



# **PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA**

**TRANSCRIPT**

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B**

Hon. Jeremy Rockliff MP

**Tuesday 2 June 2026**

## **MEMBERS**

Hon Rosemary Armitage MLC (Chair)

Hon Luke Edmunds MLC

Hon Mike Gaffney MLC

Hon Casey Hiscutt MLC

Hon Meg Webb MLC

## **OTHER PARTICIPATING MEMBERS**

**IN ATTENDANCE**

**HON. JEREMY ROCKLIFF MP**

Premier

**Ministerial Office Representative**

**Ned Whitehouse**

Chief of Staff

---

**Department of Premier and Cabinet**

**Kathrine Morgan-Wicks**

Secretary and Head of the State Service

**Lisa Howes**

Chief Governance and Risk Officer

**Mathew Healey**

Deputy Secretary, Strategy and Delivery

(in the room)

**Noelene Kelly**

Deputy Secretary and Acting Chief Operations Officer

**Courtney Hurworth**

Chief Reform Officer, Keeping Children Safe

**Amanda Russell**

Deputy Secretary, State Service Management Office

**Melissa Gray**

Deputy Secretary, Policy and Reform

**Penny Ratcliffe**

Director, Human Resources Transformation Program

**Glen Dean**

Chief Financial Officer

**Simon Hiscock**

Executive Director, Resilience and recovery Tasmania

**Justin Thurley**

Chief Information Officer

**Jessica Radford**

A/CEO, Brand Tasmania

# PUBLIC

## Premier

The Committee met at 9.00 a.m.

### DIVISION 10

#### Department of Premier and Cabinet

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much, Premier, for being here this morning, and welcome to our second day of Estimates. I'll just introduce the team at our side of the table. We have the honourable Meg Webb, the member for Nelson; myself, Rosemary Armitage, member for Launceston; the honourable Michael Gaffney, member for Mersey; and the honourable Casey Hiscutt, member for Montgomery.

Assisting us we have James and Julie, our secretaries, and Gaye on Hansard. Premier, if there are questions that you can't answer, we're very happy to provide them to you in written form so that you can provide them either later in the day or in a few days' time, preferably. If you'd like to introduce the members of your team.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I would, Chair. Thank you very much for the day, and I do have a very short opening statement. But prior to that, I want to welcome to the table Kath Morgan-Wicks, who is the Secretary and Head of State Service; Lisa Howes, who's the Chief Governance and Risk Officer; and Mathew Healey, who's the Deputy Secretary, Strategy and Delivery; and I'll introduce others as they come to the table for the other output groups; and to my left is Mr Ned Whitehouse, who's our Chief of Staff.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Premier. If you'd like to start with your opening statement, and then we'll ask a few questions.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you, Chair. The 2026-27 Budget gets the balance right. It delivers a responsible plan for strengthening the state's finances. It delivers economic growth and supports our central services. Two-thirds of this Budget will be spent on health, education and public safety, and it's about delivering this investment without increasing taxes, mindful of the cost-of-living pressures that Tasmanians are already facing.

In this Budget, health spending is more than \$15 billion, over \$10 million a day, an increase on last year's interim Budget. To put that into context, when we came into government, health spending was just \$5.8 billion, and that's a 159 per cent increase, up \$9.2 billion. Education funding has grown from \$5.8 billion in 2014. I remember it well as education minister. Today, it is nearly \$10 billion, \$9.92 billion. That's an increase of 71 per cent, or \$4.1 billion.

This Budget will also invest \$1.37 billion into policing and community safety and \$900 million for safe and affordable housing. Of course, the Budget continues our free public transport for an additional 12 months.

You can see that delivering and maintaining our frontline services remains a priority for our government. However, I do reiterate that growth in the State Service is unsustainable. It has grown by almost 6 per cent at the same time as our population's grown by just 0.6 per cent over the past four years prior to our hiring freeze.

## PUBLIC

The hiring freeze for our non-essential recruitment in March last year has helped to arrest this growth, but in order to responsibly manage growth, yesterday I announced a voluntary redundancy program across the State Service. This will assist the government in meeting operational budget efficiencies outlined in the 2026-27 Budget. We do not intend the Targeted Negotiated Voluntary Redundancy Program to be ongoing. It is a one-off opportunity for approximately 500 TNVRs for the 2026 calendar year only and will assist our agencies realign and continue to deliver essential services to the community.

I do want to be clear, Chair, that we will also be delivering sensible and considered reductions in staffing, in the main through natural attrition, transfers and voluntary exits. It will be up to each departmental secretary to consider every role in their agencies and the most efficient structures needed to support our central service delivery, prioritising workload, public service, and of course managing their budget.

This is about a sensible, measured and sustainable to approach to bring the size of our State Service to a level that we can continue to afford, and one our community can rely on for the essential services that Tasmanians need and deserve. Thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Premier. First question's from Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Morning, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Morning, Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm sure you probably realise the matter that I'm going to open with, Premier, here today. It's a serious matter, one that goes to the heart of your government's reputation for accountability, transparency and trustworthiness. Let me preface my questions with the reassurance that I am very well aware of the need to not reflect upon live legal in-court actions.

I do not believe that the questions I'm going to put to you do that, and more importantly, Premier, I don't believe that you providing answers to these questions would do so, either. That's my understanding as we go, and I'm going to genuinely put some questions to you.

Premier, it's now recognised that former minister Ogilvie misled the parliament on 17 November 2025 when she responded during that session of budget Estimates hearings with 'no' when asked if she had been a subject or party to any Supreme Court matters in the prior 18 months. Premier, when were you first aware that the minister had misled the parliament on that occasion?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you, Ms Webb. I appreciate the question, and I was asked a series of questions yesterday on this matter. My answers remain the same: these are complex matters, particularly given the confidentiality requirement, and I will not commenting further on these matters.

**Ms WEBB** - Were you aware of Ms Ogilvie's subsequent clarification note dated 20 November at the time it was submitted by the budget Estimates Committee process, in which you sought to address the error but in a less-than-transparent manner, as it still failed to disclose any legal proceedings she initiated?

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you very much for the question, Ms Webb. I will provide the same answer as I gave yesterday to these questions, and I was asked many questions to do with these matters, and I won't be commenting further.

**Ms WEBB** - If you were aware in November last year of Ms Ogilvie's attempt to clarify the situation, when did you become aware that the clarification still failed to correct the record and was misleading parliament?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question, Ms Webb. Can I say also that Ms Ogilvie has given and undertaken to provide full details when she's legally able to do so.

**Ms WEBB** - Premier, there were two serious matters of non-transparency here. One is the former minister's misleading of parliament, and the other is whether you were aware that she had done so and when you were aware.

We have to presume that those matters of ministerial responsibility relevant to our Ministerial Code of Conduct and parliamentary transparency are not being examined by the current Supreme Court proceedings, and as such there should be no impediment to you disclosing to the parliament what you knew when and what action you took. On what basis are you refusing to answer these questions?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - As I said, these are complex matters, and I won't be commenting any further.

**Ms WEBB** - Premier, can you confirm that under the Policy and Guidelines for the Grant of Indemnities and Legal Assistance to Public Officers of the State of Tasmania, the guidelines that have been referred to in some previous hearings, including ours yesterday, the definition of 'public officer' includes a minister of the Crown?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'm advised, yes, it does.

**Ms WEBB** - Premier, can you confirm that under section 3, 'Guidelines for the Application of the Policy', 3.1, 'Notification of Legal Proceedings by Public Officer', as Premier, you are the relevant responsible officer for ministers or other government members?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, that's correct.

**Ms WEBB** - According to the guidelines, can you confirm that should a minister be seeking legal assistance, they must notify you as the Premier or submit a request to you as Premier?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, under the policy, that is correct. Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Did former minister Ogilvie notify you or submit a request to you under this provision of the guidelines or any other provision?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - We're getting into areas - that brings me back to the first answer around complex matters, and I won't be commenting any further.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - Again, this is a procedural question not related to court matters; it's related to processes and procedures of your government, Premier. I'm asking whether Ms Ogilvie submitted a notification as per these guidelines, and did they comply with the requirements in the guidelines, which require that such notification include details such as a full disclosure of circumstances giving rise to the legal proceeding, inquiry or investigation; and supply of any additional information reasonably requested; and also a description of the facts leading up to and relevant to the event giving rise to the legal proceedings. Did Ms Ogilvie's notification to you comply with those requirements?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - The best of my knowledge is that the guidelines have been complied with.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, Premier. Ms Ogilvie has informed the public she has initiated a current legal action. That's a matter of public fact that she has done that. The guidelines that we're referring to state on page 12: 'Legal assistance will not be provided in relation to legal proceedings initiated by a public officer other than in respect to a range of matters.' Were you satisfied that the legal action for which she was applying for legal assistance would be exempt according to the guidelines?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - To the best of my knowledge, the guidelines have been complied with. Thank you for the question.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Premier, are all requests for taxpayer-funded legal assistance for ministers and MPs approved by Cabinet?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - What information is provided to Cabinet when a request is considered?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - That would -

**Ms WEBB** - I'm not asking about a specific example.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - All requests are complying, to the best of my knowledge, with the guidelines.

**Ms WEBB** - But I'm asking you, in terms of the Cabinet decision or a decision put to Cabinet, what information is required to accompany such a request?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - It's a matter for a Cabinet, and to the best of my knowledge, all those requests have complied with the guidelines.

**Ms WEBB** - So, the details that are required under the guidelines are the details that go to Cabinet in such an example?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - To the best of my knowledge, yes, comply with the guidelines.

**Ms WEBB** - And are ministers required to absent themselves from Cabinet when their own legal assistance is being considered?

# PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Premier, it's been reported that in the matter of the Supreme Court proceedings initiated by former minister Ogilvie it has been confirmed by court registry that the orders pertaining to those proceedings have not been made public.

While it's not unusual for the court to issue suppression and non-publication orders, the fact that the order exists is usually disclosed by the court, along with basic details such as dates, the presiding judge, et cetera, on the court portal as a matter of routine that's consistent with our principle of open justice. My question, Premier, is: did your government apply for the existence of any suppression order or non-publication order relating to these specific proceedings to not be disclosed by the court?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - To the best of my knowledge we have followed the guidelines as you've been speaking to, and I cannot comment any further.

**Ms WEBB** - The question I'm asking you about isn't relating to your guidelines. This is about whether the government requested that the court not put details on the portal of a suppression order in existence for previous minister Ogilvie's matter. Was that request made by the government?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - These are matters that I'm unable to comment on, as I said before.

**CHAIR** - With respect, member, the Premier has answered the question.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes. Thank you. I'll move on to my next one. I'm just about done, if that's okay.

**CHAIR** - So if the -

**Ms WEBB** - The final one, yes, is here.

**CHAIR** - Right.

**Ms WEBB** - Premier, can you confirm whether the government sought or received legal advice regarding the release of procedural information surrounding the public notification regarding former minister Ogilvie's current legal action?

And I'm noting, Premier, I'm not asking you to release or divulge the legal advice which may have been received; instead, on behalf of the taxpayers, I'm requesting that the factual and procedural clarification of whether any such legal advice was sought or received by the government regarding what could or could not be disclosed publicly when it comes to disclosing the dates of knowing who knew what, when, in relation to parliament being informed or misinformed, the dates of decisions that were made, or the portfolio the legal action relates to, for example.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. As I've said before, Ms Ogilvie has given an undertaking, as the other member has, to provide details - full details - when legally able to do so, and I will not be divulging whether or not I do or don't have legal advice on this matter this point of time.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - Are you claiming that the suppression order of the court is preventing you from answering procedural questions not directly related to the court action itself?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I won't be commenting on these matters any further. To best of my knowledge, the guidelines have been adhered to.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. And then in terms of that, when before you mentioned that all guidelines have been complied with in requests to Cabinet, can you please table a list of - not with details, but a list of times in recent years when requests have been made to Cabinet for legal assistance, the dates on which those requests have been made and whether they did comply with the guidelines, each of them?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll seek advice on those matters, but, of course, I won't be divulging Cabinet information.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms WEBB** - Well, it's not deliberations, it's just decisions of Cabinet relating to requests for legal advice.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Again, I won't be divulging Cabinet information.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Premier. Mr Gaffney.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - The overview?

**CHAIR** - Yes, we're still with overview.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Thank you. Just a couple of questions, and specifically to do with strategic policy and government priorities. We've got three different examples. If you can make comment, please.

The government is working with the federal government to support and secure the future for the Liberty Bell Bay smelter and its 200-plus workers with millions of dollars of public money, which is fine.

But we also have a place like TasFoods and its Nichols Poultry business - I know that you're very aware about - that's also now in voluntary administration, with 160 workers directly employed and many neighbouring farmers have invested millions of dollars in state-of-the-art contract poultry-rearing facilities.

My two questions to this: (1) what is the government doing to support the Nichols Poultry business situation; and (2) how does the government assess and determine what businesses or industries receive intervention or financial support? What is the threshold of that government stepping in to assist? Which I'm not disagreeing with; I just want to know what that process is. How do you work out which companies or which industries deserve government intervention, whether it's state or federal?

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - That's a good question, and we do take it on a case-by-case basis, and I have been speaking with a particular farmer who finds themselves in the circumstance that you're speaking of in terms of the uncertainty. With respect to TasFoods, I understand - and I stand to be corrected, because I haven't got the information in front of me that perhaps minister Ellis would have - that there's been, I think, a buyer for that, or at least believe that's the circumstances.

It is a case-by-case basis, and there's a process for the Tas Development Board as well that would go through in terms of assistance, usually. And whether it comes to the major industrials, of course, there are other threshold issues that we would consider. For example, a closure of a major industrial that consumes a lot of power may well have impact on other GBEs, such as TasNetworks, which, if that power was not utilised, it would put pressure on the network in terms of the cost to - or the economies of scale for the network, which would most notably impact on consumers of power.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And as these major industrials are matters of state and national significance - and, for example, Liberty Bell Bay, there's a sovereignty issue here, given it's the only manganese smelter in, you know, the country, and so there's other factors at play there. There's factors at play in terms of the amount of employees, the businesses that rely on a particular entity.

I can well recall the closure of Caterpillar in 2015, when they centralised their operations to Rayong in Thailand, the impact of 284 direct jobs and all the small businesses surrounding that, and so there was a need then to set up what was called a Caterpillar transition taskforce that evolved into advanced manufacturing strategy - employment of a defence advocate in terms of supporting our advanced manufacturing base, including defence.

And so it is a case-by-case basis, and obviously we as a government have got to be very mindful of not wanting to throw good taxpayers' money after bad, and so these judgements would have to be made with the best evidence in front of us. So, on the specifics of TasFoods, you may need to - minister Ellis and his portfolio and the details around that. But it gets complex. There are a lot of variables involved in terms of the impact of losing a major industrial - for example, there is heavy reliance of Boyer on TasRail, and take Boyer out of the equation, TasRail would sustain some loss out of that. And so TasRail's also would sustain some loss out of that. And so TasRail's also a government business enterprise that we'd have to support through that transition. So, a lot of factors at play.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes. Just on that, so if a situation comes up, how does the government - what process, through Cabinet or through the ministers - how does that decision come back, 'Yes, we need to support this one to  $x$  amount of dollars or have a conversation with the Feds'? I'm just wondering how that decision is - come about through your priorities and strategic policy and government priorities, I suppose.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Sure. So, in the case of major industrials, we have a subcommittee of Cabinet, which is a major industrial steering committee that's established. And so, we speak of these matters and we get full and frank advice around the circumstances surrounding major industrials. The subcommittee of Cabinet would make those decisions for the broader Cabinet.

## PUBLIC

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. Thank you. My second example is a little bit left-of-centre as well. Just a bit of a history, I understand that DPAC is responsible for managing the Neighbourhood Houses program, the connector program -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, that's correct.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - and that last year, DPAC began a review of the funding methodology used for Neighbourhood Houses. And I understand that it operates under a needs-based SEIFA index, like a Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas with a three-tier funding category outcome of: X is not eligible, B is baseline funding and A is higher-needs funding.

Given the almost level funding distribution for each house in the recent announcement, can you explain how the review came to its decision? And I read somewhere - I can't find the document - I noticed that there were three neighbourhood houses that missed out, and one of those was East Devonport.

And so, I'm just wondering how that decision came about, because if you look at the SEIFA index, I would have thought that East Devonport would have clearly qualified for extra funding. So, I just want to understand the process and the reason for that decision. Three out of - I don't know how many have - 30, I suppose, I'm not quite sure, neighbourhood houses didn't get funding - or didn't get extra funding, sorry.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, sure. Mr Gaffney, that's a good question. Now, as context, in late 2025, which I believe you've alluded to, the Tasmanian government committed to undertake a Neighbourhood Houses needs analysis to identify government and community needs for neighbourhood houses. And I might bring to the table Noelene Kelly, who is Deputy Secretary - or Acting Chief -

**Ms KELLY** - And also acting COO.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Deputy Secretary and Acting Chief Operations Officer. And thank you, Noelene.

**Ms KELLY** - Through you, Premier. The needs analysis was announced last November, as the Premier mentioned, and that's underway at the moment. We've engaged three consultants to work on that and there's a number of components to that. So, KPMG are undertaking the broad review, and then there's a company called profile.id, who are undertaking an analysis of the communities and the population areas and so on, and the results of that review are due in sort of towards September, October in time for the next budget cycle.

In terms of the Community Connector Program, that's been in place for quite a few years and that provides every neighbourhood house with resourcing, with funding to engage a community connector who is a person who, when people from the community come in and need help, they connect them with different services across the community.

And so, each neighbourhood house - and there's 35 neighbourhood houses now going into 2026-27 because we've got a new one, HATCH, in Ouse, and they all have community connectors. And in 2026-27, funding from the following year has been brought forward, so they'll actually get double the funding they were going to get for the Community Connector Program. Part of the needs analysis will actually be looking at the Community Connector

## PUBLIC

Program and the value it provides to communities, and providing recommendations to government around future funding for that.

In terms of East Devonport Neighbourhood House, another component of the Neighbourhood Houses program is CIP funding - capital investment program funding - and we were given \$6 million over three years to invest in houses that needed capital works or works done on their houses, and that program's underway at the moment. East Devonport sits slightly out of that because we're actually working with East Devonport Neighbourhood House on a new location because there are issues with their house that are sort of fundamental to the location that they live in.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes, it's terrible.

**Ms KELLY** - That one's quite complex, that one. Yes.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes. Okay. So, they haven't missed out. It's just that you're looking at a different venue and so it'd be a waste of money to put something into where they're at because it's quite - it's not purpose built, as you well know. Yes. Okay. That's fine. Good. And who are the other two houses, do you know? I read somewhere there were three.

**Ms KELLY** - Through you, Premier. I can't quite remember who the other two are. I know that we've got a couple of houses where we're actually looking at alternative locations for them.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - As well.

**Ms KELLY** - Yes, yes.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. Yes. Thank you very much.

**Ms KELLY** - Yes. Thank you.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. That's all, thanks, Premier, from me.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Mr Hiscutt.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thanks, Mr Gaffney.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you. Premier, I just wanted to turn to the Budget. I'm not sure if these are questions for yourself or the Treasurer but just noting, with the expenses in the Budget that you're looking at next year, slightly more than last year - more than this year, but the year after, 2027-28 - a real shrinkage in expenditure by between 3 and 4 per cent, I just wanted to get a statement from you on your confidence on achieving a real shrinkage expenditure in Tasmania.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. Discipline is required and I am confident. And our ministers have been - they know their responsibility to ensure that efficiencies are made. In our own Department of Premier and Cabinet, since we announced the non-essential wage freeze or the non-essential worker freeze - recruitment freeze - that Department of Premier and Cabinet have reduced FTE to the tune of around 82 FTE in the last 12 months.

## PUBLIC

So, that's taken a lot of discipline within the department and I'm very mindful when I speak of FTE; they are people and families so I'm always very mindful of that. And so that discipline that our agency has led I expect across government and each minister knows that.

**Mr HISCUTT** - And obviously recently announced the 500 voluntary redundancies. What will you do if you don't have that take-up of that total 500 through voluntary means?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - It's getting into some hypothetical territory, but we will - again, when we've announced the 250 FTE reduction as a result of the changes, or the machinery of government changes with State Growth, we've received around 148 expressions of interest - would you call it? - of voluntary redundancy.

**Ms KELLY** - First one within two minutes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - So, that's significant. And as the secretary has just said, the first one of those was in the first two minutes of that announcement.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Must have the email ready to go.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Maybe. And so, my expectation is we'll reach that number - that 500 number - but time will tell by the six months of which to work through that.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Is there any concern with voluntary redundancies being people who are most employable, people who are happy to give up a job because they may be more employed versus people who won't give up the job because they don't think they can be employed elsewhere, that there could be a concern of, I guess 'brain drain' is the colloquial term to use? Is that something you've considered or how you'd approach that?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - It is something we've considered. It's an insightful question and I received that yesterday as well, so thank you for asking the question here. How we're going to navigate our way through that, I'll ask the secretary to talk about. Thank you.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Thank you. And through you, Premier. In terms of approaching the way in which we manage a staffing reduction and noting that secretaries will always look at non-salary savings first, so that's absolutely our go-to. There are times when there's not sufficient non-salary savings to achieve that target. We'll look at our employee expenditure in - if I use my own department as an example - with natural attrition. And there's no agency that has zero per cent attrition.

**Mr HISCUTT** - No. Absolutely.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - I think a lot of people think that everyone's not going to go. There is attrition every single day across the service and that is managed. It's whether you then fill that position. If the position is essential, we would look within our department to see if there's someone else that we could transfer into the position and then not backfill that other position - so, using our own internal processes and, notably, there's a quite a few transfers between agencies.

## PUBLIC

In terms of brain drain, we absolutely do an assessment on every single expression of interest that will be made, and we have a look at the work that's undertaken by that staff member, the team that's around them, so in terms of the strength of that team.

Should that person go? Do they possess skills that haven't been, actually, shared across that team, for example. And we will make a decision not to accept an expression of interest if we think it's going to impact on our service delivery. So, that's absolutely assessed with each and every position.

**Mr HISCUTT** - That's good to know. No worries. Just one more, if I could.

**CHAIR** - No. That's fine.

**Mr HISCUTT** - And I'll just wait till the Premier's back at the table, I could ask.

I understand there's, I think, what's colloquially called the unattached list or the redeployment list. How many people are currently on that list? I'll repeat the question. I understand there's a thing called the unattached list or more commonly called the redeployment list. I was just wondering if you could answer how many people are on that list.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Sure. Yes.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. I'd need to probably - if the Premier agrees - to take that on notice. I'm not aware of a number that is currently on a list. At any point in time, an employee under managing positions in a State Service policy may be identified, and there is a process in the *State Service Act* to deal with identified employees. But the process that we're going through at the moment in terms of the 500 is about voluntary redundancy.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes. No, this isn't separate to that, but I was just wondering if I can, if you're happy to take that on notice across the government.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - I've just got the information back from our State Service management office and there's zero.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Zero on the unattached. Is that just within the whole State Service or is that just within Department of Premier and Cabinet?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - That's the whole State Service. There's zero currently on the identified list for the whole State Service.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you for the answer.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Now, Premier, I might just ask you a question about health. It's obviously not your portfolio, so I'll ask you the overview. While the Budget states that it delivers record health spending and you have mentioned that two-thirds of the Budget is spent on health; \$15 billion, \$10 million per day, -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - there's also \$700 million in operational efficiencies in the health system numbers over the next four years. How is it that you can cut millions from the health system without it affecting services, staffing, waitlists or patient care?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question. And, really, it's about the way it's presented in the Budget. And so, yes, there are efficiencies that have been outlined and we need to ensure that every dollar is spent and invested wisely on behalf of the Tasmanian taxpayer.

When you overlay the National Health Reform Agreement that we worked very hard to secure - and for the first time ever the federal government have agreed with our request for a small states adjustment when it comes to health investment from the Commonwealth - we've effectively been reaching in and funding the Commonwealth's share of health.

Overlaying the National Health Reform Agreement over the efficiencies, you end up with \$264 million increased investment across the forward Estimates. In that sense, there are no cuts to Health because of the National Health Reform Agreement and the good work that, indeed, Ms Morgan-Wicks led and, indeed, Tasmania led those discussions in national Cabinet.

**CHAIR** - If I could just ask you, then, about the Launceston General Hospital, because I noticed on 29 June 2025 there was a media release, 'A brand new seven-storey tower at the Launceston General Hospital will be delivered under a re-elected Tasmanian Liberal Government.' And it goes on, 'Premier Jeremy Rockliff said the Tasmanian Liberal Government has a strong plan... This \$240 million investment will deliver 250 additional beds and will be directly linked to the LGH, as part of our long-term masterplan while also enabling the co-location of services in the future...!'

However, I do notice on page 170 in budget paper 1 that there only appears to be \$1.2 million allocated by the end of the financial year 2029. I'm just wondering if you could advise me how the work on the new northern health complex would commence construction by 2028 when there doesn't appear to be money allocated for it, or not very much, in the Budget. Or is \$1.2 million just for the planning?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question. Since the release of the LGH masterplan in 2021, initiatives like the Northern Heart Centre, expanded emergency department, relocation of the mental health precinct and a \$240 million, 250-bed northern health complex changed the initial masterplan. Therefore, the masterplan is currently being revisited, including clinical services planning to ensure future capital investment appropriately reflects the new recent developments in the precinct.

As part of a first 100-day plan, the LGH masterplan revision draft report was released for public consultation for a period of two weeks between 21 September 2025 and 5 October 2025. Following this engagement, the final LGH precinct masterplan revision is expected to be released shortly and will be informed by consideration of stakeholder feedback received from the draft.

We've already delivered a new women's and children's precinct, various ward refurbishments across the hospital, works to the ED, ambulance bay and air lock, an additional CT scanner room, a new helipad and the redevelopment of the Northern Integrated Care Service building, including a new research and innovation centre in partnership with the Clifford Craig Foundation and the Tasmanian Health Service's first ever searchable robot.

## PUBLIC

Right now, works are underway to expand the ED, deliver the Northern Heart Centre, build a new dedicated mental health precinct, upgrade the heating, ventilation and air-conditioning system in D block and ward 40, maternity, and a new multistorey carpark is being built.

Construction on the Northern Health Complex will commence following the completion of the new dedicated northern mental health precinct at Frankland Street, I'm advised.

**CHAIR** - Do we have an idea of the timeline, then, when that - so it won't be 2028. And also, the Northern Heart Centre, that was already in play.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Mrs Archer, of course, would be well and truly across this.

**CHAIR** - No. I do understand it's not your portfolio.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - But I'm happy to take it on notice and get the new timeframe for you, if you'd like that.

**CHAIR** - It would be good. Thank you, Premier. And while we're still in overview - we're just about to leave overview. Not just yet. We may find that some of the line items have been covered in overview. You have a supplementary?

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes. Just to that question. You mentioned the enormous amount spent on health, which is - we understand - and education, I think, was the other one that was quite a high priority. Is it possible to get a breakdown of that health funding, how much of that is into infrastructure, buildings, that sort of thing, renovations, compared to the actual services or -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - The recurrent expenditure.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes. That would be handy. Thank you.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - All right. We're happy to do that for you and break it down in a non-budget paper way. But I'm advised that table 5.4 on page 106 of budget paper 2 breaks down the capital investment program succinctly when it comes to health, Mr Gaffney.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - That's fine. I've got the table there. That's good.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Any further detail you require - I'm not sure if Mrs Archer's in front of you or not.

**CHAIR** - No.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - No, that's fine.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Happy to get that for you.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Thank you.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Premier, if I could ask you, an email from the Chair of Committee B, Ms Forrest, was actually sent with a personal request with regard to strong perfume scents being used by people in Estimates committees. Can you advise whether you have investigated the leak? If so, do you have an update; or if not, why not?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question. I do not intend to take the matter any further. I note that Ms Forrest's desire was to have her request distributed. There is a mechanism for the independent complaints commissioner, of which we are working through that establishment now, of which Ms Forrest may well want to take that concern.

**CHAIR** - Further, did you respond to Ms Forrest and say you didn't acknowledge the issue that happened to Ms Forrest to -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Ms Forrest hasn't approached me. I'm not aware of how this got to the media.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Premier. Overview question?

**Ms WEBB** - Just a quick follow-up on that to start with and then on to mine, if I may. Premier, pointing to a complaints process that doesn't yet exist is somewhat problematic. There isn't a complaints commissioner in place yet. Ms Forrest didn't want her email distributed far and wide; she wanted the request made and put forward as a policy request to people appearing here. Are you suggesting that she wanted her email sent far and wide?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - No. I understand the email said it was for distribution for people's knowledge. I can't think of the exact words of the email, and I have no idea how it got to the media.

**Ms WEBB** - You're not going to investigate how that got to the media?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - No, but the independent complaints commissioner process may well be the mechanism for that.

**Ms WEBB** - Are you confirming that that email itself was sent far and wide?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I don't know where it was sent to.

**Ms WEBB** - Internally within government, surely, you can ascertain where it was sent.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I don't intend to take the matter any further.

**Ms WEBB** - All right. A quick follow-up on the others. Looking at the Policy and Guidelines for the Grant of Indemnities and Legal Assistance to Public Officers in Tasmania, two quick questions. You've confirmed that all requests comply. The guidelines set out that in granting legal assistance, a limit can be placed on how much taxpayer support can be provided to a public officer. Has any limit been placed on the expenditure of Ms Ogilvie's legal costs?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll have to seek advice on that matter.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I can take it on notice. I can take it on notice.

**Ms WEBB** - You'd like to take that on notice?

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Perhaps then associated to that, in the 2024-25 financial year, how many invoices of Ms Ogilvie's legal costs were approved by Cabinet?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll have to take that on notice.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. On to other matters, if I may. While we're still on overview, I've been asking this of each department that appears before us. I'm interested if, Premier, you could provide a detailed breakdown of the total number of external consultancies used in this 2025-26 financial year through your department, DPAC, including any still underway, and the quantum of costs for those consultancies. Is that information you can provide to us, maybe in a table or something like that?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll endeavour to get that for you, Ms Webb, if it's possible. We can search for that. Could we clarify the time period, please?

**Ms WEBB** - I was asking about the current financial year. I probably wouldn't mind the previous financial year, 2024-25, as well so we can compare.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - 2024-25, 2025-26?

**Ms WEBB** - 2026, the one we're in. And then looking ahead, the -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Up to 31 March, would that be all right?

**Ms WEBB** - That would be fine. And then I'm interested in looking ahead. Any external consultancies that are planned for 2026-27 and onwards, are they going to be subject to operational efficiencies, and have you actually had to change any plans for external consultancies in order to meet targets or outcomes around operational efficiencies?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. Just as we're finding some information, Ms Webb, I can comment, for example, in terms of future, over the last three years, if I look at advertising, for example, in DPAC, we've been on a continuous reducing expenditure; and in terms of supplies and consumables, while it looks probably pretty flat at the moment in terms of our budgeted expenditure, you'll note in our estimated outcome that we continuously underspend in terms of supplies and consumables, and that's us trying to tighten up and also probably transfer into employee expenses as required.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm mostly asking about consultancies. Does that come into that same line item, does it?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Yes, it would.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. Thank you.

## PUBLIC

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - So, in terms of contractors and consultancies, I note DPAC has the HRTF program, which is probably our highest component of contractors and consultancies. That's, for example, SAP expertise that we don't have within DPAC that we'd be required to go out and procure a contractor or consultant.

Probably the second would be in relation to independent reviews that DPAC are responsible for engaging independent experts. For example, we had engaged Peter Woolcott and Radha Thomas, for example, in relation to a review.

That would come in as a consultant or contractor expense. Our efficiency and productivity unit currently has Chris Eccles engaged to provide advice in relation to our efficiency and productivity unit, and we'll also be engaging experts in relation to the DECYP efficiency and productivity review. Certainly, we are looking to very closely control our expenditure in relation to contractors and consultants.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - I just have a follow-up on expenditure. In relation to DPAC, what proportion of the expenditure reductions shown in the forward Estimates on page 217 in budget paper 2 reflects genuine savings being implemented within the department, and what proportions simply reflect the transfer of functions and FTE positions to other agencies?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you, Chair. Kath, are you able to answer that now, or do I -

**CHAIR** - I'm happy to, if you'd prefer to take it on notice -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Ms Morgan-Wicks, thank you.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. I'd probably go to expenditure -

**CHAIR** - If you could provide a breakdown, that would be really handy.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Yes. Table 10.3, rather than 10.2, in relation to DPAC. In terms of looking at - and I know once we get to the output level, I can probably answer per output as required, but in terms of - this is a budget that is representing the Department of Premier and Cabinet as at today.

In the machinery of government change that the Premier has announced in relation to Department of State Growth and the establishment of Building Tasmania and functions coming over from that department to DPAC, that's at a future point in time, with the major functions coming over in December of the end of this year. We have groups and divisions that will be leaving DPAC and transferring to, for example, Department of Health or DECYP and also the Department of Justice, but their expenditure and revenue currently still sits within these budget papers.

The machinery of government change requires us working with Treasury to then do output transfers to receiving agencies, but that said, in terms of DPAC's effort in managing functions that will stay, these are genuine operational efficiencies that are captured within each

## PUBLIC

of our estimates of expenditure, and we are working through a list of operational efficiencies that we continue.

In fact, this is not starting now; DPAC has been doing this since 2024-25 through 2025-26, and that's how we achieved our reduction in FTE of 82. We think that most of that work has been done in relation to our FTE. There may be some more. And as the Premier announced yesterday, I'm also committed as the secretary to do a TNVR opening across DPAC. But I'll have a look at exactly where we would need to focus that TNVR process.

**CHAIR** - And State Growth was mentioned, so even though it probably fits into the next one, just while it's actually come up, just wondering, what's the likely - the projected costs of the rebranding and converting the Department of State Growth? Because we all know that rebranding has a huge cost in changing names and everything else that goes with it.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Premier?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Ms Morgan-Wicks.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. And I am aware as the chair, as the head of the State Service, of the transition oversight committee for the machinery of government change, and the intention - so, for example, for the establishment of Building Tasmania - is to do most of the work as internally as we can and for as low a cost as we can.

Obviously we need to make, you know, minimum level of changes so that the public know who they're, you know, contacting and dealing with, but Department of State Growth have, you know, a very good website, for example; and Environment, which we believe we're able to internally reskin in terms of names, et cetera. But we're trying to absolutely keep that cost down. We do not want to be spending money on big and flashy brand changes when we're obviously dealing with staffing reductions.

**CHAIR** - Is there a budget currently for the rebranding? There would be a budget, I'm assuming.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. It'd be within internal resources.

**CHAIR** - Just one last question on that: can you provide assurances that whoever provides the advice on the rebranding will be a Tasmanian business?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - That would be preferable.

**CHAIR** - But not guaranteed?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier, our intention is to use internal staffing who -

**CHAIR** - Yes. For the advice?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Here in Tasmania and working.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - They might not be external consultancies on the rebranding?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Probably internal to the department.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - As far as can be achieved, if there's a graphic design piece that could not - and I can't imagine what that would be - yes, certainly we have Tasmanian businesses that we'd engage, and we have a marketing panel.

**CHAIR** - Might be a question for next year.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - It may well be.

**CHAIR** - It may well be.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Chair, I've got an update for Mr Gaffney on poultry.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - First published in the *Advocate* newspaper at 9.09 this morning, would you believe -

**Mr GAFFNEY** - But please, please.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - that the food business has found a buyer. 'TasFoods, including' - and I'm quoting *The Advocate* newspaper here - 'including its key Nichols Poultry business, has been sold to RAMP Tasmanian Poultry for an undisclosed amount. "The sale ensures the continued local operation of TasFoods and the employment of all Tasmanian staff under the new ownership," administrator KPMG said.' I hope I got some way to your question in terms of process, particularly with Liberty Bell Bay, but that's good news.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - But the government itself had no role in that negotiation with RAMP?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - No. Thank you.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - That's a good outcome.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Good outcome, yes.

**CHAIR** - Mr Hiscutt, then we're back to Ms Webb.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you, Premier. I'm just referring back to your former statements regarding Ms Forrest's potentially sending her complaints to the independent complaints commissioner. I note in the Budget that that is only funded at \$50,000 per year over the forward - \$50,000 per year over the next four years. Do you think that is sufficient to manage and run that position?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, I do. It won't be a full-time position, I would imagine, and so I believe the \$50,000 initial investment is appropriate. If there is more need for further resources, then, of course, we'll consider that at the next budget.

## PUBLIC

**Mr HISCUTT** - What functions do you expect the commissioner to perform for that \$50,000?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I have to take that on notice. I know this has been the subject of a matter to do with the committee that's been established to work through these matters, so I can take that on notice, if you like.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you. And do you know how much was actually asked for by the Clerks for that position?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I cannot recall, no.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Are you able to take that on notice as well?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Mr HISCUTT** - No, I'll come back. I had another question.

**CHAIR** - That's fine.

**Ms WEBB** - More will fit in a line item on that, too.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Still in overview, Premier. I'm interested in: is your government still committed to delivering the pathway to truth-telling and treaty as accepted by government in 2021, and what funding is provided in this Budget and across the forward Estimates to progress truth-telling and treaty?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. I'll just come to the funding in a moment. But we are committed, firstly, to truth-telling and recognising the desire of Aboriginal communities - the TAC - for a treaty. I believe it's very important that we go through a truth-telling process first and engage the TAC, other Aboriginal communities, engage the broader public when it comes to truth-telling, which may lead, then, to treaty, of course, which I understand is really around a series of agreements that can be established in terms of - it may well be educational attainment, it may well be health and other matters.

There is a need for truth-telling and, in my view, investment in supporting engagement of all Tasmanians on this process first, rather than what I would say is a very - in the eyes of some Tasmanians who don't fully appreciate what treaty means, there needs to be a better understanding of the truth-telling process, and indeed, the history of Tasmanian Aboriginal people in Tasmania / Lutruwita.

**Ms WEBB** - And on the funding?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Funding.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - Just to state, I asked what funding is provided in this Budget and across the forward Estimates to progress truth-telling and treaty.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - \$4.4 million over four years in last year's Budget for truth-telling and Closing the Gap, which -

**Ms WEBB** - Can you break that down for me?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I can seek to do that, yes, on notice, if that's all right. It's a matter for Mrs Archer, who's the minister responsible, but we can take that on notice and confer with minister Archer's office, minister Archer.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, I appreciate that. And that brings me to my next question, actually, which is the fact that you now find yourself in a situation of having a Cabinet reshuffle to consider, and so I would put it to you that this is a very positive opportunity to restate the significance and the leadership required to drive real reconciliation and progress on this with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community and provide that portfolio with the gravitas it deserves by having it become a portfolio that you are responsible for as premier. Is that something that you would consider, Premier, taking the opportunity that now presents itself to make that kind of positive step and demonstrate the importance of driving progress on this?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question, Ms Webb, and I appreciate why you've asked the question. I have every confidence in our minister, Mrs Archer, with respect to these matters, who is undergoing a large engagement with the Tasmanian Aboriginal people right across Tasmania, and I have every confidence that Mrs Archer is doing really a very good job in this area.

**Ms WEBB** - My question wasn't premised on any criticism of Mrs Archer in this area whatsoever -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. No, I know. Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - just the opportunity to have the gravitas of a premier's leadership behind the portfolio. In terms of the Closing the Gap -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - My apologies. I do have a budget table for you of our investment and breaking that down.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - In 2025-26, \$1.4 million; 2026-27, \$1.4 million; \$800,000 in 2027-28; and \$800,000 in 2028-29.

**Ms WEBB** - That was for the truth-telling elements of that?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And Closing the Gap.

**Ms WEBB** - Right. Right. And are you able to break out within that total amount what's allocated to those different elements?

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - So, in 2025-26 there is \$250,000 each year across the forward Estimates for the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre. There's \$150,000 commencing in 2025-26 across the forward Estimates for the Tasmanian Regional Aboriginal Communities Alliance. There's \$200,000 across the forward Estimates for the Palawa Business Hub, which I had the pleasure of launching a couple of years ago. I'm very proud to do so and it's doing some really great stuff.

The truth-telling and healing element - so I just went through the Closing the Gap matters. The truth-telling and healing element of the Budget, there's the Elders Council of Tasmania is \$50,000 each year across the forward Estimates. Reconciliation Tasmania - and can I commend the organisers of Reconciliation Tasmania for the breakfast last Wednesday morning - \$100,000 across the forward Estimates. There was an Aboriginal-led design and engagement process of \$150,000 in 2025-26, and \$290,000 in 2026-27. And there are other support program initiatives across the forward Estimates, including \$500,000 in 2025-26, \$360,000 in 2026-27, \$50,000 in 2027-28 and \$50,000 in 2028-29.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. I appreciate that detail. From the sound of it, with that total number that you mentioned at the beginning, it sounds like it tapers off over time. Is that because there's programs coming to an end or projects coming to an end?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I think it really is - and I'll go back to the table - the engagement process, that first two years - was it \$250[,000] and \$290[,000]? Yes. The Aboriginal-led design and engagement was \$150,000 and then \$290,000, but then nothing in 2027-28, 2028-29, which would account for some of that -

**Ms WEBB** - Is that because it's expected to come to an end at that point in time as a project? And what will be the deliverable from that then, or the outcomes from that, if it's coming to an end?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - It's about the design and then I believe that it'd be probably another ask following the design.

**Ms WEBB** - A follow-on project of some sort. A follow-on project of some sort, potentially.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. I stand to be corrected on that. I can provide more information.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm mindful of time. The other thing I particularly wanted to hear about - thank you for the funding details. In terms of the Closing the Gap priority reforms under the DPAC responsibilities, can you update on some of those? We did discuss them in our last budget Estimates. Particularly, we discussed that the Aboriginal expenditure report was being completed at that time but not yet complete, and we also had the Tasmania State Service Aboriginal Employment Strategy and action plan being completed, but not yet complete. Can you update us on those?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Can I request, Chair, Mel Gray to the table, please.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And Melissa Gray is Deputy Secretary of Policy and Reform.

**CHAIR** - Welcome, Melissa, back to the table.

**Ms GRAY** - Yes. Thank you, Chair.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm just looking for a quick update on those projects.

**Ms GRAY** - From last night. I did go home and sleep.

**Ms WEBB** - We did, too.

**CHAIR** - Melissa spent time with us last evening, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Great.

**CHAIR** - With another minister.

**Mr HISCUTT** - We didn't sleep, we were just making up questions all night.

**Ms GRAY** - Yes. Thank you. Through you, Premier. Thank you for the question. The Aboriginal expenditure review has been completed. We're just making final editorial changes, and we'll make that publicly available by the end of this month. It's a really good story. Across all government agencies, we're working to identify existing government programs and services that can be transferred to Aboriginal community control.

Because we know when Aboriginal people are the architects of their own solutions on what's going to improve their lives, we get much better outcomes. And we're seeing that through a nationally leading partnership at the moment with the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre to transfer child safety to Aboriginal community control, and that's through the Nukara Strategy. The Department for Education, Children and Young People is working with the TAC and lots of other Aboriginal organisations to empower them to design solutions for getting better outcomes for children and young people across our state. So, that's one example in one agency. There's lots of other examples. I won't go on though.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms WEBB** - And the employment strategy and action plan, did you just mention that?

**Ms GRAY** - That's through Mandy.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. That is for another person, yes, Amanda Russell. Amanda, thank you very much, who's Deputy Secretary of State Service Management Office. Thank you, Mandy.

**CHAIR** - So, for *Hansard*, it's Mandy Russell.

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms RUSSELL** - Good morning.

**CHAIR** - Good morning. Welcome to the table.

**Ms RUSSELL** - Thank you. Through you, Premier.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm really just looking for a brief update on whether we have completed that strategy and action plan, and if so, what's the action coming from it?

**Ms RUSSELL** - Thank you. And through you, Premier. We are very close to completing the consultation on the Aboriginal strategy and action plan. I'm really delighted at the engagement that we've had right across the service and through community organisations, and that's been led by two Aboriginal employment members in the State Service Management Office.

It really does touch on the clear priorities for attraction and retention of Aboriginal employment in the State Service, and also builds on the work that I'm sure the committee is aware of around the cultural respect training that has received widespread adoption right across the State Service. It's really so important to build on the work that Mel has already spoken about in relation to cultural load and how we actually provide and support respectful workplaces and inclusive workplaces for members of our Aboriginal community.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you for that update. So it's near completion, you mentioned.

**Ms RUSSELL** - Very.

**Ms WEBB** - So, I'm looking for an indication of timeline because when we spoke in November, both these things were near completion at that time. So, I'm just looking to see if we're progressing. When are we expecting it to actually be completed?

**Ms RUSSELL** - Thanks, Ms Webb. We were hoping to have the final strategy to the head of the State Service last month. We have taken a little bit more time to consult with members of our Aboriginal employer network and the community organisations. And without putting a firm date on that, I expect that that will be within the next month.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. And is it something that then becomes public and publicly available on the DPAC website or something like that?

**Ms RUSSELL** - Yes, very -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'm advised yes.

**Ms RUSSELL** - Sorry. Through you, Premier.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Mr Hiscutt.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you. Sorry to jump around on this issue, but just coming back to the Motion for Respect and independent complaints commissioner, I just wondered if you could answer me how the decision was made regarding the quantity of funding and what consultation occurred to make that decision?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - There was a budget process and through the budget committee.

**Mr HISCUTT** - The budget committee. And can you update me on a timeline on the expected series of events that would come from that \$50,000?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll have to take that on notice.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Take it on notice.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Matter for the Clerks, as I understand it.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Okay. Thank you. And a separate issue, I just wanted to know if you have - or the government has - recommenced negotiations with LK Group on the proposed sale of Wilkinsons Point.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Not as yet.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Not as yet.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I have spoken to Mr Kestelman in recent weeks about where things are at. There's a Public Accounts process underway, but as I stated yesterday, a huge opportunity for half a billion dollars' worth of private investment, made even more significant by the recent announcement of the Dowsing Point opportunity with surplus Defence land that we've come to an arrangement with the federal Labor government on, for the benefit of all Tasmanians.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you. And do you still intend to, and when do you intend to, have that conversation, commence formal discussions regarding Wilkinsons Point?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll have to say as soon as practicable.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. I have one last question in overview. We've probably covered off some of the line items, and then we will go to Strategic Policy and Government Priorities. Premier, if I could just ask you about TasInsure, is the goal of the new version of TasInsure still to ensure that Tasmanians save on their insurance costs and premiums?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - It is. Okay. How will market interventions work where TasInsure identifies things like to hard-to-insure activities and risks or existing market settings aren't delivering

## PUBLIC

adequate outcomes? Will TasInsure have any sort of enforcement powers, and how many staff do you envisage that TasInsure will require when it's up and running?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. TasInsure is about making insurance fairer and more accessible, and I'm sure if any one of us who represent the Tasmanian community have been doing our jobs, then we would've had feedback about the high cost of insurance.

I raised this on the national agenda as tourism minister a couple of years ago because the tourism sector and those within the visitor economy were being hardest hit, and there was an indication that there would be a national approach to this that hasn't eventuated, so we're going it alone. I acknowledge that it's changed somewhat, not hugely, from our original intent.

There'll still be a state-owned statutory authority, TasInsure, but through that mechanism, we'll place sustained downward pressure on premiums by addressing the underlying drivers of insurance affordability, rather than guaranteeing specific savings for every single policyholder. Mr John Trowbridge we engaged, who is an insurance expert in the field, to deliver a report for us, and that report's there for everyone to see.

There's an implementation plan as well that takes into account, if you like, isolating Tasmania's risk and some of the big challenges that I've stated throughout the election campaign and since that time have been the fact that Australia is a large place. There's floods and there's fires, and our premiums were reflecting natural disasters across a very big country.

**CHAIR** - I'm just trying to understand, though, Premier, how TasInsure is actually going to make insurance fairer and more accessible. It's not going to offer policies itself, so does it have any teeth? Does it have any enforcement power? Actually how will it work? From a layman's perspective, if I'm - and I do have insurance - getting insurance - I use our Tasmanian insurer, I must admit, RACT - how will that actually work, and will it affect the premiums of or affect our other Tasmanian insurer, or will you work with our other Tasmanian insurer?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - The RACT, of course, is Australia's only mutual insurance agency, so it's member-owned.

**CHAIR** - Of Tasmania.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, Tasmania. That's right, and I'm sure we can have a conversation with the RACT and TasInsure, but our aim supports and facilitates an insurance arrangement. Now, that role should be -

**CHAIR** - I'm just trying to understand how it actually works.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, I'm coming to that. That role should be transparent to policyholders. The precise form of that recognition will be settled through implementation and engagement with industry. Where the insurance market or ecosystem uses the services and reforms TasInsure will provide, it will state clearly on your policy, and it will do this so that Tasmanians know that TasInsure has played a role in improving the affordability and accessibility of their insurance. Now, to your question -

**CHAIR** - Because I'm still not sure how it makes it cheaper.

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - TasInsure will have three divisions. Now, the consumer division, supporting Tasmanians to engage confidently with the insurance market, this division will be the main public-facing part of TasInsure. It will provide practical support, online resources, digital tools, and guidance materials for households, small businesses and community organisations. It will also provide more tailored advisory support where community groups or small businesses are facing hard-to-place insurance problems.

**CHAIR** - Like a broker?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I can come to that in a moment. There's a market division, supporting the market to deliver better outcomes for Tasmanians. This is the most market-facing division. It will work directly with insurers, brokers and reinsurers to reduce insurance costs, address hard-to-place risks, and support development of the designated risk pool and possible natural hazards reinsurance arrangements.

There'll also be a risk assessment and mitigation division, improving understanding of risk and supporting long-term structural change. This division, as I indicated before, will build the evidence base needed to lower insurance costs over time. It will improve hazard data, identify risk drivers, support targeted mitigation, and help align risk reduction with insurance pricing. It will also support better targeting of state and Commonwealth mitigation funding towards projects that reduce disaster risk and insurance costs. Perhaps I can ask Mr Healey to add anything further, if he wishes, who's been doing great work in this area.

**CHAIR** - It would be good because, Premier, I'm still not sure how it's going to work with insurers to reduce costs. I understand you say risk reduction, but looking at insurers, does TasInsure have any enforcement to actually make other insurers reduce their costs? It appears to me that TasInsure is basically taking the job of a broker, looking -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - No, it's different to that.

**CHAIR** - All right. Mr Healey.

**Mr HEALEY** - Through you, Premier. Just building on what the Premier has said in terms of the three divisions of TasInsure, the advice that we had was that the best way to target a reduction in the cost of insurance in Tasmania is through three mechanisms. First, I won't say 'plainly', but it's very constructively empowering individuals to better understand their circumstances and to engage with the insurance industry from more of a position of strength so they understand their risks. They can articulate those risks clearly to industry and help to drive down policies.

That's probably the first step in trying to lower insurance. We don't expect that that will drive the sorts of improvements that we need to see in Tasmania, so TasInsure will take two further steps, which are unique and which are quite innovative in terms of the government's role in the insurance industry.

The first is, as the Premier said, dealing with hard-to-place risks. They're the sorts of risks where there may be only a small number of those risks within the state. The insurance industry finds it hard to price those risks, and so what ends up is that the policyholder pays a lot more than they need to, having regard to the nature of that activity, and if I can be more specific, it

## PUBLIC

includes things like community events. They can be fairly hard to assess in terms of the risk. The insurance industry at times doesn't really want to dedicate the resources to -

**CHAIR** - TasInsure will look at the risk and be almost a broker in that case?

**Mr HEALEY** - Not a broker, but it will look at creating a designated risk pool which would underwrite policies for public events, for adventure tourism, for risks that the insurance industry is not really set up to deal with. For example, let's say the football team in Richmond wants to put on a fair. TasInsure will be able to work with the insurance industry and the Richmond Football Club to say, 'We understand the nature of this risk locally. We think that that should be priced at  $x$ , and we will, through the designated risk pool, underwrite the insurance industry to provide a policy that is affordable and reflective of the risk of that event.' That's the first hard-to-place risks approach.

The second part, which is also nation-leading, is to consider how we ensure that the prices of insurance for things like flood and fire in Tasmania reflect Tasmania's circumstances and are not being inflated by the risks associated with storms in Sydney or -

**CHAIR** - How do you do that? Will it have enforcing power?

**Mr HEALEY** - The first thing that we do is we make sure that we understand that risk better than anyone else does. We do the work. TasInsure will do the work to specifically understand the risk of bushfire for Tasmanian communities and then get itself into a position where they can work with individual landowners to mitigate those risks to the greatest extent possible and in areas that will have the biggest impact on insurance.

**CHAIR** - You're going to try to lower the risk as opposed to lower the premium.

**Mr HEALEY** - Lower the risk, and if we need to -

**CHAIR** - But rather than ask the insurers to lower the premiums.

**Mr HEALEY** - This part of the work is very complex, so TasInsure will take a little bit of time to work its way into it. But if we find, for example, that the cost of flood and fire insurance in Tasmania is too high because it's being priced at national or international risk levels, then the government can consider - and what Mr Trowbridge said is that the government should consider - whether or not it provides a form of reinsurance into the market that allows Tasmanian insurance policies to be supported by a risk profile that relates to Tasmania only and not the nation.

But I have to say, in that space, part of the issue, and what is particularly nation-leading, is the government agreeing to step in to understanding what's driving and risk-profiling Tasmania, and then linking that to the tools that we have, that local government has, that the community has, to drive that risk down so that we can put our best foot forward in terms of the insurance industry by saying, 'Actually, we're managing our risk really well; your insurance premiums should be coming down'.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Premier, so the question is the cost. I know it's a statutory authority, but the money comes from the government, so can you advise what this is going to cost? Because if it's going to save you \$100 but actually really cost you \$200 because it's still

## PUBLIC

government money, I'm just wondering, what would the cost of this TasInsure be, and how many staff do you envisage?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - We'll work that through, but the Budget has an investment of \$4.2 million to establish TasInsure, of which \$200,000 -

**CHAIR** - And ongoing.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - has been allocated to John Trowbridge.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms WEBB** - I have one more.

**CHAIR** - Yes, unless you want to go onto 1.1.

**Ms WEBB** - It's probably similar across both, so we'll stay here for the moment.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Yes. Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Premier, I know we've had some discussions about operational efficiencies already in this overview. One of the things I just wanted to clarify was, do we still have the Efficiency and Productivity Unit in existence?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - When we discussed that last Estimates, I put to you whether - and you committed to putting a gender lens over the activities and the assessments made by the EPU when they were looking at efficiencies and cuts.

What I'm interested to hear from you is how that is being operationalised in terms of the activities of the Efficiency and Productivity Unit, and when it comes to the operational efficiencies that are being applied to all agencies within this Budget, will we be putting a gender lens over what is being planned and undertaken there around operational efficiencies?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you.

**Ms WEBB** - Just to remind you, at our discussion last year we'd had a discussion about it to some extent, and at the end of that I said, 'I'm imagining that if there's ever times you're giving updates on the work of that unit, it would be clear that you've implemented a gender lens on the work that it's doing so we can see what has come of that work in terms of a gender analysis', and your response was, 'Yes, that's my expectation we'd reinforce that. It's a good idea and we'll make sure that happens.'

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Excellent.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm coming back to you to see where are we on that.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Prior to throwing to Mr Healey again, the efficiency and productivity agenda is being progressed through five practical streams of work each aimed at improving

## PUBLIC

services, reducing duplication and supporting long-term budget discipline: (1) artificial intelligence and digital service delivery; (2) functional leadership and shared services; (3) medium-term efficiency and productivity agenda; (4) program review framework; and (5) whole-of-government commitment monitoring.

Of course, we also have a gender budget statement, and placing responsibility for the gender budget statement within Treasury is an important and positive step, because it recognises that gender equality is central to strong economic policy and sound fiscal decision-making rather than a separate or supplementary consideration. I'm pleased that gender analysis is embedded in how the government plans, invests and delivers outcomes for Tasmanians. In that context -

**Ms WEBB** - That is a positive shift. I congratulate you on that. I agree. So, yes, in that context, how will we be putting a gender lens over operational efficiencies and the work of EPU?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question and the strong endorsement of that move, and if I now throw to Mr Healey to provide some more.

**Mr HEALEY** - Yes, I certainly can, and through you, Premier. The Efficiency and Productivity Unit is - well, maybe I'll start with what it's not doing. Unlike some previously conceived or some perceptions of the Efficiency and Productivity Unit, the unit is not going program by program across government considering the merits or otherwise of government expenditure. Rather, the Efficiency and Productivity Unit is looking at whole-of-government reforms that can improve generally the efficiency and productivity of the public service.

As the Premier mentioned, it is looking at things like the responsible implementation of artificial intelligence around the government. It's looking at things like a functional leadership framework and how we can promote the structured development of shared services across government.

It's also looking at setting a framework for an annual program of program reviews, looking at areas where the cost of state government services is climbing at unsustainable rates, and how we might deal with those on a case-by-case basis. In all of those, certainly a gender lens can be applied in how those frameworks are used to drive efficiencies and productivities, and the government's gender budget statement helps to give some focus on that. The government's -

**Ms WEBB** - Sorry, through you, Premier. It's not a given that it does. The gender budget statement - and it's improving every year, and I thoroughly endorse that improvement each year - is one thing. But a gender lens on the work of the Efficiency and Productivity Unit or a gender lens on the operational efficiencies that are being sought is a separate matter altogether.

It's not just something to be reported on at budget time. We know that the gender budget impact statement isn't going to report on every single thing of that. That aside, how is a gender lens being applied? Because the Premier committed last year that it would be.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'm advised that a gender impact assessment toolkit will be able to be used by the EPU for this, and that's deliverable on behalf of our Minister for Women and will

be available to all state services to support a gender lens over their work. And my understanding is that this will be released in September, Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - September this year?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, September this year. Do you have anything further, Kath, you'd like to add to Mat's answer?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Yes. So, through the -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Don't want to cut off Mat, but -

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Sorry.

**Ms WEBB** - That seems to be something that could be added to in the answer that Ms Morgan-Wicks might provide. A toolkit sounds positive. Is it going to be required that that toolkit is applied or is it just there as an optional toolkit to dip into and out of?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier - and I'm sure the Minister for Women will also be able to add to this - but certainly as Head of the State Service, that would be something that I would be raising with the Secretaries Board in terms of the rollout of the toolkit and the expectation that that will be used and promoted by secretaries across the service in that regard, noting that secretaries are responsible for each of their own operational reviews and the rollout of operational efficiencies.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, I appreciate that.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. I think at this time, while there are other questions we could go into Overview, we can always continue Overview later on if we get through our line items. We can go back to Overview.

### **Output Group 1.1 Strategic Policy and Government Priorities**

**CHAIR** - We might go to 1.1, Strategic Policy and Government Priorities, and Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Let's get some of our line items out of the way.

**Ms WEBB** - First line item. It's always a good move an hour-and-a-half in. Premier, I'm interested to talk with you a little bit about the Woolcott review and some recommendations in particular from that review. As you know, the independent Woolcott review parts A and B reports have been released, and they make a suite of recommendations across the employment framework, culture and justice reforms.

My question to you is this, and the first question is: can you please provide an update on progress of those 34 operational and strategic recommendations, including any timeframes for full completion and any resourcing required and provided in this Budget.

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the very important question. We are taking strong and immediate action to strengthen child safety in Tasmania by progressing legislative reform, improving information-sharing and reinforcing accountability across institutions in response to the Woolcott review and the commission of inquiry.

This response includes the lead agency responsible for implementation of supported-in-part and supported-in-principle recommendations. The overall coordination of implementation is sitting with the responsibilities of the Chief Reform Lead in the Department of Premier and Cabinet, reporting to me through the Secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. These reforms are focused on ensuring concerns about child safety identified earlier are shared more effectively and acted on decisively across all parts of government.

To your question and more specifically, since accepting the Woolcott review recommendations in March this year, the government has moved to progress legal and system reforms aimed at better protecting children and young people. The draft Commission of Inquiry (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2026 released for consultation gives effect to a number of Woolcott and other commission of inquiry recommendations.

The bill proposes amendments to six acts to strengthen child safety and information-sharing, improve accountability across public institutions, and support more effective child-safe responses across government, including strengthening information-sharing settings so agencies can share concerns about child safety risks and reportable conduct more effectively, improving the State Service disciplinary framework through amendments to the *State Service Act 2000*, and explicitly bringing Tasmania Police in the Child and Youth Safe Standards and Reportable Conduct Scheme with retrospective effect proposed as a priority issue.

Your other part of the question was about budget, or have I answered it in anything -

**Ms WEBB** - Probably what I'm looking for is an update across the 34 operational strategic recommendations. Perhaps the core question here is: having confirmed just now in your answer that it's your area and you're responsible for leading the implementation there, how will you be making public regular updates on how we're progressing against those recommendations so that it can be followed or monitored or held to account?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - All right. Thank you for the question. I will provide some further comments relating to your question and then hand to the secretary to give some more detail. The government's response supports recommendations directed at strengthening child safety and State Service employment in integrity settings, while noting some recommendations, particularly those relating to the State Service Management Office, further consideration as part of ongoing public sector reform work.

We welcome the review's findings, concerns raised by the commission of inquiry about state servants' conduct as being appropriately dealt with. A formal government response has been released, and the government is already progressing implementation of supported recommendations. The Woolcott recommendations, as I'm advised, do not require new funding as they refine existing child safety settings that are already in place. Where additional resourcing is required, however, funding considerations will form part of the normal budget process.

## PUBLIC

Finally, before I throw to Ms Morgan-Wicks, recommendations that directly relate to child safety are being referred to the Office of the Child Safety Reform Implementation Monitor. The Attorney-General has written to the monitor with a proposed set of recommendations to be referred to the monitor, and we are currently awaiting the monitor's response. Secretary, do you have any further matters?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Thank you, and through you, Premier. Building on what the Premier has just answered, importantly, anything to do with child safety in terms of the Woolcott report, the findings, or the recommendations will be incorporated into our Change for Children action plan, which we're very close to completing. It's due for final approval and release in early August after we provide our next progress report to the office of the implementation monitor in July, but I know the team are actively working on that.

A lot of the focus has been on the miscellaneous bill development which the Premier has just summarised. We also have some significant recommendations in relation to the State Service Management Office and, for example, employment directions that were attached in terms of drafts, which we're currently working through with agencies in relation to feedback on the drafts that were provided by Mr Woolcott in the review.

In terms of the structure and the way in which the State Service Management Office works and operates and interacts with our agency, we are examining that as part of the machinery of government changes because we're also bringing in jobs and skills from the Department of State Growth, so it gives us a true opportunity to look at both that together with what Mr Woolcott had recommended.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. I appreciate that, and I do have a question to follow up on with that, too. In terms of the monitor, the implementation monitor in that child safety space then will be providing updates on the implementation of some of the Woolcott recommendations that have been accepted, but the ones that won't go there - again, perhaps, is there any public way of seeing which recommendations will be monitored by the implementation monitor and which won't be? My question, then, is about how we will see public updates on the implementation of the others.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - We're going to have both the Keeping Children Safe website, which is a continuing way in which we're reporting on COI recommendations, and we'll be incorporating any recommendations also that aren't being reported by the independent monitor.

**Ms WEBB** - The ones relating to the State Service office and others?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Yes. We also have a page that's dedicated to the Woolcott review on the DPAC website.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. That's where we'll see it.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - We'll make sure that we are reporting against the recommendations through a combination of those websites to make it easy.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. That's good to hear. In terms of those recommendations that relate to the State Service Management Office in the part 1 report, there's some that are

## PUBLIC

supported in principle, and from some of the answer you've already provided, that's because you're looking at them in the context of other things that are moving and changing in that space.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - That's correct.

**Ms WEBB** - So, I am interested to understand, particularly around the context of operational efficiencies also overlaying everything here in the near future, how you're going to prioritise those. The one that recommends that the key stewardship role and the structural reforms that it recommends around that are of particular interest to me to know where the government's thoughts are on progressing that, even if not specifically the way it's described in Woolcott's recommendations, how you're going to give effect to the intent of the principles there.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question, Ms Webb. Ms Morgan-Wicks.

**Ms WEBB** - That's around the new role of a commissioner sort of model, not to a full state service commission, but reinstating a commissioner role.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. There are a few facets to that question, Ms Webb. Certainly, in terms of the commissioner, that's still under active review, and I had many conversations with Mr Woolcott in relation to that, noting that Tasmania has previously had a public service commissioner.

That was then abolished, went to a State Service management function and Head of the State Service function. That is under review in terms of the context of the structural changes that we're looking in machinery of government, and I need to put advice to the Premier as the employer in relation to that.

In relation to operational efficiencies, the team in the State Service Management Office have been doing an incredible amount of work, particularly as we've had our wage negotiations taking a huge focus in terms of the team, but also in the establishment of the new Shared Capability and Investigations Unit, our SCCI team, which I have prioritised as full funding within DPAC's budget. I don't have any intention of attempting to diminish or create an operational efficiency in that area. They do incredibly intensive and complex work and incredibly important work.

From the perspective of bringing in a jobs and skills area and other areas of DSG, looking at our existing teams within DPAC, it'll be about looking to make sure that we have the right structure, the right skills, and that the work is prioritised for that area in accordance with what the government's priorities of the day are. I know that the COI, the effective management of the State Service, but also making sure that the State Service is the right size, shape and location is a critical priority of the Premier and government.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - It is.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. I appreciate that. I've got more in this area, but please share around.

**CHAIR** - No, that's all right, if you want to continue.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - Keep going? Thank you. We recently had come out from the Auditor-General the report, report number 10 of 2025-26, around planning and early implementation of the Human Resource Information System. It's a pretty damning report in terms of a project that seems to have gone astray in many ways across its time, showing that during the time that it sat with the Health department, \$47 million was spent to no avail. It's switched to DPAC now and sits within your responsibilities, Premier, I would think. But there's still no assurance, really, through this report and the Auditor-General that the project is going to deliver what is intended and needed.

One of the things that interested me when I attended a briefing from the Auditor-General on the project - offered to all parliamentarians - was the comment that a briefing on this report was offered to you, Premier, and you didn't take up that offer. Why wouldn't you have been briefed by the Auditor-General's office on this report when it is such an important one in terms of highlighting some clear problems in project management here on this project?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - As I understand, the secretary attended a briefing and the secretary briefed me.

**Ms WEBB** - Right. Okay. And so in terms of now, this project sitting with you in DPAC and under your responsibility, are you confident that it's now on track, given they pointed in this report to some ongoing lack of clarity around project management, that we're going to end up with this project delivered? And what do you think the final budget and timeline is going to be for that?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. I provided a response to the report, as did the Secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. It's a critical project that will deliver critical public sector infrastructure. And to highlight how big a project it is, it will replace more than 40 ageing HR payroll and rostering platforms for our 36,000-strong Tasmanian State Service. Many of these systems are at or beyond end of life. They're no longer capable of providing reliable, accurate or timely workforce data.

Health alone runs over 1200 different rosters and enters its payroll information manually twice for over 16,000 employees, including into a system which often requires restarting during the pay run to allow it to complete. The need for a systemwide reform is both evident and pressing. This program will deliver PeopleCentral, a single modern HR platform making it easier to pay people, roster people, reduce paperwork and free up time so staff can focus on delivering services. It improves workforce visibility, including volunteers, supports delivery of commission of inquiry recommendations, and strengthens a more consistent, capable public service for the Tasmanian community.

A staged delivery approach has been adopted for PeopleCentral, and this approach allows government to realise benefits early and gain a clear, evidence-based view of the return on continued investment. This has seen position management functionality successfully implemented in the Department of Premier and Cabinet in April this year.

Work is underway to roll out this functionality to the Department of Health, followed by the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management, with additional agencies planned to follow on a phased basis.

## PUBLIC

Additionally, the next stage of the HR transformation program is underway, focusing on payroll replacement delivering a single, consistent set of processes across government. The Auditor-General's report on planning and early implementation of the human resource information system recognises both the strategic importance of this work and the scale and complexity of delivering a whole-of-government HR and payroll system.

I consider it necessary to state clearly that I do not agree with some of the observations or conclusions the performance audit report contains because, in my view, the report does not adequately or accurately characterise the program, the basis for key decisions or the extent of work undertaken to date. Nor does it sufficiently reflect the complexity, sequencing and risk profile inherent in a program of this nature. This system was built in the Department of Health. It is now the foundation of what is being rolled out to government now.

**Ms WEBB** - Given that the Auditor-General in his report has put a rejoinder there, defending the quality of the work that they have done in this report, are you suggesting that the Auditor-General has done sub-par work in this?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - No. I'm suggesting my views are as stated and the same.

**Ms WEBB** - For example, an inaccuracy or something that wasn't correctly characterised, can you give an example from the report?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I might just refer now to the secretary to say a few words. Thank you.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Thank you, Premier. If it's in relation to the accuracy of the report, there were several issues that I raised with the Auditor-General, and I raised them because I've been involved with the HRIS project, which is now known as HRTP, since its inception in 2020 when I was secretary of the Department of Health. I've basically put out the begging bowl for money for that because of the concerns back in 2020 in relation to the way in which Health was running its payroll. I worked with Jenny Gale, who was then department secretary for Premier and Cabinet, given her concerns in relation to whole of government.

This has been funded as a single project over the last seven budgets. It's not two projects. I note and I did raise with the Auditor-General my concern that the report made it look like one project in Health that's now been handed to DPAC, who has now improved things. This is a single project. While it's had a couple of project directors, the one that was at Health under me has moved to DPAC and they're still working for me, and I'm providing no key guidance in relation to the project.

In terms of accuracy, we corresponded with the Auditor-General in relation to the number that he had originally had in the draft, for example, in the report about \$58 million being wasted by Health, which was incorrect, and we corrected it to \$47 million. We provided feedback in relation to that it was a single project and not two. We provided feedback that Health did deliver in terms of the \$47 million.

Health procured whole-of-government PeopleCentral licences, securing a 10-year deal for government. Health built core system components, including employee central, recruitment, onboarding and payroll. Health developed critical integration, data migration and the testing frameworks to support deployment.

## PUBLIC

Health also cleaned and prepared tens of thousands of workforce data records. They resolved many legacy complexities and enabling future migration. Health undertook system integration and data migration testing, and this evidence was provided to the Auditor-General's team, validating the build and confirming the readiness of it.

What Health did do in 2024 was engage an ICT expert to review the readiness of the program to roll out to Health. And we've all seen what happened in Queensland when Queensland tried to roll out a payroll system and then had to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to rectify that mistaken rollout and the suffering of people who were working in Health who were not paid correctly. It's a significant issue.

That expert said pause, this needs to be piloted and rolled out into a smaller agency, and that's exactly what we've done. So, using what Health has built, we have now rolled that out and we deployed the first functionality of HRIS, which was establishment management, into DPAC in 2025.

The next functionality, position management, is now live in DPAC and we're now preparing for further deployment, having tested, piloted, gone through a hypercritical support stage. It is then going into the Department of Health and will then roll out. And we're working with each of the agencies who, importantly, are doing their business readiness work in the background.

It's not just about procuring an ICT system and making sure we've designed and developed and rolled it out. We also need to do all of the clean-up of the quite manual and paper-based systems so that we can actually -

**Ms WEBB** - I think the complexity of the project is noted, absolutely. And it is noted in the report, too, and in the -

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - And we have ICT experts, so they're involved in actually doing this. And I note the Auditor-General's rejoinder.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, and the fact that the government has accepted all recommendations made by the Auditor-General.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Because we've completed those recommendations.

**Ms WEBB** - And the Auditor-General also notes in terms of his recommendations that it would be advisable for other state entities to take note of the context of this report. Is there a way that the government, probably through DPAC, a central agency, does draw this to the attention of other agencies who are similarly engaged in complex ICT-based or digital-based projects and may be encountering some of these same issues?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - And yes - through the Premier. We're already engaged with our interjurisdictional colleagues because we've also been testing with them their rollout. I think most states around Australia, at the moment, are attempting to replace or have replaced their payroll and HR infrastructure. And, for example, New South Wales has done it very successfully, which we've - you know, they've rolled out to some 70-plus agencies within New

## PUBLIC

South Wales. We are learning and they are being very generous in terms of sharing those lessons, and we will absolutely do the same from a Tasmanian perspective.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. I've got more.

**CHAIR** - I'm just going to ask another question just in the last 15 minutes. We'll have a break at 11, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - So, very shortly. Premier, just with regard to - it was a media release back in 2025 by the now Treasurer regarding Tasmanian regulation and barriers. With reference to the media release from the Treasurer, which was entitled 'Taking Tasmanian regulation and barriers to task', the claim was that 'Tasmania has the highest number of legislative restrictions per capita in Australia, 74 per 1000 people'. So, can you advise, what's the exact methodology behind the figure and which independent source produced it? How does it account for the quality or impact of regulations rather than just a raw count?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question. I will have to take that on notice and consult with the Treasurer.

**CHAIR** - That's fine. Well, I do have some others with regard to it that you might be able to answer.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Great. Okay.

**CHAIR** - How will success be measured? Will there be a public dashboard tracking the number of repeals? The estimated compliance cost? Perhaps I could forward all the questions to you, then. Are you able to answer any of them, do you think? Or do they all need to go to the Treasurer?

I'm just wondering, has the government conducted a regulatory burden audit with the independent cost-benefit analysis? Can the government publish the full preliminary list of the 40-plus acts and regulations targeted for repeal or amendment, along with the specific reasons for each? How would the government handle regulations that appear obsolete but still serve niche protective functions? Old environmental or heritage rules.

I should mention at this time, I did ask the Attorney-General yesterday with regard to a bill or an act that's relevant to a bill that I plan to amend, and that was the *Retail Leases Act 2022*, which hadn't been fully proclaimed. Only section 1 and section 88 of that act had been proclaimed since 2022. And there were others.

I also note, I think it was the *Electrical Safety Act 2022* that hasn't been proclaimed yet either. So, we're looking at repealing legislation and regulations. I'm just wondering how many of those acts still sit there unproclaimed.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. I'll look at the *Hansard*, and you've asked a series of questions there, including the ones that you ended your contribution with, and if it's all right with you, I can take those as questions on notice.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - That's fine, Premier. I'll provide you with the list rather than spend time now if you can't answer. If they're questions you really need to take on notice, I'm happy to do that.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - If that's the appropriate process.

**CHAIR** - Yes, if that's satisfactory to you, I'll provide my list of questions to do with the repeal of legislation and regulations, and then if you could respond in a timely manner before we actually come back to parliament to deal with Estimates, that would be great.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Sure. Best endeavours.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Premier. Ms Webb, then. Are we still on -

**Ms WEBB** - Still on the first line item, I think.

**CHAIR** - Yes. So if we could just maybe start -

**Ms WEBB** - I've got two.

**CHAIR** - Two questions and we'll need to move on to some other line items.

**Ms WEBB** - I'll just get one done before the break, I imagine.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Premier, I'm interested to talk with you about hate group identification.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Sorry?

**Ms WEBB** - Hate group identification.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Okay.

**Ms WEBB** - Internationally and nationally we're seeing a disturbing rise in the presence of hate groups and hate speech. So, I'm wondering what whole-of-government work is being undertaken to identify and monitor the emergence of hate groups in Tasmania, and are there any groups or individuals currently on a watch list? And obviously I'm not looking for personal identification there, just confirmation of whether we have a watch list and whether there are groups on it.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - All right. We did have some nation-leading legislation, you'd be aware, around Nazi symbols and matters of that nature, and that was a few years ago now.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'm happy to take the rest of your question on notice in terms of identification of hate groups.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes. So the question I had about -

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - There's obviously national intelligence matters we concern ourselves with here, is my understanding. But we've recently strengthened Tasmania's *Sentencing Act 1997* to ensure that racial or ethnic hatred, including antisemitism, as you'd appreciate, is being treated as an aggravating factor in sentencing. As I've already alluded to, we have in place an offence to display a Nazi symbol and we are considering extending these provisions to cover other types of symbols.

But our government's very clear priorities, Ms Webb, are to ensure that Tasmania's Multicultural Action Plan includes ensuring Tasmanian communities feel safe, and we've already progressed a range of initiatives to achieve this, and we have continued Tasmania's community-led Social Cohesion Grants Program providing funding to support projects that address racism and foster, indeed, our social cohesion as well.

**Ms WEBB** - I appreciate that. Those are good programs. Did you indicate that you would take on notice my question about what whole-of-government work is being undertaken to identify and monitor the emergence of hate groups in Tasmania?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll take it on - yes, in the context I can possibly provide some information from a national perspective as well.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. The follow-on question I also had from this is: Premier, do you have any guidelines established to ensure that government agencies or representatives are not unwittingly liaising with or entering into government contracts with potential hate groups or individuals or those associated closely with them?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Right. Okay. Is this a similar line of questioning given to Murray Watt the other day, I saw in Senate Estimates?

**Ms WEBB** - I don't know. I didn't watch Senate Estimates the other day.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I saw something come up in my reels about this matter. Anyway, my reels tend to - algorithms obviously tend to have parliamentary stuff on them, obviously. I'm making light of this. However, hate groups are a matter for the police and particularly the counterterrorism area of responsibility, which we are involved with in terms of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The Commissioner of Police, I'm certain, and the Police minister would be available to answer such questions of this nature as well.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes. My questions are not so much from whether there's criminal activity going on side of things; it's more to do with hate groups emerging, becoming an insidious presence in our community, and then whether we have things in place from a whole-of-government, from a central-agency perspective to ensure, for example, that government agencies or representatives don't unwittingly form links with those groups, whether that's through contracts, whether it's through some sort of liaising or given - are there guidelines or are there ways that we are looking to ensure that we aren't putting our government agencies in a position where that might occur?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Okay. I'll take your question at face value and understand the sentiment and the context behind it. I will respond to you around these matters. I don't disagree with the intent of your line of questioning in terms of outcome.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - It's not meant to be a tricky line of questioning.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - No, no. No, I understand that, which is exactly why I've answered it in this way. And Ms Morgan-Wicks would like to say something as well.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - So, through the Premier, from a whole-of-government perspective or from a Premier and Cabinet perspective, we obviously work very closely with our police colleagues in terms of the Commissioner of Police. Within our own risk and recovery and resilience focus, we also have responsibility for Tasmania's Protective Security Policy Framework, which also looks at the way in which we are dealing with information, classifying information and distributing it and setting protective security measures across agencies in terms of particular hate groups, which I understand are identified and classified from a national perspective.

And that information is then shared through our intergovernmental mechanisms, which DPAC and both police have representation on. We would have to then take that information in and consider whether that's applied through our security framework in itself or whether particular instructions are provided to agencies.

Do we have a particular policy that is naming hate groups and having that as a consideration in procurement? I'm not aware of that, but I'm happy to go back and ask and talk to my teams about whether that supplement's been considered.

**Ms WEBB** - Especially in a small community like Tasmania. These things can overlap and intersect.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Understand.

**CHAIR** - Now being 11 am, if we could stop the broadcast, please. We will break for 15 minutes.

**The committee suspended from 11 a.m. to 11.16 a.m.**

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Welcome back, Premier and I believe there might be a correction that you just wanted, for clarification, to make.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Thank you. One clarification from the prior session concerning legal fees. There are occasionally some minor matters that relate to a minister that may not go to Cabinet, depending on the circumstance. As noted in the ministerial - sorry, as noted in the guidelines, ministers are automatically indemnified in the guidelines it follows.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I just follow up on that, Premier, just a quick question. So, ministers are automatically indemnified to defend for defensive legal actions, but when it is something that the minister is bringing as an action there are some exclusions and things there. Could you clarify that, because it's not an automatic - in my reading of the guidelines which I've got right here is that it's not an automatic granting of legal assistance in the case of bringing a legal action for a minister.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. As I'm informed there are occasionally some minor matters that relate to a minister that may not go to cabinet, depending on the circumstance.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - If I ask you in this instance, did the decision about then Minister Ogilvie's matter go to cabinet, are you able to provide a straightforward answer to that?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'm not going to comment on cabinet matters.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. I think that's an answer from the Premier, because it was a clarification. Premier, I'd just like to ask you the government's response to the announcement this morning that Lion announced the proposal to close James Boag Brewery in Launceston, which I'm sure you'll accept and admit that it is an absolutely terrible, terrible thing to happen for Tasmania, but particularly for Launceston and for the 42 people employed at James Boag Brewery.

Do you have a comment to make? Can you give some indication of anything the government may be able to do to assist those workers, bearing in mind what Lion had already said that they will do and contribute. And I note that they will repay the \$1 million to the government but any comment that you may make with regard to the proposed closure of the James Boag Brewery this year?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. I acknowledge the question, Chair, and of course you're a member for Launceston, of which this would be very deeply concerning to you as well.

**CHAIR** - Absolutely. Hardworking and they've already had many cuts, and it's always been a fear.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. It has and I'm extremely disappointed in the decision. I've conveyed that to Lion. I really feel for the 42 workers and their families who will be very impacted and very saddened by today's announcement. And if I can reflect on a conversation I had with an employee of the visitor's centre just a few years ago, and the despair that that person conveyed to me around the job insecurity and the announcement of the closure of the visitor's centre, which is one of the reasons why we very quickly engaged with Lion to save the visitor centre.

That's where the government put in \$1 million to revitalise the visitor centre experience but also the associated infrastructure, which has been a wise investment. Those who have been to the visitor centre and seen the new infrastructure would most certainly concur with that. I acknowledge the fact that this will be very, very concerning for the 42 employees and their families.

Naturally, our efforts of the government to work with Lion and put the best interests of the employees at the forefront of the ramifications for this decision, working with unions, of course, which we always do, workers and the hospitality industry, more broadly, for those who are impacted on this.

Acknowledging Lion's commitment to honouring employee benefits and delivering \$500,000 investment for a reskilling fund and also acknowledge - and there was some discussion in commentary around the \$1 million of investment that the government put in to save the visitor centre and, indeed, improve it. In my view, that was a worthy investment because I understand the visitor centre will remain open.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - The brewhouse will remain open. I'm guessing that's attached to the visitor's centre, the new brewhouse.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And acknowledge, of course, the \$1 million will be paid back to the Tasmanian people through the Tasmanian Government, as well, by Lion. But very disappointing and my heart goes out to all the employees who have been affected.

**CHAIR** - I would assume that as a priority that you would be reaching out and speaking with Lion, with the board of Lion? Or just trying to think who the general manager is now in Sydney. It's changed from time to time.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I have spoken to Lion directly about this. I've conveyed my disappointment. I've acknowledged the additional investment they're making in terms of repaying the grant of \$1 million and, indeed, the additional \$500,000 reskilling fund. That will be little comfort, however, to the affected employees and the workers.

**CHAIR** - Little comfort for the workers, but they also note in the media that Lion sent on to me that they would be working closely with the Tasmanian Government on the future of the brewery site. I guess if something could even be enabled on the brewery site that could employ some of those workers. Obviously, it's a brewhouse. So, I'm assuming that you actually will - or you or your people will be working with them to try to find something to actually go hand in hand with that, to try and employ some of the workers to give them something back.

It's just so devastating coming up to the end of the year with 42 workers. And as you said before, FTEs workers, they have families, they're people who have children, they've got mortgages, they've got bills to pay. So, the government, I'm assuming, will make every effort to stay in contact to try to work something out and, if possible, even to put something back in that area that could maybe re-employ some of those people.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. I agree with you. We will, quite clearly -

**CHAIR** - Reach out this week.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Well, quite clearly, at the forefront of our mind, and our first actions must be to support the workers and their families.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Absolutely.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - You're right. They have mortgages to pay, commitments, and we need to support them as much as humanly possible in terms of future economic enabling through other opportunities for the visitor economy or advanced manufacturing. In this case, food production, beverage production.

We'll consider all options and ideas and work with affected workers and, indeed, the community. Now, Business Tas has a support function, of course, that will kick in straight away, as I understand it but most importantly, the workers are at the forefront of our minds and our actions with respect to the announcement today.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - That's the thing. Any ray of hope for the workers, I think, that there might be somewhere that they can actually go if it could be repurposed, obviously. It is a brewhouse but thank you, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Indeed. And thank you for the question.

**CHAIR** - Devastating news.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Ms Webb, you had one more question in this line item before we move on.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes. Thank you. Dealing with strategic policy and government priorities. Premier, the dismantling of the Department of State Growth has resulted in a realignment of community sector areas into other departments. There's been a bit of a flow-on effect of that.

A key area of concern amongst sector members is the realignment of Older Tasmanians into the Department of Health, and it just seemed to reinforce a perception it is a health problem rather than a demographic within our community to be celebrated and supported. Premier, can you please detail the policy basis of relocating aging and Older Tasmanians out of DPAC and into the Department of Health.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question. Supporting people to age well is a priority of our government. It is a whole-of-government responsibility, which is why we've created the designated portfolio of minister for Aging; Ms Archer holds that responsibility and this portfolio ensures that a holistic view of aging informs all our decisions.

These matters, of course, when they come to the cabinet table, at the very least there is an aging lens over decisions brought to the cabinet table by our minister for Ageing and this portfolio remains in place irrespective of which agency administers the funding for these matters, and indeed in this case, the advocacy group COTA.

The Department of Health has a lifespan approach to supporting Tasmanians to live well. This aligns very closely with the role of COTA Tasmania to support Tasmanians to age well. And the Minister for Ageing expects her department to provide her with that holistic advice to discharge her role, and this will continue in new arrangements -

**Ms WEBB** - even though it was done without consultation with that representative organisation and against the advice, it would appear, of that organisation representing older Tasmanians.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I understand the view of the organisation, but we have a Minister for Ageing, which is an important area of ministerial responsibility, which does give that whole-of-government focus and lens.

**Ms WEBB** - Can I ask in a related way about the release that was put out yesterday, which I welcome, which is calling for expressions of interest for the new Ministerial Advisory Council to be established under the Older Tasmanians Action Plan. And then I note, though, that delivery detail and whole-of-government accountability for the plan is not yet clear. So, in

## PUBLIC

the Budget, it looks like there's \$281,000 per year over three years towards the Older Tasmanians Action Plan.

My question then, Premier, is around what actions contained in the plan are to be funded by that allocation, and what measurable outcomes will be reported publicly? Can you confirm that those actions are assigned to action areas assigned to DPAC and are still the responsibility of DPAC to have oversight on, or will they shift?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question. I'll seek some advice on the matter. Thank you, Ms Webb. So, if it's all right, Chair, I'll bring back to the table Ms Noelene Kelly, who has responsibilities for this matter, and Ms Webb can, through me, engage with Ms Kelly.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Welcome, Noelene.

**Ms KELLY** - Thank you. Through you, Premier, the funding and responsibility for the Older Tasmanians Action Plan will transfer to the Department of Health.

**Ms WEBB** - You might need to bring your microphone around to you.

**Mr HISCUTT** - That was me.

**Ms KELLY** - So the funding and responsibility for the Older Tasmanians Action Plan will transfer to the Department of Health as part of this transition. Also, the Ministerial Advisory Council, which the Minister for Ageing announced yesterday, will also transfer through, and we're working really closely with Health in terms of that transfer.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. And then my question around the budget allocation of \$281,000 per year over three years towards the action plan, the actions contained in the plan funded by that allocation - which actions contained in the plan are to be funded by that allocation and what measurable outcomes will be reported on publicly?

**Ms KELLY** - Through you, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Ms KELLY** - So we're working through, at the moment, in terms of the funding allocation based on the actions, and we're doing that in consultation with government agencies, because it's a whole-of-agency plan, but also we're really looking forward to the establishment of the Ministerial Advisory Council to help inform that as well. And certainly, we'll talk to Health Department about making the tracking of the actions from the action plan public.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. I appreciate that. That's always useful. Just to really clarify, while responsibility for the plan is shifting to Health, the action areas that are assigned to DPAC presumably still stay with DPAC within the plan?

**Ms KELLY** - Through you, Premier. That's right.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. I appreciate that clarification.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - While we're actually on talking about older people, I was just wondering, Premier, what safeguards will be in place to ensure that the older public sector workers are not directly or indirectly pressured to apply, including through assumptions about age, retirement intentions, salary level or length of service, to the voluntary redundancy.

I accept that we had the answer before about what's actually going to happen to try to retain skills and levels, but what's in place to actually make sure that the people who maybe - or maybe is thought to be looking to retirement, or close to retirement age - that they're not pressured to actually leave? Obviously, that's a skill as well that we need to keep in many cases.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question. Kath.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier, our older cohorts in our Tasmanian state service are an absolute value sector in our workforce.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - They're often the people that you can rely upon with the memory of exactly what has happened in relation to a particular program or project or something that we've tried before and are able to share that experience, as well as immense skill with our developing workforce. Certainly, in terms of our voluntary negotiated redundancy program, that is exactly what it is. It is voluntary. In terms of pressuring people, all secretaries absolutely understand that people choose to be employed in our Tasmanian state sector for many reasons, often, which is about -

**Ms WEBB** - Young or old.

**Mr MOGRIDGE** - Young or old, which is often about returning to the community and providing service to the community. But people may need to be employed for quite a significant length of time, and everyone has different financial pressures and perspectives, or they absolutely love the work they do and would like to continue to work for as long as they physically can.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - So we absolutely respect that. I wouldn't want to hear any complaints or stories about anyone being pressured to do something that is voluntary.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Thank you, Premier. Appreciate it.

**Ms WEBB** - Follow on -

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Supplementary -

**Ms WEBB** - No, you go.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes. I'm interested in that. That's the response I was hoping you'd say. Perhaps in a department you have four people who voluntarily want redundancy. There's a skills gap there. You've got another four over here. A couple of those may need to retrain to fill that position that's now void or now vacant.

## PUBLIC

I suppose, in the Budget, do - or does each department, I suppose, have budget allocations for professional development in case that occurs? How do you handle that, not having enough people in the right area, so you might have to reskill some people who may be quite happy to step sideways or up or whatever? Does each department have that capacity?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through you, Premier. So, Mr Gaffney - and this can obviously be quite complex - you're going from an extreme of specialists within a hospital who are part of a specialist training program. One might decide, 'Well, I guess I've had enough', or 'I want to go back to my private practice', or 'I'd like to just do two days a week'.

We have dedicated skills that are required under accreditation in hospitals, for example. So there is absolutely dedicated professional learning, continuing development and that's part of the whole hospitals' arrangement. I'm just using that as an example -

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - compared to a very senior policy analyst who sits within the Department of Premier and Cabinet who has seen everything from COAG through to COVID through to national cabinet and is able to assist in training more junior policy analysts, for example, coming through on the art of inter-government negotiations. So, in that respect, I wouldn't say that we necessarily have dedicated-learning funding.

We always manage our budgets. If someone needs to go on a policy-writing course or if we need to send them over to Canberra, for example, for a period of time to also understand and get to know that policy environment, if it's of benefit to Tasmania, we would look at prioritising that within output 1.1, for example, in strategic policies.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes. Okay. So therefore, it's not a - it could be a whole-of-government approach to whatever the vacancies are. So, it's not a siloed approach to each department looking out for its own sort of thing.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. We have our training consortium which is part of our State Service Management Office that does tend, though, in the main to look at that whole-of-government leadership and management approach, for example, as some of their outputs but they will also hear about training needs that are across the agencies. I think in terms of this timing, everyone's not going to go out in one day.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - No.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - And if a manager is concerned that there is insufficient skill within their own team, they shouldn't be accepting that EOI for a voluntary, as much as the staff member might beg for it and really want it.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - There's hurrays across the public service compared to others that absolutely want to remain as a public servant.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes.

## PUBLIC

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - And we just need to look at making sure that we are balancing the timing and that if further time is required, we'd be saying, 'Can you please stay on for this length of time so that we can make sure that Sally and Jo or Henry have got now sufficient training and experience so that they can carry on the work that you've spent years providing.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Okay. Yes. Thank you. Thanks.

**CHAIR** - No, thank you. Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Just to follow on to that as well, thank you, thinking about the questions that were there around age profile, potentially, of people taking voluntary redundancies and other redundancies from state service over the next few years, is that something that you're planning to be able to report on publicly?

When it comes to reporting on redundancies that've been taken, say, on an annual basis or however you're going to be reporting on that, will you give consideration to thinking about the ways to present that information so that we can see what the profile of the state servants who are taking those redundancies looks like?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. We report on age profiles through our Head of the State Service annual report. Certainly, in terms of separations data and commencement data, we receive an age profile in relation to separations and commencements on a whole-of-government perspective. I just need to check if that information is also included in our annual reporting, but what I look for -

**Ms WEBB** - And the granularity of redundancies as a separation, rather than other forms of separations.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Yes. I would need to check to see that we're recording that, noting that separations from a TNVR perspective will increase, obviously, with the Premier's announcement around the 500 TNVR package for this calendar year, but we'll absolutely monitor that data, including age, and report.

**Ms WEBB** - Back to what we spoke about earlier around a gender lens on operational efficiencies, it would be useful to have a gender breakdown of those as well as an age profile breakdown.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier, yes. We receive a gender breakdown in relation to the age profile, but also noting that we have, for example, a predominantly female workforce in the state service.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes. Understood within the context of the workforce that you're speaking about, again, is that done on an agency-by-agency reporting basis, then, so we can see and have that context around the figures?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. We receive the data on an agency-by-agency basis, but I'd just need to check whether that's provided in specific.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - If I may suggest that you consider the sorts of information that people are going to be interested to know about in terms of the public reporting of these separations and these voluntary redundancies and think about how you can proactively report publicly on that so we don't necessarily have to drag that information out at Estimates processes, that would be helpful.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. We'll absolutely consider that. There is an incredible amount of detail that's in our Head of the State Service annual report that we absolutely and routinely disclose.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes. I appreciate that. I'm sorry to go back to it, but because you came back with that clarification, I needed a bit of time to process it in my mind, and I just wanted to check on one aspect of that, Premier, just to make sure I'm clear about what you were clarifying, if I may, in relation to the fact that you clarified that there were instances in which things might not need to go to cabinet for approval when it came to requests for legal assistance from a minister.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Minor matters, I understand, yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Pardon?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Minor matters, yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Minor. Right. Just to clarify, when they are minor matters? When they are minor requests? What does the 'minor' attach to in that statement?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Depending on the circumstance.

**Ms WEBB** - The question I'm going to just check with you as well on this, just for full clarity, is even if it's not going to cabinet, under 3.1 of the guidelines, which is 'Notification of Legal Proceedings by Public Officer', does it still under that have to come to you as the responsible officer for that notification?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - That's my advice, yes. That's my understanding, yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - If the guidelines are followed.

**Ms WEBB** - Can you clarify the use of the word 'minor' and what that relates to?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - The nature or the dollars amount.

**Ms WEBB** - If the matter itself is a minor matter or if the amount being sought in terms of assistance was minor, that could just come to the responsible officer as a notification and under automatic coverage of ministers would be covered without going to cabinet?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - That's my understanding, yes.

**Ms WEBB** - That could happen.

# PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Thank you. I think you've probably prosecuted that.

**Ms WEBB** - I appreciate the further information brought back to the table, and I appreciate being able to fully understand what's being presented.

**CHAIR** - The Premier's answered to the best of his ability.

## **Output Group 1.2**

### Child and Youth Wellbeing

**CHAIR** - Would we like to move on to item 1.2: Child and Youth Wellbeing? Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, Chair. I'll just get myself rearranged into that area. This is an area that is clearly moving and shifting in terms of DPAC's responsibilities over the coming years. I just want to talk through some of that a bit, if we might, but first of all, perhaps, look at the key deliverables that relate to this space that's here in the budget papers.

Noting that key deliverables are continuing on from 2025-26, and one of those that is relevant here is the therapeutic services for victim/survivors of sexual violence that was going to SASS and Laurel House, that's \$3.5 million in the 2026-27 financial year and \$3.5 million in the 2027-28, or just over 3.5 in both of those. I'm just checking in.

That will cover 2026-27 and 2027-28, and then there is nothing further in the forward estimates. I want to check on what is now being funded out of that bucket of money, and what will happen when we get to 2028-29 and there's no further funding there for whatever is being funded now?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. You're referring to table 10.1, page 206 of budget paper 2, where you've correctly highlighted therapeutic services for victim/survivors of sexual violence, SASS and Laurel House, \$3.54 million in 2026-27 and 2027-28. I will, if that's okay, ask Courtney Hurworth to arrive at the table. Thank you, Courtney. Courtney is the Chief Reform Officer, Keeping Children Safe.

**CHAIR** - And Courtney's full name, Premier, just for Hansard? We have Courtney -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Courtney Hurworth, H-u-r-w-o-r-t-h.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, and welcome, Courtney.

**Ms HURWORTH** - Thank you. Through you, Premier. As you would appreciate, the funding for these organisations is complicated and comes out of multiple output groups. What is funded out of this output for SASS and Laurel House is a funding uplift for core therapeutic services that was related to demand that increased during and post-commission of inquiry and then funding for harmful sexual behaviours, which is therapeutic services for children who use violence.

We also provided a small amount of funding to SASS and Laurel House for our change leads program, which enabled key representatives across community organisations to implement Keeping Children Safe reforms in their sectors. SASS and Laurel House's core

## PUBLIC

funding and their additional funding through the Survivors at the Centre action plan, plus their funding for services delivered in Arch centres, comes out of output group 1.4.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes. In terms of the key deliverables line item, which is the \$3.5-odd million in 2026-27 and 2027-28 and then nothing after that, when that funding finishes in June 2028, what will cease in terms of the service delivery through those two organisations? What will we stop funding at that point?

**Ms HURWORTH** - If the funding did not continue at that point in time, the funding for core therapeutic services would reduce. It would reduce to the core funding provided through output group 1.4. The harmful sexual behaviours funding is additional here as well. I should have mentioned that, sorry. The additional funding for harmful sexual behaviours would also stop, and the program would reduce down to its core funding. That would be the impact.

**Ms WEBB** - Sorry, just to clarify because I think I got confused then, the harmful sexual behaviours funding, is that included in this 3.5?

**Ms HURWORTH** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - It is. Okay. Thank you.

**Ms HURWORTH** - The breakdown is \$1.35 million for HSB and \$1million for therapeutic services uplift.

**Ms WEBB** - \$1.35 million and \$1million. That doesn't equal 3.5, though, does it?

**Ms HURWORTH** - And the change leads funding.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay. Across the three.

Thank you. And so presumably there's going to be ongoing conversations prior to 2028-29 about what might happen next in that space and what funding needs will be then for those organisations.

**Ms HURWORTH** - We'll probably talk about this more this afternoon, but we have just commenced a major evaluation of the Tasmanian Government's investment into family and sexual violence prevention and response, and that evaluation will be a key informer of funding moving forward.

**Ms WEBB** - Great. I look forward to talking about that in more detail and ask more questions this afternoon in the appropriate portfolio for that. So, then the other key deliverable that's in the 2026-27 key deliverables is the therapeutic services in Arch centres.

That's \$900,000 in 2026-27 and the same in 2027-28, and again, nothing across the forward Estimates there. So, I'm keen to understand what that is - what outcomes that is looking for in these two financial years it's funded, and what's going to happen when it drops away in 2027-28 - sorry, 2028-29 is when there's no funding from then on.

**Ms HURWORTH** - Through you, Premier. That funding funds Laurel House and SASS to provide services in the Arch centres. So Arch centre funding is split between DPFEM's

budget and this budget line, and we provide, through this output, the funding for therapeutic services. If that funding ceased, therapeutic services wouldn't be able to be delivered in those Arch centres.

**Ms WEBB** - Premier, that's why I don't understand why it's a key deliverable and not some sort of core funding that's provided. The Arch centre model relies on the delivery of these services, therapeutic services within the model. That's the whole premise of the Arch model. So why are we funding it and only funding it across two years in this Budget and not funding it as part of core funding?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, Courtney. Thank you.

**Ms HURWORTH** - Through you, Premier. This funding is - we're looking at how we better integrate the Arch centre therapeutic delivery with the core services of those organisations. So, we are looking at how we can consolidate that into single funding pools, as you're alluding to. The funding for therapeutic services in Arch centres was initially provided through national partnership agreement funding, and that was to pilot innovative approaches. The inclusion of this in the budget recognises that those innovative approaches have worked and that it's now included in state appropriation.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Can I say, though, they're still relatively new, including the newest one being the North West Coast.

**Ms HURWORTH** - Yes, that's only come online.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And so we'll continue to evaluate and to see where the investment's best applied. I don't imagine a world where we don't continue funding, but we need to continue that evaluation to get the model right in terms of service delivery.

**Ms WEBB** - And that evaluation is the evaluation that Ms Hurworth referred to just before, or a different evaluation?

**Ms HURWORTH** - No. I think the Premier is referring - sorry, through you, Premier. The Premier is referring to the evaluation that I spoke about which will look at Arch centres, and how clients accessing Arch centres have or have not changed the client profiles and behaviours in terms of accessing broader sexual violence services. But there has been an independent evaluation done of Arch through DPFEM, and that provided a number of recommendations for improvement. It also commented on how excellent they are, and so we're looking at how we implement those over the next couple of years as well.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. And so, is DPAC's role going to change in terms of its oversight or involvement in these spaces in coming years?

**Ms HURWORTH** - Through you, Premier. Yes. The Family and Sexual Violence secretariat that sits under me will transition to the Department of Justice and will sit in the Justice Support Services area. Our anticipation is that it won't change in the sense that the team and the processes and the governance that we use will all remain in place, but it will be administrated out of Justice, not DPAC, and they will take on that whole-of-government coordinating role.

## PUBLIC

**Ms WEBB** - Right. And in terms of, say - so coming back then to the other aspect here, which is the Keeping Children Safe reform, which had that whole-of-government coordination function that sat here in DPAC, looking at the commission of inquiry recommendations and monitoring and sort of reporting on those, are we going to see that function for DPAC in relation to the Keeping Children Safe reforms shift as well?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Yes, through the Premier. That function will move to DECYP, and it is following the stage also of the phasing the recommendations, with the majority now sitting within DECYP to deliver.

That does not mean that DPAC does not maintain an absolute interest in ensuring that there is whole-of-government coordination and delivery of the COI recommendations and that we will continue to monitor and receive updates at our secretary's board in relation to that. We also have and report to a committee of Cabinet in terms of the Premier's interest in making sure the recommendations are implemented.

**Ms WEBB** - It's important to hear that that oversight is still there from a whole-of-government perspective, because I think it's not necessarily a good look to have both those things shifted out of the central agency, given their importance, the sexual violence side of things and the Keeping Children Safe side of things.

One thing I'm interested in, then, is, does that explain the shift in funding in this line item or are those 'machinery of government' changes not reflected in this line item at the moment? When we look ahead and see the - basically dwindles down to a fraction of things in 2028-29 and then 2029-30 - is that related to the shifting of these responsibilities?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Just on the matter, while Ms Morgan-Wicks provides an answer to you, Ms Webb - and thank you for acknowledging, still, the whole-of-government lens, if I can put it that way. While various responsibilities shift with other departments, including DECYP, there is also, as you may well be aware already, a subcommittee of Cabinet to do with child safety and including implementation of the commission of inquiry recommendations.

And all relevant ministers, including myself as Premier, sit on that. In fact, I chair it as Premier and obviously it's Minister for Education, the Minister for Police and other relevant key ministers as well to ensure there's whole-of-government oversight of the implementation of recommendations and child safety reforms more broadly.

**Ms WEBB** - Good.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - And through the Premier, in relation to budget - and I think I mentioned before, this is a Budget that's prepared as at current day for Department of Premier and Cabinet.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes, reflecting now.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - So it includes these functions. But there will be output transfers that we're working with Treasury in relation to. But noting in terms of the commission of inquiry funding, it actually increases in this Budget. So, it remains a priority. It is not dwindling, but it is shifting and moving towards recommendations that are still required to be

## PUBLIC

delivered. As once we deliver particular items, they move into base funding. You don't necessarily see them in the key deliverables table anymore.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Does DPAC still then retain the Shared Capability Investigations Unit to undertake the functions that unit's been doing in relation to the investigations that came out of the commission of inquiry?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - And is it anticipated that that has a particular shelf life or is that going to just be funded in an ongoing way until it's no longer required? What's the plan?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - So through the Premier. The SCCI, in my view, as the current head of the State Service, does not have a shelf life. It is a continuing and important function. We've developed up some significant capability within that team which looks at the greater context, serious misconduct matters and they have started their work in relation to allegations and long-standing matters in Ashley Youth Detention Centre. But we are continuing to work with agencies in relation to serious misconduct, ED5 investigations, and we see the SCCI team as being core to that investigation, uplift and delivery.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And I share honourable Ms Morgan-Wicks' view with respect to no shelf life. This is a key priority of our government, if not the number one priority, and I have the same view as Ms Morgan-Wicks.

**Ms WEBB** - Excellent. And on those long-term investigations that have been going on from AYDC, I think it's, sort of, remiss in these opportunities not to get an update on where we are, how many of the very longstanding four, five year-plus investigations still remain and what's the expectation on bringing them to a close. Thank you.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Just seek advice on that. Thank you, Ms Webb. Through you, Chair.

**CHAIR** - If you don't have the information available now, we can always take the questions on notice if that's preferable, to give a more fulsome answer.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Thank you, Ms Morgan-Wicks.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier, and noting in terms of the longstanding ED5 investigations, just in terms of context, DPAC provides routine and regular monthly disclosure in relation to suspensions of employees in relation to child sexual abuse allegations. We have done that, I think, since 2024 when I transitioned to DPAC as secretary. We have had 127 suspensions of employers in relation to child sexual abuse since October 2020, of which 124 proceeded to ED5 investigation.

Of those, 93 have now been completed; 32 of those, or some 34 per cent with breach found in relation to the investigations. Seven employees resigned prior to a finding being made, and we have 24 ED5 investigations still underway. In terms of outcomes in relation to those investigations, 25 state servants have been terminated, or would have been terminated had they not resigned prior to the finding of termination in relation to their investigation, so that's some 27 per cent.

## PUBLIC

In relation to the longstanding suspension, we currently have 23 who are suspended in relation to child sexual abuse on full pay. Fifteen of those matters are greater than 365 days and we have eight who fall into the longstanding over two-year period, which our SCCI team received a referral in 2024 - late 2024 to investigate. All of these eight have had additional allegations identified during the course of the SCCI investigation. Six are now in the final stage of determination and response, and two are in the final stages of their investigation report.

In relation to - originally, it had been 11, which contain some 193 allegations and also required the assessment of class action material, national redress claims that had been received in relation to these employees, civil claims.

Regina Weiss was also appointed to assist the SCCI team, and took some 20 statements, not all relating to these 11 cases, but the majority of which. And we've also had some - I think it's around five, from recall - Tasmanian Industrial Commission matters that have been involved. They are incredibly complex. We are disclosing as much as we are able to legally, noting the private nature of an employment relationship and also people's rights in an investigation.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. I just have a follow-up on that, actually, because I have very similar questions for Minister Palmer, actually, who obviously undertakes the AYDC. But just a question with regard to those. Obviously, the allegations are investigated, I would assume. An allegation is made; someone is stood down instantly. I would assume that the allegations made by the person are investigated to make sure they're not vexatious. But how many of those serious sexual assaults or proposed assaults are actually investigated by Tas Police? Because I would have thought that if it's a serious -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - All.

**CHAIR** - Are they all? My understanding is that's not the fact.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. Yes. All matters involving child sexual abuse are all -

**CHAIR** - All are investigated by Tas Police.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - No. Sorry, if could just finish, Chair.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - All matters and allegations are provided to Tasmania Police, but also to the independent regulator. We notify Working with Vulnerable People registrar, for example, if an employee's required to hold a Working with Vulnerable People registration. They are provided to Tasmania Police who will then undertake their own assessment of the information and make a determination whether or not they're investigated.

**CHAIR** - Because the question I would have there, and I will have these questions not necessarily now, because I believe probably the more relevant portfolio would be Minister Palmer. My understanding is that - yes. All police. That there are people on suspension who have had these serious allegations made that are still on suspension who have never had a police

## PUBLIC

officer speak to them, which is interesting. So that if the police don't consider its worthy of investigation, yet they're still on suspension, I just find that a little confusing.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. I am aware of matters that have been investigated by Tasmania Police. I'm not going to comment on individual matters.

**CHAIR** - No. That's fine. I have actually spoken - I've had these people come to my office, that's all, telling me the -

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - We are aware of matters that have been referred to the DPP.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - But I cannot comment on individual matters and -

**CHAIR** - No. That's fine. It just seemed interesting, but I will take this up.

**Ms WEBB** - And just to clarify, the people are on suspension while, say, an ED5 investigation occurs and that investigation is in relation to breach of code of conduct. So, it's not necessarily about criminal conduct or whatever the ED5 investigation done through the DPAC unit relates to the state service code of conduct. Is that correct?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. That is correct. And it responds to a multi-commission of inquiry that made recommendations that said children are to be believed. That is what we accept. We accept the recommendations of the commission of inquiry. When an allegation of child sexual abuse is made against an employee in the Tasmanian state service, we have a process where there is immediate standdown and then we consider whether there's the commencement of an ED5, which I think, as I've read out, in terms of the numbers, has occurred.

**CHAIR** - Yes. You have. No, thank you. Thank you. Are you ready to move onto a new area? Are we finished in 1.2?

**Ms WEBB** - There's just one small thing I wanted to keep going with in the Child, Youth and Wellbeing because it's the wellbeing part, and it won't take long, I don't think. The Tasmanian Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy, which was a DPAC responsibility: I just wanted to clarify, is that still a DPAC responsibility? Is it anticipated to shift elsewhere? And are we reporting against that strategy? Could somebody go and see how we're tracking against what's laid out in the strategy and how well we're delivering on it?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. That's a very important matter because the Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy sets a very clear direction of how we improve outcomes for children and young people. Since it was developed the system has changed. We've introduced new programs, shifted how services are delivered and adjusted funding across government and community sector. Over the life of the first action plan, we've made a significant investment in new and expanded services, and we continue to invest to sustain and embed those programs to support children and families across Tasmania.

But we also recognise that there is a significant amount of work that needs to be done and already being led by both government and the community sector to support children and

families. And what we are hearing loud and clear now from the stakeholders and the community is that it's becoming harder to see how everything fits together. So, the next phase of work is focused on ensuring we do provide that clarity. We're commencing work to map services across Tasmania and undertake a gap analysis to understand what has been delivered, where and, indeed, by whom.

This will give us a clear joined up picture of the system. Alongside that, we're developing a shared outcomes framework, and this will set clear, evidence-based outcomes for children and families, will provide a consistent way for organisations to align their work and measure impact. It will strengthen accountability, support better decision-making and drive shared ownership across government and, indeed, across the community sector as well.

We're going to engage key stakeholders to help develop and inform the work, and this approach brings together existing efforts across the system in a more coordinated, whole-of-government view. We're not developing a separate action plan at all. Instead, this work will be guided by coordinated action and inform future priorities, and importantly, this work will be delivered within existing resources, of course recognising the circumstances we are now in in terms of the nub of the question around driving that strategy, where that is responsibility with Department of Education, Children and Young People.

**CHAIR** - No, thank you. Thank you, Premier.

### **Output Group 1.3**

#### **Security and Emergency Management**

**CHAIR** - We'll now move on to 1.3, Security and Emergency Management. And if I could ask you, Premier, the budget papers state in number 1, volume 2, page 223, that the variation from 2026-27 primarily reflects operational efficiencies and the completion of regional drought recovery planning initiatives.

Can you expand on what these operational efficiencies have been? Have any positions been eliminated? And can you provide more information on the completion of the regional drought recovery planning initiatives?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Okay. So, I'm on -

**CHAIR** - Yes. Have any positions been eliminated?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - - table 10.3, page 223 of -

**CHAIR** - Number 1, volume 2.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - The quote there is about the variation reflecting operational efficiencies and the completion of the drought recovery planning initiatives.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - That's right.

**CHAIR** - Just wondering if you can actually expand on the operational efficiencies and what they've been.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - In addition to expenditure for core policy and emergency management functions and for fixed-term projects, Resilience and Recovery Tasmania distributes funding to disaster-affected communities, local governments and Tasmanian government agencies, delivering recovery support.

What this means is that Resilience and Recovery Tasmania's expenditure can vary from year to year, with higher expenditure, obviously, in years which there are more occurrences of natural disasters. And this also means that Resilience and Recovery Tasmania's budgetary expenditure decreases over the forward Estimates as extraordinary disaster recovery expenditure cannot be forecast over the forward Estimates.

The expenditure in 2026-27 contains approximately \$5.7 million to distribute Australian government funding provided under the disaster refund to recipients. And the difference between the budgeted expenses and revenue from appropriation that's a common feature of Resilience and Recovery Tasmania's budgets, indeed, and reflects the increasing role the business unit plays in administering Australian government funding programs as well. When it comes to matters of FTE reduction, we'll just seek that information on advice for you, Chair.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. We have look from a whole-of-agency perspective in terms of our FTE management, and I think I've spoken previously to the reduction of 82. In terms of this area, as of 31 March 2026, Resilience and Recovery Tasmania had 24.9 paid FTEs, and paid FTEs have decreased by 2.4 FTE between March 2025 and March 2026.

**CHAIR** - No, thank you. Any other members have on this item? They have no more questions on 1.3.

### **Output Group 2.1**

Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

**CHAIR** - We'll move to 2.1, Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor. Mr Gaffney.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Thank you. Thank you. I note that the Efficiency and Productivity Unit is funded through this line. We've had a brief discussion about that already, so may not take that long. This output provides advice for executive government processes as well as managing machinery of government matters. There was a significant increase in the expenses for 2025-26 estimated outcome against the Budget.

My question is, what percentage or how much of these costs, if any, have been brought on by the whole government reform and dissolution of the Department of State Growth? Would that be part of the gambit of this line item?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you, Mr Gaffney, for the question. I'll just seek advice on that matter. To the best of my knowledge, the answer to your question is no, because the EPU is funded through item or Output 1.1, which is the Strategic Policy -

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. Well, it actually says to me the Efficiency and Productivity Unit is also funded through this output, 2.1, in our government systems support, Output Group 2. I think I've got the right one.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll just confer with that.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Yes. Through the Premier while that's being confirmed. So, Efficiency and Productivity Unit organisationally sits within DPAC and within our Premier's authorities and implementations, so within Output 1.1, Strategic Policy and Government Priorities, but they advise in relation to operational efficiencies across all aspects of government, which would include all outputs within DPAC and all agencies at a whole-of-government level.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. For future reference -

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - But apologies if I've misunderstood.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - No, no. If you go to page 214 where it says, 'Output Group 2, government systems report', Efficiency and Productivity Unit is also funded through this output. So, I've based my questions on that statement.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Page 224 says, 'The increase in the 2025-26 estimated outcomes for the State Service employment and management output reflects estimated additional support for the State Service Management Office primarily for the Shared Capability and Centralised Investigations Unit'.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Sorry, I'm on page 214, Premier, not 224.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, but I thought that was relevant.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes. Okay.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Apologies, through you, Premier. I just would need to check. It might be an error due to an output restructure that has occurred within DPAC, so I just need to check whether that has been included from a previous budget line or not. But I absolutely confirm that the EPU is within DPAC. We can answer - well, the Premier is minded to answer questions in relation to Efficiency and Productivity Unit.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. So, moving on, so there was an -

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Apologies.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - No, that's all right. Got a little bit about government reform. Okay. Have legal fees formed any part of the expenditure in this increase for 2025-26 from this line item at all?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - At Output 2.1?

## PUBLIC

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes, in this Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliament and Offices of the Governor.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - No, is my understanding. The answer to that is no.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - See, all of my questions now are based on the assumption that it is funded from this output.

**Ms WEBB** - It wasn't your mistake; it was the budget paper mistake. You should still ask them.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Can I just follow up, Gaff, then on that if it's not your -

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Mr Hiscutt had a follow-up, yes.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Just, I mean, to note the fact that the Budget was 10.3 million and the estimated outcome was 13.8, which is an increase of 3.5.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Can we have an understanding of -

**Mr GAFFNEY** - That increase.

**Mr HISCUTT** - - where that increase was against the original Budget?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - My understanding is the increase in the 2025-26 estimated outcomes for the State Service Employment and Management Output reflects estimated additional support for the State Service Management Office, primarily for the Shared Capability and Centralised Investigations Unit.

Further, the decrease in the 2026-27 primarily reflects the completion of the 2024-25 key deliverables, whole-of-government human resources information system, which has been replaced by the human resources transformation project, and the decrease in the 2027-28 reflects completion of the 2025-26 key deliverable State Service Management Office report, and I refer to page 28 and 24 with respect to that matter.

**Mr HISCUTT** - To ask the question, it says, 'Primarily for the Shared Capability and Centralised Investigation Unit'. I guess the question is, if that accounts for \$3.5 million, what did that achieve in the year?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I've been advised that could include increased costs for, not funded in the output, that include an increased size of parliament, \$2.5 million; March 2026 state visit, Queen Mary and King Frederik, \$300,000; Tasmanian agricultural shows, \$500,000; and unfunded costs associated with implementing Motion for Respect, \$160,000, and that's included in the estimated outcome.

## PUBLIC

**Mr GAFFNEY** - From our discussions last year about the Efficiency and Productivity Unit and increasing use of AI, because I didn't ask it earlier, have recent hacking breaches altered the government's approach to the use of AI in the public service, because we've had some massive breaches and hacking? Is there any concern from the government about having something that fool-proofs or security-proofs, as best they can, the public service?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. That's a good question, and I'm happy to talk to artificial intelligence, which is already embedded across many of the systems and platforms that the government relies on. Perhaps if I can ask Justin Thurley, who's the Chief Information Officer, to come to the table, if that's all right, Mr Thurley, and Mr Gaffney probably has some questions of operational detail with respect to this.

**Mr THURLEY** - Sorry, could I, through you, Premier, just ask the question be clarified again?

**Mr GAFFNEY** - My question was: because we have an increasing use of AI, as was discussed last year in this forum, have recent hacking breaches worldwide altered the government's approach to the use of AI in the public service, or has it made you change the way you think of organisational - I'd be interested to know what that impact has had.

**Mr THURLEY** - Through you, Premier. Certainly, we have some concerns around the developments of AI and the potential for misuse from a cybersecurity perspective, but we also have opportunities that come through the defensive use of AI for cybersecurity-type measures as well. It's sort of a bit of a double-edged sword.

The main thing we're doing is that our obligations don't really change. We've still got the same privacy, the same security mandates in government to protect government data, and as that approach doesn't necessarily change, it just means that we're looking at different threats and different vulnerabilities that are emerging because of those AI threats. We're very cognisant of them. We're working with other jurisdictions to understand what the controls that we need to have in place are, and we are putting those controls in place where they are viable and we're able to put them in place.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - You may not be able to answer this, but in other jurisdictions as well, if there was a security breach, that's obviously going to have a budget impact about how to solve or work on that breach. Do you have contingencies planned, or where do you get the funding from for that?

**Mr THURLEY** - Through you, Premier. Yes, we have a cyber program in play in DPAC. We look after whole-of-government cybersecurity, and we have plans in place for when a cybersecurity breach takes place. That's the state cyber emergency management plan, which falls under the Tasmanian emergency management arrangements. If we have to activate that plan, the same arrangements for reserved funding, et cetera, come into play for cybersecurity issues.

For breaches that don't meet the threshold of going into an emergency, we also have arrangements in place through services that we provide through third parties and through ourselves to respond to cybersecurity matters, and we're able to engage third parties who are on retainers to respond to those types of events.

## PUBLIC

**Mr GAFFNEY** - My last question while you here, because I don't even know if you're supposed to be here in this line item: in the last 12 months, have we had many cybersecurity breaches within government of a serious nature; or do you have those at low, medium, high - or what's the word?

**Mr THURLEY** - Through you, Premier. Yes, we do. We're continuously monitoring, and we do have events that sometimes translate into incidents. I do have the number of incidents et cetera we'd be happy to share that we report against. As for serious cybersecurity incidents, ones that need to be escalated to an emergency state, I have to check back on my notes because I didn't bring them to the table with me. We have had a couple of incidents that relate to that, but we've managed to wade through them.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Ms Webb has a short question to finalise this line item. We'll just go to Ms Webb, and we'll come back to Mr Hiscutt to finish off 2.2.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you, Chair. Premier, I'd like to talk about ministerial diary reform. You released a public discussion paper and announced a review of the current ministerial diary disclosure regime in November last year, following the third successful motion of mine in the upper House. That consultation period closed in early December. Premier, when can we expect an update on that consultation and any reforms to the current inadequate ministerial diary disclosure processes that are in place?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I wouldn't characterise it in that way, shape or form. It's another example of transparency of this government, and we are light-years ahead of where we were prior to coming into government when it comes to transparency between us and the Labor-Greens government.

**Ms WEBB** - Of nothing, yes. It's not hard to be light-years ahead of nothing.

**CHAIR** - Well, we're not going to get political, Premier. If we could just answer -

**Ms WEBB** - There's plenty of opportunity here to improve. You put a discussion paper toward that end. I'm just engaging with you on an update of where we're up to with that consultation.

**CHAIR** - Just an update, Premier, would be great.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - My understanding is that we'll be providing an update on Thursday.

**Ms WEBB** - On Thursday. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Okay. Thank you. Mr Hiscutt.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you, Premier. Just in budget paper 4, which is the performance information, and this falls under the Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor. It has a performance output: draft responses to routine ministerial correspondence actioned within 10 days of receipt.

I would believe that to mean, basically, are you getting back to routine correspondence, and the budget document has that at only 59 per cent in 2023-24 and 58 per cent in 2024-25

## PUBLIC

when the target is 90. Just wondered what you're doing to ensure that ministers are getting back to correspondence from either constituents or other members of parliament.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - We'll certainly always have best endeavours. A 10-day turnaround is and can be quite challenging, given the information that often has to be sourced from across a department or, indeed, departments to get back to constituents. I have strong expectations that ministers get back as soon as practicable and provide best endeavours.

Some are better than others in terms of the types of correspondence that we're able to get and turn around very quickly, but the RTI requests and draft response to routine ministerial correspondence 2023-24 and 2024-25 actuals reflected the significant number of concurrent priorities the department managed over that time, including, I have to say, elections in both years, incoming government processes and two budget Estimates periods, has challenged this somewhat.

**Mr HISCUTT** - We can see a commitment to hopeful improvement over the coming -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, definitely.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you. Just on the same page, since you've got it in front of you, the Right to Information requests responded to, as I said, I'm not sure if you were answering the same question there, but obviously a target of 100 and lacking at 77 and then 84, another commitment to try to improve that is what I'm after.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. There's been significant policy reform work undertaken, and I do recall the release of the RTI independent review by Professor Rick Snell and Tim McCormack, which I released with them in September last year. I note an improvement in terms of table 11.2, performance information, output group 2, from 77 to 84 - of course, the target being 100 over the course of the next two years - and we will also do best endeavours, but there's been significant reform work underway in this area

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - And Mr Gaffney had the last question in this output.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Just a quick question. As this output also talks about 'provides the administrative, financial, human resources, information systems, records and property management services to support the Ministerial and Parliamentary Offices and the Office of the Governor' - and we've mentioned AI. Is AI used in any way to develop ICT policy? I mean, this may not be the place to ask. I'm just wondering, when you talked before or last year about using AI, I'm just wondering, is that used, or is that something you can provide me with?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'm happy to take it on notice.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Take it on notice. I'm just interested to see. I mean, it's about protection and whether we use AI like that.

**Mr HEALEY** - I'm not aware of any deliberate use of AI to craft ICT policy. Clearly, AI is embedded in most workplaces and most desktops now.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes.

**Mr HEALEY** - It could be used for making sure that you're correcting grammar and the like for routine documents. But there's certainly no deliberate program that I'm aware of across government for AI to be used for ICT policy development.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. Yes, I'm not saying it's negative, I'm just - I was just interested whether it was -

**Mr HEALEY** - No, no, no. Yes, the only reason we can't be definitive in saying no is because AI is becoming part of the routine daily work of everyone.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Exactly. Okay.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. If we now move on to 2.2 Principal and Subordinate Legislation. Mr Hiscutt.

## **Output Group 2.2**

### Principal and Subordinate Legislation

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you. Just while people have got the page open on book 4, I'll ask this question first; page 77, where we should be - the targets, it says, 'Proportion of key clients that are satisfied that the legislation drafted for the client meets the relevant, and implementable, policy intentions in a legally effective manner'. I've certainly had no complaints, and I understand 97 per cent is really, really good. I just wonder how we actually measure that. I've never been asked whether I was happy with how things have been drafted when I've used that service.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Fair enough question. And I'll seek some advice on that methodology.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Happy to take it on notice if you are.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. I'm advised that we probably should check in with the Office of Parliamentary Counsel. So if I take it on notice and then seek their advice, Mr Hiscutt, I'll be happy to do that.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Take that on notice. Yes.

**CHAIR** - We'll provide you a written question.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Excellent.

**Mr HISCUTT** - And, secondly, on the same line item in there, before I go to other questions, 'Percentage of achievable legislative timings that have been met to enable the legislative priorities and other critical legal or political obligations of the Government to be met' - again, how that is, and as an example, and not to be antagonistic, the greyhound

## PUBLIC

legislation didn't pass, you know, in an effective timeline. So, I would have thought that would have made that not 100 per cent in the last - well, I guess that would be in the next year. Is that the type of thing that would be covered in that? Again, not to be antagonistic with that.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - My understanding is, Mr Hiscutt, this performance indicator refers to the Office of Parliamentary Counsel and them producing the legislation rather than the legislation getting through two houses of parliament.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you for the understanding on that.

**Ms WEBB** - You sounded pretty presumptuous about that.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - No.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Good to see them at 100 per cent. Well done, OPC.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - They do a great job.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Absolutely.

**CHAIR** - They do.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And might I say, as a result of continued reforms in this area from the Liberal government, OPC is available to all members of parliament to do their job, as it should be and perhaps should have always been.

**Ms WEBB** - Yes. Credit where credit's due on that.

**Mr HISCUTT** - You've segued perfectly into my next question, Premier. Thank you for that. There is a drop across the forwards, especially a decrease in 2027-28. They do an amazing job and with the increase of more Independents in the upper House - sorry, in the lower House - I would expect their services to be used more.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Mr HISCUTT** - So, where do you expect to find the efficiencies in that department, if that is what those drops reflect?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Ms Morgan-Wicks.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. There is a decrease, so I think what we've got in that output - there are budget increases in relation to \$194,000 due to indexation, and there are operational efficiencies totalling \$132,000 for this output.

**Mr HISCUTT** - The next financial year it goes down by about \$200,000 to the 2027-28 year.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - And just while I'm finding that information, through the Premier, I'd comment that it is a very highly skilled workforce in the OPC. They will often have vacancies that they are seeking to recruit to, and they manage their salary savings to meet

operational efficiencies also, whilst they're training and looking for OPC-skilled people to join them.

**Mr HISCUTT** - And you've segued once again nicely into my next question. Last time we were here six months ago in Estimates there were three vacancies noted. I'm just wondering if we can have an update. Have they been filled or how many vacancies are currently with OPC?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question. So, OPC is, as I'm advised, 10.21 FTE - funded FTE - currently. OPC has six legislative drafters and four administrative officers, which is 9.16 FTE. It actually takes approximately seven years to train a legislative drafter to be able to work on moderately complex legislation with minimal supervision.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - National shortage.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And there's a national shortage, the secretary informs me, again. OPC currently has four vacancies for legislative drafters, from entry level drafters to more experienced drafters. Later this year, OPC will be attempting to recruit to fill these vacancies. However, as the secretary has stated, it is incredibly difficult to attract experienced drafters to this jurisdiction and the shortage across - a national shortage.

All legislative drafters must be admitted or eligible for admission to the legal profession to be able to work as legislative drafters. Each year, OPC works on approximately 40 to 100 bills per year and 100 to 250 subordinate instruments, as well as preparing parliamentary members for both houses of parliament. So they are very busy and do a great job.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes, so four vacancies, understanding the challenges with that, and that's an increase from last year. Is there any, I guess, governmental ability you can use to help assist that or is that just within that department? What are we doing to address, obviously, a declining - you know, an increasing number of vacancies in that area?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. Good question. And I'm informed that later this year OPC will be attempting to recruit to fill these vacancies.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And your question, though, is how could perhaps our central agency assist with that, potentially, of which - Kath.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Is there any extra support?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. I have regular catch-ups with Kate, our OPC. I'm aware that there is also quite a collegiate community of OPCs around Australia in terms of the recruitment and training. It is, from my experience as being a previous secretary of Justice in terms of the development of lawyers and admitted lawyers, I originally come in and think, 'Well, why can't we put a junior lawyer, just pop them in and see if we can convince them to be a legislative drafter?' It is quite an art and a very dedicated and specialist area. I do probably defer to the expertise of the OPC in working out how she can increase and fill those vacancies - but very happy to provide support as needed.

# PUBLIC

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes. Just so you can understand the concern that next year it would be unfortunate if it was five and then the year after six vacancies, that's just what I'm concerned about. But that's all right. You've taken that concern on board.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, and a fair enough concern as well.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Mr Hiscutt.

## **Output Group 2.3**

### State Service Employment and Management

**CHAIR** - If we could now move on to 2.3, State service employment management. And just a quick question with regard to this one. The document 'Managing Positions in the State Sector' from April 2026 requires agencies to report on implementation of workforce reductions. So, will those reports be made public with personal identifying information redacted, and will the government commit to a comprehensive update on savings delivery in the 2026-27 Revised Estimates Report?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. The government currently provides a regular report in relation to the level of FTEs and the establishment for agencies in the Tasmanian State Service. We're currently having a look at that reporting, noting earlier questions today in relation to composition of the cohort, in relation to the particular type of termination or separation, so certainly that's something that we can consider in terms of the increased number of TNVRs that are going to be contemplated for the 2026 calendar year. And, sorry, if I could just go to the second part, Chair, of your question.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Will the government commit to a comprehensive update on savings delivery in the 2026-27 Revised Estimates Report?

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through the Premier. I note that managing positions in the State Service does commit to a monthly report, which we will provide, so we'll be working with our State Service Management Office in relation to that. The matter of the Revised Estimates Report is one for the Treasurer, but certainly I'd be very happy to provide information to the Treasurer or release for the Premier as the employer in relation to that update at that time.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - But, yes, it's a matter for the Treasurer to consider for the revised estimates.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much. No further questions?

**Ms WEBB** - A quick suggestion in terms of the reporting on the separations as well as age and gender. I think regionality would be interesting to people.

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

**Output Group 3.2**

Management and Ongoing Development of Service Tasmania

**CHAIR** - If we could move to 4.3, Management of Ongoing Development of Service Tasmania. And I just have a couple of quick questions here. Just wondering, Premier, how are operational efficiencies at Service Tasmania being approached? Is there a plan to eliminate any positions? Are these backroom staff or people who are at service counters assisting people accessing their services? And have there been any voluntary redundancies put in place?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question, and as you, I know, would appreciate, Service Tasmania provides the Tasmanian community convenient access to a wide range of government services face-to-face at Service Tasmania's 27 service centres by phone, through the government contact centre, and indeed online through [www.service.tas.gov.au](http://www.service.tas.gov.au) and the myServiceTas digital portal.

Customers can access more than 500 services over the counter and over the phone and pay bills electronically online or by phone. Service Tasmania has a growing range of digital options, such as myServiceTas, allowing Tasmanians to access a personalised online account for selected government services in one place any time, anywhere. And, of course, we're committed to maintaining choice in how to access services, with the phone and face-to-face options remaining available.

Now, in 2026-27, to your question, funding is provided for one year to support the transition of Service Tasmania to a sustainable future funding model from 2027-28. Paid FTEs have decreased by 8.4 from 171.6 as at 31 March 2025 to 165.2 as at 31 March 26, and that relates to normal fluctuations in establishment between frontline staff recruitment intakes.

Additionally, Service Tasmania experiences regular and expected fluctuations in paid staffing due to the reporting method, meaning, in fact, that year-on-year comparisons are not necessarily indicative of staffing consistency. I do have some myServiceTas information.

**CHAIR** - Did you want to table those, Premier?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, I'd really like to. And that's from 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Some key highlights and the myServiceTas transaction: 171,319 vehicle renewals; 23,422 licence renewals; 89,355 unique accounts created; 6500 burn registrations; 6721 plates plus sign-ups; 794 fire permits. I will table that.

**CHAIR** - If you wanted to pass those, if you want to table those.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. I commend all the people who work at Service Tas. I see them both in a personal capacity and visited at a Service Tas not too far away more recently in an official capacity with respect to their service delivery, which was -

**CHAIR** - Okay. Thank you. So, you can guarantee that there'll always be a real person there, particularly with digitalisation of services? You know, there are some people with lower

digital literacy that do need to actually have a person to go and speak to, so you can guarantee that Service Tasmania will always actually have people there?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, because we're committed to choice in terms of how to access services with phone and face-to-face options remaining available, given some of the digital inclusion barriers that may well present people.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Thank you.

### **Output Group 1.1**

Support for Ministers and certain Parliamentary Office Holders

**CHAIR** - If we have no further questions from members on Service Tasmania, we'll move to 1.1, Premier. It's Ministerial and Parliamentary Support, and the first one is Support for Ministers and certain Parliamentary Office Holders. The question I'll just start with and then move to the member for Nelson: how many parliamentary cars are available now? I'm looking at 147; that's the Support for Ministers and certain Parliamentary Office Holders, and I believe it -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - You're talking about ministerial cars?

**CHAIR** - Ministerial cars. Ministerial cars and FTE of drivers. I've often found that's an interesting question. I haven't asked it for many years, but I can remember last time asking it of - I think it was Will Hodgman - and discovering that the leader at the time didn't have a car, which was an interesting announcement.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Right.

**CHAIR** - No, so just wondering how many cars we have in the ministerial fleet.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - He's always had a car. I'll seek that information for you in terms of number of cars and ministerial -

**CHAIR** - And FTEs of drivers. I'd just be interested.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - FTEs and pay tribute to the recent retirements in the -

**CHAIR** - Yes. The drivers do a wonderful job.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - ministerial drivers. I was texting my good friend and former ministerial driver Rex Bramich just last night and seeking an update on his welfare.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Rex had been there a very long time.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, since 2002. He started his job and I started my job.

**Ms WEBB** - He's retired, has he, Premier?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - He's retired.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Mr HISCUTT** - I came across him door-knocking, actually.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Did you?

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Very good. I'm sure he would've been very supportive, Casey. And others more recently as well. They do a very, very good job, all of them.

My advice is that driver FTEs are disclosed six-monthly.

**CHAIR** - Are you able to give me the figure? That's all right. Although, while you're finding that, I'll just ask on page 147, budget paper - I've lost the back page here - budget paper no. 2, bill no. 1, 2025-26, the budget, 24.473 million, I just notice the estimated outcome in 2025-26 is 28.187 million. I understand the next item you've mentioned earlier about the increase in the House. But I'm just wondering the increase here from \$24 million to \$28 million of \$4 million.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - My understanding is, that's election-related costs.

**CHAIR** - Obviously only for House of Assembly.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Yes, and people moving offices and the like, as I understand it, yes, I'm advised, and also -

**CHAIR** - When you say 'election', you mean the -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - House of Assembly.

**CHAIR** - Well, yes, but where they can actually claim back. Is that part of that or would that be under a different - ? No. So, this is purely offices, \$4 million?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And I understand also, to your previous question, that we have as of 31 March 14 FTE ministerial drivers.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Thank you. To just continue on the \$4 million, because the support for ministers and certain - it's just the Premier, the ministers, the Speaker of the House and the Leader of Government.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And I believe electorate office staff as well.

**Ms WEBB** - Ministerial.

**CHAIR** - It's only ministerial.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - That's part of MPS, isn't it?

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - It states in here, 'Support for Ministers ... This Output provides ... Premier; Ministers (including the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer); Speaker of the House of Assembly; and Leader of the Government ...'.

**Mr HISCUTT** - If I may just add to that question as well that the 2025-26 Budget we're reflecting was produced in November after the elections, and so therefore this is a change of \$4 million after that predicted amount. We knew what the election results were at the time this Budget was produced, so how are we out by \$4 million?

**CHAIR** - \$4 million just seems an awful lot. Didn't know we had that many new members or new ministers.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Explanation of major variations, output 1.1, Support for Ministers and certain Parliamentary Office Holders: 'The increase in appropriation revenue and associated expenses in the 2025-26 Estimated Outcome reflects estimated additional appropriation for salary and superannuation costs and payments for the settlement of employee entitlements following the 2025 State election.'

**CHAIR** - But it doesn't list employees here. It just says 'ministers'. You're telling me it actually includes the ministers' staff as well.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Support for ministers.

**Ms WEBB** - Could you provide a breakdown, obviously not identifying people by name or anything like that, but by position that accounts for that amount?

**CHAIR** - It's a large amount, \$4 million extra, in a budget and estimated outcome. That's all, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Ms Webb's asked us to provide a breakdown in that without naming names, et cetera, which is appropriate.

**CHAIR** - We certainly don't want any of that information, but just money-wise, when you actually read it, I think it's -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Best endeavours, we'll break it down.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much, Premier. Appreciate that. Do we have any other questions in this area? You do, Ms Webb.

**Ms WEBB** - I think it belongs in this area, Support for Ministers. Premier, I note that the most recent Code of Conduct for Ministers was dated October 2025, so October last year. Just a couple of questions around that: what's the process by which new members to Cabinet are made aware of the code of conduct?

Is there a form of ministerial induction where they're actually taken through it, or are they given it and left to their own devices to read it and become familiar with it? Following on from that, is there a formal follow-up to check that they have familiarised themselves with it and understand it?

# PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, as new ministers come in, there is a full induction program, if I can put it that way, for new ministers.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Then in terms of when a new version of the code of conduct is published, like this one is dated October last year, is there a set process by which existing Cabinet ministers are advised of the update and any revised elements of it, and a formal process by which they're required to advise that they've familiarised themselves with it and are up to date?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - To the best of my knowledge, yes, it goes through Cabinet, and any changes are highlighted where those changes are, and ministers are informed.

**Ms WEBB** - Okay, and it's taken at that stage they are familiarised with it?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. Are senior ministerial staff required to be familiar with the code and then any updates to the code?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - That's my understanding, yes.

**Ms WEBB** - Thank you. When I look at the code and look at section 9 of the current code, and it deals with misleading statements, which is pages 30 to 31, it's clause 9.7. It says, 'It's a Minister's personal responsibility to ensure that any inadvertent error is corrected or clarified, as soon as practicable and in a manner appropriate to the nature of the misinformation and the issues and interests involved.'

On that, Premier, given former minister Ogilvie's 20 November 2025 clarification that she provided still did not fully correct the record to the earlier statement she made on 17 November, in your role of custodian of the ministerial code of conduct, do you think those statements of Ms Ogilvie's complied with the spirit and intent of clause 9.7 of the ministerial code?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you for the question, and I'll refer you to Ms Ogilvie's statement and my statement following that.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Premier.

**Ms WEBB** - Just to be clear, Premier, though, in your formal capacity as head of Cabinet and government, do you consider that former minister Ogilvie breached the ministerial code when it comes to not misleading parliament as per part 9 of the ministerial code in relation to that clarification, which didn't arguably comply with the code in terms of sufficient clarification of misleading statements?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Ms Ogilvie is no longer a minister and is now on the back bench and taking responsibility, and I refer you to Ms Ogilvie's statement.

**Ms WEBB** - I'm asking for your position -

**Output Group 1.2**

Support for Members of the House of Assembly

**CHAIR** - If we could now move, if there are no further questions in this output, to 1.2 Support for Members of the House of Assembly. Mr Hiscutt.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you. I asked this question last year and revealed some interesting information, but could I ask what the total number of staff allocated to all members of parliament is in each area of parliament, i.e. minor parties, micro-parties, including members of the Legislative Council, and Independents? Secondly, what is the total number of staff they are entitled to? Happy for that to be taken on notice.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - If you're happy for that to be taken on notice, I'm more than happy to provide it to you.

**Mr HISCUTT** - Thank you very much for that. Just wanted to get an understanding, and this relates to the last output group as well, but between the 2025-26 and 2026-27 Budget Estimates, there seems to be only about a 3.7 per cent drop in the forwards for ministers or certain parliamentary office holders, and yet a full 12 per cent drop in support for members of the House of Assembly. Can you explain why there's such a difference in that drop, why one area is more or less affected than others?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Sorry, could you repeat that, please, Mr Hiscutt?

**Mr HISCUTT** - Yes, certainly. This is in budget paper 2, page 147. Have you got the advice there? You're happy to answer?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. My understanding is, and I'll seek further advice, and if I need to update the answer I will, but in the 2025 election, there would've been a better turnover of individual members of the House of Assembly, in which case - apparently I said 'better' turnover.

**CHAIR** - No, bigger.

**Mr HISCUTT** - No comment.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll say bigger turnover, just to clarify that, of members of the House of Assembly; therefore, the costs would be more when we've got new members of parliament, Prof. Razay and Mr George and Mr Di Falco and other members, whereas the ministerial changes were less.

**Mr HISCUTT** - So, it's due to the election outcome is why there's such a drop. Yes, okay. The timing of the election. That makes sense. Thank you. I just wanted to understand, in budget paper 3 on page 5, it just shows the reserved-by-law parliamentary salaries and allowances, and these continue to grow year on year.

However, as I understand last year, the report into parliamentary salaries, it actually only accounted for two years of growth, and then another report was going to be required and passed

## PUBLIC

through parliament. Is there an understanding of why that continues? Is there a policy direction for why that continues to grow?

**Ms WEBB** - Are you going to sort this out finally is the gist of the question.

**Mr HISCUTT** - That's the simple way of saying it. I was trying to say it slightly more sophisticatedly.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, and I didn't envisage that the TIC would take seven years to sort this out, frankly, but in terms of the answer to your question, do we need to sort it out? Yes, we do. That's your question, Ms Webb. My understanding is that the increases across the forward Estimates would just reflect the increases in -

**Mr HISCUTT** - I'm asking, is it a conscious decision that you expect that to happen, or is this just -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. The way it's budgeted out is just the process of budgeting out over the forward Estimates and recognising that we do need to sort this out.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Thank you, Premier.

**Mr HISCUTT** - I'll just, if I may, one more just on that same line item.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr HISCUTT** - I note that committee fees and travel allowances don't have any escalation on them. Is there any reason for them not including that, considering, for example, travel allowances, fuel's still going to increase, and if they don't take into account inflation, that will reflect a lessening allowance for work to be done in that space? Is there any reason for that not to include escalation?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I'll have to seek advice and get back to you for the reason for that one. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Take that question on notice? Thank you, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - It needs to be a very short question and a very short answer, Premier, if we could, because we have two line items to go.

**Ms WEBB** - This is one you can take on notice, anyway. There's a bit of detail. Are all ministerial electorate offices and government member and other electorate offices disability-compliant, or can you give us a breakdown of which are and which aren't disability-compliant? Any that have done change of use to be refitted out in recent years, have they complied with disability requirements?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I would hope and expect so in terms of refurbishments, although I couldn't guarantee that.

# PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - You would take that on notice, Premier, because it sounds like something you won't possibly be able to answer now about every electorate office.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, except they should be.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Well and truly. And also they should be, occupational health and safety-wise, safe for employees. And so, when we speak about these matters publicly - and often, individual MPs are in the limelight or the gun in terms of office expenses and the like, but from my point of view, the people at the front line of electoral offices are the ones who bear the brunt of people and constituents coming in. Most are very respectful, as you well realise, and others can be more heightened in their anxiety around certain matters.

**CHAIR** - Upset.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - So, safety is absolutely paramount, but also disability - safety for staff is absolutely paramount, but also accessibility is paramount for constituents who come through the doors of every electorate office.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Premier. So, you'll take the question on notice for the member for Nelson with regard to offices being disability friendly?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, I will.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Happy to do so. It's very important.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

## DIVISION 6

### Office of the Governor

#### Output Group 1.1

##### Support for the Governor

**CHAIR** - If we could move to 1.1, Support for the Governor. Mr Gaffney.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Thank you. I won't take very long with this. I'd like to thank Her Excellency Barbara Baker for her hard work and congratulate Caroline Wells, who will be our next governor, and also the government for selecting a capable person from a health background. I think that's really good.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Very proud of the appointment.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Yes. It was interesting, the support. Noting the previous year's description of the budget initiative, additional support for the Governor's program said, 'Additional funding is provided for staffing, insurance, travel and transport costs to support the

## PUBLIC

Governor's program and costs associated with the development and introduction of an appropriate governance structure and policies. Has the development and introduction of an appropriate governance structure and policy been successful and how is this measured?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. And I welcome Mr David Hughes to the table and I'm happy and encourage your dialogue with Mr Hughes. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Yes.

**Mr HUGHES** - Through you, Premier. Mr Gaffney, that governance work has been ongoing. We are not fully across and are not fully completed with the governance work. That is largely a result of the fact that the governance procedures and policies that were in place about two years ago were completely out of date or were non-existent, and so we prioritised a series of those policies. The first one that was put into place was the child and youth safe framework that was required as an outcome from the commission of inquiry.

We've implemented work health and safety as another significant piece of policy work. The work is now progressing on to performance management and other human resources policies that will bring us into compliance with legislative and regulatory requirements over time, but that body of work is ongoing and will take us a number of years.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Thank you. It looks as though the funding for that finishes in 2026-27. So, you're expected to have that work completed by the end of this financial year, or will you have to go back asking for more funding?

**Mr HUGHES** - That work will continue. We will simply be looking at attempting to roll that into other work as we go along.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. Thank you. And while you're at the table, quite a significant amount of money has been put through to the roof construction for Government House, and that was supposed to be started in May this year. I'm just wondering, is that on track? And it's started?

**Mr HUGHES** - Through you, Premier. The work has started. There was work that was initially done on two pieces. The big towers had lead work put onto those. There was a significant risk that had been identified due to leakage; that was on the internal component of the roof. And as a result of our risk assessment, we decided to re-sequence some of the work so that we would prioritise that internal lead component over the slate component.

That decision was validated recently during a rain event where a piece of ceiling fell down. And so the work that has been done on that lead roof has already started on the interior components as well.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay.

**Mr HUGHES** - We're about a month into that, and we have about another two months until that component is completed.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - And the total budget for the roof?

# PUBLIC

**Mr HUGHES** - It's just on \$7 million.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Okay. So it's on time, on budget, final cost, and not one red cent more?

**Mr HUGHES** - Not on time as it currently stands because of the fact that it's a 170-year-old building and there were no building specifications. When we opened up various areas, we found that some of the underlying structure was not what we expected, and so engineering reports needed to be completed for that. We also had assurances from the Hobart City Council that that internal lead roof component would be fine if it was replaced like for like.

But we found that the sumps in that area were nowhere near sufficient for the types of intensity of rain that we're seeing now. So, before we could start this lead component, we had to get an engineering solution which was compliant. And so we are behind time, but for everything that we've completed to date and for the works that are currently underway, we remain on budget.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - And I congratulate the government because it's one of our most significant buildings that should be protected forever. So, well done.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Thank you. Enormous heritage value. And Mr Hughes, of course, is the official Secretary to Her Excellency.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you, David.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Mr Hughes.

## **DIVISION 1 Brand Tasmania**

### **Output Group 1.1 Brand Tasmania**

**CHAIR** - If we now move on, Premier, to 1.1, Brand Tasmania.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Excellent.

**CHAIR** - Do you want to bring anyone to the table?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, I would like to request that Jess Radford come to the table, please.

**CHAIR** - Yes. I can see Jess on her way. Welcome, Jess.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And I'm very proud of Brand Tasmania and all they achieve and continue to achieve. And, of course, I can table about Brand Tasmania 2025-26 for your interest, Chair.

**CHAIR** - That would be great. Thank you very much.

## PUBLIC

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - They do wonderful work, continue to do wonderful work, capably led by Ms Radford. And if there are any questions, I'm more than happy for Ms Radford to take them.

**CHAIR** - Yes. Thank you. Premier, in April 2026, the government announced that Brand Tasmania would be brought together with Tourism, Events and Creative Industries under the Building Tasmania reforms. So, what will Brand Tasmania's governance and reporting arrangements be under the new structure? And how will you ensure its specialist brand stewardship role is not diluted?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Well, thank you for the question. And of course, the 2026-27 budget allocation is \$2.106 million. And in 2026-27 Brand Tasmania will be looking carefully at where it directs its efforts to ensure its core assets and projects are sustainably resourced and aligned with broader goals and opportunities now and into the future. The corporate plan of 2026-27 will be finalised later this month, I'm advised. I'm expecting to set out a very clear turning point in Brand Tasmania's evolution.

What we will see, though, is that through Brand Tasmania, the Tasmanian government is proactively delivering outcomes for Tasmanians by supporting business growth, contributing to a stronger economy and fostering connected, resilient and caring communities, and that's why Brand Tasmania is so very important, Chair. And it's why it will be a key component of the proposed new and enhanced Tourism, Events and Creative Tasmania. And I know the Brand Tasmania team are ready to contribute the expertise and insights to making this upcoming change as seamless and positive as possible.

I also know that Brand Tas's focus remains firmly on unlocking greater value from the foundations it has built over the past seven years. And it's fair to say, of course, the organisation has a very clear understanding of where its work creates the greatest impact and where the next stage of growth is.

And so I look forward to seeing how Brand Tas contributes to the collective efforts underway to meet Tasmania's challenges head on, and indeed the important work it does to evaluate the industries and opportunities that represent our future and reinforce the different ways the Tasmanian brand acts as what is critical social and economic infrastructure for the state.

On machinery of government change in terms of operational matters, I can hand to secretary Ms Morgan-Wicks, or indeed for matters pertaining to Brand Tasmania directly, Ms Radford would be more than enthusiastically willing to contribute to the discussion.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Premier. The budget papers state that Brand Tasmania's operational efficiencies will be achieved through vacancy control management measures and efficiencies arising from restructuring project funding. So, what specific staffing, project or program changes sit behind those efficiencies, and will they affect Brand Tasmania's capacity to deliver its core work?

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes, I'm not anticipating that, but like all agencies, it is required to find operational efficiencies. In 2026-27, these efficiencies will total \$136,000. In 2027-28 the total is \$148,000. 2028-29 and 2029-30 the total is \$152,000 per annum. As you have correctly

## PUBLIC

stated, these efficiencies will be achieved through combination of vacancy control management measures and efficiencies arising from restructuring project funding.

But I do want to commend Brand Tasmania for what they have achieved and what they continue to achieve, which is significant. I'm mindful of the fact that Brand Tasmania currently has 5.9 FTE. This will decrease to 4.9 FTE on 1 July, and so this reduction in FTE headcount is part of the Brand Tasmania savings strategy.

You know, in terms of punching above its scale, Brand Tasmania does a fantastic job with a limited number of FTE, which is why the machinery of government changes can provide, if you like, additional resources through an overarching entity, if I can call it that, and Ms Morgan-Wicks would perhaps like to explain that.

**Ms MORGAN-WICKS** - Through you, Premier. The Brand Tasmania amalgamation into the new Tourism, Events and Creative Tasmania entity is currently scheduled for December of this year, so noting again my comments about the budget papers reflecting today's events.

We obviously have a Brand Tasmania chapter, but that will change in the next budget by moving what is a small but mighty entity in terms of the Tasmanian government's decision to bring together and to try and achieve the synergies between people who are working across both brand, our destination economy, our significant events pipeline, but housing this specialty so that it can focus on the specialisation but not also have to provide its own audited financial statements, all of its own administrative support, et cetera, that can be provided within a larger entity, and probably, also from an organisational structure perspective, that greater support and collaboration amongst a larger number of staff. It's not to interrupt.

And certainly in all of my conversation with, for example, the chair of Brand Tasmania, Kath McCann, the work that they are doing - and I only reflect on the excellent work that I was just speaking to Jess about, actually, in the break, the work that they've done on the new Jobs Tasmania, website which has just been launched, so meaningful work in a meaningful place.

It's been some excellent work that's built on what Brand Tas has done with the Department of Health. But Jess is the one to probably speak more to that. But it's trying to shift a small and powerful unit into something part of even bigger and greater, but to get that support around it so that it can focus on its specialist work in brand.

**CHAIR** - Through you, Premier, did Jess have some comment to make?

**Ms RADFORD** - Only to reflect that, as the impact of the machinery of government change will come to us later in the year, there's a sequence to these conversations. We're, like, in the early stages at this point of understanding what that exactly looks like for us.

But we have extremely close relationships with all of the colleagues who are going to be part of our bigger family, and in fact, just last week we ran a Reconciliation Week event for teams across Brand Tasmania and Tourism Tasmania because we're really keen to start building the culture that will continue in our new entity. So we're looking for all of those opportunities to partner right now to start to create the atmosphere that we want to continue into the future.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - How many do we have on the board of Brand Tasmania? You mentioned the chair. Just wondering how many on the board and just trying to -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - We have on the board currently one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine -

**Ms RADFORD** - Premier, if I may, through you -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Ten, eleven.

**Ms RADFORD** - Eleven.

**CHAIR** - Eleven.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Got there in the end. One has stepped down, I understand.

**CHAIR** - Can you just give me a reasonable breakdown? Are they Tasmanian, from interstate?

**Ms RADFORD** - I'm happy to do that through you, Premier, if you like.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Ms RADFORD** - We have 11 members appointed to the board at the moment. We have one from the north-west and we have two from the north and the remainder are from the south, and that proportionally kind of represents the breakdown of applications received when we advertised these positions, which must have been towards the end of 2024.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - I would assume, Premier, that you would try to have equal representation across the state.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Well, it's -

**CHAIR** - I know. I understand geographical, or taking a -

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Geographical distribution is important. Skills-based is important as well.

**CHAIR** - One from the north-west, two from the north, eight from the south. I shouldn't be parochial here, but I know that often southern Tasmania tends to think that it is superior to the rest of the state but, you know, I believe that we should have equal -

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Coming from the north-west, they don't have that same point of view. I think it's the people who should be able to do the job, wherever they're from.

## PUBLIC

**CHAIR** - Well, maybe they should, but I still believe that, you know, eight from the south - I would ask, I guess, when board appointments are made, that there is extra effort in trying to get more representation from other parts of the state.

**Mr GAFFNEY** - Six have probably driven down from north-west and live down here now.

**CHAIR** - Perhaps that's the case, but I make no apology for being parochial, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I take your point - as much as I detest parochialism, which has held this state back for a hundred more years, at least.

**CHAIR** - And that's a matter of opinion.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - I take your point.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. Look, I do appreciate it, but it is always an issue that I'm often concerned about, the fact that, you know, representation across the state and all the boards tends to be not equal representation, and I think in something that represents Tasmania and the brand, it would be really good to make a real endeavour to actually try to have a little more equal representation. I do accept that, Jeremy, you might have more in the south, but I think eight, two and one is a very unbalanced representation.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. The skills matrix is the most important, but -

**CHAIR** - And, look, I appreciate that, but we do have good people in the north and north-west.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - We do need to consider in these things geographical spread.

**CHAIR** - But I do appreciate that there are good people in other parts of the state, so thank you.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you. I feel relieved about that, being from the north-west coast.

**CHAIR** - Well, being from the north-west yourself, Premier.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Yes. Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Look, thank you very much. There are no burning questions, and it is almost 1.15 p.m. We really appreciate you being here today answering questions as candidly as possible.

**Ms WEBB** - Hold on, we don't know that yet. [inaudible] we'll find out.

**CHAIR** - Well, I appreciate the effort by the Premier and his team, so thank you very much.

## **PUBLIC**

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - And I appreciate your efforts, Chair, and that of the committee, and I very much appreciate the efforts of the Department of Premier and Cabinet and all associated people and infrastructure and my team.

**CHAIR** - Thank you. We will return at 2.15 p.m. If we could stop broadcast, please.

**Mr ROCKLIFF** - Thank you very much.

**The committee suspended from 1.14 p.m. to 2.15 p.m.**