



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Hon. Madeleine Ogilvie MP

Monday 17 November 2025

MEMBERS

Hon Ruth Forrest MLC (Chair)

Hon Dean Harris MLC

Hon Sarah Lovell

Hon Cassy O'Connor MLC

Hon Bec Thomas MLC

OTHER PARTICIPATING MEMBERS

Ms Forrest

Mr Harriss

Ms Lovell

Ms O'Connor

Ms Thomas

Mr Hiscutt

IN ATTENDANCE

HON. MADELEINE OGILVIE MP

Minister for Environment, Minister for Innovation, Science, Technology and Digital Economy,
Minister for Community and Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Arts and Heritage.

Department of State Growth (Arts)

Brett Stewart

Deputy Secretary

Dr David Sudmalis

Director, Creative Tasmania

Mary Mulcahy

CEO, Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery

Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania (Heritage)

Jason Jacobi

Secretary

Louise Wilson

Deputy Secretary

Will Jocelyne

General Manager, Heritage

Melissa Ford

Director, Heritage Tasmania

Ministerial Office Representaives

Tristan Bick

Chief of Staff

Kandace Gilligan

Senior Adviser

Community and Multicultural Affairs

Department of Premier and Cabinet

Noelene Kelly

Deputy Secretary

Corrina Smith

Director, Community Services

Kristy Broomhall

Assistant Director, Community Services

Ministerial Office representatives

Tristan Bick

Chief of Staff

Rosita Gallasch

Senior Adviser

Output Group 6- Heritage

6.1 Historic Heritage

CHAIR - Thank you, minister. We've got a whole new change of team on your side of the table, not on this side. We are starting with your portfolio of Minister for Arts and Heritage. We're starting with historic heritage initially and then moving to the arts. We have scheduled a dinner break before we then go on to the Minister for Community and Multicultural Affairs.

If you want to let those people go for a bit on your team then they're welcome, except for some people who stay here the whole time. You're welcome to let them go because we're not going to get to them till after dinner. I will invite you to introduce the people at the table and their roles in this particular portfolio area of yours, and then invite you to make some opening comments in relation to the Arts and Heritage portfolio, if you wish.

Ms OGILVIE - Sure, thank you. Introductions which are first and foremost very important from the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania. I don't know where everybody is sitting. We have Jason Jacobi, the secretary of the department. No Louise? We're not having Louise? Melissa Ford, Director of Heritage Tasmania and Will Joscelyne, General Manager of Heritage Tasmania. We have others in the room if we need them.

CHAIR - Can I just check that Hansard is okay? You can hear? I might just move that a bit closer. Just don't want to miss anything you say, minister, after all.

Ms OGILVIE - Goodness me. That's who we have with us. Thank you very much. If it's okay with the committee, I will say a few opening remarks which I will keep brief or brief-ish, given it's such an important portfolio. Chair and committee members, I'm really pleased to be here today to talk about our ongoing investment into Arts and Heritage. The arts as we know is a beloved sector and I love it. It's integral to what it means to be Tasmanian.

In 2024-25, Arts Tasmania supported paid work for more than 3300 artists, art workers and cultural workers and was on track to support more than 476,000 attendances at arts and cultural events around our state by the end of the financial year. Additional funding in the 2025-26 Budget in the Arts portfolio includes \$4 million of operational funding over four years to enable our much-loved Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery to continue to position our state as a globally significant cultural centre.

The 2025-26 Budget also includes funding for existing initiatives such as the youth arts grant funding program, \$5.2 million invested in Ten Days on the Island, the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra and the Theatre Royal to deliver engaging experiences for audiences around the state. The screen production pilot incentive scheme in screen, which is one of our great areas, the Tasmanian government's support for screen production industry led to tremendous success in 2023-24. In 2024-25, particularly through support of video games development, we've seen that success build. Government is also vastly increasing support of our burgeoning video game sector, with the \$500,000 Level Up Tasmania fund continuing to be invested through 2025-26.

I'm also keenly aware of the importance of the Heritage portion of this portfolio. Built heritage is an important part of the Tasmanian brand and culture and makes a valuable contribution to our economy. Each year the heritage sector contributes an estimated \$976 million annually to Tasmania's gross state product, \$93 million into the building and

construction industry, more than 5,000 direct and indirect jobs across the state, and attracts around 448,000 heritage-motivated visitors annually, which is a growing and important sector.

To continue to maintain and benefit from our built heritage assets, we must invest in them by supporting conservation works and opportunities to activate underutilised sites, as we have invested in this sector with the Built Heritage Grant Scheme to support that. In the second funding round, 41 projects across the state shared in \$1.3 million of grant funds. Round 3 is now open, and a further \$1.3 million of grant funds for projects across the state is available. To conclude, alongside the Tasmanian Heritage Council and other heritage observers, we continue to ensure the heritage fabric of our state is protected and valued for generations to come. Thank you.

CHAIR - Cassy, I'll go to you to open questions on heritage.

Ms O'CONNOR - It was interesting your last comment there, minister, about how important it is that we value and protect our heritage. I want to take you to the issue of the Hobart Cenotaph, and ask if you have read the letter from RSL Tasmania which was sent to all members of the Legislative Council late last week.

Ms OGILVIE - I think I've sighted it; I don't know if I've read it in detail, but yes, I think I received it.

Ms O'CONNOR - I recommend that you do, as the minister for Heritage. The letter says in the second paragraph:

As you are aware, both the IAR and the Tasmanian Planning Commission's report confirm the proposed development would cause significant and irreversible harm to the heritage values, setting and commemorative function of the Hobart Cenotaph. The evidence is clear: the Cenotaph's visual prominence, contemplative atmosphere and national symbolism would be permanently diminished.

As heritage minister, have you advocated for the protection of the Cenotaph's values, as you're part of a government that is going to permanently diminish those values?

Ms OGILVIE - I have been across this issue for a number of years as the project has developed. I will give you a bit of detail that I do have to start with, in relation particularly to heritage on the site, the Goods Shed, the Red Shed lease and royal engineering - I will get to your question - the engineers building in particular. I do think it's important to put on the record the work that we have done, and then we can discuss your views, which I think are -

Ms O'CONNOR - It's not my views; it's the RSL's views.

Ms OGILVIE - Which I think are going to be slightly different to perhaps some of the information I provide, but we can go there as well.

Ms O'CONNOR - It's not my view that matters.

Ms OGILVIE - So for those, perhaps, who might be listening in, in relation to heritage, particularly at the Macquarie Point Development Corporation site, the Goods Shed, when nominated for listing in the Tasmanian Heritage Register some years ago - that's about the time

PUBLIC

I started to be involved, and I think I was made heritage minister around that time - but it was added to the Tasmanian Heritage Council's list for assessment in 2023-24.

;

In late 2023 an assessment was undertaken, and the shed was listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register on 17 April 2024. This process provided an opportunity to build on shared knowledge and understanding of the history of the shed, how it was originally used, including identifying specific features that are of high historic cultural heritage significance. This helped us to understand the elements of the building and to consider how important they are in its future management. Now, the -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Chair. This response is not relevant to the question.

CHAIR - Can you perhaps go first to the question of the Cenotaph, because that was the question that the member put to you.

Ms OGILVIE - I can do both. I do think it is helpful -

CHAIR - We can come back to that, but the question was related to the Cenotaph. There may well be questions related to the heritage of the Goods Shed and the Red Shed, et cetera, but the question was related to the heritage of the Cenotaph.

Ms OGILVIE - Could I seek some clarification, though, because heritage and planning law and the Macquarie Point Development Corporation are three different realms of regulation, so what I was endeavouring to do was to set the context for you so you could understand the next piece, but I'm happy to do it in a different -

Ms O'CONNOR - We understand the context.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, does everybody?

Ms O'CONNOR - We're reasonably well-informed at this table.

Ms OGILVIE - All right, that's fine. I'm happy to do it, but that's a pity, because I think it would have been helpful to understand the full -

CHAIR - We can come back to those other matters. The question was specifically related to the heritage of the Cenotaph.

Ms OGILVIE - Why don't I start with that and then reflect on the broader heritage piece if you'd like.

Ms O'CONNOR - Perhaps.

Ms OGILVIE - So in relation to - sorry -

CHAIR - The Cenotaph.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I will just get back to the right piece of paper. The Heritage Council's view that I have been informed of, in relation to the impact of the proposal on the state heritage-listed Cenotaph, is the information that I will share with you today as minister, which fits within this output group.

PUBLIC

The Heritage Council's representation agreed with the issues raised in the draft and final integrated assessment report, that the multi-purpose stadium would have an impact on the heritage values of the Cenotaph. I think that somewhat answers your question.

In its representation, the Heritage Council recommended that a landscape plan be developed by suitably qualified heritage landscaper for screen planting to minimise the view lines from the Cenotaph to the stadium. This recommendation is reflected in schedule 4 of the draft order. The Heritage Council then met with and consulted with RSL Tasmania to understand its concerns, ahead of formulating their Heritage Council representation.

Suggestions that the Heritage Council should have advocated for the protection of the Cenotaph from the proposed development are inconsistent with the council's regulatory obligations under Tasmania's Resource Management and Planning System.

There's some further information I have here which may be of interest to you, but in relation to Henry Jones building other assets there?

Ms O'CONNOR - I mean, there are other questions, but if we could just sort of stick to the issue of the statement at the moment? The RSL is really clear, and in fact, they've reinforced what the final report from the TPC said - that is, that the stadium's construction and ongoing operation will permanently diminish the values of the Cenotaph.

CHAIR - The heritage values.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, the heritage values, the spiritual values of the Cenotaph.

So, as minister for heritage, what's your response to the RSL's plea to the Legislative Council to reject the stadium order through their lights, on the basis of the permanent diminishment of the heritage values of the Cenotaph?

Ms OGILVIE - As heritage minister, I take the heritage landscape that we have in Tasmania very, very seriously. I have endeavoured to work collaboratively with Macquarie Point Development Corporation, particularly in arts and heritage - but I will say, as the minister responsible for the state Heritage Council: I take their advice. They have looked at this. We've had the advice, and I've read that into the *Hansard* - I'm happy to go over that again - but that advice is pretty clear.

We are - look, I understand - I'm a Tasmanian, I'm an old Hobart girl. I understand that change is hard, and that it does impact people, and it does impact heritage issues. I would also say that, in the main, we can overcome some of these things. So, I'm very happy to deal -

Ms O'CONNOR - Not according to the Planning Commission. Not according to the RSL.

Ms OGILVIE - I'm very happy to meet with, talk with the RSL about their concerns, to see what I can do as the arts -

Ms O'CONNOR - Have you not done that already?

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - Not directly with the RSL, no. That's dealt with through the Macquarie Point Development Corporation. I'm very happy to do that and I make that offer.

Ms O'CONNOR - But what - I mean, sure - it's a tokenistic gesture to meet with them -

Ms OGILVIE - No, it's real. A genuine offer.

Ms O'CONNOR - Sure, but to meet with them when they've been really clear that the stadium will permanently diminish the heritage and cultural values of the Cenotaph, and you, as minister, meeting with them at this point, really - I mean, it might tick the box for you, but it's not going to make any difference.

Ms OGILVIE - No. I'm not into box-ticking; let me put that to one side.

I will say, I just - which is why I was trying to read into the *Hansard* the work that I had been doing, which may have been helpful. Nonetheless, over the past two years, I've worked with the Heritage Council closely on this issue. The Macquarie Point Development Corporation, as well, has been out there. I've looked at some of their digs and what they've found, and I've been across the issue generally.

But the question of whether the stadium progresses or not - I don't think it's going to turn on the question of heritage. Nonetheless, I have endeavoured to play my part to be a reasonable and sensible and prudent person when it comes to our heritage, and to work with people for a good result.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay. Well, as the minister, if we move on from the Cenotaph, because you haven't really responded -

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I have.

Ms O'CONNOR - The fact that its values would be permanently diminished is -

Ms OGILVIE - That's not what the Heritage Council said.

Ms O'CONNOR - As heritage minister, you're overseeing across the forward Estimates a \$1.5 million cut to the historic Heritage budget, but that doesn't really look like a budget that - you know, where a minister is fighting hard for heritage, to be honest.

Ms OGILVIE - Oh. I'll take that as a comment.

Ms O'CONNOR - But it doesn't. There's \$1.5 million - well, have you been fighting to make sure that historic heritage in Tasmania is properly funded? Because the budget papers would indicate that if you had been fighting, you've failed.

Ms OGILVIE - That's the grant. You've touched on the topic of which I'm passionate about, and that is a number of years ago, and it was actually during Peter Gutwein's time in the House. We were able to fight for and win a grant round program for Heritage, which we hadn't seen for about 20 years. Off of the back of that I pulled together a number of initiatives which I think have been really well received in the heritage sector. Including, the inaugural heritage summits which have brought people together from across the state, and a grant round each year for the last - I think we're into our last year of a four-year grant round of \$1.4 million, through

which I personally really invested in and endeavoured to help build up the heritage fabric of our state. That grant round is not proceeding. We have had an election based on the fact that we have budgetary constraints. I have asked and will continue to ask for it to be reinstated, but I suspect the chances are small.

CHAIR - Just because we have to do arts as well in this time period.

Ms O'CONNOR - There is a final heritage question, if we could just ask about Woolmers Estate.

CHAIR - Woolmers, as you know, is UNESCO-listed. The government has obligations to protect, conserve and present their World Heritage convict sites. The state government is meeting its operational obligations to the other core World Heritage convict sites, Port Arthur, Coal Mines, Cascades and Maria Island, but there's nothing in there for Woolmer's and Brickendon and the UNESCO listing as I understand it is ownership-blind, if you like. It doesn't matter if it's owned by a public or a private entity. The state has obligations under UNESCO to protect its heritage sites. Why has Woolmer's and indeed Brickendon been ignored?

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you very much. Let me state categorically that Woolmers is not being ignored and that is absolutely not the case. Since 2016-17, we've provided over \$2.4 million to Woolmers, which is a substantial amount of money, Woolmers and Brickendon to support conservation works. We've also provided in 2024-25, \$95,000 to Woolmers for operational needs and the development of a plan for the sustainable conservation of the heritage assets.

Now, I know there has been some dialogue around the World Heritage Convention and what obligations we may or may not have as government and also some commentary around meeting obligations. I would like to just quickly put on record some comments.

As a signatory to the World Heritage Convention, the Australian Government, with support from relevant state governments, has an international obligation to ensure the Outstanding Universal Value of the Australian convict site serial listing is protected, conserved, presented and transmitted to future generations.

The serial listing comprises 11 places, including Woolmers and Brickendon estates, there as one place. While this does not include an obligation to provide recurrent funding in support of conservation works, both the Australian and Tasmanian governments have provided significant financial support for conservation works, primarily through grant programs.

Ms O'CONNOR - Which are not the answer, because they're not always available.

Ms OGILVIE - Woolmers has said, I think on the record, that we're not meeting our obligations. Now, I would like to just respond to that because I think that goes to the core of your question.

The Tasmanian government is meeting its obligations under the World Heritage Agreement, and the Australian Convict Sites Strategic Management Framework. The government has provided grants and continues to provide access to grant funding, program funding, heritage conservation advice, and other in-kind support to Woolmers and the government, through Heritage Tasmania, also supports the work of Australian Convict Site

PUBLIC

Steering Committee which meets quarterly and provides ongoing monitoring of the Outstanding Universal Value of the serial listing facilities and collaboration amongst member organisations and advice to the 11 places. Have a little more information?

To give you the absolute latest information, Heritage Tasmania met with Woolmers on 11 November and we're coordinating a further meeting with Woolmer's, and I'm scheduled to meet with the Chair on 26 November. We have had dialogue in writing between us.

CHAIR - Apparently, last year there was some revelation that the member for Heritage Council had some referrals to the Integrity Commission, and it was costs associated with that. Is that caught up in the Budget?

Ms OGILVIE - I would just take some advice. I don't believe we're allowed to talk about that. I'm not able to discuss that.

CHAIR - The costs associated with anything like that would be met through the Budget.

Ms OGILVIE - That's a hypothetical question -

CHAIR - If there were matters like that.

Ms OGILVIE - Like what?

CHAIR - The investigation of matters related to integrity?

Ms OGILVIE - What are you asking me? Who pays for integrity commission matters? I think they do their own investigations. This is a general principle.

CHAIR - You talked about the Budget; you referred to the Budget effectively reducing -

Ms OGILVIE - No, that's the grant funding that's reduced so that's the non-recurrence of the \$1.4 million that we only had for four years.

CHAIR - You look at historic heritage, then the appropriation under the historic heritage output group 6 when we talk about appropriation, it falls right away.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I understand there might be some confusion. I will ask Jason -

CHAIR - While Jason's addressing his mind to that, the actuals for this line item were far more than the budget appropriations \$4.378 million, the actual appropriation was \$5.452 million. Why the the uptick there?

Mr JACOBI - Are you talking about the difference between the 2024 actual and the 2025?

CHAIR - And saying if you look at the expenses, we're seeing that the actual expenditure under historic heritage, it was \$5.2 million, but the budget this year is \$4.7 million. There is a significant reduction from actual expenditure and appropriated expenditure.

PUBLIC

Mr JOSCELYNE - I am going to talk to what is in the Budget. The significant uptick was to do with really an allocation to PAHSMA in relation to water and sewerage works that the government's committed to support them to upgrade their facilities. They are for PAHSMA, but also more broadly for the region on the peninsula. That reflects a large uptick in this financial year.

A significant portion of that grant allocations is in this financial year, that then falls away and then-

CHAIR - This financial year we're looking at now or?

Mr JOSCELYNE - Yes 2025-26, correct.

CHAIR - It's a significant amount less than the actual expenditure in 2024-25. It's less than spent in 2024-25.

Mr JACOBI - The decrease from the 2024-25 Budget to the 2024-25 actual, primarily relates to the supporting Tasmania's Build Heritage Initiative, \$332,000. Due to a reprofiling of the grant budget to align with the milestone payments as per the grant deed.

CHAIR - You're saying a decrease.

Mr JACOBI - That's the decrease of \$332,000 between the 2024-25 original Budget to the 2024-25 actual Budget.

CHAIR - But there's an increase. Are we talking about expenses or appropriation?

Mr JACOBI - I am talking about expenses. Revenue for appropriation, so if you go to revenue for appropriation, the increase was \$1.4 million from the 2024-25 original Budget to the 2024-25 actual Budget. That relates to the transfer of Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania from the DPAC to the Department of Natural Resources and Environment. Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania came back to my department on 1 November 2024 -

CHAIR - Which is under a separate line here. That's a different matter that's under Minister for Aboriginal Affairs now.

Mr JACOBI - That just resolved in the transfer part year appropriation of 1.97, but then we go into in terms of the cashflow changes supporting Tasmania's built heritage initiative, \$332,000 is due to a reprofile of the grant timing to align with the milestone payments and a delay in completing the consultancy work required to determine the Aboriginal Heritage.

CHAIR - The question is, and it still remains, if we're looking at appropriation, the revenue from appropriation in the Budget for 2024-25 was \$4.3 million, 4.4 if you round it. The actual expenditure that's in the annual report and was provided is \$5.4 million -

Mr JACOBI - I have 5,774.

CHAIR - That's not what was provided to the committee. I can't remember which one this came through.

PUBLIC

Mr JACOBI - Are you talking about the annual report?

CHAIR - It didn't go to the annual report because it was provided to the committee on a question on notice through the Legislative Council. There's a discrepancy there. Maybe you can take that on notice and explain the difference.

Mr JACOBI - Happy to take that on notice.

Ms OGILVIE - Happy to do that, yes.

CHAIR - Otherwise we're going to run out of time. Because when you look at total expenses -

Ms OGILVIE - Could I just make sure I get it right, though?

CHAIR - There was a fall in total expenses, but not in appropriation.

Mr JACOBI - That's correct. To be clear, my understanding is that revenue from appropriation went from 4,378 up to 5,774 - was the 2025 actual expenditure.

CHAIR - And the explanation for that?

Mr JACOBI - Partially offset by two cash flow changes, but this is where we have to do a breakdown for heritage separate from Aboriginal heritage. The supporting Tasmania's built heritage initiative, \$332,000, was due to a reprofiling of the grant to align with the milestone payments. Then if you go to expenses for historic heritage, 2025 original budget, was 5,734 and actual was 5,268.

CHAIR - That's the number I have.

Mr JACOBI - And that was a decrease primarily relating to the supporting Tasmania's built heritage initiative, 332,000, and again due to the reprofiling of the grant to reflect the milestone payments as per the grant deed.

Ms OGILVIE - Can I check you still want us to confirm that?

CHAIR - The actual figure? Yes. I can go and look at the annual report, but I haven't -

Ms OGILVIE - That's okay we can do that. We want to be helpful.

CHAIR - The response I was given to a question on notice, if there's a discrepancy, why?

We might just move on then to, if you're happy to, arts.

Ms OGILVIE - We are going to have a change of team.

I love talking about heritage though. Do you want to have another sit down? Just generally. This is not always the best forum to have deep conversations. I suspect we are aligned in much of our thinking, generally.

Output Group 5 - Cultural and Tourism Development

5.1 Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery

CHAIR - We will just introduce the new people.

Ms OGILVIE - We have Brett Stewart, Deputy Secretary, Creative Industry, Sport, Visitor, Economy, Department of State Growth. Dr David Sudmalis, Director of Creative Tasmania. Alex Sangston, who is behind us ready to come forward when we need him, Manager of Screen Tasmania. Mary Mulcahy, Director of Tasmania Museum and Art Gallery, who will come forward as needed.

CHAIR - It would be best if she came forward now, because the first line item is TMAG.

Ms LOVELL - Minister, the budget papers referred to funding for an initiative to enable TMAG to address key operating risks. What are the key operating risks and how will that funding be used to address those?

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. I know that Mary has done a mountain of work with this. Brett, I think Mary might be the right person to address this question.

Ms MULCAHY - The Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery (TMAG) has been, for the last few years, operating at a deficit, so the board has been working really hard to diversify the income to TMAG, in addition to the appropriation provided by the government. We had been doing really well up until just before COVID around philanthropy, for example, and since then, those sort of extra funds with philanthropy and donations have fallen off quite dramatically. For example, three years ago, at our annual appeal, we got about \$65,000; that's halved in the following two years and was really low last year. We've seen that happen across the board.

The board has also been looking at what does it take to be a modern museum. We need some systems and processes in place, such as a collection-management system that will help us understand exactly what's in the collection, and how we best - how best to manage that into the future to make sure it's available for all Tasmanians. Things like a collection-management system, a digital asset-management system, which would streamline processes and requests for things like images and requests for collection items to be borrowed.

At the moment, if someone wants to borrow an item, they actually have to come physically here to see it, or our curators have to go into the collection to look at the items and then deal with someone. It's a bit of a transaction that's quite labour intensive. So we're looking at systems and processes that can automate or streamline or create electronic opportunities to make sure the collection is available to all Tasmanians, but also beyond Tasmania, to all Australians and internationally.

This funding will help us to do that, and some of the funding that has been provided in the last two budgets around asset maintenance and also building maintenance will help us with that as well. It's just trying to get some of that streamlining, some of that funding in to get some of those basic systems and processes in place that should help us to become a more sustainable organisation.

Ms LOVELL - And the funding that's been allocated for that, will that be sufficient to deal with all of those risks?

PUBLIC

Ms MULCHAHY - It will cover what our current budget deficit is and a little bit more. So yes, it will be able to help us put like a collection-management system in place. A digital asset-management system, as I said, will help bring us up to being a more modern museum, and what is expected by the general public of what a modern museum would be able to deliver. That's all, Chair.

Ms O'CONNOR - Minister, I want to take you to the case of ZAB. ZAB was a victim of the notorious paedophile John Wayne Millwood. ZAB was awarded, by Chief Justice Blow of the Supreme Court of Tasmania in December of 2021, a judgment in his favour, with civil damages to be paid by John Wayne Millwood of more than \$5 million. What followed was a scandalous episode, where institutions for which you were responsible as Arts Minister effectively traded in the colonial art assets of a convicted paedophile. You don't know about this story.

Some of John Wayne Millwood's extraordinary collection of colonial art while he was subject to civil proceedings was purchased by the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery, the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery, the Allport Library and Museum of Fine Arts, The Maritime Museum of Tasmania, the John Glover Society was involved, Woolmer's Foundation, Risdon prison, Premier and Cabinet.

What happened - and TMAG was at the centre of this - was that while there were civil proceedings underway, John Wayne Millwood, through his family, was divesting his colonial art, and there was a feeding frenzy on that art by arts institutions in Tasmania. As a constant - don't smile.

Ms OGILVIE - Big call.

Ms O'CONNOR - The evidence trail is really clear, and it's actually the subject of federal proceedings.

Ms OGILVIE - Feeding frenzy.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, it was a feeding frenzy.

CHAIR - Let's get to the question, please.

Ms O'CONNOR - All of John Wayne Millwood's colonial art was bought up, including by TMAG. As a consequence, the victim, ZAB, got not a single cent, because after Millwood sold his art, he declared himself bankrupt. Do you think it's good enough that our cultural and artistic institutions are purchasing colonial artworks from a convicted paedophile while there are civil proceedings underway?

Ms OGILVIE - That was a very long statement followed by a question which - my heart goes out to anybody who's been affected by the sorts of crimes that you're talking about. It's -

Ms O'CONNOR - This is a matter of public record.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, and those things have been so much in the public ether over the last few years, as we as a government have worked through a commission of inquiry and other work that we have done in this area. So, I want to just say that, first of all. But secondly, in

PUBLIC

relation to anything TMAG may or may not have done in procurement processes, that is a question I think that TMAG is ready, willing and able to answer.

Ms O'CONNOR - I'm very happy for TMAG to answer. If I should just let you know that TMAG was put on notice by letter by the victim in May of 2019, with the subject line 'Claim for damages for personal injuries against John Wayne Millwood', and TMAG was told that civil proceedings against Millwood were under way and that TMAG should not hinder those proceedings by dealing with Millwood's collection, and yet, TMAG did.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, through me, I would ask Mary, if you're available to speak to that? Thank you.

Ms MULCAHY - Through you, minister: TMAG has not acquired any items from the state collection from Millwood or his named associates. We have had a number of - we did borrow a couple of works from his daughter for an exhibition, which were returned to his daughter once that exhibition had been finished. We do not have any - we have not purchased any material from Millwood or his family or his associates.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay, then. And you haven't - have you had any further contact with Millwood's family in relation to his daughter Sarah's colonial collection?

Ms MULCAHY - Not since - so, the exhibition was Paradise Lost, and that loan concluded on 31 October 2021, and we've not had any further contact with his daughter, as far as I'm aware. We are assisting the Department of Justice because - in this matter. So, there's a letter that's been sent through, so we're assisting the Department of Justice at the moment.

Ms O'CONNOR - There is a letter that's been sent through, but we have certainly corresponded with the Attorney-General on this matter and haven't had an answer yet on behalf of the victim, ZAB. I guess, minister, to you, it raises a question of ethics and probity. If there are civil proceedings under way and there's this trove of colonial works, do you agree that it is not ethical or proper for our arts and cultural institutions to be seeking to obtain these assets - and it's not just TMAG; I went through the list before - when there are civil proceedings underway such as this? And, can you have a look at these and make sure we tighten up the processes?

CHAIR - Can I just remind the member that this line item is TMAG? TMAG have addressed that question, and I think you've made an allegation about TMAG that's been refuted. So, I think we need to be very cautious about other entities here, when this line item is around the funding of TMAG.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you. I put the question on the basis of TMAG's past actions to the minister - and now it's been clarified by TMAG, but I put the question on behalf of the victim of John Wayne Millwood.

Ms OGILVIE - It's fine to ask. No problem with asking. And look, I will just step into the fray a little bit and say for those at the table, you might not be aware, but my first degree was in history and classics. I wanted to be a curator, and I have worked in international cultural heritage space internationally with UNESCO as well.

These issues that you raise are real and they are global and they're substantial, and what I endeavour to do always on the art side is to work with the museum and art gallery to make sure that they have best practice in place, given we're always short of resources as well. So, I think - I acknowledge the concern. I also acknowledge the heartbreaking story that you've shared, because that's just dreadful; but it does seem to me in this situation we're in a sensible position.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay, I'm going to follow this up with you, not at the table as minister, because there is a number of alleged facts which have been put on record, and some of them are subject to federal proceedings, that I want to draw to your attention.

CHAIR - Let's be cautious about that, then, going near those.

Ms O'CONNOR - I do understand this. I am being very cautious about it, which is why I'm asking at an Estimates table carefully, and particularly in light of the fact the Attorney-General hasn't responded to a letter we sent some two months ago.

Ms OGILVIE - Okay. Well, I wasn't aware of that. But look, I'm always happy to chat with you, if there's things that we can help actual real people with that make their lives better. But if things are before the courts, we obviously take great care.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, that's the bankruptcy case. That's a different aspect of the same thing.

Ms OGILVIE - I don't have the file, so I'm not sure where all the elements line up.

Ms THOMAS - Moving on to arts because we've only got five minutes left.

Output Group 5 - Cultural and Tourism Development

5.2 Arts Industry Development

Ms THOMAS - Moving on to 5.2 Arts Industry Development, which I note is down by around \$2.5 million over the forward Estimates. I'm just wondering what specifically will be cut from arts industry development funding over that time.

Ms OGILVIE - I will ask Brett to answer that.

Mr STEWART - There's a couple of temporary election commitments that are coming off in in those forward Estimates. There were a couple of one-off uplifts in the arts programs as a result of the 2024 Election which resulted in a couple of years of additional funding. We also have an amount in the grants and subsidies area, which will go through to the TSO -

Ms THOMAS - But I'm talking specifically about that 5.2 line item. I think capital's separate, isn't it? Is that right?

Mr STEWART - Yes, so with respect to that 5.2, as I said, there're a couple of temporary uplifts to existing programs that come off once we get to the forward Estimates, they will obviously be matters for consideration at future budgets.

Ms THOMAS - Are you able to say specifically what those programs are?

Mr STEWART - I think David might be able to do that for me.

CHAIR - Have you got a list you could table, perhaps, in light of the time?

Ms OGILVIE - Is it quick?

Dr SUDMALIS - It is quick. It's a one-off commitment in 2024-25 for funding uplift for arts organisations in the order of \$1.5 million. There was a \$9,000 commitment to the TYO in that same year. There was also a youth arts election commitment totalling \$1 million that terminates in this period.

Ms THOMAS - Okay. We're running out of time, so my other key question was what is the funding amount appropriated for the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra capital support package, which you were just about to refer to? Will this be provided if the stadium order is not approved?

Mr STEWART - That's \$4.5 million. I'm not able to answer the second part of that question.

Ms THOMAS - It's a question for the minister, probably. Is the intention, minister, that that funding that's been appropriated in the Budget will still be provided to the Tasmanian Symphony Orchestra whether or not the Macquarie Point -

Ms OGILVIE - I would have to check that, but that would be my hope.

Ms THOMAS - I will just take that on notice.

Ms OGILVIE - Yeah, I will take that on notice.

CHAIR - This covers funding that we provide for other theatre organisations like the Theatre Royal and other organisations around the state. Since the Theatre Royal has been sort of co-located, like with the Hedberg, there's a lot more overheads and that doesn't appear to have been much of an uptick in their funding support. Is that something on your radar and something that you will look at because with energy costs, staffing costs, security, the whole thing. What can you tell us about that?

Ms OGILVIE - Absolutely on our radar. We've certainly been having a good look and good think about the Theatre Royal. Would you like to - or should I ask Brett to speak? I'm well-aware that you all have a close connection as well.

Mr LIMKIN - Just to clarify, my position actually is on the Theatre Royal Board as well. It's actually part of the act of the board. The secretary of the department is on the board. The Royal actually received an uplift historically. It received, a number of years ago from the current grant up to the - I think it was about \$200,000, up to about \$1 million now. It can actually bank money in this case to be prepared for the change. There are some challenges, as you said, about the arrangements at the Hedberg. We've been looking into that collaboratively with UTAS, the Theatre Royal, Hobart City Council, and other parties to look at what's the most optimal structure delivery mechanism to continue it moving forward to remove some of those cost pressures in areas such as insurance and whatnot. That work is continuing. We're

PUBLIC

hoping to resolve it within the next few months. We actively engage with the Royal board every month on this matter and we will continue to do so.

CHAIR - Are you able to provide, minister, a list of all arts organisations that you fund through this line item and how much they get?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, we can do that.

CHAIR - We can probably table that and read it all out.

Ms OGILVIE - We tried to come prepared. Yes, that's fine.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

Ms OGILVIE - My pleasure.

CHAIR - I thought you might come prepared with that.

Mr LIMKIN - Learned from last year.

CHAIR - What was the actual expenditure for this line item in the 2024-25 year?

Mr LIMKIN - Through you, Minister, I understand the actual expenditure for this line item was \$11,011,000 for the 2024-25 year.

CHAIR - That's slightly less than what was appropriated.

Mr LIMKIN - Yes. The variation mainly relates to budget reprofiling for some of the youth arts grants funding, which was based on the timing of when those grants were needing to be paid, and also some funding changes to the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery funding. Once again, it's a timing payment.

CHAIR - Any other questions on the answer?

Ms O'CONNOR - Minister, did you or any other minister in government suggest to the TSO that if they kept up their resistance to the stadium that their funding might be under threat?

Ms OGILVIE - I wouldn't do that. I don't know whether other people would do that.

Ms O'CONNOR - Did you not do that? Are you prepared to say at the table that you did not suggest that?

Ms OGILVIE - Who at the TSO are you talking about? Could you give me some details about what you're suggesting?

Ms O'CONNOR - No, I will not. You've always got to protect your source of information. Are you able to say at the table that you gave no indication that their funding would be threatened if they continued to speak up about the stadium's impact on their operation?

Ms OGILVIE - No.

CHAIR - I might, then, bearing in mind that we need to wrap up, just move to Screen Tasmania, if you want to change the deck chairs again if you need to.

Ms OGILVIE - We're alright unless it gets very specific.

Output Group 5 - Cultural and Tourism Development

5.3 Screen Industry Development

CHAIR - Could I just ask what the actual was for 2024-25 on screen industry development?

Mr LIMKIN - Screen industry development for 2024-25 was \$2.668 million and that is different to what was budgeted. The budgeted amount included, as per my understanding, \$1.04 million in shares converted to equity and therefore it doesn't appear as part of the financial statements. It's still -

CHAIR - What shares converted to what equity?

Mr STEWART - Through you, Minister, that's where we co-invest in productions and we actually -

Ms OGILVIE - The film industry.

CHAIR - Which ones did you actually invest in, then? Which productions?

Mr STEWART - I think I need to take that on notice, unless you can answer that, Alex, at the table. You'd like a list?

Ms OGILVIE - We might invite Alex to the table; he can answer that.

Mr STEWART - This is for the 2024-25 financial year?

Ms OGILVIE - We're just getting that for you.

CHAIR - While you're doing that, how many different organisations, productions, or whatever were funded through this?

Mr STEWART - Through the screen output? We can provide a list, like we did with the arts as we did with the arts output, Chair.

CHAIR - Thank you. Was the funding for *Bay of Fires* including in that last year or is that for the prior year?

Mr STEWART - The prior year. Sorry, just for clarity, what season of *Bay of Fires* are you talking about?

CHAIR - The second one, obviously.

Mr STEWART - Yes; last year.

CHAIR - It's very good, I might say; so funny, so good. This is the screen breakdown?

Mr STEWART - Just to clarify, that's for the recuperable support, so that's the list where we actually get a return.

CHAIR - That's right. So there's ones you invest in or provide funding to that you don't get a return on? And have you got a list of those as well?

Mr STEWART - We can provide one for you, yes. Something we prepared earlier. That's broken down by program.

Ms OGILVIE - We will just check confidentiality quickly.

Mr STEWART - Those are in the public domain.

Ms OGILVIE - All of them?

Mr STEWART - Yes.

Ms OGILVIE - Okay, we just need to be careful.

CHAIR - These can be public documents.

Ms OGILVIE - We're just making sure they'd all been announced, so there was nothing confidential.

CHAIR - These are all announced ones.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

CHAIR - All right, I'm very conscious of time, unless anyone's got any burning questions about screen, I know we've terribly pushed for time here. We'll thank you for your appearance to thus far, minister. You have another session this evening and then another one tomorrow with different people, no doubt. Thank you for your appearance today on your heritage and arts portfolio.

The committee suspended from 6.07 p.m. to 7.00 p.m.

Output Group 3 - Community and Multicultural Affairs

3.3 Community Services

CHAIR - Welcome back, minister. I will get you to introduce the people at the table with you under your Minister for Community and Multicultural Affairs portfolio responsibilities.

Ms OGILVIE - Certainly. I have Noelene Kelly, Deputy Secretary Community and Government Services and Corrina Smith, Director of Community Services.

CHAIR - Now, do you want to make any comments in overview of these areas?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, thank you. Thank you very much for having us, Chair and committee members.

As you know, I was appointed to this portfolio in August. What a privilege it is. I must begin by first acknowledging my friend, colleague and the previous minister for community services, the Honourable Roger Jaensch. He was instrumental in developing much of the work that I'm now launching, such as Tasmania's first volunteering strategy, which I had the honour of doing last Friday alongside Volunteering Tasmania at the Goodwood Community Centre. I do have a couple of documents I will table at the end in relation to that.

The Tasmanian government acknowledges the invaluable role the community services industry has in keeping Tasmania supported, connected and healthy. This is reflected in our 2030 Strong Plan for Tasmania's Future. Now, we know all of the great work that community services do and importantly, how they're stepping up to help Tasmanians address cost of living pressures. I am overjoyed that for the first time in our state, I believe it's the first time, we have a multicultural affairs portfolio helping to promote our multicultural communities because we know we are all richer for the diversity.

Our 2025-26 interim budget continues our commitment to supporting stronger communities and includes a focus on the needs of Tasmanians here and now as well as supporting longer term improvements. It demonstrates the Tasmanian Liberal government will always support a sustainable community sector.

Now, we're doing this through a raft of work in developing and rolling out strategies and action plans, including implementation of our Embracing Diversity Fostering Belonging: Tasmania's Multicultural Action Plan 2025-29 that we launched in March, development of Tasmania's next carer action plan, and implementation of our new LGBTQI+ strategy which I am pleased to say will be launched very soon.

A couple of highlights of the interim budget is the significant investment in food relief. We're providing record funding of \$7.1 million over four years through the food relief strategy and services and the place-based food pilot program. This is on top of the \$6 million already provided to our food relief providers. This is at the same time as the government committing \$14.6 million to double the healthy School Lunch Program and another \$6.5 million committed to partner with Variety Tasmania to deliver the free school breakfast program. That's from DECYP funding.

I know that our Neighbourhood House network is well-loved by all members of parliament, as do I. We've provided more funding of more than \$40 million since 2021. In this budget in closing, you will see the ongoing commitment to our neighbourhood houses Community Connector Program of \$1.296 million, and this is on top of that committed in the 2024-25 state budget, which totals \$8.012 million.

Chair, if I might seek your guidance, I do have a couple of documents you may wish to have. I'm happy to table them. The first is Embracing Diversity Fostering Belonging: Tasmania's Multicultural Action Plan 2025-29, which outlines our vision for a harmonious, inclusive and respectful multicultural island where all Tasmanians belong, contribute, achieve and succeed. We can talk more about that if you wish, and then also we have - and this is hot off the press, so apologies it's not bound - tabling this document, *Valuing Our Volunteers*,

PUBLIC

Tasmania's Volunteering Strategy 2025-30, which in October 2025 Cabinet approved and it's the first Tasmanian government strategy for volunteering in our state.

CHAIR - Great, just before we go to Dean, I want to ask some questions in this, I did send a question without notice through the government channels trying to get the actual outcomes from the 2024-25 Budget for this, for the total expenses and also the appropriation. What was sent was an actual Budget for the 2025-26 year, which is the figure in the budget, which -

Ms OGILVIE - Didn't help? Not what you were after?

CHAIR - Exactly not what I asked for, if we could have the actuals for expenses -

Ms OGILVIE - Let's see if we can assist.

CHAIR - total expenses by portfolio and output and the revenue from appropriation.

Ms OGILVIE - Let's just see if we can do that straightaway. Is that something we might have to hand? Just see if that satisfies your request.

CHAIR - Yes. Do other members want to note down the expenses in community services?

Ms KELLY - 3.3.

CHAIR - This says output group 7; I'm after output group 3.3, community and government service delivery under the Minister for Community and Multicultural Affairs.

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: these are the figures from 2024-25 -

CHAIR - That's correct.

Ms KELLY - when we had a different output structure. We restructured our output structure for 2025-26 as a result of a restructure within the department, so -

CHAIR - We need to look at the total of these to be under 3.3 - just have a look at this, community service 7.2 and community development 7.3 are combined now into community services; is that right?

Ms KELLY - 3.3: that's right.

CHAIR - I could share that with other members if they want to have a look. I will go to Dean while I just write these numbers in and have a look at what it means.

Mr HARRISS - Minister, just on that and the previous budget, the allocations in this budget are all below the 2024-25 Budget and forward Estimates. Can you give some indication why that is, and in this budget 2, the figures decrease into the forward estimates?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: there is quite a difference in the years and that's largely because of one-off 2024 election commitments. A lot of those commitments were funded through the Community Services budget and also, we have had an area within

PUBLIC

Community Services moved to another area within Department of Premier and Cabinet, so the grants and programs area as well, so that's accounted for a lot of that money.

Mr HARRISS - That's from the previous Budget or this current Budget? The 2024-25 figures are all above what's in this Budget or were? That is from that or you're talking about that 2024-25 -

Ms KELLY - Yes. The difference between 2024-25 and 2025-26.

Mr HARRISS - Thank you. Then, so the decreasing in this current budget in the forward years? Starts at 31,481 and by 2028-2029 it's down to 25 40?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: again, there are a number of election commitments that might have been spanning a couple of years. They finish off in the second year.

CHAIR - Can we have breakdown of these things, but there's one line item that covers what appears to be a whole heap. I'm very happy to - can we get that now, the actual breakdown so it's clear what's been finished, reducing, not there anymore?

Ms O'CONNOR - The explanation for the variation of the budget in part is that some areas of responsibility have been moved to the Minister for Ageing, but it's not about election commitment; it's about - there's no reallocation in the portfolio.

Ms LOVELL - And there's no budget line item for the Minister for Ageing. So there's no allocation -

CHAIR - So where'd the money go? Anyway, if we could have all of those.

Ms OGILVIE - Thank you. I will just ask Noelene to address that.

Ms KELLY - In terms of the Ageing portfolio, the funding still sits within Community Services at this point for 2025-26.

Ms LOVELL - Where is that reflected in the budget?

Ms KELLY - That's part of the Community Services line, so output 3.3.

Ms LOVELL - Okay.

Ms O'CONNOR - Sorry - just to be clear, that means that the footnote 1:

The Community Services output includes funding for strategies and activities that are the responsibility of the Minister for Ageing.

That cut there, which totals nearly \$30 million, is about election commitments that wind up, is it?

CHAIR - We will just ask for a breakdown, if she can give us the breakdown, if we can get that information about the breakdown.

Ms O'CONNOR - The vast sum.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - We would have to get that together for you. Would you like us to take that on notice? There's a bit of detail involved and we want to get that right. Yes.

Ms O'CONNOR - Can I just say, though, sorry, with the greatest of respect, this is Estimates. You should have expected a question like that first up, given the line item, and I wonder why we have to accept it being taken on notice.

Ms THOMAS - It makes it hard to scrutinise without it.

CHAIR - Well, it's a bit hard because - yes.

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: so, I do actually have a table that I can go through and explain it. Given the number of election commitments in 2024 that were one-offs, there's quite a number to go through here, so -

Ms LOVELL - Could we table it?

Ms OGILVIE - Well, we've offered to table information. I - let me just check. I just want to be careful with the community sector. Okay. That's fine, then.

CHAIR - Do you want to table that?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

CHAIR - I might get copies of it. Dean, I will go back to you. You may have questions once you've had a chance to look at that.

Mr HARRISS - I've just got one, well, obviously, another overarching one. So, with those decreases, bearing in mind some of them are election commitments, can you guarantee that the decreases won't impact on essential community services?

Ms OGILVIE - So what I will do is I will actually ask Noelene to talk you through what commitments are ending, and then if that doesn't answer your question, I'm happy to speak more about what we're doing.

Mr HARRISS - Right.

CHAIR - We will let Noelene answer - I'm assuming it's Noelene who will answer this - and then we'll go to Sarah. Or go now, if you'd like, while they're looking for that.

Ms LOVELL - Okay. It might be a question that's not related to the list necessarily. Minister, five-year funding contracts has been a commitment of the government for a number of years now, and there seems to have been little progress in that. I'm wondering if you can update us on how many organisations are now on a five-year funding contract.

Ms OGILVIE - We have made progress, and I do have some information on that. Noelene, could you give me the tab reference? Thank you.

Ms LOVELL - What I'd be looking for is how many organisations are on a five-year fund - or have a five-year funding contract, and how many are yet to move across to five-year funding.

Ms OGILVIE - I will give you the information that I have, and then we can take it from there. So, yes, we have made that commitment, and we've been working hard on it. The community services funding review, which you'd be aware of, was established in 2023. There were three key government priorities aimed at that sustainability issue for the sector, those being: reviewing indexation, progressing longer-term funding provision, delivering an outcomes framework, and the breadth of the work to be delivered across government is considerable, so there's complexity dealing one-on-one with those organisations. The key areas - those three key areas are intrinsically linked.

In 2025, the review focused on longer term funding arrangements, as you've mentioned, for community sector organisations, which will provide funding certainty, enabling organisations to operate with increased confidence and engage in longer-term sustainable planning practises. DPAC is leading the work across the Tasmanian government agencies to progress this whole-of-government model to implement those longer-term funding arrangements. We've got a multi-staged approach to this complex task, taking into consideration the significance of a project of this size and the complexities also across government agencies.

Stage 1, we've been focusing on recurrent funding for community services peak bodies and included in the development of a consistent framework of definitions and criteria that are being used to assist with the delivery of the project. Stage 1 is nearing completion with Tasmanian Government agencies working with relevant peak bodies to enact longer term funding agreements.

Throughout stage 2 and beyond, there will be a focus on broader recurrent funding across the government services sector and cross-agency considerations that must be addressed to effectively implement longer-term arrangements. In addition, scoping to progress the delivery of an outcome's framework has begun and will form part of stage 2 delivery.

Now, I recognise you asked me specific numbers of and details where we're at. I will actually just ask for some advice about that because the department's been managing that work.

Ms KELLY - This is a really complex project and we're working with agencies on a model that we've developed around this, and we've got multiple stages to the project. The first stage, as the minister said, focuses on peak bodies and also enabled us to define criteria and as well as look at what fixed-term versus recurrent funding and the criteria for what are longer-term agreements might look like and those sorts of things.

We have focused on the peak bodies and at the moment agencies are working with their peak bodies regarding longer-term agreements. We're at the stage of working with those organisations to say do you want a five-year agreement or do you want a sort of different yearly agreement. That was planned to be done before now but got a little bit delayed as a result of elections.

PUBLIC

In terms of stage 1, we've been through Cabinet, we've been working with Treasury and so on. We hope that in terms of stage 1, that will be completed very soon as we go through those individual negotiations.

Ms LOVELL - By completed do you mean those new funding agreements will be in place?

Ms KELLY - Yes.

Ms LOVELL - Have you had any of those organisations come back and say they don't want a longer-term funding arrangement?

Ms KELLY - We're aware of one or two organisations that would prefer not to have a longer-term funding agreement.

Ms LOVELL - How many organisations are in stage 1 and stage 2?

Ms KELLY - We've got a list of them if you'd like a copy.

Ms LOVELL - Yes, please. There's stage 1 you're expecting to be completed soon, so imminently, and then stage 2, what's the timeline for delivery on that?

Ms KELLY - Stage 2 has already commenced. Stage 2 will actually be more complex than stage 1, in a way, we pick the group that was sort of more defined and easier to work through. At the moment, stage 2, our initial process around that is for each of the relevant agencies to undertake an audit of all their organisations and determine through that what their funding lines are, what their whether they're recurrent or fixed-term and agencies are currently undertaking their audit at the moment.

In terms of when stage 2 will be finished, we expect in the next 12 months that we will progress this to quite a deep level, but we don't necessarily think that this stage 2 will be ready within the next 12 months, but we would have made a lot of inroads into that.

One of the other things that is quite complex in this process as well is the procurement arrangements with community service organisations. At the moment a lot of those are done through grants, but there is advice that we need to get from Treasury and also the Solicitor-General and Crown Solicitor around procurement and where it would be more appropriate to procure rather than do a grant.

Ms LOVELL - I'm pleased to hear there's an audit happening because I know that's something - certainly, I've heard from the sector as well as that it's been really difficult for anyone to understand what funding arrangements are in place and who and how that's all done. Thank you. I think that's all I have, Chair.

CHAIR - Dean, do you have any questions you want to particularly ask on this? While you're studying it - because it's quite small print. I'm squinting by the end of the day.

The question that Dean asked at the outset was there's a significant fall in the Budget allocation over the forward Estimates here. When you look in high-level at this chart here - I'm not sure exactly how to read it, so I'm asking for some clarity around what it's telling me. It

PUBLIC

seems that there is - for some of them. Let's just look at perhaps Neighbourhood Houses. There's funding the original budget for last year, then \$1.7 million for 2025-26, \$1.7 million for 2026-27 and then no more. Those sorts of things, like that, is that why we're seeing this drop away in the funding?

Ms KELLY - My understanding is that that money for Neighbourhood Houses is to do with the \$50,000 booster program that's in place for neighbourhood houses. Where that falls away, that's when that money is due to finish.

CHAIR - Which would account for some of the falling away in the latter years. Then if you look at all the - the bottom fifth of the table and all over the next page to well-past half, there are a number of budget allocation from the 2024-25 budget that have numbers beside them, but then it seems that they've either not been funded or pushed out. I'm just trying to understand what all those are. Are these all the election commitments, those ones that haven't been delivered yet?

Ms KELLY - The ones that are in red are ones that were one-year commitments through the 2024 election. They would have been paid and finishing. There were a small number of commitments that we haven't been able to deliver for whatever reason. We've rolled over that money into the 2025-26 financial year.

CHAIR - These are just one-year funding or one-off grants, payments, that sort of thing that were in the previous financial year, am I correct?

Ms KELLY - Some examples of that might be, of those one-offs that you might see in the funding commitments, Blackstone Heights Community News Association, or Circular Head Rotary Club. There's funding for Dorset Community Men's Shed for \$12,000 in 2024-25, or Big World Tasmania for \$75,000. They're examples of election commitments that were for one year only. They would be, I expect, listed in that list with the red figures on it.

CHAIR - Dean? I will just go to Cassy while you're still contemplating the figures.

Ms O'CONNOR - Just for some clarity here, the peak body funding that's in the A3 of \$941,000 - is that an extra election commitment? Is that the indexation uplift or -

Ms OGILVIE - What was the number?

Ms O'CONNOR - Peak body funding in the budget paper allocation 2024-25, original, and it doesn't seem to have changed - oh, it has. Can you explain this \$941,000 that's allocated towards peak body funding? Is that an election promise?

Ms KELLY - My understanding was that was a general uplift across a number of the different peaks -

Ms O'CONNOR - Is that a recurrent uplift?

Ms KELLY - No, a one-off.

Ms O'CONNOR - A one-off election promise uplift? You can partly see why we're in such difficult financial circumstances when you see the amount of money that's floating around

PUBLIC

for some of these projects. I have no issue, for example, with Men's Sheds, but there's more than half-a-million dollars here allocated towards the Sorell Men's Shed.

Ms KELLY - I understand that the peak body was through an election commitment for 2024.

Ms O'CONNOR - I thought so.

The Treasurer, in producing his interim budget, has, as I understand it, written out to community sector organisations flagging there's a budget coming up in May, and instead of requesting budget solutions, has asked the community sector, effectively, how they can do more with less -

CHAIR - Or what can they cut.

Ms O'CONNOR - Or what can they cut. That's right. 'Do more', because the demand on their services continues to increase. Implicit in that is that there will be less money. What's your understanding, minister, of what the Treasurer has asked the community sector to do?

Ms OGILVIE - I received a copy of that letter, so I read that letter -

Ms O'CONNOR - Is that the first time you knew about it; when you read that letter?

Ms OGILVIE - I had conversations with the community sector.

Ms O'CONNOR - The Treasurer didn't tell you?

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, can I do one question at a time? I share your concern about this sector. I would love it if we had a lot more money for this - also for the arts, all those sectors where things are a little bit lean - but we are where we are. We've just had an election. We've got a budget constraint. I think you've had the Treasurer in here today, probably talking about that. I didn't watch it, so I didn't know what he said, but we are where we are. We have the money that we have. The new budget cycle opens - I think it's open now for community submissions. I have very much encouraged everybody to put their submissions in as they would in any normal budget cycle, and I'm hoping for a good response.

Ms O'CONNOR - To clarify, you said you've seen the letter from the Treasurer. Was that the first time you knew that the Treasurer would be asking the community sector to identify savings?

Ms OGILVIE - I think the Treasurer was keen to deal directly with people, which I do as well; so I was happy to receive the letter, but I've had conversations with people about the letter they received and their response. I think it's fair to say there was some concern. I've worked with them as much as I can one-on-one and said, 'Put your budget submissions in. You have got to get your submissions in, and let's work through. We're dealing with what we've got, get the submissions in and we'll work through the process.' I want people to feel confident that the submissions will be taken very seriously.

Ms O'CONNOR - The community sector is manifestly already operating on the smell of an oily rag, as they have for a very long time.

Ms OGILVIE - It's a difficult situation.

Ms O'CONNOR - Do you understand that as minister, that there's actually no fat in that system?

Ms OGILVIE - I think what you're saying is that it's a very difficult economic environment, not just within government, which we appreciate, but people on the frontline are doing everything they can with what they've got. I absolutely appreciate that and want to be a strong voice for the sector, and I will. The best thing I can do right now is help communicate to the sector to please get your budget bids in and I will be an advocate for you around the budget table.

Ms O'CONNOR - Being a strong voice for the sector also means, for example, dealing with the Treasurer, who might be trying to get blood from a stone.

Ms OGILVIE - That was a statement. I don't think it was a question.

Ms O'CONNOR - Oh, I can give you a question. Are you going to engage directly with the Treasurer on the fact that the community sector is already structurally underfunded for the level of need that it tries hard to meet. As a strong advocate for the sector as you self-describe, will you engage with the Treasurer directly on the fact that the sector doesn't have fat in the system?

Ms OGILVIE - I'm always happy to engage directly with the Treasurer.

Ms O'CONNOR - But have you on this issue?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes, I have, I always do.

Ms O'CONNOR - But the first time you knew about it was when you saw the letter.

Ms OGILVIE - We have a situation where we have budgetary constraints. We have budget, it's open. Now is the time to get your budget bids in and that is the moment at which they will be assessed by the Treasurer. There will be opportunity for me to have direct conversations with him in support of the sector. I have to say it's not just this sector that is concerned. The budget constraints are very real. We're dealing with what we've got, and I will be a voice for people who need support through that process. I deal directly with all of my cabinet colleagues, and we have the conversations we need to have.

Ms O'CONNOR - Do members representatives of the community sector express to you their frustration that on the one hand they didn't ask to suggest how they might have their funding cut and on the other you've got a government that's spends like a drunken sailor, and we see it here and wants to deliver us a new stadium, our third stadium. Does the sector raise that with you? Because that gets talked about in the community, these choices.

Ms OGILVIE - I've absolutely heard from sector members who are very worried about the community and about the people they serve. The conversations have been pretty gritty, but it's actually been to their great credit about the people in their local communities that they're worried about making sure that they've got food, that they've got connection, that they continue

PUBLIC

to deliver the services that they want to deliver. So that's a context within which they express their frustration, and I'd give great credit to them for that I know they work really hard.

Ms O'CONNOR - I think they are worried about stadium austerity and how it will impact on the services they provide to Tasmanians that need them.

CHAIR - While we're on the budget challenge you've identified. Right at the top of the page here, is the budget efficiency dividend that is required across this area, which is in this budget year 35,000 then 52,000 for the next three years. How can that possibly be achieved in a in a sector that's pretty well under resourced and trying to do more with less?

Ms OGILVIE - I will actually, yes. Is that okay if you could address that?

Ms KELLY - That budget efficiency dividend will come from our staffing and also from our non-salaries operating budget. It won't go directly to any of the organisations.

CHAIR - How are we going to achieve that level of savings? I would imagine one would hope in fact, that you don't have non-essential staff sitting around. That makes it hard to get rid of people. I know it's your job to work this out, but how do you envisage that? Is it achievable and how will you achieve it if it is?

Ms KELLY - Part of it will be staffing where we might already have a vacant position and that's really, I suppose looking at how we deliver our services and the staffing we use for that. The non-salary side of it are things that we can potentially look at in terms of travel, and IT requirements and those sorts of operating expenses.

CHAIR - According to the budget papers, one of the ways that this efficiency and productivity unit seeks to achieve the savings that it needs to make the budget look half decent, but slightly better will be through IT and those sorts of independent approaches. If you're going to have to cut your IT, then how does that work? Its like cutting off your nose to spite your face, isn't it?

Ms OGILVIE - I'll ask you to start the answer and then I can put my innovation science and digital economy hat on.

CHAIR - We'll come to that another time minister, but if that's one of the areas you're looking to reduce the expenditure in, but that was still professed in the Budget as being the solution. I didn't believe this solution was by cutting IT. It was using technology and infrastructure -

Ms OGILVIE - And sits in a different portfolio.

CHAIR - I know it does, but I'm just responding to what was said about achieving these savings.

Ms KELLY - In terms of the IT side of things, it's more around looking at the systems that we use, like particularly in this area, and whether there's licencing that we don't need any more and could be more efficient. I think the budget efficiency dividend for this area equates to about \$52,000 -

PUBLIC

CHAIR - \$35,000 this current year and then \$52,000 in the out-years.

Ms KELLY - Which is about half of an FTE for us. It's really looking at - often this situation is really difficult - but it gives you the opportunity to look at how you undertake the business and where you can do things differently to be a little bit more efficient.

CHAIR - Under the previous budget efficiency dividend that was put across all departments. How did you save your portion there in this area? This is before your time as minister, Minister.

Ms OGILVIE - Minister.

CHAIR - Before your time as minister.

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister, it would have been through a similar sort of process looking at our staffing and other efficiencies.

CHAIR - Wouldn't you have cut out any of the low-hanging fruit in that process and now it's going to be quite hard.

Ms KELLY - Potentially.

Ms LOVELL - I just wonder if we can get an explanation of how to read this table and maybe using one of them as an example. If I could maybe go to - just because this is one that I'm familiar with - the Neighbourhood Houses Community Connector program, which is about a third of the way down on the first page. You've got budget paper allocations \$324,000 a year over those four years.

The movements between years, can you explain how that correlates? It's got \$324,000 in the first year, but then '000', does that mean there's no change in that \$324,000 exists over those four years? Does it mean that funding is ending, not being allocated as it was in the budget papers? I'm just not clear how to read the two tables together, yeah.

Ms THOMAS - It's movements between years of the budget.

Ms LOVELL - I'm assuming maybe where it's red and in brackets it's a cut or a reduction in funding.

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister. Where it's red, it comes off -

Ms LOVELL - Comes off what was allocated in the Budget?

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister, it means that it's not funded in the following year.

Ms LOVELL - But it was going to be or it was -

Ms KELLY - The \$324,000 is new for 2025-26 in the Budget and that continues for the forward Estimates.

PUBLIC

Ms LOVELL - Perhaps the next one down then beyond the rainbow, it's got \$66,000. The red in brackets 2026-27 to 2027-28, that means that funding is reducing by that amount in between those two years?

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister. That's a funding commitment for 2025-26 over two years, so 2025-26, 2026-27 and not funded for 2027-28, 2028-29.

Ms LOVELL - Yes, it'll go from \$66,000 to 0 essentially in that -

Ms THOMAS - In this year, it's still \$66,000 even though it says 0.

Ms LOVELL - Okay, thank you.

Ms THOMAS - I just have some questions still on Neighbourhood Houses, funding for Neighbourhood Houses. Firstly, in relation to the Neighbourhood Houses capital improvement program funding reallocation. There's \$2 million allocated to that across the forward Estimates until 2027-28. Can you give us an overview of, I guess, the housing stock that the department or the government owns when it comes to Neighbourhood Houses, and how that funding, that \$2 million, is allocated towards the infrastructure of Neighbourhood Houses and how much was spent in 2024-25 as well as that?

Ms KELLY - There's \$6 million allocated for the Neighbourhood House capital improvement program over three years and the funding for 2024-25 wasn't spent and has been reprofiled to 2027-28. In terms of the portfolio of the properties and things, that's managed through Homes Tasmania.

Ms THOMAS - Right. So, when - I know that there's Neighbourhood Houses that need improvement, so what's the barrier to actually spending that funding? What's the process for Neighbourhood Houses accessing the funding for capital improvements that are needed, and why isn't it being spent?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister. So, there was a program undertaken to look at the, if you like, the status of the houses and the work that needed to be done on the houses. And that was done, I understand, quite a few years ago in 2021. So, there's work under way at the moment to reconsider that and to work through what actually is current, and current pricing and so on. We do have a number of houses who clearly need some building works, and they are, you know, sort of 'top of the list', if you like. And, that work started in 2024-25 in terms of, if you like, 'auditing' those properties. So, that's why we reprofiled that funding to the later year, so we would have that ready.

Ms THOMAS - So, what will be the process for determining how that funding is allocated? Will Neighbourhood Houses themselves have a say in that? Will it be something they apply for, or will it be Homes Tasmania who determine that?

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister. So, that's a process where we will establish a steering committee, and that will include representation from Homes Tasmania as well as Department of Premier and Cabinet, and Neighbourhood Houses Tasmania, as well, as the peak body.

PUBLIC

Ms THOMAS - So, is that really necessary? I mean, it's maintenance works. Do we really need to - like, what's the rationale for establishing a steering committee? I'm sure Neighbourhood Houses know what their maintenance needs are, where things are falling apart, how money needs to be allocated. It seems like a bit of bureaucratic overkill for a relatively small amount of money, when you consider it's going to be allocated across 38 Neighbourhood Houses. You know, the administrative burden of actually administering a steering committee. The funding could perhaps better go into actually maintenance on the houses.

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister. So, it's not necessarily small maintenance jobs; it's more large sort of capital improvements. And really, it's around ensuring that we've got everyone around the table to ensure that we're fair and equitable in our decision-making and allocating the funding in the most appropriate way.

Ms OGILVIE - [inaudible 7.43.20] prioritising.

Ms THOMAS - So, will Neighbourhood Houses Tasmania have a seat on that steering committee?

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister. Yes.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you. My other question is around the funding - the more ongoing funding. Minister, I heard you say you encourage community sector organisations, including Neighbourhood Houses, to put in a budget submission through the community consultation process. They will tell me when I encourage them that, 'Well we did that this year and we got nothing additional to what we requested. The budget's only getting worse, so what's the point of wasting our time and writing another submission, or the same submission again, only just to be disappointed again?'

Neighbourhood Houses are resilient, but they have their limits. They're already stretched past those limits, and we can only rely on the goodwill of volunteers and community sector workers for so long before they burn out, and the essential services that they provide to 28,000 Tasmanians are really jeopardised by the government not increasing the funding that it provides for these really essential services - which, when you look at- consider, you know, it's \$31 to \$50 million across 38 Neighbourhood Houses. Really isn't a lot of money when you consider the number of Tasmanians that they reach. So, how can they be encouraged or feel encouraged, given they just keep getting knocked down every time they request additional funding from the government? And it appears that this isn't - just really isn't a priority for the government.

Ms OGILVIE - Is there a specific Neighbourhood House you're particularly concerned about?

Ms THOMAS - Well, I've spoken to a number of Neighbourhood Houses within the network of Neighbourhood Houses Tasmania and their feedback is they are stretched. They put in these budget submissions and then the level of funding they receive is not increased, it's maintained. Then if you look over the forward Estimates there are out-years where there is nothing against the line item. When they see that, what are they to think?

Ms OGILVIE - Since 2021, we've put in over \$14 million to neighbourhood houses, it's a substantial amount of money. Having said that, I too feel concerned about these completely essential community assets. I'm very aware of the volunteer networks that are engaged as well.

PUBLIC

I was just asking specifically if there's one you were very concerned about, because it does help to highlight that with us. What I can do as the minister is really encourage everybody to put their budget submission bids in. If you don't have budget submission bid in, you're not at the table. I want everybody to be at the table.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well why would you raise false hopes like that?

Ms OGILVIE - Is that a question or is that a statement?

Ms O'CONNOR - It's obviously a question.

Ms OGILVIE - I don't think we are living in a world of false hopes. What we need to do is make sure we stay engaged with our community sector. Bluntly and sadly, we have a budget problem. I don't think anybody at this table is able to magically find money for the budget that doesn't exist.

What we can do and what I can do is be an advocate for people, particularly in the community sector and also multicultural sector, which suffers from the same challenges, to get your budget bids in and I will fight for you. That's my commitment. That's what I will do. I will ask everybody at neighbourhood houses to truly consider that. I'm not sure what else I can add other than - I think characterising it as false hope is probably going a bit far. What I would like to do is encourage everybody to put their budget bids in.

Ms THOMAS - Given that we do have a budget problem and it's quite clear that a significant amount of that budget problem was caused by \$5 billion worth of election commitments over three elections in recent times. Also the fact that the government pretty much refuses to consider introducing any new revenue measures, there is a budget problem.

How can community sector organisations have hope when there are no proposed revenue measures to help fix this budget problem? Is that something you as a minister will advocate for within your cabinet to try and help fix this problem so that there is more funding pool to be allocated to the essential services that Tasmanians need every day through these community sector organisations who are really hurting?

Ms OGILVIE - I think your question was do I concede there's a budget problem? Yes. Do I have a proposal and ways of fixing that? I raise my voice on those issues consistently and constantly, not just in this sector but more broadly for economic development right across Tasmania, particularly in my area of innovation, science and digital economy, which has great capacity to grow - the tech sector, in particular, and science and research.

There are many parts to this. It's an engine room with many layers to it. The Treasurer has a view of how he needs to manage the budget. I have a view that as part of that process, I need to be the best advocate I can be for people in my portfolio areas who are at the frontline of serious, important community work, and that is my commitment.

Maybe in the future as things pick up, we will be having a slightly different conversation. But look, it's fair to say we've got a budget problem. It's pretty clear, it's been all over the newspapers, we went to election on it. We've got this situation. The best thing I can do is offer to be the best advocate I can be for the community sector to push for the funding they need through the budget process. The budget process which happens every year, is a prioritisation.

PUBLIC

That does happen. You would have seen it all here before amongst portfolios. That's what I can commit to.

CHAIR - The budget problem has been overseen by the government over the last 11 years you will remember. If you believe Saul Eslake, which I do on these matters, it's entirely related to policy decisions. What the member for Elwick was referring to was that a significant number of budget or election promises that are fed into this. Not many of them give huge leaks of money to the community sector, so therein lies the problem. I will go to Dean, I think Dean's got a question.

Mr HARRISS - No, I'm alright.

CHAIR - Cassy?

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you, Chair. If we look at this A3 table, just to help me - and there's financially smart people on this side of the table, I'm not one of them - but I would like to understand. Is this column, the first column on the left here, are we looking at election commitments here, primarily election commitments, and is it possible to provide a total figure for the quantum of funding through election commitments that Department of Communities Tasmania is administering in the 2024 year. So, after the 2024 state election, which I suspect most of these have come through. Then the 2025 state election, which obviously was a slightly more restrained election because of their understanding about the state's finances?

Ms OGILVIE - I think we could possibly prepare it, but we have to take that on notice.

Ms O'CONNOR - I think you can prepare it, because you might recall, you were actually caught up in it. There was a cheque to the sailing club that your daughter was part of.

Ms OGILVIE - Sorry, what are you trying to get at? What was that?

Ms O'CONNOR - There was the 'sports rorts' saga of 2018, which was slightly captured by -

Ms OGILVIE - I don't think there were any sports rorts going on.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, they were called 'sports rorts'.

Ms OGILVIE - No, I think you called them 'sports rorts'.

Ms O'CONNOR - Plenty of people did, actually. They were reported in the media.

Ms OGILVIE - I think you're getting a little off-track.

Ms O'CONNOR - Let me put it this way. More than \$400 million in election promises came through in 2018. You were part of it, handing over a cheque to your daughter's rowing club. Do you remember? What I'm trying to understand -

Ms OGILVIE - Fully disclosed, so what's your point?

Ms O'CONNOR - Sure. Handy, though.

Ms OGILVIE - Fully disclosed appropriately.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, I don't know about that, I think it was kind of through a computer file, but irrelevant.

Ms OGILVIE - Fully disclosed, thank you. This is getting a bit personal, now.

Ms O'CONNOR - No, you took issue with me calling it 'sports rorts', which it was described as at the time, because of the excessive spending, which is now being highlighted by Treasury.

Ms OGILVIE - You are getting to a sensible point. I get what you're saying. You're saying that a lot of election commitments have added to the budget bottom line.

Ms O'CONNOR - That's not what I'm saying. It's obvious, but it's also what Treasury said, and what Saul Eslake said. In 2018, and again in 2021, to your point before, there were tables presented by Communities Tasmania because parliament requested the information. We did have the full suite of election promises, and we had a very good indication of what Communities Tasmania was administering in terms of the election promise grants.

I am certain that there is a written record somewhere of the quantum of funding of election promises that Communities Tasmania is administering, and it is partly contained in this document.

Ms OGILVIE - We've just said we will get that for you. I'm happy to do that, but we'd have to take it on notice.

Ms O'CONNOR - You said it would have to be prepared, and I'm surprised that it's not already prepared.

Ms OGILVIE - We'll get it for you on notice. We obviously don't have it here.

Ms O'CONNOR - Sorry, to be clear, does Communities Tasmania have readily available, an understanding of the quantum of funding through these grants processes it's administering as a consequence of the last two state elections?

Ms OGILVIE - Let me just ask. We'll take that on notice.

Ms O'CONNOR - One more thing on this table. I'm trying to understand. All down this first column here are large sums; budget paper allocations, the original allocation being X. Are all these items here election promises?

Ms KELLY - They're all key deliverables in the 2024-25 budget through election commitments. Looking at the 2024-25 budget paper, you'll see those all listed under the key deliverables statement under 2024 election commitments.

Ms O'CONNOR - Going back to my original question, does this column here add up to the quantum of funding that Communities Tasmania is administering that were election

PUBLIC

commitments? Is this the election commitment funding that Communities Tasmania is administering?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: I'd have to do a double check, but yes, that's likely the case. There were some other commitments within the 2024-25 Budget that weren't necessarily listed as 2024 election commitments, so I'd just have to go back through and double check, but a number of them are.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay. Thanks, Chair.

CHAIR - Bec?

Ms THOMAS - Thank you. Just trying to be clear on this table, again, with a couple of specific organisational grants. So, on the second page of the table, it's got allocations for 2025-26 for organisations like Council on the Ageing, Volunteering Tasmania, Moonah Multicultural Hub, just to name a few, where there's a budget paper allocation in 2025-26, but nothing beyond that. So, does that mean, for those organisations within this current Budget and the forward Estimates - so, for example, Council on the Ageing Tasmania is getting \$200,000 in this budget, but then nothing's predicted in the future forward Estimates.

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: yes, that's correct. So, it would only be funded 2024-25, 2025-26, and it would have been for a particular project, I imagine, time limited.

Ms THOMAS - Okay. So, the same for Volunteering Tasmania? \$520,000, and after that, nothing.

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: yes, that's right. Again, that would have been an uplift to their funding and also some project funding.

Ms THOMAS - So, where's their base funding reflected? Or they don't get any base funding?

Ms O'CONNOR - They do.

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: that's actually part of our appropriation that we get. So the things that are listed in there are extra on top of that appropriation.

Ms THOMAS - Right. So, can we have a list of -

Ms LOVELL - Can we get a breakdown of the base funding?

Ms THOMAS - Yes. Sorry, I was thinking that the first bit of this table was base funding, but that's not the case. It's very confusing.

Unknown speaker - This is election funding.

CHAIR - So just to be clear, then, perhaps - tell me if I'm not capturing this correctly - but there's base funding that sits in the appropriation line item, and what you've given us in the table is one-off election commitment funding that may top up some of the community sector organisations.

Ms LOVELL - So, I think what we're looking for is this -

CHAIR - Is that right?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: that table is showing where there's been budget movements between the years. So -

Ms LOVELL - So, I think what we're after is on page 215, output group 3.3, Community Services - those total amounts, so 2025-26: 31, 481, 26, 774 - a breakdown of that whole amount. I'm assuming this table will give some of it but not all of it.

Ms THOMAS - Yes, it's confusing. Is that publicly available anywhere, like that breakdown of -

Ms OGILVIE - No, I think that's the problem.

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: no, it's not publicly available.

Ms LOVELL - Can we get that breakdown?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms LOVELL - Thank you. You will take that on notice, I'm assuming.

Ms THOMAS - Minister, would you consider in future budget papers providing that level of detail? Because it's very hard to scrutinise the budget appropriation when we don't know the detail, and to prepare -

Ms LOVELL - Yes, it's hard when it's all in one.

CHAIR - It's one line item for lots of things.

Ms THOMAS - Yes, lots of different things, lots of really important community organisations. Like, there's nothing in -

Ms OGILVIE - That's exactly what I was going to say.

Ms THOMAS - There's nothing in here for TasCOSS, for example. Like, how can we see what's being provided to them?

Ms OGILVIE - I agree with your desire for more information. The budget is managed by Treasury strictly according to their processes and protocols, and I don't think I would have much joy in getting more information and detail into the budget itself. Having said that, there might be another way of providing you with the information that you need.

Ms THOMAS - Well, it would be very helpful if that could be provided or even published, publicly available.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - What level of detail is in your annual report? Not having looked at that, because we've been reading other things like these. Does the annual report provide a more thorough and comprehensive list of the base funding and additional uplift or grant funding for a particular purpose?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: no, I don't think so.

CHAIR - Is that the more appropriate place to put that level of detail?

Ms OGILVIE - Well, it might be, yes. It might solve the problem with me not being able to adjust the budget papers.

CHAIR - It won't help the next budget because that's before the annual report comes out. Maybe next year when you appear?

Ms THOMAS - Perhaps that's something we can ask to be provided before Estimates next year.

CHAIR - Can I just ask, then, this area too also oversees the NILS program. Have you got an update on the number of NILS -

Ms OGILVIE - NILS, such a good program.

CHAIR - - The number of loans and the total amount of how much -

Ms OGILVIE - Okay, I do have some information. I will start here while they're seeking their information. Obviously, we're big supporters of NILS - great program. We have confirmed our commitment, an additional \$2.1 million as part of a new three-year partnership investment plan to help NILS operate at a high capacity ramping up over a three-year period, 2024-25 to 2026-27, to reach up to 2,000 more loans per year; an additional \$2 million over four years to extend the highly successful energy saver loan subsidy program. The increased capacity is enhanced by - they've got the new loans system into place, which I was pleased to hear about the other day, and was launched earlier this year.

As at June 2025, NILS loans are issued through 524 NILS volunteer loans officers who volunteer across 77 delivery partners located at 110 access points, then there is allied financial counselling. Since 2002, NILS has issued over 46,000 loans worth over \$55 million with 97 per cent of all NILS loans being paid back over the last 20 years. I have a little bit of data here: the different types of loans, microfinance and micro-business. In 2024-25, microfinance loans: 3,941 with a value of \$5,981,708. For the micro-business loans there were 114 with a value of \$334,080; I think that gets you where you wanted to go.

CHAIR - But that doesn't pick up the loans for more personal items and things like that, does it, or is it - which one is that under?

Ms OGILVIE - I believe that's a microfinance, so washing machines and things like that.

CHAIR - In terms of -

Ms OGILVIE - We have some additional information. Might table that, I think that just might be generally helpful. I think that's got the latest details.

CHAIR - With regard to the financial counselling services, we acknowledge that so many people are under enormous and increasing financial pressure. What's been the uptake of that program and how are people accessing it?

Ms OGILVIE - I can give you a bit of information. That's the Anglicare Tasmania financial counselling service. In 2024-25, we as a government provided Anglicare with funding of \$697,000, excluding GST, and including indexation for the statewide delivery of the financial counselling service which aims to assist people to manage their debt and refer people to more specialised services when needed. Anglicare has reported that between 1 January 2025 and 30 June 2025, it had 459 active clients engaged with the service. During this period, the number of new referrals, active clients and exited clients remains high, with cost-of-living pressures still impacting many clients.

CHAIR - How do you - I'm not saying it's not a worthwhile program, I absolutely believe it is, but how do you measure the outcomes of that?

Ms OGILVIE - I'm sure that there are reporting requirements, but I will just seek some help with that from the department.

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: as part of the funding that we provide, there's regular reporting that Anglicare has to provide, and also because the services that Anglicare provide are connected in with a lot of other services, you get referrals through neighbourhood houses and so on, we were able to work with them as well to get an understanding of the need and the uptake of that service. We often look at -

CHAIR - That's one thing. I'm just interested in how outcomes are measured. How many people actually -

Ms OGILVIE - If they succeed to get out of debt?

CHAIR - Yes, that's right. Is that actually tracked measured?

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister. That's a really interesting question. Part of the work that we're doing around the longer-term funding agreements, part of that is also looking at the outcomes framework and the Premier tabled this morning, the new well-being framework which will provide the sort of broad population domains that we will work to.

Part of that stage 2 of the longer-term funding agreements is to look at those well-being domains and also the sort of outcomes that agencies and the government more generally are looking at in terms of the services that these provide. Going from output counts, if you like, in terms of number of visitors or number of clients and what services to outcomes where we've really made a difference in terms of how our clients actually are able to manage their budget and so on.

CHAIR - With all these other programs or one-off financial support. How do you measure the outcomes of those in terms of value for money?

PUBLIC

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister, a lot of those programs are - a lot of the election commitments are infrastructure-related things or one-off programs. Some of them might tie in with an existing organisation that we work with already, like COTA or Volunteering Tas but a number of the others are sort of amounts of money that go into things like a new roof on a scout hall or those sorts of things as well.

CHAIR - Yes, those sorts of things, you can see - the roof doesn't leak, then the building is going to last longer, for example.

Ms OGILVIE - See it a lot in Heritage.

CHAIR - But a lot of these are more like a service delivery thing and I think it's difficult to say actually, 'No, we don't think your service is delivering the outcomes we would expect.' How do you - not so much with infrastructure things which are more tangible in some respects - how do you measure the outcomes of those more nuanced service delivery?

I'm not saying that that they don't deserve the money. I'm just asking how you assure yourself each year when you go into bat for the individual organisations, how do you assure yourself that it's a good value for money and the outcomes are positive?

Ms OGILVIE - Yeah, it's a very sensible question.

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister. I think it ties back to what I was saying before in that we're very output-focused at the moment, and we need to move to a more outcomes measure.

CHAIR - Could I take it from that then, at the moment, there's not really a full or comprehensive, rigorous and consistent process for assessing outcomes. It's all about outputs?

Ms OGILVIE - I think that might be a bridge too far, but I think there's a spectrum, so yes.

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister, I would say it's certainly an area that we need to put a focus on, and that it would probably varies from agency to agency. That's the other thing to mention as well. That community service organisation funding and the programs that they deliver and services they deliver are also done through a number of other agencies like Department of Health or Department of Education.

CHAIR - Which I was just about to come to because you would be aware, Minister, of the Auditor-General's report into the disgraceful management of community grants administered through Health. It was disgraceful that the Auditor-General didn't pull punches on that one either. A few punches to not pull recently.

Ms OGILVIE - I'm not aware of this one.

CHAIR - You should have read that, Minister, I'm surprised you haven't read it.

Ms OGILVIE - What specifically?

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Into the grants - I'm sure that Nolene knows all about it - but you should because it directly reflects your area and the absolute lack of proper process in just about every form. This was some time ago, Minister, he tabled that report.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

CHAIR - It wasn't just last week. What is your approach to that then, Nolene, because this is one the things that outlines why you need good outcome measures and proper rigorous processes around, which are absolutely lacking?

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister, it was a really interesting and valuable report and just as an aside, Department of Premier and Cabinet did some work around assessing our processes around grant management against the recommendations and findings.

We actually did a review of our grant management process with our internal auditors to show where we could make improvements, too. But the broader question is that audit provided a number of areas that have come through the work that we're doing around longer term funding agreements and outcomes framework. Department of Health are on our longer term funding agreement steering committee and are able to bring to that steering committee the things that they're putting in place to address that audit.

It was a very important audit for us, not just our agency, but also at a whole-of-government level in terms of the longer term funding agreements, the outcomes framework, where we want to go and understanding what's best practice there.

CHAIR - That's the last thing you want to do in a really constrained budget is be spending money you shouldn't be, which is essentially quite possible. You should go through and read it, Minister.

Ms THOMAS - Can I follow on from the questions before about the out years?

CHAIR - Sure.

Ms THOMAS - So are you able to tell me then, seeing as though we don't have the detail of how many of these organisations do get base funding year on year? Like, does the Council on the Ageing and what period is that funding agreement for? Volunteering Tasmania, Moonah Multicultural Hub?

CHAIR - TasCOSS.

Ms THOMAS - TasCOSS, well, TasCOSS isn't on here, but yes.

Ms KELLY - Through you, Minister, all the peaks that are listed here, the peak bodies, so that list that I gave you before. Those organisations all receive recurrent funding from government, and they might be listed in here as well, but that would be because there's either getting a short-term uplift to their funding or that there's a special project that they're working on.

In terms of the other organisations in here, I'd have to probably just go through and have a look, but if we provide, as we were saying before, that information about each of the

PUBLIC

organisations and what they get in the Budget. We can also add into that from the 2024-25 key deliverables whether there was any additional funding as well provided through that, if that's useful.

CHAIR - So you split it out to base funding plus additional funding for other purpose of base funding.

Ms KELLY - Yes.

Ms THOMAS - That's what you're taking on notice, is that right?

Ms KELLY - Yes.

Ms THOMAS - The Moonah Multicultural Hub specifically has an allocation of \$75,000 in 2025-26. What is that specifically for?

Ms OGILVIE - The Moonah Multicultural Hub, the funding is provided over two years to support the ongoing work of the Moonah Multicultural Hub as a space for community events and gatherings.

If you would like more information about that, we would have to get that for you.

Ms THOMAS - Well, I guess my concern is that if that organisation doesn't get peak ongoing recurrent funding, that ends in June next year, and the Moonah Multicultural Hub would not survive without that funding, which would have a really significant impact on our multicultural community.

Ms OGILVIE - It's a wonderful place.

Ms THOMAS - So that would be very concerning to me if that was the case.

Ms OGILVIE - We will find out.

Ms THOMAS - So you don't know if they have any funding?

Ms OGILVIE - They don't get ongoing funding. Not from our portfolio. It might be in another portfolio. We will check.

Ms THOMAS - What other portfolio? It's a very important community. You're the Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Community. So, if not in this portfolio, what portfolio could it possibly be?

Ms OGILVIE - I have to ask. I don't know the answer to this question.

Ms KELLY - We don't provide ongoing funding to the Moonah Multicultural Hub. They might be able to apply for particular grants that come up depending on the services that they offer, but but they're not an organisation that we provide recurrent funding to.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - There's a line item here in this table that \$600,000 in 2024-25 to unlock land for housing on Flinders Island. Why would that be under this portfolio, rather than under the housing portfolio or other portfolio area?

Ms OGILVIE - The information I have is that funding sits within this portfolio and managed by our department -

CHAIR - That is what it says.

Ms OGILVIE - but that is as far as the connection goes, and that was a Treasury arrangement.

CHAIR - My question comes to you as the minister for communities, with another department specifically focus on housing and planning and trying to deliver roofs over people's heads, I find it hard to think there's \$600,000 here that's come out of this bucket of money when arguably it's not something that fits here, surely?

Ms KELLY - There were a number of commitments that were made in 2024-25 that didn't necessarily sit within the community services portfolio, but they were put there by Treasury. What we've done with those is in most of the cases we weren't able to necessarily transfer them to the other organisation, but we've worked with the relevant organisations when we've been doing the money.

CHAIR - The money comes out of your budget though.

Ms KELLY - That's right. The money's been given to us in our budget and has seen come out of our budget as well.

Ms OGILVIE - So it's an input.

CHAIR - But there's work associated with delivering that. You're required to make budget cuts. Your staff is one of the things you're looking at. You have staff spending time dealing with things that don't really sit in your portfolio. I would hope minister you would fight a bit harder with the Treasurer about that.

Ms OGILVIE - What do you mean, a bit harder?

CHAIR - This is not right for here. There are several others that probably should not sit in Communities.

Ms OGILVIE - I could certainly have that discussion.

CHAIR - Especially when another election comes up.

Ms THOMAS - The annual election.

Ms O'CONNOR - Can I check, is it that because these election commitments are kind of one-off grants, that is why through minister through communities. Because it was the same in 2018 and 2021 where the bulk of the election commitments were funded through

PUBLIC

communities, some sport and rec but mostly communities and I'm wondering is that just a practical practice? What is it?

Ms OGILVIE - I don't know the answer to that. As a very new communities minister, I haven't focused on that specifically, but I do see that election commitments, which can be disparate and broad, there could be a reason that they are placed here, but that is a Treasury decision. It's not something the minister or the department has decided. I see where you're going with it, but I don't know that I can specifically answer that question.

CHAIR - Dean, do you have any questions?

Mr HARRISS - No.

Ms THOMAS - I don't know what I don't know, so I don't know what to ask.

Ms O'CONNOR - The Wings Wildlife Park received \$300,000. That grant is being administered through Communities Tasmania. What is that significant allocation to Wings Wildlife Park about because there are other wildlife rescue organisations that didn't get anything from government. Maybe they were in the wrong electorate.

CHAIR - The Raptor Rescue is in the same Braddon electorate.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, Raptor Rescue also in Franklin.

Ms OGILVIE - I do have a bit of information on that. The 2024-25 state budget provided \$300,000 to Wings Wildlife Park as a 2024 election commitment to support the new wildlife hospital and conduct flood mitigation. Funding was provided to the Department of Premier and Cabinet to administer DPAC. The Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania have been working together to ensure the ground is provided to Wing's Wildlife Park in accordance with the commitment, whilst ensuring good governance of public funds as well as good wildlife outcomes. The grant is yet to be provided as the Wildlife hospital, although completely rebuilt, does not have a veterinarian on staff to support wildlife hospital services. DPAC -

CHAIR - It was damaged and there was a big flood.

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. DPAC continues to work with the recipient and NRET to resolve the matter.

That's a bit more information.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you for that, minister.

So, you are saying that the infrastructure that was funded has been built.

The funding that was promised hasn't been delivered.

Ms OGILVIE - A sum of \$300,000 to Wings Wildlife Park as an election commitment.

PUBLIC

NRET and DPAC have been working together to ensure the grant is provided to Wings Wildlife Park, etcetera. The grant is yet to be provided as the wildlife hospital, although completely rebuilt, does not have a veterinarian on staff to support wildlife hospital services.

CHAIR - It's a hospital with no patients.

Ms OGILVIE - It sounds to me like they need a vet.

Ms O'CONNOR - It does. As an example, Bonorong delivers a really important wildlife rescue service.

They they have veterinary services that are accessible there, but Bonorong gets nothing. Wings Wildlife Park gets \$300,000.

Do you agree it's sort of emblematic of the unstrategic, haphazard way funds have been allocated in the state through the vehicle of elections?

Ms OGILVIE - No.

Ms O'CONNOR - It's not equitable.

Okay, so to your mind it is fair and reasonable that one wildlife park, maybe they're the squeakiest wheel, got \$300,000. Bonorong Wildlife Park is constantly fundraising for members of the community to pay for their wildlife rescue service.

The question was, do you believe that's fair and reasonable?

Ms OGILVIE - There are always difficult choices to make and priorities, both with government services and during election campaigns. It's part of the democratic process. I'm not sure what I can tell you.

Ms O'CONNOR - You know how difficult that choice would have been. I can select rather than stepping back and looking where the need is and investing strategically. If you're interested in wildlife rescue, you might have a grant pool where wildlife rescue organisations can be in a fair process.

Ms OGILVIE - That's a good suggestion.

Ms O'CONNOR - Would you like to see more of that?

Ms OGILVIE - That's a fine suggestion.

Ms O'CONNOR - Sorry, it is very hard to hear. \$300,000 going to the Integrity Commission would make all the difference in their capacity to perform their -

CHAIR - They recommended such a system.

Ms O'CONNOR - The Integrity Commission did in fact, when they looked at the 2018 election sports rorts bet.

PUBLIC

Ms OGILVIE - It was not sports rorts, and by you keeping saying that does not make it so.

Ms O'CONNOR - (inaudible)

Ms OGILVIE - No, it doesn't. Now what I would like to -

Ms O'CONNOR - It was subject to a thorough investigation by the Integrity Commission which found significant flaws in the way fund was dispersed.

Ms OGILVIE - I don't think anybody was - I don't want to go down that rabbit hole with you because what I'm trying to do is somewhat agree with you about the fairness of competitive grant processes which is actually at the core of your statement.

Ms THOMAS - I am sorry if we've already covered this ground, but in the overview on Page 226 of the Budget for line item 3.3, it talks about that this output for which \$50,479,000 was allocated in 2024-25 - was - and that's been cut to \$31,481,000 in 2025-26, cut again to \$26,774,000 in 2026-27, right down to the final year of the forward Estimates to \$20,540,000.

So, significant cuts, but it covers a lot of things - Neighbourhood Houses Tasmania, the No Interest Loan scheme, family support services, financial counselling services, the Gambling Support Program, food relief providers, and a range of other counselling and support services, as well as funding to peak bodies as we've talked about. Can you provide an indication of whether there will be cuts to - included in the reduction in the appropriation over the forward Estimates, will there be cuts to the Gambling Support Program, financial counselling services, and food relief providers within that budget appropriation?

Ms OGILVIE - That was a very, very long question.

Ms THOMAS - So, there's a range of things bundled into that line item. We've talked about election commitments, and them coming off, making up a big part of the reason for the reduction. But also built into the reduction over the forward Estimates, are there cuts to the Gambling Support Program?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: so the funding that we get for the Gambling Support Program comes from the -

Ms THOMAS - Community support levy?

Ms KELLY - Community support fund. So, we have to put a submission in each year for that funding, and we've put our submission in for this year, but we're yet to hear from Treasury whether we've got that money yet or not.

Ms O'CONNOR - It used to be automatically hypothecated. When I was the minister you didn't have to do applications every year.

Ms THOMAS - And has it been - have you asked for the same amount, or more, or less?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: roughly the same.

PUBLIC

Ms THOMAS - Okay, and what about food relief providers? Are there any cuts, minister, over the forward Estimates to funding in that bucket for food relief providers?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: there's \$7.1 million over four years for the food sector. There are some allocations that are in place that will be funded through that \$7.1 million.

Ms THOMAS - So, how does that compare to what was in last year's budget, 7.1 over four years?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: there's a mix of recurrent and time-limited funding in - through food.

Ms THOMAS - So it's less? Less over than what was provided this year?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: it's more this year than what it was last year for some of those organisations.

Ms THOMAS - So, will that be provided - will this detail be provided in the breakdown that you will provide?

Ms KELLY - Yes.

Ms THOMAS - Thank you. What about our financial counselling services?

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: that's recurrent funding, so that will be the same.

Ms THOMAS - Okay. And, we've talked about neighbourhood houses. And just to be clear, because I think I may have misrepresented earlier what I was saying, because I was talking about the full budget line item amount of \$50 million. Obviously, that's not the amount provided to neighbourhood houses. You mentioned, minister, that \$40 million has been provided to neighbourhood houses since 2021. So, that's around \$10 million per annum; is that right? The amount that's provided - has been provided per annum?

Ms OGILVIE - 40 since 2021, yes.

Ms THOMAS - So, do you know how that's peaked and troughed over the last four years, or has that been pretty consistent?

Ms OGILVIE - What is the annual amount? Let me check if it was annually the same.

Ms KELLY - Through you, minister: neighbourhood house funding has gone up as a result of the \$50,000 booster funding, and also the Community Connector Program funding as well.

Ms THOMAS - But that's not guaranteed long term?

Ms OGILVIE - That's project-based funding.

PUBLIC

Ms THOMAS - Project-based funding which the neighbourhood houses have been clearly advocating for, through their submissions, the need for that ongoing, given the increased need for their services. And what about family support services? What do they include?

Ms OGILVIE - I will see if I can get some information here. In family support services - I will try and just get the detail for you. So, this ranges from direct emergency relief and preventative support programs through to personal and family counselling services, and they deliver community-based preventative and early-intervention counselling service and support. We also provide services to help Tasmanian parents with parenting information, advice, mentoring and support, so that's comprised of community kinship care. In 2021-22 we committed \$2.25 million over four years to implement key recommendations from the informal kinship care review, which was called the *Ogle Report*, and extend support for kinship carers.

Key initiatives delivered through this funding include increased brokerage and respite services, community-based training opportunities for carers, an online portal to coordinate information and support and a pilot program, importantly, for a liaison officer in the north-west. Core support services continue to be funded through the 2025-26 years and the Department of Premier and Cabinet is actively working with community kinship care providers to explore options for extended support for community kinship carers in our community that address barriers to the delivery of flexible respite and brokerage services.

It also was comprised of the family assistance program. The family assistance program funds community organisations to increase provision of direct emergency relief and preventative support programs for Tasmanian families suffering financial hardship, and personal and family counselling services which deliver community-based, preventative and early-intervention counselling and support. These services aim to prevent, intervene and mitigate risk to the safety or wellbeing of individuals and families.

Then we have early childhood and parenting information and advice, where we fund early support for parents, providing Tasmanians with parenting information, advice, mentoring and support through volunteers who work with families. Now we also have the Glenhaven Family Care Kentish family support. The 2023-24 state Budget provided funding of \$145,000 per year for three years to Glenhaven Family Care to deliver services through Kentish House.

The interim 2025-26 state Budget has provided a further \$85,000 in 2025-26 for Kentish House to continue delivering important services within the Kentish community. The Tasmanian Government has also committed to consideration of Kentish House joining the Neighbourhood House network prior to the conclusion of the current funding arrangement of 30 June 2026. The service provides centre-based support in collaboration with visiting service providers, and assists families and individuals to access relevant family support.

Ms THOMAS - I didn't mean to give you a Dorothy Dixier there. I don't know that I have much more to ask, Chair.

Ms OGILVIE - If I may, just for a moment, I have tried very much - and it's always a judgement call on this side of the table about how to answer questions that I know are very genuine.

Ms O'CONNOR - Honestly is always a good policy.

Ms OGILVIE - Correct: and because you have the department here, this really is the opportunity for you to get the information you want via the department, so I have tried to favour asking the department to respond directly. I could read all of these out for you, but I'm not sure that's the best benefit of your time. If I have the information there, I'm happy to give it, but I will be guided by what you prefer.

CHAIR - Minister, you tabled earlier the volunteer strategy and the Multicultural Action Plan. There's a number of other initiatives, in terms of policy development and plans: there's the Tasmanian Carer Action Plan, the Older Tasmanian Action Plan, The LGBTQIA+ strategy, gambling support, the strategic framework and food resilience strategy - where are all those at?

Ms OGILVIE - I've been working through those. In relation to the food resilience strategy, let me just get my tab open here. I perhaps should have brought copies for you.

CHAIR - All of these are funded in this Budget?

Ms OGILVIE - Okay, so that's a slightly different question. Firstly, let me just run through it and see if I can answer your question. The cost of living, we know, is obviously impacting people badly, and we're committing \$7.1 million over four years between 2025-26 and 2028-29 to support the new implementation of that new food resilience strategy. We're supporting continuation of programs and services that support delivery of food relief to Tasmanians, delivery of initiatives that focus on building food resilience in local communities and developing community-led solutions to address long-term food insecurity. The question you've asked really crosses over a number of areas including carers, food, LGBTQI, et cetera. We have released the food resilience strategy, the LGBTIQ - I've recently met with the team. It was a really good meeting. I don't want to take people's names in vain, but I think Rodney is keen to release that jointly and we will do that soon. We have approved the food strategy. It's not yet been released. Sorry, I just need to correct that. What was your other area?

CHAIR - Are they all funded to deliver the strategies?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes. The strategies have been effectively completed. Whether they've been released, approved or wherever they're at in the program. But the next piece is the action plans that sit under the strategy. I think that's probably where you would want to see the funding.

CHAIR - The funding is there for that? That's the question.

Ms OGILVIE - I will just see if we can get the details.

Ms KELLY - In terms of the new carer action plan, which is due to be started next year, because we've got the current one that goes to the end of this year. There's a funding allocation in the 2025-26 Budget of \$110,000 that goes towards that. There's the food resilience strategy, which is due to come out soon, before the end of this month, I believe.

Ms OGILVIE - Soon. My apologies.

Ms KELLY - That's funded in the Budget. That's the \$7.1 million over four years. A portion of that money is for the implementation of the strategy. Other money goes directly to organisations. The volunteers' strategy - there's money in the 2025-26 Budget for that strategy

and also the fee subsidy for the working with vulnerable people. LGBTQIA+ - that strategy is due to come out before the end of the month. There's funding of \$202,000 in the 2025 -

CHAIR - [inaudible 8.37.50 p.m.] on that strategy?

Ms KELLY - Yes.

CHAIR - With all of this - and again, I'm not questioning the value, I'm just saying how do you measure the outcomes from these? Obviously, someone comes to the end of their life and they're being reviewed and that's the next iteration if you like. But before just launching into it to say, 'Let's have another strategy,' how do you measure the outcomes of the previous strategy?

Ms OGILVIE - Before we turn to that, for those who are listening, the strategy guides government's activities in this area and how we support these groups. You need to have a strategy in place to provide the strategic lens under which all the activities happen. It's not really a question of measuring the strategic layer; it's a question of making sure that the activities under that strategy are the right ones.

CHAIR - You assess the outcomes of the activities which are founded under the strategy.

Ms OGILVIE - That's right. That's what I'm saying.

In relation to what's happened previously, I'm sure the department can assist with that. But going forward we are doing a lot of work, particularly as you know with peak organisations to fix up the five-year contract issues to make sure that we build into those some sustainability and capability to get those projects going, projects that we know need to keep going over time. In relation to what we've done previously, before my time, I will ask Noelene.

Ms KELLY - If I take the food resilience strategy, which is due to be released shortly, that's a really nice example where we've had a previous strategy and we've gone through a process to evaluate how that went and where the money was, I suppose, invested -

CHAIR - Did you measure the outcomes for that, not just the dollars and cents? Like we can talk about outputs as much as we like, but if it doesn't affect outcomes and positive outcomes, it could just be throwing good money after bad.

Ms KELLY - Well, a really nice example with the food strategy is that through the consultation that was done in the jurisdictional analysis and so on. It was clear that we needed to move from a sort of emergency food relief towards more strategic food resilience. Looking at things like social supermarkets and those sorts of things. That's an example, I suppose, of where we've done that. However, what I would say is that absolutely there's work for us to do around measuring outcomes and that's part of that work that we're looking at through the longer-term funding agreements.

Ms OGILVIE - I think it's fair to say that it's been an extensive amount of consultation with this strategy as well right across the state. I know it's deeply important and meaningful not just to those who are suffering food insecurity. For example, thinking about the work that that great group at UTAS does. We've have students who are literally hungry. We had this great jigsaw puzzle of good organisations and good people right across our state, at every layer, who

are doing great work. It is a bit of a jigsaw puzzle, and so one of the things that we are doing, and this is the first step, is to work out how to aggregate things in a better way that's more effective to get food to the people who need it when they need it.

To make sure, for example, that kids in school have food, we put a lot of money into that as well. Doing that work is part of the work that I will do as the new incoming minister to work out how we can put this together as effectively as possible, whilst also recognising the really good work that so many people do.

Ms O'CONNOR - In the consultation, Minister, on the Food Resilience Strategy and this is one where you can put your climate minister's hat on as well. The Australian National Climate Risk Assessment points to specific risks to communities' cohesion, safety, liveability related to food insecurity as a result of disruptions to the climate system, rainfall patterns, et cetera.

How much has the science of the climate risk assessment, if at all, informed the development of a food resilience strategy?

Ms OGILVIE - Well, it's a good question. I am very aware of some superb work that our agricultural sector is doing into climate and risk. We've got our climate change action plans and the work that we're doing, particularly in the agricultural sector, with climate change resilience action is good. I mention that because that's where the food comes from. A number of our organisations deal directly with farmgate. They go; they pick up the food from the farmers and redistribute it. It's all connected.

I'm a climate change believer. I want to see work we do in that area that is incredibly meaningful that delivers better outcomes. I think, outside of the agricultural sector, when you're looking at what work we could do from perhaps a science space in climate change as well. Things like, and I have the environment portfolio as well, but things like circular economy, working with community gardens, which I love. Again, we need a strategic approach to community gardens. That's something I'm taking on as a passion project as incoming minister.

I'm working with our Waste Recovery Board, particularly against circular economy, food waste, et cetera. There's a number of ways into this question and I'm trying to convey to you that I again am agreeing with you.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes, and?

Ms OGILVIE - But there is complexity to it and how can I help?

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes, there's complexity to all big policy areas -

Ms OGILVIE - Correct, multifaceted.

Ms O'CONNOR - That's right and if - just as an observation - here in Tasmania, if any place in the world is going to be able to adapt, hopefully it's us. Part of the reason that we may be able to successfully adapt over this century is because of the connectedness of our communities, the fact that we have that sense of place and look after each other, but we also have in the food security space some really interesting social infrastructure, that if it was all

threaded together, including Neighbourhood Houses, child and family centres, for example. second bite. -

Ms OGILVIE - Agreed.

Ms O'CONNOR - I guess I'm saying this to you as just something to think about, because shocks are coming. They are going to be big shocks that are coming to our communities, and food insecurity, identified by our scientists as a real threat, is something that we should be able to plan for. We here produce more than we consume. And so, how do you make sure that we look after Tasmanians first?

Ms OGILVIE - Well, I always welcome the voice of science at the table in any portfolio and project that I'm involved with as climate change minister specifically and particularly, and again as environment minister.

I agree we could be doing a more sophisticated job of putting those threads together. I have already reached out to some particularly good academics to ask them if they might do a piece of work on this. And from your perspective, I see the climate change imperative is really important. I have a very sort of humanist thing as well, being a mumma -

Ms O'CONNOR - They're not mutually exclusive. They're totally connected.

Ms OGILVIE - No, but the same outcome is to make sure everybody is fed and looked after. We're talking about food security-

Ms O'CONNOR - That's why I'm talking about food insecurity, out of concern for people.

Ms OGILVIE - Which is what I'm talking about. Repeated agreement.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes, but- something different in what we were looking at-

Ms OGILVIE - No. What I'm saying is it's just many ways- there's many lenses that we could take on this challenge. My personal perspective is there is some work to be done which we can do around the connectedness piece.

I'm always amazed, as I travel around - I've lived and worked all over the world - with how the Tasmanian culture is very specific and beautiful and people do look after each other, and we're people who are very pragmatic. And that goes to dropping the food off to people in pandemic, which I'm sure you did and I did, making sure people have got food, looking after our neighbours - all that stuff that used to happen beautifully, perhaps, in the 80s elsewhere, still happens here. That is to be protected and is a beautiful thing about Tasmania and our communities.

I see it in the arts sector; I see it in the environment sector. As I mentioned the other day, I've been from a very old Tassie family, and we've seen the ups and downs of all of this. But, Tasmania is such a beautiful island of people who are willing to help, who are able to help. We have farmers offering food, we have the university getting the students together and working with multicultural communities.

PUBLIC

Everybody understands that service imperative, and that comes in a state where we're not awash with cash and people, and we have to be innovative and creative, care for our neighbours, and that's probably a little bit of my DNA, but ultimately, we're in agreement that this is a really important area and we could do more.

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes, and... I mean, all of those qualities that define us as island people, but they do require leadership, potentially legislative and regulatory change, and funding. And I guess I'm imploring you as the minister for communities and climate particularly, off the back of your food resilience strategy, to step back and have a look at the bigger picture through the lens of climate risk.

Ms OGILVIE - It's specifically in relation to food resilience? Or, other-

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes.

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

Ms O'CONNOR - Yes. Now, minister, I need to ask you this question, because we've been asking a number of ministers this question: in broad terms, in the past 18 months, either as a minister or an MP, have you as an individual incurred any legal costs that have been met by government?

Ms OGILVIE - Yes.

Ms O'CONNOR - Okay. And so, in the past 18 months, have you as an individual - either a minister or a member - been a subject or a party to any Supreme Court matters?

Ms OGILVIE - No.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you.

Ms OGILVIE - Why did you want to know that?

Ms O'CONNOR - Why'd I want to know that? Because we're asking questions about last year in Estimates, there was a \$600,000-plus legal bill paid for by taxpayers for private ministers' and MPs' legal expenses.

Ms OGILVIE - Private? I don't think- if they're ministers, then it's ministerial expense?

Ms O'CONNOR - It depends if they're private legal fees.

CHAIR - I'm not quite sure how this relates to our Budget.

Ms OGILVIE - No, I don't think it relates at all to the Budget. But anyway, I've answered your question.

CHAIR - You've answered it.

Ms O'CONNOR - Well, it does. Absolutely it does, because it's about probity. Whatever portfolio you're administering.

PUBLIC

CHAIR - Dean, any other questions? Cassy, any others?

Mr HARRISS - No. Thanks, Chair.

Ms O'CONNOR - No. I mean, I could cook some up.

CHAIR - We don't need to cook them up.

Ms THOMAS - No, nothing from me. Thanks, Chair.

CHAIR - Sarah, anything else? No? Well, thank you, minister, we will call it quits at that. Thank you for your appearance today. We will see you again tomorrow in the afternoon - well, in the evening.

Ms OGILVIE - I don't know why we have the late shifts, but nonetheless.

Ms THOMAS - We've got the long shifts.

Ms OGILVIE - Well, they are long days.

CHAIR - We will be here all day. You will be here half a day. We will send an invite to you to confirm those questions you've agreed to take on notice. Thank you for your appearance today.

The committee adjourned at 8.50 p.m.