Submission

No 25

INQUIRY INTO FOLLOW UP OF AUDITOR-GENERAL'S PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORTS OCTOBER 2009 TO SEPTEMBER 2010

Organisation:	Audit Office of NSW						
Name:	Mr Peter Achterstraat						
Position:	Auditor-General						
Telephone:	9275 7100						
Date Received:	4/11/2011						

Theme:

Summary





November 2011

Mr Jonathan O'Dea MP Chair Public Accounts Committee Parliament House Macquarie Street SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Mr O'Dea

Examination of Auditor-General's Performance Audit Report Injury Management in the NSW Public Sector

We have reviewed the submission provided by NSW Treasury concerning the recommendations in the above performance audit report.

Following tabling of the report, we were pleased that NSW Treasury accepted our recommendations - with one recommendation being accepted in part.

The submission indicates that NSW Treasury is making progress in implementing the recommendations, but the time target for one recommendation has not been achieved.

Please find attached our comments on the progress reported in relation to the relevant recommendations in our original report. We have not substantiated the submission.

In some instances, more information would be helpful to better understand what has been done to address our recommendations and the reasons for the delay.

I am happy to provide any further assistance the Committee may need in completing its examination.

Yours sincerely

Peter Achterstraat Auditor-General

Attachments

	Recommendation	Accepted or rejected	Reported actions	Due date	Reported status and comment	Our comments
H	The Department of Premier and Cabinet, NSW Treasury and WorkCover NSW release the proposed new <i>Working</i> <i>Together Strategy 2009-2012</i> by April 2010.	Accepted	The Working Together: Public Sector Workplace Health and Safety and Injury Management	April 2010	Completed	Completed
			<i>Strategy 2010-2012</i> was issued on 30 March 2010.			
12	Individual agencies set specific targets to reduce the: - Average cost of claims and incidence rate of claims in line with	Accepted	Continue to implement the <i>Working Together</i> <i>Strategy 2010</i> -		Completed <i>Working Together Strategy 2010-2012</i> sets targets for average cost of claims and incidence rate.	Response is satisfactory
	 relevant industry benchmarks Number of psychological injuries where appropriate Cost of premiums. 		2012.		In relation to the recommendation to set targets for psychological injuries where appropriate, the <i>Working</i> <i>Together Strategy 2010-2012</i> broadens this approach by requiring agencies to identify and target two priority areas.	
m	The Department of Premier and Cabinet require <i>Working Together</i> targets be included in chief executive performance agreements.	Accepted	Nil		Completed	Completed
4	Commencing in 2009-10, NSW Treasury require public sector agencies to: a) refer all alleged frauds to WorkCover NSW	Accepted	Direction under Section 9 of the Public Finance and Audit Act.	2009-10	Final quarter 2011 To be drafted	Action delayed. The PAC should expect the direction to be issued by December 2011. It would be helpful to know what the direction will include and the reason for the delay.

Performance Audit – Injury Management in the NSW Public Sector - NSW Treasury

-			nts							2		S	<u></u>	
	No action reported	The recommendation was rejected by NSW Treasury although it may be helpful to know whether:	 The review of annual reporting requirements in research of OH&S and worker's 	compensation flagged in the previous	Working Together Strategy 2005-08 has	occurred. It would be interesting to know	what the findings and recommendations	wêre.	 NSW Treasury will be reporting the 	interim/final results of the Working Together	Strategy 2010-12 in its Annual Report. If so,	will the report enable historical comparisons	across agencies and/or by sector and target?	
	This recommendation is contrary to	Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the number of disclosures required by the annual report regulations. This Cabinet	Red Tape Review.											
						· .	• •							
	II									-				
	Rejected						· · ·	· .						
	b)report performance against the	<i>Working Together</i> targets in their Annual Reports.												
		Rejected Nil 2009-10	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the number of disclosures required by the annual report regulations. This Cabinet	Ir Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the number of disclosures required by the Trea annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review.	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a Irr Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the The The number of disclosures required by the Treadinet annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe The Red Tape Review. Red Tape Review. The The	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a ir Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to readinet Rabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the number of disclosures required by the annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review. •	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a ir Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a ir Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the number of disclosures required by the annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review. Treat	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a ir Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to rir Reinet's 2009 decision to reduce the number of disclosures required by the number of disclosures required by the decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review. The number of disclosures required by the treated in response to the response to the Red Tape Review.	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a ir Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to rir Report Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the number of disclosures required by the trea annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review. ••••	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the The number of disclosures required by the Trea annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review.	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a Ir Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the number of disclosures required by the annual report regulations. This Cabinet decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review. •	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a Ir Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the The number of disclosures required by the Trea annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review.	ir Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the The number of disclosures required by the annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review.	Rejected Nil 2009-10 This recommendation is contrary to No a Cabinet's 2009 decision to reduce the The number of disclosures required by the Trea annual report regulations. This Cabinet whe decision was made in response to the Red Tape Review.