

Customer Service Portfolio

Wednesday 25 August 2021

Responses to Questions taken on Notice

Question

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM: So that \$37 million is gone now? That cut will not be given effect to, or will there be some additional cuts elsewhere to try to meet that, given the need to shift resources around these programs?

Ms HOGAN: I might defer to Mr Brady on the \$37 million specifically. I do not have those numbers in front of me. My view, as the secretary, is that we are appropriately funded and funded properly for next year. And then we get, and have received, a nice 12 months' additional financial support when we have needed to ramp up resources for initiatives such as these.

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM: Mr Brady?

Mr BRADY: Thank you. I think I would have to take your question on notice. Our overall expenditure budget actually increased in the last budget.

ANSWER

This question is answered on page 34 of the transcript.

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM: Okay, thank you. I ask about the amount. Forty million is not a lot. How many commercial landlords do you think will be assisted by this fund? Is there modelling on that?

Mr REES: I would need to take that on notice, Mr D'Adam.

ANSWER

This question should be redirected to the Treasurer.

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM: I ask about call times. Coming back to the data, there were some adverse comments in the media around people being required to wait for extensive periods on the phone. You are obviously running a very big call centre operation and you have extensive data on this. Would you be able to provide on notice what is the longest call that you have received in relation to this program and what is the longest wait period that someone has had to wait to have their call taken in relation to an application for any of those three business support programs that we discussed earlier? Do you have that information to hand?

Mr REES: I can certainly address the majority of that and I am happy to take anything else on notice. With the introduction of restrictions and the introduction of support we saw approximately a 4,000 per cent increase to inbound calls from business customers in a very short period of time. Certainly our average wait times did spike significantly and our customers did experience extensive waits of two hours or more trying to reach Service NSW for a period there. We responded to that by reassigning and recruiting additional support. I am happy to say that those average wait times, as of yesterday, were down to seven minutes. We aim to keep those average wait times below 10 minutes.

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM: What is the median wait time, Mr Rees?

Mr REES: The median is the average; that was seven minutes yesterday.

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM: The mean is the average. What is the median?

Mr REES: Sorry, median. I do not know. I will have to take that on notice, Mr D'Adam.

The Hon. ANTHONY D'ADAM: You will take that on notice. Thank you.

ANSWER

The median Time To Answer for the COVID business grant call queue on 24 August 2021 was 6 minutes and 26 seconds.

The Hon. MARK BANASIAK: What steps did you take to make sure customers were notified of that change of the date range?

Mr REES: I cannot recall, Mr Banasiak. I would need to take that on notice.

ANSWER

Service NSW updated all relevant grant website copy and the transaction landing pages to reflect that the Business Grant covers the first three weeks of restrictions (26 June to 17 July) and JobSaver provides support from week 4 of the restrictions (18 July onwards) on the Service NSW website.

The Service NSW Business Concierge team provided this information over the phone on inbound calls.

An eDM was sent to the Australian Business Register database on 28 August providing businesses with the latest information across the business financial support programs, eDM link here: <https://servicensw.e-newsletter.com.au/pub/pubType/EO/pubID/zzzz61272da9334f4677/interface.html>.

A number of eDMs have been sent asking businesses if they wish to proceed with their application and notified them of the latest information, for e.g. this eDM sent on 20 August <https://servicensw.e-newsletter.com.au/pub/pubType/EO/pubID/zzzz611da8c05d78f221/interface.html>.

eDMs sent

29 July – to 87 accounting and tax practitioner industry peak bodies with an update on financial support. Link to eDM:

<https://newsletter.customerservice.nsw.gov.au/link/id/zzzz613eb916620e1924Pzzzz60922ae72f0e5381/page.html>

30 July – to 28,000 accountants and tax practitioners with detailed information and a toolkit about the available financial support and applicable dates. Link to eDM: <https://servicensw.e-newsletter.com.au/pub/pubType/EO/pubID/zzzz61034b66b0039025/interface.html>

31 July – to 43,000 businesses who registered their interest in COVID-19 financial assistance. Link to eDM: <https://servicensw.e-newsletter.com.au/pub/pubType/EO/pubID/zzzz6104c79f0d507764/interface.html>

13 August – to 85 accounting and tax practitioner industry peak bodies with additional information on financial support. Link to eDM:

<https://newsletter.customerservice.nsw.gov.au/link/id/zzzz613eb96401166525Pzzzz60922ae72f0e5381/page.html>

6 September – to 36,000 business grant applicants who could also be eligible for the JobSaver grant but has not applied. Link to eDM: <https://servicensw.e-newsletter.com.au/pub/pubType/EO/pubID/zzzz6130798162917330/interface.html>

The campaign activity for grants messaging has achieved a reach of 12,194,292.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: A series of changes were made last year to provide presumptions in favour of frontline and essential workers that if they contracted COVID they would definitely be covered. I know that provided at least some sense of protection and certainty for those workers. Can you tell us what the cost to date of those claims under those amendments has been?

Mr DENT: I do not have those numbers to hand. I will have to take that on notice.

ANSWER

COVID-19 related workers compensation claims based on data provided to SIRA by insurers is on the SIRA website at https://www.sira.nsw.gov.au/resources-library/list-of-sira-publications/coronavirus-covid_19/workers-compensation-claim-statistics

As of 3 September 2021, there have been 955 COVID-19 related workers compensation claims and notifications in NSW. Of these:

- 367 were a confirmed diagnosis
- 254 were notifications of exposure
- 188 were other, including reaction to vaccine
- 146 were psychological claims.

The legislation, established in May 2020, means that workers in prescribed employment are automatically presumed to have contracted COVID-19 at work. SIRA wrote to all insurers on 13 August 2021 to reinforce the presumptive COVID-19 legislation and ensure appropriate reporting of COVID-19 cases.

Gross Incurred Cost (GIC) & Payments of confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis by Insurer type

Insurer type	Total payments (\$)	GIC (\$)
NI	\$301,017	\$512,538
SELF-INSURED	\$835,181	\$1,413,975
SPECIALISED	\$205	\$205
TMF	\$417,737	\$591,833
Grand Total	\$1,554,140	\$2,518,551

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Mr Dent, can you provide us any insight as to how many of those claims have been in the current outbreak, since mid-June onwards?

Mr DENT: I will have to come back to you. I will ask the team to follow that up for me and give me the number in relation to the current outbreak.

ANSWER

Since 15 June 2021 SIRA has received notification of 309 claims (data as at 27 August 2021).

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Do you know what the actuarial estimates were for the cost of those amendments last year? My memory was it was in the very many, many millions of dollars. Do you know what the actuarial estimates were for the cost of implementing those changes last year?

Mr DENT: Respectfully, Mr Shoebridge, at 7½ weeks in the role I suspect your memory might be better than mine on that. I will have to take that on notice and come back to you. I do know that we had actuarial advice and it was that the cost could be significant.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: If you could provide the answers as soon as you can.

Mr DENT: Yes, absolutely.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: What were the estimates and what have they been in reality to date? That would be very useful.

Mr DENT: If I cannot get those in this session, I will take that on notice.

ANSWER

April 2020 indicative cost impacts for the COVID-19 presumptive legislation ranged from \$2,923 (m) to \$8,626.6 (m) across a range of scenarios and at a time of high uncertainty regarding the trajectory of the pandemic.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I suppose, Mr Dent, it may be relevant to the presumptive work but my question was about more broadly under the current scheme. I am talking about people going to work in a supermarket and getting

COVID or people in the transport industry getting it through meeting people at the depot—those essential workers. We know that that surge of COVID-related claims in the workplace are going to be very likely if that path is followed. Is there no estimate being done using the Doherty modelling about the likely impact that will have on the workers compensation scheme?

Mr DENT: I have not to date seen that. I cannot say for certain that means it has not been considered by our actuaries at this point. If you do not mind, I might come back quickly to the question you asked before. The number of notifications since the Bondi cluster commenced was 74, so 10 per cent of the total at this point in time. I will come back to you on whether our actuarial advice has taken into account the Doherty modelling at this point in time.

ANSWER

SIRA will be receiving the actuarial report soon, and once SIRA has had the opportunity to review the report it will decide next steps, including whether to publish the report.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: If you could give us a breakdown on the Treasury Managed Fund claims, including nurses, healthcare workers and the like, that would be really useful.

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

ANSWER

The top ten TMF employers account for 259 COVID claims, which is 92% of total claims:

	Number of claims	Total payments	Gross Incurred Cost
Top 10	259	\$1,428,553	\$2,943,357
Total TMF claims	283	\$1,615,575	\$3,303,050
Top 10 as a proportion of total	92%	88%	89%

Top ten TMF employers:

TMF Cluster/Employer	Number of claims	Total payments	GIC
NSW Police Force	207	\$530,212	\$1,489,945
Health: RYDE HOSPITAL	11	\$284,311	\$284,311
Department of Education	24	\$244,662	\$283,642
Ambulance Service of NSW	4	\$44,308	\$226,188
FAMILY & COMMUNITY SERVICES	1	\$77,983	\$153,543
Health: SES CORPORATE SERVICES	1	\$121,027	\$126,358
Health: MURRUMBURRAH-HARDEN DIS HOSP (SCHEDULE)	1	\$22,370	\$106,485
Health: THE SYDNEY HOSPITAL	1	\$9,833	\$105,217
Health: GOSFORD HOSPITAL	8	\$67,716	\$85,904
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH NSW	1	\$26,130	\$81,764

Gross Incurred Cost is the sum of payments plus an estimate of future liability if the claim is still open at the end of the current financial year.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: You have set out the objectives. Before I turn to some of those specific elements, could I ask—in general, rather than about this specific bill—would an arrangement to increase the machines at The Star by about 1,000 machines require a change to the law?

Ms WEBB: I think it might but I can take that on notice. I think it might depend a little bit too on the actual arrangement that we come up with. I can take that on notice and confirm whether it would be absolutely necessary or whether it would depend on the arrangement.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: What are the sorts of variables that could take part in a deal which might mean that the law was required or was not required?

Ms WEBB: I would really have to take that level of detail on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: It has also been reported that such a deal might require The Star to purchase 1,500 licences and then 500 of those might be retired under the existing framework for these machines. Asking in general rather than about the specific deal, is that correct?

Ms WEBB: I cannot say anything about the specific number, but I think the concept that the overall number of machines and entitlements would be reduced is quite a good consideration.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, so that is part of the consideration but my question is: Would it be required by the existing framework?

Ms WEBB: I will have to take that level of detail on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: This is pretty fundamental to the management of poker machines in New South Wales; it is not really a question of detail, Ms Webb. If these machines were transferred, if they were purchased, would machines have to be retired?

Ms WEBB: I do not want to mislead the Committee. I could look up the legislation and try to get some advice to you in the course of this hearing if you like. I know there are requirements in various circumstances when entitlements are transferred for reductions in numbers, but the rules are a little complex and I really do not want to mislead you that it would definitely happen on any case here. There are definitely some requirements in the arrangements that you reduce the number of entitlements when you transfer, but I would prefer to take it on notice to make sure that I can give you a correct answer.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: If you could take it on notice in the course of this hearing that would be helpful, Ms Webb.

ANSWER

The question is answered at page 27 of the hearing transcript.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Do those requirements still apply regardless of whether those machines are purchased or leased?

Ms WEBB: That is the sort of detail I want to confirm with my colleagues.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: If you could confirm that specifically that would be very welcome. Has the agency completed any assessment or analysis about what an additional entitlement might mean for The Star in terms of a boost to their bottom line? Industry analysts would suggest it might generate revenue in the order \$100 million to \$230 million per year. Is that something where there is a State Government analysis, either conducted by your agency or by the Treasury, that you are aware of?

Ms WEBB: I am not aware that it has been done as of yet but I imagine that that might be something that would be part of the discussion of the negotiations.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Could you confirm the first bit on notice—has it been done previously and if it is the first time these suggestions have come up? Perhaps on notice. I might ask you to be reasonably stronger in your response on the second part. This surely would have to be done, would it not, Ms Webb? It will be part of the process. Can you confirm that?

ANSWER

The question relating to machines being purchased or leased was answered at page 27 of the transcript.

Please see answers to Supplementary Questions 20-23 and 40 regarding the proposal and advice provided to the Government.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: When did The Star come to the Government with this offer for consideration of discussion?

Ms WEBB: I do not have that date in front of me. I can get it to you—

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: You will take that on notice?

Ms WEBB: Yes, that is okay.

ANSWER

The question is answered at page 27 of the hearing transcript.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: To whom were those informal indications made?

Ms WEBB: I do not have a copy of the initial correspondence from The Star in front of me so I just cannot say exactly who they wrote to. They might have written to the Minister, they might have written to ILGA or they might have written to Liquor & Gaming NSW. I do not have that in front of me.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Okay, but you will take that on notice?

Ms WEBB: Yes.

ANSWER

The question is answered at page 27 of the hearing transcript.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: One of the views was put by others—prominent figures such as Tim Costello—was that they were surprised that the Minister was spending time rearranging poker machines in the State rather than dealing with the pandemic. Those were not his exact words but his sentiment—not mine, although I certainly thought it was understandable. To Ms Hogan or Ms Webb, when was the last time you and the Minister met together with representatives from the hospitality industry to discuss the COVID-19 situation and what support they required?

Ms WEBB: I was involved in a meeting with the Minister and the clubs sector. I do not have the exact date but, from recollection, it was about three weeks ago. I can definitely find the exact date of that meeting. I will take it on notice. People in my team might have been involved in some other meetings that I was not able to attend, so I could also check those.

ANSWER

The Minister, the Minister's Office and the Deputy Secretary Better Regulation Division (BRD) met with Clubs NSW on 3 August 2021.

BRD representatives have met with stakeholders from the hospitality industry, relevant to COVID-19 and related support, on multiple occasions since the current COVID-19 restrictions commenced on 26 June 2021, including:

- Clubs NSW
- Australian Hotels Association
- Restaurant and Caterers Industry Association of Australia
- Retails Drink Australia; and

- Liquor Accord network members.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Sorry, I inadvertently hit mute there. Mr Rees, you have given us the processing times for those Service NSW programs rolled up together. Could you break those down? For each of the three programs, what is the processing time at the moment?

Mr REES: I do not have the average processing time split out by program, Mr Graham.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Could you take it on notice?

Mr REES: Yes, I could provide that on notice.

ANSWER

The demand for COVID business support programs has been unprecedented and the significant volumes of applications received in the initial weeks unfortunately resulted in delays in processing. Service NSW addressed this by increasing its resourcing and working around the clock to assess applications.

Once applications are approved, in most cases customers receive payment in their bank account within 24-48 hours however this can take 5-8 days depending on the customer's bank.

Micro-business Grant

Since August 30 and effective from August 10, processing time is 24 hours.

2021 COVID-19 Business Grant

Since August 30, the average processing time is 5.3 days.

Job Saver Grant

Since August 30, the average processing time is 4.6 days.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Well, I am very surprised by that, so can I ask you to take it on notice and consider the answer?

Mr REES: Of course.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Thirdly, before I hand to my colleague, you are reporting publicly—and I think this is to your credit—the call wait time for business customers. What is the call wait time for non-business customers for Service NSW at the moment?

Mr REES: That would vary depending on the nature of the call. We have a COVID hotline for non-business calls. That COVID hotline typically operates at around an average wait time of 10 minutes but, like business calls, can fluctuate. Depending on the nature of a transaction that a customer is calling for, we will have a different level of service agreed with the partner agency for that. So it would really depend on the specific type of call you are interested in.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Could you provide those agreed times on notice?

Mr REES: For any specific types of calls, Mr Graham?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, in general for each type of call.

Mr REES: Sure, we will provide that on notice.

ANSWER

Service NSW is not able to separate the call wait times for COVID business calls by particular programs. The average speed of answer times for non-business calls for the week commencing 30 August 2021 were:

COVID (non-business): 3 minutes

Community/Life Events: 2.56 minutes

General/tolling: 2.45 minutes

Roads and Licencing: 15.25 minutes

Revenue: 3.40 minutes

Travel/Rec: 33 seconds

There are 400 different Service Level Agreements in place with partner agencies for different call types, these range from 60% of calls being answered within 60 seconds to 90% of calls being answered in five minutes. It would require significant resources to source and compile the agreed service levels for each call type and the diversion of resources to do so cannot be supported at this time.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I am not asking about whether or not you agree with the level of risk; I am asking you what the level of risk is—what that appetite for risk is—for the each of the current COVID-related grants payments being managed by Service NSW. What the number is, if you like. Is it a 3 per cent fraud, a 10 per cent fraud or a 2 per cent fraud? You must have that because the Auditor-General said that was one of the major failings of Service NSW and the grants programs that the Auditor-General reviewed earlier this year.

Mr REES: I think the question of what is the appetite for risk of Government is not one that I can answer. I can certainly take on notice the question around what guidance we have provided and what assessment we have provided to inform that process.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Mr Rees, the Auditor-General said that it needs to be documented in advance; the level of risk needs to be clearly identified. We have seen in some of the bushfire-related grants fraud claims going in to almost 10 per cent—tens and tens of millions of dollars. I think it is only fair that you advise this Committee what the current risk profiles are for the COVID-related grants being administered by Service NSW. I ask again: Will you provide us with that detail?

Mr REES: I am happy to take that on notice, Mr Shoebridge.

ANSWER

Service NSW's risk appetite is low for fraud risk (customer) and zero for fraud risk (internal). A risk assessment is completed for each grant taking into consideration Service NSW's risk appetite and the risk appetite of the partner agency. Our partner agencies' risk appetite may differ for each program based on a number of factors including community hardship being experienced, and the size of the program.

Service NSW builds fraud controls into the program design and delivery in accordance with the agreed risk appetite and then Steering Committees oversee the implementation of grants including monitoring of risk management.

To date, the fraud team have conducted a total of 1093 fraud assessments on covid business grant applications. The following tables depict the number and dollar value of applications still being assessed for fraud (Level 2) or deemed fraudulent and being prepared for referral to Police (Level 3).

	LEVEL 2 (currently in Fraud Triage due to indicators of fraud)				Total Amount	Total Applications under review
	Paid		Unpaid			
Grant	Amount	Applications	Amount	Applications		

C19 Job Saver 21 - Application	\$ 63,544	6	\$ 3,864,438	572	\$ 3,927,982	578
Micro Business Support Grant 21 – Application			\$ 252,000	168	\$ 252,000	168
2021 COVID-19 Business Grant 21 – Application	\$ 175,500	14	\$ 9,432,000	746	\$ 9,607,500	760
Grand Total	\$ 239,044	20	\$ 13,548,438	1486	\$ 13,787,482	1506

LEVEL 3 (Deemed Fraudulent)								
	Paid		Unpaid		Total Amount	Total Applications in L3	Total Applications (overall)	% Fraud
Grant	Amount	Applications	Amount	Applications				
C19 Job Saver 21 - Application	\$ 159,953	32	\$ 294,616	69	\$ 454,569	101	159966	0.06%
Micro-Business Grant 21 - Application			\$ 42,000	28	\$ 42,000	28	40080	0.07%
2021 COVID-19 Business Grant 21 - Application	\$ 387,000	27	\$ 1,861,500	150	\$ 2,248,500	177	169714	0.10%
Grand Total	\$ 546,953	59	\$ 2,198,116	247	\$ 2,745,069	306	369760	0.08%

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: I see in the evidence to the cybersecurity inquiry held earlier this year by Portfolio Committee No. 1 in the upper House that the charter of Cyber Security NSW was described as providing whole-of-government leadership, coordination, advice and intelligence across New South Wales government. What role does

Cyber Security NSW play in ensuring that the standards and protocols that you have supervised the development of in relation to cybersecurity measures are actually adhered to by government agencies?

Ms HOGAN: Again, I would take the details of it on notice, but we play a broad role.

ANSWER

Cyber Security NSW implements the NSW Cyber Security Policy which provides the overarching framework that applies to NSW Government agencies. NSW Cyber Security Policy reporting provides an annual view of cyber maturity that many other jurisdictions do not have in place. Clusters report monthly updates on cyber uplift to the Secretaries Board. This enables better decision-making by agencies.

The NSW Cyber Security Policy uses a risk-based approach which enables clusters and agencies to determine and respond appropriately to their own risk environments. This also does not preclude agencies from setting their own internal requirements in-addition to the NSW Cyber Security Policy, appropriate to their risks.

A Governance, Risk and Compliance (GRC) team was established in Cyber Security NSW in February 2021. The GRC team is developing an audit capability to provide additional validation and assurance of maturity reporting.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: I do not want to put words in your mouth, Ms Hogan, but the mandate to Cyber Security NSW to fulfil, if you like, that central agency-style role in relation to cybersecurity to be able to actually enforce compliance by other agencies, that is not yet fully in place. You are building your capability but you do not yet have that authority. Is that correct?

Ms HOGAN: No. I think that Cyber NSW has that as its role to play. I am just saying I think I would be misleading the Committee if I said that we were 100 per cent there, given that we have only just been expanding the team. I would be happy to take on notice from Tony Chapman, who is our lead in Cyber Security, for further detail on exactly what the progress has been and when we expect to see those duties to be fulfilled.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Yes.

ANSWER

The role of Cyber Security NSW is supported by the NSW Cyber Security Policy and its circular DCS-2021-02 which directs public service bodies to comply. The work of Cyber Security NSW is also supported by DCS-2020-05 Cyber Security NSW directive – Practice Requirements for NSW Government. This expands on existing responsibilities under the NSW Cyber Security Policy and includes expectations for compliance such as actioning advisories and alerts issued by Cyber Security NSW, mandatory training for all staff as well as setting expectations for audits of policy reporting and maturity assessments.

Clusters and agencies are ultimately responsible for protecting their information and systems from cyber risks. Cyber Security NSW supports agencies and clusters through strategic coordination of policy, awareness, intelligence and incident response. Responsibilities are defined through the NSW Cyber Security Policy.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: In terms of the cyber incidents though, do you get visibility of all of those things from the Privacy Commissioner? Is there that information sharing to enable you to do your work? Or is that a gap in the system that needs to be remedied?

Ms HOGAN: No. I would say that if Mr Chapman were here—and I will take his actual response on notice—he would say that he has visibility of the various cyber incidents that have occurred across the State.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: So he would be able to tell us what departments have been the subject, whether there are sort of repeat offenders, if you like, or whether they are spread? Through you, could you provide us on notice which departments have been responsible for those 205 incidents?

Ms HOGAN: Well, if the 205 incidents are cyber related, I would be able to share more information and I would have to check through my departmental experts—

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Could you take that on notice please and come back?

Ms HOGAN: Yes, I will take it on notice and we will provide what we can and if not—yes, we will provide what we can.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Of that \$180 million for cluster departments, how much of that has been spent to date?

Ms HOGAN: I would have to come back on the numbers. I can do that by the—

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: And on what has it been spent?

Ms HOGAN: Yes. I can come back and tell you potentially by the end of the session, and if not, on notice, how much of that money has been allocated to which department. In terms of what each department has spent that money on specifically, that would be a very detailed response that I would need to take on notice.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: I am happy to have a detailed response, and I am sure if you need more time than we have allocated the Committee would indulge you. That information is very important. Ms Hogan, in March of this year the Electoral Commissioner stated:

Lack of adequate investment in the cybersecurity of NSW electoral systems and personnel over time has meant that the Commission does not comply, and cannot comply in the immediate future, with the NSW public sector's mandatory cybersecurity policies. The Commission also does not meet the ACSC's Essential 8 standards for cybersecurity.

Now, that is very disturbing coming from the Electoral Commissioner because it speaks to the potential lack of integrity around our electoral processes. Do you think this is adequate? Has money been allocated to the Electoral Commission to help bring it up to speed?

Ms HOGAN: I would have to take on notice whether the Electoral Commission has actually applied for additional funding through the money that has been set aside for cyber.

ANSWER

- The NSW Information and Privacy Commission (IPC) reported the total number of data security breaches reported to the Privacy Commissioner for the 2020-21 financial year for State Government was 205.

Not all data breaches are the result of cyber security incidents. It is a matter for the IPC to provide further particulars relating to this reporting, including how many of the 205 data breaches were the result of a cyber security incident.

Cyber Security mandates reporting of cyber security incidents as part of the NSW Cyber Security Policy. Cyber Security NSW has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the IPC to enable the sharing of information where a cyber security incident results in a data breach.

- At the end of July 2021, ERC and DaPCo have approved funding for each cluster to enable them to uplift their cyber security maturity.
- On 6 September, the business case of NSW Electoral Commission was undergoing assurance and review by an independent panel as part of DRF requirements.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Accellion in February said that it notified all of its customers on or around 23 December. I think in estimates earlier this year the health Minister and the Health secretary indicated that Health knew or became aware around about Christmas Day or Boxing Day. We have now learnt that the police and Cyber Security commenced Strike Force Martine in February. I just wanted to know when Cyber Security NSW was in fact notified of the Accellion data breaches. Was it in December or at some subsequent point in time?

Ms HOGAN: That is casting my mind back quite a while, so I will have to take the details of that on notice. But I can say that Transport and Health have proceeded to manage those incidents since then.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Sure, but that is not my question. My question really is: Do you know when they reported to Cyber Security NSW that the incidences had happened? When were they aware of the incidences? Because there seems to be some lack of clarity around the time lines.

Ms HOGAN: Without Cyber NSW here in the room, I would have to take it on notice, I am afraid. I do not have that level of detail with me.

ANSWER

Please refer to the response to Question 11 in the Supplementary Questions.

The CHAIR: I will ask just a few questions before I hand over to the Hon. Mark Banasiak. I just wanted to pick up, Mr Rees, on the issues we were discussing before in relation to Datacom. Perhaps you could take it on notice, but I am interested in knowing what percentage of calls to Service NSW is being answered by Datacom people and also what percentage of issues raised through that service is being actually resolved by Datacom, as opposed to having to be passed on to somebody else. Are you able to provide that information on notice?

Mr REES: Yes. I can provide some guidance, which is Datacom represent a relatively small percentage of our overall contact centre workforce. It would be, I think, in the region of maybe 10 per cent. But I can certainly come back to you on notice with the specifics.

The CHAIR: That would be very useful. And just one last question: I understand that a number of businesses with suppressed Australian business numbers [ABNs] were finding it very difficult to apply for the micro grants in particular because basically when they went online to do this they had to put in an ABN. So if you had a suppressed ABN, it was not able to cope with that. I understand there was a workaround put in place where people could call and speak directly with somebody in order for them to still be able to apply with a suppressed ABN. But has there been a technical fix put in place for that or is the expectation still that people will have to call and speak to somebody in order to apply?

Mr REES: I will have to check.

ANSWER

Datacom commenced taking calls from 2 August 2021 and have taken 10.24% of total calls since this time. During the week of 30 August 2021 to 5 September 2021. Datacom resolved approximately 80% of calls they received without referral.

ABN - Service NSW confirms that we are aware of this issue and the team is currently reviewing a potential solution. In the meantime, our Business Concierges are ensuring the relevant details of potential applicants are collected and will be contacting those businesses when the issue is resolved to advise on when applications can be made.

The Hon. MARK BANASIAK: My questions are directed towards Ms Webb, particularly around the property expert panel. Last estimates, which was on 5 March, the Minister announced that the property expert panel had been established, but we were not able to get an answer on the day as to what the composition of that panel was. The question was taken on notice and the response was that the composition had been announced on Fair Trading's website on 24 March. My question is: Was the actual panel established when the Minister made that announcement or had he actually jumped the gun? Because it seems illogical that if a panel had been announced at 5 March, someone would have been able to tell us the composition.

Ms WEBB: Mr Banasiak, I don't think I can answer that question. I do not have any particular briefing on the Better Regulation matters with me today because we were here for the Customer Service portfolio. So I would have to take on notice exactly the time line of when the establishment of the committee occurred versus the announcement versus the invitation to members. I just do not have that material with me today.

ANSWER

This question should be directed to the Minister for Better Regulation and Innovation.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just returning to the cybersecurity matters, under the protocols in place, Ms Hogan, if a department discovers a cyber attack, who are they meant to report to? Are they

meant to notify Cyber Security NSW first and foremost before they do anything else? What level of visibility are you supposed to get? Could you answer that question.

Ms HOGAN: Yes. So there is a framework in place about what constitutes a cyber incident. Some cyber breaches might be—they might just be an attempt. An agency might have picked up an attempt to get into a system. That might be, depending on the system that it is, considered low risk and then we move up to a heightened risk and then a significant risk. I would have to take on notice the specific threshold but once you get to a specific threshold there is a requirement to report it to Cyber NSW. That is correct.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: In relation to the Accellion incidents, I see in reporting earlier this year that Transport's information got put on the dark web by a ransomware outfit called CLOP. It said that Health's data was not also put on the dark web, although it was also subject to the Accellion data breaches. Can you find out and tell us on notice when those two agencies reported to Cyber Security NSW the Accellion data breaches and when they in turn became aware of their own internal breaches?

Ms HOGAN: Yes, I can.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: In relation to that, I see in a 1 March report earlier this year that Accellion themselves say there were two incidents: one in December and one in January. That might explain some of the lack of clarity over time lines. Can you bear that in mind when you provide us with your answers?

Ms HOGAN: Yes.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Ms Hogan, no doubt you would be aware of this report from the Audit Office about managing cyber risks, in particular looking at Transport. It found that there were a number of significant problems in Transport for NSW and Sydney Trains around managing their cyber risks. There are some quite disturbing findings there, including that the senior executives were not really given visibility of matters and also that they do not appear to have really met their own benchmarks in terms of cybersecurity. In fact, I think these risks were so significant that parts of the Audit Office's report had to be redacted because, between December 2020 and this report being tabled, I think in July of this year, neither Transport for NSW nor Sydney Trains had in fact identified the vulnerabilities identified in the report. In fact, even more disturbingly, they were not aware of those vulnerabilities until the report was done. My question is: Why didn't Cyber Security NSW have knowledge of these matters until the audit report? Is that because, again, it was not your job to superintend the agencies?

Ms HOGAN: I will answer that as best as I can but, as Cyber NSW has not been called as a witness, again I have not prepared myself as fully as I might have on cyber had they been called. I will do my best and I will take the rest on notice.

ANSWER

- Cyber Security NSW mandates reporting of cyber security incidents as part of the NSW Cyber Security Policy. Incident thresholds for reporting to Cyber Security NSW are defined by the NSW Cyber Incident Response Plan.

Incident reporting by agencies allows Cyber Security NSW to provide alerting across the NSW Government Sector.

Agencies are also required by the NSW Cyber Security Policy to report intelligence relating to cyber-events that may not result in cyber incidents. This also allows Cyber Security NSW to engage other stakeholders such as the Australian Cyber Security Centre and NSW Police Force.

The impacted agency or cluster is ultimately responsible for leading the incident response. Cyber Security NSW provides a supporting coordination role across NSW Government.
- Please refer to the response to Question 11 in the Supplementary Questions for questions relating to Accellion.
- Clusters and agencies are ultimately responsible for protecting their information and systems from cyber risks. Cyber Security NSW supports agencies and clusters through strategic coordination of policy, awareness, intelligence and incident response. Responsibilities are defined in the NSW Cyber Security Policy.

Questions relating to action undertaken by Transport for NSW in response to the Audit Report should be directed to the Minister for Transport and Roads.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: That gives rise to two possibilities. One is the plans were in place but they were crap and they did not work because you guys did not design them properly. Or, secondly, maybe they did not properly implement them. Again, there seems to be a lack of granularity in the Audit Office report, but it does sound like the two agencies were fully compliant with the requirements put in place by Cyber Security NSW. Yet there were these pretty devastating vulnerabilities when you read the full report. Does that suggest to you that maybe Cyber Security NSW needs to sharpen its pencil and refocus the content of its mandatory requirements across the public sector, particularly if it is going to take on this central agency policing kind of role?

Ms HOGAN: Well, I think, as I answered earlier, that is already the case. We are already ramping up our own capability on the way in which we work with other agencies and hold them to account. But the granularity of the Transport report itself I am not across. You would have to ask Transport or I can take it on notice and get our Cyber NSW team to respond in more detail.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Yes, I look forward to your response on notice.

ANSWER

Cyber Security NSW continually considers all feedback on the Cyber Security Policy from stakeholders including the NSW Audit Office, clusters and agencies, and industry. The NSW Cyber Security Policy is currently undergoing review with scope to update the mandatory requirements to better meet the cyber security needs of NSW Government.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: That is okay. In terms of taking on that greater superintendence, what time horizon do you see before that is fully realised, Ms Hogan?

Ms HOGAN: I think from a resource perspective we are almost there, but I will get my office to contact me before the end of this session and I will come back to you with a more fulsome answer.

ANSWER

The role of Cyber Security NSW is supported by the NSW Cyber Security Policy and its circular DCS-2021-02 which directs public service bodies to comply. The work of Cyber Security NSW is also supported by DCS-2020-05 Cyber Security NSW directive – Practice Requirements for NSW Government. This expands on existing responsibilities under the NSW Cyber Security Policy and includes expectations for compliance such as actioning advisories and alerts issued by Cyber Security NSW, mandatory training for all staff as well as setting expectations for audits of policy reporting and maturity assessments.

Clusters and agencies are ultimately responsible for protecting their information and systems from cyber risks. Cyber Security NSW supports agencies and clusters through strategic coordination of policy, awareness, intelligence and incident response. Responsibilities are defined through the NSW Cyber Security Policy.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: So that is still a lot of people who were not able to be contacted. And that is one of the themes that came through the inquiry: concerns about notification. Ms Hogan, can you talk us through how the mandatory data breach notification scheme will work? What are the requirements on agencies and what are the requirements specifically for those agencies to tell their customers where there have been these breaches?

Ms HOGAN: I do not have that detail to hand, Mr Searle. I will have to take it on notice.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Thank you. The inquiry also recommended the development of a cybersecurity skills framework for, presumably, Cyber Security NSW to deliver to the workforce across the public sector. Can you tell us where the development of that is up to or if it is being developed?

Ms HOGAN: I would have to take that on notice also.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Okay. The committee also recommended a review of the cybersecurity policy to make it much clearer to agencies what the standards and benchmarks they are supposed to comply with are to be. Again, I am happy for you to take that on notice, if you are not able to respond.

Ms HOGAN: I can say that the cybersecurity policy was scheduled for review anyway, I believe. So I think that is occurring. But I will take the details again on notice.

ANSWER

This is currently being considered in the Government response to the Parliamentary Inquiry into Cyber Security.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Which agencies have access to that tolling information?

Mr REES: I will double-check, but my expectation would be it would only be accessed by Service NSW for the purpose of delivering on that program. But I am happy to take it on notice and double-check that.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Thank you. Regarding those arrangements with toll providers, how many arrangements and how many contracts do you have in place with those toll providers?

Mr REES: There has been some movement since the start of the program, I think, through consolidation of various retailers. I would need to confirm the current number.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Great. If you could confirm both who the arrangements are with and the nature of the arrangements, that would be helpful. Are there any constraints on the use of that information from a New South Wales Government point of view in those contracts? You have indicated what the information is used for, but are there constraints in place?

Mr REES: I would expect there would be. Those contracts were originally put in place three to four years ago now so I would need to take on notice the specifics of those constraints.

ANSWER

Both Service NSW and Transport for NSW (the “Government Agencies”), have access to specific tolling data under the “Toll Relief Program – Data Sharing Agreements” (the Agreements”).

There are two Agreements with the following parties:

First Agreement:

- Service NSW;
- Roads and Maritime Services;
- Transport for NSW; and
- Roads and Maritime Services Tolling Branch (a “Toll Service Provider”).

Second Agreement:

- Service NSW;
- Roads and Maritime Services;
- Transport for NSW; and
- Tollaust Pty Ltd (a Toll Service Provider).

The nature of the Agreements is for the Toll Service Provider to provide the Government Agencies with data to support the implementation of the Toll Relief Program.

Yes, there are constraints as to how the data is used by the Government Agencies. The Agreements set out certain obligations on the Government Agencies to ensure that the data provided to them by the Toll Service Provider is used only for the purpose of the operation of the Program. The Agreements also contain several clauses dealing with the obligations on the Government Agencies to protect the data, notify the Toll Service Provider of any data breaches and to comply with all of the applicable privacy laws with respect to not only the use of the data, but also the collection and disclosure of the data. There is also provision within the Agreements for Service NSW to ensure that data which it transmits to the Toll Service Provider is encrypted with the same level of encryption as that which applied to the data at the time it was received by Service NSW from the Toll Service Provider.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Can you tell us, then, on the basis of that information, how many toll tags have paid at least one toll on Sydney toll roads in the last financial year?

Mr REES: I do not have that information. I would need to take that on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, if you could take that on notice for the last couple of financial years, that would be helpful. Perhaps you might need to take this one on notice, then, as well: Could you tell us the value of the tag with the highest toll burden in the last financial year?

Mr REES: I would need to take that on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Thank you. You have indicated the uses of the information. Is the data used to make policy decisions to drive government decisions around tolling?

Mr REES: Any policy decisions in that space would not sit with Service NSW; they would sit with Transport for NSW. I can certainly say that Service NSW does not use that information in that way. I would have to take on notice whether that information is supplied to any other agencies in order to support policymaking.

ANSWER

These questions should be redirected to the Minister for Transport and Roads and/or Toll Providers. Service NSW only has data provided from toll providers to administer the program. Service NSW does not have access to tolling information as it is held by toll providers. Policy decisions sits with Transport for NSW as the owner of the program. Service NSW only administers the program.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Following the estimates in March a range of questions on notice were asked and the agency provided information in relation to a range of those. I will indicate specifically which ones I am requesting, but can I ask that you update, on notice, the information you provided in that instance for the relevant time period? That was a set of requests about toll relief data and it was questions on notice Nos 623 to 632. The agency indicated some of them were really a matter for Transport, but Customer Service provided a range of those on notice. If you could update those, it would be helpful.

Mr REES: Of course.

ANSWER

623 – Total claimed in FY 2020/21 is 198,508

624 – This question should be redirected to the Minister for Transport and Roads

625 – 626 - Please refer to Attachment A. Note only postcode data is available (data is not available by region or LGA)

627 – 628

Age	Gender	Beneficiaries
Under 25	Female	2,032
25 – 34	Female	10,225

35 – 44	Female	11,946
45 – 54	Female	13,535
55 – 64	Female	8,405
65+	Female	2,234
Unknown	Female	358

Age	Gender	Beneficiaries
Under 25	Male	2,609
25 – 34	Male	15,638
35 – 44	Male	21,844
45 – 54	Male	22,390
55 – 64	Male	15,729
65+	Male	4,961
Unknown	Male	810
Unknown	Unknown	65,791
Grand Total		198,508

629 – This question should be redirected to the Minister for Transport and Roads.

630 – From 1 July 2021 to 6 September 2021 total number of Beneficiaries is 71,206.

631 – This question should be redirected to the Minister for Transport and Roads.

632 – This question should be redirected to the Minister for Transport and Roads.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I forget your words from this morning. Negotiations have not yet commenced but the formal negotiation process has been initiated—that is, we are selecting who will negotiate; we are inviting an offer.

Ms WEBB: I did not mention anything about—

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Why has the Government not made that clear?

Ms WEBB: I do not think I mentioned about inviting an offer so I do not want to confirm [disorder].

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Sure. Understood.

Ms WEBB: I do not think we have done that. I cannot answer that question. I will have to take it on notice because you are asking me about the Government's position.

ANSWER

Please see answers to Supplementary Questions 20-22 and 40.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Could you also inform the Committee of the result of that information that you have gathered?

Mr DENT: I am certainly happy to take on notice if anything substantive comes out of that information, yes.

ANSWER

SIRA will be receiving the actuarial report soon, and once SIRA has had the opportunity to review the report it will decide next steps, including whether to publish the report.

Mr DENT: From my point of view, a day longer than it needs to be is obviously too long. We are working with icare to make sure that process is expedited as best as possible. My understanding is that now that the majority of letters have gone out to those potentially eligible workers, the information is now coming in to be assessed for each of those claims. I understand the process is underway but at this stage there is still a significant way to go. I am just looking, sorry, and I cannot see in the notes I have in front of me whether icare have committed to a particular date at this point in time.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: I am happy for you to take that on notice and come back to us.

Mr DENT: I will take it on notice. I am happy to provide that to you.

ANSWER

The icare PIAWE remediation program for the proactive review of PIAWE payments is scheduled to be completed by December 2021 for both the NI and TMF. The reactive reviews, although expected to be largely completed by that time, will transition into a business-as-usual activity after this deadline.

The PIAWE remediation program undertaken by icare includes both proactive and reactive reviews. Proactive reviews are comprised of a select number of high risk and highest needs workers have had their claims proactively reviewed by icare with subsequent payments made to workers where underpayments were identified (“proactive review”). Workers not falling within this class have instead received communications from icare inviting them to contact icare and seek a PIAWE review. The response from injured workers taking up the opportunity for a PIAWE review is estimated at 5.2% of all recipients (“reactive review”).

An estimated number of 23,000 workers were part of icare’s initial estimate of potentially impacted workers provided to SIRA in March 2020. However, the remediation program has progressed substantially since that time and updated figures have been provided by icare since the March 2020 initial estimate.

icare have since advised that 273,660 workers are eligible for a PIAWE review for the period of 1 October 2012 to 21 October 2019, across both the Treasury Managed Fund (“TMF”) and the Nominal Insurer (“NI”). icare has advised that each of the impacted workers have been provided with correspondence inviting them to contact icare for a PIAWE review.

icare have further advised that of the 9,461 PIAWE proactive and reactive reviews assessed, they have identified an approximate underpayment error rate of 3.5%.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: Given that these matters were flagged with clarity in March 2020, how has it taken 18 months or more to actually get these various reviews underway?

Mr DENT: I cannot answer that with any certainty, obviously. Given that I am 7½ weeks into the role I cannot speak for my predecessor. What I would say is that throughout that course of time this particular audit of the TMF has not commenced, but that does not mean SIRA has not continued to monitor the performance of the TMF and its return to work, for example, through icare.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: If you could take on notice and provide us at least an institutional response to the delay—

Mr DENT: I am happy to do that.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: —notwithstanding the moving on of the chief executive. I find it very concerning, given the nature of the problem that was clearly identified in budget estimates in March 2020, that here we are well into the second half of 2021 and things have not really commenced. It is a concern to me, at least.

Mr DENT: I will certainly take that on notice and come back with an answer.

ANSWER

The questions asked by the Hon Adam Searle relates to three independent activities conducted by SIRA, with the comments made by Ms Donnelly in the March 2020 hearing related to the **Pre-Injury Average Weekly Earnings (PIAWE)** calculations errors identified by icare and SIRA’s review and audit of **Self and Specialised Insurers PIAWE** calculations, and the comments made by Ms Donnelly in the March 2021 hearing relating to the **compliance and performance review of the TMF**.

SIRA is continuing to monitor the **icare PIAWE remediation** program, which is scheduled to be completed by December 2021. SIRA’s monitoring activities include:

- monitoring complaints relating to PIAWE; and
- fortnightly operational meetings with icare. with regular reporting on remediation activities
- monthly executive meetings and monitoring of icare activity against the remediation plan
- working with icare on the establishment and embedding of claims service standards that include regular PIAWE reviews throughout the life of a claim
- establishment of a proactive remediation program which includes but is not limited to writing to all potentially impact workers
- monitor the icare implementation of the Deloitte recommendations.

SIRA’s review and audit of **Self and Specialised Insurers PIAWE** calculations was completed in 2020. The review revealed strong conformance by most Self and Specialised Insurers on timely and accurate payment of weekly payments. However, seven insurers were identified as poor performers across the most significant weekly benefits measures. In response to the ‘poorest performers’ SIRA undertook formal claims file audits of all processes, procedures, and internal governance around PIAWE calculation and weekly payments (including confirmation of remediation actions for under/overpayments); claim file reviews or audits (including confirmation of remediation actions for under/overpayments) of the balance of poor performers. In September 2021, SIRA commenced a further review of the Self and Specialised Insurers PIAWE compliance.

SIRA’s **review of the TMF’s compliance and performance** arose out of an investigation SIRA completed in 2020. In 2020, SIRA investigated the management of a select number of government agency workers compensation claims administered by the TMF. In October 2020 SIRA’s investigations determined that various instances of non-compliance with legislative and best practice standards had occurred. As a result, SIRA made numerous recommendations which included a further and wider claims audit of TMF managed workers compensation claims. As the review needs to appropriately capture a representative cross section of the TMF’s performance, which is comprised of approximately 200 government agencies, detailed planning and preparation for this review is being done by SIRA. This detailed planning and preparation will be finalised soon, and the formal review work will commence. The compliance and performance review is expected to take some months, and is estimated to be completed by late 2022.

The Hon. ADAM SEARLE: All right. The independent review conducted by Janet Dore—which I think was commissioned by SIRA and which also fed into the McDougall review—found, for example, that there were a number of problems impacting return to work rates, including the lack of qualified or experienced general practitioners and medical practitioners generally, particularly in country or regional settings in New South Wales. What has SIRA done to address that situation?

Mr DENT: I do not know that I have that in front of me, Mr Searle. I would have to take that on notice and come back to you on that specific point.

ANSWER

The Dore Report identified problems affecting return to work rates, including the lack of qualified or experienced general practitioners (GPs) and medical practitioners generally, particularly in country or regional settings in New

South Wales. Insights included a lack of access to the same claims manager, and a lack of knowledge by GPs about the personal injury system and tendencies for prescribing without a focus on return to work. Further, in the worst cases this resulted in addiction to drugs (opioids) rather than appropriate pain management practice. Finding 4 from the Dore Report identified that priority should be given to a training program for GPs by icare.

SIRA has done the following to help address the problems identified in the Dore Report:

- SIRA does not regulate GPs. SIRA actively engages with medical colleges and associations to increase the capability of GPs in managing compensable injuries to support recovery and return to work outcomes, including delivering podcasts in both 2020 and 2021 in conjunction with the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (RACGP) with a focus on education for GPs.
- SIRA has reviewed and provided input, including a submission to the RACGP's review of the GP curriculum in March 2021, with suggested enhancements to integrate the principles of the 'health benefits of good work' into their clinical practices; undertake evidence-based assessments; and the need for evidence-based certification practices to facilitate recovery at work (unless medically contraindicated).
- In July 2020 SIRA published the Medication management in the NSW personal injury schemes: Better practice guide to address the potential for negative health outcomes, including addiction, associated with the use of high-risk medications such as opioids. In line with best practice, case managers are recommended to monitor the use of high-risk medications and to liaise with the GP on the use of medication management reviews. This should result in an individualised medication management plan that transitions the injured worker off high-risk medications where appropriate, or minimises the risk of harms through regularly monitoring medication use. In 2021 SIRA introduced new codes for high-risk medications to gain greater visibility of the use of these medicines within the workers compensation system.
- SIRA is co-funding a project through Monash University to develop and implement a national clinical guideline to help GPs improve their diagnosis and management of work-related mental health conditions. The trial of the [Clinical guideline for the diagnosis and management of work-related mental health conditions in general practice](#) is currently underway and was established to help implement the guidelines into clinical practice. SIRA remains a member of the working group facilitating this trial.
- SIRA allows telehealth as a method of service delivery, which is particularly useful in rural and remote regions. In addition in response to COVID 19 changes were made which also broadened the range of health practitioners who can certify certificates of capacity to now include physiotherapists and psychologists in addition to medical practitioners. This enables these allied health practitioner's opinions (who have expertise in assessing functional capacity) to be reflected in an injured worker's capacity certificate.
- SIRA is a participant in a cross-sector collaborative partnership to improve work participation. The collaborative partnership, led by Comcare is a national alliance between the public, private and not-for-profit sectors finding new ways to drive system-wide change that gives people with a health condition or disability the chance to engage in good work. This includes a focus on supporting GPs in their role to facilitate work participation via the development of Australia's first national Principles on the role of GPs in supporting work participation. The Principles have been officially recognised as a Supported Position Statement by the RACGP.
- SIRA has provided feedback to the Australasian Faculty of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (AFOEM) on their two papers on evidence-based work injury scheme design (an evidence-based discussion paper and a values and principles-based paper). SIRA's feedback included priorities for change, ways to overcome barriers to change, options for systematically tackling psychosocial barriers, and facilitators, and value-based healthcare.
- SIRA has a network of Injury Management Consultants (IMC) who assist doctors in understanding workers compensation and return to work (RTW) to progress a worker's recovery at/return to work and optimise health and work outcomes. The IMC is a medical practitioner who assesses the situation, examines the worker (if necessary) and discusses possible solutions with the relevant parties, especially the nominated treating doctor. The IMC mediates with parties to seek agreement on actions and outcomes.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I am just conscious of the time. Perhaps on notice could you let us know how many venues have taken it up, including that New South Wales trial, and how many councils have taken up that opportunity for the trial?

Ms WEBB: Yes. We have got Randwick, Parramatta, Narrabri—but I will take it all on notice.

ANSWER

The trial was implemented across NSW in three stages. Firstly, in the Rocks and Darling Harbour, followed by City of Sydney and state-wide from 1 December 2020.

A number of councils and businesses transformed public space into dining spots which improved public amenity and provided support for businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic.

As at 30 June 2021 there were 311 venues across NSW operating with outdoor dining and nine participating Local Government Areas (LGAs).

As at 20 July 2021, LGAs which participated included: City of Sydney, inclusive of the Rocks and Darling Harbour, Parramatta, Randwick, Narrabri, Inner West, Byron Shire and Northern Beaches.

Toll Relief QoN – September 2021

625 and 626 – Toll Relief

Note that postcode data is only available.

Post Codes	FY 20-21
2155	5,410
2153	5,043
2145	4,310
2148	3,628
2154	2,855
2761	2,803
2088	2,783
2765	2,584
2147	2,451
2747	2,337
2770	2,334
2768	2,303
2171	2,255
2066	2,240
2763	2,230
2065	2,186
2750	2,152
2170	2,141
2745	1,977
2759	1,918
2560	1,840
2756	1,719
2176	1,681
2570	1,642
2125	1,603
2160	1,578
2026	1,512
2760	1,505
2031	1,502
2035	1,425
2046	1,425
2137	1,386
2113	1,362
2068	1,328
2567	1,280
2120	1,279
2112	1,276
2121	1,270
2090	1,258
2767	1,251
2074	1,249

2036	1,230
2073	1,229
2126	1,229
2040	1,169
2118	1,169
2093	1,160
2089	1,157
2127	1,147
2075	1,135
2099	1,124
2151	1,113
2119	1,097
2060	1,094
2076	1,083
2156	1,050
2769	1,047
2041	1,038
2762	1,027
2168	1,007
2122	1,005
2146	937
2067	936
2034	933
2161	931
2766	924
2030	917
2117	900
2017	889
2150	888
2077	879
2021	873
2777	868
2753	861
2152	847
2069	842
2565	822
2142	798
2010	797
2749	792
2230	774
2070	754
2250	747
2071	733
2135	730
2216	730
2774	720

2217	712
2100	710
2229	703
2011	697
2018	690
2019	681
2566	681
2096	675
2138	667
2144	665
2164	656
2111	653
2195	650
2023	649
2063	647
2062	639
2141	639
2095	638
2000	630
2029	630
2009	605
2024	603
2047	602
2101	592
2158	591
2557	591
2204	588
2196	586
2207	586
2020	585
2037	577
2087	576
2165	576
2022	557
2234	554
2086	549
2039	547
2027	534
2064	534
2140	528
2131	520
2210	520
2758	518
2200	511
2259	511
2038	502

2114	500
2190	500
2205	500
2179	499
2110	489
2097	484
2085	479
2261	479
2194	475
2033	470
2061	466
2115	452
2025	451
2107	451
2042	448
2773	443
2206	440
2232	436
2219	433
2220	433
2032	423
2177	423
2203	416
2092	410
2193	408
2166	402
2780	400
2228	397
2221	394
2251	394
2072	370
2174	360
2260	358
2132	350
2133	349
2257	348
2213	347
2049	344
2223	343
2015	339
2224	337
2233	336
2576	334
2106	330
2103	328
2571	326

2045	325
2159	324
2173	324
2575	320
2754	319
2134	318
2016	316
2558	311
2028	299
2094	293
2218	293
2050	279
2211	278
2564	276
2752	266
2212	262
2209	260
2102	257
2157	257
2136	255
2208	252
2116	251
2782	250
2192	248
2043	246
2227	244
2178	241
2130	239
2048	237
2776	234
2540	232
2577	232
2167	228
2500	222
2795	220
2044	216
2079	213
2779	205
2162	197
2222	190
2199	188
2082	172
2226	166
2800	161
2580	160
2008	157

2191	157
2256	156
2084	155
2574	150
2263	148
2785	144
2081	142
2748	137
2104	128
2143	125
2529	125
2530	123
2790	123
2128	122
2850	122
2262	121
2175	117
2539	114
2007	112
2225	112
2533	108
2428	107
2444	106
2527	106
2778	105
2320	102
2264	99
2283	99
2515	98
2430	97
2573	97
2198	96
2508	96
2519	95
2783	95
2830	95
2315	94
2572	94
2650	91
2172	89
2325	89
2197	85
2518	83
2620	81
2105	79
2163	79

2281	79
2579	79
2556	78
2108	77
2214	76
2290	76
2517	75
2300	74
2287	71
2340	71
2450	70
2526	69
2280	67
2291	67
2516	64
2775	62
2528	59
2535	59
2541	58
2258	57
2324	56
2282	55
2525	55
2322	54
2559	54
2502	53
2680	53
2083	52
2231	52
2534	52
2757	49
2285	47
2784	47
2330	46
2080	43
2265	42
2481	42
2787	40
2640	39
2786	39
2289	38
2446	38
2478	38
2536	38
2578	38
2594	38

2299	37
2323	37
2569	37
2305	36
2317	36
2440	34
2429	33
2568	33
2335	31
2480	31
2318	30
2350	30
2487	29
2284	28
2316	28
2550	28
2622	28
2627	28
2321	27
2486	27
2506	27
2630	26
2295	25
2319	25
2849	25
2304	24
2583	24
2794	24
2337	23
2423	23
2460	23
2537	22
2871	22
2582	21
2303	20
2298	19
2799	19
2456	18
2483	18
2505	18
2548	18
2870	18
2333	17
2443	17
2447	17
2546	17

2619	17
2477	16
2628	16
2482	15
2538	15
2798	15
2479	14
2852	14
2422	13
2427	13
2454	13
2590	13
2705	13
2720	13
2327	12
2581	12
2847	12
2293	11
2360	11
2400	11
2448	11
2452	11
2464	11
2484	11
2621	11
2641	11
No Details from RMS	10
2307	10
2312	10
2445	10
2587	10
2722	10
2880	10
2267	9
2326	9
2334	9
2343	9
2420	9
2441	9
2489	9
2666	9
2793	9
2804	9
2820	9
2829	9
2380	8

2431	8
2455	8
2463	8
2485	8
2555	8
2339	7
2346	7
2365	7
2421	7
2563	7
2710	7
2821	7
2292	6
2390	6
2586	6
2824	6
2832	6
2845	6
2846	6
2865	6
2866	6
2877	6
2329	5
2354	5
2357	5
2388	5
2449	5
2549	5
2625	5
2700	5
2810	5
2848	5
2296	4
2297	4
2302	4
2311	4
2328	4
2336	4
2341	4
2370	4
2425	4
2439	4
2470	4
2488	4
2663	4
2665	4

2729	4
2730	4
2792	4
2831	4
2867	4
2278	3
2286	3
2294	3
2338	3
2469	3
2551	3
2618	3
2623	3
2629	3
2631	3
2651	3
2711	3
2726	3
2727	3
2731	3
2823	3
2840	3
3029	3
4211	3
2006	2
2124	2
2347	2
2352	2
2353	2
2358	2
2396	2
2397	2
2398	2
2424	2
2466	2
2471	2
2474	2
2545	2
2584	2
2585	2
2606	2
2612	2
2632	2
2655	2
2656	2
2659	2

2660	2
2671	2
2672	2
2675	2
2706	2
2791	2
2805	2
2807	2
2809	2
2825	2
2827	2
2833	2
2835	2
2836	2
2843	2
2844	2
2869	2
2876	2
4215	2
1355	1
1875	1
2001	1
2052	1
2059	1
2306	1
2344	1
2345	1
2355	1
2359	1
2361	1
2371	1
2372	1
2381	1
2382	1
2386	1
2387	1
2399	1
2405	1
2406	1
2410	1
2426	1
2453	1
2462	1
2465	1
2472	1
2473	1

2490	1
2520	1
2588	1
2600	1
2624	1
2642	1
2643	1
2644	1
2646	1
2652	1
2653	1
2658	1
2668	1
2669	1
2701	1
2702	1
2703	1
2712	1
2715	1
2725	1
2737	1
2738	1
2751	1
2806	1
2808	1
2818	1
2828	1
2838	1
2839	1
2864	1
2868	1
2875	1
2878	1
2879	1
2898	1
2903	1
2904	1
2913	1
2914	1
3044	1
3059	1
3168	1
3198	1
3220	1
3429	1
3435	1

3644	1
4101	1
4106	1
4209	1
4212	1
4217	1
4218	1
4350	1
4390	1
4670	1
4814	1
4871	1
5076	1
1670	0
1730	0
2057	0
2129	0
2356	0
2401	0
2402	0
2404	0
2409	0
2607	0
2609	0
2611	0
2615	0
2626	0
2633	0
2648	0
2681	0
2707	0
2713	0
2714	0
2717	0
2739	0
2755	0
2797	0
2803	0
2834	0
2842	0
2873	0
2874	0
2905	0
2906	0
3000	0
3004	0

3006	0
3023	0
3026	0
3030	0
3043	0
3048	0
3064	0
3074	0
3076	0
3144	0
3161	0
3169	0
3170	0
3171	0
3173	0
3175	0
3179	0
3180	0
3189	0
3192	0
3205	0
3207	0
3215	0
3219	0
3228	0
3630	0
3691	0
3912	0
3936	0
4000	0
4012	0
4017	0
4030	0
4031	0
4032	0
4051	0
4066	0
4076	0
4102	0
4110	0
4113	0
4115	0
4127	0
4131	0
4157	0
4163	0

4170	0
4171	0
4172	0
4207	0
4213	0
4226	0
4271	0
4300	0
4310	0
4383	0
4500	0
4557	0
4558	0
4562	0
4567	0
4570	0
4572	0
4573	0
4660	0
4879	0
5009	0
5013	0
5015	0
5031	0
5042	0
5063	0
5069	0
5159	0
5160	0
5174	0
5417	0
6005	0
6017	0
6030	0
6056	0
6057	0
6059	0
6155	0
6163	0
6166	0
6280	0
7248	0
7320	0
0810	
0830	
1671	

1891	
2109	
2123	
2308	
2314	
2342	
2351	
2369	
2379	
2395	
2403	
2408	
2415	
2602	
2603	
2604	
2614	
2617	
2645	
2647	
2716	
2721	
2732	
2733	
2764	
2817	
2826	
2902	
2911	
2912	
3002	
3018	
3025	
3039	
3042	
3054	
3081	
3083	
3103	
3104	
3116	
3125	
3128	
3131	
3133	
3145	

3147	
3149	
3153	
3164	
3178	
3182	
3194	
3201	
3305	
3315	
3335	
3337	
3352	
3374	
3437	
3505	
3550	
3564	
3649	
3690	
3749	
3820	
3885	
3934	
3977	
4001	
4005	
4019	
4059	
4064	
4103	
4114	
4119	
4122	
4132	
4165	
4178	
4210	
4221	
4225	
4312	
4509	
4510	
4512	
4560	
4571	

4575	
4650	
4655	
4817	
4870	
5000	
5012	
5039	
5068	
5081	
5082	
5084	
5085	
5098	
5108	
5162	
5352	
6000	
6008	
6032	
6055	
6064	
6065	
6104	
6122	
6154	
6168	
6430	
6714	
7008	
7017	
7170	
7177	
7215	
7301	
7310	