Contents

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group – Heads of Agency

Heads of Agencies – Recruitment Processes

Current as at: **25-May-2026**

Talking Points

- It is important that we recruit the best possible people to Head of Agency roles in the Tasmanian Government.
- Our Secretaries and CEOs undertake the crucial task of leading our organisations and driving good outcomes for the people of Tasmania.

Secretary, Department of State Growth

- As part of my State of the State address on 3 March 2026, I announced the transformation of the Department of State Growth including a restructure to create a new department called Building Tasmania.
- Building Tasmania will deliver the roads, housing and infrastructure our state needs to be fit for the future. This will include the transition of Homes Tasmania into Building Tasmania.
- Secretary, Department of State Growth, Craig Limkin is taking a period of leave which commenced on 7 March 2026.
- Shane Gregory is acting as Secretary, Department of State Growth in Mr Limkin's absence.

CEO, Homes Tasmania

- On 22 December 2025, Ms Eleri Morgan-Thomas stepped down from her role as CEO Homes Tasmania before taking a period of leave which finished on 11 February 2026.
- I have appointed Mr Ben Wilson, former Chair of the Board of Homes Tasmania as CEO for a period of up to 12 months while a recruitment process can take place.
- As one of the most impactful and influential leaders in Tasmania's building, construction and housing sectors, Mr Wilson will continue to build on the work and leadership shown during his time as Chair of the Homes Tasmania Board.
- Mr Wilson has a wealth of experience in the building and construction industry, social and affordable housing and training the next generation of skilled tradespeople.
- With Mr Wilson stepping down from the Board to take on the CEO position, Ms Sarah Courtney will move from her role as Director to take on the Chair of the Homes Tasmania Board for the remainder of her term.
- Ms Courtney's experience and business acumen will ensure that Homes Tasmania's future is one focused on delivery and financial stability, including implementing the recommendations from the Crawford review.
- Both Mr Wilson and Ms Courtney commenced in their roles on 16 February 2026.
- I thank Ms Morgan-Thomas for her commitment to Homes Tasmania as its inaugural CEO.

CEO Brand Tasmania

- Mr Todd Babiak left Brand Tasmania in February 2025 to take up a new opportunity as the inaugural Chief Executive Officer of Brand Gold Coast.
- Ms Jessica Radford is currently acting CEO of Brand Tasmania to provide stability and continuity for the organisation.
- Brand Tasmania will become part of the new entity Tourism, Events and Creative Tasmania as part of restructuring the Department of State Growth.

Commissioner for Children and Young People

- The *Commission for Children and Young People Act 2025* received Royal Assent in December 2025.
- The Act, among other things, created the office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People as a Head of Agency under the *State Service Act 2000*.
- The Commissioner upholds, protects and promotes the rights of children and young people in Tasmania.
- The Commissioner is independent from the Tasmanian Government and reports directly to Parliament.
- The recruitment process to select the Commissioner is currently underway, with an announcement of the successful candidate expected in the first half of 2026.
- Ms Ros Cornish is Interim Commissioner for Children and Young People until the recruitment process is completed.

Background

- On Sunday 15 March 2026, *The Mercury* published an article 'State Growth boss Craig Limkin could get $1m payout as new department created.'
- Secretary of the Department of State Growth, Craig Limkin is taking a period of leave which commenced on 7 March 2026.
- No public comments are ever made in relation to an individual's employment circumstances.

- On 24 March 2026, Megg Webb MLC asked a Question Without Notice to the Leader of Government Business in the Legislative Council about the contract of the Secretary of the Department of State Growth, its clauses about termination without cause and relating to termination payout.
- On 15 April 2026, Ms Helen Burnet MP asked the Premier in Question Time: Can you confirm if the former Secretary of State Growth, Craig Limkin, is still employed by your government? And if he has been terminated without cause due to the axing of State Growth, whether he was paid out for one-year employment or for the remainder of his contract? How much was that payout?
- The Premier responded that Mr Limkin is on leave. Mr Limkin has not been terminated and any future employment matters for Mr Limkin the Government will ensure that the public has full knowledge of.
- On 20 May 2026, Megg Webb MLC asked a Question on Notice to the Leader of Government Business in the Legislative Council asking for clarification about Mr Limkin's employment status and whether he is still on annual leave.
- Ms Webb asked the same questions about the contract of the Secretary of the Department of State Growth, its clauses about termination without cause and relating to termination payout as in her previous Question Without Notice.
- Mr Limkin is currently on annual leave.
- Any further comment on the matter would be inappropriate.

Heads of Agency Remuneration

- Typically, Heads of Agency are covered by a special salary structure. The structure is based on the Mercer CED job evaluation system, which is also used for Senior Executive Service (SES) officers. [redacted] s.27

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Bridget Hutton	Senior Executive Officer, Executive Services
Cleared By	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer
Reviewed	Courtney Ingham	Director, Executive Government Services
DPAC contact for more information:	Courtney Ingham [redacted]	Director, Executive Government Services

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1 – Policy, Reform and Government Priorities
Output 1.1 –Strategic Policy and Government Priorities

Efficiency and Productivity Agenda

Current as at: **11-May-2026**

Talking Points

- Firstly, its important that I clarify the purpose and focus of the Government's efficiency and productivity unit. The EPUs primary focus is not about short-term savings.
- The EPU is focussed on longer-term structural efficiency and productivity improvements across the public sector.
- Its role is to support government in ensuring that services are delivered in a way that is effective, sustainable and capable of meeting future demand. This isn't only about the current expenditure for the current year but exploring fit for purpose service delivery models over time – these aren't one-off or short term measures.
- This approach reflects Government's stewardship of public resources.
- This Budget makes clear that efficiency and productivity are essential to keeping Tasmania's finances sustainable while continuing to deliver the services Tasmanians rely on.

- The government's approach is not about blunt cuts. It is about working smarter, using technology well, strengthening accountability and making sure every tax dollar works harder for the community.
- The Efficiency and Productivity Agenda is being progressed through five practical streams of work, each aimed at improving 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
    5. Whole-of-Government Commitment Monitoring

This work is also being informed by ideas submitted by State Servants through the Efficiency and Productivity Portal.

How will AI improve what government agencies do?

- The Efficiency and Productivity Unit (EPU) is leading a whole-of-government approach to using artificial intelligence and digital tools to improve service delivery and reduce administrative burden.
- The 2026-27 Budget includes provision of up to $4.25 million a year for two years to support the establishment of an AI Accelerator.
- The AI Accelerator will bring together the Tasmanian Government, the University of Tasmania and the private

sector to identify practical opportunities to improve services and reduce the cost of delivery.

- This work is still at an early stage, but it is already showing practical potential.
- For example, the Huon Valley Council has demonstrated how AI can help reduce the time and cost involved in assessing planning applications, and we are working with councils and the Local Government Association of Tasmania (LGAT) to explore broader application of that approach.
- Tasmania Police is also using AI to better prepare prosecutors for court appearances, helping to reduce adjournments and improve the efficiency of the justice system.
- Across government, the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC) is also exploring ways to use AI to triage incoming information, reduce administrative overheads, strengthen risk management and support better service delivery.
- Work is also underway on major digital platforms, including a new HR Information System and electronic medical records.

In parallel, agencies are identifying manual steps in high-volume transactions so more processes can be digitised end-to-end and paper-based forms reduced over time.

How will the State Service work more effectively to deliver on what it needs to?

- Functional leadership is about reducing duplication, lifting capability and bringing greater consistency to key enabling functions across the Tasmanian State Service.
- It gives government a more disciplined way to set standards, manage cross-government risk, coordinate capability uplift and, where appropriate, move to shared or coordinated service delivery.
- An early delivery priority is Communications and Marketing Shared Services, where the current model is fragmented across government and reform can improve consistency, responsiveness, procurement leverage and community experience.
- The proposed model for communications and marketing is a shared services hub with embedded departmental capability, so agencies remain close to their service delivery environments while benefiting from stronger whole-of-government coordination, shared standards and specialist support.
- That reform is expected to improve campaign coordination, media buying, digital publishing, accessibility, evaluation and crisis readiness, with indicative efficiencies of around $2.5 million a year at steady state.

- Another early priority is Building Tasmania, which is intended to bring together infrastructure delivery and related service functions to improve coordination, accountability and productivity across government.

These early priorities show that functional leadership is not just a governance concept; it is a practical reform tool to support better services, clearer accountability and more efficient use of public resources.

What sort of expertise does DPAC have to lead this work?

The government has engaged Mr Chris Eccles AO, a former Secretary of Premier's Departments in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia, to provide external advice on the delivery of the **Efficiency and Productivity Agenda.**

The contract cost for this engagement was $90 000.

- Mr Eccles brings deep experience in public sector governance, performance frameworks and service reform.
- In developing the Agenda, he will draw on recent interstate reform experience as well as the 2021 Independent Review of the Tasmanian State Service.
- The Agenda is examining expenditure and revenue trends, the effectiveness of service delivery, and the practical reforms needed to put the Budget on a more sustainable path.
    - Strong financial management
    - Revenue measures

- Rebalancing the size and structure of the Tasmanian State Service
- Reform of public entities
- Intergovernmental relations
- Modernising service delivery
- Implementation and governance

The Agenda will be delivered in two tranches, with the first three domains provided to government in June and the remaining domains, together with associated action plans, to be completed by October this year.

What practical steps are being undertaken to look at what government departments are doing to find solutions to improve?

- Advice provided to the Victorian Government highlighted the value of building a structured program review process into the annual Budget cycle, particularly where there are concerns about outcomes or pressure to deliver services within available funding.
- That approach is also relevant to Tasmania as we strengthen the way programs are reviewed for value, performance and sustainability.
- The EPU is currently working with the Department of Treasury and Finance to develop this program review capability.

An initial priority for 2026-27 is the Department for Education, Children and Young People (DECYP), with a focus on the efficiency of back-office functions and options to manage the unsustainable growth in service costs.

Whole-of-Government Commitment Monitoring

- A key part of driving efficiency and productivity is making sure government delivers on its commitments.
- The EPU has been implementing a whole-of-government commitment monitoring capability to strengthen coordination, transparency and accountability across agencies.

The current focus is on election commitments and commitments under the Government's 100-day plans, but that capability will expand over time to include other major cross-government priorities and review recommendations.

How are staff being engaged in the process? How are we generating ideas about what needs to be improved?

- Noting that no-one knows more about improving the workplace than workers themselves the EPU opened a public portal to collect ideas from workers for a leaner, more efficient and more productive State Service. No-one knows more about improving the workplace than workers themselves.
- To the beginning of May, the survey had attracted 735 ideas from 438 responses from across the service. The highest number of ideas came from our front-line workers, such as teachers, police, doctors and nurses.

The new ideas focussed most heavily on efficiencies in the workforce, improved service delivery and streamlining in internal processes.

We have extended this survey until June to ensure that everyone who wants to share an idea, has the opportunity to.

We are still analysing these ideas in consultation with Agencies.

Q and As

What has it cost to establish the EPU?

- There has been no new funding for the EPU.
- The EPU is funded through the reprioritisation of resources within the Premier's Implementation and Delivery Group and repurposed funding allocated in the 2024-25 Budget.
- That repurposed funding totals $3 million over two years and was previously allocated to performance improvement teams supporting agencies to improve delivery and service performance.

Will this mean cuts to public sector jobs?

- A sensible pathway back to surplus does require a savings task, and over time that means a smaller and more productive public service.
- The government has committed to a reduction of 1,800 FTE across the State Service, of which this Budget delivers around 1,700.

- It is important to note that the focus is on reducing duplication, redesigning processes and better targeting back-office functions, not cutting the frontline services.
- The purpose of the Efficiency and Productivity Agenda is to deliver the government's Fiscal Strategy with the least impact on services, the Tasmanian economy and outcomes for the community.

Isn't this just a large cut with no detail behind it?

- No. The Budget sets the savings task, but the delivery work is being done in a staged and disciplined way through the work of Agencies, with support from the Efficiency and Productivity Agenda.
- That is exactly why the government has established the EPU, engaged external expertise and identified specific work streams such as digital transformation, functional leadership, program review and commitment monitoring.
- The point is to move away from blunt, across-the-board reductions and toward practical reforms that reduce waste, improve systems and protect service delivery.

Budget Information

Table 1	Efficiency and Productivity Unit				
	2024-25 ***$'000***	***2025-26*** ***$'000***	***2026-27*** ***$'000***	***2027-28*** ***$'000***	***2028-29*** ***$'000***
Efficiency and Productivity Unit	-	1,500	1,500	-	-

Note:

1. Funding for the Efficiency and Productivity Unit has been reallocated from funding provided in the 2024-25 Budget Key Deliverable Performance Support Teams.

Background

- The creation of the EPU aligns with proposed Department of Treasury and Finance initiatives for Budget repair including annual fiscal targets, regular review of the Fiscal Strategy, reform of the Budget Management Framework and reviews of operational and capital expenditure.
- The EPU has been created by reprioritising the resources of the Premier's Implementation and Delivery Group. The EPU will also have access to the balance of funding provided in the 2024-25 budget for performance support teams ($3 Million over two years).
- The EPU reports to the Premier and Treasurer through the DPAC and Treasury Secretaries.
- Operationalising the decisions of government on efficiency and productivity is the responsibility of the Secretaries Board.

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Mathew Healey	[redacted]

4

P-7

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1 - Policy, Reform and Government Priorities
Output – 1.1 Strategic Policy and Government Priorities

Machinery of Government Transition

Current as at: **27-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The machinery of government changes announced on 3 March are aimed at enhancing delivery of the government's key priorities and consolidating functions to strengthen outcomes for the Tasmanian community.
- As I have announced, the Department of State Growth will undergo a total transformation.
- We have engaged with a range of stakeholders from small business, tourism, hospitality, forestry, mining, manufacturing, energy, ICT, events, arts, brand, stadia, housing, homelessness, community services.
- This has been an important and valued step in the process.
- A high-level timeline and governance arrangements have been agreed by government with a staged implementation through to December 2026.
- The changes will include:
    - **2 July** – Establishment of Building Tasmania – a department focused on strengthening Tasmania's

integrated approach to infrastructure delivery and housing and to lead procurement services across government for capital projects.

- **13 August –** State Growth Climate Change functions will be transferred to Department of Natural Resources and Environment.
- **10 September** – Stage two of the Building Tasmania transition will commence with capital projects transferred from other agencies.
- **3 December –** Transfer of Economic Development and Recfit functions within the Department of Premier and Cabinet - to deliver on the Government's economic agenda.
- **3 December** - Establishment of Tourism, Events and Creative Tasmania – an entity to focus on the State as a destination economy and a leader in the Arts.
- Reshaping the Department of Premier and Cabinet so that functions that are better aligned with other Agencies are transferred, including:
    - **2 July -** Department of Health to receive Disability Services and Reform, Office of the Senior Practitioner, administrative support for the independent Office of the Disability Commissioner and Ageing.

    - **16 July** - Department of Justice to receive Prevention of Family and Sexual Violence and Office of Local Government
    - **30 July -** Department for Education, Children and Young People to receive Keeping Children Safe Reform Program, Literacy and the Frank Macdonald Memorial Prize
  - **3 December** – Department of Premier and Cabinet will commence delivery of shared services arrangements.
  - **3 December** - Homes Tasmania will join Building Tasmania
- These machinery of government changes are significant, and as I have said, we will take the time to ensure it is planned and coordinated, ensuring our workforce is involved, supported and respected.
- There are some obvious complexities including some around legislation needed to enact the changes, employment arrangements and other operational considerations
- The principles being applied in implementation the changes are:
  - continuity of services will be maintained to the greatest extent possible
  - workforce impacts will be managed carefully to support employee wellbeing, safety and equity

  - communication and consultation will be timely, enabling meaningful employee participation and stakeholder engagement
  - workforce decisions will prioritise natural attrition, redeployment and skills matching wherever possible
  - workforce planning will support long-term capability, sustainability and service quality across the Tasmanian State Service
  - Agencies will work collaboratively to ensure coordinated implementation and minimise disruption for employees
  - risk to service delivery, workforce stability and organisational performance will be identified early and managed proactively.
- A functional alignment was announced to staff on 10 April 2026.
- An implementation timeline was announced and discussed with DSG and DPAC staff on 22 May 2026.
- This was followed by a Head of the State Service communication to all staff.
- DSG and DPAC have been engaging with unions and keeping them updated on the timeline. This engagement will continue throughout the project.

- A project team has been convened to oversee and coordinate the implementation and is reporting to the Head of the State Service on this work.
- The governance arrangements to oversee the delivery of the project have been stood up.

Building Tasmania – Establishment Progress

- Work is underway to ensure that Building Tasmania is operational from 2 July 2026, including:
  - A steering committee has been established, including the Chief Executive Officer of Homes Tasmania,
  - Work on an organisational design has commenced.
  - Operational requirements such as IT, branding, drafting of orders and budgeting matters are being worked through.
  - Engagement with Agencies is occurring on the design of a proposal capital delivery model.

Shared Services

- The 2021 Tasmanian State Service Review, commissioned by the Tasmanian Government, recommended strengthening of government leadership for key enabling functions so that, where appropriate, the State Service can reduce duplicated effort, improve standards and operative more cohesively.
- As part of the announced Machinery of Government changes, corporate services for Building Tasmania (BT) will be provided centrally by the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC).
- Given that a high number of corporate functions for Tourism Tasmania are currently provided by the Department of State Growth (DSG), DPAC will provide corporate services for the new Tourism, Events and Creative Industries entity when it is created.

- Homes Tasmania will be integrated into Building Tasmania in December 2026; as such, DPAC will also provide corporate services to support Homes Tasmania functions from December 2026.
- Work is underway to establish a shared services model. It is intended that the model will strengthen accountability, drive efficiencies and support innovation in delivery of services.

FTE Reduction

- The government has committed to managing the size and sustainability of the broader public service.
- State Growth is subject to a reduction target of 250 FTEs.
- The reshaping of the workforce will occur through a voluntary redundancy program, skills matching, natural attrition and redeployment.
- On 23 April 2026, the Acting Secretary State Growth opened a targeted and negotiated voluntary redundancy program (TNVR) in accordance with Managing Positions in the State Service.
- This is an operational decision by the Acting Head of Agency.
- The EOI program closed on 18 May 2026 with Expressions of Interest received from 148 employees.
- The next step is for these EOIs to be assessed by the department's Workforce Committee. Where EOIs are accepted, separations are anticipated to occur by 7 August 2026, except

where a different date has been agreed in accordance with business needs.

- During this process any decision to approve a TNVR will be carefully balanced with our commitment to continue delivering key priorities and maintaining strong service delivery for our stakeholders.
- Costs associated with TNVRs will be managed in accordance with normal Budget processes.
- In the first instance, TNVRs will be managed within existing Budget allocations, consistent with Treasurers' Instructions requirements.
- As can be seen in the agency's Budget information, efficiencies associated with staff reductions are assumed to be achieved in full from 2027-28.
- The majority of costs associated with TNVRs are expected to be met in 2026-27.

Implementation timeline

- A staged approach to implementation will occur through to December 2026.
- A number of stages in the implementation may be contingent on legislative changes.

(If required) Use of Consultants to support Transition

- The Transition Project team has been established utilising existing State Growth resources, funded from existing appropriation.
- It may be necessary to engage expert or technical advice at different stages of the transition process.
- Currently two consultancies have been entered into to support organisational design in the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Department of State Growth.

(If required) Changes taking effect in July 2026

- We recognise that there are some DPAC teams that will move agencies in the immediate term – over July.
- The absolute priority is to support staff through this transition, and into their new agencies, whilst maintaining service continuity.
- To ensure a meaningful engagement with staff on transition, last week we shared change proposals with each impacted team and the relevant unions.
- Further feedback sessions will be held in mid June to discuss staff and union feedback and how we are addressing it.
- The focus is on how we can ensure a seamless transition for staff, and continuity of services for the community.
- We also have met with and welcomed feedback from key stakeholders on some of the machinery of government changes.

- Feedback on how we can strengthen ways of working is informing the transition and new arrangements, and I thank key stakeholders for working with us collegially.

(If required) – DPAC staff transition to DOH – Award changes

- DPAC staff who will be moving to the Department of Health and who are currently paid under the Tasmanian State Service Award will be transitioned to the Health and Human Service Award.
- A set of information for staff comparing the awards has been prepared and shared as part of the change consultation process.
- The change plan for staff transitioning from DPAC to Health clearly outlines that staff will not be worse off under this change.
- We are being transparent, and working in good faith, to make changes to our departments that maximise outcomes for Tasmanians.
- I thank DPAC staff for the highly collegial way they have engaged in the transition process to date.

(If required) Concerns about DPAC functions related to Aging (COTA), YNOT, Family and Sexual Violence

COTA Tasmania

- Supporting people to age well is a priority of my Government, which is why we created the designated portfolio of Minister for Aging.

- This portfolio ensures that a holistic view of aging informs all our decisions.
- This portfolio remains in place, irrespective of which agency administers funding to COTA Tasmania.
- The Department of Health has a lifespan approach to supporting Tasmania's to live well.
- This aligns very closely with the role of COTA Tasmania to support Tasmanians to age well.
- The Minister for Aging expects her Department to provide her with holistic advice to discharge her role, and this will continue in the new arrangements.

YNOT

- The Minister for Children and Youth has a wide remit that covers young people from birth into early adulthood.
- In addition, the Minister is responsible for the biggest cohort of youth workers in Tasmania, who are employed by DECYP.
- DECYP doesn't only work with school aged children.
- DECYP provides services to families, to young people at different stages of life, and through Libraries Tasmania to all lifelong learners.
- This is valuable work undertaken by DECYP, under the purview of the Minister for Children and Youth and Minister for Education.

- To suggest that DECYP only works with school age children is misleading.
- YNOT provides valuable advice to Government about the experiences perspectives and needs of young people, as well as the youth worker sector.
- This closely aligns with the role of the Minister for Children and Youth and the new arrangements will strengthen this critical relationship into the future.

Tasmanian Family and Sexual Violence Alliance

- I welcome the Tasmanian Family and Sexual Violence Alliance' very constructive feedback and collaborative approach to ensure the new arrangements strengthen responses to family and sexual violence.
- The Minister for Prevention of Family Violence retains her critical role at the Cabinet table.
- This will ensure that prevention and response to family and sexual violence remain a priority, as they have been for the past ten years (since we released Tasmania's first plan).
- The Minister works with all Ministers in cabinet to take this whole of Government approach.
- This includes the Attorney General, Minister for Justice and Minister for Police who retain their distinct responsibilities for Tasmania's criminal justice response to family and sexual violence.

- The Minister will continue to take this holistic perspective, recognising that our response to family and sexual violence spans prevention, early intervention, response and healing.
- In having a designated Minister, separate from the Minister for Police for example, we also recognise that victim-survivors do not always want a criminal justice response.
- Our establishment and ongoing investment in Arch Centres, which bring together family and sexual violence, police and child safety service is a demonstration of this approach in action.
- This will continue. And I welcome collaboration with the Alliance to ensure our coordinated approach is strengthened.

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group – Output Group 1 - Policy, Reform and Government Priorities
Output – 1.1 Strategic Policy and Government Priorities

Salmon Industry Study

Current as at: **26-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The salmon industry is a significant contributor to Tasmania's economy, providing jobs and prosperity for many regional communities.
- It is critical that we have a regulatory environment that is effective in enabling sustainable development, while protecting the State's marine and freshwater environments.
- The Terms of Reference for the study was developed in consultation with members of the crossbench and with industry.
- The study commenced on 17 February 2026 with the official appointment of Dr Russell Reichelt AO and Dr Wendy Craik AM to co-lead the study.
- Drs Reichelt and Craik together represent extensive cross-disciplinary expertise in marine science, natural resource management, agriculture, economics and public policy.
- The study leads will identify other experts in relevant fields to be engaged for specific components of the study.
- The study leads will be empowered to consult widely, and all evidence, data and findings will be made public available to ensure transparency and accountability.
- The study will enable all stakeholders to focus on transparency, science and best practice for protecting our environment,

strengthening public confidence and providing investment certainty for the future.

- The Draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Study Plan were published on the Salmon Study website on 25 May 2026 for public consultation and feedback.
- Comment on the Draft Study Plan is sought from all interested parties until Sunday, 5 July 2026.
- The Salmon Study website is accessible from the main Tasmanian Government website.

Study Plan

- The Study Plan sets out a clear two-phase program covering environmental, social, economic, scientific and regulatory issues across the salmon industry.
- Phase 1 focuses on building a trusted evidence base through targeted research on six core topics, with Phase 2 examining future opportunities, climate adaptation and global best practice regulation.
- For each topic, the plan identifies key questions, expert sources and proposed engagement methods so the work is transparent, methodical and evidence-based.

Stakeholder Engagement Plan

- The Stakeholder Engagement Plan is designed to support transparent, impartial and inclusive engagement across government, industry, communities, Aboriginal groups, researchers, NGOs and the broader public.
- It provides for a mix of engagement methods, including direct meetings, public submissions, site visits, webinars and roundtables, with opportunities for stakeholders to participate safely and, where needed, confidentially.

- The Plan also commits to regular public updates, progressive publication of evidence and an open diary of formal engagements to strengthen transparency and public confidence in the study.

Terms of Reference

- The Terms of Reference for the independent study were developed in consultation with members of Parliament, Salmon Tasmania, and portfolio ministers.
- The study will be conducted in 2 Phases.
    - The first phase will collate all of the evidence and present it in a form that can be easily understood by all stakeholders, including the Tasmanian community and members of Parliament.
    - From these foundations, Phase 2 of the study will compare our regulatory system to systems around the world to make sure that we are striking the right balance between securing the jobs and economic benefits of marine farming, while protecting our marine and freshwater environments.
- The Terms of Reference are comprehensive and require the study to look at all aspects of the industry.
- This is an enormous task and a very significant step forward in ensuring that Tasmania benefits from a well-regulated, strong and sustainable salmon industry.

Recommendations

- The original Terms of Reference did not include recommendations. As discussed with Members of Parliament, the absence of recommendations was not in any way to lessen the significance of this piece of work.

- We wanted the study to provide the foundations for further engagement with Parliament on the right regulatory system for Tasmania.
- Policy decisions are the responsibility of Governments and legislative changes are ultimately the responsibility of Parliament.
- However, members of the crossbench have put forward their strong views that recommendations should be included, and the Government has amended the Terms of Reference to allow the study leads to make recommendations where appropriate.

<u>Public Consultation</u>

- I also appreciate that some members of the crossbench would like to see the study opened to public submissions.
- An early draft of the Terms of Reference said that the study would not include public submissions.
- However, based on feedback from Members of Parliament, the Terms of Reference were amended to require the study leads to produce a community engagement strategy as an early output.
- This strategy could include public submissions if the study lead considers that to be a positive component.
- The Government wants to see strong engagement with the Tasmanian community throughout the study, including with members of the community that have concerns about the salmon industry and with those that rely on the industry for their livelihood.
- Public submissions are just one form of engagement, which caters for a relatively narrow segment of the community. It may also not be the most effective way of engaging the Tasmanian

community in a conversation about the salmon industry in Tasmania.

Background

- On 17 August 2025, the Government issued a media release announcing an independent study of the salmon industry.
- Initial briefings occurred with members of the crossbench and draft Terms of Reference were circulated for formal feedback.
- Extensive feedback, including alternative ToR, was received from the Hon Rosalie Woodruff MP, Leader of the Tasmanian Greens, the Hon Peter George MP and the Hon Craig Garland MP.
- Jointly these three members also submitted a list of 'salmon review minimum requirements':
    - a review of the industry, its practices, and its impacts, not 'a study'
    - recommendations as well as or instead of findings
    - clearly defined objectives that focus on the environment and social impacts, not economics
    - a public submission period
    - a truly independent and reputable Chair, supported by an independent expert panel
    - properly financially resourced to enable a thorough independent research and review period - not reliant on departmental administrative support.
    - full and transparent access to information for the Chair and Panel, including information considered commercial-in-confidence.

Dr Russell Reichelt AO – brief bio

- Russell is currently Chair of the Marine Estate Management Authority, NSW Government and has extensive experience in Chief Executive, Board Member and Chairperson roles in marine, climate and environmental science organisations over the last 30 years.
- Russell's qualifications, including his PhD, represents significant expertise in marine science that DPAC considers would be highly valuable for an effective lead in a study of this nature.
- Relevantly, Russell was appointed the Australian Sherpa representing the Prime Minister for the High-Level Panel for a Sustainable Ocean Economy in 2018, which is a strong indication of his reputation and capability to engage in diplomacy in the sustainable ocean economy space.

Dr Wendy Craik AM – brief bio

- Dr Wendy Craik AM is an independent public policy advisor, particularly on issues related to natural resource management.
- Dr Craik has been:
    - a Commissioner of the Productivity Commission;
    - Chair of the Climate Change Authority;
    - President of the National Competition Council;
    - Chair of the Australian Fisheries Management Authority;
    - Executive Director of the National Farmers Federation;
    - Deputy Chancellor of the University of South Australia;
    - Chief Executive of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission; and
    - Executive Officer of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority.
- Dr Craik was also a Board member of one of the CGIAR centres, WorldFish.
- She is currently:
    - Chair of the OneBasin CRC;
    - board member of the Reserve Bank;
    - Crawford Fund ACT Committee Chair;
    - Chair of the Steering Committee overseeing the Eradication of Red Imported Fire Ants;
    - member of the Future Drought Fund Consultative Committee; and
    - now independent external member of the AIFFP Board.
- Dr Craik was awarded the Member of the Order of Australia in 2007 for service to the natural resource sector of the economy, particularly in the areas of fisheries, marine ecology and management of water reform, and contributions to policies affecting rural and regional Australia.

Cawthron Institute

- The Cawthron Institute is a globally recognised research organisation with expertise in marine science and aquaculture, based in New Zealand.
- The Cawthron Institute is being considered by the study leads for potential engagement to provide technical, research and project support.

Budget Information

- Funding for the independent study includes budget allocations for:
  - $400,000 in 2025-26; and
  - $600,000 in 2026-27

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Cameron McLennan	Senior Policy Analyst
	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Mathew Healey	[redacted]

Attachments

1. Terms of Reference: Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry
2. Stakeholder Engagement Strategy
3. Study Plan

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1 - Policy, Reform and Government Priorities
Output - 1.1 Strategic Policy and Government Priorities

TasInsure

Current as at: **17-May-2026**

Talking Points

- TasInsure is the Government's response to rising insurance costs and access challenges for Tasmanians.
- TasInsure will be established as a Tasmanian Government-owned, not-for-profit statutory authority with a broad mandate to oversee and support the insurance ecosystem in Tasmania.
- TasInsure will focus on long-term affordability by addressing risk, prevention, resilience and competition - stepping in where the market fails rather than relying on short-term or artificial price interventions.
- Initial priorities are practical support and targeted market interventions for "hard-to-place" risks - including public liability and specialist cover linked to community events, adventure tourism/outdoor recreation, and organisations working with vulnerable children and young people.
- We will do this by creating a Designated Risks Pool that allows the Government to underwrite insurance policies at affordable rates where the industry is unwilling to do so.
- TasInsure will build Tasmania-specific risk intelligence (high-resolution hazard data) and work with insurers to ensure that the price of insurance in Tasmania reflects our local circumstances, and not the costs of disasters in other States.

- We will also use that improved understand of risk to target mitigation with the knowledge that it is having the greatest impact on the cost of insurance for Tasmanian households and businesses.
- TasInsure will progress advisory, transparency and comparison functions to help households, small businesses and community organisations navigate insurance options and reduce premiums where possible.
- TasInsure will explore (and carefully assess) the feasibility of a Tasmania-specific Natural Hazard Reinsurance Pool focused on adverse Tasmanian weather events (principally bushfire and flood), to better align local risk and pricing.
- Implementation will be phased: early action from 2026-27 (advisory services; designated risks pool; risk data work), building capability in 2027-28 (online tools and comparator; reinsurance feasibility), and longer-term structural change from 2028.
- Legislation to formally establish TasInsure is a priority, alongside continued engagement with insurers, brokers, community organisations and technical experts to protect long-term financial sustainability.

Why did the Government drop the idea of a state-owned insurance company?

- We commissioned independent expert advice and listened to consultation feedback - including concerns about fiscal risk and unintended market impacts.
- The expert advice supported a model that targets the real drivers of affordability (risk, resilience, competition and information) rather than establishing a full general insurer.

- TasInsure will still step in where the market fails - but in a way that is disciplined, targeted and financially sustainable.
- TasInsure may offer direct to consumer insurance products if there are areas where the insurance industry cannot provide a reasonable and affordable product. Our preference, however, is to work with the insurance industry in the first instance to support them to respond.

Is this a backflip?

- Our commitment is to deliver fairer, cheaper insurance for Tasmanians - and to do it responsibly.
- The pathway we are implementing is based on the independent assessment and stakeholder feedback, and is designed to deliver practical benefits quickly while building structural change over time.

Where are the savings for households and small businesses?

- Premiums are driven by expected claims costs (risk) and market dynamics. TasInsure targets those fundamentals through better risk information, targeted mitigation, and stronger competition and transparency.
- Early benefits include advisory support and hard-to-place risk interventions. We will, as a priority look to establish a Designated Risks Pool and underwrite policies for hard-to-place risks at affordable prices where the insurance industry is unable to do so.
- Longer-term benefits come as we take steps to protect Tasmania's insurance prices from mainland and international events and as risk mitigation at all levels flows through to premiums.

If TasInsure is not an insurer, what will it actually do?

- TasInsure will support better outcomes through three complementary functions: Market (hard-to-place risks and market engagement), Consumer (advice and guidance), and Risk Assessment & Mitigation (hazard data and targeted mitigation alignment).
- It will partner with insurers, brokers and reinsurers to address gaps in availability and affordability, and will participate directly through underwriting policies where necessary.

Will TasInsure underwrite policies?

- TasInsure is not being established as a broad general insurer. Feedback that we have received is that the insurance industry is best placed to perform this role.
- The focus is to facilitate solutions and, where needed, provide targeted participation (for example through a designated risks pool) where private market solutions are not viable.
- TasInsure will underwrite policies where the insurance industry is unable or unwilling to provide policies that are reasonably priced having regard to the risk.

How will TasInsure help community events and small operators that can't get cover?

- TasInsure will establish a designated risks pool to aggregate "hard-to-place" risks that are difficult to insure due to small market size and limited underwriting appetite.
- Initial focus includes public liability and specialist lines for community events, adventure tourism/outdoor recreation, live entertainment/hospitality, and organisations working with vulnerable children and young people.

- TasInsure will also provide face-to-face advisory support to help organisations present their risk appropriately, identify mitigation actions, and access suitable cover.

What is the Natural Hazard Reinsurance Pool and why consider it?

- TasInsure will assess the feasibility of a Tasmanian-specific pool for adverse local weather events (principally bushfire and flood), using strong local hazard data.
- The aim is to better align pricing with Tasmanian risk and reduce uncertainty that can drive conservative pricing.
- This will be approached with discipline and rigour - feasibility, financial and market implications will be thoroughly assessed before any commitment.

What does RACT say about the new approach?

- RACT has described the Implementation Pathway as a positive step, emphasising the link between resilience and affordability and welcoming the partnership-first approach.
- RACT has indicated it is looking for deep collaboration with industry experts as the detail is developed.

What is the Insurance Council saying?

- The Insurance Council has welcomed ongoing collaboration on risk reduction, data and affordability, while arguing that underlying drivers include extreme weather risk, repair costs, compensation settings and taxes.
- I understand that they have also argued that tax and liability reform and resilience investment are within the State's power to progress. We can look at some of those over time.

How will you make sure TasInsure doesn't become an "insurer of last resort"?

- The designated risks pool will be designed to operate alongside the private market and will be developed with insurers and stakeholders.
- Eligibility, governance and risk management settings will be designed to avoid perverse incentives and to ensure the pool is sustainable and targeted to genuine market gaps.

How will TasInsure be governed?

- TasInsure will be established through legislation as a statutory authority with a clear mandate and governance framework.
- Implementation will be led jointly by the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Department of Treasury and Finance, with specialist advisory capability for complex initiatives.

Background

- Public consultation (Nov 2025) attracted 20 submissions supporting Government action to address market gaps and rising premiums, while raising concerns about fiscal risk and unintended market impacts of a state-owned insurer model.
- In Jan 2026, the Government engaged insurance expert John Trowbridge OAM to provide an independent strategic assessment and recommendations. [redacted]
- The model focuses on addressing underlying drivers (risk, mitigation, competition and information) and targeted interventions where market settings are not delivering adequate outcomes.

	Name	Position
Prepared & Cleared by	Mathew Healey	Deputy Secretary, Strategy and Delivery

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Mathew Healey	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1 – Policy, Reform and Government Priorities
Output 1.1 - Strategic Policy and Government Priorities

Tasmanian State Service Review (TSSR) Implementation (Watt Review)

Current as at: **22-April-2026**

Talking Points

- The Tasmanian Government supports, or supports in-principle, the recommendations of the Independent Review of the State Service (the Watt Review).
- The focus for the next stage of the State Service Review is on recommendations that align with work to be undertaken by the Efficiency and Productivity Unit.
- This includes implementing a functional leadership framework for the Tasmanian State Service that identifies and supports the delivery of shared services and capabilities across Agencies. These align to recommendations 21 – 23 in the Tasmanian State Service Review.
- This also means prioritising the recommendations that ensure state services are aligned with the evolving needs of the community, government, and budgetary contexts, and focusing on the value of outcomes delivered.
- Continuing to implement recommended reforms will strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of the State Service, leading to improved outcomes for the government and the Tasmanian community.

- To date, priority has been given to implementing reforms with strong linkages to recommendations arising from the Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings (the Commission of Inquiry).
- DPAC's website includes an update on TSSR recommendations underway and those that are complete to April 2026.

Alignment with the Woolcott Review

- I see strong alignment between this review and the recommendation of the Tasmanian State Service Review, including the need to:
    - modernise the State Service Act
    - strengthen values and conduct expectations, and
    - make sure the legislative framework better defines the purpose of the State Service and the standards expected of employees.
- I also note that both reviews identify the Employment Directions and disciplinary framework as needing reform, and we have already taken practical steps in that area, including updating Employment Direction 5 and establishing shared capability for serious Code of Conduct investigations.
- Both reviews place a strong emphasis on stewardship, leadership accountability and cross-agency responsibility, which is why performance agreements and whole-of-government governance arrangements are such an important part of our reform program.
- I recognise that Woolcott builds on the Watt Review by applying these reform principles to the specific child safety failures identified by the Commission of Inquiry, particularly in relation to information sharing, accountability and the handling of misconduct.
- I would also say that the fact both reviews, undertaken four years apart and for different purposes, arrive at similar

conclusions gives us a strong basis to continue integrating State Service reform with our broader child safety reform agenda.

Budget Information

Table 1 Budget table

Title	*2024-25* $	*2025-26* $
Budget		
State Service Review	175,000	175,000
State Service Review Implementation Rollover	280,000	355,000
Total Budget	455,000	530,000
Actuals	228,373	175,409

Background

The Review

- The government announced the Tasmanian State Service Review (TSSR or the Review) in June 2019 with the objective of ensuring that the State Service is fit-for-purpose for Tasmania today and into the future. The scope of the Review was determined by the Terms of Reference, which were subsequently amended in September 2020 and January 2021.

- The Review was conducted by an Independent Reviewer, Dr Ian Watt AC, appointed under a fee for service contract with the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC). [redacted] The Review identified structural, legislative and administrative changes intended to transform current systems, services and practices to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the State Service.

- An Interim Report was provided to the Premier and Treasurer and released in November 2020. The Final Report was provided to the Premier and Treasurer in July 2021 and publicly released in September 2021. The Review made 77 recommendations (Attachment 1) across five domains, including: Principles and Values, Leadership, Capability, Workforce, and Service Delivery.

Review implementation

- The Tasmanian Government's Response to the Review was released in November 2021, supporting or supporting-in-principle all 77 recommendations. It committed to implementing all recommendations through a five-year reform program across three 18-month stages to 2026. Implementation commenced in 2022.

- In line with Recommendation 11, the Secretaries Board was established in early 2022. The Board's responsibilities include oversight of implementing TSSR recommendations across the State Service and reporting to Cabinet. Three standing subcommittees to the Secretaries Board were also established in 2022—each responsible for leading key aspects of reform implementation. The subcommittees are:
    - Corporate and Workforce Deputy Secretaries Subcommittee – Chaired by DPAC Associate Secretary and Co-Chaired by the Deputy Secretary State Service Management Office (DPAC), with membership comprising Chief People Officers and corporate/governance/operations Deputy Secretaries from all agencies.
    - Policy and Intergovernmental Deputy Secretaries Subcommittee – Chaired by DPAC Deputy Secretary Policy and Reform, with membership comprising of policy/strategy/services Deputy Secretaries from all agencies.
    - Data and Digital Senior Officers Subcommittee – Chaired by DPAC Deputy Secretary Community and Government Services, with membership comprising the Tasmanian Government Chief Information Officer (DPAC), agency Chief Information Officers and other specialist officers from across government.
- To coordinate actions and outcomes to keep children safe, including the response to the Commission of Inquiry, a fourth subcommittee to the Secretaries Board was established early 2023. The Child and Youth Safety and Wellbeing Subcommittee is chaired by the Secretary DPAC, with membership comprising of Department Heads of Agency, Reform Lead – Keeping Children Safe, Child Abuse Royal Commission Response Unit – Senior Representative, Director State Service Management Office (DPAC) and Associate Secretary (DPAC).
- To date, 15 recommendations have been completed. A progress update of recommendations underway and those completed, is available on the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC) website. Those completed are:
    - A new scanning framework to inform strategic priorities for disaster risk reduction and resilience in Tasmania (Recommendation 1).
    - Updating performance agreements for all Heads of Agency (Recommendations 7 and 8).
    - Establishing the Secretaries Board and renewed cross-agency collaborative governance (Recommendation 11).
    - Establishing a digital services governance framework, including the Chief Information Officer as a member (Recommendations 24 and 25).
    - The State Service Management Office to work with human resource directors or equivalents from all agencies to develop communities of professional practice across the TSS (Recommendation 47).
    - Amendment of Employment Direction 5 (Recommendations 55 and 56).

- Setting up a new unit with shared capability for Serious Code of Conduct investigations (Recommendation 58).
- Adopting a life events framework as the basis for the integration of services across agencies (Recommendation 64).
- Transforming service delivery in Tasmania, including the launch of the myServiceTas digital portal (Recommendation 65).
- Enhancing service delivery partnerships with the Commonwealth, local government and, where appropriate, the private sector (Recommendation 66).
- Formally capture the lessons learnt from establishing and expanding call centre capabilities in response to COVID-19 (Recommendation 67).
- Establishing a committee of heads of agency that oversees the implementation of recommendations (Recommendation 75).
- Across the 2024-25 and 2025-26 Budget and Forward Estimates, a total investment of $24 million is budgeted to build a whole-of-government system for human resource administration management systems (HRIS) across State Service agencies. This aligns with Recommendation 34 of the TSSR.

- In addition to Recommendation 34, a further 19 recommendations are currently underway or prioritised for implementation.

Revised Government commitment

- In October 2023, the government revised its commitment to delivering TSSR reforms to align more strongly with emerging strategic priorities and the most critical areas for reform investment. The revised commitment included amended timeframes and prioritising a targeted number of recommendations.
- Government prioritised the implementation of TSSR recommendations that contributed to keeping children safe and outcomes of the Commission of Inquiry, including changes to Employment Directions, the management of serious Code of Conduct investigations, and strengthening the accountability of Heads of Agency.
- Following the Commission of Inquiry, the Blake Review (released in March 2024) and the Woolcott Review (due for release in 2025) are also expected to inform ongoing prioritisation and implementation of TSSR recommendations.
- A comprehensive update on TSSR implementation progress and priorities was prepared for the Secretaries Board in August 2024.
- The progress update included:
    - In addition to the 15 TSSR recommendations already completed, a total of 20 recommendations are currently underway:
        - One State Service (Recommendation 2)
        - Functional Leadership (Recommendation 21)

        - Whole-of-Government and Cross-Portfolio Priorities (Premier's Priorities) (Recommendations 5, 9)
        - Whole-of-Service Human Resource Administration Management System (Recommendation 34)
        - Employment Directions / Regulations (Recommendations 35, 37, 43, 54, 57, 59)
        - Strategic Workforce Planning (Recommendation 38)
        - Employee Mobility (Recommendations 46, 49)
        - Employee Capability Assessment and Development (Recommendations 13, 50, 51)
        - Employment Engagement Pathways (Recommendations 41)
        - Whole-of-Government Evaluation Framework (Recommendation 18)
        - TSSR Implementation Coordination (Recommendation 76)
    - The intent of 21 additional recommendations are also being progressed – noting that the achievement of many of the 77 recommendations necessarily involves incremental changes alongside business as usual, supported by foundational elements of governance, systems and capability improvements.

- At this stage, 18 recommendations are not proceeding, and three have not yet been started (but are planned for implementation).

- In October 2024, DPAC published a progress report of TSSR Recommendations on its website. The website also reflects the focus on recommendations aligning with keeping children safe – noting that the original Tasmanian Government Response to the Independent Review of the State Service remains on the website.

	Name	Position
Cleared by	Mathew Healey	Deputy Secretary – Strategy and Delivery

DPAC contact for more information:	Mathew Healey Phone: [redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1: Support for Members of Parliament
Output – 1.1 and 1.2 Ministerial and Parliamentary Support, Support to Members of the House of Assembly

Funding for Opposition and Cross Benches

Current as at: **28-May-2026**

Background

- The elected Cross Bench Members of the House of Assembly comprise six Independent Members of Parliament (MPs), four Tasmanian Greens MPs and one Shooters, Fishers and Farmers MP.
- The elected Labor Members remain unchanged, which comprises ten MPs.
- Negotiations with the Premier's Office and Crossbench members for 2026-27 Budget allocations are currently underway. Budget advice for the Independents, the Tasmanian Greens, the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers and the Opposition are yet to be confirmed by the Premier's Office.

FTE Information

- As at 31 March 2026, the total opposition and crossbench Paid FTE was 53.6, consisting of:
  - 25.6 FTEs for the Labor Opposition
  - 11.9 FTEs for Independent offices
  - 13.7 FTEs for Greens offices and
  - 2.4 FTEs for Shooter, Fishers & Farmers.
- This is a decrease of 0.9 FTE from 31 March 2025, which had a total of 54.5 FTEs for the Labor Opposition and crossbench.

Table 1	Paid FTE comparison – March 2025 to March 2026	
FTE	***31 March 2025***	***31 March 2026***
Labor Opposition	26.2	25.6
Independents	11.2	11.9
Tasmanian Greens	14.1	13.7
Jacqui Lambie Network	3.0	-
Shooters, Fishers & Farmers	-	2.4
Total FTE	**54.5**	**53.6**

Budget Information

- Funding for Opposition and Crossbench MPs is structured to support their parliamentary duties similar to majority party members. This support is provided annually, with entitlements and budgets reviewed each year to ensure they remain appropriate and aligned with parliamentary needs. As a Member of the House of Assembly, the Crossbench is entitled to:
  - Electorate Office Budgets
  - Staffing allocations
  - Parliamentary Allowances
  - Additional operational funding, including extra staffing resources, recognising the absence of party support that many members receive.
- Total Opposition and Crossbench funding was $7.87 million in 2025-26. While the total for 2026-27 is yet to be confirmed due to pending budget allocations for the Labor Opposition, the Independents, the Tasmanian Greens and the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers. Total funding for 2026-27 is estimated to increase by two per cent, in line with indexation of the non-salary budget.

- Funding ceased for former Labor, Independent and the Lambie Network Members in 2025-26 following their exit from Parliament after the 2025 State Election, with this annual funding reallocated to the new members of parliament.

s.27

[redacted]

s.27

[redacted]

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Karelyn Stephens	Manager Budget
	Adeline Hu	Budget Analyst
Cleared by	Glen Dean	Chief Financial Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Glen Dean	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1 – Policy, Reform and Government Priorities
Output – 1.1 and 1.2 Ministerial and Parliamentary Support, Support to Members of the House of Assembly

Legal Fees and Indemnity

Current as at: **25-May-2026**

Talking Points

- Public officers and Ministers are involved in complex issues in undertaking their duties in serving the Tasmanian community.
- Sometimes they may be the subject of legal proceedings, inquiries, claims and actions despite the fact that they are acting in good faith and within the scope of their duties.
- When this occurs, it is necessary to provide legal assistance and indemnity to public officers and Ministers to protect the Crown's interests and the integrity and effective management of the State Service and ensure fair treatment of employees.
- The decision to grant indemnity is not made lightly.
- Consideration and granting of indemnities and legal assistance to public officers is undertaken in accordance with the Government's 'Policy and Guidelines for the Grant of Indemnities and Legal Assistance to Public Officers of the State of Tasmania'.
- The Department of Justice is currently undertaking a review of the ED16 process to ensure it remains fit for purpose and reflects the lessons learned from the Commission of Inquiry and the review into ED16 payments made to individuals represented during the Commission of Inquiry, referred to as the 'ED16 Review'.
- This review will consider how to strengthen the criteria for granting legal assistance, improve oversight and accountability mechanisms, and ensure that conditions - such as acting in good

faith and cooperating fully - are clearly understood and enforceable.

- In addition, the ED16 Review has highlighted the importance of applying a consistent and transparent framework for assessing eligibility and potential repayment, which will inform future policy updates.
-
- This review has engaged with all State Service Agencies and Crown Law to seek initial submissions on ED16, including their experiences, perceived opportunities, and overall feedback.
- Decisions relating to the approval of legal indemnity of a Minister is a matter for Cabinet.
- The amount spent on legal advice in any given year or instance will vary, dependent on the individual circumstances of the case.
- The Department of Premier and Cabinet processes payments for legal fees from both the DPAC budget and the Ministerial and Parliamentary Support (MPS) budget.

[If asked re legal costs paid for other Ministers/MPs]

- Decisions relating to the approval of legal indemnity of a Minister is a matter for Cabinet.
- All matters prepared for consideration by Cabinet, as well as deliberations and decisions by Cabinet, are confidential. I will not be drawn into responding to questions that seek information I am precluded from providing.

[If asked re legal costs paid for Jane Howlett MP, Mark Shelton MP and/or Madeleine Ogilvie MP]

- I am unable to comment on the specifics of a particular legal matter.
- Indemnity was granted to Ms Howlett/Ms Ogilvie/Mr Shelton in line with indemnity protocols.

[If asked re legal fees paid for former Minister Ferguson]

- As I have indicated publicly, it was appropriate that the government pay legal costs to support a member who was maliciously targeted in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown.
- The Court's judgement and orders in relation to costs in favour of the Minister at the time clearly demonstrate fault in the actions of the other party.
- A letter of demand for costs pursuant to the court order was issued; however, to date, unfortunately I understand that no repayment of those costs has been made.
- Should any costs be recouped, reimbursement would be made to the Crown.
- Our Government expects all public servants to have access to a safe, accessible and respectful workplace.
- Public servants acting in good faith and performing their role appropriately should be provided with appropriate support.

[If asked re Northern Midlands Council Supreme Court finding and repayment of fees by Councillors in relation to defamation proceedings]

- I note the Supreme Court decision in November 2024 concerning the payment of legal expenses for the Mayor and General Manager by the Northern Midlands Council.
- I understand that in that instance the provisions of the *Local Government Act 1993* and council's policies and decisions regarding the reimbursement of legal expenses were considered.
- In that instance, it was determined that the Mayor and General Manager should repay to the Council the costs incurred for bringing the proceedings.
- It is important to note the Court was considering that matter in the context of the roles and functions of councillors and council policies and decisions under the *Local Government Act 1993*.

- The Court was not considering the application of the Tasmanian Government's 'Policy and Guidelines for the Grant of Indemnities and Legal Assistance to Public Officers of the State of Tasmania'.
- It is not appropriate to simply apply the context of one legal matter to that of another.

[If asked re Anti-Discrimination Commissioner finding that State Servants have been granted legal support in relation to complaints made by other State Servants (2023-24 EOT Annual Report)]

- I am aware of the references made in Equal Opportunity Tasmania's 2023-24 Annual Report, to instances of legal assistance or indemnity being afforded to one State Service employee in relation to complaints being submitted by another State Service employee.
- The EOT Report observes that such practice is apparently in conflict with the 'Policy and Guidelines for the Grant of Indemnities and Legal Assistance to Public Officers of the State of Tasmania'.
- I note in this regard that the Policy and Guidelines establish an Indemnity and Legal Assistance Panel, responsible for administering and making decisions in respect of the Policy, including whether or not to provide legal assistance to state servants.
- The Government itself is not involved with Panel decisions.
- The Panel comprises the Secretary of the Department of Justice, the Solicitor-General and a third member determined in each case in accordance with the Policy.
- Importantly, the Policy and Guidelines set out that the Panel may, after taking into account all the circumstances of the matter or incident, approve an indemnity and/or legal assistance in applications where the Public Officer may have otherwise been excluded from an indemnity or legal assistance.

- This inclusion allows for the reality that the Panel will be considering an array of circumstances in determining the provision of legal assistance. Not all situations will be foreseeable, hence the need to afford the Panel discretion and flexibility in its decision-making.
- I support this policy intent.

Background

Parliamentary Scrutiny

- The amount spent on Ms Ogilvie MP's legal fees was taken as a question on notice on Thursday 4 December 2025.
- Late that day, the Treasurer provided an answer to the question taken on notice, advising that the total fees expended from January 2023 to 11 November 2025 is $120,493.66.
- The amount spent on Ms Howlett's MP's legal fees was taken as a question on notice on Wednesday 4 March 2026.
- On Thursday 5 March 2026, the Treasurer provided an answer to the question taken on notice, advising that the total fees expended since July 2023 to date for Minister Howlett MP is $303,800.
- The amount spent on Mr Shelton MP's legal fees from 1 January 2023 to date was asked during question time on Thursday 7 May 2026 and taken on notice.
- the Treasurer provided an answer to the question taken on notice that between 1 January 2023 to 7 April 2025, $14,958 (exclusive of GST) has been spent on legal fees for Mark Shelton MP. The ABC have reported on this: Rockliff backs away from revealing reasons for backbencher Shelton legal costs. *On 11 May 2026, the Mercury published 'Greens demand answers on MPs 15k legal bill'.*

RTI Applications and Associated Media

- There have been seven RTI applications relating to the granting of legal fees for Ministers and Members of Government since 2024.
- All applications have been determined in the same way, by providing information relating to legal matters where the existence of the matter is not legislatively prohibited from being disclosed, subject to personal information and legal professional privilege exemptions.
- s.27 [redacted]

- The first RTI application was submitted by [redacted] MP in May 2024 and related to legal fees for Jane Howlett MP, Madeline Ogilvie MP and Mark Shelton MP. The existence of information was neither confirmed nor denied in a decision provided in July 2024.

- The second request was submitted by [redacted] MP in August 2024 for determinations and costs for all grants of legal assistance for Ministers and Members of Government and corresponding dates. A decision was provided in September 2024 providing a de-identified table of costs paid (extracted form DPAC's finance system) and neither confirming nor denying the existence of any other information.

- The table of costs provided with this RTI decision was also tabled in a Budget Estimates Committee Hearings for the 23-24 FY.

- A response was provided as part of a Question on Notice from the 2024 Budget Estimates hearings to identify which legal fees in the table relate to Ministers and which relate to Members of Government.

- The third application was submitted by journalist [redacted] with the ABC in September 2024 seeking information relating to the table of costs tabled during Estimates. An original decision was provided in September 2024 neither confirming nor denying the existence of any information sought.

- [redacted] MP submitted a request in October 2024 for information relating to payments of legal services for Ms Jane Howlett MP. A decision was provided to her in October 2024 neither confirming nor denying the existence of the information she sought.

- [redacted] sought an internal review of his application in October 2024. A fresh decision was provided to him in February 2025 releasing invoices relating to Mr Ferguson MP's defamation proceedings against Mr Kane Dallow, subject to personal information and legal professional privilege exemptions. The existence of any remaining information was neither confirmed nor denied.

- On 27 February 2025 Mr Holmes' ABC Report was published: Former Liberal minister Michael Ferguson's personal defamation action used $300,000 in public funds, documents show - ABC News

- [redacted] sought an external review of his application which is currently being considered by the Ombudsman's office. A decision is expected to be provided this year.

- s.27 [redacted]

- A fifth application on this subject was submitted by [redacted] in November 2025 seeking invoices for legal fees since August 2024. A decision was provided to him in January 2026 releasing an invoice relating to a claim against Ms Howlett MP, subject to personal information and legal professional privilege exemptions. The existence of any other information was neither confirmed nor denied.

- [redacted] MP submitted two requests in December 2025 relating to legal fees for Madeline Ogilvie MP and Jane Howlett MP. One request was to the Department of Premier and Cabinet, and the other was to the Premier's office.

- A decision for the DPAC request was released to [redacted] MP in February 2026 providing one email exchange that related to the invoice previously released to [redacted] in January, and neither confirming nor denying the existence of any other information.

- Dr Woodruff raised the delay in providing a decision in response to the request to the Premier in Parliament on 25 March 2026. She stated that she believes Minister Ogilvie and Minister Howlett are deliberately being obstructive and breaching the RTI Act and called on them to supply the relevant information.

- [redacted] MP applied to the Ombudsman for review of this decision on the basis of a deemed refusal due to a decision not being supplied in time. The Ombudsman's office issued a direction to release a decision by 13 May 2026.

- A decision was provided to [redacted] MP on 1 May 2026 which shared some information and neither confirmed nor denied the existence of other information.

Northern Midlands Council Decision

- On 12 March 2025, Pulse Tasmania reported that Labor MP Ella Haddad will introduce a parliamentary motion that the Liberal Government 'reverse its decision to allocate public resources to Mr Ferguson's private defamation action'.

- In the article, Ms Haddad MP refers to the Supreme Court decision made in November 2024 ordering the Northern Midlands Council Mayor Mary Knowles and General Manager Des Jennings to repay the Council for legal costs spent on a personal defamation action (*McCullagh v Northern Midlands Council, Knowles and Jennings [2024] TASSC 660).*

- The Supreme Court decided in that case that the Northern Midlands Council had no legal authority under the *Local Government Act 1993* to resolve to pay the legal costs of Mr Jennings and Ms Knowles in that specific instance, and therefore the decision to pay the legal costs and disbursements of Mr Jennings and Ms Knowles defamation proceedings was invalid and of no effect.

- [redacted] s.27

Anti-Discrimination Commissioner

- The ADC 2023-24 Annual Report includes the following observations (p.29):
    - *'It is the observation of the Anti-Discrimination Commissioner that the grant of indemnity for one state service employee but not another, contrary to the Guidelines, exacerbates power imbalances. It means that one state service employee has the benefit of the resources and expertise of the State, whereas the other employee, who has made the complaint, does not.'*
    - *'In the majority of instances, the individual granted indemnity and legal representation by the Office of the Solicitor General is also a manager of the person who made the complaint. Noting that the complaints are about discrimination or prohibited conduct under the Anti-Discrimination Act, it can be said that this approach to indemnity and legal representation also arguably undermines the State Service Code of Conduct.'*
- The 'Policy and Guidelines for the Grant of Indemnities and Legal Assistance to Public Officers of the State of Tasmania July 2021' set out at p.11 that:
    - No indemnity or legal assistance is to be provided to a Public Officer in respect to an investigation or inquiry that constitutes an internal employer investigation or internal administrative review mechanism, including such matters as complaints against the Public Officer e.g. staff grievances, performance management or disciplinary proceedings.
- The endorsed Policy for the grant of indemnities and legal assistance to Public Officers of the State of Tasmania is that: ...
    - *...(v) The Panel may, after taking into account all the circumstances of the matter or incident, approve an indemnity and/or legal assistance in applications where the Public Officer may have otherwise been excluded under the Guidelines from an indemnity or legal assistance.*

Budget Information

- The expenditure in relation to legal advice and fees fluctuates year on year and is based on demand for services.
- Legal Fees expenditure relating to Ministerial and Parliamentary Services includes the cost of legal assistance to Ministers and Members of Government as well as general legal advice.

Legal Fees Expenditure for the year ending:

Table 1	Legal Fees Expenditure			
	31 March 2023	***31 March 2024***	***31 March 2025***	***31 March 2026***
Departmental	69,453	184,135	611,997	1,242,583
Ministerial and Parliamentary Services	33,226	22,813	278,343	341,117
Total	**102,679**	**206,948**	**890,340**	**1,583,700**

Attachments:

- Att 1 – QoN response – 2024/25 Legislative Council Estimates Committee B – Legal fees table
- Att 2 – QoN response – Legislative Council March 2025 – legal fees 2 August 2024 to 1 March 2025

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Gemma Smith	Executive Government Services
Through	Courtney Ingham	Director, Executive Government Services
Cleared by	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer

DPAC contact for more information:	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer

11

Attachment 1 - QoN response – 2024/25 Legislative Council Estimates Committee B – Legal fees table

Question 3: Please provide a version of the tabled document – Legal Fees related to Minister or Members of Government – which separately lists those fees related to Ministers and those related to Members of Government.

Answer:

Legal Fees related to Minister or Member of Government

		Advice to:	
Date Paid	**Amount (ex GST)**	**Minister**	**Member of Government**
1/08/2024	20,000	X	
17/06/2024	28,023	X	
17/06/2024	9,000	X	
17/06/2024	68,000	X	
17/06/2024	21,416	X	
17/06/2024	195	X	
17/06/2024	32,000	X	
30/05/2024	2,106	X	
30/05/2024	5,750	X	
30/05/2024	7,794	X	
30/05/2024	4,950	X	
10/04/2024	2,770		X
21/03/2024	6,802	X	
19/03/2024	7,895		X
5/02/2024	1,032	X	
12/05/2023	4,204	X	
30/11/2022	25,200	X	
27/07/2022	2,566	X	
22/12/2021	6,837	X	
22/12/2021	125	X	
22/12/2021	11,674	X	
22/12/2021	2,172	X	
22/12/2021	10,312	X	
22/12/2021	1,364	X	
22/12/2021	8,663	X	
22/12/2021	2,094	X	
22/12/2021	13,970	X	
22/12/2021	9,237	X	
20/12/2021	67,200	X	
28/05/2021	624	X	
28/05/2021	2,229	X	
28/05/2021	12,250	X	
22/04/2021	40,775	X	
22/04/2021	24,155	X	
17/02/2021	38,193	X	
20/01/2021	2,524	X	

12

Attachment 2: QoN response – Legislative Council March 2025 – legal fees 2 August 2024 to 1 March 2025

Question:

Payment of Government Members' Private Legal Fees

Ms O'Connor
Leader of the Government
11 March 2025

With regard to payments made by the Government towards private legal fees of its Members, and using the same format by which previous data was provided to Legislative Council Estimates Committee B in September 2024, setting out the dates payments were made, the amount of each payment and whether the payment related to a Minister or other Member of the Government – how much has the Government paid in private legal fees relating to Ministers or Members of Government between 1 August 2024 and 1 March 2025?

Answer:

Legal Fees related to Minister or Member of Government			
1 August 2024 - 1 March 2025		Advice to:	
Date Paid	**Amount (ex GST)**	**Minister**	**Member of Government**
11/10/2024	-898*	X	
22/10/2024	3,220	X	
31/10/2024	4,293		X
12/11/2024	10,185	X	
12/11/2024	4,030	X	
Total:	**20,830**	**16,537**	**4,293**

*Refund of overpayment

13

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

P-19

Premier

Output Group 1 - Support for Members of Parliament
Output – 1.1 and 1.2 Ministerial and Parliamentary Support, Support to Members of the House of Assembly

Ministerial and Parliamentary Services Staffing

Current as at: **24-April-2026**

Talking Points

Staffing by Party

- The Paid FTEs providing Ministerial and Parliamentary Support (MPS) decreased by 10.7 Paid FTEs (-14 Paid Headcount) from 200.9 at 31 March 2025 to 190.2 at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Liberal Ministerial Offices

- Staffing in Liberal Ministerial Offices decreased by 10.5 Paid FTEs (14 Paid Headcount), from 131.5 Paid FTE at 31 March 2025 to 121.0 FTE at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Liberal Electorate Office

- Staffing in Liberal Electorate Offices has increased by 0.7 Paid FTEs (1 Paid Headcount), from 14.9 FTE at 31 March 2025 to 15.6 FTE at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Tasmanian Government Communications Office

- Staffing in the Tasmanian Government Communications Office has increased by 0.6 Paid FTEs (1 Paid Headcount), from 15.2 FTE at 31 March 2025 to 15.8 FTE at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Office of the Opposition

- Staffing in the Office of the Opposition has decreased by 0.5 Paid FTEs (-1 Paid Headcount), from 12.1 FTE at 31 March 2025 to 11.6 FTE at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Labor Electorate Offices

- Staffing in Labor Electorate Offices has decreased by 0.1 Paid FTEs (-1 Paid Headcount), from 14.1 FTE at 31 March 2025 to 14.0 FTE at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Leader of the Tasmanian Greens Office

- Staffing in Leader of the Tasmanian Greens Office has decreased by 0.1 Paid FTEs (0 Paid Headcount), from 8.0 FTE at 31 March 2025 to 7.9 FTE at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Tasmanian Greens Electorate Offices

- Staffing in Tasmanian Greens Electorate Offices has decreased by 0.3 Paid FTEs (0 Paid Headcount), from 6.1 FTEs at 31 March 2025 to 5.8 FTEs at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Independent Electorate Offices

- Staffing in the Independent Electorate Offices has increased by 0.7 Paid FTEs (1 Paid Headcount), from 11.2 FTEs at 31 March 2025 to 11.9 FTEs at 31 March 2026.

Staffing by Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Electorate Office

- As at 31 March 2026, staffing in the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Electorate Offices was 2.4 Paid FTE (3 Paid Headcount).

Table 1 – Staffing by Party – Comparison

Party Offices	31 March 2014		31 March 2024		31 March 2025		31 March 2026	
	Paid FTE	Paid H/C	Paid FTE	Paid H/C	Paid FTE	Paid H/C	Paid FTE	Paid H/C
Liberal – Ministerial Offices[1]	9.0	9	98.0	100	131.5	139	121.0	125
Liberal – Electorate Offices	10.0	13	9.4	10	14.9	17	15.6	18
Liberal – Staffing Total	**19.0**	**22**	**107.4**	**110**	**146.4**	**156**	**136.6**	**143**
Labor – Ministerial Offices[1]	100.0	108	12.3	15	12.1	13	11.6	12
Labor – Electorate Offices	11.6	14	9.7	14	14.1	20	14.0	19
Labor – Staffing Total	**111.6**	**122**	**22.0**	**29**	**26.2**	**33**	**25.6**	**31**
Greens – Ministerial Offices[1]	4.6	5	0.0	0	8.0	8	7.9	8
Greens – Electorate Offices	3.3	5	5.0	7	6.1	7	5.8	7
Greens – Staffing Total	**7.9**	**10**	**5.0**	**7**	**14.1**	**15**	**13.7**	**15**
Independent – Electorate Offices	-	-	4.0	4	11.2	13	11.9	14
Independent – Staffing Total	**-**	**-**	**4.0**	**4**	**11.2**	**13**	**11.9**	**14**
Jacqui Lambie Network – Electorate Offices	-	-	-	-	3.0	3	-	-
Jacqui Lambie Network – Staffing Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**3.0**	**3**	**-**	**-**
Shooters, Fishers and Farmers – Electorate Offices	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.4	3
Shooters, Fishers and Farmers – Staffing Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**2.4**	**3**
MPS Total	**138.5**	**154**	**138.4**	**150**	**200.9**	**220**	**190.2**	**206**

[1] Ministerial Offices includes Ministerial Drivers, Parliamentary Secretaries, Office of the Speaker, Office of the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, and the Tasmanian Government Communications Office.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Rhys Roberts	Senior Consultant – Systems and Reporting
Cleared by	Noelene Kelly	A/Chief Operations Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Andrew Prior Director People & Culture	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1: Support for Members of Parliament
Output –1.1 and 1.2 - Ministerial and Parliamentary Support (MPS), Support for Members of Parliament

MPS - Corporate Expenditure – Accommodation (Ministerial and Electorate), Travel and Entertainment

Current as at: **27-May-2026**

Electorate Offices and Costs

- Electorate offices are provided to Members to support their electorate responsibilities and their duties as Members of Parliament.
- Following the 2024 election and the expansion of Parliament, the Government invested to ensure electorate offices are contemporary, accessible, secure and fit for purpose.
- All office refurbishments and fit-outs are subject to a needs-based assessment, considering the condition of the premises, security requirements, accessibility, operational needs, energy footprint and cost.
- As at 31 March 2026, total electorate office lease costs for House of Assembly Members are approximately $1.79 million per annum, comprising $1.57 million in rent and $0.22 million in variable outgoings.
- This represents an increase of approximately $280,000, or 19 per cent, compared with 2024-25. The increase is primarily attributable to:
    - the expansion of Parliament and the provision of additional electorate offices, and

- rising market rental rates across Tasmania, including scheduled annual rent increases linked to CPI or fixed escalations.

- The average cost of an electorate office lease is approximately $51,000 per annum, reflecting an increase of around eight per cent compared to the previous year.
- Fit-out costs have also increased due to significant construction cost inflation, a trend impacting the broader property and construction sector statewide.
- The Government is committed to transparency, with electorate office fit-out costs routinely disclosed through the bi-annual Routine Disclosure process.

If asked:

Member for Franklin – Fit-out Costs

- On 31 March 2026, media reported the fit-out costs for the Member for Franklin and Treasurer at $347,634, reflecting the condition of the premises and required landlord and tenant works.
- Construction cost escalation across Tasmania has contributed to higher fit-out costs generally.
- Works were delivered through a competitive procurement process, engaging local Tasmanian small and medium enterprises.
- Consistent with the Government's commitment to transparency, electorate office establishment costs are routinely disclosed.

Table 1. Annual Leased Electorate Office costs by Party at 31 March 2026

0	No. of Offices	Lease costs per annum[1]
Liberal	14	$708,139
Labor	10	$455,376
Independent	7	$364,088
Greens	3[2]	$214,897
Vacant	1	$50,000
Total	**35**[3]	**$1,792,500**

Note:

- Lease costs are as per the Lease. Actual expenditure may vary slightly due to variable outgoings incurred on net leases.
- Rosalie Woodruff and Vica Bayley share an electorate office. Helen Burnet became an independent member.
- The number of electorate offices has increased in the past 12 months largely due to the expanded Parliament from 25 Members to 35 Members.

Table 2. Members' Allocated Electorate Office addresses and lease costs at 31 March 2026

Electorate Offices (Liberal)	Location[1]	Annual Lease Cost
Premier Rockliff	65a Emmett Street, Smithton	$10,872
Mark Shelton	10a Marlborough Street, Longford	$26,040
Minister Barnett	Shop 2, 76 Emu Bay Road, Deloraine	$25,903
Minister Felix Ellis	4/21 Alexandra Road, Ulverstone	$39,105
Minister Abetz	47 Channel Highway, Kingston[2]	$0
Minister Jane Howlett	32 Cole Street, Sorell	$51,250
Minister Bridget Archer	1/139-143 Hobart Road, Kings Meadows	$54,364
Roger Jaesch	80b Wilson Street, Burnie	$91,975
Rob Fairs	275 Invermay Road, Invermay	$56,743
Minister Ogilvie	119 Sandy Bay Road, Sandy Bay	$64,898
Jacquie Petrusma	1/10 Bayfield Street, Rosny	$85,074
Marcus Vermey	362 Main Road, Glenorchy	$98,032
Minister Gavin Pearce	58-60 Wilmot Street, Burnie	$43,055
Michael Ferguson	25-27 Paterson Street, Launceston	$60,828
	TOTAL	**$708,139**

Note:

1. The locations are representative of offices allocated to Members at 31 March 2026.

- The lease attracted a rent-free period to 15 July 2026, commencing annual lease cost $68,466

Electorate Offices (Labor)	Location	Annual Lease Cost
Brian Mitchell	1a/1b, 33 Cole Street, Sorell	$25,800
Anita Dow	15 Wilson Street, Burnie	$39,566
Janie Finlay	253 Wellington Street, Launceston	$39,545
Shane Broad	9 Oldaker Street, Devonport	$41,518
Jen Butler	Shop 9 Cove Hill Shopping Centre, Bridgewater	$42,943
Dean Winter	Shop 86, Channel Court, Kingston	$44,479
Jess Greene	219 Invermay Road, Invermay	$51,883
Josh Willie	Shop 11, Glenorchy Central, Glenorchy	$60,227
Ella Haddad	186 Collins Street, Hobart	$53,847
Meg Brown	3/11 Bayfield Street, Rosny	$55,568
	TOTAL	**$455,376**

Electorate Offices (Greens)	Location	Annual Lease Cost
Tabatha Badger	4 Gordon Street, Sorell	$32,925
Cecily Rosol	8 Willis Street, Launceston	$53,588
Rosalie Woodruff & Vica Bayley	50a Murray Street, Hobart	$128,384
	TOTAL	**$214,897**

Electorate Offices (Independent)	**Location**	**Annual Lease Cost**
Craig Garland	56 Goldie Street, Wynyard	$30,431
Carlo Di Falco (SFF)	13a Tasman Highway, Midway Point	$44,721
Kristie Johnston	Shop 2, 331 Main Road, Glenorchy	$43,229
David O'Byrne	3/90 Clarence Street, Bellerive	$51,714
George Razay	87 George Street, Launceston	$108,790
Helen Burnet	265 Elizabeth Street, North Hobart	$49,368
Peter George	Shop 96 Channel Court, Kingston	$35,835
	TOTAL	**$364,088**

Electorate Offices (Vacant)	**Location**	**Annual Lease Cost**
Unallocated	23 Franklin Street, Lindisfarne[1]	$50,000
	TOTAL	**$50,000**

Note:

1. This site was selected by former Franklin MP Nic Street, the premises were not allocated to any of the incoming MPs in this electorate.

Table 3. Minister's Allocated Ministerial Office addresses and lease costs at 31 March 2026

Ministerial Offices	Location	Annual Lease Cost
Premier Rockliff	Level 11, Executive Building, Hobart	$480,868
	43 Best Street, Devonport[1]	$53,191
	53 St John Street, Launceston[1]	$59,677
	TOTAL PREMIER	**$593,736**
Deputy Premier Barnett	Level 10, Executive Building, Hobart	$196,195
	53 St John Street, Launceston[1]	$53,344
	TOTAL DEPUTY PREMIER	**$249,539**
Minister Palmer	Level 9, Executive Building, Hobart	$192,550
	53 St John Street, Launceston[1]	$53,835
	TOTAL MINISTER PALMER	**$246,385**
Minister Vincent	Level 10, Executive Building, Hobart	$196,195
Minister Abetz	Level 10, Executive Building, Hobart	$196,195
Minister Howlett	Salamanca Building, Hobart	$192,374
Minister Ogilvie	Salamanca Building, Hobart	$192,374
Minister Archer	Salamanca Building, Hobart	$192,374
	53 St John Street, Launceston[1]	$53.344
	TOTAL MINISTER ARCHER	**$245,718**
Minister Ellis	Salamanca Building, Hobart	$192,374
Minister Pearce	Salamanca Building, Hobart	$192,374
Minister Duigan	7-9 Franklin Wharf, Hobart[2]	$86,554
	53 St John Street, Launceston[1]	$53,344
	TOTAL MINISTER PALMER	**$139,898**
Michael Ferguson MP	53 St John Street, Launceston[3]	
TOTAL MINISTERIAL OFFICE LEASE COSTS		**$1,475,226**

Note:

1. These are secondary ministerial offices located in northern and north-western regional centres.

2. This site was leased to accommodate an additional minister due to the expanded Parliament.
3. Former minister Michael Ferguson retains an office at 53 St Johns Street, until such time as an Electorate Office is established.

Additional Talking Points

Ministerial Offices

- The annual lease cost for Ministerial Offices at 31 March 2026 is $2.507 million.
- The combination of Ministerial and Electorate Offices changes from time to time due to the location and make up of Government Members. This situation may affect the way rent is apportioned from one period to the next.
- Rental costs increase annually by CPI or a fixed percentage in accordance with the lease. Upon exercise of an option, rent is reviewed to market.
- These circumstances can make it difficult to compare one period to the next.
- Following the state election on 19 July 2025, there have been changes to the occupants of the premises.

Background

- All property matters relating to electorate offices are managed by DPAC's Building and Transport Services team.
- Reasonable costs are incurred to establish fit-for-purpose electorate offices, including accessibility, security, signage, minor works and furniture, as required.
- Electorate offices are designed to a consistent standard, typically providing a private office, meeting space with video conferencing, open plan workspaces for staff, accessible amenities, and secure reception and waiting areas.
- DPAC works closely with the Premier's Office to source, design and fitout offices, with sites assessed against accessibility, security, privacy, size and value-for-money criteria.

- Offices are delivered in line with established government standards, including the Tasmanian Protective Security Policy Framework, the Strategic Asset Management Plan, and workplace health and wellbeing requirements.

Table 3. Annual Leased Electorate Office numbers and costs by Party at 31 March 2026

Party	Lease costs per annum 2014	No. of Offices 2014	Lease costs per annum 2025	No. of offices 2025	Lease costs per annum 2026	No. of offices 2026
Liberal	$243,326	9	$564,366	12	$708,139	14
Labor	$363,290	12	$438,602	10	$455,376	10
Independent	0	0	$269,464	6	$364,088	6
Green	$168,104	5	$239,993	4	$214,897	3
Vacant					$50,000	1
Total	**$774,720**	**26**	**$1,512,545**	**32**	**$1,792,500**	**34**

Table 4. Comparative Summary of Annual Leased Ministerial Office costs at 31 March 2026

Date	**2014 Labor**	**2022 Liberal**	**2023 Liberal**	**2024 Liberal**	**2025 Liberal**	**2026 Liberal**
Lease cost per annum	$1,547,570	$2,207,172	$2,085,257	$2,236,821	$2,581,163	$2,507,218

Travel

- Ministerial travel costs totalled $246,838 in the year to 2026, which is an increase from the previous year's expenditure by $22,865.
- The increase in travel is primarily due to timing of payments, with Ministerial Allowances processed as an when they are lodged.

Table 1. Travel Expenses comparison for the year ended 31 March

	2024	2025	2026
	$	$	$
Travel – Ministers Only (ministerial staff not included)	275,168	223,973	244,470

- Ministerial travel expenses fluctuate from year to year depending on the requirements of the individual Ministerial portfolios.
- Ministerial travel guidelines are in the *Handbook for Elected Members and Prescribed Parliamentary Office Holders*, which is administered by the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC).
- Details of Ministerial travel costs are routinely made available on the DPAC website as part of the Government's focus and commitment to increasing transparency and accountability by enhancing and extending the routine disclosure of information across government.
- Amounts listed relate to payment date rather than when travel occurred, with some expenditure in advance of travel and some in arrears of travel.

Background

Table 2. Travel by Minister – 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026

Minister	Intrastate	Interstate	Overseas	Total
	$	$	$	$
Premier Jeremy Rockliff	13,786	21,277	38,135	73,198
Deputy Premier Guy Barnett	23,862	5,756	-	29,618
Minister Eric Abetz	2,030	287	-	2,317
Minister Bridget Archer	20,705	6,543	-	27,248
Minister Nick Duigan	9,646	4,315	-	13,961
Minister Felix Ellis	26,689	-	-	26,689
Minister Jane Howlett	6,710	1,712	13,982	22,404
Minister Roger Jaensch	10,103	742	-	10,845
Minister Madeleine Ogilvie	1,025	-	-	1,025
Minister Jo Palmer	1,708	7,414	-	9,122

Minister Gavin Pearce	19,580	2,419	-	21,999
Minister Jacquie Petrusma	357	738	-	1,095
Minister Kerry Vincent	4,136	813	-	4,949
TOTAL	**140,337**	**52,016**	**52,117**	**244,470**

Entertainment

- The Premier is required to host a range of events, including visiting dignitaries and representatives from a variety of not-for-profit and other Government and non-Government organisations.
- Each Minister is provided with a monthly entertainment allowance under the *Parliamentary Salaries, Superannuation and Allowances Act 2012.*
- Details of the Ministers' entertainment expenditure are routinely made available on the Department of Premier and Cabinet website as part of the Government's commitment to increasing transparency and *accountability by enhancing routine disclosure of information.*

- Total entertainment expenditure for the Premier and Ministers for the year ending 31 March 2026 was $19,632.

Table 1. Entertainment Expenditure comparison for the year ended 31 March

	2024	**2025**	**2026**
	$	**$**	**$**
Entertainment	14,663	19,161	19,632

Background

Table 2 – Entertainment Expenditure for the year ended 31 March 2026.

Minister	Total $
Premier Jeremy Rockliff	3,811
Deputy Premier Guy Barnett	2,391
Minister Eric Abetz	2,767
Minister Bridget Archer	1,101
Minister Nick Duigan	1,620
Minister Felix Ellis	1,516
Minister Jane Howlett	1,257
Minister Madeleine Ogilvie	936
Minister Jo Palmer	1,773
Minister Jacquie Petrusma	802
Minister Kerry Vincent	1,013
TOTAL	**19,632**

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Rhonda Dillon	Principal Property Services Consultant
	Adrian Lockley	Specialist Accountant (Financial Reporting and Operations)
Cleared by	Noelene Kelly	Acting Chief Operations Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Karelle Logan	[redacted]
	Glen Dean	[redacted]

15

P-24

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1 - Policy, Reform and Government Priorities
Output – 1.2 Child and Youth Wellbeing

Commission of Inquiry Budget

Current as at: **14-May-2026**

Talking Points

- Our government committed $424.5 million in the 2024-25 Budget and Forward Estimates for the ongoing implementation of these reforms, including $92 million in 2026-27.
- This builds on funding of $55.1 million provided in 2023-24 prior to the acceptance of the Commission of Inquiry (COI) report.
- In addition, the 2026-27 budget commits $22 million in additional funding to support Commission of Inquiry implementation:
    - $2.5 million in 2026-27, $5 million 2027-28 and $7 million per annum from 2027-29 provides for up to 48 additional Child Safety Officers to ensure that every child and young person in contact with Child Safety, including children in Care, and their families have an allocated Child Safety Officer.
    - $155 000 in 2026-27 and $400 000 in 2027-28 to support the Tasmanian National Preventive Mechanism Office to improve custodial oversight and monitoring of non-custodial settings.
    - $233 000 in 2026-27 to support the Custodial Inspector to maintain monitoring of Ashley Youth Detention Centre and give effect to recommendations 12.38 and 12.39 of the Commission of Inquiry.

- With our additional investments this year (including $22m in 2026-27) and in previous years (2023-24, 2024-25 and 2025-26), the whole of government budget to deliver Commission of Inquiry has increased from $424.5 million over the forwards to over $600 million.
- In addition, we have set aside a further $600 million to compensate victim-survivors of child sexual abuse in our institutions.

Background

Presentation of Commission of Inquiry Funding – 2026-27 Budget Papers

- The 2024-25 Budget clearly outlined and detailed the whole of government Commission of Inquiry funding allocation as a key deliverable in 2024-25.
- This information is not repeated in the 2026-27 Budget Papers (or last year's 2025-26 Budget Papers) as Commission of Inquiry funding is a continuing commitment and not new funding.
- A full outline of the whole Commission of Inquiry funding position by line item is provided in Budget Information below or Attachment 1 (Spreadsheet - 2026-27 Budget COI funding).
- The current Budget papers do not include a specific line item that consolidates whole-of-government COI funding. Instead, activities arising from the COI recommendations are funded in their relevant output. This reflects the fact that the COI is an integrated part of service delivery and should feature in policy development in an integrated way.
- The 2026-27 Budget refers to Commission of Inquiry when:
    - describing new key deliverables related to the Commission of Inquiry response, such as additional funding for child safety workers and resourcing for the Custodial Inspector and Office of the Tasmanian National Preventative Mechanism.

'Reprofiling' of Commission of Inquiry funding in 2026-27 Budget Papers

- Reprofiling refers to the adjustment made to the 2024-25 Budget's funding for Commission of Inquiry responses, including over the forward estimates.
- The 2026-27 Budget papers refer to the 'profile of funding' when there has been a variation from the 2024-25 Budget allocation.

- In the 2026-27 Budget Papers 'profile of funding' is referred to several times in relation to Commission of Inquiry response initiatives to indicate a decrease or variation in funding from the 2024-25 Budget.

Attachment

1. Spreadsheet - 2026-27 Budget COI funding

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Harley Avent	Policy Analyst
Cleared by	Courtney Hurworth	Chief Reform Lead, Keeping Children Safe Reform Unit

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Courtney Hurworth	[redacted]

2025-26 Budget - funding for Commission of Inquiry responses

	2024-25 Budget allocation			
	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
	$'000	$'000	$'000	$'000
DECYP				
Child and Youth Empowerment	429	457	451	451
Education Regulation	114	116	119	119
Information Management - Storage and Access	....	....	....	....
Office of the State Archivist – Increasing Information Management	512	529	527	527
Reducing Harmful Sexual Behaviours	711	732	974	974
Teachers Registration Board - Customer Relationship Management	240	240	240	240
Teachers Registration Board - Resourcing	1 122	1 156	1 181	1 181
Policy Resources for Legislative Work	300	....	....	....
Aboriginal Youth Justice	586	496	494	....
After-Hours Service	779	1 061	1 037	....
Building Youth Justice Workforce Capability	574	590	603	....
Critical Case Management	546	581	574	....
Disability Liaison	409	436	431	....
Early Intervention and Diversionary Services	2 894	2 933	2 331	....
Enhanced Case Management for children and young people	1 962	2 200	2 393	....
Keeping Kids Safe in Detention	2 389	3 648	2 528	....
Strengthening Leadership and Cultural Change in Services for	880	937	925	....
Therapeutic Supports and Case Management for Children in Detention	1 730	1 840	1 819	....
Office of Aboriginal Policy and Practice and implementing the Aboriginal	400	426	671	250
Complaints Management System	200	200	200	....
Volunteer and contractor management - System Development	200	200	200	....
Youth Justice Reform	1 376	1 486	1 447	....
Out of Home Care Reform Implementation Unit	812	858	855	....
Implementation Taskforce	835	....		....
Out of Home Care - Additional funding	30 000	30 000	30 000	....
DECYP Total	60 000	60 000	60 000	3 742
Health				
Child Safety and Wellbeing Service	2 000	2 080	2 151	2 151
Engagement with Children and Young People	177	182	188	188
Enhancements to the Child and Adolescent Youth Forensic Mental Health	2 300	3 244	3 971	3 971
Mental and Physical Care for Children in Detention	2 142	2 142	2 205	2 205
One Health Culture Program	2 000	2 000	2 000	2 000
Recovery Assistance for the Launceston Community	200			
Specialist Mental Health Services in Out of Home Care	2 976	4 137	4 261	4 261
Statewide Complaints Management	1 800	1 800	1 800	1 800
Health Total	13 595	15 585	16 576	16 576
Justice				
Assistance for Victims of Crime	299	299	299	....
Audit of Historical Government Records	482	....	....	....
Commission for Children and Young People	....	....	....	....
Commission of Inquiry Legislative Program	790	790	381	....
Implementation Monitor				
Implementation Taskforce	697	697	697	....
Improvements to Audiovisual Equipment in Courts	39	39	39	....
Increase Victims of Crime Counselling Service	666	686	810	....
Making Justice a Child Safe Organisation	948	....	....	....
Office of the Independent Regulator	4 230	4 230	4 230	4 230
TASCAT Expansion of Services for New Jurisdictions	360	720	720	....
Tasmania Legal Aid – Commission of Inquiry Response	388	324	324	....
Tasmanian Law Reform Institute Review of the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1995 and Evidence Act 2001	....	....	....	....
Training for Statutory Officers	54	54	54	54
Trauma Informed Apologies for Victim-Survivors of Child Sexual Abuse in	203	203	203	....
Treatment Programs for Offenders and Non Offenders	831	1 188	1 188	....
Witness Intermediary Scheme	1 078	1 078	1 078	....
Justice Total	11 066	10 288	10 023	4 284
DPFEM				
Arch Statewide Permanent Funding	4 536	4 838	5 149	5 149
Develop a Strategy to Engage with Priority Communities	869	913	958	....
Evidence Recording Equipment	169	223	115	....
Implementation of the Community Protection (Offender Reporting)	565	588	594	....
Implementation Taskforce	587	....	....	....
Management of Information for the Protection of Children	1 140	1 140	1 140	....

[redacted]

S.27

Online Reporting of Sexual Violence	1 069	68	68	
Police Professional Standards	263	263	263	
Quality and Audit Assurance File Sampling	149	149	150	.
Tasmania Police - Professional Development	270	270	270	-
OPFEM Total	**9 616**	**8 452**	**8 707**	**6 149**
DPAC				
Child and Community Engagement	900	900	900	
Commission for Children and Young People	2 470	2 475	2 475	2 475
Enhanced Communications to the Community	900	900	900	...
Implementation Monitor	1 488	1 497	1 504	-
Partnering with the Community (funding for community sector)	1 000		...	..
Reducing Harmful Sexual Behaviours	1 350	1 350	1 350	
Reform Unit	1 574	900	900	
Resilience and Recovery - Support for Victim Survivors - including Victim-	1 800	900	900	-
DPAC Total	**11 482**	**8 922**	**8 929**	**2 475**
Integrity Commission				
Oversight and Compliance Program	200	200	200	-
DPP				
Increased capacity to respond to COI recommendations	2 700	2 700	2 700	..
Office of the Ombudsman				
Right to Information - additional staffing for Investigation, Review and Education	200	200	200	-
TOTAL	**98 858**	**96 347**	**97 335**	**38 228**

CAPITAL				
DECYP				
Teachers Registration Board - Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system	1 500		..	-
Enhanced Case Management for children and young people in detention and out of home care	1 382	2 777	2 793	
Health				
Human Resources Information System	10 000			-
St Johns Park - Child and Adolescent Mental Health Inpatient Unit and Day Facility	2 000	5 000	9 000	15 000
Justice				
Improvements to Audiovisual Equipment in Courts	420	..	...	..

[redacted]

S.27

16

P-26

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 1 - Policy, Reform and Government Priorities
Output – 1.2 Child and Youth Wellbeing
(Note: Woolcott Review - Part B is subject to a separate BEB developed by DoJ)

Woolcott Review - Response to Implementation

Current as at: **18-May-2025**

Talking Points

- The Tasmanian Government is 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.
- The Government's response includes the lead agency responsible for implementation of supported, supported in part, and supported in principle recommendations.
- The overall coordination of implementation is sitting within the responsibilities of the Chief Reform Lead in DPAC, reporting to me through the Secretary, DPAC.
- These reforms are focused on ensuring concerns about child safety are identified earlier, shared more effectively, and acted on decisively across all parts of government.
- Since accepting the Woolcott Review recommendations in March 2026, the Government has moved quickly 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 information sharing, improve accountability across public institutions, and support more effective child-safe responses across government.
- Key amendments include:
    - 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 within the Child and Youth Safe Standards and Reportable Conduct Scheme, with retrospective effect proposed as a priority issue.
- These reforms are supported by broader implementation work already underway, including strengthened regulator oversight, agency-level child-safe action planning, and continued monitoring of high-risk settings.
- The Tasmanian Government has committed to incorporating Woolcott recommendations that relate to child safety into the Change for Children Action Plan and the broader Keeping Children Safe Reform Program.
- The Action Plan is due for final approval and release in early August 2026, after we provide our next progress reporting to the Office of the Implementation Monitor in July 2026.

- This work will continue at pace, with further reforms to ensure Tasmania's child safety system is stronger, more transparent, and better equipped to protect children over the long term.

Q&A

Q1. Have all the recommendations been accepted?

The Tasmanian Government has carefully considered all recommendations from the Woolcott Review and has broadly accepted the Review's findings.

The Government's response supports recommendations directed at strengthening child safety and State Service employment and integrity settings, while noting some recommendations - particularly those relating to State Service Management Office - for further consideration as part of ongoing public sector reform work.

The Government welcomes the Review's findings that concerns raised by the Commission of Inquiry about State Servants' conduct have been appropriately dealt with.

Q2. When will the recommendations be implemented?

A formal Government Response has been released and the Government is already progressing implementation of supported recommendations.

Recommendations relating to child safety and wellbeing will be incorporated into the Change for Children Action Plan (due mid-2026) and the broader Keeping Children Safe Reform Program, with progress to be publicly reported.

Q3. Will funding be provided to implement the recommendations?

Many Woolcott recommendations do not require new funding as they refine existing child safety settings already in place; where additional resourcing is required, funding considerations will form part of the normal State Budget process.

Q4. Will the Independent Monitor have oversight of the recommendations?

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.

Background

- In November 2023 the Tasmanian Government appointed former APS Commissioner Peter Woolcott AO to review how agencies responded to Commission of Inquiry concerns about Tasmanian State Service employees and officers.
- The Review examined the TSS misconduct policy and legislative framework and how concerns raised by the Commission were assessed, escalated and managed.
- The Review found that complaints about named State Servants raised by the Commission of Inquiry had been addressed under existing frameworks, while also identifying opportunities to strengthen consistency, transparency and system-wide responses.
- The Woolcott Review's recommendations are explicitly framed to enhance and tighten the State Service employment, integrity, information sharing and oversight settings that have been put in place through the Tasmanian Government's response to the Commission of Inquiry.
- Many Woolcott recommendations directly align with, or build on, specific Commission of Inquiry recommendations (for example, on code of conduct obligations, investigation practice, stewardship of the State Service, and information sharing about child sexual abuse matters).

- The Government has committed to incorporating supported Woolcott recommendations that relate to child safety and wellbeing into the Change for Children Action Plan and the broader Keeping Children Safe Reform Program.

Woolcott Review Cost

- The Review was commissioned in November 2023, with Peter Woolcott and the review team commencing in February 2024.
- The final part of the Review was delivered in December 2025.
- [redacted]

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Harley Avent	Policy Analyst
Cleared by	Rani Cavarretta	Assistant Director
	Lisa Howes	CGRO

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Courtney Hurworth	[redacted]

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

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

Current as at: **10-May-2026**

Talking Points

- This Output provides:
    - administrative support for Executive Government bodies such as Cabinet and the Executive Council;
    - management of machinery of government matters;
    - coordination of State protocols and advice;
    - Right to Information responses; and
    - other Executive Government processes.
- This Output also 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.

FTE Information

- Paid FTEs decreased by 27.1 FTE, from 138.3 at 31 March 2025 to 111.2 at 31 March 2026.

Table 1 – FTE Comparison as at 31 March

Title	*31 March 2025*	*31 March 2026*
Paid FTEs[1]	138.3[2]	111.2

Budget Information

Table 2	**Budget Allocation as outlined in 2026-27 Budget - (Total Expenses by Portfolio and Output)**				
Premier	***2025-26 $'000***	***2026-27 $'000***	***2027-28 $'000***	***2028-29 $'000***	***2029-30 $'000***
Output Group 2 – Government System Support					
2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor	13 757	15 109	12 521	11 872	11 996

- The 2026-27 Budget includes the following increases in funding compared to 2025-26:
  - $300 000 for Tasmanian Agricultural Shows - AGFEST
  - $2.0 million for continuation of funding to support services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor.

[1] Agencies now report using Paid FTEs for a more consistent reflection of FTEs, and the number provided is how many FTEs are paid as at the last pay period in March. This figure changes constantly with ons and offs, work pattern changes and unpaid leave.
[2] Output Groups were updated for the year ending 30 June 2025.

Performance Information

- RTI Requests and Draft responses to routine Ministerial correspondence: 2023-24 and 2024-25 Actuals reflected the significant number of concurrent priorities the Department managed over that time (including elections in both years, incoming government processes, two budget estimates periods).
- IT performance figures responding to requests from Government House and MPS 2023-24 decrease reflected re-prioritisation of IT services due to additional pressures particularly relating to the 2024 and 2025 House of Assembly Elections.
  - IT performance percentage is calculated on requests that are logged in the service management system and are resolved within the timeframes defined in the relevant service level agreement.

Performance Information

Table 2 – Performance Information – Output 2.1

Performance Measure	Unit of Measure	2023--24 Actual	2024--25 Actual	2025--26 Target	2026--27 Target
Support Service for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor					
Right to Information Requests responded to within statutory timeframes	%	77	84	100	100
Documents provided to Cabinet within agreed timeframes	%	96	96	100	100
Draft responses to routine Ministerial correspondence actioned within ten days of receipt	%	59	58	90	90
Percentage of Payroll and HR functions provided to Government House and MPS in agreed timeframes	%	100	100	100	100
Percentage of IT requests from Government House and MPS met within agreed service level agreement timeframes	%	87	72	90	90

	Name	Position
Prepared by		EGS/Finance Teams
Cleared by	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Courtney Ingham	[redacted]

18

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

P-34

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Gifts and Benefits - DPAC & Ministerial

Current as at: **14-April-2026**

Talking Points

- The Tasmanian Government is committed to the highest standards of public disclosure, transparency and accountability.
- This commitment is reflected through the Tasmanian State Service *Gifts, Benefits and Hospitality Policy and Procedures* as well as the *Code of Conduct for Ministers: Receipt and Giving of Gifts Policy* which manage the acceptance, receipt and disposal of gifts by public officers to ensure the highest standards of impartiality and integrity.
- My Department has contributed to the Management of gifts and benefits audit, being conducted by Audit Tasmania.

TSS Gifts, Benefits and Hospitality Policy

- The Government produced an updated the Whole-of-Government Gifts, Benefits and Hospitality Policy and Procedures in November 2025.
- These documents can be viewed on the Department of Premier and Cabinet website.
- The changes reflect recommendations made by the Integrity Commission in Project Vulcan as well as other general policy improvements.

- The new policy and procedures set the minimum standard that applies to all officers working in the Tasmanian State Service in relation to managing gifts and will support better decision-making and reinforce public trust in the integrity of the State Service.
- As well as introducing the new policy and procedures, the Department of Premier and Cabinet has introduced a new digital process for making declarations to improve efficiency.

Code of Conduct for Ministers: Receipt and Giving of Gifts Policy

Gifts Received

- The Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC) arranges for a valuation of all gifts received by Ministers.
- Gifts valued at $50 and under are not recorded on either register.
- Gifts valued between $50 and $500 can either be kept by the recipient, remain the property of the Crown or be donated to an organisation of the recipient's choice.
- Gifts valued over $500 must remain the property of the Crown or be donated to a not-for-profit organisation of the recipient's choice.

Gifts Given

- For gifts given, the responsible Minister (through their Department), provides the detail and value of the gift to be recorded on the register.
- The Gifts Received and Gifts Given registers relate to all gifts received or given in relation to an individual Minister's position and/or portfolio responsibilities.

- The Premier tables the two registers during the last sitting week of Parliament each year (i.e. November).
- Once tabled, both registers are published on the DPAC website as annual routine disclosures.
- Ministers are personally responsible for ensuring the accuracy of these registers.

Motion on Government Transparency

- On 20 May 2026, Craig Garland MP, moved a motion in the House of Assembly. That the House -

  (1) Acknowledges;

  (a) that public trust, governmental integrity, and confidence in democratic decision making systems in Tasmania are improved by timely, accessible, meaningful, and transparent disclosure of:

  (i) ministerial diaries; and

  (ii) gifts and benefits of hospitalities received by government ministers in the course of their official duties (hereinafter referred to as gifts disclosure).

  (b) the submissions received by the Department of Premier and Cabinet during the December 2025 public consultation on the ministerial diaries discussion paper; and

  (c) the current process for gifts disclosure in Tasmania is significantly less frequent than in other Australian states.

  (2) Calls on the Government to table in the House, by no later than 16 June 2026:

  (a) its formal response to submissions received during the ministerial diaries disclosure consultation process;

  (b) the specific improvements it intends to make to the ministerial diaries disclosure process, including a definitive timeline for doing so; and

  (c) advice as to whether it intends to improve the gifts disclosure process and if so, detailed information in relation to the process and timing by which this will be done.

- The Motion was supported and agreed to.
- DPAC is currently reviewing its policy position and will provide a response as requested.

Background

(Refer to the 'Performance Audits April 2025' BEB for information on the Auditor-General's Gifts, Benefits and Hospitality Audit. This is due to be released early June.)

Code of Conduct for Ministers: Receipt and Giving of Gifts Policy

- **Acceptance of event tickets:**
  There may be times when a Minister or the Premier receives a ticket with a value greater than $500 for an event that is related to their portfolio responsibilities. Acceptance is at the discretion of both the Minister and Premier.
- **Declaration of gifts and updates to the register:**
  The 'Code of Conduct for Ministers: Receipt and Giving of Gifts Policy' requires that the Premier will ensure the registers for each calendar year are tabled in the House of Assembly. Apart from these two gift registers, a register of Members' Interests is managed by Parliament House which relates to the legislated requirement to disclose pecuniary and other interests.

Attachments

- Attachment 1 - Official Gifts RECIEVED Register - November 2024 - October 2025
- Attachment 2 - Official Gifts GIVEN Register - November 2024 - October 2025
- Attachment 3 - DPAC Gifts Register - January 2025 - November 2025
- Attachment 4 – ABC – Media – Gifts and Benefits – December 2025
- Attachment 5 – Mercury online article – 5 May 2026
- Attachment 6 – Motion – Government Transparency – 20 May 2026

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Gemma Smith	Program Manager, Executive Government Services
Cleared by	Lisa Howes	Chief Risk and Governance Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Gemma Smith (for TSS gifts)	[redacted]
	Deanna Turnbull (for Ministerial gifts)	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group – 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Integrity - Conflict of Interest for State Servants

Current as at: **13-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The Tasmanian community expects that public sector employees will put the interests of the community first.
- The Tasmanian State Service is well placed to manage any actual or perceived conflicts of interest, with appropriate policies, practices and procedures currently in place.
- All public sector employees are responsible for identifying and managing conflicts of interest.
- Failure to identify, declare and manage conflicts of interest can lead to a loss of confidence in the individual employee, the organisation and trust in the public sector.
- The State Service Code of Conduct in section 9(1)(8) of the *State Service Act 2000* provides:

  An employee must disclose, and take reasonable steps to avoid, any conflict of interest in connection with the employee's State Service employment.

- In addition to identifying and managing conflicts of interest, DPAC proactively records any interests for Senior Executive Service Officers or identified officers responsible for significant decision-making in government more broadly on an annual basis.

Conflict of Interest Policy

- DPACs Conflict of Interest Policy sets out a framework for staff to identify, disclose, manage and monitor conflicts of interest in a transparent way. The Policy covers functions where the risk of a conflict of interest may arise:
    - Recruitment and selection processes
    - Secondary appointment
    - Contract or grant allocation/awarding
    - Board membership
    - Performance management/workplace relationships
    - Procurement
    - Receipt and giving of gifts, benefits and hospitality.
- DPAC is implementing the recommendations of an internal audit report on managing conflicts of interest.
- The recommendations include extending the annual declaration process to all employees and better management and monitoring of declarations and mitigating conflicts that have been declared.

Background

Conflict of Interest policy

- The Department of Premier and Cabinet Conflict of interest policy is currently being updated taking into account the recommendations of the WLF Conflicts of interest management report and guidance from the Integrity Commission on how to manage conflicts of interest.
- Further, Audit Tasmania is currently conducting an audit to assess whether Tasmanian Government Departments transparently mitigate the risk of actual, perceived or potential conflicts of interest through effective management of gifts, benefits and hospitality. This Audit Report is due for release in June 2026.
- The internal audit conducted by the Department's contractor was completed in August 2025 at a cost of [redacted]. This audit was conducted as part of the Department's strategic audit plan. This audit was relied upon by Audit Tasmania when conducting their review of the management of gifts, benefits and hospitality.

Name Position

Prepared by	Bridget Hutton	Senior Executive Officer, Executive Government Services
Cleared By	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer
DPAC contact for more information:	Courtney Ingham	Director, Executive Government Services, [redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group – 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Integrity - Code of Conduct for Ministers and Conflicts of Interest

Current as at: **10-April-2026**

Talking Points

- All members of this Government are strongly committed to the highest standards of integrity and propriety for the people of Tasmania.
- This Government is committed to acting honestly, professionally and with accountability in the performance of our duties for a strong future for our State.
- The Government has reviewed and approved an updated Code of Conduct for Ministers following the election in July 2025.
- Following the swearing in of the new Cabinet, I wrote to all Ministers requesting any conflicts of interest be declared.
- Any potential conflicts of interest declared by Ministers are managed in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

Code of Conduct for Ministers **(the Code)**

- The Code applies to the Premier and each Minister. Ministers must observe the Code at all times and the consequence of any failure to do so is a matter between the Premier and the Minister concerned.

- Should there be an allegation that a Minister has breached the Code, it is up to the Premier to determine if, or how the complaint is to be investigated.
- By convention, an independent investigator who has relevant investigatory or legal skills is usually engaged to investigate potential Code of Conduct breaches.
- The Code is based on the framework that was adopted by the Government in March 2014 and updated with the formation of each new government.
- The Code was most recently reviewed after the July 2025 election and was subsequently accepted by Cabinet. No substantive changes were made in this revision.
- In 2021, the Government amended the section of the Code relating to respect for people, to demonstrate that the Government will operate in a manner that withstands the closest public scrutiny.
- We are committed to ensuring that everybody can work in a safe, respectful, and inclusive environment, free from discrimination, harassment, and bullying.
- We value diversity and work respectfully with people of different cultures, ages, ethnicities, religions, abilities, sexual orientations, and identities.
- The Code is available on the Department of Premier and Cabinet's website.

Conflict of Interest

- To protect and uphold the public interest, Ministers must take reasonable steps to avoid, resolve or disclose any material conflicts of interest, financial or non-financial, that arise or are likely to arise, between their personal interests and their official duties.

- All Ministers have been asked to declare to the Premier whether they have any conflicts of interest in relation to their portfolio responsibilities.

- All Ministers have completed declaration of interest forms, and any potential or perceived conflicts will be managed in accordance with the Code of Conduct for Ministers.

Report of the Auditor-General No. 3 of 2025-26 Proposed sale of Wilkinsons Point land

- The Auditor-General's report dated 24 September 2025 recommended that DPAC establishes protocols to support State entities working with Ministers in a way that aligns with the State Service Principles.

- DPAC will review the Code of Conduct for Ministers and Ministerial and Parliamentary Support Code of Conduct in conjunction with the Premier's Office to determine if any additional guidance or protocols are required.

Background

Respect for persons

- Following the 2021 election, the Code of Conduct for Ministers was updated to better articulate and reflect community standards of behaviour and issues of community concern, particularly with respect to the treatment of women.

Conflict of Interest

- The Code and associated guidelines provide clear guidance to Ministers on how to deal with potentially difficult accountability issues, including conflicts of interest and any pecuniary interests.
- Any material conflict between a Minister's private interest and their official duty which arises, must be resolved promptly in favour of the public interest.

s.27 [redacted]

s.27

[redacted]

s.27

[redacted]

s.27

[redacted]

s.27

[redacted]

s.27 [redacted]

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Ella Bray	Senior Policy Officer, Executive Government Services
Cleared By	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer

DPAC contact for more information:	Courtney Ingham	Director, Executive Government Services, [redacted]

Premier

Output Group – Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Lobbying Code of Conduct

Current as at: **22-April-2026**

Talking Points

- Ethical lobbying is an important part of the democratic process.
- The Lobbying Code of Conduct exists to:
  - guide ethical conduct between public officials and lobbyists;
  - enhance fairness and transparency in government decision making; and
  - improve the quality of government decision making.
- Lobbyists and public officials are expected to comply with the requirements of the Code to ensure high standards of professional conduct and to facilitate an open and transparent government.
- This government is committed to the highest level of transparency and this includes releasing more information than ever before.
- As part of my government's transparency agenda, Ministerial diaries will now be routinely disclosed on a monthly basis.
- This means the public will be able to access up-to-date information about any meetings held between Ministers and registered lobbyists or lobbying organisations on our routine disclosures webpage.

(If asked, Simon Behrakis)

- Mr Behrakis served as my Parliamentary Secretary and as the Parliamentary Secretary for Housing and Planning prior to the 2025 State election.
- Mr Behrakis was unsuccessful in retaining his seat in the 2025 election.
- I was advised that Mr Behrakis had registered as a lobbyist with The Advisory Tasmania Pty Ltd in compliance with the Lobbying Code of Conduct.
- I wrote to all Ministers reminding them of their obligations under the Code of Conduct when engaging with any registered lobbyist.
- My Cabinet is committed to upholding the principles of the Lobbying Code of Conduct and operating with transparency, integrity and honesty.

Background

- The Tasmanian Government Register of Lobbyists and Lobbying Code of Conduct was previously administered by DPAC from 2009 until 2022.
- On 9 March 2021, Cabinet agreed to transfer responsibility for the Tasmanian Government Lobbying Code of Conduct and Lobbyist Register to the Integrity Commission from 1 July 2021. The purpose of the transfer was to align the administration of the lobbying framework with the functions of the Integrity Commission as provided by the Tasmanian *Integrity Commission Act 2009*. The transfer also brought Tasmania's lobbying regulation into alignment with Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland by providing oversight by an independent statutory authority.
- The CEO, Integrity Commission wrote to the Secretary, DPAC accepting its role to establish and maintain lobbying codes of conduct and registration systems but requested more time and additional funding prior to the transfer. The transfer of the administration of the lobbying framework took effect from 1 July 2022.
- The Integrity Commission considered that this transfer presented an appropriate opportunity to review how lobbying is managed in Tasmania and other jurisdictions, and to seek expert and community views on the best system for managing and recording lobbying within Tasmania.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Ella Bray	Senior Policy Officer, Executive Government Services
Cleared by	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Courtney Ingham	Director, Executive Government Services, [redacted]

26

P-38

Parliamentary Briefing 2025

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Media Monitoring

Current as at: **08-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The Tasmanian Government Shared Media Monitoring Services contract is a whole-of-government contract that provides print, radio, TV and online media monitoring about Tasmanian Government projects and programs.
- The department spent $47,025 for a whole of Government media monitoring service in the year ending 31 March 2026.
- The multi-agency media monitoring contract results in savings across government through sharing the cost of copyright and sourcing, and improved economies of scale through the procurement process.
- Monitoring what is being reported on across media channels about the projects and programs that agencies present provides an understanding of the reach, impact and perception of activities delivered by government to the benefit of Tasmanians.
- The expenditure noted for 2026 is attributed to a media monitoring Pilot program that is being delivered to ascertain governments media monitoring needs.
- This expenditure and other costs noted, are a shared investment made by the four (4) agencies that are participating in the Pilot

program and who have accessed the service in previous years. Agencies include DPAC, DoH, DPFEM and Homes Tasmania.

- Having a dedicated provider of media monitoring services for the Tasmanian Government delivers a range of cost efficiencies and helps government to communicate policies, and garner insights and community opinions to inform policy positions or actions.

Background: Media monitoring pilot

- On December 1, 2024, the Tasmanian Government entered a whole of government "media monitoring pilot" with Isentia Pty Ltd at a cost of $99,000 per annum.
- The initial pilot involved five (5) participating agencies including:
  - DPAC
  - DPFEM
  - Health
  - Homes Tasmania
  - TasTAFE
- The pilot program allowed DPAC and participating agencies to better understand a more modern media monitoring system prior to conducting a whole of government media monitoring tender.

- The proposed breakdown of investment into the Pilot by each participating agency (excluding GST) was:

Agency	Cost (annually)
DPAC	$59,000
DoH	$12,000
DPFEM	$8,000
Home Tasmania	$8,000
TasTAFE	$12,000
TOTAL	**$99,000**

- DPAC manage the contract and invoice each participating agency for their contribution.

- On December 1, 2025 the pilot program was extended on a quarterly basis to ensure continuity of media monitoring services while DPAC progressed the whole of government media monitoring tender.
- TasTAFE opted to no longer participate in the pilot program.
- The updated breakdown of costs were as follows:

Agency	Total (12 months)	Quarterly instalment amount
DPAC	$61,000	$15,250
DoH	$13,050	$3,262.50
DPFEM	$10,000	$2,500
Homes Tasmania	$10,000	$2,500
TOTAL	**$94,050**	**$23,512.50**

Efficiencies in costs

- A key part of the media monitoring pilot and tender process was ensuring better cost efficiencies in media monitoring services.
- Rather than a "cost per clip" fee model, the current media monitoring contract provides an annual flat rate for all services, removing uncertainty of fluctuating costs based on periods of increased media coverage.
- The current media monitoring service also provides a 24/7 online portal to access media monitoring clips, transcripts, and broadcasts - removing the requirement to request these items and services at an extra cost to government.

Whole of Government Media Monitoring tender

- A Request for Tender (DPAC 2023-24-156) was conducted to procure a software as a service solution for a Shared Media Monitoring Service for the Tasmanian Government.
- This service involves a supplier providing media reports to government that capture what is being reported on and/or broadcast across media channels (print, radio, TV and online) about the Tasmanian Governments projects and programs as well as political commentary.
- Having a whole-of-government Shared Media Monitoring Service will provide cost and time efficiencies for government and avoid unnecessary administration of multiple contracts with various providers for the provision of media monitoring services.
- The procurement of the service was undertaken in accordance with the relevant Treasurer's Instructions through an open Request for Tender process managed by DPAC in consultation with the Office of the Crown Solicitor.
- DPAC is currently in the final contractual stages of a new whole of government shared media monitoring service, which will involve the following participating agencies:
  - Department of Education, Children and Young People
  - Department of Health
  - Department of Natural Resources and Environment
  - Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management
  - Department of Premier and Cabinet
  - Department of State Growth
  - Homes Tasmania
  - Macquarie Point Development Corporation
  - Tasmanian Audit Office

  - Tourism Tasmania
- It is anticipated the new whole of government media monitoring service contract is expected to be in place in the second half of 2026.

Budget Information

Table 1 – Media Monitoring expenditure for the year ending 31 March.

	March 2024 $	March 2025 $	March 2026 $
Media monitoring	$71,107	$122,681	$47,025

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Michael Saunders	Manager, Strategic Communications and Media
Cleared by	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Lisa Howes	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Strategic Communications and Media – Role of Department and Staffing

Current as at: **08-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The Department of Premier and Cabinet Strategic Communications and Media unit provide specialist communications and media advice and services to a range of stakeholders including:
    - DPAC business units
    - Agency communications units
    - Government Media Office
    - Premier and Ministerial offices
    - The wider Tasmanian community.
- The unit also plays a Whole-of-Government function in overseeing and advising on the Tasmanian Government Corporate Brand Identity and Communications Policy and managing the Tasmanian Government Communications and Marketing Panel.
- The Strategic Communications and Media unit currently employs seven (7) permanent staff with a total FTE of 6.2.
- Other roles and responsibilities of the unit include:
    - Graphic design support
    - Marketing and advertising
    - Internal communications

- Media management and support
- Proofreading
- Managing DPAC websites and social media channels

Difference between DPAC Strategic Communications and Media unit and the Government Media Office

- The Strategic Communications and Media unit sits within the Governance and Risk group in the Department of Premier and Cabinet.
- While the unit provides support to the Government of the day – it is not part of the My (Premier's) media advisor team – known as the Government Media Office.
- In accordance with the State Service Code of Conduct, the Strategic Communications and Media unit is apolitical, performing its functions in an impartial, ethical and professional matter.

Election Commitment

- DPAC is leading a project to progress implementation of the election commitment to consolidate communications, marketing and media across the public service.
- This will strengthen the Tasmanian Government's communications, marketing and media capability to deliver clear, consistent and timely communication, improve community trust, and enhance whole-of-government response effectiveness.
- An external consultant, McGregor & Associates, was engaged to provide independent advice on current communications capability and options for future operating models.
- The contract is worth up to $35,000.

- Using targeted external expertise helped make sure the review reflected current practice.
- When Government is considering long-term changes to a core function like communications, it is important the work is careful, evidence-based and informed by the right expertise.
- This is about getting the design right so any improvements are practical and sustainable.
- The work so far has been done in consultation with agencies and will continue to be refined through the next stage of design and implementation.

(Further information is in the EPU brief)

FTE Information

- Paid FTEs decreased by 3.3 FTE, from 9.5 on 31 March 2025 to 6.2 on 31 March 2026.

Table 1	**Paid FTE comparison – March 2024 to March 2026**		
Title	***31 March 2024***	***31 March 2025***	***31 March 2026***
Paid FTEs[1]	8.0	9.5	6.2

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Michael Saunders	Manager, Strategic Communications and Media
Cleared by		

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Lisa Howes	[redacted]

[1] Agencies now report using Paid FTEs for a more consistent reflection of FTEs, and the number provided is how many FTEs are paid as at the last pay period in March. This figure changes constantly with ons and offs, work pattern changes and unpaid leave.

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Parliamentary Disclosures of Interests

Current as at: **10-April-2026**

Talking Points

- The Tasmanian Government is committed to the highest standards of public disclosure, transparency and accountability.
- As part of that commitment, the Government updated the *Parliamentary Disclosure of Interests Act 1996* (the Act) in 2017 to ensure that Members' interests are available for public scrutiny.
- The amendments were based on recommendations put forward by key stakeholders including the Integrity Commission and the Parliamentary Standards Commissioner.
- The amendments made a number of significant changes to disclosure requirements, including requiring:
    - the register of interests to be published online;
    - the disclosure of the interests of spouses (which includes de facto partners); and
    - the disclosure of a broader range of gifts and benefits, such as non-monetary gifts.
- The Register of Parliamentary Members' interests can be accessed on the Parliamentary website.
- Under the Act, Members of Parliament are required to complete an Annual Return Form on or before 1 October each year.

- New Members are required to complete a Primary Return within three months of taking the Oath.
- The Integrity Commission has responsibility under section 30(a) of the *Integrity Commission Act 2009* to monitor the operation of the Parliamentary Disclosure of Interest Register.

Integrity Commission Monitoring

- In March 2023, the Integrity Commission released an audit report which recommended three changes to how Members of Parliament disclose their personal interests.
- The recommendations suggested amending the *Parliamentary Disclosure of Interests Act 1996* to include:
  - declaring any direct or indirect benefits, or advantages or liabilities, whether pecuniary or not, that may raise a conflict between a Member's private interests and their duties as a Member;
  - broadening and simplifying disclosure of interests in trusts and including disclosures of the assets of dependent children; and
  - that any changes to disclosed interests be notified by Members within 28 days.
- It is important to note that the Integrity Commission *'found that the audited members did not have substantial personal pecuniary interests and generally they declared all interests required by law. Two of the audited members were found to have failed to declare an interest of their spouse; both members explained that this was the result of an error'*.
- DPAC is working on a number of initiatives as part of its broad transparency agenda. Part of this work will consider the Integrity Commission's recommendations on Parliamentary

disclosures and how these recommendations are taken forward.

- DPAC acknowledges that the reform work is not yet completed. Since the IC Report, there were two State elections, two caretaker periods, multiple machinery of government changes, a Commission of Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings and the establishment of the Keeping Children Safe whole-of-government Reform program. This context is not to excuse the length of time it has taken to respond to the Integrity Commission's recommendations, but to illustrate the significant competing priorities for DPAC during this period.

Background

- The *Parliamentary (Disclosure of Interests) Act 1996* (the Act) has been in place for nearly 30 years. In this time, community expectations have changed, with increased demand for openness and transparency of the actions of the Government and the Parliament.
- In 2016-17, the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC) reviewed the Act and considered the recommendations of a number of external reviews and the practices of other Australian jurisdictions. This research informed the development of the *Parliamentary (Disclosure of Interests) Amendment Act 2017* (the Amendment Act).
- The Amendment Act received final endorsement by the House of Assembly on 21 September 2017 and received Royal Assent on 16 October 2017. The Amendment Act was proclaimed on 1 December 2017.
- The Regulations, gazetted on 29 November 2017, prescribe:
    1. the register is to comprise the returns of Members lodged within the previous eight years, be divided into two parts (Primary Returns and Annual Returns) and may comprise multiple electronic files on a website;
    2. the relevant Clerk is to make a hard copy of the register available for inspection at the Parliamentary Library during normal business hours;
    3. the relevant Clerk is to publish a register online within seven days after tabling before the relevant House of Parliament and ensure it has a series of security properties, which include: that the register be uploaded in a file format that cannot be edited, that it have a watermark applied across each page, and have deleted any other information in accordance with Section 21 of the Act;

4. in forming an opinion to delete certain matters that would unreasonably compromise the privacy or safety of a person under section 21 of the Act, the relevant Clerk may seek confidential advice from a third party and ask a Member to provide reasons; and
5. the relevant Clerk is to amend the register if a return is amended by a Member.

- DPAC developed revised Primary Return, Annual Return and Variation Return forms to support Members to meet the revised disclosure requirements.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Ella Bray	Senior Policy Officer, Executive Government Services
Cleared by	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Bridget Hutton, Senior Executive Officer, Executive Government Services	[redacted]

29

P-41

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Release of Cabinet Information

Current as at: **20-May-2026**

Talking Points

- Cabinet is the highest decision-making body in government and the types of matters considered can have significant implications for government and the broader community.
- Government is committed to transparency and providing the community with information that supports community confidence in the decision-making of government.
- That's why we are working through a policy position to proactively release Cabinet information.
- An active release scheme will demonstrate the Government's commitment.
- This is a very significant policy change for Tasmania.
- There will need to be a balance between active release of cabinet information, and preserving the importance of Cabinet Confidentiality, which of course is foundational to our system of government
- Government is looking at lessons learned from other jurisdictions as we design, build and implement a policy which balances these considerations in a Tasmanian context.
- In fact, in our response to the independent review of RTI, we committed to exploring the mechanisms to align with the

Australian Government's practice of releasing Cabinet Documents after 20 years.

- Work had commenced to design, implement and deliver on the recommendation around the 20 year routine release of Cabinet records.
- The Department of Premier and Cabinet will lead this work.
- I have been advised that there is no requirement to amend legislation to implement the active disclosure scheme or to release Cabinet Documents after 20 years. We are however, committed to developing, designing and building this process to get it right.

Cabinet Confidentiality

- My Government will work to ensure that we find the appropriate balance is met between transparency surrounding Cabinet information and the foundational principles of Cabinet considerations.
- Active and historical releases will be made in the public interest, with considerations given to important protections such as legal proceedings, law enforcement, commercial in confidence, personal privacy and national security amongst others.
- Cabinet is the highest decision-making body in government and the types of matters considered can have significant implications for government and the broader community.
- Cabinet confidentiality is a foundational principle of our Westminster system which should not be undermined.
- It is a long-held principle of that system, that the public interest is upheld when deliberations of Cabinet remain confidential.

- This allows members of Cabinet to exchange differing views and at the same time maintain the principle of collective responsibility for any decision which may be made.
- The active disclosure scheme and the 20 year release of cabinet documents will be designed not to impede discussions of Cabinet, and to ensure that State Service employees are able to continue to provide frank and fearless advice.
- The release of Cabinet records is a complex matter, with work underway to identify and digitise all historical paper-based cabinet records which are stored within the Archives Office.

Background

- Everyone involved in the Cabinet process is responsible for confidentiality – this includes Ministers, ministerial staff and agencies. Cabinet confidentiality requires strict observance of the security requirements for Cabinet documents by Ministers, their staff and public sector officers. Cabinet confidentiality is supported by restricting the distribution of, and access to, Cabinet documents and any documents prepared for Cabinet, or generated to support Cabinet matters.
- All documents prepared for the purpose of submission to Cabinet must be clearly identified as such, whether or not they form part of the documentation which is finally submitted.
- Section 26 of the *Right to Information Act 2009*, allows information that would disclose a decision or deliberation of Cabinet to be exempt for a period of ten years from the date the information was first considered by Cabinet.
- Currently, Cabinet documents held by the Archives Office are not available to be accessed until after 25 years and there's no active release of the documents after that time.
- Requests for access within the 25-year period are dealt with in the following way:
    - o Requests are to be directed to the Secretary, Department of Premier and Cabinet.
    - o Access to archived Cabinet papers is not granted without the approval of the person who was Premier at the time that the record was created.
    - o If the person who was Premier at the time is dead or not legally capable, then the approval would be sought from the current leader of the appropriate political party, which formed the government at the time.
    - o If access is approved and records are to be made available at the Tasmanian Archives, the Secretary DPAC will advise the State Archivist in writing.
    - o If access is at the Cabinet Office within DPAC, the records will be retrieved according to normal Tasmanian Archives processes.

- The Cabinet Handbook (August 2025) outlines that:
    - *"The deliberations of Cabinet and its Committees are to be conducted in a secure and confidential environment, and ongoing confidentiality of Cabinet and related records must be maintained.*

House of Assembly Motion – Disclosure of Cabinet Papers after 30 Business Days

- Kristie Johnston MP moved a successful motion on 18 March 2026, calling on the government for proactive publication of Cabinet documents within 30 business days of final decisions, subject to reasonable exemptions.
- Specifically, the motion called on the Government to:

  (a) adopt this publication policy;

  (b) amend the *Archives Act 1983* and *Right to Information Act 2009* to remove prohibitions on publication;

  (c) establish a public register of withheld information, grounds for exemption and review dates;

  (d) empower the proposed Information Commissioner - or, in the interim, the Ombudsman - to review claims of Cabinet or public interest immunity in line with *Egan v Chadwick*; and

  (e) table an annual report detailing documents published, exemptions claimed and review findings
- The motion also sought agreement that the policy to release Cabinet records ought to take effect immediately, with the week of the motion counted as day 1 for publication timeframes, applied retrospectively once operational if needed.
- The motion has no legally binding effect, and any matters relating to Cabinet release are a matter for the Premier of the day.
- In Question Time on 5 May 2026, in response to a Question surrounding the successful motion from Hon Kristie Johnston MP, you indicated that:
    - *"Our government is looking at what documentation can be released. It will take some time to put a process in place for the release of this documentation. As the Attorney-General pointed out in the debate, this is not a small procedural change. It is a very complex change process and even the Labor shadow minister agreed during the debate, saying that the reality is that it will take more than thirty days to develop, design, build and implement a program like this. Both are accurate. We will take the time to get this right. We're committed, of course, to the motion that was passed and notwithstanding Cabinet confidentiality, it is fundamental to the effective functioning of government. We will proceed with the intent of the motion and identifying what areas are able to be and what areas are unable to be disclosed.*
- In response to Ms Johnston's supplementary question you indicated:
    - *"we would like to make every endeavour to have this implemented by the Winter Recess."*

RTI Review and Release of Cabinet Records

- An Independent Review of RTI was undertaken in 2025. The final report was released in September 2025 and contained 43 recommendations to improve Tasmania's right to information framework.
- Chapter 4 of the final report relates to Culture and RTI in Tasmania. Part 4.1 is titled *Narrowing the zone of Cabinet protection* and calls for Cabinet to proactively release Cabinet records sooner in line with New Zealand and Queensland.
- Specifically, the report made two recommendations relating to releasing Cabinet records:
- ***Recommendation 14:*** *Programmed release of Cabinet Information after 10 years subject to relevant exemptions under the Right to Information Act 2009 (Tas).*
- ***Recommendation 15:*** *Adoption of a policy requiring all cabinet submissions, agendas and decision papers (and appendices) to be proactively released and published online within 30 business days of a final decision being taken by Cabinet, subject only to a number of reasonable exceptions which should be outlined in the policy.*
- The Government's Response to the Independent Review of RTI signals Government's intention to consider releasing Cabinet documents after 20 years, in alignment with the Commonwealth Government's practice.
- Work has commenced to form the RTI Improvement Steering Committee and commence planning and delivery of recommendations.
- Included in this will be planning the release of Cabinet records after 20 years, in consultation with the Cabinet office.

Committee on the Production of Documents

- In 2019, there was a Legislative Council Select Committee on the Production of Documents. The nature of the inquiry concerned Parliamentary privileges and the extent to which the Government may refuse to provide documents when requested or otherwise ordered by the Legislative Council or its Committees.
- The Tasmanian Government provided a submission to the Committee indicating that any change to the framework for the production of documents was not supported due to the need to protect the public interest by maintaining public interest immunity over information where necessary.
- The final report produced by the Committee found '*There may arise appropriate and reasonable claims of immunity relating to the production of documents. Australian parliaments have respected the notion of documents revealing the deliberations of cabinet as being immune from disclosure*'.
- It recommended that the report be referred to the Legislative Council Standing Orders Committee to '*consider the use of a suitably qualified independent adviser on claims of public interest immunity*'.
- It also recommended that '*consideration be given to the development of procedural orders to assist when claims of public interest immunity arise in the Legislative Council and its committees*'.
- It does not appear that these recommendations were ever actioned.

Production of Cabinet Documents Report to Parliament (August 2023)

- On 8 August 2023 *Production of Cabinet Documents – Report to Parliament* was tabled in the House of Assembly, it was subsequently tabled in the Legislative Council on 15 August 2023.
- The report provided an overview of release of Cabinet documents across Australia and New Zealand, noting that where a disclosure framework is in place generally exemptions are provided for the following areas:
  - Prejudice to legal proceedings;
  - Prejudice to law enforcement investigations;
  - Damage to commercial interests;
  - Unreasonable invasion of privacy;
  - Disclosure of Executive Council or cabinet deliberations;
  - Prejudice to national security or defence;
  - Prejudice to Australia's international relations;
  - Prejudice to relations between the Commonwealth and the states; and
  - Other grounds (i.e. undermining public revenue or the economy).
- In Tasmania, Cabinet documents include all documents prepared for the purposes of Cabinet deliberations, whether or not they form part of the final submission to Cabinet and includes Cabinet official records.[1]

[1] *Production of Cabinet Documents – Report to Parliament, (*August 2023) page 10.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Josh Munting	Manager, Cabinet and Executive Council Office
Cleared by	Courtney Ingham	Director, Executive Government Services

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Josh Munting	[redacted]

Premier

Output Group – 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.1 Support Services for Government, Ministerial Parliamentary Offices and Office of the Governor

Right To Information - Key Processes, Statistics, and Ministerial Delegations

Current as at: **14-April-2026**

Talking Points

- It is Government policy that Ministers delegate their functions and responsibilities under the *Right to Information (RTI) Act 2009* to departmental officers.
- Delegating Ministerial responsibilities reduces perceived conflicts of interest that may arise if Ministers or Ministerial staff conducted assessments.
- The Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC) currently has two delegated RTI officers who regularly undertake assessments for DPAC, the Premier's Office, and other portfolio Ministers.
- Five other officers have delegations to provide surge capacity assistance.
- Despite the number of applications received each financial year continuing to increase, DPAC has made improvements to the number of applications decided within statutory timeframes.
- We remain committed to improving access to information, both through streamlining RTI disclosure practices and increasing the amount of information routinely disclosed.

Background

RTI Requests to the Premier's/Minister's Office - Process

- When an RTI application is received by the Premier or Minister's Office it is forwarded to a delegated RTI officer in DPAC.
- The delegated RTI officer assesses the scope of the request to determine whether it requires refining and clarification. If clarification is required, it is done in consultation with the applicant and the Ministerial office.
- When the RTI scope is agreed, the delegated RTI officer issues a request notice to the Ministerial Office with instructions to search for information and submit it to the delegated RTI officer.
- The delegated RTI officer assesses the information and drafts a response, including a schedule of documents, as soon as possible, but before the due date.
- Wherever possible, a Response Decision Notice (which attaches the letter, schedule and any information to be released) is provided to the DPAC Associate Secretary and the Ministerial office's Chief of Staff for noting.
- Provided no extension is required, the response is typically provided to the applicant within statutory time frames, usually 20 days after the initial application.
- Sometimes there are unforeseen events such as application volume and complexities, statutory third-party consultation, or staff absences which will impact a delegated RTI officer's ability to provide a decision within 20 working days. If a third-party consultation is required, the RTI time will automatically be extended. Where this happens, the delegated RTI officer endeavours to keep the applicant informed with the progress of the application.

RTI Requests to DPAC - Process

- Once an application is received by DPAC and the scope of the request is agreed, the delegated RTI officer liaises with the appropriate DPAC manager to provide the information.
- The delegated officer then assesses the information and provides a decision to the applicant.
- The draft response is provided to the DPAC Associate Secretary and the Premier's Chief of Staff for noting.

RTI Application Timeframes

- Applications for assessed disclosure are managed in accordance with the timeframes specified in the Act. The Act provides specific timeframes for:
    - processing the application;
    - consulting with third parties;
    - negotiating with the applicant to re-define the application; and

    - transferring the application either in full or part to another public authority or Minister where the subject matter of the application is more closely connected with the functions of another public authority or Minister.

Specific DPAC RTI Assessment data

- RTI data is reported over financial year periods in both departmental annual reports and the Department of Justice's annual RTI report.
- Data for the 2025-26 financial year will be prepared at the conclusion of the financial year and reported in annual reports.
- During 2024-25, 87 applications for assessed disclosure were determined compared with 62 in 2023-24.
- Of the 87 applications determined in 2024-25:
    - information was provided in full for 21 applications
    - partial information was provided for 14 applications
    - information was determined to be fully exempt from release in four applications
    - 21 applications were transferred in full
    - no applications were refused
    - 15 applications were withdrawn
    - no information was held for 12 applications.
- Ten applications received in the 2023–24 financial year were determined in the 2024–25 financial year.
- DPAC Right to Information Officers are delegated officers under the Act for the department, the premier and other portfolio ministers.
- Of the 87 applications determined in 2024–25:
    - 50 were determined for the department
    - 30 were determined for the Premier
    - five were determined for the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy
    - one was determined for the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs
    - one was determined for the Minister for Veterans Affairs.
- Three applications were received and accepted in 2024-25 and were yet to be determined.
- Three applications were received in 2024-25 and were yet to be accepted.
- DPAC seeks to use assessed disclosure as a method of last resort. Information was provided actively without assessment in response to 12 applications for assessed disclosure received in 2024-25.

RTI applications and decisions

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Applications determined	29	59	71	87
Decisions released within statutory timeframes (%)	92%	90%	76%	88%

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Gemma Smith	Program Manager
Cleared By	Lisa Howes	Chief Governance and Risk Officer

	Name	Phone Number
DPAC contact for more information:	Courtney Ingham	Director, Executive Government Services [redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

Bullying, Harassment including Sexual Harassment

Current as at: **11-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The Government remains committed to building and maintaining a positive workplace culture where employees feel safe and supported to raise concerns.
- All State Service employees and agencies share responsibility for fostering respectful, inclusive and professional workplaces that enable everyone to perform at their best and deliver essential services for Tasmanians.
- Workplace bullying, harassment and sexual harassment have no place in any Tasmanian State Service workplace.
- The 2024 Tasmanian State Service Employee Survey (the Survey) showed that the overall index measuring workplace behaviour and conditions remained steady at 71 percent in 2024, consistent with 2023 and up from 68 per cent in 2020. These reflects progress over time, while highlighting that further improvement is needed.
- Reports of workplace bullying remained steady, with 21 per cent of employees indicating they experienced bullying in the last 12 months. Confidence to report bullying has continued to improve, increasing to 40 per cent in 2024 from 39 per cent in 2023.

- The Survey indicated 98 per cent of respondents did not experience sexual harassment in the workplace in 2024. While only two per cent reported experiencing sexual harassment, any level is unacceptable.
- Employee comfort in reporting sexual harassment continues to improve, rising to 34 per cent in 2024 compared to 30 percent in 2023 and 22 per cent in 2020.
- Heads of Agencies continue to work closely with the Head of the State Service to build on these results and drive ongoing improvements in workplace culture across the State Service.
- Work has commenced on reviewing the State Service's approach to resolving employee grievances, with engagement underway across agencies and unions to ensure processes are fair, timely and accessible.
- These initiatives form part of a broader program of continuous improvement aimed at strengthening workplace culture, supporting employee wellbeing and ensuring the State Service remains an employer of choice.
- Several Commission of Inquiry recommendations focus on strengthening complaint management and critical incident systems. The work underway to continue building positive workplace cultures will support these reforms by promoting safe to speak up environments, addressing fear of reprisals, increasing accountability, and improving reporting systems to ensure concerns are heard and acted on.

Background

Initiatives to build positive workplace

- Agencies remain committed to the Workforce Equality and Respect Standards, with action plans and reporting in place since 2022. Work continues to strengthen measurement across the six Standards using both qualitative and quantitative data through the Head of the State Services' Annual Report.
- Ageices continue to implement Work Health, Safety and Wellbeing initiatives, including training on responsibilities, reporting pathways and consequences of unacceptable behaviour, as well as workplace values programs that reinforce respectful conduct.
- Agencies are also developing and embedding supportive frameworks to encourage employees to report negative workplace behaviour, including when they witness it. Human Resource teams and managers play a key role in promoting and modelling professional conduct.

Tasmanian State Service Employee Survey 2024

- The TSS Employee Survey asks all State Service employees about their experience of work, covering topics such as diversity, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and work health safety and welling.
- In 2024, 26.4 per cent (10,089) of the workforce, across all government departments and agencies, responded to the TSS Employee Survey. This was an increase of 134 individuals from 2023.
- 21 per cent (2,119 individuals) of survey respondents reported experiencing bullying and harassment in the past 12 months. Those responsible for the bullying were similar to 2023, being a senior manager, an individual's immediate manager/supervisor and fellow workers. The most common type of bullying experienced by respondents were intimidation, exclusion/isolation, psychological harassment and deliberately withholding information. 40 per cent (848 individuals) of those who experienced bullying reported it to their workplace. For those who did not report, the main reasons were believing no action would be taken, feeling the process for reporting would be too much of a hassle, and not wanting to upset relationships in the workplace.
- Two per cent of respondents (211 individuals) reported experiencing sexual harassment in the past 12 months. The most common type of sexual harassment experienced were verbal abuse and physical behaviour. Those responsible for the sexual harassment were fellow worker, a client/customer, and member of the public. 34 per cent (69 individuals) of those who experienced sexual harassment reported it to their workplace. For those who did not report, the main reasons were feeling the process for reporting would be too much of a hassle, and feeling the behaviour was not serious enough.

- As part of the TSS Annual Report for 2024-25 information is received from TSS agencies on grievances lodged. In the 2024-25 reporting period, a total of 34 grievances were formally lodged relating to bullying and/or harassment and four for sexual harassment.
  - Of the 34 for harassment and/or bullying, 18 were resolved within the Agency's internal grievance management procedures and two were assessed by the respective Head of Agency through a Code of Conduct (ED5) process, the remainder were carried across to the next reporting period.
  - Of the four grievances related to sexual harassment, one was resolved within the Agency's internal grievance management procedures, and one was assessed by the respective Head of Agency through a Code of Conduct (ED5 process), the remaining two were carried across to the next reporting period.
- The State Service Management Office has reviewed the Employee Survey instrument and developed amendments to strengthen questions on bullying, sexual harassment and discrimination and safe to speak up cultures. These changes are design to provide deeper insights into the employee experiences and will be incorporated into the next Survey.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Yvette Steele	Director Workforce Strategy State Service Management Office
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary State Service Management Office

Name	Contact number
Amanda Russell	[redacted]

32

P-52

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

Code of Conduct (ED5 Investigations)

Current as at: **13-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The Commission of Inquiry (CoI) made a number of recommendations towards improving processes, guidance and reform to conduct and disciplinary processes in the Tasmanian State Service.

- Employment Direction No. 5, the procedure that guides the investigation and determination of whether an employee has breached the Tasmanian State Service Code of Conduct, was revised effective 29 August 2024 to ensure the safety and protection of children is the primary consideration when managing the allegations.

- Following the release of the Woolcott Review Report in November last year I welcomed Mr Woolcott's observations in relation to the significant improvements seen through our Government's response to the Commission of Inquiry, including the revision of the updated ED5 which strengthened processes to investigate and determine whether a State Service employee has breached the State Service Code of conduct.

- Further updates to ED5 are under consideration as part of the Government's response to the Woolcott Review Report. The Woolcott Review recommends that the Head of the State Service review the employment directions within the report and undertake further consultation with relevant stakeholders to finalise revised drafts for final approval by me.

- It was always recognised that the revised ED5 was a first phase of change – and did not mean we were finished with the job of making reforms. An important observation was that building capability in the way in which ED5 is applied in Agencies is also required and that will continue to be a priority focus.

- A further recommendation of the Woolcott report is for the State Service Management Office to prepare and publish guidance on employment matters including investigations and sanctions.

- We have already put some short term measures and longer term structures in place to assist further with cultural change, some of which were also directly in response to CoI recommendations.

- The whole of service panel for external investigators has been in operation since November 2023, having undergone an extensive tender assessment process including the development of bespoke trauma-informed training for investigators. Membership on the panel also requires ongoing professional development for all investigators.

- To assist with the timeliness and management of ED5 matters wherever possible, the investigator is required to complete investigations within a maximum period of 12 weeks subject to particular complexities that might arise with some matters.

- There has been an increased focus on sharing information where legally possible between investigative processes and a continued review of any barriers to this. The establishment of the Shared Capability and Centralised Investigations Unit (SCCI) has created a central point of contact with reportable bodies which has strengthened relationships and improved the sharing of information in a timely manner.

(Refer: 'Shared Capability and Centralised Investigations' parliamentary brief)

- I acknowledge that there are some investigations that continue to exceed our own expectations of timeframes. These cases are the most complex and sensitive of cases, many of which had commenced before the revised ED5 was released and before the SCCI was established. We continue to monitor these closely.
- Factors that decision makers must take into account in progressing these matters are broad and they include:
- Accessing key witnesses. The timing has to be right – particularly when a victim survivor, child or young person is involved.
- New information arising during the course of an investigation can require additional allegations to be put to the employee and further engagement may be necessary with existing and new witnesses.
- All of the elements of the ED5 process must be trauma-informed.
- At times we may also need to pause an investigation for a time where a Police investigation is also underway, or the matter moves to criminal prosecution.
- In addition, we must provide support and ongoing engagement to witnesses, complainants, victims, and respondents; and support to case managers.
- These are complexities that cannot be mitigated by the flexibilities that the revised ED5 has provided Heads of Agency.
- Having said this, we are and need to do all that we can within the law to ensure ED5 processes and investigations and resulting outcomes are dealt with as timely as possible.
- The Government remains committed to the safety and protection of children as a primary consideration to ensure that any allegations of breaches of the code of conduct are fully

investigated and it will take as long as it takes to ensure fairness to all parties in these complex and sensitive matters.

- Both the Tasmanian State Service Review and the CoI found that changes to ED5 to ensure fairness, timeliness and flexibility and importantly, the way in which ED5 is applied in Agencies were required.
- Key themes from these reports included that processes should be more streamlined and that the State Service needed to build capability across Agencies in how to manage ED5's. This included dealing with the most serious of allegations with keeping children safe, a paramount concern.
- More work is to be undertaken to continue to build on the progress already made in realising the cultural change and capability building required to support the effective and consistent management of ED5 investigations into the future.

<u>The Revised ED5 – Key Changes</u>

- Changes to ED5 support a more flexible approach to dealing with disciplinary matters (noting that ED5 deals with a range of potential breaches of the Code of Conduct) and more efficient and timely management of ED5 processes.
- These included:
  - Providing the ability for Agencies to consider different delegations for managing ED5 processes to improve efficiencies.
  - Providing some flexibility for the Head of Agency to determine how to deal with specific behaviour or conduct, so when the behaviour is lower risk or less serious in nature, this may be managed in the workplace, allowing for improved timeliness and response to the more serious of matters.

- The revised ED5 provides for limited circumstances where an Investigator may not be appointed, that is where the evidence is already available, or the employee has already been found to have committed reportable conduct and/or the employee has been charged with a crime that carries a penalty of a term of imprisonment of 6 months or more.
- Where Agencies have been implementing these changes there have been positive outcomes and there is ongoing feedback on future improvements that will support the contemporary management of ED5 matters.
- CoI recommendations addressed through the revised ED5 and Guidance included that:
    - All matters of concern relevant to an employee's conduct with a child or young person pertaining to child sexual abuse or related conduct be treated as potential serious conduct.
    - The protection and safety of children is to be a primary consideration when managing allegations and determinations of breaches of the Code involving children.
    - All processes should be undertaken with a trauma informed approach.
    - An investigation under ED5 that relates to reportable conduct may be combined with, or constitute, an investigation under the *Children Youth Safe Organisations Act 2023*, ensuring where relevant, these processes occur concurrently.
    - the standard for Code of Conduct matters is on the balance of probabilities and does not therefore require the same standard of proof as required in criminal matters.

Whole of Government Panel of Investigators

- Work continues with the Government panel of investigators to improve practices, share learnings and ensure ongoing professional development of investigators to improve consistency and set clear expectations for engagement.

Shared Capability and Centralised Investigations Unit (SCCI)

(Refer: 'Shared Capability and Centralised Investigations Unit' parliamentary brief for further detail)

- The Government accepted recommendations from both the Tasmanian State Service (TSS) Review and the Commission of Inquiry (CoI) to centralise ED5 processes and investigations of allegations of serious Code of Conduct breaches and to increase the capability across the state service to investigate and manage allegations of breaches of the code of conduct.
- The Shared Capability and Centralised Investigations (SCCI) Unit has been established within the State Service Management Office in the Department of Premier and Cabinet with a team of five, which includes a Manager, three senior workplace consultants who can undertake Investigations and Case Management and a further senior workplace consultant who leads the data management, routine disclosures and systems training for the team.
- This unit's initial and continuing focus is on allegations of child sexual abuse and related conduct at Ashley Youth Detention Centre both historical and contemporary. This includes the finalisation of investigations arising from the CoI.

Trauma Informed Training in Agencies

- Training in relation to Trauma Informed Practice for Investigations has been developed and made available to all people involved in managing ED5 processes. This continues to be offered through the Tasmanian Training Consortium including ongoing professional development for members of the whole of service external investigator panel.
- To support the implementation of new delegations within the revised ED5, trauma informed decision-making training has been developed and will be provided to delegates.

FAQS:

With a focus on accountability, shouldn't the responsibility for ED5 investigations remain with the Head of Agency and not be delegated to others?

- It has been clear from both the TSS Review and CoI that ED5 investigations take too long and are inefficient and that this has an impact on all the parties involved.
- One way to contribute to a timelier process is for decisions to be made by delegates, who are both appropriate in the circumstances and capable, as opposed to all decisions having to be made by the Head of Agency,
- I'm talking about decisions such as – does this behaviour meet the threshold to commence an investigation, appointing an investigator or determining, based on evidence, if the behaviour is a breach of the Code.
- To further support a timelier approach, a Head of Agency may also delegate decisions within an ED5 process to delegates within other Agencies as appropriate in the circumstances.

- Noting, only a Head of Agency can impose the sanction of termination.
- As mentioned, I understand to assist in the implementation of the new delegations that training will be provided to delegates in relation to trauma informed decision making, and I would note that there are a range of decisions that are made in an Agency under delegation, as is reasonable and appropriate for the efficient operation of an Agency.

The revised ED5 provides discretion for a delegate as to whether they commence an investigation or not. It used to be that an ED5 MUST be commenced if there is a belief that a breach of the Code may have occurred. Won't this result in more matters being swept under the carpet?

- The TSS Review highlighted that Agencies must have greater flexibility for managing workplace behaviour.
- The Code of Conduct covers a wide range of behaviour and does not differentiate between the seriousness or nature of behaviour that may be considered a breach.
- This change provides the delegate with the ability to assess the behaviour and consider whether it is lower risk or less serious in nature and could be dealt with more effectively and proportionately by managing the behaviour in another way. This may include through performance management or other management actions such as the issue of a lawful and reasonable direction.
- The Guidance material includes some of the things a delegate may consider when making this decision.
- As already outlined, the revised ED5 makes it clear that the protection and safety of children is to be a primary consideration in any of these decisions. And that further for the avoidance of any doubt, the Guidance developed states that any behaviour by

an employee in relation to child sexual abuse or related conduct, would be a potential serious breach of the Code and could not be dealt with any other way than as a potential breach of the Code and an ED5 process must commence.

How is the process procedurally fair for an employee if there are circumstances where an Investigator may not be appointed?

- This relates to specific circumstances where an ED5 process is commenced but the delegate decides an actual Investigator does not need to be appointed because the evidence is already available.
- Unnecessarily appointing an investigator to investigate facts and evidence that is already available can result in additional time, resources and costs and is also not consistent with trauma informed practice.
- It is expected this will be in limited circumstances, where the facts are clear/uncontested, and/or the employee admits to the alleged behaviour, and/or a Head of Agency may have an investigative report from another authority.
- The ED5 is clear that in these circumstances the same procedural fairness is to be provided to the employee as when an Investigator may be appointed.

Why haven't specific timeframes been included in the Revised ED5 to address timeliness?

- It is recognised that it is difficult to impose a specific set timeframe to managing ED5 processes that can range in risk and complexity.
- Flexibilities have been introduced that may result in some matters being able to be dealt with expediently within weeks, other due to

the nature and complexity may be difficult to finalise within several months due to the historical nature of evidence or witness availability.

- So, completing matters within a reasonable timeframe means that the ED5 process needs to be conducted as soon as reasonably practicable – but not at the expense of a more thoroughly conducted process or procedural fairness obligations.
- Part of the cultural change process will be more active management of investigations to ensure they are managed as efficiently as possible.
- As outlined further above, as part of the whole of Government panel of investigators, an investigator is to be given 12 weeks where possible to complete their investigation, with regular updates, any delays identified and explained, and extensions of time requested and actively assessed.
- As part of building greater capability across Agencies, the SCCI are specifically looking at where processes can be improved to contribute to a more timely process.

How are you ensuring no known perpetrators are re-employed in the State Service?

- Practices, Procedures and Standards No.5 (PPS No.5) was issued in July 2022 establishing a Register to assist agencies in conducting due diligence during the recruitment process by providing them with information on whether an applicant has previously been terminated from the Tasmanian State Service or would have been, had they not left prior to a determination.
- The register established through PPS No. 5, is being accessed by Agencies prior to an offer of employment being made to an applicant for a role with the State Service.

- Therefore, Agencies can check if an applicant has been terminated from the State Service, or would have been, had they not left prior to that decision being made.
- As part of the CoI, where an employee may have left the State Service, prior to an ED5 process being commenced, but a Head of Agency has made an assessment from the CoI report that they WOULD have commenced an ED5 if they had still been an employee, Heads of Agencies have written to the person informing them that, if they were they to seek reemployment in the Agency or State Service, an ED5 Code of Conduct would be commenced.
- As we move into Phase 2 of implementation of the CoI recommendations, we will be considering ways to continue to more broadly strengthen systems regarding appropriate record keeping and sharing of all this information.

Background

- Employment Direction 5 (ED5) is issued under section 17 of the State Service Act 2000. ED 5 provides direction for all State Service agencies for investigating and determining whether an employee has breached the State Service Code of Conduct.
- The Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings (CoI) has raised issues relating to ED5 processes including:
  - Issues with the consistency and quality of training for investigators, particularly trauma informed training.
  - The quality of trauma informed training for agency employees in managing the process and in document discovery for ED5 investigations and processes.
  - The length of time some ED5 processes took/are taking.
  - Issues around lack of and inability to share information with other investigative bodies.
  - Interactions with other investigative process, including pausing a Code process, pending the outcome of a criminal investigation or Teachers Registration Board process.

TSS Annual Report

Please refer to *"TSS Annual Report"* brief for figures relating to:

- ED6 "inability" determinations;
- ED4 suspensions;
- ED5 code of conduct allegations and determinations;
- Terminations.

Further detail on the Changes to ED5

Changes to Delegations

- Providing the ability for a Head of Agency of all Agencies, (not just DoH and DECYP as was the case in the former ED5) to delegate the responsibility for commencing an ED5 process, appointing an investigator, consideration of adding further allegations to an investigation, and making a determination as to whether the Code has been breached or not.
- That all agencies (not just DoH and DECYP as was the case) may request the Minister delegate the ability to impose a sanction, other than termination, noting that only a Head of Agency can impose the sanction of termination.

Flexibility

- The Code of Conduct relates to a range of behaviours that may occur in the workplace. Currently if behaviour may be a breach of the Code, an ED5 process MUST be commenced.
- The revised ED provides some flexibility for the HoA to determine how to deal with specific behaviour or conduct, so that when the conduct or behaviour is of a less serious or lower risk in nature this can be managed in the workplace – as you may expect, rather than an ED5 process being commenced for all matters that may be considered a breach of the Code.
- Obviously this will not be the case where a HoA or delegate forms 'a reasonable belief' in relation to an employee's conduct with a child or young person pertaining to child sexual abuse or related conduct, such as grooming, and the Guidance provides that this would clearly be a potential serious breach of the Code of Conduct and could not be dealt with in any other way, other than as a potential breach of the Code.
- The Revised ED also includes a clause to make it clear that the protection and safety of children is to be a primary consideration when managing allegations and determinations of breaches if the Code involving Children.

In limited circumstances – recognises an Investigator is not required to be appointed

- The Revised ED5 provides that there may be limited circumstances where an Investigator may not be appointed.
- Unnecessarily appointing an investigator can result in additional time, resources and costs.
- It is anticipated this will only be in specific circumstances where evidence directly relevant to the alleged breach is already available, the facts of the situation are clear/uncontested, the employee admits to the alleged behaviour, or a HoA has an investigative report from another authority.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Kiralee Gates	Deputy Director, Workplace Management and Employment
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary State Service Management Office
DPAC contact for more information:	Jane Fitton	Director WME State Service Management Office

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

Managing Positions

Current as at: **12-May-2026**

Talking Points

- As part of our strategic workforce priorities, we are focused on ensuring the State Service can better respond to the increasing and evolving demands of the Tasmanian community. This includes ensuring we have a workforce that is sustainable in size and shape, located where it is needed and supported with the right tools and resources to deliver essential services.
- The Managing Positions in the State Service framework is a key mechanism that enables agencies to actively shape their workforce in line with these priorities. It provides a suite of tools to manage workforce size and capability, including establishment management processes, leveraging natural attrition, redeployment, targeted and negotiated voluntary redundancies (TNVRs) and workforce renewal incentive payments (WRIPs).
- This framework forms an essential part of the broader State Service workforce strategy. It supports agencies with tools and options to manage their resources effectively, adapt to changing service delivery requirements, and ensure the workforce remains aligned with service delivery requirements and the needs of the Tasmanian community.

Managing Positions in the State Service – Changes

23 April 2026 Update

- The Head of the State Service reissued the framework on 23 April 2026, updating the TNVR exclusion period for re-employment in the Crown. The previous approach, where the exclusion period varied based on the number of weeks of separation payment received, has been replaced with a standard two year exclusion period.
- This change introduces a more contemporary and consistent approach to employment exclusion periods for employees who accept a TNVR. It supports our broader efforts to realign the size and shape of the State Service employment to a more sustainable level in the current fiscal environment.
- Employment exclusion periods exist to ensure TNVR's are genuine, equitable, and fiscally responsible.

February 2025 Update

- The framework was previously updated in February 2025 to increase the Workforce Renewal Incentive Payment (WRIP) from $30,000 to $60,000, and to extend the timeframe for filling a reprofiled role from six to eight months.
- These changes recognised the importance of reprofiling jobs to meet evolving service delivery needs and to address challenges in how we conduct business.
- The updates supported broader employment strategies, including increasing youth employment, improving diversity, equity and inclusion outcomes, and addressing skill shortages across the State Service for the benefit of the wider community.

Ongoing Review

- We will continue to review and refine this framework to ensure it remains contemporary, fit for purpose, and responsive to the evolving needs of the State Service and the Tasmanian community.

Background

- Mechanisms contained within MPSS are governed by the *State Service Act 2000* and associated policies, issued by the Head of the State Service under section 15(1)(b) of the Act.
- MPSS provides details or practices and procedures that must be applied in assisting Heads of Agencies to meet Government's commitment or reduce employment costs as well as to have a more productive and effective TSS.

Workforce Renewal Incentive Payments and Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancies – 2023-24, 2024-25 and 1 July 2025 to 31 March 2026

- Workforce Renewal Incentive Payments (WRIPs) and Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancies (TNVR) are part of the Managing Positions in the State Service (MPSS) framework.
- The WRIP expressions of interest programs conducted by the Departments of Premier and Cabinet and State Growth in 2024-25 were open for general expressions of interest and did not target specific cohorts.
- The Department of State Growth opened an TNVR Expression of Interest Program on 23 April 2026, for a period of three weeks.

[redacted]

s.27

Name Position

Prepared by	Yvette Steele	Director Workforce Strategy
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary, State Service Management Office

---

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Yvette Steele	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

Public Sector Wages Agreement 2025 - Tasmanian State Service Standard Leave and Conditions

Current as at: **13-May-2026**

Talking Points

- I am pleased to confirm that that a key outcome of the recent wage negotiations has been a package of new and improved Tasmanian State Service standard leave and conditions to apply across all the awards and agreements that have been negotiated.
- This package of modernised leave and conditions are important reforms that support the broader State Service workforce.
- This package of leave and conditions was carefully considered alongside the salary increases and structural adjustments and other specific occupational matters to ensure a total package for employees that is both fair and reasonable in the current budget economic environment.
- The new modernised standard leave and conditions include:
    - New entitlement to five days (pro rata) of Reproductive Leave;
    - A reduction in the qualifying period for parental leave from 52 weeks to 40 weeks;
    - New entitlement to the 'Right to Disconnect';

  - Provision to allow Personal Leave (including for carers leave purposes) to be used to attend medical appointments for diagnostic purposes.
  - Greater flexibility for employees accessing Gender Affirmation Leave and ability to access four weeks continuously at half pay;
  - New Pregnancy Loss Leave (combining current still birth in bereavement leave and special parental leave provisions);
  - An increase in Family Violence Leave from 20 to 25 days;
  - Broader and updated salary sacrifice provisions;
  - Expanding the definition of 'immediate family' for access to Compassionate/Bereavement/Personal and Family Violence Leave to include aunt, uncle, niece and nephew in the award;
  - Relaxation of the evidence requirements for Compassionate and Bereavement leave;
  - Amendment to Recreation Leave, to require a response to Recreation Leave requests within 14 days of the application being made; and
  - Clarity in relation to certain employees attendance at delegate training.
- State Service Agencies are working hard behind the scenes to implement the new salary rates and the associated backpay and will also progress to implement the new standard leave and conditions once the orders are made by the Tasmanian Industrial Commission.
- The Standard Leave and Conditions will be operative from the date of registration of the Public Sector Union Wage Agreement being 11 May 2026.

- The Tasmanian Industrial Commission is expected to hear the applications for the variations for the majority of the Tasmanian State Service awards and to make the orders to vary the awards on 1 June 2026.

Reproductive Leave (new)

- Reproductive Leave is a new paid leave entitlement of five days per annum non-cumulative (pro rata for part-time employees).
- Reproductive Leave provides leave for employees who are unable to work because they are managing specified chronic reproductive health and wellbeing issues, including such issues as endometriosis and polycystic ovary syndrome, or undertaking medical procedures associated with fertility treatment or requiring treatment associated with reproductive health including (but not limited to) a hysterectomy or vasectomy.
- Whilst Reproductive Leave is not gender specific, reproductive health issues often disproportionately impact women and introducing this leave supports employees manage these issues as they arise through various life stages.

Reduction in the qualifying period for Parental Leave

- This improved standard reduces the existing qualifying period to Parental Leave from 52 weeks to 40 weeks.
- Parental Leave is already accessible to primary and secondary caregivers and the reduction in the qualifying period applies to both.

'Right to Disconnect' (new)

- We have introduced new provisions for employees to have the right to disconnect from work related contact outside of their normal working hours if they so choose unless that refusal is considered unreasonable.

Increase and greater flexibility for the use of Personal Leave

- The amount of Personal Leave that can be utilised to provide care for immediate family members or household has increased from 20 days to 40 days per annum.
- Personal Leave (including carers leave) can now also be used to attend medical appointments for diagnostic purposes which provides greater flexibility as previously personal leave could only be accessed for when an employee is ill or injured.

Expanding the definition of 'immediate family'

- The definition has been extended to include aunt, uncle, niece and nephew of the employee or their spouse. This includes leave taken for the purposes of Personal, Compassionate, Bereavement and Family Violence Leave.

Greater flexibility for employees accessing Gender Affirmation Leave

- Gender Affirmation Leave was introduced during the last round of bargaining that provides up to four weeks of paid leave at full pay and a further entitlement to unpaid leave.
- The updates to this leave, ensure that the restriction to use the leave within 52 weeks of first accessing it, has been removed.
- Further, where an employee may need to be absent for a continuous period of four weeks, they have the option to access the leave during this period at half pay and extend this to eight weeks.

Increase in Family Violence Leave

- Family Violence Leave has been increased from 20 to 25 days per annum.
- Greater clarity has been provided to ensure that fixed-term casual employees, will still be paid for the hours they would have worked, if not able to attend due to experiencing family violence.

Broader and more beneficial salary sacrifice provisions

- An employee benefit delivered through these negotiations includes an expansion of the standard salary sacrifice provisions.
- Expanding on salary sacrificing arrangements for superannuation, and novated leave these arrangements now include:
  - Personal Airport lounge memberships
  - Eligible work-related items
  - Home office expenses
  - Interest only investment loans
  - Portable electronic devices -Mobile phones and accounts
  - Self-education expenses
  - Remote are housing benefits, rent and loan interest
- This contributes to more attractive benefits for employees, particularly as they may relate to attracting people to our regional and remote locations.

Evidence requirements for Compassionate and Bereavement Leave

- Employees will only need to provide evidence in these circumstances where it is absolutely considered necessary and where it is considered necessary a statutory declaration can be provided.

Employer to respond to recreation leave requests within 14 days

- Changes have been made to the management of Recreation Leave provisions that ensure that employees will receive a response to their application for recreation leave within 14 days of submitting an application.
- It is noted that approval of recreation leave is subject to operational requirements and will not be unreasonably refused.

Pregnancy Loss Leave

- Pregnancy Loss Leave will create a single stand-alone leave entitlement for employees who are dealing with pregnancy loss.
- The new clause brings together entitlements (previously accessed under Bereavement Leave and Special Parental Leave)
- These entitlements, already provide 10 days paid leave for stillbirth or the loss of a pregnancy and up to 52 weeks of parental leave (including 18 weeks of paid primary caregiver leave) where a pregnancy terminates other than by the birth of a living child, not earlier than 28 weeks before the expected date of birth.

Workplace Delegate Training

- The update provides for part-time workplace delegates to be paid for any training they attend that may not occur on their normal working days.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Kiralee Gates	Deputy Director Workforce Management and Employment
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary State Service Management Office

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Jane Fitton	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

Routine Disclosures (Child Sexual Abuse and Commission of Inquiry matters)

Current as at: **12-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The Tasmanian Government continues to prioritise accountability and transparency about actions taken to keep children and young people safe following the learnings of the Commission of Inquiry (CoI).
- The Head of the State Service is committed to providing as much information about allegations of child sexual abuse and related Code of Conduct investigations and outcomes to the community as is lawfully and practically possible.
- Since March 2021 we have progressively enhanced the range of information published in the monthly routine disclosure, which now consists of a combined report from all data sources and provides explanatory notes about substantive movements month-to-month.
- This monthly report includes data about ongoing suspensions due to allegations of child sexual abuse; assessments and actions by Heads of Agency of all current and former employees referred to in the CoI report; and the work of the multi-agency Joint Referral Review Team (JRRT) in reviewing 'Matters of interest identified through the CoI'.

- To further ensure transparency and accountability my government appointed Mr Peter Woolcott AO, former Australian Public Service Commissioner, to also independently consider the actions, and effectiveness of those actions, by government agencies and other relevant state authorities, including Tasmania Police, taken in response to the information and concerns raised in the final report of the Commission about Tasmanian State Service employees and officers.
- This was to ensure victim-survivors and the community can have confidence that we are leaving no stone unturned.
- All current allegations of child sexual abuse in the State Service are immediately referred to Tasmania Police for notification and assessment and dealt with following their normal investigative process.
- At the same time, the relevant Head of Agency commences an assessment of whether there may have been a breach of the State Service Code of Conduct.
- The appropriate legal and regulatory bodies are advised – for example, Working with Vulnerable People, so, if appropriate, the registration may be suspended or cancelled.
- This means the person also can't work in any other situation where the RWVP registration is required.
- A report to the Independent Regulator under the Reportable Conduct Scheme is also made immediately.

FAQS:

Why are there still so many people suspended on full pay?

- It is important to understand that the headline number of the 'Notifications of State Service employee suspensions from duty as a result of allegations of child sexual abuse' table in the routine disclosure is a cumulative total since October 2020, so every new notification received increases that number.

- In April 2025 the cumulative total was 111; in April 2026 it has increased to 127.
- While the cumulative notifications have increased by 16 over the past year, the number of additional ED5 processes completed over the same period is 31.

- The net impact is that while there were 41 State Service employees suspended on full pay in April 2025, one year later that number has reduced to 26.
  - Since October 2020, there have been 89 ED5 processes completed, which have resulted in 28 determinations that the employee breached the Code of Conduct in relation to an allegation of child sexual abuse, and 20 of these individuals have either been terminated or notified that they would have been terminated but for resignation or contract expiry.

If you are committed to accountability and transparency, why won't you release further details about investigations?

- Whilst it is not appropriate to comment on any specific employment matters, I am committed to providing the community with as much information as is permitted by law.
- I am advised the level of detail in the Routine Disclosures balances matters of natural justice and due process with transparency and the public's clear interest in this matter.
- Any release of finer details than those currently released may have the potential to prejudice any legal proceedings.
- As an employer we are also bound by the current requirements of the *Personal Information Protection Act 2004*, in relation to employee information. We are no different to any employer in this regard.

- I have stated many times, there is no more important task for any Government than to ensure the safety and wellbeing of our children, and it's a personal priority for me.

Why have some investigations taken so long – some individuals have been suspended for more than 1,000 days?

- I acknowledge that there are some investigations exceeding our own expectations of timeframes. These cases are the most complex and sensitive of cases.
- Factors that decision-makers must take into account in progressing these matters are broad.
- The allegations can relate to historical matters and this can delay the investigation with accessing records.
- This also affects accessing key witnesses. The timing has to be right – particularly when a child or young person is involved.
- New evidence obtained during the course of an investigation can require additional allegations to be put to the employee and further engagement may be necessary with existing and new witnesses.
- All of these elements must be trauma-informed.
- At times we may also need to pause an investigation for a time where a Police investigation is also underway, or the matter moves to criminal prosecution.
- Having said all of this, I do not shy away from the fact we need to do all we can within the law to ensure investigations and outcomes are dealt with as timely as possible.
- There are checks and balances to ensure we do this. It is important that agencies work in a way that ensures the processes would not be open to legal challenge and recognises that we are dealing with people in challenging circumstances.

What are we doing to improve timeliness?

- We are already shifting to a new way of working.
- The State Service Management Office has established the Shared Capability and Centralised Investigation (SCCI) unit to manage and investigate serious Code of Conduct matters.
- This SCCI team will manage the most serious of cases, and has had an initial focus on matters relating to child sexual abuse and related conduct of current or former employees of the Ashley Youth Detention Centre (AYDC).
- In addition to providing centralised case management and investigations, the unit will be focusing on improving the timeliness and capability of State Service investigations and ED5 processes on all these types of matters across the service.
- A whole-of-government panel arrangement for external investigators has been established and the SCCI unit will work with the panel to improve practices, share learnings and ensure ongoing professional development of investigators to improve consistency and set clear expectations for engagement.

Background

- The current routine disclosure consolidates all reporting in relation to child sexual abuse and Commission of Inquiry (CoI) matters of concern and includes the following tables:
  - Routine disclosure of State Servant suspensions as a result of allegations of child sexual abuse - since October 2020 ("Routine Disclosure")
  - Report of assessments and actions in relation to matters referred to in the CoI report by Heads of Agency ("Head of Agency assessments and actions")
  - Joint Referral Review Team (JRRT) matters of interest identified through the CoI (section 34A Notices and other data sources) – State Service employees and general public persons of interest ("JRRT matters of interest").
- The Routine disclosure of State Servant suspensions (relating to child sexual abuse allegations) includes all suspensions that have been notified since October 2020. Some of these matters relate to the CoI and others are as a result of allegations made directly to agencies.

- The 'Head of Agency assessments and actions' disclosure represents a different dataset to the Routine Disclosure of State Servant suspensions, as it relates specifically to matters referred to in the Commission of Inquiry report. There may be some overlap of individual cases but direct comparison of the data is inappropriate.
- A further routine disclosure commenced publication on 29 August 2024 to provide information about the work of the Joint Referral Review Team (JRRT) in reviewing 'Matters of interest identified through the Commission of Inquiry'.
- This routine disclosure represents consolidated information collected through the review of all Section 34A Notices as well as pre-existing information holdings collected from the Commission of Inquiry's Draft and Final Reports, and the previous work of the Joint Safety and Accountability Team (JSAT).

Routine Disclosure of State Servant suspensions as a result of allegations of child sexual abuse

- Since October 2020, there have been 127 suspensions of State Servants as a result of allegations of child sexual abuse and related conduct.
- Of the 127 employees as at 30 April 2026 reporting:
    - 28 have been found to have breached the code of conduct in relation to child sexual abuse allegations;
    - 61 investigation determinations have found "no breach in relation to child sexual abuse".
- This Routine Disclosure provides a breakdown of location of employee and whether the matter is historical or contemporary, the progress of all investigations in accordance with ED5, and details of the actions taken and ultimate outcome of each matter.

Head of Agency assessments of current and former Tasmanian State Service employees referred to in the Commission of Inquiry (COI) report

- This report provides an update on the assessment and actions by relevant Heads of Agencies of current and former Tasmanian State Service employees referred to in the Commission of Inquiry (COI) report (including alleged perpetrators).
- This report provides information regarding the total number of employee matters arising from the COI report considered by Heads of Agencies, the breakdown of former and current State Service employees, the progress of those assessments and whether actions under the *State Service Act 2000* were commenced or have since been determined.
- This information is further broken down into separate agencies and work areas.

Joint Referral Review Team (JRRT)

- The JRRT is a multi-agency team including key law enforcement and regulatory authorities. The core purpose of the JRRT project was to review all Section 34A Notices sent by the Commission of Inquiry into the Tasmanian Government's Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in Institutional Settings (Commission) to Tasmanian agencies, law enforcement and regulatory entities. The review focused on identifying any current risks to children and young people in connection to government institutions.
- This extensive data consolidation exercise has created a comprehensive dataset of all persons of interest relevant to the Commission of Inquiry.
- Section 34A Notices are the mechanism by which the Commission notified agencies, law enforcement or independent regulators of concerns it may have had with respect to the conduct of an individual.
- It is noted that not all Section 34A Notices received from the Commission contained enough information to identify alleged persons of interest, the specific nature of the allegations, or sufficient details about the alleged victims. Some Section 34A Notices were sent to multiple entities relating to the same allegation, and some Section 34A Notices contained reference to multiple persons of interest. Therefore, the number of Section 34A Notices issued by the Commission does not equal the number of persons of interest identified.
- Other important notes about the information provided in this report:
    - These numbers are subject to change as forensic investigation continues on every matter referred;
    - Matters identified and reflected in this report include both sexual and physical child abuse allegations;
    - All matters have been reported to the relevant legal and regulatory authorities.

Annual Disclosure

- The Commission of Inquiry made a recommendation that the Head of the State Service should monitor and publicly report annually on the management of misconduct matters related to child sexual abuse or related conduct, to commence by 1 July 2026.
- On 13 October 2023, DPAC published the first annual report as of 30 September 2023, showing the total numbers of state servants currently suspended at that time, by Agency.
- In August 2024 the "Head of Agency assessments and actions" report was enhanced and exceeds the requirements for the annual reporting, noting that this will continue to be updated and published monthly.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Lydia Horne	Senior Workplace Case Management Consultant, Shared Capability and Centralised Investigations
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary State Service Management Office

---

DPAC contact for more information:	Jane Fitton	Director, WME State Service Management Office

Attachments

1. Routine disclosure relating to Commission of Inquiry matters – 30 April 2026

37

P-59

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group – State Service Management Office
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

SES Offices Profile

Current as at: **11-May-2026**

Senior Executive and Equivalent Specialist Offices

- Senior Executive (SES) and Equivalent Specialist (ES) Offices are the mechanism to appoint highly experienced and qualified people to provide strategic leadership and high-level skills, within and across agencies, in order to meet Government's objectives and deliver services to Tasmania.
- SES and ES offices may only be created by the Premier, and are created in consideration of a Head of Agency's request that an office is needed to perform duties of a senior executive or equivalent specialist nature in that agency.
- Offices may then be abolished where the duties are no longer required to maintain or reduce FTE establishment in agencies as part of right sizing the State Service, and Heads of Agencies are expected to progress requests for abolition to me in a timely manner.
- As Premier I have created 16 senior executive or equivalent specialist offices in the year ending 31 March 2026 and abolished 23 offices in that same year, where duties were no longer required.
- State Service FTEs have increased by 1.97 per cent in the year from 31 March 2025, while there has been a 2.3 per cent reduction in SES offices.

- The number of SES and ES offices as a percentage of all State Service FTEs have decreased slightly since March last year, from 1.04 per cent to 0.99 per cent.
- Offices may be created for a finite period as determined by me as Premier to address shorter term needs and are scheduled for abolition after that need has passed.
- Offices are also routinely reviewed on vacancy for ongoing need, and where no longer required they are also abolished.
- Heads of Agencies are actively managing their SES and ES establishments in light of the broader recruitment freeze on non-essential roles and need for FTE reductions, and SES and ES office vacancies are assessed prior to any advertising in the same way as other senior roles.

Table 2 - Senior Executive and Equivalent Specialist Office Establishment

Title	31 March 2024	31 March 2025	31 March 2026
SES and equivalent specialist offices that were created in the year to date	64	30	16
SES and equivalent specialist offices that were abolished in the year to date	44	20	23
Total all active[1] Senior Executive and Equivalent Specialist Offices at 31 March each year	**296**	**306**	**299**

[1] Inactive offices are offices that may only be filled on activation of an emergency taskforce, time-limited emergent situation or similar; they are not considered part of the ongoing SES / ES Establishment.

Table 3 - Senior Executive and Equivalent Specialist Office Establishment as proportion of Tasmanian State Service FTE

Title	31 March 2024	31 March 2025	31 March 2026
Tasmanian State Service FTE[2]s	31,042.18[3]	29,704.84	30,291.08
SES and ES offices	296	309	299
Percentage of FTEs represented by offices	***0.95%***	***1.04%***	***0.99%***

- Comparisons have been made using Full Time Equivalent figures, with the exclusion of fixed-term casual employees, rather than head count as a more accurate reflection of the size of the Government Sector.

Background

- Offices may be created for various government priorities for example, during the year ending 31 March 2026:
    - Four offices were created to progress essential reforms in Child Safety and Youth Justice including an office of Chief Practitioner – Professional Practice which was recommended by the Commission of Inquiry;
    - Two offices were created to support the transformation of Macquarie Point;
    - One office was created to strategically lead and manage the redistribution of functions from the Department of State Growth and establish Build Tasmania and Tourism, Events and Creative Tasmania; and
    - One office was created in Treasury to focus on fiscal sustainability.
- There may be some delay between an office becoming vacant and no longer required and it being abolished
- Changes to office numbers do not necessarily result in a commensurate increase or decrease in officer numbers, as offices may be filled by transfer of an existing officer, or be temporarily filled by an employee who is not taken to be appointed as an officer under the Act but is instead paid an allowance to undertake the duties of an office.

---

[2] The 2014 and 2024 figures are based on Treasury FTEs for employees and officers under the State Service Act only, excluding casual FTEs. They may therefore differ from FTEs or Head Counts that include other General Government Sector employees and/or are derived from the WiRS reporting contained in other briefs which use a different data set.
[3] Figures taken from WiRS data excluding casuals

Table 4 – Offices created year to 31 March 2026

Office Title	Agency	Classification
Director Youth Justice Operational Commissioning	DECYP	SES 2
Chief Practitioner - Professional Practice	DECYP	ES 2
Director Youth Justice Facilities Reform	DECYP	SES 2
Director Service Transformation and Change	DECYP	SES 2
Director Office of the Secretary	DECYP	SES 1
Project Director Strategic Reform and Change	DPAC	SES 4
Director Strategy and Delivery	DPAC	SES 1
Executive Director Finance	Mac Point	SES 1
Executive Director Commercial	Mac Point	SES 3
Deputy Secretary ReCFIT and Resources	State Growth	SES 4
Director Policy	State Growth	SES 2
General Manager Operations	State Growth	SES 2
General Manager Office of Sport and Operations	State Growth	SES 2
General Manager Transport Policy and Planning	State Growth	SES 2
Director People and Culture	Treasury	SES 1
Director Financial Policy and Fiscal Sustainability	Treasury	SES 2

Table 5 – Offices abolished year to 31 March 2026 – duties no longer required or incorporated in other offices or positions

Office Title	Agency	Classification
Director Strategic Systems Development	DECYP	SES 1
Director Youth Detention	DECYP	SES 1
Director Children and Families	DECYP	SES 2
Director Children and Family Services	DECYP	SES 1
Deputy Director - Culture and Growth	DECYP	SES 1
Director - Strategy, Information Management and Governance Office	Health	SES 1
General Manager Office of Racing Integrity	NRE Tas	SES 2
Director Operations and Planning (Marine Resources)	NRE Tas	SES 1
Director Keeping Children Safe Reform Unit	DPAC	SES 1
Director Youth Justice Reform (Programs)	DPAC	SES 1
Motion for Respect - Independent Project Manager	DPAC	SES 2
Director Children and Young People Reform Unit	DPAC	SES 1
Interim Disability Commissioner	DPAC	SES 2
Executive Director Youth Justice Reform Unit	DPAC	SES 2
Director Youth Justice Reform (Partnerships)	DPAC	SES 1
Director Community Policy and Engagement	DPAC	SES 1
Project Director Tas Arts, Entertainment and Sports Precinct	State Growth	SES 2
Deputy General Manager Skills Tasmania	State Growth	SES 1
CEO Renewables, Climate and Future Industries Tasmania	State Growth	Equiv Spec
Director, Infrastructure Review and Evaluation	State Growth	ES 1
Executive Director Trade	State Growth	SES 1
Director Forest Policy	State Growth	SES 1
Director Designate Shareholder and Policy Markets	Treasury	SES 1

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Helen Smith	Senior Consultant, State Service Management Office
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary State Service Management Office

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Amanda Russell	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

State Sector Employee Numbers and Workforce Profile

Current as at: **11-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The Tasmanian State Service is the largest employer in the State.
- The total paid headcount as at end March 2026 was 36,822, compared to 35,925 at end March 2025, an increase of 897 or 2.4 per cent. These figures exclude casuals.
- The total paid full-time equivalent at end March 2026 was 30,291.08, compared to 29,704.84 at end March 2025, an increase of 586.24 or 1.94 per cent. These figures exclude casuals.

Senior Executives

- The total number of Senior Executive Service (SES) Officers, Heads of Agencies, Equivalent Specialists and Prescribed Office at end March 2026 was 259. This excludes employees acting in SES roles who are not appointed SES Officers.
- The total paid full-time equivalent for these roles at end March 2026 was 257.92.
- SES Officers represented 0.70 per cent of the total State Service workforce (paid headcount), and 0.85 per cent of total State Service full-time equivalents.

- Female SES officers accounted for 55.5 per cent of SES Officers, an increase of 3.6 per cent since March 2025. Across all senior executive roles (including Heads of Agencies, Equivalent Specialists and Prescribed Officers), females comprised 53.3 per cent.
- There will be differences between the number of Senior Executive Officers and the number of Senior Executive Offices created. At any point in time some Offices may be vacant, and others may be filled by employees acting in the role who are not appointed as Senior Executive Officers.

State Service Workforce Profile

- The gender ratio of the State Service remains consistent with last year, with 68.41 per cent female and 31.07 per cent male.
- The part-time remains stable at around 55 per cent with:
    - 81.9 per cent female
    - 17.6 per cent male
    - 0.5 per cent not disclosing or recognising as a different gender.
- The average age of the workforce was 43.6 years in March 2026, compared to 43.7 in March 2025.
- Employees aged 30 to 39 years continue to make up the largest cohort, representing, just under 26 per cent of the workforce.
- The Statewide workforce is primarily based in Southern Tasmania with:
    - 56 per cent located in and around Hobart
    - 22.8 per cent in the North
    - 15.9 per cent on the North West Coas
    - 4.9 per cent in the South East
    - 0.4 percent on the West Coast.

Background

- Part-time employment levels reflect a range of factors, including the part-time nature of some roles, as well as employees being supported by their agency to access flexible working arrangements.
- Increases to SES paid headcount over time can be attributed to the creation of new offices and the filling of previously vacant offices. It is typical for 10 to 15 per cent of SES Offices to be unfilled at any point in time.
- Employees acting in SES Offices are not included in the SES headcount, as they are not appointed Officers under the *State Service Act 2000*.
- For information on SES Offices refer to the SES Offices Profile Brief.

Data Notes

- Workforce data is currently held across multiple, disconnected systems across agencies. This fragmentation limits the ability to produce timely, comprehensive insights and to respond effectively to emerging workforce needs.
- Data in this brief is sourced from agency fortnightly reports to the State Service Management Office (SSMO) and the Workforce Information Reporting System (WiRS) as at the last pay date in March 2026.
- Data includes only State Service employees and officers in agencies listed in Schedule 1 of the *State Service Act 2000*.
- Data is uploaded to WiRS quarterly and manually reviewed for quality. Corrections may result in inconsistencies in historical data compared to previous reports or previously published whole-of-service or agency data.
- Since TasTAFE left the State Service on 1 July 2023, totals after this date exclude TasTAFE employees and officers.

Table 1 – Total Paid Headcount[1] by Agency – March 2025 and March 2026

	Paid Headcount		
Agency	**March 2025**	**March 2026**	**Difference**
Department for Education, Children and Young People	12,937	13,293	+356
Department of Health	15,547	16,105	+558
Department of Justice	1,811	1,891	+80
Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management	1,256	1,297	+41
Department of Premier and Cabinet	651	579	-72
Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania	1,561	1,496	-65
Department of State Growth	1,111	1,080	-31
Department of Treasury and Finance	352	366	+14
Tasmanian Audit Office	52	66	+14
Brand Tasmania	6	6	0
Environment Protection Authority	126	123	-3
Homes Tasmania	189	201	+12
Integrity Commission	17	16	-1
Macquarie Point Development Corporation	17	19	+2
Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority	131	134	+3
The Public Trustee	84	73	-11
Tourism Tasmania	77	77	0
Total	**35,925**	**36,822**	**+897**

[1]Paid headcount for March 2025 and March 2026 data comes from Agency fortnightly reports to SSMO, remaining data is from the Workforce Information Reporting System (WIRS).

Table 2 – Total Paid Full-Time Equivalent[2] by Agency – March 2025 and March 2026

	Paid Full-Time Equivalent		
Agency	**March 2025**	**March 2026**	**Difference**
Department for Education, Children and Young People	10,161.31	10,365.50	+204.19
Department of Health	12,692.79	13,108.34	+415.55
Department of Justice	1,706.68	1,783.00	+76.32
Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management	1,199.02	1,215.57	+16.55
Department of Premier and Cabinet	585.20	513.50	-71.7
Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania	1,431.10	1,379.30	-51.8
Department of State Growth	959.50	930.61	-28.89
Department of Treasury and Finance	327.81	343.38	+15.57
Tasmanian Audit Office	53.78	63.34	+9.56
Brand Tasmania	5.90	6.00	+0.10
Environment Protection Authority	115.11	112.46	-2.65
Homes Tasmania	179.77	190.08	+10.31
Integrity Commission	16.00	14.90	-1.1
Macquarie Point Development Corporation	16.72	17.92	+1.2
Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority	105.87	111.02	+5.15
The Public Trustee	79.77	68.85	-10.92
Tourism Tasmania	68.51	67.31	-1.2
Total	**29,704.84**	**30,291.08**	**+586.24**

[2]Paid full time equivalent for March 2025 and March 2026 data comes from Agency fortnightly reports to SSMO, remaining data is from the Workforce Information Reporting System (WIRS).

Table 3: Paid Headcount and Full Time Equivalent - Fixed-Term Casuals – March 2025 and March 2026[3]

	March 2025		March 2026	
Agency	**Paid Headcount**	**Paid FTE**	**Paid Headcount**	**Paid FTE**
Department for Education, Children and Young People	980	210.39	1,041	227.87
Department of Health	1,746	923.33	1,741	929.94
Department of Justice	26	7.90	35	12.30
Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management	27	12.61	22	12.03
Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania	0	1.3	21	7.73
Department of State Growth	46	7.67	50	14.19
Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority	56	20.63	53	19.65
Tourism Tasmania	0	0.00	1	0.90
Total	**2,881**	**1,183.83**	**2,964**	**1,224.61**

[3] Table 3 provides information in relation to Fixed Term Casual employees, not included in Tables 1 and 2

Table 4 - SES, Equivalent Specialists, Prescribed Office Holders, Heads of Agencies – Paid Headcount and Gender – March 2025 and March 2026[4]

Officer type	Gender	March 2025	March 2026	Difference 2025-2026
Head of Agency	Male	7	7	0
	Female	8	9	+1
Total Head of Agency		**15**	**16**	**+1**
Senior Executive Service	Male	102	94	-7
	Female	109	117	+7
Total Senior Executive Service		**211**	**211**	**0**
Equivalent Specialist	Male	14	18	+4
	Female	10	10	0
Total Equivalent Specialist		**24**	**28**	**+4**
Prescribed Office Holder	Male	2	2	0
	Female	2	2	0
Total Prescribed Office Holder		**4**	**4**	**0**
Total	Male	125	121	-4
	Female	129	138	+9
		254	**259**	**+5**

Table 5 –Senior Executive Service (SES) by level and gender – Paid Headcount – March 2025 and March 2026

SES Level		March 2025	March 2026	Difference 2025-2026
SES 1	Male	36	34	-2
	Female	44	48	+4
Total SES 1		**80**	**82**	**+2**
SES 2	Male	40	33	-7
	Female	40	41	+1
Total SES 2		**80**	**74**	**-6**
SES 3	Male	14	13	-1
	Female	15	18	+3
Total SES 3		**29**	**31**	**+2**
SES 4	Male	12	14	+2
	Female	10	10	0
Total SES 4 (including Associate Secretaries)		**22**	**24**	**+2**
TOTAL SES		**211**	**211**	**0**

Table 6 – State Service - Gender Profile – Full-Time and Part-Time – Percentage - March 2025 and March 2026

		March 2025	March 2026	% Difference 2025-2026
Full-time	Male	23.7%	23.4%	-0.3%
	Female	34.2%	33.2%	-1 %
	Other	0.2%	0.2%	0%
Total full-time		**58.1%**	**56.8%**	**-1.3%**
Part-time	Male	7.4%	7.7%	+0.3%
	Female	34.4%	35.3%	+0.9%
	Other	0.1%	0.2%	+0.1%
Total part-time		**41.9%**	**43.2%**	**1.2%**

Table 7 – State Service - Location of Workforce – Percentage – March 2025 and March 2026

Location	March 2025	March 2026	% Difference 2025-2026
North	22.9%	22.8%	-0.1%
North West	15.9%	15.9%	0.0%
South	56.1%	56.0%	-0.1%
South East	4.7%	4.9%	0.2%
West Coast	0.5%	0.4%	-0.1%

Table 8 – State Service - Age Profile – Percentage – March 2025 and March 2026

Age Group	March 2025	March 2026	% Difference 2025-2026
19 and under	0.5%	0.6%	+0.1%
20 to 24 years	4.4%	4.3%	-0.1%
25 to 29 years	9.5%	9.7%	+0.2%
30 to 34 years	12.9%	12.9%	0.0%
35 to 39 years	13.3%	13.7%	+0.4%
40 to 44 years	12.5%	12.7%	+0.2%
45 to 49 years	11.5%	11.5%	0.0%
50 to 54 years	12.0%	11.7%	-0.3%
55 to 59 years	11.3%	11.2%	-0.1%
60 to 64 years	7.9%	7.5%	-0.4%
65 to 69 years	3.2%	3.2%	0.0%
70 to 74 years	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%
75 and over	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%

Table 9 – General Stream Band 9 Employees - by Agency – Paid Headcount – March 2025 and March 2026

Agency	March 2025	March 2026	Difference 2025-2026
Department for Education, Children and Young People	3	2	-1
Department of Health	14	22	+8
Department of Justice	2	2	0
Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management	4	5	+1
Department of Premier and Cabinet	3	3	0
Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania	6	5	-1
Department of State Growth	12	12	0
Department of Treasury and Finance	1	1	0
Tasmanian Audit Office	3	4	+1
Brand Tasmania	0	0	0
Environment Protection Authority	0	0	0
Homes Tasmania	0	0	0
The Public Trustee	0	0	0
Integrity Commission Tasmania	0	0	0
Macquarie Point Development Corporation	0	0	0
Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority	2	3	+1
Tourism Tasmania	3	4	+1
Total	**53**	**63**	**10**

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Andrew Byrne	Principal Consultant, Workforce Planning
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary, State Service Management Office

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Yvette Steele, Director Workforce Strategy, State Service Management Office	[redacted]

39

P-62

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output –2.3 State Service Employment and Management

Sustainable State Service

Current as at: 25-May-2026

Talking Points

- Tasmania's state service workforce growth is unsustainable.
- Last year we put in place a hiring freeze on non-essential recruitment.
- And that has helped arrest the growth. However, in the four years prior to that, the State Service had grown by almost 6 per cent – at the same time as our population grew by 0.6 per cent.
- We are all agreed that we need responsible budget management.
- And we need to bring the state service workforce back in line with population growth.
- **That will mean reducing the workforce by 6 per cent over the next four years.**
- **That's around 1,700 positions – 1,100 less than anticipated.**
- We will do this in a careful considered manner that respects our workforce and protects frontline services.
- We have always said that Tasmania needs a sustainable and efficient public sector.

You previously said 2,800 jobs would go – why the change?

- We've worked to arrest the growth in the State Service.

- But we need to bring the state service workforce back in line with population growth.
- That will mean reducing the workforce by 6 per cent over the next four years.
- That's around 1,700 positions – 1,100 less than anticipated.
- We have already shown that we can do this responsibly in my own Department, where 82 positions have been reduced since the recruitment freeze a little over a year ago.
- That's 12% of the DPAC employee numbers and we have done this responsibly, with an eye to continued service delivery.
- We will achieve this through natural attrition, targeted and negotiated voluntary redundancies and workforce renewal. and sensible consolidation of functions.
- Forced redundancies are not currently being contemplated.
- We will take a disciplined approach to achieving the forecast reductions in employee numbers right across the state service.
- We must do this to ensure that we continue to deliver the essential services that Tasmanians need.
- That cannot happen if we have higher expenditure, higher borrowings and interest payments.

State Service numbers

- In line with our Transparency Agenda, the Department of Premier of Cabinet commenced routinely disclosing agency paid FTE and paid Headcount data to provide full transparency on the size of the Tasmanian State Service.
- The number of Full Time Equivalents in the State Service at 22 May 2026 was 30,455.53 (excluding casuals), with a 3.07 per cent increase since March 2025.
- Even with our success in arresting growth in the public service, employee numbers remain above pre-pandemic levels.

- This size workforce cannot be sustained in the long-term.
- The Government is focusing on ensuring our State Service is appropriately sized, financially responsible and capable to delivering high-quality services into the future.
- This involves ensuring we have a workforce that is sustainable in size and shape, in the right place, and equipped with the right tools and resources to deliver our important services to the community of Tasmania.
- We are focussed on a State Service that operates as effectively and efficiently as possible, meets community needs and delivers value for money.
- We remain focused on increasing productivity across the State Service, supporting professional development and continuing to strengthen the capability and capacity of our workforce.
- While we continue to invest in the essential frontline services, we must also ensure the public service remains sustainable and appropriately sized for Tasmania's needs.

How will you shed those jobs?

- Managing Positions in the State Service (MPSS) is an existing suite of tools that enables agencies to actively manage the size and capability of their workforce.
- It supports vacancy control, redeployment, voluntary redundancies and workforce renewal incentives.
- MPSS was updated by the Head of the State Service effective 23 April, amending the employment exclusion period for an employee who accepts a Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancy (TNVR) to a period of two years.
- Departmental Secretaries will be working closely with their Agencies to achieve these measures.
- An example is the Department of Education, Children and Young People (DECYP) who have identified that they will examine how

corporate, governance and enabling functions are structured and managed.

- A reduction of 10 per cent would be sufficient to achieve targets set for DECYP in 2026-27.
- All agencies have outlined a high level approach to achieving these targets in their Budget Chapters.

Non-Essential Recruitment Freeze

- On 2 March 2025, the Treasurer announced a refocus of the public service including a recruitment freeze on non-essential positions.
- Since the commencement of the recruitment freeze, Heads of Agencies have been considering a range of measures to manage workforce sustainability.
- These include allowing natural attrition of non-essential roles; increasing the use of Workforce Renewal Incentive Payments to support renewal and reprofiling; identifying opportunities to reduce unnecessary layers of bureaucracy and duplication and streamlining services through greater use of digital technology.
- Agencies are also examining shared service models and pursuing digital uplift to replace paper-based and manual processes.
- Agencies have reviewed their internal recruitment approval processes, including establishing or refining agency recruitment committees.
- Work has also progressed to confirm workforce data definitions and metrics across agencies, with reporting monitored by the Head of the State Service.
- Decisions about which roles are considered essential are made by each Head of Agency, considering their operational requirements, environment and context.

Workforce Renewal Incentive Payments

- In January 2025, the Head of the State Service reissued the Managing Positions in the State Service framework, which included two key amendments:
  - an increase to the Workforce Renewal Incentive Payment from a maximum of $30,000 to $60,000, and
  - an extension to the period to fill a reprofiled role from six months to eight months.
- These changes reflect the importance of reprofiling jobs, addressing the challenges of how we deliver service to the Tasmanian community and maintain the Tasmanian State Service as a great place to work, including supporting broader employment strategies including youth employment.
- A Workforce Renewal Incentive Payment is an important component of the State Service workforce strategy and provides our people with an opportunity to express interest in separating from the State Service. Agencies have the option to engage in a formal expression of interest process or manage on an individual employee basis.
- The Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Department of State Growth sought formal expressions of interests for Workforce Renewal Incentive Payments. Other agencies were utilising these on an individual, case by case basis.

Frequently Asked Questions- if asked

Question - Why have numbers increased slightly during the hiring freeze?

- Since the non-essential recruitment freeze was announced in March 2025, paid FTEs have increased by 3.07 per cent, representing 908.38 more FTE (from 29,547.15 to 30,455.53 as at 22 May 2026).
- The majority of the increases have occurred in frontline and essentials services, including Investment in frontline staff in schools, child safety and youth justice.

- Continuing investment in Health with an increase in the number of staff essential to meeting the health and wellbeing needs of Tasmania.
- An increase in DPFEM numbers, including Fire Service employees who are essential to keeping Tasmania safe, including those in Community Fire Education and the Bush Fire Risk Unit.
- An increase in staffing in the Tasmanian Prison Service
- The most recent increase has been due to a large intake in the Department Health, with the commencement of 100 nurses (mostly transition to practice); and 157 salaried medical practitioners (mostly junior doctors, particularly registrars).
- We do not step away from continuing to address resourcing in key frontline services and support our health system to deliver essential services to Tasmanians.

Question - How do we achieve FTE reduction if we can't when a hiring freeze is in place?

- The intent of the recruitment freeze was always to arrest growth in non-essential roles. The freeze has achieved this, with the majority of increases being in essential and frontline roles.
- FTE reduction will come from a deliberate process of identifying where efficiencies can be made, a process which is already underway by Heads of Agencies supported by the Efficiency and Productivity Unit.

Questions– Why was the employment exclusion period for an employee accepted a TNVR changed?

- The changes to MPSS introduce a more contemporary approach to employment exclusion periods for employees accepted a Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancy (TNVR). This supports our ongoing work to realign State Service employment to a more sustainable level in the current fiscal environment.
- Published by the Head of the State Service, the updated MPSS reflects our circumstances and ongoing workforce requirements.

Question – How long was the previous employment exclusion period?

- Prior to the update, the employment exclusion period for employees who accepted a TNVR was equivalent to the number of weeks applicable to their TNVR payment, rounded up the nearest whole week.

If asked - will there be forced redundancies?

- As I said, *"Managing Positions in the State Service"* is an existing suite of tools that enables agencies to actively manage the size and capability of their workforce.
- These tools support vacancy control, redeployment, voluntary redundancies and workforce renewal incentives.
- They are mechanisms that are governed by the State Service Act and are issued by the Head of the State Service.
- I would also point out that **these are not new tools.**
- **They have been available within the State Service for years**, and are also similarly available in other jurisdictions, including the Australian Public Service.
- In practice, however, employees are more likely to take up a targeted voluntary redundancy which is a higher financial benefit than the calculation for an involuntary redundancy, which is calculated under the Industrial Relations Act.
- So, while these tools remain available for use to right size the service, forced redundancies are not currently contemplated at this time.

Background

Refer to Machinery of Government QTB for DSG information.

Growth in State Service FTEs

- The table below shows the year-to-year growth from 2020 to 2025 (based at June of each year). For consistency, all data is sourced from the Workforce Information Reporting System (WiRS).

Table 1: FTE Variance – June 2020 to June 2025

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Total FTE	25,288.84	26,274.54	27,723.84	27,647.20	28,964.64	29,891.66
Variance (FTE)	576.09	985.70	1,449.30	-76.64	1,317.44	927.02
Variance %	2.33%	3.90%	5.52%	-0.28%	4.77%	3.20%

- From the start of the recruitment freeze on 2 March 2025 to the last fortnightly report on 22 May 2026:

Total FTE:	30,455.53
Variance (FTE):	+908.38
Variance %:	+3.07%

- The FTE increase for 20 May is largely due to DECYP staff returning from non-attendance periods during the school holidays as well as fixed-term contracts beginning at the start of term two. Health reported 107 commencements, mostly due to the onboarding of Junior Doctors and Transition to Practice Nurses. Across all other agencies, the paid headcount and FTE have remained stable over the fortnight.
- Following the commencement of the freeze, there was a significant decrease in the number of positions advertised on the jobs.tas.gov.au website. Since this initial drop, the number of advertisements have fluctuated.
- On 22 May 2026, the number of active jobs listed on Tasmanian Jobs Website was 217, increasing from 181 the previous fortnight, with 56 employment registers. Whilst the most recent fortnight saw an increase, overall, advertisement numbers have been trending down since March 2025.
- The non-essential recruitment freeze applies to the Tasmanian State Service and Ministerial and Parliamentary Services.

Additional Workforce Profile Information – 2023-24 and 2024-25

- Total paid headcount as at end June 2025 was 36,168 compared to 35,001 at end June 2024, representing an increase of 1,167 or 3.3 per cent. These figures exclude casuals.
- Total paid full-time equivalent at end June 2025 was 29,789.09 compared to 28,760.01 at end June 2024, representing an increase of 1,029.08 or 3.6 per cent. These figures exclude casuals. These figures are obtained from agency fortnightly data provided to the State Service Management Office (SSMO).

- In February 2026, in line with the election committee, DPAC commenced routinely disclosing agency paid FTE and paid headcount data to support transparency on the size of the Tasmanian State Service.
- Routine disclosure refers to the monthly publication of paid FTE and paid headcount reports on the DPAC website.
- TSS workforce numbers can fluctuate for a range of reasons, including recruitment activity, role reprofiling, seasonal demand and changes in program funding or service delivery priorities. These variations are a normal part of workforce management and reflect the dynamic nature of public service operations.

Workforce Renewal Incentive Payments and Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancies

- Workforce Renewal Incentive Payments (WRIPs) and Targeted and Negotiated Voluntary Redundancies (TNVR) are part of the Managing Positions in the State Service (MPSS) framework. Mechanisms contained within MPSS are governed by the *State Service Act 2000* and are issued by the Head of the State Service under section 15(1)(b) of the Act.
- The WRIP expressions of interest programs conducted by the Departments of Premier and Cabinet and State Growth in 2024-25 were open for general expressions of interest and did not target specific cohorts.
- For 2024-25, 15 State Service employees separated via a WRIP, and 15 leaving through a TNVR.
- For 2025-26, to date, 47 State Service Employees separated via a WRIP, and 14 leaving through a TNVR

[redacted]

	Name	Position
Reviewed and updated by	Yvette Steele	Director Workforce Strategy
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary, State Service Management Office

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Yvette Steele	[redacted]

40

P-63

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group – Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

Tasmanian State Service Human Resource Transformation

Current as at: **29-May-2026**

Talking Points

- The HR Transformation Program will deliver critical public sector infrastructure to 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 and 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 re-starting during the pay run to allow it to complete.
- The need for system-wide 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.
- Improved 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. 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 (DPAC) in April 2026.
- Work is now 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- The system that was built in the Department of Health is the foundation of what is being rolled out to government now.
- This has delivered the critical foundations required for success including design development, market engagement, governance structures, and a far more mature understanding of delivery risk.
- During the early phase of the Program, Health procured whole-of-government SAP SuccessFactors licences, securing a ten-year deal for government.
- The Program built core system components, including Employee Central, Recruitment, Onboarding and Payroll.
- The Program cleaned and prepared tens of thousands of workforce data records, resolving legacy complexities and enabling future migration.
- The Program undertook system integration and data migration testing, validating the build and confirming readiness.
- From this health build, the first functionality, Establishment Management was deployed to the Department of Premier and Cabinet in 2025.
- The system that was built in Health is the foundation of what is being rolled out to government now.
- There are always lessons to learn in major ICT programs and we note the guidance provided by the Auditor General's report, and his acknowledgment of the improvements we have made.
- Both Health and DPAC have noted and accepted the recommendations of the Auditor General and will continue the difficult and complex work to deliver a new whole of service HR system.

- While this is a significant investment, its purpose is clear, it is about supporting the people who deliver essential services to Tasmanians.
- Across hospitals, schools, police, courts, parks and corrections, this program underpins the systems those workers rely on every day.

Background

Program Delivery Approach

- The Program will deliver a single system across Government that supports the full people management lifecycle, commencing with establishment and position management, followed by staged releases of payroll, rostering and timekeeping with automated award interpretation, and finally recruitment and talent management.
- The staged roll out approach reduces risk, strengthens outcomes and ensures agencies are well prepared for change.

Work to date - Position Management

- The implementation of Position Management in DPAC was successfully delivered in April 2026.
- Building on the initial functionality rolled out in late 2025 supporting establishment reporting, Position Management in DPAC has delivered simpler, digital workflows, replaced paper-based processes and reduced administrative effort.
- It delivers greater transparency and accountability in workforce decision-making by providing clear visibility of requests and approvals.
- The system improves vacancy control and workforce visibility, supporting stronger planning and more informed recruitment decisions.
- The shift away from manual and paper-based processes directly aligns with workforce feedback, including the Efficiency and Productivity Unit staff survey, which identified opportunities to lift productivity through modern systems.
- Position Management is anticipated to be deployed across all agencies before the rollout of the payroll functionality.

Next Steps – Payroll Replacement

- The next stage of the HR Transformation Program is underway, focusing on confirming and finalising the People and Pay design - delivering a single, consistent set of processes across Government.
- This work builds directly on the significant investment and progress made through the Department of Health's HRIS project and other earlier work.
- This work will provide clarity on future-state processes, agency impacts, and the Program's delivery and release approach.
- To support the next phase of work, the Program is supplementing its core team through the targeted use of contractors and consultants who bring specialist skills required to deliver a program of this scale and technical complexity.
- This approach reflects the temporary and specialist nature of the work, ensures delivery momentum is maintained, and allows the Program to access critical expertise without creating a long-term increase in the permanent workforce.

Concurrent Projects

- An initial Human Resource Case Management System (HRCMS) was rolled out from August 2024 across agencies, establishing a single platform that supports consistent reporting across Government and builds foundational capability and operational experience.
- Building on the investment to date, the Program is advancing to the next stage of HR Case Management maturity, informed by operational use, agency feedback, and whole-of-government process alignment.
- A Request for Tender issued in April 2026 supports the design and delivery of an enhanced HRCMS, strengthening workforce systems, improving data quality and capability, and supporting the Government's commitment to delivering better public services efficiently and effectively.
- In parallel, the Program is working in partnership with the Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management to design and implement a pilot rostering solution for Police.
- Lessons learned from the pilot will inform the development of a scalable whole-of-government rostering solution, planned for delivery in later phases of the Program.

Has Health Failed?

- Health did not fail.
- The work undertaken by Health delivered the critical foundations required for this program to succeed, including design development and system build, market engagement, governance structures, and a much more mature understanding of delivery risk.
- That work has not been lost. The system that was built in Health is the foundation of what is being rolled out to government now.
- The program we are delivering today is stronger because of that experience, with lessons learned from the Health initiative directly informing and improving the current approach.

Has public money been wasted?

- No. Public money has not been wasted.
- The investment to date has delivered substantial value and has been carried forward into the current activities of the program and what it is rolling out today.
- It has established the critical foundations required for success, including design development, market engagement, governance structures, and a mature understanding of delivery risk and our complex workforce and their needs.
- That work has not been lost or wasted; it has been directly leveraged, ensuring continuity and strengthening the current approach.

- For a program of this scale and complexity, these foundations are not optional, they are essential to enable successful implementation and avoid the very failures seen elsewhere.

What did Health spend $47M on?

- The investment by Health funded substantial and necessary foundational work to support a program of this scale and complexity.
- That work was not limited to system design and development; it also focused on preparing the organisation to successfully adopt and operate a new solution.
- This included market engagement, and establishing the governance and program structures required to deliver a program of this nature.
- Importantly, it also included significant business readiness work, building capability within the department to support implementation and change.
- That encompassed a new Human Resources service delivery model, payroll remediation activities, and extensive data cleansing to improve the quality and integrity of workforce information.
- It also involved addressing long-standing structural issues, such as complex employment arrangements and multi-FTE roles, which are critical to resolve before any modern system can be successfully implemented.
- That work has not been lost. It has been directly leveraged, ensuring continuity and strengthening the current approach, placing it in a significantly stronger position to succeed.

How will the Program ensure successful implementation?

- The Program has studied experiences from other jurisdictions to identify what makes HRIS implementations successful, recognising that while some programs have faced challenges, many have achieved strong outcomes.
- The New South Wales Government now supports 75 agencies and 60,000 employees on a single, integrated system, demonstrating the potential for whole-of-government HRIS success using SAP SuccessFactors.
- Extensive engagement with jurisdictions across Australia has allowed the Program to learn from successful deployments ensuring these lessons inform program planning.
- Key to success in these programs is a shared commitment to outcomes across portfolios, supported by strong ministerial and executive leadership.
- In Tasmania, the Program is being guided by an actively engaged governance group, with hands-on leadership from agency Heads, providing the governance, oversight, and accountability required to deliver a successful, whole-of-government HR solution.

Why does it cost so much?

- HRIS is a core compliance and payroll control system, not a discretionary IT product. It holds the official employment record for the workforce and directly underpins pay, entitlements, leave, superannuation, and access to government systems. Reliability and accuracy are non-negotiable.
- All off-the-shelf HRIS products require configuration to support workforce complexity such as differing awards, classifications, delegations and are required to meet regulatory obligations.
- Large and diverse workforces, like the Tasmanian State Service, increase the time and effort required to configure, test, integrate, and undertake assurance. The same cost drivers apply across governments and large regulated employers.
- Implementation of PeopleCentral requires us to redesign and align HR processes across government, clean years of legacy data, and undertake extensive change management and training across the entire workforce, all of which takes time and resourcing.
- Analysis of programs in similar jurisdictions indicates that our investment in the program is proportionate.

Can Tasmania afford to deliver this Program in the current fiscal environment?

- Yes. Tasmania can afford to deliver this program, and it is necessary that we do so.
- The real risk in this context is not investment; it is standing still, and continuing to carry the ongoing cost of outdated and fragmented systems.
- Many of our current systems drive inefficiency, rework, duplication, and manual processing, all of which come at a real and recurring cost to government.
- This program is expected to return thousands of work hours to the public sector each year, by reducing duplication, improving accuracy, and eliminating manual reporting.
- That means fewer manual timesheets, fewer payroll errors, faster recruitment processes, and real-time reporting instead of paper-based or delayed data.
- It means less time spent fixing mistakes, and more time delivering services, whether that is in hospitals, classrooms, police stations or courts.
- It also provides a single, consistent platform across government, reducing fragmentation and creating further efficiencies over time, including opportunities for shared services.
- This is not just an IT investment; it is a productivity and workforce investment that strengthens how government operates.

Why were business cases not approved?

- That characterisation is not accurate. Business cases have been developed and approved at each stage of this program in line with its evolution.

- The program has transitioned from an agency-led initiative to a whole-of-government focus, and as it has evolved, so too have its governance and approval processes.
- The Department of Health developed a business case in 2020, which was reviewed and approved through the relevant steering committee and the Head of Agency at that time.
- In 2022, a whole-of-government business case was developed and approved by the Secretaries Board that subsequently supported a submission to the Budget Committee.
- Following the transition of the program to DPAC, an updated business case has been endorsed that reflects our current estimates of cost to finalise build, implementation and operation over the next 10 years
- Since the completion of audit fieldwork, this comprehensive whole-of-government business case has been finalised and approved through the current governance framework, including the Head of the State Service.
- What this reflects is a program that has matured over time, with governance, business cases and approvals adjusting appropriately to its scale, scope and progress, not a lack of approval.

What are the ongoing costs of the Program

- The ongoing cost of the Program is projected to be lower than the cost of maintaining the current fragmented systems environment which are escalating rapidly.
- At present, government is sustaining more than 40 separate systems, many of which are outdated, costly to maintain, and require significant manual intervention.
- The costs of the current payroll system alone across Government has grown from $2.6M in 2023-24 to $9.2M in 2026-27.
- Moving to a single, standardised platform reduces that complexity and the ongoing cost of supporting multiple systems.
- More material benefits are realised through what the system removes, manual processes, duplication, and administrative effort, including fewer manual timesheets, less paper-based processing, reduced rework, and improved workforce management practices.
- Over time, that translates into a more efficient and lower-cost operating model, as well as a more sustainable platform that avoids the ongoing cost of maintaining legacy systems.

Why were key design decisions not made?

- That characterisation is not accurate. Key design decisions have been made in line with a structured and sequenced approach to delivery.
- Since the conclusion of audit fieldwork, a number of critical design decisions have been resolved, including those relating to how we will manage our people with multiple

assignments, where our salaried and rostered people apply for leave and how we will manage our contingent workforce.

- Further, smaller design decisions are continuing to be worked through as part of the current enterprise design phase, which is exactly where they are intended to be addressed.
- This is a complex program supporting a highly diverse workforce operating within a complex legislative and industrial environment, and these decisions require careful consideration to ensure the solution is fit for purpose.
- Rather than rushing decisions prematurely, the program is deliberately working through them in a controlled and governed way, ensuring they are informed, tested, and aligned to the needs of agencies.
- Strong governance arrangements are in place to support this process, providing oversight, challenge, and assurance as design decisions are finalised.
- This approach ensures that decisions are not only made, but made well, supporting a system that will operate effectively across government in the long term.

Other jurisdictions have tried to deliver these programs and failed. What assurances can you give to the Parliament that Tasmania is not the next State to fail?

- Programs of this nature do carry real risk if they are not delivered well, and we have seen in other projects what happens when that risk is not effectively managed, cost overruns, delays, and systems that do not meet the needs of the workforce.
- However, it is equally important to recognise that there are jurisdictions that have successfully delivered programs of this kind, including New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia.
- The program has actively studied both the successes and failures across jurisdictions, and those lessons have directly shaped the way this program is being delivered in Tasmania.
- This has not been a passive exercise, it has involved ongoing engagement with other jurisdictions and delivery partners to understand what drives success, what creates risk, and how those risks can be mitigated in practice.
- A consistent theme from successful implementations is strong, sustained executive leadership and a shared commitment to outcomes across government, and that is reflected in Tasmania's approach.
- We have implemented strengthened governance, including a cross-government steering committee, oversight from the Secretaries Board, and direct reporting to Cabinet, ensuring active leadership, accountability, and alignment at the highest levels.
- Importantly, we are not pursuing a "big bang" implementation. The program is being delivered in a staged and structured way, allowing benefits to be realised early while reducing delivery risk and the impact of change on agencies and staff.

- It is this combination of actively learning from real-world experience, embedding those lessons into governance and delivery, and maintaining strong executive oversight, that gives confidence that Tasmania is well positioned to succeed.

Why can't existing systems be improved instead?

- The current environment is fundamentally fragmented and outdated, and that cannot be effectively resolved through incremental improvement of existing systems.
- Government currently relies on more than 40 separate HR and payroll systems, some dating back to the 1980's.
- Many of these systems are no longer fit for purpose. They are costly to maintain, difficult to integrate, and increasingly unable to meet modern workforce and compliance requirements.
- Improving them individually would not address the core issue, which is fragmentation, it would simply continue the duplication, manual work, and risk that exists today.
- The reality is that continuing to patch and extend these systems comes at a growing cost, through inefficiency, errors, and strain on the workforce, and those costs ultimately flow through to service delivery.
- This investment is therefore deliberate and necessary to move from a fragmented, high-risk environment to a single, consistent, and sustainable platform.

Why has there been two projects?

- There have not been two separate projects, the current program is a continuation and evolution of the original Health-led initiative.
- As the work in Health progressed, it was clear that operational need and successful delivery required transition beyond a single agency-led program to a whole-of-government approach.
- The program was therefore expanded and transitioned to a broader, whole-of-government approach.
- In doing so, it has deliberately retained and built on the work already undertaken by Health.
- It has also integrated related work led by the State Service Management Office to support greater consistency and harmonisation of HR processes across government.
- What this reflects is not duplication, but the natural progression of a program that has matured in scope and ambition, from an agency-focused initiative to a coordinated, whole-of-government reform.

How does this Program represent value for money?

- **Better use of taxpayer dollars:** replacing more than 40 legacy systems reduces duplication, lowers maintenance costs, and delivers long-term efficiency savings.

- **Stronger frontline focus:** by cutting administrative burden, frontline managers and staff can spend more time delivering health, education, and community services.
- **Workforce accountability and visibility:** a single dataset improves oversight of where people are working, including contractors and volunteers, which supports safer services and aligns with Commission of Inquiry recommendations.
- **Service consistency across government:** By standardising HR practices and data, the system enables easier sharing of staff, more consistent services across agencies, and stronger reporting for government and the community.
- **Future-proofing the public service:** modern tools equip leaders with real-time workforce insights, helping government respond faster to emerging pressures (e.g. health demand, disaster response, child safety).
- **Managing risk:** many legacy HR systems are at end-of-life, creating risks to critical services such as payroll and exposing government to cyber security threats. PeopleCentral mitigates these risks while modernising service delivery.

Budget Information

- From 2021 to the end of the 2023-24 financial year, a total of $47M was spent on building the solution (system and processes) and business readiness by the Department of Health. A further $11.8M was invested last financial year in readying PeopleCentral for use by all agencies.
- Future stages of PeopleCentral are contingent on continued investment, which will enable the Program to build on current successes, deliver remaining functionality, and realise the full benefits of a modern, whole-of-government HR solution.

Table 2	**Appropriation funding for Human Resources Transformation Project**	
Title	***2025-26 $'000***	***2026-27 $'000***
Human Resources Transformation Project – Capital Funding	16,000	24,800
Whole of Government - Human Resources Information System – Operational Funding	2,000	0

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Penny Ratcliffe	Director, HR Transformation Program
Cleared by	Noelene Kelly	A/Chief Operations Officer

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Penny Ratcliffe	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group 2 - Government System Support
Output – 2.3 State Service Employment and Management

Work Health, Safety and Wellbeing (incl Worker's Compensation)

Current as at: **12-May-2026**

Talking Points

- This Government prioritises a strong culture of workplace safety and wellbeing, with a focus on hazard management, improved injury outcomes, and proactive measures to support both physical and mental health of our employees.
- Safety and wellbeing initiatives are delivered through coordinated whole-of-service approaches and tailored agency actions, with a commitment to ensuring employees can access appropriate care and support in the event of illness or injury.
- In the twelve-month period to 30 June 2025*, there were 1,877 workers' compensation claims reported in the TSS, which is an increase of 157 claims (9.12 per cent) from the previous twelve-month period.
- The cost of these payments was $153.2 million. This is an increase of $39.6 million, or 34.8 per cent, from the previous 12-month reporting period.
- There were 547 mental stress claims during the period to 31 March 2026, which represents 1.48 per cent of the State Service headcount. This is an increase of 79 claims from the previous reporting period.

- I am very aware of the stigma which has historically existed in relation to mental illness and my Government is committed to fostering workplace environments where employees feel supported to seek help when they need it.
- Mental stress claims represent 29.14 per cent of total claims lodged in the TSS, for the period to 31 March 2026. Compared to the same period last year mental stress claims represented 26.07per cent of total claims lodged in the TSS, for the period to 31 March 2025.
- Post Traumatic Stress Claims have increased over the 12-month period to 31 March 2026, from 48 to 75.

Additional Talking Points

- My Government is committed to important work aimed at destigmatising mental health issues and encouraging health-seeking behaviours in our State Service workforce. We are also focused on improving the reporting of mental health prevalence.
- This includes the development and implementation of Health and Wellbeing Strategies within Government agencies. These strategies outline programs of work which positively contribute to employee wellbeing by increasing awareness and reducing stigma.
- Agencies are adopting a holistic approach to address psychosocial hazards, which encompass a wide range of potential workplace hazards. These include workload management, workplace and job design, recruitment, and resourcing considerations, training and support services, all of which can impact staff wellbeing.

- Through the most recent round of State Service wage agreement negotiations, we are delivering a range of conditions to support our employees. Examples include a new entitlement to five days paid Personal Impact Days to manage the risks associated with consistent exposure to vicarious trauma and critical incidents; and the introduction of 'right to disconnect,' improving the mental health of our employees and providing the ability for employees to disengage from work to balance work, life and family responsibilities.
- My Government has and will continue to take active steps to improve the management of WHS and Wellbeing across the State Service.
- The development of a Tasmanian Government framework for workplace mental health is currently under way. This WorkCover Tasmania Board project is led by the Department of Justice, through WorkSafe Tasmania, in collaboration with the Department of Health (Community, Mental Health and Wellbeing) and a range of key stakeholders representing the public and private sectors.
- The State Service Management Office is involved in this work through representation on the Working Well Steering Committee and Reference Group and has supported participation across agencies.

FAQ (If asked); What are you going to do to reduce workers compensation claims and costs?

Answer: We are working closely with the experts to strengthen advice and guidance related to employee health and safety and worker's compensation. The WorkCover Board has specifically engaged with the Tasmanian State Service on two major projects to assist in improving workplace mental health and identifying opportunities to improve the workers' compensation process. These initiatives were designed to support injured employees, a reduction in the number of claims and the overall cost of worker's compensation across the State Service.

Tasmanian Workplace Mental Health Framework

- Work has commenced to develop a Tasmanian Workplace Mental Health Framework.
- Working Well is a research initiative funded by the WorkCover Tasmania Board to inform the development of Tasmania's Workplace Mental Health Framework. This project is led by WorkSafe Tasmania, in the Department of Justice in partnership with Community, Mental Health and Wellbeing, Department of Health.
- The Working Well study was undertaken by researchers at the Menzies Institute for Medical Research at the University of Tasmania. It was a state-wide survey designed to establish a benchmark of capabilities in Tasmanian organisations for managing employee mental health.
- The State Service Management Office is represented on both the Working Well Steering Committee and Reference Group to inform the experiences of the State Service are reflected in the project's findings and future work.

Improving Injury Outcomes – Workers' Compensation Project:

- A further project was commissioned by the WorkCover Tasmania Board aimed at Improving Injury Outcomes in the Tasmanian State Service, to better understand the experiences of State Service employees who had been injured, and to identify opportunities for improving the workers compensation process. This was undertaken with particular reference to four agencies: Department of Health, Department of Police, Fire, and Emergency Management, the Department for Education, Children and Young People and the Department of Justice.
- The key learnings and suggested strategies from the project aimed to address barriers, reduce risks, enhance organisational performance, and improve the experience and outcomes for employees with injuries. While the project focused on the State Service, many of these insights apply to supporting employees in any setting.
- Agencies have now had the benefit of key learnings from this project and have considered what may be applicable to their agencies.
- Supporting employees and their mental health continues to be a challenging and ongoing issue. Mental health concerns are becoming more prevalent across the Tasmanian community, and agencies are actively implementing Health and Wellbeing Strategies in the workplace to promote positive outcomes. These initiatives focus on increasing awareness and reducing stigma surrounding mental health.
- While these efforts are contributing to improved employee wellbeing, it is acknowledged that further work is required. Agencies remain committed to continuing collaboration with WorkSafe and other community partners to strengthen and

expand the support available to employees who may be impacted by mental stress.

Background

- **Note: For the purpose of the Workers' Compensation Scheme claims data, 'Tasmanian State Service' refers to Tasmanian Government agencies and entities covered through the Tasmanian Risk Management Fund (TRMF). This includes Tasmania Police and TasTAFE. Further, where possible data is extracted from relevant datasets to 31 March 2025 however some data is only available from the WorkCover Tasmanian Board Scheme Review which reports to 30 June each year. The report is released in November each year.*
- Total claim payments for the TSS workers' compensation scheme in the twelve months to 30 June 2025 were $153.2 million, as indicated in Table 2 below. This is an increase of $39.6 million, or 34.8% per cent, from the previous 12-month reporting period.
- The Scheme Report notes that some of this has been driven by an increase to the lumps sum payments (54.6%) and medical expenses (25.1%).
- Over the past decade, payments for non-mental health claims have remained relatively stable, whilst payments for mental health claims have increased significantly. Over this time, the increase in mental health claims is a key driver in the increase in total claim payments.
- Mental-health claim payments continue to make up the majority of payments in the TSS, accounting for 30% of total claim payments in 2025-26 which is in line with the proportions observed in the 2024-2025 year. Mental health-related claims tend to be more costly, given that they are often of a longer duration than physical injury claims, and also have a greater propensity to receive lump sum benefits.
- .
- The most recent TSS Employee Survey (2024) showed a positive response in relation to work health, safety and wellbeing across the TSS which included;
    - 97 per cent of respondents having an awareness of their agency's work health and safety management systems that are in place, such as a strategy, action plan and/or policy and procedures
    - 90 per cent of respondents knowing how to report a work health and safety hazards, incident or near miss in their agency
    - 81 per cent having received instruction / training appropriate to their role to address work health and safety hazards, incidents and injuries in line with their agency policies

Table 1: Tasmanian State Service Scheme Report Card – Claims per $million of Wages Earned

Measure	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Earned Wages ($m)	3,115.6	3,427.4	3690.4	3982.6
Number of Claims Reported	1,644	1,673	1719	1877
Claims per $million of Wages Earned	0.528	0.488	0.466	0.471

Note: Data for this table is extracted from the WorkCover Tasmanian Board Scheme Review which reports to 30 June each year. The report is released in November each year.

Table 2: Tasmanian State Service Scheme Report Card – Costs (per annum)

Measure	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Earned Wages ($m)	3,115.6	3,427.4	3690.4	3982.6
Total Claim Payments ($m)	73.4	85.4	113.6	153.2
Weekly Benefit Payments ($m)	39.7	44.7	56.9	71.6
Lump Sum Benefit Payments ($m)	15.7	20.2	33.5	54.4
Medical & Related Benefit Payments ($m)	14.2	15.9	17.7	20.9
Legal & Investigation ($m)	3.8	4.6	5.5	6.3

Note: Data for this table is extracted from the WorkCover Tasmanian Board Scheme Review which reports to 30 June each year. The report is released in November each year.

Serious Injury

- Duration of time away from work or lost time is an indicator of injury severity. Injury causing lost time of equal to or greater than 5 working days is considered serious injury.
- While gross injury numbers may indicate a greater preparedness of workers to seek workers' compensation assistance, severity of injury demonstrated by lost time is a better indicator of efforts to keep workers safe from injury and support workers back to work when they are injured.
- There have been 850 claims to March 2026 which as at this date resulted in lost time equal to or greater than 5 working days. This data is subject to a time lag due to the time taken for the nature of an injury to be fully realised.

Table 3: Serious Injury – Claims for Injury Causing Lost Time Greater Than or Equal to 5 Days

Injury occurrence (date claim received by insurer)	March 2014	March 2023	March 2024	March 2025	March 2026
Lost Time >= 1 Week*	533	865	938	1041	850^

** Data extracted from WIMS database 7 May 2026.*

^ Note that serious injury data is susceptible to a significant lag, as lost time may occur at a point in time after the claim is made. The data for the period to March 2026 is indicative to-date only and is expected to increase as the serious nature of claims are realised.

Mental Stress

- The reason for an employee taking personal leave is not recorded, and beyond a medical certificate there is no obligation on the employee to disclose the nature of their medical condition. Therefore, the only data available on employees experiencing mental stress is through the number of workers' compensation claims. Claims of this nature are generally costly claims associated with longer term incapacity for work and a greater propensity to receive lump sum benefits.
- In the 12 months to 31 March 2026 the TSS received 547 workers' compensation claims where the primary mechanism of injury was identified as mental stress. This represented 1.48 per cent of the State Service headcount, as indicated in Table 4 below.
- This is an increase of 79 more claims than the previous year compared with an increase of 34 claims in the preceding year between 2024 and 2025.
- The table below displays TSS workers' compensation claims where the mechanism of injury is defined as mental stress.

Table 4: Psychological Claims – Mental Stress Mechanism

Occurrence (date claim received by insurer)	March 2014	March 2023	March 2024	March 2025	March 2026
Mental Stress*	*179*	370	423	468	547
Claims as a percentage of TSS headcount^	*0.64%*	1.14%	1.24%	1.31%	1.48%

**Mental stress mechanism injuries are injuries where the primary cause of the injury is mental stress, extracted WIMS database 7May 2026.*

^Headcount data is extracted from the State Service Workforce Report and is accurate as at 31 December for each reporting period, with the exception of the 12 months to March 2014 - where the headcount is accurate as at 30 June 2013.

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)

- PTSD claims in the workers' compensation scheme reached an original high of 55 in 2022-2023 however decreased in 2023-2024 and increased minimally in 2024-2025, both in terms of claim numbers and claim numbers as a percentage of TSS headcount. PTSD claims have increased significantly in 2025-2026 from 48 to 75 in the last 12 months, as indicated in Table 5 below.

- DPFEM (Police Officers) continue to account for the highest number of claims (around 37%) of the PTSD injuries reported in this period.
- This is followed by Teachers 14% and correctional officers 10%.
- Since 2020-21 police officers followed by prison officers, ambulance officers and fire and emergency workers in the Tasmanian State Service have reported the highest number of PTSD injuries accounting for almost 61% of all PTSD injuries.
- In 2019, Tasmania became the first Australian jurisdiction to legislate a presumption that a PTSD diagnosis is work-related until proven otherwise.

Table 5: PTSD Injuries – Claims

Occurrence (date claim received by insurer)	**March 2014**	**March 2023**	**March 2024**	**March 2025**	**March 2026**
PTSD Claims*	5	55	46	48	75
Claims as a percentage of TSS headcount^	0.02%	0.17%	0.13%	0.13%	0.20%

** Data extracted from the WIMS Database 7 May 2026*

^Headcount data is extracted from the State Service Workforce Report and is accurate at 31 December for each reporting period, with the exception of the 12 months to March 2014 - where the headcount data is accurate at 30 June 2013.

Tasmanian Workplace Mental Health Framework

- Working Well is research initiative funded by the WorkCover Tasmania Board to inform the development of Tasmania's Workplace Mental Health Framework. This project is led by WorkSafe Tasmanian, Department of Justice in partnership with Community, Mental Health and Wellbeing, Department of Health.
- The Working Well study is conducted by researchers at the Menzies Institute for Medical Research at the University of Tasmania. It was a state-wide survey designed to establish a benchmark of capabilities in Tasmanian organisations for managing employee mental health.

- The State Service Management Office is a member of both the Working Well Steering Committee and Reference Group.
- The Working Well survey was open from the end of August 2024 to March 2025 across Tasmania. SSMO collaboratively closely with the Working Well Project Team to promote the survey across State Service agencies through messages from the Head of the State Service and via agency intranet / newsletters / emails. Promotional material was also made available to the broader community, including Service Tasmania, to encourage participation.
- A high-level summary of findings is available on the WorkSafe website.

Improving Injury Outcomes – Workers' Compensation Project

- This project was commissioned by the WorkCover Tasmania Board and aimed at Improving Injury Outcomes in the Tasmanian State Service (TSS) to better understand the experiences of TSS workers who had been injured, and to identify opportunities for improving the workers compensation process. This was undertaken with particular reference to four agencies: DoH, DPFEM, DECYP and DoJ.
- The key learnings and suggested strategies from the project aim to address barriers, reduce risks, enhance organisational performance, and improve the experience and outcomes for workers with injuries. While the project focused on the TSS, many of these insights apply to supporting workers in any setting.
- The WorkCover Tasmania Board has accepted all recommendations from the project and has further funded a project to implement the findings.
- Key strategies identified from the project included;
    - **Clear communication and accessible information**
        - Make communication consistent and clear, use empathetic language to avoid confusion and stigma. Establish early personal contact to provide reassurance and guidance, and offer regular updates to foster trust and reduce uncertainty.
    - **Empathy and Person-centred support**
        - Assign a dedicated case manager to ensure consistency through the process. Train case managers and supervisors in empathy and person-centred approaches and tailor communication and individual worker needs and preferences. Involve workers in decision making to empower them throughout their recovery journey.
    - **Proactive return to work strategies**
        - Maintain connection between the employee and the workplace to prevent isolation. Use a holistic approach to assess and address physical, emotional and social impacts for returning to work. Develop flexible return pathways, including part-time or alternative roles.

- **Building Organisational capability**
  - Train managers and supervisors to understand the workers compensation process and develop skills in empathetic communication. Foster a culture that values employee's wellbeing and use feedback mechanisms to future improvements. Implement effective case management systems to reduce errors and streamline processes.

- It is of note that the WorkerCover Tasmania Board and some TSS agencies have already begun implementing some of the suggested strategies.

	Name	Position
Prepared by	David Appleyard	Senior Workplace Relations Consultant
Cleared by	Amanda Russell	Deputy Secretary, State Service Management Office

DPAC contact for more information:	Jane Fitton Director, Workforce Management and Employment	[redacted]

Parliamentary Briefing 2026

Premier

Output Group – Output Group 3 - Community and Government Service Delivery
Output – 3.2 Management and Ongoing Development of Service Tasmania

Capital Investment Program

Current as at: **24-April-2026**

Talking Points

- Service Tasmania receives an annual Capital Investment Program (CIP) allocation of $250,000. It is used to:
    - maintain and refurbish Service Tasmania service centres
    - upgrade core technology systems
    - improve customer amenities.
- The CIP primarily supports Service Tasmania's proactive approach to:
    - improve the customer experience
    - enhance public safety and access to Service Tasmania service centres across the State
    - mitigate Workplace Health and Safety issues.

Additional talking points:

- For 2025-26, Service Tasmania utilised its full Capital Investment Program allocation of $250,000 to contribute to the costs for upgrading the Smithton service centre to Service Tasmania's modern look and feel, to significantly improve customer and staff amenities.
- The Smithton upgrade project was delivered within the planned cost, at a total of $317,831 with $67,831 of this cost budgeted from Service Tasmania Special Purpose Account.

- The refurbished site opened on 11 August 2025.
- Service Tasmania is working through the plan for 2026-27, with several projects being prioritised around the available funds.

Budget Information

Table 1 **Service Tasmania Capital Investment Program**

Project	2025-26 $'000	2026-27 $'000	2027-28 $'000	2028-29 $'000	2029-30 $'000
Service Centre Capital Investment	$250	$250	$250	$250	$250

	Name	Position
Prepared by	Laurelle Halford	Communications & Portfolio Services Manager, Service Tasmania
Cleared by	Noelene Kelly	Deputy Secretary Community and Government Services

	Name	Contact number
DPAC contact for more information:	Andrew Wilford	[redacted]