposed to be. But for a home detention model this was the model that we had put in place initially and we had been working through.

There were some challenges with it, and I think everyone saw the challenges after we had implemented it. So we undertook a review and community corrections really drove a review, and we developed up a range of alternative models that we can offer to the courts to support them to be able to make a model of home detention that is more fit for purpose for the person. What we're really trying to do is – the legislation's quite broad in how it allows courts to tailor orders so we're trying to just catch up and be able to support the courts to make those tailored kinds of intervention orders that are really appropriate for the offender for their life circumstances, for their criminogenic needs and for their lifestyle factors.

We really want to support them in their reintegration journey and I think the challenge we have - well it's not a challenge - but with these alternate models that we've come up with what we're able to do is really focus in on what are the criminogenic risks that we are trying to manage through this order and how is that going to best support someone to be in the community and be kind of a contributing, engaged member of the community. So that's why we've come up with these alternate models. Those models have - we've got them through to the courts and we're starting to make assessments on them. So we're going to start to see those flow through.

So when you're asking about what do we anticipate this to look like we're trying to broaden the scope of what home detention in particular looks like so that the courts can more freely use it, and they can have a broader scope in terms of compliance and rehabilitation support when they're developing an order that's really tailored to the needs of the person.

CHAIR - Thank you, I think in light of the honourable member's coughing we need to suspend for morning tea. We will be back two minutes before 20 past: 18 minutes past ready to start again. Thank you.

The committee suspended from 11.05 am. to 11.20pm.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Welcome everyone back and hope that the member for Launceston is not going to have a coughing fit. Thank you. Did you have another question on the monitoring bracelets.

Ms ARMITAGE - Yes. We were still answering my other questions about how many - that's what we have now and the money that we actually have coming. How many more are we going to purchase? Also, it might be good to explain the new alcohol one that had the first one fitted this week. Sorry minister, through you.

CHAIR - The minister might pull her microphone around.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I am in complete agreement with you. I think it's a really interesting area plus we're leading the nation.

Ms ARMITAGE - Very interesting.

Ms OGILVIE - So I'm really happy. Chris, if you'd be happy to give that overview. I know you have enthusiasm for the technology side, and it is a good story.

CHAIR - Yes. As brief as possible, thank you, Chris.

Ms OGILVIE - Then particularly the small one and the alcohol one and how it will fit with the work we're doing with the magistrate's courts.

Mr CARNEY - Sure. So I might go through and show the committee - we were talking about victim-survivors being issued with a device. This is a device that we issue them with. It has a clip. It charges very simply. That's all it is. They plug it in. This allows victim-survivors to carry the device with them or to choose not to if they don't want us to know their whereabouts at all times. It is GPS monitored. It also has a duress alarm, so they just press each side, and it comes immediately through us and we escalate it through to the police. We have a monitoring centre that we use.

The good thing about these devices is that they can be linked to an ankle monitoring device that's worn by a perpetrator. We can make sure that they don't come into proximity. It also allows us to set up alerts around - sometimes family violence orders can say you can't go within a certain distance of a victim so we can make sure that that occurs.

This is the standard ankle monitoring device. It fits onto a perpetrator to the ankle with a little strap. The strap has a fibre-optic cable in it to link for each side of the device. If that fibre-optic connection is ever frustrated, we get an alert on our system and we can manage those immediately. The straps frustrate being removed. It would require 185 kilograms, we're told, to rip it off. But they are able to be cut. It's difficult to cut them but they are able to be cut and that's just to allow paramedics if they ever need to get a device off for jaws of life or anything like that.

So that's what that is. When I was going through the devices on perpetrators these are the ones that are fitted to them and then lastly - sorry, I do want to give one part of this. This is really amazing technology. We signed a contract initially with Buddy Pty Ltd who is a UK supplier. That was almost six years ago now and we signed on another contract with them just this year. The minister did. They will be continuing to supply our technology for the coming

five years and they provide the technology. They also provide us access to the system to be able to monitor it here in our monitoring unit in Tasmania.

This is an additional device that we have, that Buddy has released, and we have fitted our first person with this device yesterday. It's a little bit larger than the normal one. It does do the GPS monitoring. We can link it to other devices, so it does the same thing. The additional thing that this device does is it also tests for metabolised alcohol. So through skin contact it will test someone's sweat to see whether they're metabolising alcohol so that we can manage some of those abstinence conditions that can come across on parole and other types of orders. It's a new technology. It's not going to be for everybody but for those people who require it to support greater community safety outcomes it's really valuable technology that we're jumping on board with right now. So that's really great.

Ms ARMITAGE - And the number that we're increasing to with the extra funding?

Ms OGILVIE - What will the extra funding do? Chris, are you able to respond to that?

Mr CARNEY - We don't actually have a cap at the moment for these devices. We're on a bit of a sliding scale when we're paying for the devices. The first ones come at one cost and then it goes down after we get 400 and 600. They will supply a significant additional number, but we haven't limited the ability of courts or the parole board to make orders with these conditions at this point. There is a cap that we have in terms of the family violence numbers. That was originally set up under the Project Vigilance funding, so that was 100 devices. They've never hit that. They've never come back to us and said, 'We need more'. I think the reason for that, I have to say is really just because this technology is really beneficial and it's great for the police to be able to identify those highest risk people, both in terms of perpetrators and victims. So that when they get the calls through and when situations start to escalate, they know that these are the ones they need to respond to immediately. So establishing that definition.

Ms ARMITAGE - To keep them out of jail.

Mr CARNEY - It really does keep people out of jail. It gets us ahead of making sure those high-risk victims are kept as safe as possible in the community. There was a review undertaken on the Project Vigilance program as well that was tabled in parliament in November 2021. They'd actually spoke to victims and said, 'How's it going', and that the feedback from that was that they felt significantly safer just because they were able to carry these devices just because they knew someone was at the other end of the line, just because - so it's not even just the actual safety. It's the feelings of safety that this sort of technology is continuing to deliver.

Ms ARMITAGE - Thank you. The \$3 million, minister? What exactly is that - the extra \$3 million in the budget.

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, that's what Chris was just talking about.

Ms ARMITAGE - Yes, but he didn't really specify where the \$3 million was actually going.

Ms OGILVIE - Systems upgrades, et cetera. Chris, if it's all right with you, would you mind -

Ms ARMITAGE - What was it all for, Chris? Because you did mention Astria as well.

Ms OGILVIE - Chris, would you mind actually just specifying some detail in relation to the granularity.

Ms ARMITAGE - Just to see where we're getting some of the money - where it's actually going - is it in staffing?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, more specifically - is that you're asking?

Ms ARMITAGE - You'd say that the more we buy, so we've got \$3 million. What are we actually doing with it?

Mr CARNEY - The additional million dollars that's gone to electronic monitoring -

Ms ARMITAGE - So a million on them. We've got two left.

Mr CARNEY - So it's a million a year. Is that what I understand?

Ms ARMITAGE - Well there's three in the first year. We've gone from 2019 up to 2022 and obviously that includes Astria as well.

Mr CARNEY - Sorry. No. There's also the sex offender - the context in the high risk -

Ms OGILVIE - The offender treatment program.

Ms ARMITAGE - I was wondering about the three million. That was all. So you got a million of it?

Mr CARNEY - No. I'm getting more than a million of it, which is good. There is a million dollars for electronic monitoring that we're going to be focusing on increasing the number of devices that we can have and that we can supervise and manage.

CHAIR - Welcome to the table, Gavin. We're familiar with Gavin.

Ms OGILVIE - Okay, so I think it would be helpful if you want to get to the granular that we'll get Gavin to give you a bit of a breakdown.

Ms ARMITAGE - I noticed it's a \$3 million increase and you know we look at footnotes 1 and 13, and it was interesting to know where it was going.

Ms OGILVIE - Happy to do that. Through you, Kristy.

Mr WAILE - Through you, minister. So as the director of community corrections has outlined, there's an extra million dollars there for electronic monitoring, effectively. The majority of the additional funding relates to the allocation of the Astria.

Ms ARMITAGE - Right. So the majority goes to Astria.

PUBLIC

Mr WAILE - Operational funding. That's been split across the four major outputs which are community corrections, the TPS, the supreme court and the magistrate's court in quarters.

Ms ARMITAGE - No, that's good. It was getting an understanding of how much was Astria and how much was the monitoring. Thank you, Chair. I've got more later.

Mr WAILE - It's probably worth adding as well that there is some of the build costs including within Justice Connect as well, which is included across those four outputs. There's the operational component and also the Justice Connect project were added costs as well.

CHAIR - I'm always interested in how many people we have on community orders and how much supervision there is available. We know it's been a challenging area, minister, for some time particularly in the more rural and remote areas to be able to fulfill their community orders obligations.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I am able to provide you with that information. We have community correction orders, offender numbers are 1167.

CHAIR - And how they're spread?

Ms OGILVIE - I'll just seek some advice. Sorry, Chris, thank you.

We spoke specifically about community correction orders, but there is a range of orders, so I will perhaps give you all the different orders. The offender numbers: 1999, and then in relation to orders which includeS community correction orders, parole, drug treatment orders, home detention, CS (community service) and other, those range with community corrections from 1167, 117 on parole, 62 on drug treatment orders, 42 on home detention, 1005 on community service orders and six on other.

CHAIR - The community service orders are the ones that I am more interested in -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, that's what I thought you were saying.

CHAIR - how they are being able to complete their obligation, particularly in more rural and remote areas because of having to have that supervisory role.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, thank you. I might ask through Kristy to get a bit more information from Chris.

Ms BOURNE - Certainly. I'm very happy for Chris to talk to that, minister.

Mr CARNEY - Hello, Ms Rattray. Thank you for the questions.

CHAIR - You know I am interested in this. This is my retirement job.

Mr CARNEY - The interest you have is in relation to whether we have projects out to more rural and remote locations. So yes, and I am perfectly happy to have a chat with you about where we do have them in some of those more rural and remote locations. What is really important for us to talk about is that from a Community Corrections perspective we accept orders from the court, and we try to action those. Community service is such an important

opportunity for people to be able to reinvest in their community and for them to be able to - I think the most important thing that we can do with community is -

CHAIR - Self-worth?

Mr CARNEY - The most important thing that we can do with community service is to get people to feel a part of their community and to feel pride in their community, and to give them something that is tangible. That they can walk past every day and kind of go, 'You know what, I played a part in that change. I played a part in that activity'. Why I bring that up is because we have a community service program that works across the state and occasionally that means that we find somebody who gets a community service order in a place that is very remote or it is very out of the way, that we may not necessarily have a project site existing today.

What I want to give you confidence about, and the rest of the committee, is that it is really our role from that place to go 'what is a community service project this person can do in their local community that is going to give them some of those investment outcomes'. The project site roster that we have, it fluctuates, yes? It fluctuates in response to - if we do not have anyone in a location, we don't maintain a project site in that location because it is actually - it can be quite challenging for people - no, not challenging. People have to talk to me to maintain a project site.

We have to go in and do a workplace health and safety assessment regularly. We have to do all of this sort of stuff, and if they are not getting any value from work for it, it is not really worth their time or investment to be maintained as a project site. We let them drop off and we pick them back up again. Sometimes we may not have an existing project site in some of those more regional or rural or remote locations, but we do have capacity to pick them up if and when we need them. The easy answer to your question, sorry, is you are - see, now I have lost everything.

Ms OGILVIE - I have some additional information that I think would help, if I might chip in? This is in relation to the orders and what they are working on and the hours that they have been able to address.

CHAIR - I was really interested in whether you are able to facilitate right across the state?

Mr CARNEY - Yes.

CHAIR - So the answer is yes?

Ms OGILVIE - The answer is yes.

Mr CARNEY - Sorry, and through you, minister?

Ms OGILVIE - Please go.

Mr CARNEY - For instance the question you raise almost every year, I think, is do we have one on Cape Barren. We do currently have one on Cape Barren. We don't have one on

PUBLIC

King Island this year, whereas other years we have had. It just fluctuates, because we don't have an order on King Island that we are currently managing.

CHAIR - The challenge that I have been aware of in the past is providing that supervisory role, and we used to have community members who were keen to put their hand up to take part. Is that still the case?

Mr CARNEY - We run the - sorry, minister. Through you.

Ms OGILVIE - No, no, it's good. I am going to put a little statement on the top when you're finished.

Mr CARNEY - So we run the community service project in a couple of different ways, and one of them is through self-serviced sites. For some of those more regional or remote locations, we might partner in with an existing community organisation to actually -

CHAIR - Like the council or something like that?

Mr CARNEY - Yes, or Vinnies, or something that is actually local run.

CHAIR - Community House?

Mr CARNEY - A non-government organisation on-site and they would manage the actual supervision and work of the person. For locations that are closer to town, we do have community service supervisors who actually go out and manage sites. Then there is also some education sites as well that we use. We have a patchwork -

CHAIR - A mix, yes.

Mr CARNEY - of available avenues, just to make sure that we are targeting the right needs for the right people.

CHAIR - I am pleased to hear that, because I think it is a really positive program.

Ms OGILVIE - It is, thank you.

CHAIR - I am just keen to make sure that it is still underway in the communities.

Ms OGILVIE - Absolutely. Could I just add to that, that I agree with you. It is a really important program and a lot of energy and effort goes into making sure that it works.

CHAIR - When Chris has anything to do with it, of course it has energy.

Ms OGILVIE - The energy is great, because we need that. I wanted to lay on the record very quickly the number of orders and what has been completed. Community Corrections was able to complete 392 orders with the community service component in the 2023-24 financial year, which equates to 25,118 hours of community service having been acquitted. In the same period, the court branded 492 new community-based orders requiring a total of 31,138 hours of community service to be completed. Thousands and thousands of hours of unpaid work for

PUBLIC

almost 120 community groups across Tasmania, charities, not for profits, organisations, schools, churches, councils. Big tick.

CHAIR - Thank you, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Pleasure, pleasure.

CHAIR - Any other questions, members? If not, we will move quickly to - you have done a great job.

Capital investment, any questions? We have sort of talked about capital investment and that is it.

Ms OGILVIE - I do have the worker's comp data.

CHAIR - Can we have the worker's comp data? Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - I am very keen to get that in. The worker's comp data, I don't recall who asked that question. Settled claims was the question. 2023-24 we have 20 claims settled; they are TPS claims. I might have mentioned 24, but it is 20. I want to make sure I have that correct.

CHAIR - Twenty, thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - And in the 2024-25 year, six claims settled year to date.

CHAIR - All right, thank you. Before we leave this area, on behalf of the committee, I acknowledge the former Director of Prisons, Ian Thomas and thank him for the time that he has presented to not only this committee -

Ms OGILVIE - I know. What a legacy.

CHAIR - but other areas that we have chosen to provide some inquiry into at a previous time. We sincerely wish him all the best in his new role with the Health Department.

Ms OGILVIE - We will absolutely pass that on.

CHAIR - I am sure he is probably watching.

Ms OGILVIE - He may not be.

Mr GAFFNEY - Everyone's watching.

Ms OGILVIE - Of course everyone is watching. Thank you so much. I thank everybody who was helped.

CHAIR - We shall have a brief suspension while we change people at the table to prepare for the Minister for Science and Technology.

The Committee suspended from 11.39 a.m. to 11.42 a.m.

CHAIR - Minister, would you please introduce those who you have with you at the table and provide us with, as usual, the brief overview under your responsibility as the Minister for Science and Technology. Thank you.

DIVISION 9

(Department of Premier and Cabinet)

Minister for Science and Technology

Output group 3

Electronic Services for Government Agencies and the Community

3.1 Information, Technology and Digital Services Strategy and policy Development

Ms OGILVIE - Very happy to do that. Can I just confirm with you, Chair, how much time we have for this output?

CHAIR - About 15 minutes.

Ms OGILVIE - Really?

CHAIR - Well, 20 if you like. We'll keep going.

Ms OGILVIE - Okay. Well, it's not up to me. I am very happy to introduce everybody. We have Dr Justin Thurley, Tasmanian chief information officer, digital strategy and services, Department of Premier and Cabinet; Malcolm Smith, manager, Tasmanian government cybersecurity, digital strategy and services, DPAC; Jenna Cairney, deputy secretary, business and jobs, Department of State Growth; and we also have Noelene Kelly from community and government services, dep sec; Dennis Hendriks, executive director, Business Tasmania, Department of State Growth. We have the brains trust in the room, I hope.

Would you like me to just go straight into opening statement?

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - The last time we got together to discuss this portfolio, I was very pleased to advise that our science and technology sectors contribute more than \$1 billion in gross state product. I'm pleased to say this year, Estimates suggest that this figure is around \$2 billion, and of this around \$300 million can be attributed to the science section and \$1.7 billion to ICT, with each directly employing approximately 4000 Tasmanians.

In science, we're proud to continue our support for events like National Science Week, Science Meets Parliament, the Annual STEM Awards, and last year these three events saw around 20,000 people get directly involved in science in one form or another. We are proud to continue to partner with key organisations including UTAS, CSIRO, the Antarctic Division and the Menzies Institute for Medical Research.

In ICT, we continue to focus on workforce development and growth. Now, we know there are approximately 10,000 Tasmanian technology workers employed across our economy,

and this number is projected to grow to more than 12,300 by 2027. Additionally, it's estimated that almost every Tasmanian worker, every Tasmanian worker, will need some reskilling as technology completely transforms our economy.

That's why it's vital that we continue to work closely with the industry through their peak representative bodies, TasICT and the Australian Computer Society, on skills development. In May we signed the first ever Tasmanian technology industry skills compact, which is a great step forward, and this work is setting up the industry for a stronger future by supporting that workforce development, skills and training in the short-, medium- and long-term.

I want to touch on the subsea cable issue, which I know has been in the news lately, or is subject of some discussion. Whilst it was incredibly disappointing that the Australian Government was unable or unwilling to support the connection of the proposed HyperOne subsea data cable to Tasmania, I want to be very clear that the Tasmanian government has committed \$11.5 million towards making that connectivity happen. This is a project that I've been working on in some detail. That investment and ensuring connectivity to Tasmania and making sure - I know you have an interest in this, as we all do.

Mr EDMUNDS - Well, we tried to ask the Premier about yesterday.

Ms OGILVIE - It's my remit.

Mr EDMUNDS - I'm sure he gave you the heads up.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, great. I'm happy to do a deep dive with you on it.

Ms O'CONNOR - It's a very long introduction, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Our aim is to ensure that telecommunications infrastructure is at a level of quality, reliability and performance required by the Tasmanian community, education, business and government services. These opportunities are rare. We're ready to co-invest on new subsea cable proposals if and when the right opportunity arose. I've certainly been pushing for that to occur. Thank you.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you, minister. A lot of what you said will probably be part of what we talk about now.

Ms OGILVIE - Great. Okay, good.

Mr EDMUNDS - As you pointed out, there's the huge growth both in terms of jobs numbers and in the economy more broadly. Access to reliable connectivity infrastructure is critical for all Tasmanians, business, government, education, consumers.

Ms OGILVIE - I agree. Yes.

Mr EDMUNDS - As you refer to, the announcement from SUBCO did not include Tasmania. Can you take us through why we are not connected to this cable?

Ms OGILVIE - Good question. I think we're all in heated agreement that connectivity is incredibly important, so I'm grateful for your question. It's an issue that we're hypervigilant and focused on. I've been personally and our government has been a strong advocate to see its instigation and completion. First, let me say that we are taking action as a government to broadly ensure our telecommunications infrastructure is at a level of quality, reliability and performance required by the Tasmania community, business and government. So that's on every range. We've got black spot programs, we've got projects and programs on digital engagement, all sorts of areas of the digital economy.

We all remember in 2022 the disruption that occurred with our inability to access digital services as a result of damage to Telstra's fiberoptic subsea cable, which really did bring home and highlight the risks to everybody that we understand more about the necessity of fiberoptic subsea cables which do deliver communications, both internet, mobile and fixed line telephone. In response, we stepped in and worked with HyperOne, Australia's first national fibre backhaul network, to explore an additional subsea cable link to Tasmania. The state made a commitment of \$11.5 million to support the project, subject to Australian Government co-investment. Let me say that \$11.5 million commitment is still there. We need a project that will work and we need the feds to come on board, which they have refused to do.

This funding was earmarked to improve Tasmania's digital connectivity and deliver an additional subsea cable link landing in southern Tasmania to underpin economic and social benefits into the state for the future. The project obviously was unable to progress, and I have the letters here from the feds saying, 'Unfortunately, my department advises at this time the project does not meet the criteria for existing Commonwealth infrastructure funding programs'. So we were rejected, sadly. Co-investment is critical given our shared responsibility and the scale of investment. I'm an ardent advocate for a new subsea cable. Alongside my office, we are continually engaged with industry participants and industry leadership groups on this. There are other opportunities that are in the pipeline, such as the Marinus Link and ensuring that what was the Bass Link cable continues on. I hope that scene sets for you.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. Following up from that, obviously you've referred to the correspondence there, but can you take me through the engagement that you had with the federal government throughout this to get to that point?

Ms OGILVIE - Absolutely. I'm very happy to refer that also to Jenna. The engagement was both at an administrative government layer and also at a ministerial layer. In relation to what the engagement was through government layer, I will ask Jenna to speak to that. I know a lot of work was done. If I need to provide more information on the ministerial or the political layer, I will.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you.

Ms CAIRNEY - Yes. Certainly, Luke. There was department to department discussions with senior officials from Canberra and the then-deputy secretary as well as representatives from the Department of State Growth. I am digging into my memory here, but I believe a presentation was provided and also a letter sent as well from department to department about the project.

Mr EDMUNDS - And at a ministerial level?

Ms OGILVIE - Certainly. At a ministerial level, I sit on the Digital and Data Minister's meetings and I was able to raise Tasmania's connectivity challenge at those meetings. And recognising I had an interregnum when I wasn't at those meetings, but when I did raise that, the voices of the Northern Territory and South Australia and all regional Australia rose up as well because we've got this challenge now where the eastern seaboard, which has deep commercial business opportunities, can be better served on a purely private sector basis than states and territories which don't have those deep commercial opportunities for the private sector to come in.

I'm really strong on this one. I've worked hard to try to get this project up and running. I wrote to Michelle Rowland in particular, I've got my date stamp there, 18 December, talking again about Tasmania being the only island state and how we are wholly served by these subsea cables for any degree of good, big, fat pipe telco. The styling's great, and that's good, but we need this for economic development and for the work that we do.

I think that since the federal government constitutionally is responsible for communications - Michelle Rowland agrees that that is the case. I would like to circle back and work with her. I seek your support to do that as a Labor member. If we can get the project going, we should do it for Tasmania.

Mr EDMUNDS - Can I also understand - so there is \$11.5 million from state. What were you asking for from the federal government?

Ms OGILVIE - Sure, absolutely. Let me just look at this. We committed \$11.5 million, and subject to an Australian Government commitment sufficient to fund the overall project to \$53.3 million is the total cost. \$53.5 million - sorry, I misread that.

Mr EDMUNDS - So you are asking for \$40 million from the federal -

Ms OGILVIE - No. We are - let me just check that.

Ms CAIRNEY - No. Through you, minister, it was \$53.5 million from the federal government.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay, and then the \$11.5 million.

Ms CAIRNEY - The proposed total cost of the project was \$177.5 million.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay. Can you talk to me about what is going to happen to that money? Is that going to stay in the budget?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, yes. That is a commitment that we made. The commitment is available for a project that actually stacks up. At the moment I am still assessing what we do from here now that HyperOne has made decisions about its ordering. So it still exists. It is not in the budget because we don't have a project, but it is available in the future for a subsea cable project or better digital connectivity project. This, to me, is one of the key future economic drivers of the state.

If we can get this and nail this down, it will be game changing for our state across education, the economy, connectivity, all those issues that I know our businesses and our people are dealing with daily. I would also like to - not to be too negative about what we currently have, our current providers are providing connectivity to the state. My concern is to make sure that Tasmania is at a national level of connectivity, the same as any other state and territory, and to do that it requires the feds to come to the table as well.

Mr EDMUNDS - Do you think, from our perspective as the Tasmanian government, that \$11.5 million is going to be enough for the next cab off the rank to deliver this?

Ms OGILVIE - We don't know what the next cab off the rank would or might be, but certainly I am pleased to keep that \$11.5 million commitment there. We need to do some work, I think, on what we might do to address this challenge now, given the decisions that have been made both by HyperOne and also the federal government.

CHAIR - Minister, it has been suggested that these funds may have been reallocated away from the proposed Bevan Slattery SMAP cable.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. That's HyperOne, so that's Bevan's project, yes. So that was - just to picture it in your minds, his project was to create subsea cables that effectively made loops around the eastern seaboard of the nation, into which we were going to create a joint so that we could run a cable down to the south of the state. That requires the purchase of equipment. He would need to know that he had the funds to go forward, both from the state and federal government, to create that link. That was unfortunately not the case due to the federal government's decision, which I hope to get back into them about.

Mr EDMUNDS - Do you have any data, or do you have any concerns about - you talked about the growth in how our IT economy is going and the jobs growth. Do you have any projections around the impact of not delivering this cable might have on the Tasmanian economy or jobs?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Look, you are asking the converted about this. My view is that every job going forward becomes a digital job, because our digital economy and our ability to use technology is now embedded across everything. We must -

Mr EDMUNDS - I totally appreciate that. I wondered if there was any data or any work being done, or any concerns flagged about potential to stagnate in this space if we don't.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, sure. Let me just ask. Yes, thank you, Jenna.

Ms CAIRNEY - There was some work done by the department. The department spent - I believe it was \$33,000 on a study that was commissioned and done by Deloitte. That gives high level numbers and data as to the impact from the lack of connectivity to the state. I don't have a summarised version of that report with me. But I could probably, as we continue, get some high level numbers, if that's helpful.

Mr EDMUNDS - That would be great.

Ms OGILVIE - The answer is yes, I am concerned.

PUBLIC

Mr EDMUNDS - Of course. Thanks.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Mr GAFFNEY - Minister, you said in the correspondence from the federal government that the project didn't meet the criteria. What criteria didn't it meet?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. The criteria that they set.

Mr GAFFNEY - Yes, obviously. So what criteria didn't they meet?

Ms OGILVIE - In relation to getting the specific criteria, the details of that, I don't have that with me.

Mr GAFFNEY - They have said that your project didn't meet the criteria, so I want to know was it a lack of information or a lack of capacity? I want to know why -

Ms OGILVIE - I want to know why too.

Mr GAFFNEY - Yes. They didn't meet the criteria?

Ms OGILVIE - No, I agree. Let me see. Did we get - Jenna, to you, I am not sure if we had more than this response. Were there more details there? I will see if there was more detail received.

Ms CAIRNEY - Through you, minister, no. The top line response was just that a project of that nature didn't fit any of the infrastructure programs that were available. We didn't get a detailed breakdown as to why.

CHAIR - Did you ask for one after that?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Just to be really clear, the federal government does not, according to this letter, have a fund that would be able to fund part of a subsea cable to Tasmania. That was the response we got. I can read you, perhaps, a little bit more detail.

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

Mr GAFFNEY - My first response would be, 'Well, what criteria? What don't we meet'. It's no use putting in funding if there is no project available -

Ms OGILVIE - Well, there are projects available.

Mr GAFFNEY - and them blaming the feds for not coming up with the money.

Ms OGILVIE - I will just read you this paragraph, it might help. So in the correspondence I received, 'The Australian Government recognises the importance of the project to the Tasmanian government', so we have made our case. 'I have asked my department to continue engagement with their counterparts in DSG and notified Tasmania if they become aware of any new initiatives that may provide an opportunity for Tasmania to seek funding for

PUBLIC

the project'. As you know, I have recently been reinstated as the minister, so this is what I am working on currently.

Mr GAFFNEY - Okay. Thank you.

Mr EDMUNDS - One final - has the ship sailed on this? Is there still time to - you know, he has a federal election coming up. Is there any scope, or is that it? Has this cab left the rank and it is a matter of -

Ms OGILVIE - I hope you are proposing that you and I team up to get a cable.

Mr EDMUNDS - I am wondering what stops you are prepared to pull out.

Ms OGILVIE - I know, yes.

Mr EDMUNDS - Because obviously we have seen the stuff around the Heart Centre only this week and today.

Ms OGILVIE - I know, that was a -

Mr EDMUNDS - So I am interested in what stops you are prepared to pull out to try to get this done.

Ms OGILVIE - Sure, sure. My understanding - and please, I will say carefully that this is my understanding - that it is an engineering challenge, and it is in relation to the ordering of the appropriate equipment that they need to do the jointing. So that is HyperOne. In order to get their supply chain and the ordering done, to get that joint into the cable that runs Vic down takes some time. That's not to say that we ought to give up. I think, Mr Edmunds, that you and I both understand the importance of this, and I would like to see if we can find a way forward.

I am aware that we have been around this loop previously. It is not something that will naturally go away. It is not something that will naturally remediate itself. The connectivity issue is going to be a challenge for all the smaller states and territories and all the smaller countries globally. This is the real challenge that we have as an island state. I don't think that I want to make a proclamation about the horse has bolted and the door has shut. We need to see what we can do from here.

Mr EDMUNDS - So you will keep working on it, I suppose. Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - I welcome and I will work with everybody who wants to do Team Tasmania push for this. We have the executive summary from the Deloitte information.

CHAIR - Can that be tabled?

Ms CAIRNEY - Through you, minister. I won't be able to table the full document because I think there's some commercial confidence in here.

Ms CAIRNEY - I'm happy to -

Ms OGILVIE - Perhaps just read the paragraph.

Ms CAIRNEY - I can give you the headline number just now if you'd like.

CHAIR - Yes. What is the headline?

Ms CAIRNEY - I won't read the exec summary, don't worry. Basically what it says here is that a catastrophic event - and this report doesn't assess the likelihood of a scenario - but a catastrophic event resulting in a broadband outage of one month or 31 days, the economic cost to the economy would be approximately \$51 million. So yes, \$51 million for the one month and \$1.6 billion respectively, sorry. I've read that wrong.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, \$51 million. Yes.

Ms CAIRNEY - Sorry about that. I'm trying to shorthand read. The moderate event, the cost would be \$51 million, and the 31 days, that would be a catastrophic event, the cost would be \$1.6 billion. I will type up that summary and table it so you can read it in full.

Ms OGILVIE - Mr Edmunds, sorry, just on the matters political that you raised, we did write to the prime minister Anthony Albanese in March this year to outline our government's priorities ahead of the federal Budget at that time, and those priorities did include subsea cable network so that Tasmania has similar access to high-speed backhaul interconnectivity as other states and territories. So it may be that that could be reinvigorated.

CHAIR - My question is how is the single software application for agencies for HR going? It was something that was going to be focused on.

Ms OGILVIE - We might see if Dr Thurley might address that. Yes, thank you.

Dr THURLEY - Through you, minister. We have the HRIS program that's operating within the Department of Health at the moment. In the Budget, we received additional funding, two lots of \$10 million for the next two years to move that program across government, to do a whole-of-government implementation of the HRIS. It's part of a broader transformation program in HR and government.

CHAIR - But how's it going?

Dr THURLEY - The Department of Health has -

CHAIR - They're the trial.

Dr THURLEY - Yes, they're the starting point, we'll call it. They've implemented the solution, so a HR software solution, and that software solution has been contracted and aligned and is ready to move and implement the actual operational aspects of it.

CHAIR - When will that be rolled out to other departments?

Dr THURLEY - Starting in this financial year.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Also around a question, the comparative spend percentage-wise between Tasmania and other states. Is that something that you would have when it comes to digital technology?

Ms OGILVIE - In relation to government spend?

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - Sort of our benchmark, about per capita or? Would be hard to do. Maybe -

Dr THURLEY - Yes. Through you, minister.

CHAIR - Is that a possible number?

Dr THURLEY - It's a complex question to ask a benchmark across all states and territories due to the nature of how they spend the money. The actual patterns and areas where they spend can be very different. I would suggest that benchmarking it would be comprehensively difficult. There may be areas of particular software or industry that maybe you might find easy to benchmark in isolation, but as a whole overall, ICT investment across states would be difficult to compare. You could get numbers, but they just would be difficult to make comparisons with and there would be arguments about those comparisons.

CHAIR - But at this point time, Tasmania's doing poorly, if we can't get a grant from the feds. Would that be fair to say?

Ms OGILVIE - No. I think there's sort of two pieces to it. The digital side of things in government we're actually, I think, doing well. The telecommunications piece is definitely a problem.

CHAIR - Right. Thank you. Capital investment, I think pretty much we've covered that. Thank you. We shall now just suspend while we change at the table and move into your responsibility of the Minister for Arts and including heritage.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you so much.

The Committee suspended from 12.07 p.m. to 12.10 p.m.

CHAIR - Minister, thank you for that changeover and under your responsibility for Arts and heritage would you like to provide a brief opening statement and then we'll launch into it. I intend to finish around 1.30 p.m.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, very happy to, in your hands. May I first introduce the people at the table.

CHAIR - Absolutely.

Ms OGILVIE - At the table we have Brett Stewart, deputy secretary Culture Arts and Sport, Dr David Sudmalis, director of Arts Tasmania. In the room, Mary Mulcahy, director of

TMAG; Alex Sangston, executive manager, Screen Tasmania; Kate Mackey, manager special projects in Industry Development, previous acting director of Arts Tasmania.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - I will give a short overview. I will do my best.

Ms O'CONNOR - I can see two full A4 pages there.

DIVISION 10
(Department of State Growth)
Minister for the Arts
Output Group 5
Cultural and Tourism Development
5.1 Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery

Ms OGILVIE - We'll get going. We love the arts. It's a sector that expresses who we are as Tasmanians, where we've come from. It unlocks our creativity and imagination. I'm always really pleased as I get about the state and go to events and concerts and theatre productions, to see the incredible amount of creativity that just pours forth from our beautiful island state.

We know that Arts Tasmania last year paid for employment for more than 3300 artists and cultural workers around the state and almost 430,000 people attended arts and cultural events across the year.

On screen, which is a fantastic area for us, we are achieving major ongoing success. For the second year running, we have broken the record for screen industry expenditure in Tasmania and we have been focusing on extending that reach. Excitingly, and I'm very excited about this - it feeds into our tech capability as well - this weekend we are hosting the first ever Tasmanian videogame development expo, called Level Up Tasmania, at Princess Wharf No. 1. People can head down there over the weekend. There will be a screen if you have to watch the football, but I think everyone should go in there and see the incredible games that our local industry has developed. There will be an e-sports championship, I think Friday night. For those who haven't been to one it's worth going to see. Take your kids. It's free but do register.

TMAG, which we know and love, holds the cultural heritage items of Tasmania that we want to look after well. It's had a hugely successful year with total visitor engagement exceeding 510,000 people. It's almost a quarter of a million people visiting in person and continuing to play an important role in telling our Tasmanian story. Thank you very much to everybody at TMAG. We have serious responsibilities in this portfolio including that stewardship of cultural heritage and artefacts and items. TMAG is currently doing some important work around the centre that we are building for the Tasmanian Holocaust Centre. We are pleased to update that that project team has been assembled and tendering for a lead supplier is due to open at the end of 2025.

The second matter that is incredibly important - quite a serious moment I think in time, both here and internationally - is the matter of repatriation of culturally-sacred materials and human remains. This is an issue that is challenging institutions globally. TMAG holds items going as far back as the mid-1800s when societal values were very different and record keeping

was not what it is today, which means that repatriation is a long and complex process. Repatriation communications and discussions are happening between states and territories, internationally and also between institutions to try to find an appropriate and careful landing for this challenge. We remain committed to this process. I can say around a third of items held have already been repatriated. We continue to welcome representatives from communities who believe we may hold remains of their ancestors. We take it very seriously.

Overall, the Tasmanian government, as we know, is continuing to support the arts. Arts is a wonderful portfolio. It's a great department. We have reflected love of the arts in a new \$1 million budget contribution dedicated to a youth arts grants program; and a \$1.5 million uplift for arts organisations. I am really looking forward to talking to you to more genuinely about all of this and hearing hopefully about some of the things that you think we're doing really well and open to suggestions of things we could do better.

CHAIR - Thank you. Minister, \$500,000 per year for the next four years has been allocated to asset maintenance to address compliance risks and ensuring that the state collection is managed and protected for all Tasmanians. So, a couple of questions. What is different about this approach to asset maintenance than has previously occurred, and how much funding has been allocated to asset maintenance in previous years, if you're playing catch-up.

Ms OGILVIE - Sure. I think I have that information for you. If it's acceptable to you, Chair, there's two parts to this. One is the financial questions you've asked, but you also might like to hear a little bit about what's happening on the ground in TMAG to do this work. That's the next layer to it.

CHAIR - No, I think they were pretty clear questions so just -

Ms OGILVIE - Sure. I'm happy to read it out but I thought you might like to hear from Mary, who we have here, who's in charge for TMAC. That's fine. I'll answer it. If we need to do more, we can.

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - In the 2023-24 Budget, we've allocated \$11.28 million to TMAG arising across the forward Estimates to \$12.229 million in 2026-27. We've included in the state Budget 2023-24 \$2 million in additional funding to address priority works on the TMAG buildings over the next three years to ensure continued public safety in and around TMAG. Let's be clear. Despite this funding TMAG faces financial challenges that are well-known.

Balancing operating costs and a high-quality public offering is an ongoing challenge for any cultural institution and our priority is for a sustainable TMAG that excels as a key cultural and tourism asset for the state. That's why we've included the additional \$500,000 per annum to which you refer, Chair, over the estimates for asset maintenance to help TMAG address the critical issues outlined in the WLF report. If you would like more granularity on that that is one, I would then refer.

CHAIR - My question around that: what's the different approach to asset maintenance than has been previously approached? I mean is it that there hasn't been enough maintenance and now you're playing catch-up? Is that it?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I think we can always do more when it comes to TMAG. It is an old building for example. So here's an example of how we can have a more contemporary approach and might be included in that funding. We've developed a phased capital plan involving a green-filled site to address storage issues for the state collection and development of contemporary gallery spaces with scope for commercial premises to generate income. This vision as well was further developed with an additional \$100,000 provided in the state budget. So that's an example of a project.

It is an iterative process. We do have a very old building, and if we had all the resources in the world, we would have the most incredible, amazing new facility, galleries, et cetera. Again, we're working with what we've got and with the resources that we have. But we have been able to provide that uplift. Would you like to say more about what exactly we think that \$500,000 might specifically go towards?

Mr STEWART - Yes, certainly, minister. Thank you and through you. So the initial \$2 million that was allocated in last year's budget, some of that funding has been used throughout this year to further work being done by TMAG with Mary and the team to further understand the issues around longer-term building maintenance at in particular the -

CHAIR - Is that the secretary's cottage in Customs House?

Mr STEWART - Yes, predominantly.

CHAIR - Yes.

Mr STEWART - That work continues. I think it's fair to say as the minister had pointed out that the challenges particularly at the Customs House site are unique. The age of the building presents some particular challenges, and the government has provided an additional \$2 million in this year's budget to assist with addressing those challenges as they are better understood over the next four years. So we have a total of \$4 million, some of which has been expended to better understand the problem.

CHAIR - Will any of it actually go towards addressing the problem? I mean it's different assessing it than addressing it.

Mr STEWART - Correct. Sorry, through you, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, please go ahead.

Mr STEWART - Yes, we will certainly be working -

CHAIR - I'd hate to think you're going to spend \$4 million when you already know there's a problem.

Ms OGILVIE - We're here to fix problems.

CHAIR - Yes, that's right.

Ms OGILVIE - That's the goal.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Also I'm just interested in - there's a future focused project this year which partners with the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery and the University of Tasmania and libraries on a new collection management system to be implemented by each partner institution. Can I have some indication of the cost of that and what that will entail?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. With the okay from you, Chair, I do think it would be helpful to have Mary Mulcahy to the table for that one because the granularity will be able to be answered. Thank you, Mary, would you mind? I think she will have the answer.

CHAIR - Welcome, Mary.

Ms OGILVIE - The information you're seeking. Thank you, Mary.

CHAIR - So the future focus project.

Ms MULCAHY - So through you, Chair. This is a project that's been running since before I came into the role. The partnership has been developed in a common platform that each of the institutions can put their collections onto and in the longer term make them available to the general public or to anyone who wants to access information on collections. Last year - was that the annual report from last year?

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms MULCAHY - Yes. So last year -

CHAIR - I haven't got a new one yet.

Ms MULCAHY - No, we're preparing that at the moment.

CHAIR - That's the best I can do. That's fine.

Ms MULCAHY - So last year, that platform was handed back to the institution who built it, and each of them is then customising it to their own collection. TMAG has actually prioritised the old database they've got because it's a cybersecurity risk. So this year we've been prioritising updating that while working on the customisation of that common platform for TMAG. QVMAG's doing the same thing, library's doing the same thing, UTAS has been doing the same thing. So we've got a common system, and then it's just customising it specifically to the collections because they're not all the same.

CHAIR - So is there any understanding of the cost of implementing that system?

Ms MULCAHY - To be honest, I don't have it with me at the moment. I know that some of the funding came through the -

CHAIR - The Launceston City Deal.

Ms MULCAHY - That's exactly right, yes. Yes. I can't remember -

CHAIR - No, that's okay. I just thought you might have -

PUBLIC

Ms MULCAHY - I don't have it with me at the moment.

CHAIR - Minister, I can understand why you invited Mary to the table.

Ms OGILVIE - She knows what she's doing, yes. Thank you.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - My pleasure.

CHAIR - So any other questions, members, around TMAG? No? All right. Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - Great.

CHAIR - Thank you very much. Appreciate that. 5.2 which is Arts Industry Development.

5.2 Arts Industry Development

CHAIR - Just a quick one there.

Mr EDMUNDS - I wanted to ask about the youth arts grant funding program. Is that a two-year program or a one-year program? I've just got a bit of conflicting - I've got a media release saying two years, but can you just point to it in the budget?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me just get that information for you.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thanks.

Ms OGILVIE - I've got a folder that's got a number of portfolios in it. Here we go. So let's find you the exact information.

CHAIR - Our folder's got four days' worth in it.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I can imagine. So youth arts program - no, that's the -

Mr EDMUNDS - Or if we can point to it in this.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Thank you. Just bear with me and I'll get David to assist.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes, you're right. It's one of those things. I saw it on a screen. I can't find it in the book.

Ms OGILVIE - No, I think you're correct, Mr Edmunds. The election commitment was \$1 million over two years. It's reflected in the Budget in the 2024-25 year. I've just been informed that we will seek to reprofile that \$1 million so it is over the two years.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes, okay. So that explains why the numbers are a bit lumpy.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, you're correct.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - Pleasure.

Mr EDMUNDS - But obviously that still then is only a two-year program. My question is, what is the plan to actually support the youth that this program supports beyond that initial funding?

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. It's important to remember also that young people are not excluded from applying for all the other grants as well.

Mr EDMUNDS - Obviously the whole reason for this grant program was to specifically target them. So I'm wondering what there is for them in 2026-27 and 2027-28.

Ms OGILVIE - Absolutely. I was very pleased to make the election commitment, and in making that election commitment, we've given ourselves a two-year program. During that, we learn a lot as we put those grants out about what is needed and what we ought to do, and we are able to then look at what grants we might need going forward. We do run a fairly large grants making organisation.

CHAIR - And you usually provide us with a list.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, I can provide you with a list.

CHAIR - Thank you. And you'll table it, thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - I think I'm able to. I will make sure it doesn't have any confidential stuff. And so -

CHAIR - If it's a grant, there's nothing confidential.

Ms OGILVIE - I will just check though. To finish answering your question, Mr Edmunds, it would absolutely be my desire to continue a youth arts grants program, but we will do that within the context of what happens as we put the grants out there and the returns that we get. But again, just to be really clear, young people are not prevented from applying for any of the other grants that we have just by virtue of age.

CHAIR - Thank you. Minister, my question -

Ms WEBB - Can I ask a follow-up on that?

CHAIR - Yes, supplementary on that. Thank you, Ms Webb.

Ms WEBB - Having said that though, we know that young people also might not feel they can compete against adults applying for grants in that formal way and then if you had a youth specific grant round -

Ms OGILVIE - Which we do, yes.

PUBLIC

Ms WEBB - - That's a really important way -

Ms OGILVIE - I understand that.

Ms WEBB - To make sure they do have a door open to them. Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. No, absolutely take that on board and I think we agree.

CHAIR - My question is around what support or what input does this particular area have in supporting those artists who might want to be involved in the art scheme, every public works that we have that they have up to - and most of them have an \$80,000 art scheme component. I'm just interested if that's available of what work is done with artists to support them to be involved in putting forward something for that art to be considered for the art scheme for either new builds or redevelopments.

Ms OGILVIE - So around capacity development and ability to connect. That capacity development question is one that we are very tuned into. Capacity development for Tasmanian artists to create work under the Art Site Scheme to which you refer, we've got \$160,000 towards that and as a per annum 2024-25 and 2025-26, \$80,000. It's a new program. It is a pilot industry development initiative to upskill young and emerging artists to deliver public art commissions. Yes, we're excited to have that become available.

CHAIR - That's fine.

Ms ARMITAGE - Thank you, Chair. The COLLECT Art Scheme. Just wondering, it's still going, I'm assuming.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, absolutely.

Ms ARMITAGE - And the funding for that.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. It's highly successful.

Ms ARMITAGE - Can you tell me, the last financial -

CHAIR - You've lost one gallery recently, one in my -

Ms OGILVIE - Have we?

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - Who have we lost?

CHAIR - Scottsdale Art and Framing are no longer a gallery, and they were part of the COLLECT Art.

Ms OGILVIE - That's a pity.

CHAIR - So you need to pick one up somewhere else.

PUBLIC

Ms ARMITAGE - Just a bit of an update on that, how it's going and -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Let's see if we -

CHAIR - While you're finding it, minister, I'd just like to acknowledge Shirley and Rod Martin, the owners of the former Scottsdale Art and Gallery Café. They did a wonderful job in promoting art in the community.

Ms OGILVIE - Fantastic. I wonder if we might encourage them to -

CHAIR - They've retired.

Ms OGILVIE - Is that what happened? I was going to encourage them to come back on board.

CHAIR - They've retired.

Ms OGILVIE - We might need somebody to take up the mission.

CHAIR - It's now a café. It's a café now.

Ms OGILVIE - All right. So the COLLECT Art Purchase Scheme, which provides 12-month interest free loans to purchase artworks, is going strong: 289 loan applications were approved supporting the purchase of 336 artworks with a combined value over \$1.4 million. So it is successful. There are now 30 arts businesses around the state - or is it 29 now you've told me that - participating in COLLECT with more joining each year. It's been going since 1975, and a total of 22 artists were contracted in 2023-24 to undertake 16 commissions valued at approximately \$908,000. We provide direct support to the sector to assist that to happen. No, that's what I've got on the COLLECT Art Scheme.

CHAIR - Okay. Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - Is that what you wanted?

CHAIR - Will you table the grants, thank you. We can ask for a -

Ms OGILVIE - No, I've got the cough - Rosemary is passing it around the table. Can I just check that we are able to table -

Mr STEWART - I think that it might be best if we take that on notice, minister.

CHAIR - Thank you. It is annually provided?

Mr STEWART - Yes.

CHAIR - Okay. If there are no questions in the arts industry, can we move to screen industry? Thank you.

5.3 Screen Industry Development

PUBLIC

Ms ARMITAGE - Minister, you mentioned earlier the Level Up videogame showcase, receiving \$500,000 for this financial year. Is this a one-off event for Tasmania?

Ms OGILVIE - I would like it to be ongoing. It is the first time that we have had it.

Ms ARMITAGE - No future funding at the moment?

Ms OGILVIE - Funding wise? At the moment, yes, we have enough for this year.

Ms ARMITAGE - That's what I mean. There is nothing - no future. Are you hoping that it will continue? Maybe funding for the budgets?

Ms OGILVIE - I'm hoping that it will be a huge success. Which I think it will, because our screen industry is booming. Our video people are an incredible cohort of people.

Ms ARMITAGE - Who are your target audiences for this?

Ms OGILVIE - This is a beautiful confluence of the technology sector and the arts sector, so anything digital and screen sits in that realm. We are funding it through the arts sector. The audience for this is - it has got two audiences: those who love to play games, electronic games, online games, VR games; and also those who want to work in the sector, who might want to program games, be part of businesses that are doing that work, and it is huge globally.

We have big streaming providers such as Netflix and others, who we already know are here working with our screen industry on documentaries, *Bay of Fires*, those sorts of things, and now they are coming to look at our games sector as well. This is happening nationally. Tasmania has a very high level of really good credibility and capability in this sector in our niche area, and we seek to uplift that. Level Up is a way of doing that, to get families to come in and have a look.

Ms ARMITAGE - Has there been any interaction - you are talking about future employment and things - any interaction between Screen Tasmania and the Education Department to ensure that school and college aged children or people get an opportunity to attend, seeing as the program events are in the south of the state. Obviously other areas might need to know, but if they are looking to have a job in that area. So have we been communicating with schools through Screen Tasmania or colleges?

Ms OGILVIE - That is a question I would have to ask.

Ms ARMITAGE - Let's hope the answer is yes.

Ms OGILVIE - Would you mind if we asked Alex, director of Screen Tasmania, to come to the table?

CHAIR - We normally do, minister.

Ms ARMITAGE - That sounds a good idea.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - I can also say that we are doing a huge amount of work in the tech portfolio on working with schools to encourage digital and screen as well.

Ms ARMITAGE - I hope that schools in the north and north-west have also been involved.

Ms OGILVIE - Let's hope that it is a huge success and we can take it around the state.

Mr SANGSTON - Good afternoon, everybody.

CHAIR - Hello, Alex, welcome.

Mr SANGSTON - Thank you very much.

CHAIR - It hardly seems any time since we saw you last year.

Mr SANGSTON - Through you, minister, we did speak to the Education Department to raise awareness of Level Up. Clearly because it is a Hobart-based event, we got some nibbles from the colleges and I am aware that there are a number of schools that are thinking of bringing groups around. The problem with it, of course, is that school groups and schools tend to commit most of their funding towards trips and outreach quite early in the year. We were a little bit late to be able to get a lot of them. But that is a learning for next time around.

Ms ARMITAGE - Apart from the Education Department, the public area, did you also, through your minister, communicate with the private schools and colleges?

Mr SANGSTON - Through you, minister, no, we actually didn't, because we were aware at that stage that it was just too late.

Ms ARMITAGE - So in the future, minister, if this does continue, can you commit to giving information, particularly - well, let's hope it's not just always held in the south, but maybe next year if it goes on it might be in the north. But you will commit to communicating with schools and colleges as well as the private sector?

Ms OGILVIE - Of course. I am very happy to do that. I am hoping that it will be hugely successful and we will have the opportunity to grow it.

Ms ARMITAGE - Is one last question all right?

CHAIR - Yes, absolutely.

Ms ARMITAGE - There are many grant programs available from Screen Tasmania for Tasmanian productions. I must admit, I did ask a friend who is involved in this for some questions, and all she would say is 'we need more money'.

Ms OGILVIE - Welcome to my world.

Ms ARMITAGE - Yes. Apart from that, what grant conditions are there to ensure that productions and projects that receive grants from Screen Tasmania implement a buy local or

PUBLIC

buy Tasmania policy? Are they required to attempt to purchase goods and services from Tasmanian businesses before they seek them from interstate? If not, why not?

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. Is that okay to refer that one?

Mr SANGSTON - Certainly, of course.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. We know you're all over it.

Mr SANGSTON - For our production support program we require, as a matter of eligibility, they have to spend \$4 on Tasmanian goods and services for every dollar of Tasmanian government support they receive, so there is an automatic multiplier in there. That is a KPI we report in the budget papers, and from memory we got a seven to one ratio last financial year. Yes, so that's pretty much it.

Ms ARMITAGE - My final question in this area, are there any Screen Tasmania grant programs that receive no applications at all or only very few? I am wondering which are the most popular grant programs, or are there some that you really get very limited applications on?

Mr SANGSTON - Through you, minister, the most popular programs are the project development program that we would usually get a lot for. The industry development program is huge, but that is because it is targeted at individuals and it is small grants. Production support would be the next. Games is probably historically, but that is before the new budget measure. Video games would be the quietest application program, but we certainly don't have any that we don't have any applications for, no.

Ms ARMITAGE - No? That's great. Thank you, minister, thank you, Chair.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you. I have a similar question to what I asked before on Budget Paper Output 5.2 about 5.3, is that dollar figure in 2024-24, that is 3.3, is that again incorporating the money for the Screen Productions Pilot Incentive Scheme, and then that will be re-profiled over two years as well?

Ms OGILVIE - So in 5.2?

Mr EDMUNDS - It is Output 5.3 now.

Ms OGILVIE - 5.3. And your question was is -

Mr EDMUNDS - Is the pilot incentive scheme -

Ms OGILVIE - Because it's lumpy?

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. Is that also a one-year fund but to be re-profiled over two?

Ms OGILVIE - I will just check for you.

PUBLIC

Mr STEWART - So the sort of lumpiness of that figure accounts for the \$500,000 for Level Up, and half of the figure for the overall commitment for the production pilot incentive scheme.

Mr EDMUNDS - Right. The pilot incentive scheme is spread over the two financial years?

Mr STEWART - Correct. So that is half of the total commitment, which is \$500, and \$500 for Level Up.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes, cool. Thank you. Minister, so then from 2026-27 onwards, there is no - that is when this scheme does not apply, so I will probably ask the same question.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. We want a hugely successful outcome, and we would be looking to do the most contemporary thing we can.

Mr EDMUNDS - That is potentially dollars to come in two budgets' time, perhaps.

Ms OGILVIE - We have put bids in to make things happen.

Mr STEWART - If I can just add through you, minister?

Ms OGILVIE - Please do.

Mr STEWART - Given some of these programs are in very dynamic spaces, it also gives the department the opportunity to provide the minister with contemporary advice of the back of, you know, how the programs go in there in the next couple of years.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes. The reason why I ask is there is obviously concern from people within the sector that there is sort of the lag from an election and then - yes. If we do go the full four years, then the concern about those out years and about making investments in the technology and the equipment that they have.

Ms OGILVIE - No, I understand.

Mr EDMUNDS - If they are worried that they miss one of these application rounds, that then that might be off a cliff and then that is a big investment that they have to make as well.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I understand. Small business concerns, I totally understand.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - We will certainly consider in future budgets and mount or case, yes.

CHAIR - Thank you. If there are no further questions we will leave this area and head to heritage. Thank you, Alex.

Capital investment program

PUBLIC

Mr GAFFNEY - Thank you. Just a little pre-empting. I was pleased the minister acknowledged that the arts industry contributes to much of our wider community forms of tourism, employment, wellbeing, music performance and active participation and use the 430,000 people for the year. A cynic might say that given that the government is intending to spend hundreds of millions of dollars for that already wealthy corporate sporting codes, roughly \$5 million a year in grants and subsidies for the arts sector seems to be an insult. So my question, what can the government do to address this mismatch? Do you really think \$5 million is anywhere near enough for the sector or is it simply a case of corporate might attracting even more government money? Six games of footy is 140,000 people for a year. I'd just like to see -

Ms O'CONNOR - That's a rhetorical question, Mr Gaffney.

Mr GAFFNEY - I'd just like to see how you deal with that around the cabinet when you're seeking funds for the sector which seems to be very poorly underfunded compared to other codes.

Ms OGILVIE - I understand what you're saying when you say 'codes'. It is obviously a different sector to the sporting arena. But first, if you think about our festivals and events budget, there's a quite a deal of funding in that that goes to our big arts festivals as well. For example, MONA, et cetera. The money that I'm able to achieve, I do it by being a very loud and very squeaky wheel at the cabinet table. Of course, members speak about dialogue there, but I am pushing -

Ms O'CONNOR - Did you speak up against the chocolate fountain? That's \$4 million that could have gone into the local arts industry.

Ms OGILVIE - Pushing very, very hard. In particular - and I will just sketch this for you - I have a bit of a bee in my bonnet about music in Tasmania as well, and I think we are not doing enough to encourage music education and participation, both within our schools but also more broadly. If we want a really vibrant community and culture where you can walk into a pub and there's music playing, we have to build structures that make that happen.

So quite a lot of it is about the grants that you quite correctly point out, but what is also within my remit and is just as important is getting those structures right. We're doing some important work with that and perhaps, Mr Sudmalis, that might be something that you could add to. I agree with you about we all want the money, but we also need structures in place. Would you contribute? Thank you.

Mr SUDMALIS - Thank you. Through you, minister. Thank you for the question, Mr Gaffney. The line that you identify in the budget papers that's titled Grants and Subsidies should not be mistaken for the entirety of Arts Tasmania's grants program. Specifically, the Grants and Subsidies line is the allocation that is administered by Arts Tasmania in this instance for what we call administered expenses. It's three large-scale arts organisations: the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra, Ten Days on the Island, and the Theatre Royal Management Board.

All take the entirety of that \$4 million, \$5 million that's noted in the Grants and Subsidies line. In the Output Budget line that's 5.2, Arts Industry Development, you will see, Mr Gaffney, that in 2024-25, we have an allocation of \$12.2 million or thereabouts. From that figure, we

PUBLIC

administer approximately 18 other grant programs for arts organisations, arts organisations multi-years, individuals and groups, another standalone youth arts program.

In addition to this further, we in Arts Tasmania are the beneficiaries, if I can use that term, of a treasurer's instruction, treasurer's instruction 4.23, that provides funds for the Tasmania government Art Site Scheme. In 2023-24, a further \$908,000 or thereabouts was allocated for the commissioning of works from Tasmanian particularly visual artists in that instance.

I think reading the budget papers, one could be easily persuaded that the entirety of Arts Tasmania's allocation for grants is \$4.95 million, but that's a very specific section of the arts ecology that is the beneficiaries of those moneys, and the vast bulk of the \$12 million or thereabouts that's allocated to Arts Tasmania for 2024-25 goes out in the way of grants.

Mr GAFFNEY - Thank you. Could you give me a figure then of what does the Tasmanian government spend per head or per capita on arts and culture?

Mr SUDMALIS - I can certainly provide that information. I don't have it with me at present.

Mr GAFFNEY - Okay. That'd be interesting because I'd like to see a comparison of that and sports and recreation compared to the -

CHAIR - We can put that on our -

Ms OGILVIE - I understand.

CHAIR - Later in the day.

Mr SUDMALIS - Sports and recreation I wouldn't be able to - I beg your pardon. Through -

Mr GAFFNEY - But we can ask that somewhere else.

Ms OGILVIE - No, no. I'm agreeing with you. I'm behind you going yes, yes.

Mr GAFFNEY - Yes. I just want the arts and culture so I can compare that with what we were spending on sports and recreation.

Ms WEBB - Even just comparing with what we spend on AFL per capita.

Mr GAFFNEY - I'm not going to go there.

Mr SUDMALIS - We might need to put some limits around that because in terms of the ABS figures, arts and culture also include museology.

Mr GAFFNEY - That's fine. I don't mind.

Mr SUDMALIS - Libraries.

Mr GAFFNEY - Yes.

Mr SUDMALIS - Okay. We can get that from the cultural statistics -

Ms OGILVIE - It's a definitional challenge.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Mr SUDMALIS - Certainly.

CHAIR - So pleased we didn't let everyone leave the table. Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - Always another question.

CHAIR - We shall suspend while we change those at the table. Thank you.

The Committee suspended from 12.46 pm to 12.48 p.m.

DIVISION 7

(Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania)

Minister for the Arts (inc. Heritage)

Output Group 6

Heritage

6.1 Historic Heritage

CHAIR - We shall recommence with heritage. Historic heritage. Thank you, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. So to introduce the people at the table we have Michael Giudici, who is acting general manager Surveyor-General, and we have Melissa Ford, Heritage Tasmania director. I do have a short opening statement.

CHAIR - Welcome to you both. Two pages is not short.

Ms OGILVIE - I'm not sure where Mr Edmunds is gone, but I have his executive summary.

CHAIR - Thank you. We'll make sure that everybody will get a copy of that.

Ms OGILVIE - So make sure I get that Deloitte information that he will want. All right, I can do it in one page if that's what you wish.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - I love heritage. It's a fantastic area. We're doing a lot of great work. We have a huge amount of technological work particularly on systems to make sure that it's easier to search and review and look at our rich-built heritage. We know that this traverses from – again it's built heritage from convict days through to current days. To help maintain our state's heritage for future generations we have committed \$4.5 million over three years in last year's budget with the Built Heritage Grant Scheme being a key component. I was very,

very pleased that we were able to do that. That took quite a lot of work and it's been a long time since we've been able to put some money into heritage.

In round 1 the scheme comprised a conversation grants program and a larger activation grants program which is where the innovation comes in. An amount over \$1.15 million was allocated to successful applicants all over Tasmania. It's a really popular program and I'm pleased to share that round 2 of the Built Heritage Grant Scheme opened for applications on 2 September. I hope everybody applies. To further collaborate, and as I mentioned earlier in the day, I'm really interested in proper and deep collaboration with community around working on things that matter to us as all good Tasmanians.

So we have hosted the second annual historic heritage summit which is an initiative I commenced previously with the Tasmanian Heritage Council in May which was at the tram sheds in Launceston. Great day. It was great to be there with some of my colleagues. I did invite a range of MPs as well to cast the net broadly and try and be as collaborative as possible.

Heritage is an important part of our brand and contributes \$375 million to the Tasmanian economy, supports 2085 jobs and indirectly a further 2967 jobs, injects upwards of \$93 million annually into the building and construction economy and is a strong drawcard for tourism. We've done the research, and we know that it's one of the key reasons why visitors spend \$900 million coming here every year.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

Ms WEBB - Thank you, Chair. I've got a couple of questions here. Minister, it's my understanding that a previous amendment made to the historical Cultural Heritage Act 1995 repealed a 'no interest' clause which detailed timeframe requirements by which the Heritage Council was required to make a decision regarding the entering or rejecting of a place on the heritage register, and before those particular amendments the Heritage Council is required to receive formal and documented briefings and advice from Heritage Tas staff in writing as part of the determination process.

Are you aware of concerns that since the removal of those provisions and requirements we now have regular extended delays on determinations being made by the council? With little documentation around that and without those written briefings being part of the transparency there's accountability or transparency concerns that could come into play about the degree of evidence-based decision-making and the public interest being served. Are you aware of that as an area of concern and what's your response to that?

Ms OGILVIE - I'm always concerned to make sure we have the most efficient and best processes that we can have within the constraints of the resources that we have to deliver them. I think it would be helpful if I perhaps, through you, called on Melissa to speak to this from the frontline so to speak about how that process is working.

Ms FORD - Yes, thank you, minister and the member for their question. I probably wouldn't mind a little bit more clarity because if I was speaking of my experience since starting here there actually is, through the processes that the Heritage Council has in play, there is significant opportunity for people to have input into both the pre-assessment process and assessment of a nomination to go into the register and also for a permanent entry to be removed from the register and the Heritage Council also has in place its pre-advice process for when a

place is listed in the register when they want to undertake works and how to go about that process. So I'm not quite sure -

Ms WEBB - The element that's been raised is around the previous requirement that there be formal documented briefings and advice from heritage staff in writing as part of the council's determination process. Presumably then, that was a transparency matter and an accountability matter around the decision-making. So that no longer being required was the issue that was raised with me and therefore - and also extended delay. The next question I'm going to have is around the average turnaround of register application assessments by the Heritage Council.

Ms FORD - Through you, minister. I don't have the data on the average time it takes to - but we can -

CHAIR - Is it available?

Ms OGILVIE - We can take that on notice.

Ms WEBB - In terms of the documentation and formal advice on the record around that decision-making, is that indeed not there anymore, or in your view is it there?

Ms FORD - Through you, minister. There's a range of places where a decision can be made. Mostly the Heritage Council has the ability to delegate some of its decision-making powers. For things that are very routine, and that decision-making power can be down to the level of the manager of a particular area or to me as the director. For anything that is not at all routine, it will be elevated to a subcommittee of the council or directly to the council itself. All of its decision-making is documented, and its minutes are published on the website, and we provide formal papers to them for deliberation.

The other thing that happens around delegated decisions is that the Heritage Council undertakes once a year an audit of any delegated decisions made by the branch to review whether they take a cross-sample selection and they review them to see were those decisions made as the council would've made them. So that happens annually, so I think that's a pretty good governance process.

Ms WEBB - Can I move onto another related Heritage Council question, if I may, Chair, before I pass to someone else. Minister, I acknowledge that we are fortunate to have a broad range of talented and committed people constituting our 15 member Heritage Council, but what I am interested in is there a limit on the number of consecutive terms that individual council members can serve knowing that that would be the case in many governance arrangements like that in other instances.

Ms OGILVIE - I'll just see if I can get information for you on that. Just see what I have in front of me. I think under our current arrangements there is no limit.

Ms WEBB - Right. Do you regard that that's appropriate in contemporary circumstances when we recognise that you'd want to see governance refreshed over time in these sorts of bodies?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - I'm always open to improvement. I'm just reflecting on other boards that we have. Some have limits and some don't. Certainly open to considering whether an improvement or change is required.

Ms WEBB - Are you able to provide me with a breakdown of the length of the term served by the current council members? Obviously not the departmental staff who are representing the state on that council, but those others.

Ms OGILVIE - I can absolutely do that. So Brett Torossi who's the chair. She was appointed 16 January 2015 and the expiry of her term 30 June 2025. Caroline Evans -

Ms WEBB - Was that with the reappointments in the intervening time, or was the term of appointment a nine-year term?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, please, if you would.

Ms FORD - Through you, minister. The appointment is up to a three-year term by the minister, so in Brett's case that would have been a reappointment, and then another reappointment. And so -

CHAIR - And so it goes on.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes, just rolling it over. She'll be still there in a century.

Ms WEBB - So nine years in already. All right, okay.

Ms OGILVIE - Give the rest? Yes, so Caroline Evans -

Ms WEBB - I am happy for you to table it, it is just I would like that information on the record as part of the questions.

Ms OGILVIE - Sure. Let me just check there's no personal details. I will make sure there's no personal information.

Ms WEBB - The other question I had around that that relates to the membership of the council, I am wondering - I note in the council's meeting minutes that are available online, there are declarations - there is an opportunity for declarations of conflicts of interest, which is really positive to see as we would all agree. However, are there any formal limitations on council members concurrently working in private consultancy capacities on heritage matters? In relation to that, do you have any concerns over any perception that rolls as Heritage Council members could be leveraged or perceived to be leveraged to benefit state remunerated members in the private sector?

Ms OGILVIE - I am not quite sure I understand. What is your -

Ms WEBB - I am wondering are there any formal limitations on council members concurrently working in private consultancy capacities on heritage matters while they are on our Heritage Council? That's the first one.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Outside our conflict of interest registration processes, which is the valve for that concern that you hold.

Ms WEBB - Yes. Outside of that, are there any other formal limitations?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, thank you. I will seek some information for you.

Ms FORD - Through you, minister. There is nothing - well, what I should say is the Heritage Council has a governance charter, and within that document it goes through quite a range of best practice matters to ensure that the members are not putting themselves in a position where they might be making a decision that is conflicting their outside work.

A number of them have professional careers as well, and so I can think of several that are in that space: architects, archaeologists and so forth. And if they have a matter that comes before them where they have had any association, or perceived or potential conflict of interest, that matter is declared and they are - they disclose it and they may step out of the room and not be involved or so forth.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. Just one last one there, in a similar area. Concerns have been raised with me regarding a perceived advantage for personal gain regarding the private acquisition of heritage assets. I want to ask you about that.

The council minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday 19 April 2023, which were subsequently ratified at the next meeting held on 21 June 2023, notes the council decision not to accept a bequeathed property in Fingal. The resolution to not accept the bequest also encourages the executors - and I will quote from the minutes - 'to support the updating of the datasheet to maximise protection of the site and then explore other options for ownership of the property'. Apparently without the property ever going to the open market, it was subsequently purchased by a then-member of the Heritage Council who had been a part of receiving and considering that bequeathed Fingal property and deciding not to accept it.

Minister, you would see why eyebrows may be raised over that sequence of events. Whether any impropriety occurred or not, the perception of a conflict of interest can be damaging as we know and undermining in the same way that a proven conflict of interest can be.

Have you or will you undertake to have an independent investigation into that particular instance to ensure absolute clarity and transparency over the sequence of events that occurred, as well as to inform the development of any future protocols to address future similar scenarios were they to arise? Will you consider amending the act to ensure clearer transparency regarding the assessment of or subsequent disposal of potential heritage assets bequeathed to the estate by the Heritage Council or other entities?

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. I can respond to that, and it was an important and quite lengthy question, so I will endeavour to give you the information that you request. First, to answer the overarching question around best processes and best systems, we are currently updating our statement of expectations, so that is a ministerial level. And then in relation specifically to the Fingal property question, in September 2022, the Tasmanian Heritage Council was offered a heritage registered property at Fingal as a bequest from a deceased estate.

PUBLIC

The Heritage Council's remit is to work within the planning system to provide heritage regulation, and through the support of Heritage Tasmania to assist in the proper management and activation of heritage places across the state. At its April 23 meeting, the consensus of the 15 member Heritage Council was that, as the regulator, the holding of property would present a significant conflict of interest and therefore the bequest offer was declined. The property was subsequently purchased through a commercial vendor by the deputy chair of the council. I am advised that the property owners had been trying to sell the property for some time, and therefore the bequest was seen as a possible way to ensure preservation of the building.

In the interests of conserving the building the Heritage Council also investigated other management options. However, I understand that this matter has been referred to the Tasmanian Integrity Commission. As such it is not appropriate for me to comment further. I can say that, as the Minister for Heritage at the time, I requested that the department conduct an internal review on the processes undertaken by the Heritage Council on matters of this type, and I am advised that the review is close to being finalised.

Ms O'CONNOR - Chair.

CHAIR - Supplementary. Thank you.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you. Minister, I would like to ask you about the heritage precincts in and around Sullivans Cove and the stadium. As you know, under section 7 of the act, the Tasmanian Heritage Council is required to advise you on matters relating to our historic cultural heritage and the measures necessary to conserve that heritage for the benefit of current and future generations, and to work with the planning system to achieve the proper protection of Tasmania's historic cultural heritage. Minister, have you had advice from the Tasmanian Heritage Council on the heritage impacts of the proposed Macquarie Point Stadium, particularly on the Cenotaph and the Goods Shed?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me just confirm in my notes, I don't believe that I have had specific advice on the Cenotaph, but I will check that. I certainly have had specific advice - there we go - on adjoining sites more generally. In February 2024, the Tasmanian Planning Commission released its guidelines for assessment of the stadium as a project of state significance, and those guidelines require the applicant to consider all places and precincts of historic, cultural significance within the project site, including those within or partly within 100 metres of the title boundary.

Ms O'CONNOR - Minister, I understand this, and it is not actually relevant to the question. The question was given that the Tasmanian Heritage Council, under the ministerial statement of expectations, is to bring to your attention any information on significant issues affecting the council's work - that is, heritage - have you been provided with advice by the Tasmanian Heritage Council on the Cenotaph and the Goods Shed as it relates to the impact on heritage values?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Turning to the goods shed specifically, alongside the nomination for the Macquarie Point Goods Shed, of which you would be aware, the Heritage Council has also received a nomination for the whole of the Macquarie Point site on an archaeological basis. At that layer. So yes, on the Goods Shed, the archaeological basis for the nomination of the whole site is being considered from what I am currently advised.

I don't believe I specifically have been provided advice in relation to the Cenotaph, unless something is working its way through the system, and I will just need to confirm that. But in 2023, the Heritage Council did determine to accept the nomination for part of the Macquarie Point in the vicinity of the Royal Engineers Building, which is just slightly before the Cenotaph site, and this area is subject to potential detailed archaeological assessment subject to studies to be taken by the Macquarie Point Development Corporation. I understand these studies are yet to be finalised.

Let me just check specifically on the Cenotaph question for you. I'm just getting some advice about the process and protocols. It would be the department that would provide that advice, and I don't believe I've had specific advice about the Cenotaph, and also we're dealing with the POSS act, so the processes - because the Heritage Council is independent of me, it would be inappropriate to be provided with that advice in relation to the Cenotaph.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, hang on. Section 7 of the act is really clear. The Heritage Council provides you with advice on heritage impacts.

Ms OGILVIE - I'm happy to get advice on it. I'm just saying I don't -

Ms O'CONNOR - Just to be clear -

Ms OGILVIE - From the department.

Ms O'CONNOR - I'm not suggesting you get advice.

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, I'm -

Ms O'CONNOR - What I'm saying is under the act, the Heritage Council has an obligation to provide you with advice on matters that are relevant to historic cultural heritage of state significance. What I'm hearing from you, minister, is that your Heritage Council has not provided any advice to you as minister on the Cenotaph which next year celebrates its centenary and on which there'd be very significant impacts on their sightlines which are part of their historic heritage value.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I want to be careful and I don't want to split hairs about where the advice comes from, but my understanding is it's the department. Melissa would be available just to comment on that process.

Ms O'CONNOR - That's fine, but are you telling us that you haven't had a meeting with the Heritage Council about the heritage impacts of the stadium?

Ms OGILVIE - No, I'm not saying that. I'm saying I haven't specifically had a meeting in relation to the Cenotaph. I've just detailed the archaeological work and the application for nomination of the Goods Shed. So there's been quite a bit of work, but not the Cenotaph specifically.

Ms O'CONNOR - Can I ask then while this information is coming to the table, has the Tasmanian Heritage Council advised you that it is supportive of those stadium works that would impact on the Cenotaph's values but also that would require the removal and relocation of the Goods Shed? Does that have the endorsement of the Tasmanian Heritage Council?

Ms OGILVIE - No, but I would -

Ms O'CONNOR - No advice from the council?

Ms OGILVIE - To the Cenotaph question. I would like Melissa to just flesh out the process, and then I would like to speak specifically the one I have had a meeting with them on, and this is public knowledge, the decision that they have made around the Goods Shed. So that's where the focus has been.

Ms O'CONNOR - But did you, at that meeting, minister, talk about the impact on the Goods Shed? What did the Heritage Council say to you about the impact on the Goods Shed of relocating it and -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. So the Heritage Council makes independent decisions. I can't influence that and I don't go over the top and I don't direct them. So they've made a -

Ms O'CONNOR - I understand that. We're talking about the advice they gave you.

Ms OGILVIE - They've made a decision and that's the decision of which I'm aware, and I have that conversation about what was the decision. I will just ask Melissa to go through the process because I know there is complexity, particularly around the POSS space.

Ms FORD - Through you, minister. Regarding the Macquarie Point Railway Goods Shed and its consideration in the context of the stadium, the project of state significance process is outside the Historic Cultural Heritage Act and the Tasmanian Heritage Council will not be making a statutory determination -

Ms O'CONNOR - Unbelievable. Thank you very much for that answer. So just to be clear, what the committee's just heard, minister, is that because the stadium is a project of state significance, the Heritage Council's obligations to provide a statement of significance over our sacred Cenotaph and the Goods Shed has been thrown out the window.

Ms OGILVIE - The Heritage Council would, of course, want to make a submission under the POSS process.

Ms FORD - I hadn't finished my answer.

Ms OGILVIE - She hadn't finished.

Ms O'CONNOR - Sorry.

Ms FORD - Through you, minister. Thank you. I hadn't finished the rest of that answer.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, go ahead.

Ms FORD - So the Tasmanian Planning Commission has advised that the Macquarie Point stadium assessment process will be a 12-month process from the date of acceptance of the applicant's submission. As an agency with a relevant interest, the Heritage Council will have the opportunity for input at several stages, the first being a high-level response within 28

days of notification of acceptance of the applicant's submission. Then there will be an opportunity for the Tasmanian Planning Commission to engage with technical experts in heritage matters.

That's the technical experts that are in the works team in the Heritage Tasmania branch. To inform that, the assessment panel's draft integrated assessment report. So that's two members of my team. Then there'll be another opportunity when the assessment panel seeks public submissions in response to the assessment panel's draft integrated impact assessment report. My understanding is they will also conduct hearings as part of that process. It is at that point that the Heritage Council will most likely provide a submission.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you. Minister, is it still within your ministerial statement of expectations that the council brings to your attention any information on significant issues affecting the council's work?

Ms OGILVIE - We are currently redoing the ministerial statement of expectations. As for what is - I haven't a photographic memory. I would have to bring that forward and -

Ms O'CONNOR - Pretty significant line.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. So we are currently redoing that and it will be published. In relation to what the current ministerial statement says, I'd actually have to get that document in front of me and read it.

Ms O'CONNOR - I'm a little bit surprised, to be honest, given the significance of the whole precinct and the buildings that we've talked about, that the Heritage Council has not advised you on this matter -

Ms OGILVIE - It's the department that advises me.

Ms O'CONNOR - But the Heritage Council has an obligation under the act, as I understand it, to bring matters to your attention when they have an impact on the council's work but also an impact on heritage of state significance, which you'd agree the Cenotaph of course is.

Ms OGILVIE - Love the Cenotaph.

Ms O'CONNOR - It's a pity that your government wants to take away one of the key sightlines to St George's Church.

Ms OGILVIE - POSS project -

CHAIR - Let's get the question and answer process going here, otherwise I'm going to have to move on.

Ms OGILVIE - Fair enough.

CHAIR - Does the member have another question because I can come back.

PUBLIC

Ms O'CONNOR - My question is, will you take this up with the Heritage Council and ask why you haven't been provided with a statement of significance on the Cenotaph or the Goods Shed?

Ms OGILVIE - What I will do -

Ms O'CONNOR - Or why you haven't been provided with advice.

Ms OGILVIE - Very happy to seek advice from the department around the most appropriate way to do that.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - No probs.

CHAIR - Ms Webb, you had a follow-up question, and I apologise. I thought that the member did have follow-on questions. If you want to finish that.

Ms WEBB - Yes. It was really just to follow on from the answer I received from the minister on the matter we were discussing from my last question, which is around that purchase of the Fingal property by the then-deputy chair of the council. Noting that you said there's an internal investigation that you have ongoing at the moment within the department. There's a referral made to the Integrity Commission, which we won't discuss. In relation to the internal investigation, will you commit, in the interests of transparency, to tabling that internal investigation and the results of it once it's completed?

Ms OGILVIE - I'll just see if I have some information on that. The advice I have is that that is an internal departmental investigation and so it will not be able to be tabled. However, the results of that will and have been informing the updating of the ministerial statement of expectations, including improvements that we might make, for example, to member induction processes and training and annual governance training, particularly for the Tasmanian Heritage Council members, specifically around identifying, declaring and managing conflicts of interest. So that will be subjected to uplift.

Ms WEBB - Minister, I don't believe it's acceptable to say that's an internal process and won't be made public in any way. A significant matter and concern has just been raised in the public domain now here in the Estimates process about a significant potential conflict and certainly a perceived conflict by somebody who's a senior member of - or who was a senior member of the Heritage Council. There will need to be a public statement or a public undertaking of some kind that you will provide information about, one way or the other, how that internal investigation has been resolved and what consequences and actions have been taken as a result of it. It's unacceptable for that to also be a matter of opacity behind closed doors when there's a public question about a perceived conflict of interest from a member of a public body like a Heritage Council. So what undertaking will you make to put into the public domain information about the resolution of that internal inquiry?

Ms OGILVIE - As I have said, and I think you have agreed, that with an Integrity Commission investigation underway, it's inappropriate to wade into that and we need to make sure that processes take place. That review is internal. We will not be able to table that, unfortunately. The processes that are underway through the Integrity Commission will reach

PUBLIC

a conclusion, and obviously we will have some information at that time. I think also there are some internal issues relating to tenure on that board. The deputy chair has moved on. So that's another piece of information that might be helpful to you.

Ms WEBB - Certainly, but yes, an Integrity Commission investigation may well be underway if a referral has been made -

Ms OGILVIE - We don't want to pre-empt that publicly.

Ms WEBB - We don't know. The findings are of your internal investigation, could be communicated to the Integrity Commission and a question put then, 'Will this interfere if I put this information in the public domain with anything happening?' If they indicate no, then you're at liberty to put that into the public domain. I'm asking you to commit to transparency here when there's been a question mark over a perceived conflict of interest, if not an actual conflict of interest.

Ms OGILVIE - The advice I have -

Ms WEBB - So what will you put into the public domain?

Ms OGILVIE - The advice I have is I'm not able to table that review. I'm also very -

Ms WEBB - You can table something about it.

Ms OGILVIE - I also take very seriously the Integrity Commission's investigations. We know that they are investigations and they should be allowed to run their course because -

Ms WEBB - Sure, but separate matter.

Ms OGILVIE - It's not really a separate matter, is it?

Ms WEBB - Well, you could ask them. How about you communicate with them and ask, 'Here's what I have and this is the statement I'd like to put in the public domain about it. Will it interfere with your investigation, if there is one?' If they say no, you can put it in the public domain.

Ms OGILVIE - The current advice is that we're not able to table an internal review.

Ms WEBB - So I'm not asking you necessarily to even table the whole review. A piece of communication about the outcome of that review. It doesn't have to be the whole detail of the review. Just so that there's public accountability about where that has landed.

Ms OGILVIE - Just let me seek some advice on that. I'll see what we can do.

Ms WEBB - Thank you.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Madam Chair. Minister, under the act, section 7, general functions and powers of the Heritage Council, the first function, (1)(a), is 'to advise the Minister

PUBLIC

on matters relating to Tasmania's historic cultural heritage'. Are you confirming today at the table that you've received no advice from the Heritage Council on the likely impacts of the stadium on the cenotaph's heritage values, the goods shed's heritage values, the engineering building's heritage values, Evans Street, the art school? Are you saying that through all this time when it's been known that this project of state significance development application would be lodged, you have received no advice from your Heritage Council about the impact of this project on our heritage? I could put it another way. Have you received -

Ms OGILVIE - It's a question of timing.

Ms O'CONNOR - Have you received any advice?

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, I'm just getting some advice here. The advice I'm just receiving there is around the process and the timing of how these matters are addressed. I understand that there has been no development application until last week, at which - is that correct? I think that's correct. It's the information I have. That is a large document, which is currently being reviewed.

CHAIR - It is 4000 pages.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, large document.

CHAIR - We've heard about it.

Ms OGILVIE - That's currently being reviewed. We do know that the POSS process overrides some of the original -

Ms O'CONNOR - Wouldn't you want that advice anyway as Heritage Minister?

Ms OGILVIE - Regulations and laws and processes that we have in place. I am aware of the Goods Shed issue. The Heritage Council has made a decision on that which is available publicly. I don't have specific information in relation to the Cenotaph, but certainly -

Ms O'CONNOR - I'm just -

Ms OGILVIE - I am very interested -

Ms O'CONNOR - I am stunned.

Ms OGILVIE - I am very interested in cultural heritage generally -

Ms O'CONNOR - But you're not interested enough, minister, with respect, apparently -

Ms OGILVIE - Particularly the archaeological site.

Ms O'CONNOR - To ask your Heritage Council for some advice -

Ms OGILVIE - I think that is -

PUBLIC

Ms O'CONNOR - On the values particularly of the Cenotaph. Particularly of the Cenotaph.

Ms OGILVIE - Now we have a -

Ms O'CONNOR - But the whole place is rich with cultural heritage.

Ms OGILVIE - Indeed, which is what I've been trying to say.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes. But why haven't you sought advice?

Ms OGILVIE - We now have a development application so it might be now is the correct time to do that.

Ms O'CONNOR - Might be or will be? Will you be seeking from the Heritage Council, which apparently has abrogated its number 1 core function -

Ms OGILVIE - I don't think that that's a fair characterisation of the Heritage Council.

Ms O'CONNOR - It's in the legislation.

Ms OGILVIE - What I was just about to say is that I will certainly be seeking advice from the department on this issue, and I would have an update for you in a matter of weeks.

CHAIR - Thank you. Thanks, minister.

Ms O'CONNOR - No, the council's your -

CHAIR - Ms Webb.

Ms O'CONNOR - Expert body there and -

Ms OGILVIE - I can't direct them. Yes.

Ms O'CONNOR - No, but they've got an obligation under the act and you know it, and you should have sought advice.

CHAIR - Ms Webb. Thank you.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. Just one quick follow up on the internal review we were discussing just a moment ago. Is there a timeline that you have for completing that internal review of the matter we discussed?

Ms OGILVIE - We'll just seek that information.

Ms WEBB - There's just one tiny extra, if I may. One tiny extra.

CHAIR - Then I have one question from Mr Gaffney as well before we leave.

Ms OGILVIE - The best we have at this stage is it will be wrapped up soon.

CHAIR - Soon.

Ms OGILVIE - Soon. It's feeding into the -

CHAIR - That's what the Tasmanian Industrial Commission said, 'soon', in 2019. I hope it's not going to be that length of time.

Ms OGILVIE - I don't know what you're referring to, I'm afraid.

CHAIR - I'm just saying we get told 'soon' quite regularly here, and it means not much.

Ms OGILVIE - The department is working on it and it -

Ms WEBB - Are we expecting it to be this year, for example?

Ms OGILVIE - I would hope so, absolutely. The work that's being done is feeding into the reworking of the ministerial statement of expectations. That is the output that really is the result of the work we're doing around specifically - we did write it down - governance, declarations, inductions. So very practical administrative side of how to be on a board and make your declarations.

Ms WEBB - A quick stats question. In terms of this Budget and any efficiency cuts that might be made, will the staffing profile of Heritage Tas be changing over the next year or two years?

Ms OGILVIE - I will seek some advice on that.

Mr GIUDICI - Can I answer that?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, thank you. That would be great.

Mr GIUDICI - Through you, minister. The staffing profile is expected to be quite stable, but it's of interest and note that both the Aboriginal Heritage organisation, Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania's coming out of DPAC and joining into the department, so that's been announced by the government. That will form a new business unit of Heritage Tasmania and Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania, so there are expected to be some efficiencies in terms of processes and systems through that process. That's not due to commence until the beginning of November. At the moment, there's consultation with staff in relation to that. It's quite early days in terms of understanding what that new landscape might look like.

Ms WEBB - Okay. There's not a ballpark figure of how many job cuts there'll be in that bringing together of the two?

Mr GIUDICI - No, there's absolutely not. There's no intended reduction in staff as a result of the joining together of the two organisations.

CHAIR - So how are you going to get efficiency then -

Ms O'CONNOR - But there is a funding cut.

CHAIR - How are you going to get an efficiency dividend then if there's no staff cuts? How does that work?

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, you're losing \$1.5 million.

Ms FORD - Through you, minister. I'd like to make one comment about how those two branches might come together that would deliver some benefits to both. The heritage management system that we use that records all the information is in need of replacement, and that system - it would be work that we would have to do. At the moment, we're aware that Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania is working on a similar system of its own that might be very fit for purpose for both branches to use going forward, and by doing that we would save an enormous amount of time, if we could find a way to - if it was dealing with the things that we wanted to see in a new system, then we also could use that system without all of the lead time and the development and so forth. There is one good example of the two coming together -

Ms WEBB - It doesn't give you an efficiency dividend, though.

Ms FORD - It does give us an efficiency dividend, because we wouldn't have to then do two years of project work to develop a new system to replace our current system. It actually is a massive -

Ms WEBB - It sounds like it saves future spending which is good. You know, it does sound positive.

Ms FORD - That will be very positive -

Ms WEBB - It saves future spending, which is great.

Ms FORD - Yes.

Ms WEBB - If there is a cut being made it will be interesting to see.

CHAIR - Thanks for that explanation. Mr Gaffney, grants and subsidies.

Grants and Subsidies

Mr GAFFNEY - I might have missed something here, but there is no footnote to why the grants and subsidies in 2025-26 is \$17,577,000 compared to every other year is around \$4 million or \$5 million. What is that referring to on table 7.13.

Ms OGILVIE - I will just have a look at that.

Mr GAFFNEY - And it is a significant - is that \$17 million?

Ms WEBB - It's an uptick of \$10 million-plus.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. We will just check for you.

Mr GAFFNEY - Yes. Usually, with a grant jump like that, there is a footnote.

Ms OGILVIE - I think we have that for you. The quick answer is that it is the Port Arthur investment that we are making. We have a \$16 million allocation to the Port Arthur historic site to enhance the visitor experience. It is over the next two years, and the funding enables PAHSMA to carry out essential upgrades, including the world-renowned heritage site to continue to attract visitors, et cetera. That \$16 million addresses legacy infrastructure issues, including remedial works for the water and sewerage. Which as we know is not just servicing PAHSMA and that site, but it is a peninsula, weirdly, a peninsula-wide facility. So that is what that fund is for there.

Mr GAFFNEY - Could I suggest that next year if you have something like that there should be a footnote, and then I wouldn't be asking that question because it is contained somewhere else?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I agree with you.

Mr GAFFNEY - You know, it's just - it's totally -

CHAIR - And when it is a significant up-lift.

Ms OGILVIE - When it's, yes, a big lift.

Mr GAFFNEY - It is too hard to find out where that might be. I think just -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, agreed. I did think we might have covered it in Heritage, but we didn't do that.

Mr GAFFNEY - No.

CHAIR - We have been busy with other things. The last question, the member for Hobart.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Chair. Minister, will you seek advice from the Tasmanian Heritage Council on the impact on the heritage Cenotaph, particularly, but also of the Goods Shed, and do you know whether the Tasmanian Heritage Council supports or believes it is feasible to relocate the Goods Shed? Has that had the tick from the council, which you think would take an interest in this matter.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, absolutely, and I see you choosing your words carefully, which I appreciate.

Ms O'CONNOR - I try to.

Ms OGILVIE - The information I am getting from the department is that because the development application has just been released - it is large. What did we say? 4000 pages. Their views have not been expressed yet, but I would anticipate that they will be expressed.

Ms O'CONNOR - To you as minister?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - And that will come through the department to me, and to others. I would have line of sight on that, I am getting nods. But in relation to the feasibility question, which is a bit different -

Ms O'CONNOR - Sorry, feasible. It would protect the heritage values of the Goods Shed.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms O'CONNOR - That it is feasible to do it and retain those values.

Ms OGILVIE - I understand. Has the Heritage Council made a determination about the Goods Shed and its heritage values. That is the determination and the constraints of that, are what we have to know about the dialogue and the investigations that they have done around that. In relation to a question of feasibility I am not certain.

Ms O'CONNOR - Or whether they believe it is possible?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I can give you a little information about what they said. I will be really quick.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes, please. Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - A permanent listing, which has occurred, does not prevent development of a site or place from being developed. Listing on the Register does not prohibit the Goods Shed from being relocated. But the question of feasibility is a separate -

Ms O'CONNOR - Sure. But that doesn't mean the Heritage Council supports its relocation. Will you seek advice from the council on the heritage impacts from the stadium to the Goods Shed?

Ms OGILVIE - What I am advised is if relocation of the Goods Shed is considered an option, the Heritage Council would require the applicant to satisfy its works guidelines. There is a process there.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes. I will be following this up with you, particularly in relation to the Cenotaph and the Goods Shed, because you should have advice from the Heritage Council, as they are statutorily required to do.

Ms OGILVIE - Now the development application has been made available we will probably see that information come forward.

CHAIR - Thank you. I am mindful of the time, and it is not just those at the table, it is other people as well.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. That's right, and we have the POSS process as well.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, minister, and apologies for going just a tad overtime.

Ms OGILVIE - That's okay.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - I ask that we suspend our broadcast and we return at 2.30 p.m. in your capacity as the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Family Violence.

The Committee suspended from 1.33 pm. to 2.30 p.m.

CHAIR - Thank you very much and welcome those people at the table that have come to support the minister in her capacity as the minister for Women and the Prevention of Family Violence. Do you have an overview, minister?

Ms OGILVIE - I do, but perhaps first to introduce who's at the table if that's okay.

CHAIR - Absolutely, thank you. That's a given.

Ms OGILVIE - I'm certainly happy to do that. We have Katherine Morgan-Wicks, secretary of DPAC, we have Mel Gray, deputy secretary of Policy and Reform, Rebecca Pinto, executive director Community Partnerships and Partnerships; and Courtney Hurworth, chief reform officer of FIDUS. Thank you very much. A very important area. How long do we have for this, Chair?

CHAIR - We have 90 minutes for the complete suite of women's -

Ms OGILVIE - For Outputs 7.5 and 7.6?

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - All right. I do have an opening statement. As Minister for Women and the Prevention of Family Violence, I see gender equality as fundamental to our success as a state and I'm proud to say that Tasmania's a great place for women to live and thrive. Our government continues to deliver Equal Means Equal, the Tasmanian women's strategy 2022-27, which I'll call Equal Means Equal from here on in; to continue to foster a society where women and girls have equal opportunities to thrive in all facets of their lives. That document outlines our government's commitment to ensure women have access to the necessary resources and opportunities to fully participate in economic, social, political and community life.

Now, we know our efforts to support women's leadership, and we are leading by example. We've got 48.3 per cent of positions on Tasmanian government boards and committees held by women and we're striving for gender equality across all of the aspects of government and we're increasing opportunities for leadership and skills development. We are partnering with Healthy Tasmania to deliver the latest round of women's leadership scholarships which are going to be fantastic and through this more Tasmanian women, particularly those in male-dominated industries will be supported to build leadership skills and grow into the leaders of tomorrow that we know and want.

I was very, very pleased to be able to release the Tasmanian government's third gender budget statement alongside this year's state Budget and this year, importantly, the statement was produced in close collaboration with treasury in-house, and I would very much like to thank my colleague, the treasurer, honourable Michael Ferguson for his and his department's support in doing that. It's very encouraging that Tasmania continues to lead the nation in closing the gender pay gap, currently at five per cent.

Under the government's 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's future, we are also investing in Tasmanian women to cement Tasmania as the best place to live, work and raise a family and this year's gender budget statement highlights some of these commitments including the government's \$15 million commitment for a new public diagnostic breast care centre, and this year's gender budget statements builds on the two previous iterations and reconfirms our government's commitment to gender-responsive budgeting. To continue this work, we're building a practical gender impact assessment toolkit which we could tell you a little bit more about today, and the toolkit will equip agencies with the resources needed to understand how people of different genders are impacted by the work of government.

I'm very much looking forward to this being implemented later this year and seeing the changes that considering gender impacts can bring to the work that we all do. However, we know that there remain areas for improvements and barriers to gender equality particularly when it comes to women's safety, and we will no doubt talk a lot about that today. Our government remains strongly committed to ensuring that women and girls are safe at work, home and in the community. In relation to prevention of family violence, I don't know how you want to run this session. Are you planning on doing women first?

CHAIR - We'll have the overview all at once. Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - All at once. Yes. That's what I'm asking. Thank you. Almost done.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - In relation to prevention of family violence which is a very weighty area. Tasmania is among the nation's leaders when it comes to taking action to prevent and respond to domestic violence and holding perpetrators to account. We are on track to meet our target under the national action plans 500 worker initiative of 24.6 FTE additional workers commenced by 30 June 2025.

Since 1 July 2024 it is anticipated that a further 5.4 FTE workers will have commenced by the end of September 2024 taking the total from 15.6 FTE to 21 FTE workers. Recruitment action is continuing for the balance of 3.6 FTE workers. Ultimately the impact of family and sexual violence for victim survivors, women, children and young people are widespread in our community and across government in terms of prevention, responding, healing and recovery.

Areas of impact include education, health, housing, justice and police and therefore an inter-agency and coordinated approach is incredibly important and of course we all recognise whilst there is much that we have done there is obviously so much more that needs to be done. Eliminating family and sexual violence is a key priority of our government and the governments third Family and Sexual Violence Action Plan, Survivors at the Centre is supported by funding of \$100 million over five years to deliver actions. We've got a nation-leading electronic monitoring program which we've talked about this morning, and you've seen -

Ms O'CONNOR - Can I ask, minister, you're on your six-minute intro so far and I see another whole page there. I'm just wondering how long this intro will be?

Ms OGILVIE - I'm entirely in your hands. I thought you would like the information.

PUBLIC

Ms O'CONNOR - Well we can ask questions and obtain information.

Ms OGILVIE - You don't want to know about it?

CHAIR - Have you got any key points that you want to provide?

Ms O'CONNOR - Well there's another two pages, three pages.

Ms OGILVIE - They're all pretty important.

CHAIR - I think we might launch into questions, and we'll probably ask and there'll be something you can come back to.

Ms OGILVIE - Maybe.

Ms WEBB - By all means table it. We can have it as part of the record.

Ms OGILVIE - Well let's see how we go at the end. If I haven't been able to tell you about the arch centres, the national cabinet and all the good things we're doing then I might write to you.

Ms O'CONNOR - I've got some questions on the arch.

Ms OGILVIE - I'm sure that you'll have questions on -

CHAIR - So, thank you very much, minister and I'll invite the honourable member for Hobart to ask the first question. Thank you.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, chair. Minister, I want to go to the level of funding that's provided to those really important organisations, I'm sure you'll agree, that support victim survivors, Laurel House and the Sexual Assault Support Service. A request was made in their budget submission to increase therapeutic support to victim survivors and their supporters – community engagement and primary prevention activities. The request was made for \$2.4 million in additional core funding but there's a shortfall in the funding allocated of about \$860,000. You would be aware, minister, each of those organisations has waitlists where people are waiting to receive counselling or a therapeutic service for up to six months. Why didn't your government properly fund SASS and Laurel House?

Ms OGILVIE - I have met with SASS and Laurel House recently and have encouraged them to write to us which they have done. I'm working very closely with them. In my meeting with them it wasn't completely clear to them or myself exactly what the delta was that they were concerned about, so I have actually -

Ms O'CONNOR - Delta?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. The gap. I have actually referred that to the department, and I would like to invite you if you could, to speak to that. We have done some work on this.

Ms GRAY - Thanks minister and through you. Yes, we are aware of that issue and I can advise the committee that the core funding through Survivors at the Centre for the family and sexual violence services is maintained and any uplift that has been provided as a result of the absolutely amazing work that the community services sector in the family and sexual violence work does, I take the opportunity to thank them for the way that they have partnered with the department in relation to the response to the commission of inquiry.

We deeply value the expertise of this specialist service sector and the network of supports that fund, as the member has outlined, support for victim-survivors. Since 2021, of course, we've provided significant additional funding to the specialist sexual violence services to respond to increased demand, and it represents, actually an over 200 per cent increase in funding for these organisations since 2019, which, yes, is commensurate also with the demand that organisations are seeing. This year's budget continues this funding with no funding decreases at all as part of the \$423 million investment to deliver the recommendations of the commission of inquiry over the forward Estimates.

We will continue to work closely with the family and sexual violence service sector as we always do to really monitor demand and need, and this includes informing our negotiation with the Australian government on our new national partnership agreement for family and domestic and sexual violence, which has commenced, and also through the codesign that we are undertaking with them at the moment around the revisions on the Change for Children strategy and action plan over the next part of this year. Through the delivery of some related recommendations, including the recommendations relating to workforce, service gap analysis and future funding needs, which are due in 2026. We are going to keep closely monitoring the needs of the family and sexual violence service sector.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Ms Gray. The level of need, I think, is reasonably well understood by government. It is certainly well understood by this sector, that, I know you agree, minister, does such important and outstanding work. I was pleased to hear Ms Gray talk about monitoring demand and need. Has there been any assessment undertaken by government, or do you have some advice or analysis of what not providing that extra funding will mean in terms of the impact on services and staffing levels?

Ms OGILVIE - Can I just seek some advice? The advice I have received is that they do work very closely with SASS and Laurel House, and that they are in continuous dialogue and are appraised of the impacts that the funding commitment would have or does have. But I would also like to just to agree with you that the demand is there, and it has, in a sense, become a national discussion in a timely way.

When we get to the national cabinet conversation, which I am sure that we will have, there is an opportunity, I think, to do more and do better, and I think we are getting nods here at the table. I would like to think that we could lean into those conversations with SASS and Laurel House, and we have a new budget coming forward.

Ms O'CONNOR - Minister, doesn't it sort of - I mean, we have been having this conversation as a society for a very long time. We had Rosie Batty, Australian of the year.

Ms OGILVIE - I agree, yes.

PUBLIC

Ms O'CONNOR - There are many women I think thought that would be catalytic to a change of approach by government, and yet we are still dealing with chronically underfunded sexual assault support services, services that respond to the needs of women and children. You would agree, wouldn't you, that it is not tenable to continue to underfund these services?

Ms OGILVIE - I agree that this is the number one issue that is besetting our state and our community. I care deeply about this area. The question of funding goes to the budget. Those conversations are always difficult. Laurel House and SASS in particular I think do a superb job, and others. We are working with what we have got to do the best we can.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, you could have funded them twice over if you hadn't put \$4 million into a chocolate fountain. Can I just ask a final question on this line of questioning for now, Chair? What is the composition or the breakdown of funds for the financial year 2025 for the Family and Sexual Violence Action Plan, and I am happy for this to be taken on notice, Chair. What is each service funded, and how much of this allocation is going towards policy development in the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Ms OGILVIE - I will just see if I can get that information for you. The information that I have to hand, whilst they seek further details, is that Tasmania's third Family and Sexual Violence Action Plan received a funding allocated under Output 7.5 for survivors at the centre is maintained at \$12.5 million per annum across current and forward Estimates. The budget revenue line for survivors at the centre shows, in error, the application of a budget efficiency which was initially applied in error to that output.

CHAIR - So these figures are not correct?

Ms O'CONNOR - I think we are getting a set of figures shortly from the department.

Ms GRAY - To respond to the member's question through you, minister, we have a breakdown of the funding allocation over the life of the plan, split by funding on government actions as opposed to community sector actions. Not broken down into 2024-25 specifically, so I would have to take that one on notice.

Ms O'CONNOR - Is that over five years or something, that -

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister, the timeframe is from 2022 to 2027.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay, thank you. Do you think that would be helpful in understanding the question, through you, minister, Ms Gray?

Ms GRAY - I think the question, through you, minister, was about breakdown on policy versus funding direct to the community. The FTE for the portfolio is modest. I can get that from the overview. It is extremely modest compared to other jurisdictions, which is not unusual as a small jurisdiction. 2.7 FTE. The funding to policy and policy development is quite small.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes.

Ms GRAY - The bulk of the funding goes either to government agencies to administer actions in the plan or direct to the community sector.

PUBLIC

Ms O'CONNOR - I will put that on notice, just for that extra detail, if that is okay, minister?

Ms OGILVIE - No, that's fine. Perhaps a little bit more information -

Ms GRAY - Sorry, if I may just add also, Ms O'Connor, through the minister, we have resources within DPAC's Strategic Policy Unit that support national cabinet and you would be well aware that family violence and the prevention of family violence has been elevated as a priority of national cabinet, and was in fact the last subject of entire national cabinet meeting which I attended with the Premier, and which the minister was also supported in terms of advice on Tasmania's position to support. It was around \$4.7 billion that was announced following that national cabinet meeting directly on this subject.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you.

Ms GRAY - And of course, in looking at the distribution of that, and Tasmania's, you know, contribution, also through our Sexual Violence Plan, we will be continuing to work with the sector on what that involvement will be over the years to come.

CHAIR - Thank you. Ms Webb.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. I am interested in a similar sort of area. Is the Tasmania Family and Sexual Violence Alliance funded through this bucket of funding or is it through a different, DPAC-located bucket of funding? Because I am interested, if it is, I am just wanting to - if you can break down, at least, the funding that is being applied to that across this budget and the forward estimates?

Ms OGILVIE - I will need to ask the department, thank you. I will throw that to the department. They have the details.

Ms GRAY - Yes. Through you, minister, yes, it is funded through the action plan. And in 2023-24, the Tasmanian Council of Social Services, TasCOSS, was funded \$170,000 to auspice the establishment of the Family and Sexual Violence Alliance. To progress this work, an Alliance steering committee was established, comprising seven specialist family violence service providers. In June 2024 TasCOSS was granted an extension until December to fully consider the peaks proposed governance framework and membership structures and the activities to be delivered.

Ms WEBB - Can I clarify that point? Sorry, before you move on. That six-month extension essentially from June to December for TasCOSS; was that also additional to the \$770,000 that they were funded in the 2023-24 year? Did they get an extra half of that again on top to fund the next six months that that extension covered?

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister. I'm advised that in addition to the \$170,000 we're funding the alliance now under the new national action plan a further \$200,000.

Ms WEBB - Is that the 2024-25 amount of funding that's going to the alliance?

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister. We covered the extension from June until December and now the extension is for the next -

Ms PINTO - The extension will be two lots of \$200,000 each over the next two years funded centrally through the Commonwealth's national action plan.

Ms WEBB - To clarify did that Commonwealth money kick in from July? Is that cover the 2024-25 financial year and then the 2025-26 financial year?

Ms PINTO - Yes, it will be. It was just a matter of the tie over until the flow through of the money came through from the Commonwealth.

Ms WEBB - Right. Will the model be in place from December and then it steps away from TasCOSS at that point, or?

Ms PINTO - Through you, minister. We're still working with the alliance to determine the makeup of the peak body and what that will look like. The purpose of providing the funding was to enable them to continue to undertake that work to determine the best model for becoming a peak body. They do have to become incorporated and so there is a reasonable amount of paperwork and governance that needs to be put in place for them to become established.

Ms WEBB - It's important that this alliance becomes established and in place in an ongoing secure way. We now have no skin in the game as a state then if that money is coming through a Commonwealth source. There's two years of it that I heard you describe \$200,000 twice. So presumably 2024-25 and then 2025-26.

Is there any certainty past that point from the Commonwealth source for funding? If there isn't, minister, is the state prepared to commit to continue to fund that alliance, which will act as a peak for the family and sexual violence sector, to ensure that we're not setting them up just for two years only to be cut down again if the Commonwealth money were to disappear?

Ms OGILVIE - Look, the information that I'm receiving is that the department is working very collaboratively with the sector to work out exactly what it is that they want and how best to provide that. The commission of inquiry also recommended the establishment of a sexual assault clinic.

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister, a separate sexual violence peak.

Ms OGILVIE - There's a bit of work to be done there. The chances of federal government funding not being received going forward are very very slim. I think that the commitment has been made at National Cabinet and certainly from my personal perspective I would be pushing very hard for there not to be a gap.

Ms WEBB - Thank you for that. I hope we can have that confidence in the Commonwealth funding. Another last question around that funding then for the alliance. To what extent does it match up with what they're now going to be receiving to continue to develop the model and become established over the next two years? How does that match up to what was identified in budget submissions from the sector? I presume probably TasCOSS put something in their submission. I presume the alliance, the group of organisations who are working to develop the alliance, put a submission in. What was identified as necessary funding to continue the work of its establishment?

Ms OGILVIE - What I can provide you, I do have some information around the family and sexual violence alliance's state budget submission seeking funding which was \$500,000 per annum for five years 2024-25 to 2028-29 years to establish and operate the peak body.

Ms WEBB - Sorry, I missed that amount. Could you say that again?

Ms OGILVIE - The family and sexual violence alliance made a budget submission in the 2025 state Budget year seeking funding of \$500,000 per annum for five years for the 2024-25 to 2028-29 years to establish and operate the peak body and \$170,000 per annum for two years for the 2024-25 year to the 2025-26 year; to investigate and provide recommendations to the government for a separate peak body for sexual assault services which largely reflects the commission of inquiry recommendation as we just had previously discussed.

Ms WEBB - Right. The alliance identified \$500,000 per year across the forward Estimates as being necessary plus the extra \$170,000 for the next two years to develop the separate sexual violence peak body. What you've said is they're going to get \$200,000 per year for two years through Commonwealth money. Clearly there's a mismatch there, minister, in your patch in trying to establish a successful peak in this space or perhaps two peaks ultimately in this space. Yet we're not investing state money. Have you stepped back from it. You're not funding this alliance. From what you've described it sounds like there's only Commonwealth money being provided to do it, and even that falls far short of what was identified as necessary. What's your explanation for not funding this alliance?

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. I don't think we have stepped back. We've got that \$170,000 per annum to auspice the TasCOSS establishment.

Ms WEBB - Sorry, I thought that had finished. We extended it to December.

Ms OGILVIE - It's over five years.

Ms WEBB - It's over five years per annum. Right.

Ms OGILVIE - I don't think we're stepping back but we are obviously trying to seek funding that the federal government has on offer to assist our organisations which is a good thing.

Ms WEBB - That \$200,000 per year for the next two years from the Commonwealth, is that specifically targeted from the Commonwealth end to fund a peak body? Or have we decided to use a bucket of Commonwealth money to do that? I'm not familiar with the Commonwealth funding peaks in this space.

Ms OGILVIE - The advice I'm getting is that we would have to check the numbers but if we could take that on notice we can bring that to you.

Ms WEBB - Okay. Thank you. You understand what I'm after is - was it allocated that way from the national or from the Commonwealth end of things, or did we take money that was broadly available and decide to put it into this space? I'm not familiar with the Commonwealth specifically funding peaks. Thank you. Sorry, thanks for the time, Chair.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Can I have some understanding of the Arch centre? I know that there's been an announcement of a new centre as well. We have one or two existing? I know there's one in the north.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. Let me just get that for you.

CHAIR - I assume that they have some sort of relationship with Tas Police as well?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, and this is the challenge. The Arch centres sit with the minister for Police by way of funding. This portfolio as I described in my opening statement really goes across many other portfolios.

CHAIR - Right so there's no funding from this area of scrutiny that sits with the Arch centres?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me just check that. I can state that the 2024 budget provides \$22.572 million over the forward Estimates in permanent funding for the Arch but it doesn't sit in my portfolio output. Maybe that assists.

CHAIR - But the operation of the centre, does that fit anywhere within here? Because you mentioned the Arch centre, that's all.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, at a policy level. We sit on the steering committee of the Arch centre, and the operation side of it sits within the police outputs.

Ms WEBB - We will be able to follow up on that with the police tomorrow, but as a supplementary thing -

CHAIR - Ms Webb?

Ms WEBB - My understanding is that the interactions into the Arch centre that come from Laurel House and SASS, as the two service providers, has never had the funding it probably needs into that space. Do you have any discussions from this policy space that you are responsible for appropriate funding for that particular functioning of the two community-based service providers?

Ms OGILVIE - I understand that SASS and Laurel House also sit on that steering committee, so those conversations can be had within the steering committee environment. I wasn't sure what you meant about the engagement, please?

Ms WEBB - I'm wondering about your advocacy and engagement into the space. As the person responsible for this policy area of the Family and Sexual Violence Action Plan, advocacy for there to be appropriate funding.

Ms OGILVIE - For?

Ms WEBB - For the two services in the Arch spaces, who are providing that function of support into that space.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, thank you. I will ask Kath Morgan-Wicks to provide some information on that, thank you.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Through the minister, there has been significant advocacy in relation to the establishment of the Arch centres, but it hasn't been dealt with in a siloed approach: it has been done through a collaboration of all secretaries around the children and youth sexual safety governance structures. We basically - in terms of looking through the submissions and determining funding for the commission of inquiry items.

This included the establishment of the third Arch and making sure that there is permanent funding available within the DPFEM budget, both for example the deputy secretary, Mel Gray, myself and police provided advice to ministers and cabinet on the proposals for the funding and the level of funding for the Arch centres. We were weighing that up across that over \$400 million worth of initiatives, and that was a part of it. But it was for sexual violence in general, and not in a siloed space, just to this output, is what I am trying to explain.

Ms WEBB - No, I understand that.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes, thank you.

Ms WEBB - I am probably also keen to hear from the minister about what she did to advocate in that space given this policy responsibility, thank you.

Mr O'CONNOR - Thank you, Chair. Minister, what is the breakdown of funds in partnering with the community, which is funding, more broadly for the community sector in this space. It says 'Financial year 2025, \$1 million; financial year 2026, \$1 million', which the budget papers say is to address commission of inquiry recommendations 21.3, 21.4, and 21.7. This relates to a question that was earlier asked by Ms Webb.

Ms OGILVIE - I am seeking some information for you.

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister, the partnering with the community sector, funding for community sector, and the reducing harmful sexual behaviours line items that the member has highlighted are 100 per cent allocated to the community sector.

Mr O'CONNOR - Okay. Is it reasonable to say this is still a very modest allocation to the community sector in light of those recommendations of the commission of inquiry?

Ms OGILVIE - The advice I'm receiving is that our view is that it is a significant investment. We do have some information around the commission of inquiry investment as well, and of course, as you understand, in this area, which is highly matrixed across a number of fronts, making sure that there is sufficient funding is something which is top of mind. What the department is advising me is that they believe it is a significant investment. Courtney Hurworth may be able to add some assistance if you would like?

Mr O'CONNOR - There will be other members with questions, so I am quite comfortable with that.

Ms OGILVIE - Okay.

PUBLIC

Mr O'CONNOR - Has there been any attempt to bring the sector together to identify what you could do to improve the implementation of your Family Violence Action Plan prevention? Like, what sort of conversations do you have as minister?

Ms OGILVIE - What is the engagement strategy?

Mr O'CONNOR - Engagement with that broader sector who have got the on-ground experience?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, certainly. As I have said, I have recently met specifically with SASS and Laurel House at a meeting, and of course I have attended and had conversations with the Alliance when they have their event. My door is very much open. I am very mindful that this is a very sensitive and challenging area that is really now at national conversation level. Which is pleasing in the sense that more funds are flowing from the federal government, but also very disturbing in the sense that the challenges are sometimes seemingly intractable and it's hard. It's hard yards.

Mr O'CONNOR - Sure, but in terms of a structure that you could establish to bring the sector together.

Ms OGILVIE - We really rely on the Alliance. That is the - that's behind the -

Mr O'CONNOR - Is that enough?

Ms OGILVIE - Well, I think that the peak organisation work is really framing up a place where conversations can be had. I do like to have a peak organisation. It does make it easy to have that single point of contact with a range of views, but it is, personally, also really important to be able to be taking inputs from others. Without disclosing anything personal or confidential, I do have constituents, of course, who write to me with their stories.

Mr O'CONNOR - Of course. We all do.

Ms OGILVIE - All of that happens, and every day as I walk into the office there is another challenging story, particularly holding prisons and also this area. It's hard yards, and it is the most serious of areas. I am personally committed to doing all that I can to push forward solutions to this, particularly around the prevention issue. I think -

Mr O'CONNOR - It is hard to be really effective with prevention if you are underfunding at the beginning.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, the funding issue is one piece of the puzzle. Obviously very important, but it is also really important that we raise awareness. That is the benefit of having a minister in this area to be able to - and I do work closely with the Premier. He attends National Cabinet; this is a national level dialogue. We have nods here. The funding issue and backing in the people who are doing the work on the frontline is an incredibly important piece of the puzzle, but funding obviously is always important.

CHAIR - A question around emergency - you have something there?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - No, it is just about the workshops that we have been running as well with the community sector reps, particularly to discuss the Change for Children review and Working for the Together. A lot of these areas blend into each other when you are dealing with families.

CHAIR - Just around the emergency shelter services across the state, is there any discussion or allocation for additional shelter opportunities?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me see what - so housing and shelters, that funding does sit with the Minister for Housing.

CHAIR - He's going to be busy tomorrow, isn't he?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I'm sure he will be. Having said that, I have visited the Hobart shelter.

CHAIR - It was just a question in last year's Estimates here, so that makes it interesting.

Ms OGILVIE - Having said that, I cannot speak more highly of our shelters and the work that they do, and I have visited the Hobart women's shelter and have met with them and had conversations. I am very, very supportive.

CHAIR - They received some funding last year of \$432,000. It increased to \$432,000 and continued to 2026-27.

Ms OGILVIE - So under - and not sort of wishing to speak in other people's areas, but the Family Violence Rapid Rehousing Program is administered by Homes Tasmania and will receive \$6,334,000 over the five-year plan, including a funding burst of \$1.5 million in the state budget. So that is good news.

CHAIR - My next question is around Tasmania's Third Family and Sexual Violence Action Plan, Survivors at the Centre. Last year there was a discussion in the other committee of the 38 actions. It talked about how many actions had been completed, and there were eight - five actions which had already been completed and three which were on track. Can I have an update on where those actions are?

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. Yes, I do -

CHAIR - From my reading it looked like Ms Hurworth was the person responsible for those.

Ms OGILVIE - Perhaps if I might refer that for answering.

Ms GRAY - Yes. Through you, minister, it is fortunate that I received an update from Ms Hurworth most recently and that I am very grateful for. I do have here a list of the 38 actions.

CHAIR - Is that able to be tabled?

Ms OGILVIE - We need to verify there's nothing controversial, first.

PUBLIC

Ms GRAY - Yes, we would want to verify, yes.

Ms OGILVIE - It's all right if we check, but yes, we will see what we can do.

CHAIR - Is there a summary?

Ms GRAY - And a status report as at Q4 2023-24. We can't table this.

Ms WEBB - Well, can we have another version that is cleaned up?

Ms OGILVIE - If you could give us an opportunity to do that. I am happy to provide as much information as we can, but we obviously need to confirm things are appropriate. Yes, we will have a look at what we can do.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Mr O'CONNOR - Thank you. Minister, are you moving to put family violence response - are you working to take it out of Premier and Cabinet and move it into Justice?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I did look at that and that is one of my intentions.

Mr O'CONNOR - On what basis -

Ms OGILVIE - I will ask the department to talk that through, as there has been a change to plan, but -

Mr O'CONNOR - Well, that would be your directives, though, wouldn't it? Isn't it your -

Ms OGILVIE - Well, I work with everyone. It was my intention.

Mr O'CONNOR - It wasn't the department's decision. It's your decision, if you're minister.

Ms OGILVIE - I work collaboratively, obviously.

Mr O'CONNOR - No, but in a Westminster - a decision like that is a ministerial - the responsibility sits on you.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, but I don't bark orders at people; I work with people.

Mr O'CONNOR - No, but - no, I understand that. You're the minister.

Ms OGILVIE - So I might ask you to refer to that. I am happy to talk to it and get the information from the department first.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Through the minister, when I have come in as a new secretary for Premier and Cabinet, I have had a look at the structure, the teams and functions, and noting also the maturity of the Tasmanian Plan, and the significant funding that is under that plan, so

PUBLIC

the sum \$12.5 million per annum, but noting probably the small number of FTE that sit within Premier and Cabinet to administer the plan and continue those conversations, but other resourcing that sits within our Strategic Policy Division to support it on a national level.

We did have a look at whether that - and in discussions with the minister - but also discussions with the Premier, given the Premier represents this issue at the national cabinet basis, to look at whether it would be those FTE are better placed and situated with Justice who have a larger number and supporting staff frontline. So that went to consultation with our staff, and we received feedback from the sector who wrote to the Premier and no doubt the minister also.

We have considered that feedback and recommend that that now remains within Premier and Cabinet, also noting the additional investment that has come through nationally. So that is a decision that was discussed with the relevant ministers, including obviously the minister for this portfolio. I can confirm that that will remain within Premier and Cabinet.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Ms Morgan-Wicks. Presumably, the feedback from the sector was it is a bomb of an idea and don't do it? The sector would have like the fact that it is a whole-of- government approach if you have it within Premier and Cabinet.

Ms OGILVIE - I think Mel would like to make a comment?

Ms GRAY - Yes. Through you, minister, we did also sit down with the sector, and the sector did acknowledge the logic behind considering the alignment with Justice, and acknowledged that there was some logic there. Looking at departmental arrangements across jurisdictions was also considered including with many jurisdictions leading this work through their line agency Department of Justice equivalents, and the intent was to develop sort of synergies with other programs that are currently administered by Justice, including legal assistance and Safe at Home, and keeping women safe in their homes program, flexible support packages.

Although there were synergies with these programs, it wasn't intended that the Family and Sexual Violence portfolio was going to be amalgamated into Safe at Home or a criminal justice response. However, acknowledging those strong links, the feedback was quite clearly from the sector that the links to commission of inquiry and the national cabinet priority meant that, to be honest, it could have - it could have worked either way, but there was a strong preference for it to remain more with that central whole of government focus.

Mr O'CONNOR - That is obviously also a recognition at some level, an appreciation of the work that is done through Premier and Cabinet in this area. Can I ask, minister - and I might have missed it when it - it might have come up before when I was on my computer briefly. The Women's Policy Unit in the Department of Premier and Cabinet -

CHAIR - We haven't got there yet.

Mr O'CONNOR - We aren't?

CHAIR - No.

Mr O'CONNOR - Okay. Sorry. I'm just looking at two-line items in the one budget page.

CHAIR - No. Just hold your thoughts.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. I first wanted to pick up back when we were discussing the Arch centres and the funding that goes into that space for the service delivery organisations, SASS and Laurel House. We talked about the fact that we have got overlapping departments and overlapping - in a good, synergistic way. You would appreciate, though, that it can make scrutiny tricky and accountability tricky.

So while we are - you know, we were asking for some details around the funding for SASS and Laurel House in that space, and you say, 'Well, the Arch centres are in the police portfolio', are we going to get to tomorrow, when we have the Police Minister in front of us, and we are talking about Arch centres, and when we start asking questions about SASS and Laurel House funding there he says to us, 'Oh, well, we're responsible for the other parts of the other parts of the Arch funding, but we're not responsible for that Arch funding. You should have asked DPAC when you had DPAC in front of you'.

I am mindful that we have played that game before here at Estimates in many other areas, and the risk is real. So where is - in terms of scrutiny and accountability of funding for that element of Arch, where can I best ask questions about it?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Through the minister - and this is not us trying to be difficult or tricky -

Ms WEBB - I understand.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - If I may comment on the evolution of the Arch centres, and also pay tribute to the sector, to the work of, you know, previous ministers and DPFEM to bring these to fruition, and that they started with one, it has grown to two, and through the commission of inquiry, you know, analysis and policy work and advice, we have advocated for there to be three. Certainly, in terms of whether SASS and Laurel House are separately contracted or a part of Arch, you know, funded by DPFEM, I would need to check. Because I don't have the line items sitting here in terms of DPFEM.

I am aware, however, of the very close working relationship our DPAC team has with SASS and Laurel House, particularly through existing family violence work but also now through new and stepped up funding that's been provided through the Commission of Inquiry to try and support the community. We just need to take that on notice if there's - or if Mel's able to add whether there's separate funding through DPFEM to SASS and Laurel House, for example.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, that's for the police minister to -

Ms WEBB - That's right. Thank you for that answer, and I appreciate we'll get a bit more answer. I didn't ask the question with any accusation that there was deliberate opacity there. It's complex, I understand, because even just that space that you spoke of that DPAC has that relationship and those funding arrangements for those organisations, is it this part of DPAC that we're talking about here under this manager or was it under the premier that we

should have addressed those things yesterday because it was commission of inquiry related? Because within DPAC there's crossover and overlap.

So again, for us, from a scrutiny point of view, it's going to be a learning process, I think, this year where we might be tripped up not knowing where to ask the questions and be sent round the mulberry bush a couple of times potentially because of that. It's something to think about for next year when we do come to scrutinise budgets. For these wonderfully integrated, non-siloed approaches we've got to service delivery, which I applaud, we're actually going to have to have clarity for budget scrutiny purposes about which parts of what funding are taken to which minister so that we don't sort of go in circles with it.

Ms OGILVIE - I totally appreciate what you're saying because we are trying to work in a highly matrixed way to fix a problem that is complex and multifunctional. But probably the outputs are where you'd go to find where the funding sits.

Ms WEBB - So that's not always clear either because I can't go to these line items and know -

Ms O'CONNOR - There's no breakdown.

Ms WEBB - Where's the funding for SASS and Laurel House that relates to Arch centres. I don't know whether it's here in Output 7.5 or whether it was in one of the commission of inquiry related DPAC other line items or whether it's in the police line item relating to Arch. I can't tell that. So actually, we need to have the advice back through the departments as to where it's attached for scrutiny purposes. We'd love to work with you on it if that's helpful, but it's important.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Through the minister. I can note the member's interest and we can attempt to determine how we could, for example, release further information so that that is clearer. Because for example, it could be whether it's in our information in relation to grants agreements, whether it's in contracts or consultancies which we do publish in annual reports, for example. After this session we can also make contact with our colleagues at DPFEM just to let them know of this interest. If it's not within their portfolio, we can provide the information, if that's of assistance, or take this on notice.

Ms WEBB - I really appreciate that. Thank you for the opportunity to have the conversation today.

CHAIR - Minister, was there anything to add? And I apologise, I referred to Ms Gray by her Christian name earlier.

Ms OGILVIE - I've been doing that too. My apologies.

CHAIR - So was there anything else that was to be added by Ms Gray?

Ms GRAY - No.

CHAIR - No. Okay. Thank you. Any other questions in this area?

Ms WEBB - One more if that's - sorry.

CHAIR - Yes, thank you.

Ms WEBB - Because actually that wasn't my question. Noting that the third family and sexual violence action plan 2022-27 is in train and we're sort of halfway through, do we have a set of metrics that we're using to monitor and evaluate success and impact of that plan? So not just ticking off - because I know we're going to get an update on implementation of actions, and that's fine. That's a valuable thing to have. But I'm wondering about how we evaluate success for the plan and what we've got on track in terms of metrics for that.

Ms OGILVIE - I'll just seek some information. I think we can talk about the evaluation framework.

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister. In talking about the evaluation, I can update the committee that in relation to the question on Survivors at the Centre progress, seven of the actions have been completed, 12 are progressing and 19 are represented as embedded business as usual. I'm just going to seek a little more advice, minister, in relation to the evaluation framework for the Survivors at the Centre. It's my understanding that we work really closely with the national action plan as well, and we have committed to the delivery of an outcomes framework rather than just ticking boxes, as the member's aware.

Our approach to strategies and action plans can sometimes - we've learnt over a number of years that rather than ticking boxes, embedded systems change and a robust sort of theory of change and systems change methodology is the way that we should be doing these things. We have committed to the delivery of an outcomes framework, and my understanding is that the Commonwealth has just landed theirs and so that we need to make sure that our evaluation framework aligns with what's happening at the national level and associate with the national action plan.

Ms WEBB - I appreciate that answer, minister, and it's good to hear that that's the intention. Is there a timeframe then that we can put around that, even broadly, knowing that that progress has happened at a national level, and I agree we'd want to align with that. But what's our intended timeframe for having an evaluation framework that's outcomes based?

Ms OGILVIE - I'll just seek some information on that.

Ms GRAY - Yes. Through you, minister. We'd be looking to complete that work this year.

Ms WEBB - Great. Thank you for that.

Ms GRAY - Sorry, I might correct - 2024-25.

Ms WEBB - This financial year that we're in.

Ms GRAY - This financial year, yes.

Ms WEBB - Right.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you. Minister, we heard in hearings in Attorney-General and Justice yesterday, and in fact when you look at the data in the annual reports, domestic and family violence, sexual assault are persistently - the levels of them in our community and the matters that come before the courts are persistently high and, in fact - I don't have the Magistrates' Court annual report here, but there's an increase in matters coming before the courts that relate to intimate partner abuse and sexual assault.

Obviously, something is not being done in terms of prevention and early intervention. Could you outline to the committee what work is happening, particularly with young people, in relation to Respectful Relationships, which was a program that was rolled out in schools in the Labor-Greens government in order to prevent sexual abuse, discriminatory language and much worse by talking to young people early to prevent it?

Ms OGILVIE - So you've touched on two points there. First, I agree with you that there is a trend and Tasmania -

Ms O'CONNOR - It's getting worse and -

Ms OGILVIE - That's the trend. Tasmania Police suggest that the trend suggests increased awareness and reduced tolerance within the community in relation to family violence along with a greater knowledge of reporting avenues available. Second, in relation to the government's priority and long-term commitment to eliminate family and sexual violence in Tasmania, that does have an element of community change, changing attitudes, and to challenge attitudes that allow family and sexual violence to occur. And we're supporting primary prevention activities and we've -

Ms O'CONNOR - In schools?

Ms OGILVIE - We've been a proud member of Our Watch since 2015. We're continuing to fund membership of Our Watch which is \$28,000 per annum, and the Our Watch senior advisor role which is \$135,000 per annum under the third action plan. Our Watch is the national leader in the primary prevention of violence and works to drive nationwide change in the culture, behaviours and power imbalances that lead to violence against women and their -

Ms O'CONNOR - And the children? Minister -

CHAIR - While the minister takes a breath, I'd like to acknowledge in the room the former Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Honourable Michael Polley. Lovely to see you here today.

Ms OGILVIE - Good to have you in the house. I just wanted to touch on -

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, minister. To address the question, which is talking to young people about respectful relationships is really important, wouldn't you agree -

Ms OGILVIE - That's where I was -

Ms O'CONNOR - and could you tell us what's happening in this area?

Ms OGILVIE - That's where I was

Ms O'CONNOR - Could you tell us what's happening in this area?

Ms OGILVIE - That's where I was going.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - So the action plan committed \$700,000 in 2022-23 rolled over to 2023-24, and implementation under action 24 of the action plan includes a dedicated project officer to work with Tasmanian government schools to imbed Respectful Relationship education in alignment with the Australian curriculum. I think you were specifically asking about that and continued development of resources and to support and assist all learners to increase their understanding of consent, coercive control and grooming informed through the voice of children, young people and key stakeholders.

CHAIR - One more question. Ms Webb, thank you. Just snuck in there.

Ms WEBB - I'm not sure that this fits into here really, but it might just be the beginning of a conversation. We know the federal government recently criminalised the nonconsensual sharing of deepfake images and video content, which is a form of sexual violence I think, the nonconsensual sharing of that. So it's great to see it criminalised at that federal level. I recognise that legislative reforms for this may fall in the Attorney-General's remit, but as the minister for Women, likely you take a keen interest in it -

Ms OGILVIE - I do.

Ms WEBB - Given the responsibility of the action plan, for example. According to the Commonwealth parliament's briefing document on the federal bill, they said this: 'The Commonwealth lacks a direct constitutional head of power to legislate regarding technology generally, including computing, which appears to restrict its capacity to create offences regarding individuals who create, produce or generate deepfakes'.

So according to the federal government, the responsibility does sit with the states and territories to legislate to penalise the actual creation of the deepfake material in the first place. The particular question I had is that the government is investigating, you in conjunction with the attorney, no doubt, whether the state can legislate to criminalise the creation of such nonconsensual deepfake imagery to strengthen the application of the federal law here at the state level and to close that loophole that's been identified?

Ms OGILVIE - I can give you a little bit of information about this, and you're correct, I do take a very deep interest in this. I have the science and technology portfolio -

Ms WEBB - From multiple angles. That's right.

Ms OGILVIE - Women, and I have long been a voice against revenge porn, which is another area. We know that there is a national discussion happening about the safety and security of children online. It's not just children, it's all of us. Some of the revolting things that happen in the online environment, particularly on social media is just profoundly disturbing. I have taken it upon myself to seek and ask for a review and for some advice in relation to moves

that the federal government wishes to make, what state-based application or powers we could have to start to look at a model at a state level that would work.

What I will say again - and this is where it annoys me when the federal government shirks its responsibility in communications - so they do have the Telecommunications Act, they do have the power to regulate telecommunications, and a crime that is caused over the carriage service provider, they do have the power there to prevent that. It is a complex area. It's very much an emerging area of technology and law, so it is cutting edge stuff. It is an area that I have a deep interest in and I've just started to turn my mind to it.

Ms WEBB - That's good to hear. That's excellent because the faster we do look at it, the better.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, it's going to be hard, so it's going to require all hands-on deck.

Ms O'CONNOR - Have you written to the federal minister?

Ms OGILVIE - No.

Ms O'CONNOR - Or spoken to the federal minister?

Ms OGILVIE - No, I have not. No, I literally just started to do this work this week.

CHAIR - While you turn your mind, minister, to that letter or that contact, I'll turn mine to Output 7.6 which is women's policy.

7.6 Women's policy

CHAIR - In your overview, you talked about this women's policy allowing women and girls to thrive and survive, and then it says all of the wonderful things on page 282 about Equal Means Equal and promoting gender equity and opportunities for women in leadership participation, economic scrutiny, safety, health and wellbeing. Yet you've cut the budget by more than half. What is the explanation about why that would be. In the outward years, you've cut it again almost by half, and then nothing and nothing. I'm not quite sure whether all this, what's being said and what's being written, actually equates to support with funds.

Ms O'CONNOR - Good question.

Ms OGILVIE - So this is the Equal Means Equal.

Ms O'CONNOR - What's the footnote? 13?

CHAIR - 13. Completion of budget initiatives, but I expect that there'd be still required funds to do all these wonderful things.

Ms OGILVIE - So I've just had inputs from both sides.

CHAIR - Both sides.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Very helpful. At detail and strategic level. The Budget is the same as last year. We'll obviously be considering future budgets as we move into future budgeting territory.

CHAIR - So \$659,000, and the Budget for 2024-25, unless I've got the wrong page, it says \$310,000. Am I wrong?

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, we'll just check that.

Ms O'CONNOR - I think its page 273.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - We were just looking at the output expense summary.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - So \$661 and \$660 in 2024-25.

CHAIR - Are we at odds?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - But I can check back to if it's revenue by appropriation.

Ms WEBB - Revenue for appropriation by output, page 290.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - And expense summary will include rollovers or other departmental transfers. In terms of output group expense summary, it's budgeted at the same level in terms of expense.

CHAIR - Maybe the figures are wrong again.

Ms WEBB - So we're not spending - if we're rolling over it's because we haven't spent it from one year to the next, so we rolled it over. So how much are we actually spending?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Through the minister. I'd need to check that, so I'll just check the total.

CHAIR - The footnote tells me the decrease in women's policy over the forward Estimates reflects the completion of 2021-22 Budget initiatives. But there'd still have to be money going forward if we're going to support what women's policy does.

Ms OGILVIE - I might be able to assist. 2025 is the final year of allocated funding for Equal Means Equal, Tasmanian women's strategy 2022-27. I am advised that DPAC will consider funding as part of subsequent budget processes to continue to deliver programs under the women's portfolio, continue to roll out Equal Means Equal and develop the next Tasmanian government women's strategy.

Ms WEBB - It drops away in expenses as well, just so you know. It well and truly drops away in expenses. When I'm looking at the output group expense summary on page 273, women's policy, for 2024-25 we've got \$660 and then 2025-26 189 and then nothing in the out years.

PUBLIC

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Which, through the minister, is what I said. This year's Budget, 2024-25, is exactly the same in terms of the expenditure. \$660,000 I should say is \$1000 less.

Ms WEBB - Yes.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - So \$660,000 compared to \$661,000 budgeted last year, and we will consider in terms of the strategy what funding's required through the 2025-26 budget submissions.

Ms O'CONNOR - Can I ask a supplementary to this after you, Chair?

CHAIR - We'll try to get an extra page in the budget papers for next year.

Ms O'CONNOR - After you, Chair?

CHAIR - Thank you, Ms O'Connor.

Ms WEBB - We've spent half of what we.

Ms O'CONNOR - Just following up on the Chair's question, the women's policy unit in the Department of Premier and Cabinet has always, for as long as I can recall, been a really important part of policy development in government. The flatlining in the two out years, does that mean that the women's policy unit won't have human beings in it? I'm just trying to understand, page 290, Women's Policy, you've got two flat years, 2026-27, 2027-28. Will there be a women's policy unit if there's no funding in those two years for it? Will it have people in it?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Through the minister. We absolutely have people working on women's policy within Premier and Cabinet, including a component of myself. That is within our strategic policy and advice unit, which has, from last memory and I could get this wrong, between 70 and 80 people working in strategic policy.

In terms of trying to get a budgeted line, these numbers reflect, in my understanding, project-based funding to support Equal means Equals program. It's not to say that there's not going to be future projects that are funded in the budget that we put into the next 2025-26 Budget submission, but there will always be, whilst I am secretary of DPAC, people working on women's policy within the department and advising the minister and premier.

Ms O'CONNOR - So within that strategic policy and advice unit, and I know it's created to deliver some flexibility so that particular policy priority areas, you can put people on the case. In broad terms your expertise and FTEs, how many people in DPAC do you think are working on women's policy?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Through the minister, of course.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - If I may comment on the first five or so months that I've been at DPAC and seen various pieces of, for example, obviously our deputy secretary here in terms

of strategic policy, other deputy secretaries and many DPAC representatives that are supporting Women Supporting Women, an initiative that was led and founded by the previous secretary Jenny Gale and which I continue under DPAC.

We have, you know, many people across DPAC contributing in women's policy support, for example, varying initiatives across cadets, graduates, influencing, for example, selection, looking at recruitment and bias, for example, and assisting other agencies. I don't have a direct number that I can give.

Ms O'CONNOR - No, that's okay. It sounds -

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Mel might know that space better, given her longer history at DPAC.

Ms O'CONNOR - I'm reassured, Ms Morgan-Wicks. Minister, the government has the Women on Boards policy. Highly commendable. There is one organisation which is a bit reprobate in this regard, and that is the Integrity Commission, which has long had a manel.

Ms OGILVIE - Has had a what?

CHAIR - A manel.

Ms O'CONNOR - A manel as its board. Yes, a manel is a panel made of men. It's a matter certainly that the Greens have raised over the journey. As the minister responsible for women's policy and someone who I know takes a close interest in justice broadly, can I encourage you to take this one up? From our point of view it seems to be falling on deaf ears. This is no reflection on anyone who's on the board other than to observe there are many very talented and skilled women with a background in the law or criminology who'd make great integrity commission board members. I mean, do you think it's well past time that the integrity commission extended itself beyond being a manel, the board?

Ms OGILVIE - It's probably best for me to talk in terms of principles, and I would like the principle of equal representation across all of our boards to apply. That's where we need to end up. If you look at a number of our boards, particularly those that I'm aware of that may come from more engineering territory as well, could possibly benefit from the inclusion of highly skilled women.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, would certainly benefit from it.

Ms OGILVIE - That's right. I know there's some pejorative language used around some women's talents maybe being needed or not needed in relation to certain areas that have occurred over the past few days. My view is women are fantastic. When you look at the private sector, women on boards send profits up. Women are great on boards. It's a cultural issue that is - I think we're a bit sluggish within government. It's something that the private sector has got right. We see that the work being done there is fantastic.

We are working on that, but not just within government but across the private sector, too, to find those learnings, bringing people through, internships, leadership, those sorts of things. We've got 48.3 per cent of women on Tasmanian government boards and committees. Not quite there, in my view. It is an achievement, though, because it's an increase, and we're very

close to reaching what has been our overarching target of 50 per cent of women on boards and committees.

Ms O'CONNOR - Not very close. You're still 6.5 per cent off.

Ms OGILVIE - It's close. However, I do think there's more to be done and I do think we need to look at not just making sure that we've got women representing on boards of all our important boards, not just a global figure. That work needs to be done, making for those next generation of female leaders opportunities for them to come through. I'm always happy to take things on. Always happy to be open-minded about ways forward with this kind of stuff.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, minister. I'm pleased to hear your answer. I actually am asking you to commit to take this one on because it's a persistent issue where our primary - our integrity body has a board that's entirely male, and it's been that way for a very, very long time. I just hope that, because you've got a position of authority in government, you can, for example, have a chat to the Attorney-General and your other colleagues about correcting this.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. I do speak up and raise my voice on the women's issues regularly. I'm very happy to continue to advocate. Now you've drawn it to my attention I'm certainly happy to have a look at what we might do as we contemporise our Women on Boards strategy. That's the right place for it to sit so it's not specific to any individual or any particular organisation. We need to get this right as a framework and as a culture to make sure that we are doing the best we can across all our organisations. As you have specifically raised it with me, I will ask the department to have a look at it.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. I'm just trying to crunch the numbers so I can properly understand the expenses and appropriation issue. My understanding is from the tables here, in 2023-24 we budgeted \$661,000 in the women's policy line. This year for 2024-25 we're appropriating \$310,000 but we're still spending the same, apparently. So we're having a \$660,000 expense in the table for expenses, which tells me that \$350,000 wasn't spent in 2023-24 and is being brought forward to 2024-25. Am I correct so far?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR - Yes. That's perfect.

Ms WEBB - So \$350,000 brought forward would mean we go with the original budget of \$661,000 minus the \$350,000; we spent \$311,000 in 2023-24. Why did we underspend so dramatically, only spending \$311,000 and then carrying forward the other \$350,000? What happened in 2023-24 where we didn't actually spend the allocated budget?

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister. It's as a result of the timing for the women's workforce participation project.

Ms WEBB - Okay. That was lucky for us, I guess. Can I ask another question around the Tasmanian gender budget statement? Thank you very much for providing it. It's great to see a third iteration. It's definitely developing year on year, which I absolutely acknowledge.

Ms OGILVIE - Working hard on that.

Ms WEBB - I'm very pleased to see it. Absolutely. Knowing that the commitment was made to start producing this, at the time we were debating my motion in the upper House calling for it, and it was announced in response and I was really pleased. Over time it's definitely improving and progressing. I was really pleased to hear you say in your opening statement, minister, that the development of the toolkit, the assessment toolkit, gender assessment toolkit, is progressing. Did we have a timeline on when that will be rolled out with departments and in the context across other agencies?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, we do. I'll just get that for you.

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister. Yes, we do. The toolkit is really exciting because it's an example of one of those system change initiatives that I was talking about earlier where we're working with other government agencies to have not just two, three or 40 FTE that understand this portfolio, but -

Ms WEBB - Everyone.

Ms GRAY - It becomes embedded in agencies. We are anticipating - we're in the process of refining the toolkit based on feedback with those agencies that we've been codesigning the toolkit with.

Ms WEBB - Which agencies are those? Obviously Treasury.

Ms GRAY - We do have them.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes. Justice, I think. State Growth.

Ms GRAY - Yes. DPFEM.

Ms OGILVIE - I might have them. Yes.

Ms GRAY - DPFEM, Justice, State Growth. Obviously working in close collaboration with Treasury as our fellow central agency always and in relation to the gender budget statement. Based on that feedback, alongside this we're developing a website to host the toolkit, the training package, extra supporting materials and, importantly, case studies as well to support the rollout of the toolkit. And it's anticipated in terms of timeframe and the member's question that the toolkit will be available to government agencies later this year.

Ms WEBB - Fantastic. You mentioned a website that will be there. Is it a publicly accessible website. I am really hopeful that the government is leading the way on this work which provides a really great example and a learning point for the community more broadly and for the private sector as well. A publicly available website where people can see that work and what it entails?

Ms GRAY - Through you, minister, not at this stage of the project. But as always -

Ms WEBB - Perhaps down the track?

Ms GRAY - Yes. As always, I think if we are developing something so innovative and helpful for gender equality, we would look in future phases of the rollout as to how we could share that with the community sector or the broader community.

Ms WEBB - Yes. That sounds really positive. The other sort of natural flow on that I have always imagined and understood from my research and reading on this topic is that down the track it can feed into - once you get that toolkit in place and people come - the capacity built into government agencies to utilise it. Naturally there could potentially be something that becomes part of the regular cabinet process, minister, where any proposal or bill that comes to cabinet, in the same way that it would have economic analysis attached to it, and information about that, could have a gender assessment attached to it as a matter of course, which I think is a wonderful outcome which we could be looking ahead to. Is that where you see the benefit of this potentially flowing through in the longer term, minister?

Ms OGILVIE - So it is already in the budget submission template, so those factors are taken into account. Look, I don't want to -

Ms WEBB - Sorry, not the budget submissions, no, cabinet submissions.

Ms OGILVIE - I hear what you are saying, so I am just giving you additional information. I am not going to commit to that, because I would like to see how this rolls out. I would like to make sure we get it right. I would like to understand the benefit of what we are able to produce and then make an assessment when I have more information.

Ms WEBB - That's fine. I wasn't raising it to pressure you for a firm commitment, just a shared vision that this is a direction that we could be heading in.

Ms OGILVIE - I am sure it will give us some very insightful and helpful information.

Ms WEBB - I can keep going or we can -

CHAIR - We have another five or six minutes, if you want to - or if anybody else has -

Ms WEBB - No, I still have questions. I just don't want to provide a barrier to others.

CHAIR - Well, you had something about the Arches, but you ended up telling me that I can ask that tomorrow.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, you will need to about funding, because it is not in this output. I am happy to talk about the multidisciplinary nature of the Arch centres, which is where I was trying to get to. We might have run out of time. You understand how they work.

Ms WEBB - I think we are quite familiar with it, and we covered a bit of it and the difficulties of scrutinising it, wonderful though the model is. I note the gender budget statement includes, as part of some discussion, a snapshot on men's sheds, which I think is welcome and appropriate.

It does not, because of course we would understand - although this is sitting in your portfolio, which is around women's policy, a gender budget statement isn't in fact, a women's issue as such: it is a gender budget statement so ideally it would be a gender assessment of

policies in the budget and initiatives in the budget which isn't women-specific. It is just, 'What impact does this have in terms of gender, where do we see the flow-on effect? Is there also an intention that there will be a more broader application of a gender assessment across certain issues that might relate to impact on Tasmanian men and also impact on Tasmanians of non-binary gender to also be included more fully into this assessment document down the track?

I am not posing criticism now for where it is. I want to be very clear I am very complimentary of progress to date. Is that something that we look ahead to, that it becomes not necessarily just about women, the gender of women, but covers more assessment of impact across all genders?

CHAIR - I can hear the former member for Windermere being channelled here.

Ms OGILVIE - I am very open-minded about how this evolves and how it grows and how it develops into giving us the best information that we can have in relation to this topic. You know, my mind is absolutely not closed in relation to that. I do recognise very much - and I want to thank the Department of Treasury in particular: bringing this document in-house I think has been very helpful and gives us a little bit more traction on how we can build it and bring it together, and that it is really an iterative process. It is growing, and I guess the issues that you refer to would be one of a range of issues that people want to bring forward, to ask us, 'Could you look at this', 'Could you look at other things'. I'm open to all of those conversations.

CHAIR - Probably someone is making a note as we speak.

Ms OGILVIE - Possibly.

Ms WEBB - It needed the leadership of this portfolio and it has had that from you and the previous minister, so thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - It has and we have done that date. I reiterate we are very open-minded to it. I am keen to hear from everyone. They might be happy to take that one on board as a question, but there might be other things as well. In some senses, it is a little bit organic in the sense that as ways of doing things become better understood, family violence stuff happening, the toolkits happening, so there are a few moving parts to this which would feed into future iterations. I too thought it was good to have the men's shed issue in there, recognising it is gender, not just women.

CHAIR - Some of them are she sheds as well.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, that's right, in Huon.

CHAIR - They have she sheds and they have both genders.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, and Ms Morgan-Wicks is happy to add a little bit more.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - If I may, through the minister, comment. I was very pleased when I saw the draft of the statement coming through to see the men's shed there as an example. But particularly being aware of the disparity in health outcomes and men seeking health help and noting really the success of those sheds in promoting the conversations around men's health, and the impact that also the loss of a partner can have on a family and then the wealth

of the partner that is left behind. We do need to make sure that on both sides and all sides of gender that people are seeking health assistance when they need it.

CHAIR - Yes. You know they have morning tea from 10 am to about 3 pm?

Ms OGILVIE - They do. It's perfect if you turn up.

CHAIR - They appreciate a cream cake or a packet of cream biscuits every time you turn up. So, minister, always mindful of the time.

Mr GAFFNEY - I have to make comment on this gender budget statement. This is a big improvement, I think. I am not saying that last year's was not good.

Ms OGILVIE - I worked hard on this.

Mr GAFFNEY - This is a big improvement on last year, because it does acknowledge some of that. I want to make the point that I understand what is meant by men's sheds and the roles they play for a certain small percentage of men, but it is a start. But what I am sometimes frustrated by, if you go to the department's website, of the 20 community groups that feed into decisions, five of them are women-specific, no male-specific ones.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Mr GAFFNEY - If it was in reverse, there would be hell to pay. I am concerned that - especially with, there is a community group called 'International Women's Day'. International Men's Day does not even get a mention on the website. When you ring up and say -

Ms O'CONNOR - Every day is International Men's Day, Mr Gaffney. Every day.

Mr GAFFNEY - That's correct, and I am saying that this is important that we strike a balance of both genders whenever we look at this. I have raised that issue last year. I take offence at the member for the Greens for doing that, because it is unfair and it is not balanced. I just want to raise the point.

Ms O'CONNOR - It's a woman's perspective down here.

Mr GAFFNEY - Yes, and we hear it a lot.

Ms OGILVIE - No, I understand. May I just quickly respond to that?

CHAIR - So the minister will either agree or disagree.

Ms OGILVIE - No, it's not a black and white thing. I am a mother of sons. I care deeply about their future on this planet and in this world, and I do wish to strike appropriate balance on that issue in particular and I do appreciate what you are saying. I will reiterate that I have very much an open mind about how we can do better. This document and the work here, as I say, I have worked hard on it. We have all worked hard on this. This is something that is part of a community effort, and to make that real we need to be listening to all voices and I am very open and happy to do that.

PUBLIC

Mr GAFFNEY - Thank you.

CHAIR - Thank you very much, minister. On behalf of the committee, thank you all for your contribution to today's areas of scrutiny. It is very much appreciated. We acknowledge the work that goes into providing those briefs for the minister and all the hard work that people do.

We shall suspend and have an afternoon tea break and come back at 4.15 pm, for the next part of our day. Thank you very much, minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Not me.

CHAIR - Not you. We shall suspend the committee.

The Committee suspended at 4.00 p.m.