

**SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
ESTIMATES AND FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

**2011–12 AGENCY ANNUAL REPORT HEARINGS
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (WORKSAFE)**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
TUESDAY, 02 OCTOBER 2012**

SESSION THREE

Members

**Hon Philip Gardiner (Chair)
Hon Ken Travers
Hon Ljiljana Ravlich**

Hearing commenced at 3.24 pm**BRADLEY, MR BRIAN****Director General, Department of Commerce, sworn and examined:****McCULLOCH, MR LEX****Executive Director WorkSafe, sworn and examined:**

The CHAIR: On behalf of the Standing Committee on Estimates and Financial Operations, I would like to welcome you to the hearing this afternoon. Before we begin, I am required to ask all witnesses to take either an oath or an affirmation.

[Witnesses took the oath or affirmation.]

The CHAIR: You will have signed a document titled “Information for Witnesses”. Have you read and understood this document?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIR: This hearing is being held in public, although discretion is available to the committee to take evidence in private, either of its own motion or at a witness’s request. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during this afternoon’s proceedings, you should request that the evidence be taken in closed session before answering that question. These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and a transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document that you refer to during the course of this hearing for the record. Members, it would greatly assist Hansard if when referring to the annual report you give the page number in preface to your questions. We accept the important role that agencies and departments have in assisting the Parliament to review agency outcomes on behalf of the people of Western Australia, and we value that assistance that you give us.

Do members have any questions?

Hon ALISON XAMON: I note that the elements pertaining to WorkSafe are strewn throughout the Department of Commerce annual report, so I will have to go back and forth a bit in terms of the pages that I am referring to. But I will start off by looking into the issue of WorkSafe’s compliance activities. I refer to pages 9 and 12 and note that the report states that more than 7 600 investigations were completed in 2011–12. In making these comments, I am also going to refer to the Department of Commerce annual reports for the years 2007–08, 2008–09, 2009–10 and 2010–11. Comparing this report with previous reports, I note that of the investigations completed, in 2007–08 there were 9 975 general; in 2008–09 there were 10 000; in 2009–10 there were over 9 800; in 2010–11 there were over 9 400; and in 2011–12 there were over 7 600. Could you please explain why there was a decrease in the number of investigations completed in 2011–12 of close to 2 000 investigations, compared with the previous year’s data and the data relating to the years prior to that?

Mr Bradley: Just as a point of clarification, which pages are you referring to?

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am referring to page 12 and WorkSafe compliance activities.

Mr Bradley: This is the 2011–12 annual report?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes. It is the annual report 2011–12, Department of Commerce overview, and at the bottom of the page it says 7 600 investigations. I have compared that data to the previous annual reports, and we are looking at a reduction of approximately 2 000 investigations. I would like an explanation of why there has been such a dramatic reduction.

Mr Bradley: We have 103 authorities for investigations—so, investigators. In the last couple of years, we have not been able to have a full complement of investigators, to a point this year where we were 20 short. I think at the present moment we are 19 short, with some coming on. So that would be one of the contributing factors. Also, because of the rotation of people retiring and new people coming on, we are finding that a lot of the new inspectors do not get up to speed quickly enough to pick up the slack of doing inspections and therefore issuing notices. So that would be the principal reason for the reduction over these years.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Is it a case of not being able to find these investigators, or is this part of a cost-saving measure as part of the three per cent efficiency dividend?

Mr Bradley: No, member; it really is a question that we cannot find suitable inspectors. We would say that for the manufacturing sector, we do find inspectors, but for the construction sector, they are very, very difficult to find, mainly because of the attraction into the resources sector. One thing we have done is that we have quarantined frontline inspections from any efficiency dividends or savings. So we are always trying to keep a full complement of inspectors for both the construction and the manufacturing sector.

Hon ALISON XAMON: The thing is that you are talking about not wanting to lose frontline inspectors. But I have just outlined that you have had a reduction of 2 000 inspections. So not being able to fill those staff positions is clearly having an impact on frontline services. As you would be aware, I have been asking a series of questions about this in Parliament, and I have been quite concerned about this. I will say in fairness that it is something that I have been concerned about for a number of years in terms of the staffing of WorkSafe. I refer to page 137 of the report in relation to staffing of the labour inspection service. I note that the report states that the WorkSafe division has a full FTE complement of 103 inspectorate positions—which is exactly what you have just said. I was told in June, in answer to one of the questions on notice that I asked, that the inspectors are theoretically divided, with 92 in the metro area, one in Albany, one in Broome, seven in Bunbury and two in Karratha. However, I was also told that as of 21 June, there were 16 vacancies for all positions in Perth. In relation to the figures that you have just given me, can you tell me which of those 16 vacancies have been filled since you answered the question on 21 June, because you mentioned that you have got some people coming on line? That is for Perth.

Mr Bradley: Can you answer that, Lex?

Mr McCulloch: What I can say is that at the moment, we have 19 vacancies.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I had 16 vacancies for Perth. Are you saying that is 19 vacancies across the state?

Mr McCulloch: Across the state, yes. Three of those are in health, hazards and plant, but we have made an offer and somebody has accepted that offer and we will be starting a school for inspectors on 22 October and we will be starting then. We have a senior scientific officer position vacant in health, hazards and plant as well, which we are interviewing for at the moment, and we are really confident that we will fill that. In the manufacturing, transport and services industry team, we have six vacancies at the moment. We have made five offers. Four of those have been accepted and one has been declined, which is disappointing for one, but those four will also come into that school on 22 October. We have nine vacancies in our construction teams, metro, and we made one offer and unfortunately it has just been declined. We have one vacancy in the country, which is —

Hon ALISON XAMON: That is still in Bunbury?

Mr McCulloch: Yes.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Of the 13 specialist inspector positions that are currently vacant, which ones are they; which are the areas of specialist positions that are currently vacant? Are they the ones that you just outlined or over and above?

Mr Bradley: No; they are part of the 19. I did not think we had 13 specialists in that context. Our context of specialist would be a scientific officer or an engineer, and those type of things. Is that what you are talking about?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Of the 103 FTE, how many would you consider to be specialist positions; and, of the specialist positions, how many are currently vacant? I am doing a bit of cross-referencing between the annual report and answers to questions you have given me, so I am operating from two bits of data to try to ask these questions.

Mr Bradley: Rather than us trying to give you an estimate, can we take that on notice and provide that information?

Hon ALISON XAMON: I will just clarify the question. The question is: of the 103 FTE positions, how many of those are specialist inspector positions; how many of those are currently vacant; and what are the areas of specialty that are currently vacant?

The CHAIR: Just for clarification, it is 103 as of 30 June.

Hon ALISON XAMON: The 103 is actually what is articulated in the annual report.

The CHAIR: The annual report says of 30 June, am I correct on that?

Mr Bradley: That figure has not changed for a number of years. We have had 103 FTEs for some time.

[Supplementary Information No C1.]

Mr Bradley: And most of our specialist inspectors are in the health, hazards and plant area, and I suspect that is the full complement of the health, hazards and plant area.

Hon ALISON XAMON: A secondary question I would like to add to that is: of those specialist positions—I will obviously take this on notice—could you please tell me how long those positions have been vacant for?

Mr Bradley: Yes.

The CHAIR: Thank you, that is part of supplementary information C1.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I presume, and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong, that one of the reasons you are having difficulty in finding these positions is that the limitations on public sector wages mean that you simply cannot attract the level of expertise required in order to bring appropriate staffing into WorkSafe; is that correct?

Mr Bradley: That is probably not the full answer. Part of the criteria, of course, is that if you advertise for a position and you get no applicants over a period of time, you can then apply for an attraction and retention allowance. What we find with all WorkSafe positions essentially, unlike the mining sector, is that when we advertise, we get applicants; so we do attract people. We can make one or two appointments—not as many as we want. We also have to be conscious of the fact that we have certain criteria and standards that we want to try to make sure we keep. Part of the difficulty is that the level of applicant we are getting because of other pressures outside is probably not what we thought we would get in the past, but we do not similarly qualify for applications for attraction and retention allowances.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Of course, we had similar issues within the mining inspectorate and we know that the mining minister proposed, and received unanimous support for, new legislation in relation to remuneration of mine inspectors.

Mr Bradley: Before that, member, they were part of us and we were able to get them an attraction and retention allowance because of the simple reason that when we advertised we got no applicants. We are advertising with WorkSafe, but we are getting applicants.

Hon ALISON XAMON: But are they just not of the quality that you need?

Mr Bradley: Some are, but we are not getting the number that we wanted.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am concerned that there seem to be some vacancies that have been around for a very long time, so clearly, you are looking at a serious ongoing issue of not being able to staff the agency appropriately, and I was really concerned when I saw those figures in the annual report, which I will say correlated with my anecdotal understanding of what had been happening with WorkSafe and businesses.

Mr Bradley: That is good!

Hon ALISON XAMON: It is not good because it is so far down from what is needed at a time when figures show we are getting record incidents occurring. I am happy to make reference to why I make that statement. I am interested to know what is being done to rectify this ongoing issue of staffing, because this is clearly becoming a chronic problem.

Mr McCulloch: The director general indicated earlier that we had actually been up to 23 or 24 vacancies earlier in the year, but we have recruited and we have a group that is going through their induction and coaching at the moment, and they will be fully-fledged inspectors soon. We have been out and advertised specifically, and we have developed some particular ads around WorkSafe. We did some different types of ads to try to attract people. Traditionally in WorkSafe, advertisements have been for level 4 and they have had a career progression system. They would recruit at level 4 and people would then go through the career progression and get to level 5. We have reworked that so our most recent advertisements have been at level 5. Consequently, particularly for the manufacturing, transport and service industry, we have been able to recruit people. We have adjusted the criteria of progression from level 4 to 5. We have linked the salary increments within level 5 to a number of tasks that need to be completed, which is about building the capacity of our inspectors. The thing we have just done some work on is a career progression from level 5 to level 6 and that has gone to the union for consultation at the moment. We are trying to say to people that if they come into WorkSafe there is actually a career system that they can work through, so we will have a number of dedicated level 6 positions but people will have the opportunity to progress through to level 6.

Hon ALISON XAMON: So, to understand, do they basically stop at level 6 then in terms of wages?

Mr McCulloch: There are level 7 principal inspectors, but in that career progression they will stop at level 6.

A particular issue—back to the numbers—is in the construction area and we are in the process of developing a particular recruitment strategy to try to target getting some more applicants in for that area.

Hon ALISON XAMON: With those new strategies and the changing of levels, are you saying that you are still looking at a vacancy of 19 FTEs?

Mr Bradley: That is very, very current. That is what we have done and we are just putting it out in the marketplace now. We are hoping that that will be a strategy that will rectify that. We understand that because of the contraction in the resources sector, for the last advertisements that we have run there seems to be a better level of applicant coming through.

[3.45 pm]

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am aware that there will be ongoing tension about having to compete with the resources industry. Construction is occurring in the resources industry as well. Has any consideration been given to looking at any sorts of schemes beyond what you have just described, which is the level 5 to level 6 positions, similar to something that has occurred within the mining inspectorate so that you can effectively compete against the resource industry for talent?

Mr Bradley: That will be a policy decision of government, as you understand.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Has anything been proposed?

Mr Bradley: We have considered it in the past. Many, many years ago we considered it. The difference between the mining area—mining is very discrete and you know who they are; we do not have a database of employers to levy, as such. I think that is where you are coming to. We have thought of other ways around that but that is a policy consideration of government as to when and if —

Hon ALISON XAMON: Has that been proposed recently at all to the minister as a way forward? I am thinking particularly of areas like construction where you can actually look at discrete industries to a greater degree, particularly with the large construction companies.

Mr Bradley: We have not had a lot of joy from the employer organisations —

Hon ALISON XAMON: That is not a surprise.

Mr Bradley: —or from the employee organisations, I might add. When I last checked with the ILO, they were a little ambivalent about a regulator being funded from external sources as well.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Why?

Mr Bradley: Because of the independence.

Hon ALISON XAMON: But at the moment the inspections are not happening. I think if you had a choice between perceived independence and not having anything being done, I think it is quite clear that —

Mr Bradley: It is exercising our mind.

Hon ALISON XAMON: What is the current staff turnover rate like in WorkSafe?

The CHAIR: Sorry, Alison, before you move on to that slightly next step, I think Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich has a question.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I wonder whether you can provide us for the past 12 months the month-by-month vacancies in terms of your inspectors. I want to get a trend line to see how you are going on a month-by-month basis. Also, can you provide information in relation to the length of time that these positions have been vacant?

Mr Bradley: That is very similar to the previous question.

The CHAIR: Yes it is, but it is more the month by month to get the trend.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yes, I want it month by month.

[Supplementary Information No C2.]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Is the member going onto something else?

Hon ALISON XAMON: No, I have heaps more questions on staffing.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I have heaps too.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am happy to stay on staffing for now but I have other areas I want to focus on.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can you explain to me the difference between an inspection and an investigation?

Mr McCulloch: They are basically the same thing.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: You talk about an average cost per inspection or investigation, which would infer that there is a difference between the two. So, we are talking about the same thing. I wonder whether we can have a breakdown by industry sector of those 7 600—let us call them “investigations”—if that is possible. Do you normally break it down by industry sector? How do you keep your data?

Mr Bradley: We normally do country versus metropolitan and proactive versus reactive.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Do you have any information in relation to whether you visit the highest risk areas where there were 29 deaths in agriculture, forestry and fishing; 19 in construction; 18 in mining—I think these are for the last financial year —

Mr Bradley: No. The figures you just quoted were over five years.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Sorry. When you do your investigations, do you have information based on major industry sectors? Can you provide that information for us in terms of inspections?

Mr McCulloch: In terms of where we focus our inspections?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yes.

Mr McCulloch: We know what the major industry sectors are that we need to focus on. The top five for lost-time injuries are manufacturing; arts and recreation; health care and social assistance; transport, postal and warehousing; and agriculture, forestry and fishing. Like you said, for the last five years agriculture, forestry and fishing has been at the top of the list of fatalities, followed by construction; mining; transport, postal and warehousing; and manufacturing.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Injuries do not seem to rank very high in mining; is that correct? You seem to indicate that the rate of fatalities is pretty high but not injuries.

Mr McCulloch: I do not know about mining because we do not look after mining.

Hon ALISON XAMON: DMP does that.

The CHAIR: I suggest that we come back a little bit. The investigation by industrial sector —

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Of the 7 600 investigations, I want to know where they took place by industry sector category.

[Supplementary Information No C3.]

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I also would like to know how many WorkSafe inspections were carried out in TAFE colleges—if you can take that on notice and provide it to me—in the last financial year. Also, do you investigate schools?

Mr McCulloch: Yes.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Can you give me the number of investigations into schools, hospitals and prisons, and can I have the investigation reports for the TAFEs? I do not imagine you would have done too many for the schools.

Mr McCulloch: What do you mean by “reports”?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: You go out there and find out whether there are breaches of safety standards —

Mr McCulloch: So you mean improvement notices?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Improvement notices; okay, we will get the language right.

Mr Bradley: Just the number of notices?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I am assuming that in TAFE there might be 20 of them—I do not know; it might be heaps. Why do you not give me the numbers first and I will reserve the right to come back and ask for the detail of the notices. I think that would be the fair thing to do.

Mr McCulloch: So that is for TAFE colleges, schools, hospitals and prisons.

[Supplementary Information No C4.]

Hon ALISON XAMON: Going back to the 7 600 investigations—I am happy to take this on notice—how many were initiated following employee notifications of workplace occupational

health and safety issues, unless you have that data there? I want to know how many were initiated by WorkSafe inspectors on the basis of its own information. Finally, which ones were proactive investigations as part of WorkSafe's general monitoring of workplace safety? I am particularly interested in the latter. Considering that you have had the ongoing pressures of low FTEs, has that final category of investigation had to drop off the agenda and have you simply had to be reactive as an agency?

Mr Bradley: I can answer that question.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Fantastic!

Mr Bradley: I will break it down further. We did 2 322 inspections in the country and 5 353 in the metropolitan area. There were 4 432 reactive inspections.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Is that of the 7 600?

Mr Bradley: Yes. There were 3 243 proactive inspections.

Hon ALISON XAMON: The second one you have is those that were initiated by WorkSafe inspectors on the basis of its own information, but you do not have that as a category; you simply have reactive and proactive categories.

Mr Bradley: That is proactive.

Hon ALISON XAMON: If that is what you classify as proactive, that is fine. I am aware that sometimes you get inspectors who actually know something about a particular site and so they might not be directly reacting to an employee but know that there are ongoing problems. That is why I looked at that as a separate category. In relation to the reactive investigations, do you have the average time between WorkSafe's receipt of a notification and the commencement of an investigation?

Mr Bradley: The average time will vary.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am aware of that. What I am conscious of is—again, this is something I am aware of that has been happening for years and has preceded your appointment—people will ring up and advise that there is a problem on a site and it can take weeks before an inspector even gets out there. I am hoping that that is not still the case. I want to know if you are keeping records of the times.

Mr McCulloch: I would have to check and see if we do keep records of the time. In terms of process, those calls come into the call centre and if it is a request to attend or a notification of an injury or a disease notification, it will be referred from the call centre to the relevant team leader and they then have to manage the workload. Obviously, when it is really serious or there is an imminent risk of harm, that will get the most immediate attention and then they will work their way through. It tends to be that the highest degree of risk gets the quickest response.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Do you keep that data at all so that you can determine—even if you have categories of seriousness, do you have any way of identifying what an average response time from the inspector will be?

Mr McCulloch: I would have to look at that. I am not sure that we do.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Can I suggest that if you do not have that, it would be a really important KPI to introduce so that you can get an idea. In terms of the issue of the time frame, I was also interested to see whether you kept data on the average resolution of investigations.

Mr McCulloch: We will look at that.

Mr Bradley: That is difficult, as you would appreciate.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Absolutely.

Mr Bradley: Fatalities sometimes take an awfully long time.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Even then, it is really important to have that data. I am aware that dragged-out investigations can be incredibly distressing for the families, so it is an issue of resourcing so that you can ensure that those things are investigated. I am aware that the coroner also has staffing issues that aggravates the situation. All of my subsequent questions on that pertained to those different categories, so I suppose I will have to find out whether you even keep that data before we do that. Can I please ask some more questions?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am referring to pages 137 and 138 in relation to the labour inspections completed by the WorkSafe division. I note that you also report as of one of your ILO obligations. The report states that the WorkSafe division undertook 5 643 workplace visits in 2011–12. I am interested in that figure compared with the data you just read out to me. Certainly that tells me that a good number of the investigations occurred without an inspector even setting foot on the work site. Would that be the case?

Mr Bradley: I am just trying to correlate the —

[4.00 pm]

Hon ALISON XAMON: I will just tell you where it is. It is page 138 and it is (d): “... the WorkSafe Division undertook 5,643 workplace visits.”

Mr Bradley: Interestingly, in the statistics that we provide to the commission, the figure for workplaces visited is 6 334, so I will have to check which figure is correct.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Okay. That would be really good to know to get the difference in those figures.

[*Supplementary Information No C5.*]

Hon ALISON XAMON: That is part of my question. In addition to that, I note that that is still a dramatic decrease in the workplace visits from the previous four annual reports. In fact, in 2010–11, there were over 10 400, and it has now reduced down to—the figure I am again working on is 5 643. Are you again saying that that decrease is as a direct result of the 20 per cent reduction in staff, or the 20 per cent vacancies in staff, I should say?

Mr Bradley: I am pretty sure that that is a major component of that.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Okay; but we are talking about an almost 50 per cent decrease.

Mr Bradley: Which figures —

Hon ALISON XAMON: What I have done is I have actually pulled out the figures from the previous annual reports.

Mr Bradley: Okay.

Hon ALISON XAMON: The previous annual reports—I will give you the figures. In 2007–08, we had over 12 000; in 2008–09, over 11 000; in 2009–10, 10 800; in 2010–11, 10 400. So you see that we are already looking at a disturbing trend down, and then in 2011–12, 5 643. So that is a dramatic decrease from previous years, and it is more than would be accounted for by 20 per cent vacancies.

Mr Bradley: Yes. I just wonder whether we are counting the same things, because here I have investigation visits —

Hon ALISON XAMON: No; this is workplace visits.

Mr Bradley: Workplaces visited for 2009–10 was 7 973; for 2010–11, it was 7 585; and for 2011–12, it was 6 334. Investigation visits were 10 817 in 2009–10; 10 418 in 2010–11; and 8 457 in 2011–12.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Can I say I will be really interested to know where you got those figures from, because those figures do not correspond with the previous annual reports.

The CHAIR: I wonder, then, whether—we are not going to get a resolution because there seem to be different numbers—we can get some reconciliation somehow.

Mr Bradley: Yes. Can I just say that the last figures I quoted were investigation visits; the first figures I quoted were workplaces visited, so we will give you the —

The CHAIR: In the annual report, under (d), there is the labour relations division inspections and WorkSafe division workplace visits.

Mr Bradley: Yes.

The CHAIR: So I must say I am a bit confused.

Mr Bradley: Yes. We need to clarify it.

Hon ALISON XAMON: And can I just clarify that in terms of the comparative data that I have been picking, I have been looking specifically at investigations, at workplace visits, at improvement notices, at prohibition notices and at prosecution notices, so when I am actually making reference to—the figures now I have pulled directly from the annual report; the previous figures I have also pulled directly from previous annual reports. So if you are operating from a different set of figures, I would really like to know where that has come from.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Perhaps we could get a copy of the director general's set of figures so we can all be on the same page.

Mr Bradley: They are on the internet, member, because they are part of the figures that go to the commission.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Maybe we could get yours photocopied so that we could get them all —

The CHAIR: I think it may be more than that, member. I think it is really just looking through the numbers and then trying to put it so that we can reconcile it both to the annual report and to those figures—Hon Alison Xamon, maybe you might give a copy of your figures to the director general.

Mr Bradley: No, no. I think —

The CHAIR: You understand those?

Mr Bradley: We know where they are. I think all we need to do for the members is to clarify what we term a workplace visit and what we term an investigation visit.

The CHAIR: Okay. That is all to do with supplementary question C5.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes. What I am also asking, though, is that the figures that I am operating from show more than a 20 per cent reduction in the workplace visits, so I am trying to get an idea of why it is so dramatically low. What I have been hearing is that you have got 20 per cent less staff than you need. That is quite clear; we have known that for a while. I have also heard that you have had an issue with needing to bring in new people, so that has also slowed things down quite considerably as well. So I understand that. I am sure you would agree, though, that the figures we are talking about in terms of the, I think, quite dramatic decrease in activity that has come out of WorkSafe as a result are really quite concerning.

Mr Bradley: It is. We were aware of that. That is why we are trying to change things.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am really glad to hear that because I think there has been a bit of a problem with WorkSafe for quite some time, actually, and I am really quite concerned about the lack of proactive activity and also responsive activity that is coming from what I think is one of the most important agencies in the entire government—I think you have a very important job. So I am really quite alarmed by that. We have seen a decrease in improvement notices since previous annual

reports. In 2010–11, we had 10 419, and we have got 8 216. Are they, again, going to be as a result of lack of staff?

Mr Bradley: Pretty much so.

Hon ALISON XAMON: With the prohibition notices, we have seen a decrease from the previous year of 602 down to 399, and that has been a steady decrease over a number of years. Would you say that that is as a result, again, of the number of staff?

Mr Bradley: The vacancies, yes.

Hon ALISON XAMON: The vacancies. Again, prosecution notices have almost halved as well. So are you also putting that down to the vacancies in the staff? They have gone from 66 in 2010–11 down to 35 in this year. That is at page 201.

Mr Bradley: Yes. I hesitate to say that is due to vacancies. I think there could be other reasons for that.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Okay. Could you please explain what those other reasons might be?

Mr Bradley: Not at the moment, no. I need to go back and see. Just because an inspector goes to a workplace does not mean to say that a prosecution is going to evolve from that. I really do not know the answer, and I cannot just say that because there are vacancies, that has resulted in less prosecutions, because there may be more to that. I would have to interrogate the data further. I do not know.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Okay. I am actually going to refer to another statistic as well. There is, of course —

The CHAIR: I beg your pardon; the reason why there are no prosecutions is why they have fallen?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes. I do want to find out: why have they fallen by almost 50 per cent?

The CHAIR: That is to do with that one you just said you were not sure about.

Mr Bradley: Well, I do not just want to say that is because of a vacancy issue. There could be other issues.

The CHAIR: Fair enough; okay.

[*Supplementary Information No C6.*]

Hon ALISON XAMON: On page 44 of the Department of Commerce's annual report, it talks about an increase in the overall frequency rate of lost-time injuries and diseases—so, an increase. I am also going to make reference to the WorkSafe report on WA key OSH statistics that found that the frequency of severe injuries at WA workplaces in 2010–11 rose to the highest frequency rate in 11 years. These are pretty alarming statistics. So what I am talking about is that we are actually looking at, on the one hand, a dramatic increase in injuries at the same time as we are looking at a significant decrease in not only the number of inspectors, but also the number of prohibition notices, prosecution notices, inspections and workplace visits that have actually been occurring, and I was wondering if you had any comment about that.

Mr Bradley: What is the data that you are quoting again there?

Hon ALISON XAMON: The data I am quoting is that WA key OSH statistics found that the frequency of severe injuries at WA workplaces in 2010–11—so that is the previous year—rose to the highest frequency rate in 11 years. That is the WorkSafe report, WA key OSH statistics.

Mr Bradley: Yes.

The CHAIR: Is the table in the report?

Hon ALISON XAMON: It is cross-referencing a couple of things. I am referring to page 44 of the Department of Commerce —

The CHAIR: Right. But it entails data from elsewhere that you have researched.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Data from elsewhere, that is correct. I am just really concerned and I want to make sure that the two are seen in conjunction with each other. If we were looking at an overall dramatic decrease in injuries, I do not think we would have such an issue, but we have an increase in injuries at the same time —

Mr Bradley: That is one year, though, is it not?

Hon ALISON XAMON: But it showed that it was the highest frequency rate in 11 years.

Mr Bradley: But we have had a 74 per cent decrease since 1988.

Hon ALISON XAMON: But I am interested in looking at what has been happening, in particular, in the last five years.

Mr Bradley: Yes, and that one year we have got a blip, maybe.

Hon ALISON XAMON: You are saying it is a blip.

Mr Bradley: That is the purpose of data, is it not, to see if there is a trend developing, if something has happened, that has turned it the other way, because every other indicator is still going down, albeit at the last five years it has slowed?

Hon ALISON XAMON: I have not got the data yet for the 2011–12 injury rate.

Mr Bradley: Yes.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am not anticipating, though, that we are going to see a decrease in the injury rate that would correlate with a decrease in the number of activities that have been undertaken by the WorkSafe division.

Mr Bradley: Right.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Are you anticipating that you are going to see a decrease that would correlate with that, so overall are you going to suggest that the decreased activity of the Department of Commerce, while undesirable because there is FTE that needs to be filled, is not so much of an issue because you are expecting that the injuries will decrease as well?

Mr Bradley: No, I am not suggesting that at all, because I watch those figures, as I have done for 20-odd years, to make sure that we do show improvement, and that is why it has been heartening to get a 74 per cent decrease since the general duty-of-care legislation has been in Western Australia, but I have noticed that over the last five years the level of decrease has slowed, and we have been looking for potentially a catalyst to change or to get a further decrease, and we think it is probably tied up with changing the culture of workplaces and getting change within the workplace itself. You can inspect and enforce and seek compliance to a point, but we need now to get other people in the workplace to take it to the next level.

Hon ALISON XAMON: What would you say is “take it to the next level”?

Mr Bradley: Well, one of the things we have done—and it has been a very, very successful program over the last 15 years—has been the ThinkSafe awards program. We believe that that does allow workplaces to embrace a safety culture. They do that for two or three years, but people move, and then what you have got to do is seek continuous improvement and also make safety integral to each of the work processes, so it does not matter who comes in, the safety culture has changed. That is really what we are trying to work with in terms of some of our education programs at the present moment. We have also done the ThinkSafe Small Business program as well. To take the compliance feature away, because small business seemed to be spooked by inspectors, we get approved health and safety providers to go into small business to advise them on how to seek compliance to the law, and we actually then pay the provider to do that function.

[4.15 pm]

Hon ALISON XAMON: You are talking very much about a carrot approach. In the meantime WA has the lowest occupational health and safety penalties in Australia. What is your view on the need to increase our penalties?

Mr Bradley: I think that is a policy decision.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Do you think that if we were to increase the penalties it might help to assist with decreasing the number of injuries?

Mr Bradley: I am not here to give my view, member. I think it is a policy decision of government.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am happy to go back onto the expenditure breakdown. I refer to the Department of Commerce annual report page 73, which details the summary of consolidated account appropriations and income estimates. I refer also—I have a copy here—to my question on notice in which I asked about the budget actual for the 2011–12 financial year. At that point it was reported as \$22 667 300. I was wondering whether you could please give me the WorkSafe expenditure budget estimate for years 2007–08, 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 and 2011–12?

[Supplementary Information No C7.]

Hon ALISON XAMON: I have got that through a series of questions on notice. I am interested to see those figures again. I refer again to the Department of Commerce annual report page 73, where it details the summary of consolidated appropriations and income estimates and shows a \$17 773 000 deficit between the 2012 budget estimate and budget actual for the expenses of the safety and employment protection and construction standards division. How much of the 2012 deficit is borne by the WorkSafe division and how much of the 2011 deficit was borne by the WorkSafe division? I am happy to take that on notice.

Mr Bradley: I will give that on notice.

[Supplementary Information No C8.]

Hon ALISON XAMON: Can WorkSafe please provide a full breakdown of the 2011–12 actual budget expenditure by directorate?

Mr McCulloch: For 2011–12?

Hon ALISON XAMON: For the 2011–12 financial year by directorate.

The CHAIR: Is that terminology fine with you?

Mr Bradley: I think you are meaning by inspectorates, are you?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes; the various divisions.

The CHAIR: Is that the industrial divisions?

Hon ALISON XAMON: No.

Mr Bradley: It is the health hazard plant division, manufacturing and transport construction and region.

[Supplementary Information No C9.]

Hon ALISON XAMON: Obviously, the Department of Commerce has advised in Parliament that it is in the process of determining how the two per cent efficiency dividend cuts would be applied to WorkSafe. Have you made a decision on that; is WorkSafe able to advise how this efficiency dividend will be applied?

Mr Bradley: I think the Treasurer will make an announcement in the midyear review.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I believe you have been trying to pursue this for a while.

The CHAIR: We understand that part of it, yes.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Has WorkSafe submitted to Treasury its plan for meeting the efficiency dividend?

Mr Bradley: We have.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: When did you submit that?

Mr Bradley: Early last month. I think we had to submit it on 7 September.

Hon ALISON XAMON: In relation to the Treasurer's announcement on 26 September of an immediate lowering of the ceiling on the number of FTE in the general government sector, will that apply to anyone in WorkSafe?

Mr Bradley: I cannot answer that question because we have yet to receive official advice as to how it will apply to the Department of Commerce.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Considering you have been working on a static 103 FTE and there is a strong argument to say they should have been going up anyway over the years, even though you cannot fill them, I would be concerned if they were to be cut back any further, especially as you are just initiating arrangements to try to fill those positions.

Mr Bradley: I have yet to be provided details of that decision.

Hon ALISON XAMON: When do you anticipate a decision will be made on the issue of the FTE and whether it will apply to the inspectors—by the midyear review?

Mr Bradley: I am sure it will be before then.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Do you have an idea of when?

Mr Bradley: No; I was advised by the Treasurer last week that I would be receiving a letter, so I am waiting on that letter.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Whilst you have sent it to the Treasurer, I wonder whether you can provide the WorkSafe proposal of how you are going to achieve your efficiency dividend.

Mr Bradley: That is a decision of government; it is a policy decision, member. I cannot provide it.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Yes, you can. This is a committee of the Parliament. You can provide that to this committee and the committee can decide what it will do in respect of that particular document or documents.

Mr Bradley: The Treasurer has indicated that he will provide a response in the midyear review.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That may well be the case, but this committee, which is a committee of the Parliament, has asked you as a director general to provide information directly to the committee and through this committee to the people of the state.

The CHAIR: I think in a case in which it is going before the minister we need to leave that I think in the hands of the director general. There is a fair case to ask for it and we would then consider whether it be kept private. That would be our decision. I think the better call is that since it is going to the Treasurer at this stage, I can accept the reservation that you have.

Mr Bradley: Thank you.

The CHAIR: I presume you submitted a notice of corporate intent for the agency to the Treasurer, or you developed yourselves and submitted it to the Treasurer for approval?

Mr Bradley: That is right.

The CHAIR: Has that notice of corporate intent been submitted to the Treasurer and been approved for the year 2012–13?

Mr Bradley: It has not been approved officially, no.

The CHAIR: Is that dependent on the agreement about what the FTEs will be and determining how far you will go with carrying out the corporate intent?

Mr Bradley: The answer to that is yes, but, as I said, until I get this letter advising of the impact for the agency, I cannot really answer that.

The CHAIR: You will have to reformulate your corporate intent.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I refer to the key efficiency indicators on page 35 of the annual report. Why has the variance in the average cost for inspection or investigation been explained by a significant increase in the number of inspections or investigations when, as I have already pointed out, investigations and workplace visits carried out by WorkSafe have dramatically decreased? Why did you describe it that way?

Mr Bradley: In part, it is due to the fact that we have taken over the Building Commission and we have inspectorate activity in there as well. We have put together all the inspectorate activity so it has distorted the figures.

Hon ALISON XAMON: It has not been a significant increase has it? I have pulled out the figures from previous years. It is a dramatic decrease, not a significant increase?

Mr Bradley: The average cost per inspection is \$1 166.50.

Hon ALISON XAMON: What does that mean?

Mr Bradley: It is the average cost—\$1 166 per inspection. Do you want us to provide how we arrived at that figure?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes, please, and how you have arrived at that explanation. I am happy to take that on notice.

Mr Bradley: I will have to; I do not have that information.

[Supplementary Information No C10.]

Mr Bradley: It is because we have coupled the Building Commission in there.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Can you give me the breakdown of which ones are the Building Commission and which ones are the ordinary inspections undertaken by WorkSafe, because I want to be able to unpick that data? That flowed on to my next question anyway, which is about whether there will be large increases in the number of inspections carried out by other divisions that are part of the safety and employment protection and construction standards division. It sounds as though you are saying yes?

Mr Bradley: We have got the Building Commission in that data and the labour inspection in that data.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Are you able to give that to me please, including the 2010–11 data and the 2011–12 data as a comparison, separating out those two divisions?

Mr McCulloch: The Building Commission and WorkSafe?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes, please.

[Supplementary Information No C11.]

Hon ALISON XAMON: Are there any other divisions in the Department of Commerce carrying out work that WorkSafe cannot undertake?

Mr Bradley: No; I cannot think of any.

Hon ALISON XAMON: EnergySafety of course

Mr Bradley: Of course, yes.

Mr McCulloch: To clarify, do you want to know the average cost of WorkSafe inspections for the last two years?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes, please. Can I please have it for the previous five years, 2007–08, 2008–09, 2009–10, 2010–11 and 2011–12? That is the data I have been using, so I will have the data for all the others, and it would be really good to know what that is. Can I have the average cost over the five-year period for a Building Commission inspection and can I have the data for the EnergySafety inspection?

Mr Bradley: The Building Commission has only just come in so we may not have it all.

Hon ALISON XAMON: That is right, of course, but EnergySafety?

Mr Bradley: Yes, we have EnergySafety.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Can I please have it for EnergySafety as well.

[Supplementary Information No C12.]

Hon ALISON XAMON: In relation to the prosecutions on page 201, can you please tell me the average cost of prosecutions and the average time frames? I am aware that there is not a direct correlation between, obviously, initiated prosecutions and subsequent convictions. What are the time frames usually between prosecutions and convictions being finalised? You will have to take it on notice.

Mr McCulloch: Just for clarity, is it the time it takes between when we lodge the prosecution papers and the finalisation of it?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes, not the initial investigation, the actual beginning of the prosecution itself.

[4.30 pm]

Mr McCulloch: Some of that is out of our control; that is in the hands of the —

Hon ALISON XAMON: DPP?

Mr Bradley: No.

Mr McCulloch: We do most of our own prosecutions.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Can I still get a time frame for how long they are actually taking?

Mr Bradley: Okay, but as I said it is outside of our control—the court system.

Hon ALISON XAMON: But I would still like to know.

Mr Bradley: It may be data we do not have, but we will try.

[Supplementary Information No C13.]

Hon ALISON XAMON: But I had a question before that, Mr Deputy Chair, and that is also the average cost of prosecutions.

The CHAIR: I have got that; that is the cost of prosecutions and I think the time.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Do you have the average cost of prosecutions on you, by any chance?

Mr McCulloch: No, I do not.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am curious to know how much of a disincentive there may be to proceeding with prosecution due to cost, and also what your success rate would be if cost recovery —

Mr Bradley: The answer to that is no.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Why do you say that?

Mr Bradley: Because it is not our culture to do that. If it passes the prosecution policy test, we go ahead.

Hon ALISON XAMON: What happens in terms of budgetary guidelines if you exceed the number of prosecutions which are required? Do you get to just go back and ask for more money?

Mr Bradley: We do not have a number.

Hon ALISON XAMON: You accept that each prosecution will cost a certain amount of money to actually pursue, so what I am asking is: if one year you need to do 350 prosecutions instead of 35, do you get to go back to government and ask for more money or are you expected to find it within existing budgets?

Mr Bradley: We would be expected to find it within the existing budget, but we do not look at a prosecution and say, “Well, this is too expensive for us to run.” So, we take the prosecution on its merits.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Because you have gone from 66 new prosecution notices down to 35 in the last year, although I do note that there were significantly less prosecutions in the previous years to that —

Mr McCulloch: And the 66, I have actually talked to the director around that. We were sending some stuff off to State Solicitor’s for them to prosecute on our behalf; we pulled a lot of that back.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Why did you do that?

Mr McCulloch: Just because of the time line, the time they were taking to get them to make their assessment of them to determine whether they would prosecute or not, so we brought them back. We did our own assessments of them and we had that blip of 66. The response from the director was because we just had to clean up that backlog and get them before the courts.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Could you tell me the bulk of the industries where the prosecutions were sought?

Mr McCulloch: Yes, we can do that. So you want the average cost of prosecution and the industries in which those prosecutions were sought.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes, please, because I also note, to your credit, that in this year there has been a significant increase in the number of convictions as well. So, I am presuming it is as a direct result of the initiated convictions.

Mr McCulloch: We prosecute them ourselves.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes, which is good.

The CHAIR: That is all part of supplementary information C13.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: Page 209, just the review of the improvement notices, can you just explain to me what those categories are in terms of you had 10 affirmed of the 636 and then you had affirmed with time extended? First of all, can you explain the difference between the two: What is “Affirmed” and what is “Affirmed with time extended”? Why would so many of them need to have their time extended anyway?

Mr Bradley: I will let the commissioner answer that question.

Mr McCulloch: That is my job! “Affirmed” is they actually challenge the notice and they do not challenge the time. It comes to me and I get information and make the decision to affirm the notice and go back to them and say, “It’s affirmed and you’ve got to complete it by this date.” Most of the reviews that I get are related to extensions in time, so businesses say, “Look, we can’t.” They issue a lot of notices around racking and they have got to have it assessed to make sure it is safe and they have got to load weights on it, and manuals for forklifts. The manuals are not available or they are

not there, so we say, “You need to get the manuals in”, they try to get the manuals, the forklift is out of date, it takes them a while, so they write and ask for more time.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: So what sort of time frames are we talking about—days or weeks or months? And then what happens to this equipment? For example, if it is a forklift, you would think that it could not be used, but how do you know it is not?

Mr McCulloch: We have not prohibited them using the forklift; we just say, “You need to get the manuals”, because they have to be driven by people with a high-risk work licence. The times can vary. I did some today—I think I did four today—and they range from two weeks to the end of December. So, it depends on what we have asked them to do. As long as they are making the effort, and we do follow up and just see what they are doing to try and resolve the issue, and then I made my decision based on that.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: In terms of those 13 notices that were cancelled, on what basis might a notice be cancelled?

Mr McCulloch: A lot of those the inspector uses the wrong regulation, so they write the notice so the words do not match the regulation, so we have to cancel it and then I write to the people and say I have cancelled it, but on a technicality really. So I will send it back to the inspector for them to determine what they do. Normally, they go back out and put the right regulation on it and away we go.

Hon ALISON XAMON: In relation to the improvement notices, do your inspectors go out every time to check that the improvement notice has been complied with?

Mr McCulloch: No.

Hon ALISON XAMON: On a percentage basis, roughly, how often would you say an inspector follows up an improvement notice?

Mr McCulloch: Can I just take you through the system?

Hon ALISON XAMON: Yes.

Mr McCulloch: When we issue the improvement notice, on the bottom of the improvement notice is a compliance slip. The biggest bulk return the compliance slip by the date to say that they are done. The computer automatically picks out about five per cent—to answer your question—and automatically randomly selects and refers those back to the inspector and then the inspector within 10 days goes back to check that that improvement notice has been complied with.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Okay, and the reason I ask that is because anecdotally I am aware there have been cases where workplaces have been issued with improvement notices and have returned the slip but have not actually improved anything. So, I was curious to know how it was determined who got a follow-up visit or not. You are saying that it is a random —

Mr McCulloch: The computer randomly selects it out of the system, yes.

Hon ALISON XAMON: It is computer generated and it is about five per cent. Can I ask: approximately what percentage of people do not even return the slip?

Mr McCulloch: There is a system around that as well, so I will explain the system. If they do not return the slip, within a week they get a letter to say, “You haven’t returned it to say you’ve complied.” Another two weeks go by and if they have not returned the slip, they get another, more forceful, letter to say that they have not returned to say that they have complied. Then another two weeks go by and we send a third letter to say they have not complied. The next day, a request to attend gets generated for the inspector because it has not been returned and the inspector within five days goes back to visit.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Over the last few years, there is increasing awareness about the issue of workplace bullying. How much has that increased the load of WorkSafe in terms of the increased

numbers of phone calls complaining about workplace bullying? Have you noticed that there has been a significant increase at all?

Mr McCulloch: Coming to the call centre, there have been increases in that area. Obviously, if it is clearly what they are saying, it will go straight to the directorate. But sometimes if from what they are saying it is not clear whether it is a human resource issue or an equal opportunity issue, we have got a form that we send out to the person and they, I guess, work their way through that. It helps them to decide whether actually what they are talking about does fit bullying, or it may well be equal opportunity or performance management or something else. Once they have worked through that, if they come back to us, then that goes off to the inspectorate. Our role in it then is to go and make sure that the workplace has systems in place and that they have used those systems in relation to this case.

Mr Bradley: And that system includes having policies.

Mr McCulloch: Yes.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I suppose what made me particularly think about that was when I looked at the increase. I noticed on page 43 that it said the WorkSafe division responded to 104 786 requests for OSH information. Then I looked at the previous report and it was 44 584 requests, so a dramatic increase. I was just wondering why, and I was going through my own mind where there has been particular interest —

Mr McCulloch: Not all of that increase is bullying.

Hon ALISON XAMON: I would never presume that 60 000 would be bullying, but could you explain what your understanding is and why there has been such a dramatic increase?

Mr McCulloch: Yes. The licensing unit used to take all of the calls around queries around licences. So, someone would lose their licence or they would want information about licensing, and that would all go into the licensing unit. That was pretty inefficient because instead of processing licences and dealing with them, they were answering calls, answering queries. So, people would ring in and they had lost their licence and wanted to know what their number was, employers would ring in to see if so-and-so had a licence, and stuff like that. So what we did was we moved all of that to the call centre, so now the call centre has the ability to check a lot of that detail to provide information to people about licensing and what they have to do, so it is not actually going into the licensing unit. The number of licences we have issued has gone up quite significantly as well and we have had this certificate of competency conversion as well, so to try to create the space for the licensing unit to be able to deal with their increased workload, a lot more of the calls get dealt with from the call centre.

Hon ALISON XAMON: All right then.

Can I just ask another, Mr Deputy Chair? I am aware that we are running out of time, but I just want to go back to that staffing issue again, if that is okay?

The CHAIR: Is this the last one?

Hon ALISON XAMON: This is all related, if that is okay.

I am going to go back to this issue of staffing because it really seems that a lot of the core problems around what has been happening with WorkSafe has been this ongoing issue of staffing. What is the staff turnover rate in WorkSafe? What is the average length of time that an inspector—I am actually talking about inspectors here—will stay in WorkSafe?

Mr McCulloch: I do not know the answer to that —

Hon ALISON XAMON: I am happy to take that on notice.

Mr McCulloch: — but there are some that have been there 25 years.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Good—their level of expertise is probably very high!

Mr McCulloch: Exactly what are you wanting, though? Do you want to know the turnover rate?

Hon ALISON XAMON: The turnover rate and whether there has been any significant change in the last few years to that. I am particularly interested to know whether the mining boom has aggravated that factor.

[4.45 pm]

Mr Bradley: It has.

[*Supplementary Information No C14.*]

Mr Bradley: Also I think you have to realise that there is the ageing population too. A lot of inspectors are of that age and retire.

Hon ALISON XAMON: Okay, so you have the same issue as in a lot of other industries then of an ageing workforce and not attracting new people into what should be one of the most interesting professions.

Mr Bradley: Yes.

Hon ALISON XAMON: So, do you know if this is consistent with other states?

Mr McCulloch: Every state has the same issue.

Hon ALISON XAMON: An issue with an ageing workforce?

Mr McCulloch: An issue with an ageing workforce, and particularly having trouble recruiting in the construction area.

Hon ALISON XAMON: It is construction in particular?

Mr McCulloch: South Australia just did a big recruitment thing—we know this because we talked to them the other day—and there the most difficult place they found to get people was in the construction area.

The CHAIR: That is it? Okay. It was quite an interesting session for all of us, I suspect, or for me at least anyway. If there are any other additional questions we have for you, they will be forwarded by the minister in writing in the next couple of days together with the transcript of evidence, which includes the questions you have taken on notice. Responses to the questions are requested within 10 working days from receipt of the questions. If you are unable to meet this due date, please advise the committee in writing as soon as possible before the due date, and in that request to advise the specific reasons to why the due date cannot be met. If there are any unasked questions, we will submit these to the committee clerk at the close of this hearing. On behalf of the committee, thank you very much for your attendance and for your contribution to giving us the answers and to taking up additional questions.

Hearing concluded at 4.46 pm
