



FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Members present:

Ms DE Farmer MP (Chair)
Miss VM Barton MP
Mr MJ Crandon MP
Mr CD Crawford MP
Mr DA Pegg MP
Mr PT Weir MP

Staff present:

Ms D Jeffrey (Research Director)
Dr M Lilith (Principal Research Officer)
Ms C Heffernan (Executive Assistant)

PUBLIC DEPARTMENTAL BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE HOLIDAYS AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2015

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, 15 JULY 2015

Brisbane

WEDNESDAY, 15 JULY 2015

Committee met at 9.46 am

BICK, Mr Bradley, Director, Work and Electrical Safety Policy, Office of Industrial Relations, Queensland Treasury

HOPGOOD, Mark, Principal Industrial Policy Officer, Industrial Relations Policy and Regulation, Office of Industrial Relations, Queensland Treasury

JAMES, Mr Tony, Executive Director, Private Sector Industrial Relations, Office of Industrial Relations, Queensland Treasury

MAHON, Mr Andrew, Acting Executive Director (Transport Access and Use), Transport Regulation Branch, Department of Transport and Main Roads

CHAIR: Good morning, gentlemen. I declare this public departmental briefing of the Finance and Administration Committee's inquiry into the Holidays and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 open. I am Di Farmer, the chair of the committee and the member for Bulimba. The other members of the committee are: Mr Michael Crandon, the member for Coomera; Mr Duncan Pegg, the member for Stretton; Mr Pat Weir, the member for Condamine; Miss Verity Barton, the member for Broadwater; and Mr Craig Crawford, the member for Barron River.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive information from the department about the bill which was referred to the committee on 3 June 2015. This hearing is a formal proceeding of the parliament and is subject to the Legislative Assembly's standing rules and orders. The committee will not require evidence to be given under oath, but I remind you that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. Thank you for your attendance here today. The committee appreciates your assistance.

You have previously been provided with a copy of the instructions for witnesses, so we will take those as read. Hansard will record the proceedings and you will be provided with the transcript. This hearing will also be broadcast. I also remind witnesses to speak into the microphones.

I remind all those in attendance at the hearing today that these proceedings are similar to parliament to the extent that the public cannot participate in the proceedings. In this regard I remind members of the public that under the standing orders the public may be admitted to or excluded from the hearing at the discretion of the committee.

I remind committee members that officers are here to provide factual or technical information. They are not here to give opinions about the merits or otherwise of the policy behind the bill or alternative approaches. Any questions about the government or opposition policy that the bill seeks to implement should be directed to the responsible minister or shadow minister, or left to debate on the floor of the House.

I also request that mobile phones be turned off or switched to silent mode and I remind you that no calls are to be taken inside the hearing room. I just ask the most senior officers from each department to make a brief opening statement. I suspect that all of you have been here before, but it is a different hearing room to the one we normally use. You would know that to speak into the microphone you press the button to your right which says 'speak'. I invite Tony to start.

Mr James: Chair, if it assists the committee, Mr Hopgood and I will deal with matters relating to the public holiday amendments and Mr Bick and Mr Mahon will deal with matters relating to high-risk work licences. By way of a brief introduction, the bill as it relates to public holidays responds to the government's election commitment to restore the Labour Day public holiday to the first Monday in May and to move the Queen's Birthday public holiday to the first Monday in October in the second half of the year to maintain the holiday in the second half of the year. The change, if passed, will take effect from 2016. The bill also makes consequential amendments to the Industrial Relations Act 1999 to reflect changes in the dates of those particular public holidays.

Mr Bick: Thanks for the opportunity to make an opening statement today. I am here to discuss what the proposed bill means in the context of high-risk work licences issued under the Work Health and Safety Act. A licence to perform high-risk work forms part of a nationally recognised system which authorises individuals to carry out particular classes of work. There are currently 29 high-risk work licence classes. Some examples include scaffolding, riggers, doggers and tower crane operators. We have approximately 260,000 workers in Queensland that currently hold a high-risk work licence, and each year we process approximately 30,000 new applications.

For an individual to obtain a licence they first attend a registered training organisation and get trained in a unit of competency and then they get assessed as competent. Following that process, they then attend an Australia Post outlet where they submit their application form, pay their fee, supply a passport sized photograph and actually have their identity verified by Australia Post staff. This bill includes amendments to transport legislation that will actually allow someone to apply for their high-risk work licence online rather than through attending an Australia Post outlet. In summary, the proposed amendments will extend the Department of Transport and Main Roads existing scheme for taking, keeping and recording digitised photos and signatures for transport licensing products and will allow Workplace Health and Safety Queensland to access these records and the department's card production processes for the purposes of issuing, renewing or replacing someone's high-risk work licence.

Implementing an online system will have a number of benefits for both workers and government. In particular, the new process will make it easier for workers to apply for a high-risk work licence, especially for those living in rural or remote areas or for those people who might be fly-in fly-out workers. Workers will save both time and money in no longer needing to attend an Australia Post outlet. In fact, it means a worker could apply for their licence 24 hours a day, seven days a week and at any location, whether that be from the comfort of their couch in Birdsville or from their employer's office on the Gold Coast.

In addition, it is also estimated for workers and employers savings of approximately \$1.6 million per year, and that is on the basis of not actually having to travel during work time and business hours to attend an Australia Post outlet or from purchasing a passport sized photograph. However, where an applicant does not currently hold a digital photograph or signature with the Department of Transport and Main Roads, they will need to attend a transport licence issuing centre to have this photo taken. But the good news is that once they have their photograph taken it can be used for future transport licensing products. For example, if someone is about to renew their driver's licence but a few months ago they went into a transport centre and had their photograph taken for their high-risk work licence, on that basis there would be no need for them to return to have their photograph taken to renew their driver's licence.

Government will also benefit from Workplace Health and Safety Queensland using the Department of Transport and Main Roads' existing processes and capabilities to process licences. The ongoing cost to administer the new scheme would be between \$1 million and \$1.2 million. On the basis of those costs, we are estimating savings in the range of \$690,000 to \$750,000 per year based on maintaining the current arrangements. So there are some savings for government in this process as well.

The online process will also reduce delays in processing applications, so there will be a faster, more efficient service for Queenslanders. There will also be a more robust identification and verification process by using the Department of Transport and Main Roads' secure processes which will significantly reduce the potential for identity fraud. So that is also good news.

In relation to consultation on the proposed amendments to the transport legislation, we have spoken to both representatives of employers and workers including the Chamber of Commerce & Industry Queensland, the Australian Industry Group, the Australian Workers' Union and also the Queensland Council of Unions. In addition, we have also consulted with the Office of the Information Commissioner and the Privacy Commissioner. That concludes my opening statement.

CHAIR: Thank you, Bradley. You have possibly answered most of the questions we had to ask you. Thank you for that very thorough opening statement. Mark, did you need to add anything to that?

Mr Hopgood: No, nothing.

CHAIR: We will now go to Andrew.

Mr Mahon: Good morning, Chair and committee members. Further to what Bradley has articulated already, the Department of Transport and Main Roads is in a very good position to provide this service on behalf of the office of high-risk work licences. The changes are customer focused.

Approximately 95 per cent of the adult population already has a TMR product, whether that be a driver's licence, an adult proof-of-age card or a marine licence of some description. We took approximately 850,000 images last financial year across our 183 centres, so that includes customer service centres, QGAPs and Queensland police centres that will issue driver's licence type products on behalf of TMR.

The same privacy standards will apply as we already apply to our TMR products. In preparing the bill that is before the House at present, we also consolidated some of those provisions that were across five different acts to put them into one place.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will go straight to questions. I would like to ask about the holidays bill. The explanatory notes talk about there being no significant financial impacts from the proposed amendments. I just want to go back to a house keeping question. The department had requested some extra time to look at the submissions we have that you will not have seen at this stage. So we have actually just agreed at our committee meeting that we will extend the time for response from the department to next Monday at two o'clock, just to give you time to look at those submissions. Some of the submitters—and you will have seen some of them already and there will be some that you will not have seen—have actually mentioned that the Queen's Birthday holiday will not be aligned with other jurisdictions. Some have referred to particular annual events that they have on over that weekend. Could you tell us whether you have conducted any analysis of potential costs to different industries or organisations?

Mr James: Thank you for the question. In regard to the financial impact directly relating to the movement of the public holidays, the explanatory notes indicate that there is no financial impact that is directly related to the shifting of public holidays. That is because we have not increased the number of public holidays. Effectively what we have done is exchange the Queen's Birthday weekend to October and then Labour Day back to May. So the government has not increased the number of public holidays. There is still the same number of public holidays available to Queenslanders. On that basis, there is no particular increase to the obligations in terms of paying for additional public holidays.

In terms of events, the government was aware of events in 2015, and if this bill is passed it will take effect in 2016. It was an election commitment of the government which was released in May 2013 to flag their intention, and there was a public statement by the Treasurer and Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations on 17 March to announce his intention to move the public holidays and that they would take effect in 2016. It was considered that that would give the community sufficient notice—and it was considered as very important to give sufficient notice to the community to make changes to its events.

CHAIR: For the committee's purposes, could you look at some of the specific instances that have been raised by submitters and in your response to us by next Monday actually make comment on the issues that they raise?

Mr James: We shall do that.

CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Mr CRANDON: Tony, you have probably partly answered this question. We note once again that there was no formal consultation. Is it that it was an election commitment and on that basis you did not go out to the marketplace and formally consult with, for example, the tourism industry and others? In particular, we have had a few submissions come to us from the west. I suppose the second part of the question is: did you give consideration to the results of the 2011 review in making a decision? So the first part of the question is: is it just on the basis that it was an election commitment that you thought, 'Oh well, there is no need for us to go out and have a yarn to anybody to see what impact it might have on them' or was there something else?

Mr James: Thank you for the question. It is a bit of a combination of both those things. First of all, there was a very clear policy position of this government to honour the real Labour Day, and that was their choice. So that was very clear about restoring Labour Day to the first Monday in May, and that is in recognition of particular specific events in Queensland's history. In 2011 there was a survey conducted, and the Queensland community responded very strongly to have a public holiday in the second half of the year. This bill seeks to maintain the community's desire to keep a public holiday in the second half of the year, and it also recognises the government's policy position to recognise Labour Day on the first Monday of May.

Mr CRANDON: Just coming back to that survey, was there an overwhelming preference for either the Queen's Birthday or the Labour Day weekend to be moved? What were the results, if it is possible for you to give us that?

Mr James: The discussion paper that was released directed to an online survey where the community could vote for and against proposals and make commitments in relation to the proposals. There were 24,505 people who responded to the survey. The results indicated: 85.4 per cent or 19,393 of 22,705 respondents supported moving the Queen's Birthday to the second half of the year; 82 per cent of 22,705 respondents agreed to move it specifically to the Monday in October; and the remaining 3.4 per cent agreed to move the public holiday but not to a Monday in October. That was the Queen's Birthday, but the question was directed around the Queen's Birthday.

Mr CRANDON: Can I just clarify that? Did you say that the question was directed towards the Queen's Birthday, so people were not given an option between the Labour Day public holiday—

Mr James: My recollection of that survey, Getting the Balance Right, was that it was directed towards the Queen's Birthday.

CHAIR: Could we see the results of the survey? Could you forward those to us?

Mr James: I can certainly look at our records and see what I have and forward whatever I have to the committee. It was an online survey at the time. I am sure that we would have records.

CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Mr PEGG: Mr James, I was hoping you might be able to provide the committee with a brief history of the changes to the two public holidays that are being amended in this bill.

Mr James: I can do that. The outline of the public holidays is in the explanatory notes. In 2011 the former Bligh government conducted a survey and made a policy decision to move the Queen's Birthday public holiday to the second half of the year. So in 2012 the then Labor government moved the Queen's Birthday holiday from the second Monday in June to the first Monday in October. The move was made after consultation. In 2013 the former LNP government moved the Labour Day public holiday from the first Monday in May, where it had been observed since the turn of the century, to the first Monday in October, and it moved the Queen's Birthday holiday back to the second Monday in June.

So what we have had over the last three or four years here is the Queen's Birthday shifted first from June to the second half of the year, and that was the decision of the government of the day. The previous administration of the day determined that it was the Labour Day holiday that could be moved, so it moved that to October, recognising that a holiday in the second half of the year was the desire of the community, and it shifted the Queen's Birthday back to June. What this bill seeks to do is to, again, put the Labour Day back to May and put the Queen's Birthday into the October break to maintain the holiday in the second half of the year, whilst recognising the significance of Labour Day.

Mr CRANDON: I note you talked in your comments there about the Labour Day weekend and how long it had been celebrated, if you like, on that May day. Could you provide us with a history of how long the Queen's Birthday weekend has been celebrated in the early part of June, both in Queensland and in the rest of Australia?

Mr James: Yes, I can give you a potted history, and I am also able to put further information to the committee. I know it is related to the birthday of George V and it was proclaimed upon his death, which was around 1953. If you bear with me, I will get the detail of that.

CHAIR: I think that is fine to give us that on notice, if you are fine with that.

Mr James: Okay,

Mr WEIR: Some submitters have noted that it is the business community's preference for the Queen's Birthday to remain in June. Many businesses have their head office in eastern Australia or have general dealings with other businesses in eastern Australia, so Queensland would be the only state at work on the second Monday in June and there are concerns that this would affect productivity. Could you explain what you believe the impacts would be?

Mr James: Thank you for the question. Public holidays are celebrated across Australia on various different days. It is not unique for one state to celebrate a public holiday and other states not celebrate on that day. There are numerous examples. I believe in Tasmania they celebrate a regatta day, there is a Melbourne Cup Day in Victoria, and Western Australia declares their public holiday for Queen's Birthday on a different day each year.

In terms of whether we did an analysis of the impact of that, the answer is, no, I have no direct analysis of that. As I said in the explanatory notes in terms of the financial impact, it was a straight exchange of days so the number of days has not increased at all in Queensland. It is clearly a position of the government that it was going to recognise Labour Day on the Monday in May, and it was also responding to the community's wishes to have a public holiday in the second half of the year and that holiday was taken to be the Queen's Birthday. I think that is where I will leave that.

Miss BARTON: Just following on from that question from Pat, I am conscious, coming from the Gold Coast, that particularly around the border there are some issues with different public holidays on different dates. Had you given any consideration to what the implications are for regions of Queensland that are on the border of Queensland and New South Wales? I am thinking of Coolangatta. What will the impact be for people who live in Queensland and work in New South Wales or vice versa? Also, what will the impact be not only on businesses but also on families and children attending school?

Mr James: Thank you for the question. First of all, the government certainly had consideration to the impact of the changes. In that regard it has announced that the changes, if passed, will take effect in 2016, so that gives the community sufficient notice or considerable notice and considerable lead time in order to become aware of and make whatever arrangements.

In terms of the differences in public holidays, as I said before, there are numerous public holidays celebrated across Australia and they do not line up directly. Certainly, in terms of the public holidays, Easter is a uniform day based on a religious calendar, Anzac Day is a particular day, Australia Day is celebrated on a particular day, but there are other days that are celebrated at different times. I think it is just the nature of living in a federation of states where states celebrate their holidays on different days. I think the Australian community is aware of and understands that. As I said, given the particular lead time is over a year, it is considered the community has time to adjust.

Mr CRANDON: I take your point that different holidays are celebrated at different times, but can I just read out some information for you that you might not be aware of about the Queen's Birthday weekend: in New South Wales it is the second Monday in June; in Victoria it is the second Monday in June; in Tasmania it is the second Monday in June; in South Australia it is the second Monday in June; in the Northern Territory it is the second Monday in June; in the ACT it is the second Monday in June; and in Queensland it is currently the second Monday in June. The only out-of-step state really is Western Australia that declares it at various times. Everybody else in Australia celebrates currently on the second Monday in June, so what you are saying about various dates being celebrated et cetera does not really hold true. Even when we look at the Labour Day weekend: in New South Wales, it is the first Monday in October; in Victoria it is the second Monday in March—

CHAIR: Perhaps you could summarise, Michael. We only have a certain amount of time left.

Mr CRANDON: Okay. I think it is important to put it on the record because of what Tony was just saying. In Tasmania it is the second Monday in March; in South Australia it is the second Monday in October; in the Northern Territory it is the first Monday in May; in the ACT it is the first Monday in October; and currently in Queensland it is the first Monday in October. Of course we then have the proposal. So there is some inconsistency with us going back to the way things were, if you like. Would you like to comment on that?

Mr James: You have got the dates for the public holidays correct. I would say that the proposed arrangements will achieve some consistency in observing the public holiday in the second half of the year, and I think that was the government's intent to recognise the Queensland community's desire for a public holiday in the second half of the year. That day will be the Queen's Birthday. As for Labour Day, there is a policy position of the government to celebrate Labour Day on Queensland's traditional day.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. I think we have probably explored that question. Craig, did you want to ask a question?

Mr CRAWFORD: Yes. Some of the councils have stated that they would like to have an opportunity to do the Queen's Birthday a bit like the show days, where they can pick whether they have it in June or October. Can you comment on that and whether that would be feasible or not?

Mr James: Yes, we were aware of that particular proposal and it was considered. The councils do have that capacity to pick a day for their agricultural show or other celebratory event, and that is used across the state. In terms of their capacity to move the Queen's Birthday, it was felt that the Queen's Birthday serves a purpose to provide a public holiday in the second half of the year in response to the community's strong desire which was expressed in that survey. Therefore, it was considered that it was not appropriate to allow that day to not be observed as a statewide public holiday.

CHAIR: We only have several minutes left and I want to ask Bradley about the high-risk work licences, and forgive me if you actually answered this in your introduction. The explanatory notes talk about the capital investment that will be required to enhance the IT systems. Could you advise the committee what the approximate capital investment will be?

Mr Bick: Thank you for the question. The initial establishment costs, and that is just the IT establishment costs, range between \$1.7 million and \$2.46 million. There will be ongoing costs of between \$1 million and \$1.2 million as well. I have actually got a table of costs that I can hand up to the committee as well that sets out the costs and the costs under the new system.

CHAIR: That would be really helpful. It has just been pointed out to me by the other members of the committee that in fact I have the timing wrong, so I beg your pardon, I do not mean to give you a panic about that. Michael, would you like to ask a question?

Mr CRANDON: Bradley, I had reason to look at my passport photo a few days ago, and it is very different from the face you are looking at now. I do not know whether it has something to do with the job I am doing now. Is there a time line on photos? Do they get to a point where they are out of date now and we need a new one?

Mr Bick: I might let Mr Mahon answer that question because it relates to the transport products.

Mr Mahon: You are correct in that it does have a time line. The image life for TMR products is 10 years. There is a small extension to 10 years and six months to enable someone to renew a licence or product twice for five-year periods. That is effectively a system based time frame. It allows the system that we use that does the facial recognition to recognise the person's image and so that the person's face does not change too much from the original image. The longest you would possibly have an image is about 10 years.

Mr PEGG: Mr James, I have a question following on from the question raised by the member for Broadwater about people who, for instance, live in Queensland and work in New South Wales and vice versa. I note the member for Barron River brought up the issue of show holidays. Isn't it the case that right across Queensland you would have a situation where, for instance, someone would live on the Gold Coast but work in Brisbane and so, therefore, the same scenario would occur? I am assuming it would occur up north and all throughout Queensland in relation to the show holidays.

Mr James: You are right, in terms of living in one area and observing a show holiday in another. I live on the Sunshine Coast. I work in Brisbane. The show holiday I observe is the one in Brisbane. Yes, the Queensland community does live with that inside the state in terms of living in one area and observing a holiday in the area where they work.

Mr WEIR: Just on the HRW licences. The explanatory notes do not provide any indication of privacy issues with regard to the sharing of that information between departments. Could you please advise if any privacy issues were raised and how they were addressed?

Mr Bick: Thank you for the question. As I stated earlier, we have met with the Office of the Information Commissioner and the Privacy Commissioner on a couple of occasions to discuss the proposal. I guess there are a couple of points to make. The existing privacy provisions or controls that are contained in the transport legislation with regard to how this information can be used, who it is shared with and when it is able to be shared and retained is not being changed in the legislation. So that primary act is staying the same. What we will be doing, due to the information privacy principles, is alerting everyone who applies for a high-risk work licence, the law that we are actually collecting the information under, for what purpose we are collecting it and also who we will share it with including third-party providers. For example, we will be sharing that information with Queensland Transport for the purposes of issuing a licence but then subsequently that information will be shared with the third-party card production provider. That will be all set up up-front in that collection notice. We will be liaising with the Office of the Information Commissioner to develop that notice subject to the legislation being passed in the House.

I should also say that the meeting with the Information Commissioner and the Privacy Commissioner did not raise any concerns regarding the proposal or any privacy or information sharing concerns. It was supported on the basis that this proposal sort of allows just one government agency to collect this information. So there are fewer government agencies collecting the same information. So they were supportive of it from that point of view.

CHAIR: On that, what happens if they do not want the information shared?

Mr Bick: As part of that process, they can elect not to have their photograph taken. The legislation basically says then that that would be referred to the administrator of the particular act they are applying for. So, for example, if someone had to go to a licensing centre and then refused to have their photograph taken, the DTMR would notify their regulator under the Work Health and Safety Act to let them know that that person had applied but had refused to have their photograph taken. That

being said, the five-year renewable photographic licences have been around for nearly 10 years—and I can come back to the committee on that exact time frame. It is not something that is foreign. The other situation is that this licence provides people with an opportunity to get their livelihood. So they are very engaged in the process, anyway.

Miss BARTON: Bradley, in your opening statement you gave us some very good detail about what the costs of implementation would be and what the savings would be. In terms of the person who would have the HRW licence, are you able to detail what the current cost is—and forgive me if there are different costs for different licences. If so, I am happy for you to use one or two as an example. I am after what the current cost is and whether or not there would be a reduction in the fee given that there is obviously going to be some savings associated with the production of the licence.

Mr Bick: At the moment the only government fee for the high-risk work licensing process is the actual application fee, and that is \$82.50. That lasts for five years and then there is a renewal fee of \$74.95. They are probably the two government fees that apply to the process. With the current process as it is, in addition to paying that fee, they have to pay approximately \$17 to have their photograph taken by Australia Post as part of this process. The online process will knock out that cost of having to have their photograph taken. We are estimating that to be about \$500,000 a year in savings for applicants who would be applying for that.

In relation to the estimated savings, at the moment we have used a range for savings of around \$690,000 to \$750,000 based on how much the final cost is for the IT build for the process. Government has agreed that those savings will be reinvested to pay back the costs of actually setting up the IT set-up in the first place. We will be using those savings to look at exploring bringing other licences on to this online process.

Mr CRAWFORD: The explanatory notes talk about other acts that might be added to the scheme. Could you talk about those, whether there are any other possibilities there?

Mr Bick: At the moment the acts that will join the scheme will actually be prescribed by regulation. That will occur obviously subject to passage of the bill. The Work Health and Safety Act will be the first act that will be added to that list, along with a number of other transport ones that are already in that system. Moving forward, we need to consult with our stakeholders in terms of what other licence products we could bring in online. We do issue a number of other licences to individuals such as an asbestos assessor or an assessor for high-risk work classes. They are individuals who are actually licensed by the regulator at the moment. The plan is to look at moving other licences on, but we will need to consult with our stakeholders before we do that. I do not know whether Mr Mahon wants to make any further comment on that question.

Mr Mahon: The bill has been set up as obviously enabling legislation. As Brad mentioned, via regulation we will be able to prescribe other types of products that TMR could produce on behalf of other departments if need be. While there are not any at the moment, there may be others in the future where using our card-producing mechanism might be an easier way for departments to issue different products. It has just been set up in that way and allows us to proclaim other products by regulation should other departments in the future wish to follow a similar process.

CHAIR: My question is to Bradley and Andrew. This seems like a very thorough and well thought through process. Can you tell the committee whether there have been any major concerns raised by any of the stakeholders or any concerns of any particular kind?

Mr Bick: We have consulted representatives of both employers and workers. Generally everyone was definitely supportive of the proposal because of the benefits that it provides to both employers and workers. The one question we did have from the AiG was around whether the process would be compatible with smart phone technology and tablet devices. A lot of the time people may not have a PC at home—whether that would be compatible. The system itself will be built on a platform that is compatible with all different operating systems. You will be able to do it on your tablet or Apple iPad from the comfort of your couch. I think that is good news as well.

CHAIR: Do any of the other committee members have further questions on either matters?

Mr WEIR: Who actually designated what is a high-risk industry? Who makes the guidelines? Are there going to be other ones added to it?

Mr Bick: The high-risk work licence system is actually agreed nationally. It is part of the harmonised model work health and safety laws. There was national agreement. Without being too technical, they developed a decision-making framework looking at the different types of risks that exist with operating different pieces of equipment and that went through the decision-making framework. Where they came in on the scale—there was a cut-off of where something required a

licence and where something does not. It is based on the risk of operating the equipment and the risk to members of the public from operating that equipment. With a tower crane, obviously you need to make sure that a person is very responsible and competent because the impact of a tower crane lifting something and falling over in the city can actually have very devastating effects.

CHAIR: Bearing in mind that we are scheduled to finish at 10.45, I think you have given us a very thorough submission. Thank you very much and your answers have been very useful. We will now conclude the public hearing. If members require any further information, we will contact you. Thank you very much for your attendance today and we appreciate your help. I declare this briefing closed. Is it the wish of the committee that the evidence given here before it be authorised for publication pursuant to section 50(2)(a) of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001? Thank you.

Committee adjourned at 10.26 am