

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Ms MONAGLE
Committee member:	Mr RIORDAN
Page/s of transcript:	8

Question:

Mr RIORDAN: So, in light of now what we know—that you cannot necessarily believe everything you read that they fill in on the forms—**have you given any further grants to either Victorian Trades Hall Council or the Migrant Workers Centre following this revelation?**

Ms MONAGLE: There is a funding agreement that ends—I will just check—on 15 March. So there is a funding agreement that goes to the 15 March, but that is with the Migrant Workers Centre.

Mr RIORDAN: **And how much is that?**

Ms MONAGLE: I might have to take that on notice, sorry.

Answer:

The Department of Premier and Cabinet's (DPC) current funding agreement with Migrant Workers Centre Inc. commenced on 23 April 2018. It was varied on 30 December 2020 to extend the end date to 15 March 2021. The total amount provided through the current agreement to Migrant Workers Centre Inc. since its commencement is \$3.384 million.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Ms MONAGLE
Committee member:	Ms VALLENCE
Page/s of transcript:	9

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: I notice budget paper 3, page 98, refers to funding for 11 scout halls. How were these 11 scout halls selected? Can you provide to the committee the criteria and how they were selected?

Mr MOULE: Thank you, Ms Vallence. I will ask Deputy Secretary Monagle to respond to that question. Thank you.

Ms MONAGLE: Just to confirm, Ms Vallence, that was about how the original 11 were identified?

Ms VALLENCE: That is right, yes, in the 2019–20 year.

Ms MONAGLE: In the 2019–20 year. The actual detail of how they were identified I would have to take on notice, but I can take you through those 11 if you would like.

Ms VALLENCE: Oh, no, well, they are clearly stated in the budget. The 11 are listed in the budget, so I have already seen those. **So you will take on notice in terms of the selection process—**

Ms MONAGLE: I will, yes.

Ms VALLENCE: **And how they were selected?**

Ms MONAGLE: Yes.

Ms VALLENCE: **Can you explain also why 10 of the 11 are located in Labor-held electorates?**

Ms MONAGLE: As I just said, I will take it on notice in terms of why they were identified.

Ms VALLENCE: Yes.

Ms MONAGLE: I know that the program is being delivered with Scouts Victoria—it is a partnership—and we would also need to talk to Scouts Victoria about how they prioritise these as well.

Ms VALLENCE: Yes, sure. **And in terms of that selection and what advice you provided to the minister in relation to these scout halls, can I get that on notice?**

Ms MONAGLE: We would have to refer that back to the Department of Health and Human Services. The youth portfolio was sitting with them at that time.

The CHAIR: Again, that question could have been asked of the Department of Health, and I would remind the member not to politicise her questions to the public service.

Ms VALLENCE: It is under the youth portfolio.

Ms MONAGLE: That is correct. It is just that at that time, though, the youth portfolio sat with the Department of Health and Human Services, so we will just have to go back and go through them.

Ms VALLENCE: Right. Okay. There was \$1.4 million allocated in 2019–20. How much was spent at 30 June?

Ms MONAGLE: All of the funding has been allocated to Scouts Victoria, who are delivering the project.

Ms VALLENCE: Sorry, could you repeat that?

Ms MONAGLE: Scouts Victoria is delivering the project, so the funding has been allocated to them to deliver.

Ms VALLENCE: **So the full \$1.4 million has been expended at 30 June?**

Ms MONAGLE: I would have to confirm that with Scouts Victoria.

Ms VALLENCE: If you could. Well, at least, has it been paid by you to Scouts Victoria?

Ms MONAGLE: That is correct, yes.

Answer:

During the 2018 election, the Victorian Government committed \$5.5 million over four years (2019–20 to 2022–23) to build, upgrade or refurbish a number of Scout halls across Victoria. At that time the Government publicly announced 11 sites to share in funding of \$3.2 million.

The selection of the announced Scout halls is consistent with the priorities identified by Scouts Victoria in its “Building the Resources for Victoria’s Future Leaders” plan. The plan details a number of high priority sites for building new Scout halls and halls requiring major and minor refurbishment building works.

DPC provided the full budget allocation of \$1.4 million to Scouts Victoria in 2019–20 to commence delivery of the election commitment.

In November 2020, the Minister for Youth announced a further eight Scout halls to receive funding as part of the \$5.5 million commitment, which took the total number of announced scout hall projects to 19:

- 1st Avoca Scout Hall
- 1st Ballan Scout Hall
- 1st Baranduda Scout Hall
- 1st Bayswater Scout Hall
- 4th Caulfield Scout Hall
- 1st Cranbourne Scout Hall
- Epping North Scout Hall
- 1st Healesville Scout Hall
- 1st Ivanhoe Sea Scout Hall
- 10th Ivanhoe Scout Hall
- 1st Koo Wee Rup Scout Hall
- 1st Mount Evelyn Scout Hall
- Scout hall in Narre Warren South
- Pakenham Lakeside Scout Hall
- Scout hall in Port Melbourne
- 1st South Frankston Scout Hall
- 1st Strathfieldsaye Scout Hall
- 1st Upwey Scout Hall
- 2nd Woodend Scout Hall

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Mr HIBBINS
Page of transcript:	13

Question:

Mr HIBBINS: I think in your opening remarks you gave some figures in relation to the exchange, . . . **how many public servants have actually been successfully placed through the job exchange?**

Mr MOULE: I am happy to take that on notice.

Mr HIBBINS: **And how many public servants—in relation to the savings initiatives—who may have lost their jobs or work not continued through savings initiatives in 2019–20—would you have the figure of how many of those public servants have been successfully placed through the jobs exchange?**

Mr MOULE: So you are referring to savings requirements of departments that are already embedded in budgets passed flowing through; is it?

Mr HIBBINS: Yes.

Mr MOULE: I do not have that information at hand, but we could take that on notice.

Answer:

At 30 June, the Jobs and Skills Exchange (JSE) tracked data including the number of Victorian Public Service jobs advertised and the number of applications received through the JSE. It did not hold comprehensive job placement data. Hiring decisions are made at a departmental level.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr ADA
Committee member	Mr HIBBINS
Pages of transcript	13–14

Question:

Mr HIBBINS: . . . in previous budget years, or even in the previous term, there was a forestry task force that was managed by DPC. My understanding is its work has concluded. Does DPC now have any involvement within the forestry industry?

Mr ADA: Mr Hibbins, thanks for your question. DPC has been working closely with relevant departments over the course of the last couple of years, particularly in the development of the *Victorian Forestry Plan* that was announced by the government in late 2019 and more recently over the course of the last nine months with regard to a code review that was announced by the government in the middle of last year.

Mr HIBBINS: **The forestry plan was announced in 2019–20, but the task force ceased its work, in my understanding, or was no longer continuing, I think, in 2016. Is there a connection between the two bodies of work?**

Mr ADA: Mr Hibbins, the work of the task force to some extent predated my time in DPC. I might have to take that specific question on notice. But just to make the point, DPC did work closely with departments with regard to the formulation of the *Victorian Forestry Plan* and again has worked in a formal sense with other departments over the course of the last nine months with regard to the code review. With regard to the interrelationship between the task force you mentioned and that work, perhaps I could take that on notice.

Answer:

DPC provided administrative support to the Forestry Industry Taskforce, an independent body that brought together industry, unions and environmental organisations. The Taskforce concluded its work in 2017, ultimately not reaching a consensus on a plan for the future of Victoria’s forests and forest industries.

DPC and relevant departments contributed to the development of the *Victorian Forestry Plan*. This continued the government’s broader work to find a sustainable future for the forestry industry.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Mr O'BRIEN
Page of transcript:	14

Question:

Mr D O'BRIEN: Secretary, can I just begin—the department let a contract that started on 31 January last year for \$905 000 for Givit, the not-for-profit donations broker, I guess you would call them. It is described as for 'End-to-end management and coordination of individual and corporate donations associated with disaster and emergency recovery Victoria'. **Could you provide some information on what that actually was? Was that the bushfire fund?**

Mr MOULE: Excuse me. Are you referring to an item specifically in the questionnaire, or just not—

Mr D O'BRIEN: No, it is a contract on the government contracts website—Department of Premier and Cabinet, \$905 407. It is a two-year contract. There is a number on it, a contract number—DPC19-20-149—if that helps. I just wanted to get an idea of what it was for and what they are doing and whether it was perhaps related to the government taking over the bushfire donations fund.

Mr MOULE: We may need to take that on notice, Mr O'Brien. We cannot seem to find at hand material related to that. But we are happy to take any questions on that.

Mr D O'BRIEN: Okay, **could you provide a bit more detail on it, including a breakdown of what the contract actually involves, what services they are providing and what sort of money they are managing, so for nearly a million dollars, was it managing \$5 million donations or was it 100? And was there was a tender process as well for that?**

Answer:

Bushfire Recovery Victoria entered into a services contract with Givit Listed Ltd on 31 January 2020 for a two-year period, with a total contract value of \$905,407. The engagement was actioned under critical incident procurement processes, in line with the provision set out in the Victorian Government Purchasing Board's governance policy.

This contract does not apply to the administration of the Victorian Bushfire Donations Fund.

Givit, on behalf of Bushfire Recovery Victoria, coordinates and manages the offers of goods and services (donations) made to bushfire affected communities through a sophisticated online donation management platform (the Givit platform). Givit works with local councils, charities and community groups to match and distribute the donations. As part of this engagement, Givit has created a tailored page for Victoria on their platform and has employed two staff to work in the eastern part of Victoria. These staff costs form most of the contracted expenditure.

To date, Givit has worked with 40 charities and local organisations to support recovery needs by ensuring more than 16,000 donations have been received and distributed into bushfire affected communities in Eastern Victoria. Through the Givit platform, Givit has provided power tools, water tanks, vouchers towards equipment, food, fuel and items for schools. Givit has also furnished more than 30 modular homes provided by Bushfire Recovery Victoria to families who lost their home.

Givit's platform and on ground presence helps reduce the burden of managing such large volumes of donations by local services and also reduces the volume of goods which may not be utilised and sent to landfill.

Givit is contracted to continue providing these services until January 2022.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr O'CONNOR
Committee member:	Mr O'BRIEN
Page/s of transcript:	15 – 16

Question:

Mr D O'BRIEN: Okay. Can I just move to some enterprise bargaining questions, so perhaps Mr O'Connor: **In relation to major EBAs for 2019–20, can you provide a list of the annual pay increases agreed to under the various EBAs that the central bargaining unit has been involved in that were settled in 2019–20?**

Mr O'CONNOR: We can take that on notice, Mr O'Brien. We are happy to provide that, as usual.

...

Mr D O'BRIEN: What percentage of public sector wage agreements complied with the government's enterprise bargaining framework for 2019–20?

Mr O'CONNOR: All of them, as far as I am aware, Mr O'Brien.

Mr D O'BRIEN: 100 per cent?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Mr D O'BRIEN: Okay. **Did any of them only comply with the framework because ERC approved a variation from wages policy, and if so, which agreements?**

Mr O'CONNOR: I would have to take that on notice, but I am not aware of any falling in within that category. I am obviously not able to talk about cabinet deliberations.

Mr D O'BRIEN: No. So as far as you are aware, though—well, not as far as you are aware; you are the man—did all EBAs comply with the wages policy?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Mr D O'BRIEN: Okay. Can I ask: **which EBAs, for the full final year aggregate costs of that, are higher than the offsets for that EBA so as to create a net cost to the government that is likely to continue beyond the EBA period? Were there any of those?**

Mr O'CONNOR: I am not quite sure what your question is there, Mr O'Brien, in the sense that obviously the agreements are assessed by Treasury and Finance for financial viability and sustainability, and all of the agreements will have passed that test—but I am not sure whether that answers your question or not.

Mr D O'BRIEN: Well, I guess, **looking at the, as I said, the final year aggregate costs, if there is any increase in those costs, whether they are offset by departments or are there any where they were not?**

Mr O'CONNOR: Again, I am not aware immediately of whether any fall into that category, but I might have to take that on notice.

Mr D O'BRIEN: Can I ask you to check that on notice?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Answer:

Major Agreements approved by the Victorian Government in 2019–20 were:

Name of Agreement	Nominal Expiry of this Agreement	Annual Salary Increases
Victoria Police (Police Officers, Protective Services Officers, Police Reservists and Police Recruits) Enterprise Agreement 2019	30 Nov 2023	Average salary increase of 2.0% p.a. 01/01/2020- 1.5% 01/07/2020- 1.5% 01/07/2021- 1.5% 01/07/2022- 2.0% 01/07/2023- 1.5%

In order to comply with Wages Policy all proposed enterprise agreements must be fiscally sustainable and fully funded from capped indexation, revenue or have appropriate costs offsets, which do not create a net cost to the government. All agreements approved by government complied with Wages Policy. Where there are other obligations or commitments including legislative requirements (e.g. superannuation guarantee increase), these do not contribute to the Wages Policy calculation.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness	Mr O'CONNOR
Committee member	Mr O'BRIEN
Pages of transcript	15 – 16

Question:

Mr D O'BRIEN: The portable long service leave scheme for 2019 set a target for workers registered of \$75 000—that is on budget paper 3, page 303, of the 2019–20 budget—and as stated that 'reflects the total number of estimated eligible workers under the scheme'. But the outcome in this year's budget papers showed that there were 114 000 registered workers for the portable long service scheme. So the question I have is: **was the original target wrong and the estimate of who would actually be eligible to be registered, or is the authority registering workers outside the industries that were supposed to be covered?**

Mr O'CONNOR: No. Look, I think the original target would have been an estimation of what we thought would be achievable within the time period. If it has been exceeded, that would be in recognition of the processes that we have put in place. The original estimate was not based on estimating the total number of workers that would be eligible for the scheme; it was more linked to the time period within which we would have to register them.

Mr D O'BRIEN: Well, like I said, the actual note in the budget papers says it 'reflects the total number of estimated eligible workers under the scheme'.

Mr O'CONNOR: In relation to the 75 000?

Mr D O'BRIEN: Yes.

Mr O'CONNOR: Well, I will have to take that on notice, but I think my understanding was that we were setting a target based upon the time frame within which the authority would be up and running. We never contemplated that we would be registering every worker within the three sectors in that first year.

Answer:

The 2019–20 Budget Paper 3 (BP3) estimate of 75,000 employees registered for the scheme was a conservative estimate based on:

- the scheme being the first of its type in Victoria (other than CoINVEST, the construction industry portable long service leave scheme)
- uncertainty regarding the actual number of employers and employees who may have been eligible for the scheme
- advice from similar schemes in other jurisdictions, where experience indicated that take-up was gradual rather than immediate.

The Portable Long Service Leave Authority (PLSA) exceeded its 2019–20 target, because it was successful in registering eligible employers. Although employees can apply to be registered, the primary responsibility for registering employees under the legislation rests with the employer.

The PLSA has only registered eligible employers and employees, based on the information provided by employers. In doing so, it exceeded its first year of operation target.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness	Mr MOULE
Committee member	Mr O'BRIEN
Page of transcript	17

Question:

Mr D O'BRIEN: That dovetails neatly with what I was coming to. The 691 to 1471 is nearly a 100 per cent increase. What KPIs of government have improved in proportion with that increase in executives, given, as you have just said, about a 45 per cent total employment increase in the VPS and a 45 per cent increase in government output but yet nearly a 100 per cent increase in executives? So what have we got for that?

Mr MOULE: So I think the first thing that I would reflect on, and **I am happy to provide you more precise information on this**, Mr O'Brien, is that there was a process undertaken where a category of the VPS—senior technical specialists, sometimes referred to as VPS7—over a period of time prior to and including the terms of this current government had been used almost to create quasi-executives who might have otherwise not fit the pure definition of a senior technical specialist, who are employed not to manage large groups or large projects but because of their expertise. At one point in the period of time that you are referring to **there was an uplift as a result of reclassification of those individuals to their correct classification, so I think that has contributed to the number.**

Mr D O'BRIEN: So they were changed from VPS 7 to executive level?

Mr MOULE: Yes. They were reclassified, because the nature of their jobs meant that they should be. **I am happy to provide you the data on that change.** And then I think in terms of the broader growth, it is reflective of the government's agenda and its investment in new projects and activities.

Answer:

In July 2015 the Premier directed the Victorian Public Sector Commission (VPSC) to review Victoria's executive officer employment and remuneration framework. The review and subsequent summary report (published in August 2016) found that the former Executive Officer envelope caps had resulted in the Senior Technical Specialist (STS) classification being used in lieu of new Executive roles.

The VPSC recommended that the envelope be removed and the STS classification no longer be used for Executive equivalent roles.

In response to the report, departments have steadily worked to convert STS roles to Executive positions where appropriate. In DPC, this has resulted in 19 roles being reclassified to Executive positions.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Mr O'BRIEN
Page of transcript:	17

Question:

Mr D O'BRIEN: Can I ask—on notice if you do not have it—what the average salary of an executive in the department was for 2019–20?

Mr MOULE: In the Department of Premier and Cabinet specifically?

Mr D O'BRIEN: Yes.

Mr MOULE: Yes, we can provide that.

Answer:

The average DPC Executive salary (total remuneration package) of those employed as at 30 June 2020 was \$236,388, which is in line with the median salary for the whole of the VPS of \$235,000.

This figure includes all Department of Premier and Cabinet Core executives, excluding the Secretary.

VPS Executives remuneration is inclusive of superannuation.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Mr O'BRIEN
Pages of transcript:	17–18

Question:

Mr D O'BRIEN: Can I move on to ministerial offices. For 2019–20 could you provide for us for each quarter the number of ministerial staff in each office, including the Premier's private office?

Mr MOULE: Yes, insofar as we are able to do that, we can.

...

Mr D O'BRIEN: Right. Okay. Are you able to tell me how many staff were in the Premier's private office as at 30 June?

Mr MOULE: Yes, we are.

Mr D O'BRIEN: Now, or not?

Mr MOULE: I do not have that figure with me, but we will be able to provide that.

Mr D O'BRIEN: Can I get that information, as I said, as best you can for all ministerial staff? Is it possible also to get the staff numbers broken down by job title? So, for example, if we find out there are 100 staff in the PPO, there is a chief of staff, four deputy chiefs of staff, whatever—obviously not their names, just the titles, if that is possible, please.

Mr MOULE: Yes. I think we should have access to some delineation within the payroll system that allows us to do that.

Answer:

There were 286.63 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) ministerial staff employed as at June 2020, comprising 86.90 FTE staff employed in the Premier's Private Office and 199.73 FTE staff employed in other ministerial offices.

The following table shows a breakdown of ministerial staff across all ministerial offices:

Ministerial Office	Total FTE Staff
Premier's Private Office	86.90
Deputy Premier Merlino	12.40
Minister Pulford	8.60
Minister Pallas	13.80
Minister Allan	13.40
Minister Donnellan	9.00
Minister Foley	8.60
Minister Hennessy	11.00
Minister Tierney	6.00
Minister Mikakos	11.90
Minister Pakula	12.00
Minister Scott	6.00
Minister Wynne	10.80
Minister Neville	10.63
Minister D'Ambrosio	9.00
Minister Kairouz	6.60
Cabinet Secretary	1.00
Minister Carroll	8.00
Minister Horne	7.00
Minister Somyurek	6.00
Minister Williams	9.00
Minister Symes	11.00
Minister Spence	8.00
Total FTE Staff	286.63

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Mr LIMBRICK
Page of transcript:	21

Question:

Mr LIMBRICK: I would like to just pick up firstly some of the points that you were raising previously around the Staying Apart Keeps Us Together campaign that you were running. What was the total cost that was paid out in advertising fees during that campaign?

Mr MOULE: . . .For the Staying Apart Keeps Us Together campaign, for the period within 2019–20, the cost of the campaign from 1 May to 30 June was \$6.31 million. This included \$4.54 million in advertising costs, and the balance was for the creative material and the agency that was leading the campaign.

Mr LIMBRICK: Thank you. And with those advertising costs, what was the break-up of media types? I think you said 4 point—sorry, what was it?

Mr MOULE: The media buy itself was \$4.54 million.

Mr LIMBRICK: Yes. And do you know what types of media that was broken up between? I know that there was some stuff on radio and social media and television and bus shelters and all those sorts of things.

Mr MOULE: In terms of the channels used, it was probably one of the broadest campaigns the government would have run. I do not have the entire breakdown here. Some of that material would be in our annual report, but otherwise I am happy to provide what we have on notice.

Answer:

All available paid media channels were utilised for the campaign, including channels where there were opportunities to have in-language materials for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse audiences, e.g. press, radio, digital display, social media and video. The breakdown of spend across those channels for the period of May–June 2020 is listed below.

Channel	Percentage of total spend (May–June 2020)
Press (incl. CALD and Regional)	27.4%
Television	21.2%
Out of Home	18.3%
Radio	17.4%
Digital Display	7.4%
Social Media	3.9%
Online Search	2.9%
Video	1.5%

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness	Mr ADA
Committee member	Mr LIMBRICK
Page of transcript	23

Question:

Mr LIMBRICK: Thank you. A couple of other things unrelated to that, in budget paper 3 on page 320 there are a couple of performance measures that I am interested in learning a bit more about. Firstly, there is one saying the jobs resulting from government facilitation services **under the Victorian Jobs and Investment Fund, and it says that there are 474 jobs created during the 2019–20 financial year. How much money was expended to create those jobs?**

Mr ADA: Thanks, Mr Limbrick, for the question. The Victorian Jobs and Investment Fund was established in the 2019–20 budget. As you point out, the output measures fell well short of the target in 2019–20. That was for a number of reasons. There was some reprioritisation out of the fund to a number of urgent bushfire projects in eastern Victoria that did not contribute to new jobs growth or capital investment. That was a particular reason why the actual performance fell short of the target.

Mr LIMBRICK: Yes, I am aware of the reason it states in the budget paper, but my question is: **how much money was expended for those 474 jobs?**

Mr ADA: I think probably the best thing to do is to take that question on notice and provide that breakdown for you, Mr Limbrick.

Answer:

In 2019–20, \$4,106,500 million in Victorian Jobs and Investment Fund (VJIF) funding was allocated to contracted projects that generated 474 new ongoing FTE positions.

Beyond this, a significant portion of VJIF funding was allocated in 2019–20 to bushfire recovery projects and to other projects that supported the retention of Victorian jobs.

Further significant VJIF funding in 2019–20 was committed to numerous investment projects which were finalised in 2020–21. The jobs and capital expenditure outcomes arising from these projects will be claimed (and reported on) in 2021–22, as the year in which the grant agreements were formally executed.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Mr LIMBRICK
Pages of transcript:	23–24

Question:

Mr LIMBRICK: . . . Another performance measure that is in here is the number of projects facilitated by the behavioural insights unit.

. . .

Mr LIMBRICK: . . . Where could one find those if they wanted to find one that was publicly available?

Mr MOULE: I am happy to take on notice providing you with advice on where there is specifically a bespoke piece of work that is now publicly available and not just incorporated in perhaps the outcome of the overall project. . .

Mr LIMBRICK: Would it be possible to get a list of those 10 projects and a one-sentence summary of what they did? Is it possible to take that on notice, maybe?

Mr CAMPBELL: . . . because of the partnership approach we obviously would want to check with those who we are working with to make sure we take any sensitivities into regard. But we can give you that list and provide that.

Answer:

1. Behavioural approaches to communication Mar–Jun 20

The Behavioural Insights Unit (BIU) provided advice and training to DPC’s strategic communications area in the application of behavioural concepts and approaches, particularly in relation to COVID-19 communications. This advice was applied across government communications and campaigns which has seen a high degree of public compliance with COVIDSafe behaviours and COVID-19 restrictions.

2. Maintaining compliance as restrictions change Mar–Jun 20

BIU provided behavioural science informed advice to promote a range of COVID Safe compliance behaviours to Strategic Communications (DPC), Coronavirus Hub (DPC), and various teams in the Department of Health. The advice helped guide government communications to the public as restrictions were changing, optimising public understanding and likelihood of compliance.

3. Understanding barriers and enablers to remote working Jun 20

BIU developed the Whole of Victorian Government (WoVG) pulse survey on remote working in the VPS and generated insights on wellbeing, work design, and remote working preferences. BIU continues to advise on the longitudinal WoVG pulse survey, which is being used to inform ongoing WoVG reform work, such as embedding flexible work across the VPS and the approach of returning employees to the workplace.

4. PlayLearnGrow SMS program for parents of 2–3 year olds Jan–Mar 20

BIU partnered with the Department of Education to develop and implement a 12-week behaviourally-informed SMS program (PlayLearnGrow) that provided tips and resources to 2,700 parents of 2–3 year olds, with the aim of fostering the home learning environment and improving children’s learning and development at a critical stage to support their long-term health and wellbeing. 87 per cent of participants in the PlayLearnGrow trial said the program was useful to them and their child, and the program has since been scaled into a 24-week program to support more parents during COVID-19 restrictions.

5. Emergency Department Diversion Jul–Sep 19

The project directed patients who presented at Austin Hospital Emergency Department with semi-urgent or non-urgent health conditions to access more appropriate community-based health services through a trial of nurse-led face-to-face education sessions on management of respiratory related illnesses. The trial findings were used to inform patient engagement and communications in a range of other initiatives to increase emergency department capacity for critical service delivery.

6. Evaluating a whole-of-government youth engagement initiatives suite Jul–Aug 19

The BIU supported an evaluation to assess the delivery and impact of a suite of youth engagement initiatives. Drawing on a transdisciplinary range of methods, the evaluation identified key findings and provided specific behavioural recommendations to enhance the impact of existing programs and further improve how government responds to youth offending and disengagement. These recommendations are being used in the development of the Government’s youth strategy.

7. St Vincent’s hospital specialist clinics RCT Jul–Sep 19

The BIU redesigned the SMS reminders at St Vincent’s Hospital to increase the share of patients who brought their referral letter with them by 12 percentage points from 71 per cent to 83 per cent. The findings from the intervention provided insight to help develop improved ways of supporting patients to complete their pre-surgery requirements, minimising avoidable elective surgery cancellations.

8. Northern Health hospital specialist clinics RCT Jul–Sep 19

The BIU partnered with Northern health to run a randomised control trial sending reminder letters to patients ahead of their specialist appointments. The behaviourally informed reminder letter reduced missed appointments at Northern Health by 32 per cent. Scaled across Northern Health, this reduction could represent over \$1.5 million savings per year.

9. Organ donation - Seniors card

Mar–Oct 19

The BIU worked with Donate Life Victoria, Seniors Card and Department of Health to increase organ donation registration rates among Senior Card applicants. In total, an additional 364 people registered to be an organ donor through the Senior Card organ donation trial (an almost 100-fold improvement on previous trials). One organ donor can save up to 7 lives, so this trial alone has the potential to save 2,500 lives. Learning from the trial was used to inform future design and service delivery approaches.

10. Training and capability build

Jul 19–Mar 20

The BIU is building the behavioural science capability of the Victorian Public Service, providing bespoke courses to support key skillsets in policy development and service delivery. This investment saves government money that would otherwise be spent on consultancies by building internal specialist capability — even insourcing the training saves more than \$1 million per year. Over 520 VPS attended courses over the nine months where face-to-face training was available in 2019–20, with high participation satisfaction rates; more than 95 per cent of attendees would recommend the course to others.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Ms VALLENCE
Pages of transcript:	27 – 28

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: I would just like to pick up on something that was discussed earlier, Secretary, and it is in relation to the Facebook page and expenditure related to promoting the Premier’s Facebook page. Can you provide us a full figure for the 2019–20 year—on promoting the Premier’s Facebook page?

Mr MOULE: Yes, Ms Vallence. And sorry, Mr O’Brien, that time beat us when I was answering this question last. For the 2019–20 financial year the expenditure was commensurate with but less than the previous two years. It was \$158 874; the previous two years were in the 160s.

Ms VALLENCE: So, \$158 874 for the 2019–20 year, **and you mentioned there was a credit card that is utilised and then journalled back. What is the value on that credit card? Is it unlimited?**

Mr MOULE: I understand that just to be the DPC credit facility that we have. I would need to get details on exactly that. It is not a Premier’s office credit card, it is a department card, but in order to facilitate the transaction with Facebook you have to use a credit card.

Ms VALLENCE: **No, I understand that, but if you could provide, on notice perhaps, in terms of if there are any limits there. Is that okay?**

Mr MOULE: Yes.

Answer:

DPC has three departmental Corporate Credit Cards used for central expenses. Two have monthly credit limits of \$50,000 and a transaction limit of \$5,000, and the other a monthly credit limit of \$50,000 and a transaction limit of \$25,000.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr HEMMING
Committee member:	Ms VALLENCE
Page of transcript:	28

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: . . . Mr Hemming, a question to you perhaps. Page 92 of budget paper 3 has

\$1.2 million given to the chief parliamentary counsel to employ additional legislative drafters. **How much was spent at 30 June 2020, and how many additional drafters did that provide?**

Mr HEMMING: I might defer to my colleague, Deputy Secretary Campbell. I do not have that figure, I am sorry. Collectively we might take it on notice.

Ms VALLENCE: Yes, that is fine.

Answer:

Budget Paper No.3 (page 92) listed an allocation of \$1.2 million for a range of purposes under the heading of ‘Building capacity in the Office of the Chief Parliamentary Counsel’.

The allocation of \$1.2 million included funding for additional legislative drafters and publishers, it also included allocations for maintaining and upgrading IT systems, and infrastructure to support service delivery.

Additional drafters assist the Office to meet the needs of members of Parliament and deliver the Government’s legislative agenda, and IT system and infrastructure improvements support more efficient processes and deliver accurate legal information and records to the public.

At 30 June 2020, \$563,000 (including on costs) was spent on additional legislative drafters and publishers, as follows:

- Three new VPS4 legislative drafters, employed at different times during the year (\$238,000)
- Two STS legislative drafters on 12-month fixed term, part-time contract renewals (\$265,000)
- One VPS4 legal verification officer, employed for part of the year (\$60,000).

Other components of the \$1.2 million allocation included:

- IT software, server and laptop upgrades (\$355,000)
- Scoping for a replacement legislative database (\$181,000)
- Implementation of digital records (\$115,000).

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Ms VALLENCE
Page of transcript:	28

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: How much in the 2019–20 year was spent on the Premier’s Instagram page, the Premier’s Tik Tok page and all other well-known social media platforms?

Mr MOULE: I only have Facebook information with me. I am happy to provide that on notice if there is in fact any.

Ms VALLENCE: You will provide that on notice—for Instagram, TikTok and any other well-known social media platform?

Mr MOULE: Yes, Ms Vallence.

Answer:

Expenditure totalling \$158,874 was incurred during the 2019–20 financial year for the Premier’s Facebook page and Instagram.

All charges for Instagram are included in the Facebook invoices. DPC is unable to provide any further breakdown of that spend, as these platforms are treated as one entity by Facebook for advertising purposes.

There was no other social media platform expenditure.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr HEMMING
Committee member:	Ms VALLENCE
Page/s of transcript:	28 – 29

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: Were any external lawyers used in drafting the lockdown directions?

....

Mr HEMMING: Ms Vallence, I believe they were. They were engaged, I believe, by the Department of Health and Human Services, though. I do not have any further details about who they were or which firm they were.

Ms VALLENCE: Are you able to provide on notice the names of the firms and the total value spent on those external lawyers for the lockdown directions?

Mr HEMMING: I would have to check with my colleagues at the Department of Health, as it now is, but I can take that on notice and come back if appropriate.

....

The CHAIR: I was about to rule that I think the question is appropriate insofar as it relates to the Department of Premier and Cabinet. Any other elements of that question should have been asked of the Department of Health when they appeared before us previously. I am sure DPC will answer the parts that they are able to answer.

Answer:

DPC did not engage external lawyers to assist in drafting directions made under the *Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008* (Vic) (PHWA) in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness	Mr ADA
Committee member	Ms VALLENCE
Pages of transcript	30 – 32

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: Secretary, I refer to your questionnaire at page 16 regarding the Suburban Rail Loop, and the Treasurer’s advance notes that **over \$3 million was allocated to the Premier and Cabinet for the cost of the Suburban Rail Loop Authority. Why wasn’t this money budgeted for in the first place, and if we could also have a full breakdown of the \$3.021 million—where that was spent?**

Ms VALLENCE:And in terms of that \$3.021 million, when you provide your breakdown, can you tell the committee now if that was exclusive of staff costs to set up the authority?

Ms VALLENCE:So I presume the breakdown will detail whether it included staff costs. But if it did not cater for 100 per cent of staff costs, could you also provide to the committee the total value of staff costs to set up the authority?

Answer:

DPC received a Treasurer’s Advance for \$3.021 million in the 2019–20 financial year to progress work in relation to the Suburban Rail Loop project, including but not limited to supporting the establishment of the Suburban Rail Loop Authority.

The funding was broken-down into the following components:

- Internal DPC staff costs — \$1.130 million
- Specialised advice and resourcing support from other agencies — \$1.416 million
- External contractors — \$0.109 million
- Legal, probity and governance advice — \$0.213 million
- External consultancies — \$0.084 million
- Unallocated — \$0.069 million.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Ms VALLENCE
Page of transcript:	32

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: In the 2019–20 financial report, Secretary, at page 166, from the Treasurer’s advance in relation to COVID there was \$6.5 million for ‘COVID ... response—Public Health Communications campaign’. **Could you provide a full breakdown of that \$6.5 million to the committee?**

Mr MOULE: Yes, I am able to do that. I think that in some way goes to the answer I gave to Mr Limbrick as well.

Ms VALLENCE: Yes, I notice Mr Limbrick asked about that, but in terms of that \$6.5 million, if you could provide a breakdown.

Mr MOULE: Yes, we can.

Answer:

The available budget for the Staying Apart Keeps Us Together campaign in 2019–20 was \$6.5 million, as noted in Department of Treasury and Finance’s 2019–2020 financial report (page 166).

The actual cost of the campaign in 2019–20 was \$6.31 million, as reported in the Department of Premier and Cabinet 2019–20 Annual Report (page 137).

A breakdown of the \$6.31 million spend is provided below:

Advertising media expenditure (excl. GST)	\$4.5360 million
Creative and campaign development expenditure (excl. GST)	\$1.7640 million
Other campaign expenditure (excl. GST)	\$0.0066 million
Total (excl. GST)	\$6.3100 million

The Regional spend component of the Advertising Media Expenditure was 27.7% (\$1.256 million).

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness	Mr ADA
Committee member	Ms VALLENCE
Page of transcript	32

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: Is there a business case for the Suburban Rail Loop?

Mr ADA: The investment case is almost finalised, as I understand it. Obviously there was work done prior to this term of government with regard to the project and the broader benefits and opportunities it would bring.

Ms VALLENCE: Are you able to provide that to the committee?

Mr ADA: I am not sure. It is not DPC's product, Ms Vallence, so I would have to take on notice the question about whether or not it would be possible to do that.

Ms VALLENCE: Okay.

Answer:

Development Victoria was commissioned by Government to develop the Suburban Rail Loop (SRL) Strategic Assessment prior to this term of government.

The Strategic Assessment is available on the SRL website:

<https://suburbanrailloop.vic.gov.au/Library/Project-Documents>

The Strategic Assessment identified the following benefits to Victoria:

- Productivity benefits from enhanced business productivity and labour supply by connecting NEICs, health and other precincts along the corridor and enabling broader interconnectivity between the new orbital and existing rail lines.
- Liveability benefits from urban renewal along the corridor with further liveability improvements as more people take advantage of living and working in a highly accessible area with high amenity along the project corridor.
- Accessibility benefits associated with improved travel times, public transport frequencies and increased capacity along the corridor and lower reliance on the existing radial rail network and roads resulting in improvements more broadly across the transport network. The SRL is forecast to take around 200,000 vehicle trips off Melbourne's major roads by 2051.
- Connecting regional Victoria. Regional Victorian passengers would benefit from interchanges at Clayton, Broadmeadows and Sunshine. These direct connections into growing economic precincts outside of the CBD would provide Victorian's with better access to economic opportunities as well as world-class education and health services.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness	Mr O'CONNOR
Committee member	Ms VALLENCE
Page of transcript	32

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: Thank you. And I notice also in the Treasurer's advance—I am not sure if it is for you, Secretary, or you, Mr O'Connor—there is \$2.89 million for the Wage Inspectorate Victoria from the Treasurer's advance. **Can you provide a breakdown to the committee of that amount, of why that was required—why the wage inspectorate needed money from the Treasurer's advance to the tune of nearly \$3 million?**

Mr O'CONNOR: I can provide that on notice, Ms Vallence, yes.

Ms VALLENCE: You can provide that on notice?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Answer:

Regulatory functions expanded within Wage Inspectorate Victoria (the Inspectorate) in late 2018. The funding provided was appropriated outside of the budget cycle therefore the funding mechanism was a Treasurer's Advance to:

- enhance dispute resolution mechanisms available under the *Victorian Owner Drivers and Forestry Contractors Act 2005*, and establish a new compliance and enforcement function under proposed amendments in the transport and forestry sectors
- provide resourcing to undertake education, assessment, investigation and compliance activities under Victorian child employment and long service leave laws which were underfunded and insufficient to meet legislative responsibilities
- implement changes under new long service leave laws being established
- review the *Child Employment Act 2003* to ensure that the Act remains effective and responsive to the issues of employers and children in the workplace and aligns with changes in rules around child protection.

Further, this funding was allocated to support the preliminary investigation and development of the Inspectorate's role in the enforcement of Wage Theft laws.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Mr MOULE
Committee member:	Ms VALLENCE
Page/s of transcript:	32

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: In the 2019–20 financial report, Secretary, at page 166, from the Treasurer’s advance in relation to COVID **there was \$2.24 million for COVID response—it just says multicultural and faith communities.** It does not indicate quite what that is for. **Can you provide a breakdown of that amount also to the committee?**

Mr MOULE: Yes, Ms Vallence, we can do that.

Answer:

The \$2.24 million Treasurer’s Advance for ‘COVID-19 response — Multicultural and faith communities’ (page 166 [DTF 2019–20 Financial Report](#)) formed part of an \$11.3 million package announced in May 2020 to support Victoria’s multicultural and multifaith communities during the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic over two years. The remaining \$9.06 million was provided through other funding sources.

This package included:

- Close to \$2 million to support community wellbeing and connection and deliver practical supports through existing networks and community organisations, by providing community organisations with flexible funding to build online engagement and support their communities remotely.
- Close to \$5 million to deliver initiatives to support at-risk families, promote youth wellbeing and address youth disengagement.
- \$2.2 million to support asylum seekers and refugees facing financial hardship through basic needs assistance packages that provide practical support to buy food, clothing and other essential items.
- \$1.1 million to support multicultural and ethno-specific organisations to deliver culturally appropriate family violence prevention and early intervention by proactively engaging with women and families in isolation.
- \$1 million in additional funding to ensure that key government information is translated and that those that need interpreters can access them.
- \$50,000 for the Victorian Multicultural Commission and Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission to combat racism, working with community leaders to respond.

Questions taken on notice and further information agreed to be supplied at the hearings

Department:	PREMIER AND CABINET
Witness:	Ms MONAGLE
Committee member:	Ms VALLENCE
Page/s of transcript:	33

Question:

Ms VALLENCE: Just back to the youth portfolio, there was \$6 million at budget paper 3, page 92, for supporting young people. I am just wanting to know how much has been spent at 30 June 2020?

Mr MOULE: Thank you. I might ask Ms Monagle to come back to the table to respond to that question.

Ms MONAGLE: Sorry, Ms Vallence, do you mind repeating that, please?

Ms VALLENCE: Budget paper 3, page 92, there was \$6 million for supporting young people. How much has been spent at 30 June 2020?

Ms MONAGLE: The overall budget portfolio for youth was over by about \$2 million, so I would assume that that \$6 million was fully expended, but I would have to double check.

Ms VALLENCE: Okay. Then, if it was over, could you provide the full expenditure for that amount for that line item?

Ms MONAGLE: Yep, no problem

Answer:

The 2019–20 State Budget provided \$6.0 million to continue initiatives which support young people at risk of disengagement (2019–20 BP3, page 92). This funding was fully expended in 2019–20 and included*:

- \$3.89 million for three Community Support Groups (CSGs) supporting South Sudanese young people and their families
- \$0.8 million to provide youth alcohol and other drug workers
- \$0.6 million for the Le Mana Young Pasifika Project to support young Pasifika people
- \$0.29 million for VPS staff to support the delivery of CSG operations
- \$0.2 million for sport and recreation activities
- \$0.1 million to provide training and resources to Aboriginal organisations delivering the Aboriginal Youth Mentoring Program
- \$0.1 million for trauma counselling.

* Total adds to \$5.98 million due to rounding. The full budget allocation was expended.