



TASMANIA
PREMIER OF TASMANIA

Hon Rosemary Armitage MLC
Chair
Legislative Council Estimates Committee B
Email: julie.thompson@parliament.tas.gov.au

Dear Ms Armitage

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 2025

Please find attached responses to the question raised at the Estimates Committee B hearing on Tuesday 18 November.

DIVISION 10 – DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER AND CABINET

Output Group 1.1 – Strategic Policy and Government Priorities

1. With regard to board representation, can you please provide a current list of the regional (north, northwest, south, interstate) representation for Government Business Enterprises and State-Owned Companies? (RA)

Answer:

Please refer to Attachment 1 - Current composition of Government business boards by region

2. The Premier agreed to table the letter from the Government to the Integrity Commission on concerns with the implementation of the Lobbying Framework, which prompted the implementation to be stopped in June 2025 – can the letter please be provided. (MW)

Answer:

Please refer to Attachment 2 – correspondence from Attorney General to Integrity Commission.

3. With regard to the agreement between the Department of State Growth and Deloitte to develop a report into the social and economic impact of electronic gaming machines reform (Pokies Card) in Tasmania, a draft report was provided to Government.
 - a) When did the Government receive that draft report?
 - b) Given that a draft report has been received, why has the work taken so long to deliver the final report?
 - c) Has the Premier or anyone else in his Government made a decision to stall the completion of the final report?
 - d) What was the cost of the Deloitte review? (MW)

Answer:

The Government has not yet received the final Deloitte Access Economics report. As previously stated publicly, once the final report is received by the Government, it will be released.

The Department of State Growth (State Growth) has received two drafts of the report and has been working with the consultants to finalise the report. This has included requesting:

1. more information be included in the report so readers can understand the methodology, assumptions, and analysis undertaken.
2. the report include details regarding why international benchmarking was selected compared to other benchmarking.
3. an analysis of how this works compared against the 'Comparison to the Fifth Social and Economic Impact Study of Gambling in Tasmania 2021' and documenting why assumptions and results may vary

In relation to 3(c) the answer is no.

In relation to 3(d) the cost of this work has already been publicly disclosed and is available at:

https://www.stategrowth.tas.gov.au/about/right_to_information/disclosure_log

4. With regard to Closing the Gap, will you commit to a separate Closing the Gap line item to be included in all future budgets to enable tracking of progress and that be required across all portfolios? (MW)

Answer:

It is not considered practical or appropriate to provide a separate Closing the Gap line item in every portfolio within the Budget Papers.

The National Agreement on Closing the Gap is a cross-government commitment involving 17 socio-economic outcomes and 4 priority reforms, delivered across multiple portfolios.

Funding is integrated into mainstream Outputs to ensure Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander outcomes are part of core service delivery, not siloed.

Creating a separate Closing the Gap line item would require restructuring the Output framework and could obscure the link between funding and service delivery.

To this point, it is of note that no jurisdiction in Australia includes Closing the Gap as a separate line item across all portfolios.

Further, Closing the Gap focuses on measurable outcomes (e.g. life expectancy, education attainment, housing), not funding inputs.

Reporting is outcome-driven and supported by independent monitoring, which provides clearer accountability than a Budget line item.

Transparency is achieved through:

- Annual Implementation Plans and Reports (e.g. Commonwealth Closing the Gap Annual Report and Implementation Plan).
- The Productivity Commission's Closing the Gap Dashboard and Annual Data Compilation Report, which tracks performance against 19 targets and 26 indicators.
- Jurisdictional Implementation Plans published by states and territories.

- As the Government has budgeted \$40,000 a year for women over the four years of budget estimates, will the Government consider providing some funding for International Mens Day? (MG)

Answer:

The Government has noted the suggestion and will consider it as part of future policy and budget development processes.

Output Group 2.2 Principal and Subordinate Legislation

- With regard to the current vacancies (x3) within the Office of Parliamentary Counsel, how long have these positions been unfilled? (CH)

Answer:

OPC currently have 3 vacant positions.

- Level 1 Legal Practitioner vacant since January 2025.
- Level 2 Legal Practitioner vacant since August 2021 (position is shortly to be filled by current Level 1 Legal Practitioner through promotion)
- Level 4 Legal Practitioner vacant since June 2024 (incumbent promoted to Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel).

DIVISION 7 – MINISTERIAL AND PARLIAMENTARY SUPPORT

1.1 Support for Ministers and certain Parliamentary Office Holders

- Can you please provide an organisation chart of each ministerial office, including the bands each staff member are on? (LE)

Answer:

The six monthly Ministerial disclosures on staff in MPS to the 30th September is available on the DPAC website, along with a range of other routinely disclosed information - for further information please visit: https://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/rti/MPS_routine_disclosure_log

1.2 Support for Members of the House of Assembly

- What is the total number of staff allocated to non-ministers in each area of parliament opposition, minor parties, micro parties (1 member parties), independents, MLCs)? (CH)

Answer:

At 30th September 2025, the staffing allocations for each of the Labor Opposition, Tasmanian Greens, Shooters Fishers & Farmers and Independents are outlined below. Opposition Parties and Independent Members are provided with their own annual budget funding to manage, including employee recruitment.

Labor Opposition	FTE
Chief of Staff	1.0
Director Policy	1.0
Office Manager	1.0
Adviser Strategy	1.0
Adviser Digital	1.0

Advisers	2.0
Director Media	1.0
Media Advisers	2.0
Electorate Officers	10.35
Community Organisers	3.37
Total	23.72

Tasmanian Greens	FTE
Chief of Staff	1.0
Senior Policy & Parliamentary Adviser	1.0
Policy Adviser	1.0
Campaigns Coordinator	1.0
Office Manager	1.0
Senior Communications Adviser	1.0
Communications and Campaign Adviser	1.0
Digital Media Adviser	1.0
Electorate Advisers	2.9
Electorate Officers	4.1
Total	15.0
Shooters Fishers & Farmers	FTE
Adviser	1.0
Media Adviser	0.4
Electorate Officer	1.0
Total	2.4
Independent for Bass, George Razay	FTE
Electorate Officer	1.0
Total	1.0
Independent for Braddon, Craig Garland	FTE
Adviser	1.0
Electorate Officers	1.5
Total	2.5
Independent for Clark, Kristie Johnston	FTE
Adviser	1.0
Media Adviser	0.5
Electorate Officer	1.0
Total	2.5
Independent for Franklin, David O'Byrne	FTE
Advisers	1.8
Electorate Officer	0.8
Total	2.6
Independent for Franklin, Peter George	FTE
Chief of Staff	1.0
Senior Adviser	0.9
Electorate Officer	0.33
Total	2.23

DIVISION 1 - BRAND TASMANIA

Output Group 1 – Brand Tasmania

1.1 Brand Tasmania

1. About Table 2.4 Statement of Comprehensive Income (Budget paper 2 vol 1, page 20): Supplies and consumables decrease from \$1,512,000 in 2024-2025 to \$512,000 in 2028-2029. Can you explain this significant reduction? (CH)

Answer:

The decrease in Expenses – Supplies and consumables primarily reflects the profile of funding for the Little Tasmanian initiative provided in the 2025-26 and prior year Budgets and the completion of funding for the Tasmanian Mark Certification Scheme in 2026-27.

Yours sincerely,



Jeremy Rockliff MP
Premier

25 November 2025

cc . julie.thompson@parliament.tas.gov.au

Att. 1 - Current composition of Government business boards by region
Att. 2 – Letters to Integrity Commission from the Attorney-General

Attachment 1 - Current composition of Government business boards by region

	Min no. of board members	Max no. of board members	Current no. of board members	Board members by region			
				South	North	North-West	Interstate
Hydro	4	9	5 ¹	3	-	-	2
MAIB	4	9	5	3	-	-	2
STT	4	9	6	2	1	1	2
Tascorp	4	9	4	1		-	3
PAHSMA	4	9	6	3	1	-	2
Public Trustee	4	9	5	3	1	1	-
Aurora	3	5	5	3	-	-	2
Metro	3	8	5	3	1	-	1
TasIrrigation	3	8	7	3	3	-	1
TasNetworks	5	8	6	1	1	1	3
TasPorts	5	9	7	1	1	-	5
TasRail	2	8	5	1	1	-	3
Tasracing	7	7	7	4	2	-	1
TT-Line	3	8	6 ²	2	1	-	3
Total	55	115	79	33	13	3	30

¹ Excludes one currently vacant non-executive director position.

² Excludes one currently vacant non-executive director position.

Deputy Premier
Treasurer
Attorney-General
Minister for Justice

Level 9, 15 Murray Street, HOBART TAS 7000
GPO Box 123 HOBART TAS 7001
Phone: 03 6165 7678
Email: Barnett.correspondence@dpac.tas.gov.au



Mr Greg Melick AO SC
Chief Commissioner
Integrity Commission
Level 2, 199 Macquarie Street
HOBART TAS 7001
contact@integrity.tas.gov.au

13 FEB 2025

Dear Mr Melick *Greg*

Thank you for your response of 19 December 2024 and for providing a revised Lobbying Code of Conduct (the Code) for lobbyists in Tasmania.

Firstly, I would like to thank you for the productive conversations we have had to-date and recognise the value in delaying the commencement of the new Code until 1 July 2025.

It is my understanding from your letter that the intent of the amendments to the Code was that disclosure requirements would only apply to lobbying activities undertaken by registered lobbyists (as opposed to all lobbyists). However, having reviewed the revised Code, it appears that the amendments have created uncertainty and may have unintended implications. I have outlined some of these below.

The removal of the caveat, "regardless of whether the activity was done by a registered or unregistered lobbyist" in the contact disclosure log section. This has the unintended effect of capturing non-lobbyist interactions with public officials, and may for example, unintentionally extend lobbying entities to employers of non-lobbyists.

The amended definition of 'lobbying activities' does not rely on, or relate to, the definitions of lobbyist or lobbying entity. Instead, it refers to communication by 'a person or entity'. This has the effect of broadening the scope of lobbying activities to include communications made by persons who are not lobbyists, provided those communications meet the stated criteria relating to subject matter and being for the purpose of influencing decision-making.

I also consider a great deal of uncertainty remains in relation to what constitutes a lobbyist and lobbying activities. There are further amendments that could simplify the Code such as combining elements of the definition of lobbyist into the definition of lobbying activities, for example:

Lobbying activities means communication with a public official(s) by

any person who receives a fee or other benefit to conduct activities on behalf of a third-party client (that is, a third-party lobbyist),

or any person whose role is primarily to conduct activities on behalf of an entity (excluding not-for-profit organisations, other public authorities and unions) as an employee (that is, an in-house lobbyist)

in an effort to influence decision-making regarding:

- o the making or amendment of legislation
- o the development or amendment of a government policy or program
- o the awarding of a government contract or grant, and
- o the allocation of funding, with the exception of the following activities: [and so on]

These revisions aside, I still remain deeply concerned with other elements of the proposed Code. Specifically, the inclusion of in-house lobbyists and the onerous contact disclosure log requirements.

I note I am meeting with Ms McKenzie to welcome her to the CEO role on 26 February and would appreciate clarity on the intention of the revised Code and continued discussion on the outstanding points of difference.

I am very happy to support your request to second a resource to the Integrity Commission to assist with the rollout of educative material and briefings. Please contact Ms Pauline van Adrichem, Deputy Secretary, Justice & Reform on (03) 6165 4943 or pauline.vanadrichem@justice.tas.gov.au, to facilitate this.

Yours sincerely _____



Hon Guy Barnett MP
Deputy Premier
Attorney-General
Minister for Justice

Deputy Premier
Treasurer
Attorney-General
Minister for Justice



Level 10, 15 Murray Street, HOBART TAS 7000
GPO Box 123 HOBART TAS 7001
Phone: 03 6165 7678
Email: Barnett.correspondence@dpac.tas.gov.au

Mr Greg Melick AO SC
Chief Commissioner
Integrity Commission
Level 2, 199 Macquarie Street
HOBART TAS 7001
contact@integrity.tas.gov.au

Dear Mr Melick *Greg*

I write to you further to my letter of 10 December 2024 in relation to the proposed Lobbying Code of Conduct (the Code) for Tasmania.

Thank you for your letter of 12 December 2024. I do not consider that the significant issues in relation to the Code that were raised in my letter have been addressed. In the view of the Government those issues continue to make the commencement of the Code impractical and potentially entirely unworkable. Those concerns are shared by both the Government and a number of other affected Public Officials who have raised concerns with my office.

I understand that the Integrity Commission has today sent correspondence to a range of people identified as "Public Officials" under the Code, advising of the commencement of the new lobbying oversight framework from 1 January 2025.

I remain of the view that the material sent to Public Officials is inadequate to answer the questions being raised in the context of the imminent commencement date. I further understand that the Commission has declined to provide briefings to affected Public Officials who have requested them.

It is patently unreasonable to pass on the burden of these obligations, particularly to employees in Ministerial and Parliamentary offices, and expect them to conform within a few weeks, particularly when education and implementation advice from the Commission has been wholly inadequate. As I advised in my previous correspondence the Government would fully support an arrangement to second State Service employees to assist with these activities.

If the commencement of the trial is not deferred to 1 July 2025 to allow for sufficient briefings, education and training from the Integrity Commission and the development of an appropriate implementation plan, the Government—in consultation with other Members of Parliament—will have to consider what other options are available to address the above concerns, including the need for legislative reform.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Guy Barnett', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Hon Guy Barnett MP
Deputy Premier
Attorney-General
Minister for Justice

Deputy Premier
Treasurer
Attorney-General
Minister for Justice



Level 9, 15 Murray Street, HOBART TAS 7000
GPO Box 123 HOBART TAS 7001
Phone: 03 6165 7678
Email: Barnett.correspondence@dpac.tas.gov.au

Mr Greg Melick AO SC
Chief Commissioner
Integrity Commission
Level 2, 199 Macquarie Street
HOBART TAS 7001
contact@integrity.tas.gov.au

Dear Mr Melick *Greg*

I write to you in relation to the proposed Lobbying Code of Conduct (the Code) for Tasmania.

Firstly, I would like to thank you for the concessions following our recent meeting, particularly in relation to the exclusion of political advisers from the 'cooling off' periods. As you are aware, this issue was causing concern and distress for our employees.

I note your commitment to the introduction of the new Code as a 6 month 'trial period'. The purpose being to provide further feedback about the administrative impacts of these significant reforms.

However, I would like to reiterate my concerns about the commencement of the Code of Conduct on 1 January 2025, and urge you to defer the commencement until 1 July 2025. I am particularly concerned that there are insufficient education, communication and awareness activities about these significant changes, and about the impact on Members of Parliament, their offices, and employees.

As you know, the amendments within the new Code are significant and far reaching. In our view, the reforms will make Tasmania's Lobbyist Code essentially equal to, or the most restrictive across Australia.

We are particularly concerned about a number of key reforms that will have significant administrative impacts on political offices going forward. They include:

In-house lobbyists

- No other Australian jurisdiction requires in-house lobbyists to register on a Lobbyist Register.
- The Commonwealth Senate Standing Committee on Finance and Public Administration Inquiry into Access to Australian Parliament House by Lobbyists noted the rationale given by the Attorney-General's Department for not including in-

house lobbyists under their lobbying regime was that in-house lobbying is already "sufficiently transparent as it is clear whose interests in-house lobbyists represent".

- The definition of in-house lobbyists will include local small businesses and other organisations with limited means to meet the registration requirements.

Disclosure of political donations

- No other Australian jurisdiction has this requirement.
- The requirement for lobbyists to disclose any political donations above the required threshold to the Integrity Commission. These donations are already disclosed through our electoral laws.
- Government routinely meets with a broad range of organisations, community groups and individuals, regardless of their political affiliation.

Contact disclosure log

- Only Queensland requires the disclosure of details of meetings with lobbyists. In Queensland the onus is on the (third-party) lobbyist to provide the details and they are given 15 days after the end of each month to provide these details.
- Tasmanian Ministers already proactively disclose all meetings that Ministers have through our routine disclosure of Ministerial diaries.
- The timeframes are onerous, effectively requiring real-time reporting, and will have significant resource impacts on political offices, including independents who have limited resources. It is anticipated that the additional staff will need to be recruited and retained to meet the new obligations.
- Under the new Code's disclosure requirement, a significant administrative burden will be incurred on all members of Parliament, as well as members of the TSS, GBEs and State-owned companies.

We continue to receive numerous questions and concerns from colleagues and staff within Ministerial and Parliamentary Services about the proposed changes to the Code, particularly in relation to the Contact Disclosure Log, and who will be considered a lobbyist under the new definitions.

I have reviewed the material intended to be sent to Public Officials but remain concerned that it is inadequate to answer the volume and real-world nature of the questions being raised in the context of the imminent commencement date.

I also note the difficulty in addressing these questions, when there is no comparative scheme operating in Australia, and when no preparatory education and guidance has been provided. Any model employer cannot reasonably pass on the burden of these obligations to employees and expect them to conform within a few weeks.

Across the Tasmanian State Service, there are processes that are utilised for effective change management and implementation planning where significant changes are to be implemented. In my view, the implementation of this Code requires a similar approach.

Accordingly, I must ask again that sufficient time be allocated to allow for the opportunity for exhaustive briefings, education and training from the Integrity Commission. I note that there are mechanisms within your Act to second State Service employees to assist with such a project and the Government would fully support such an arrangement.

Again, I request that you delay the commencement of the Code until 1 July 2025. This would provide the opportunity for appropriate education activities and continued engagement on our concerns.

I look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Guy Barnett', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Hon Guy Barnett MP
Deputy Premier
Attorney-General
Minister for Justice

