

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2019-2020

Questions taken on notice

Portfolio Committee No. 5 – Legal Affairs

MINISTER FOR COUNTER TERRORISM AND CORRECTIONS

Hearing: Wednesday 4 March 2020

Answers due for tabling by: Thursday 2 April 2020

ANSWERS

PORTFOLIO: COUNTER TERRORISM

Question (p10-11)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **How many staff have you got in counterterrorism?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I think we would need to take that on notice.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Seven?

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: There are staff with specific functions within Corrections but to some extent the whole of the Corrections custodial workforce and the whole of the Youth Justice workforce both have training and some degree of responsibility in trying to identify and call out for specialists any concerns they might have about extremist views emerging, the radicalisation of individuals. It is a difficult thing to quantify. We have got particular roles that are wholly devoted to—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Could we start with how many are in the Ministry as such?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: We will give you that data but I need to take it on notice.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Last year it was six, I think.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I am sorry?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Has it increased substantially?

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: I think we will take that on notice.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes, we will take it on notice. The elements of the cross-government strategy work in schools, work with non-government organisations through the COMPACT Program, the Step Together helpline, capability in youth justice, funds for future initiatives, training for frontline workers, so there are a lot of people involved in this.

Answer

I am advised:

In the Department of Communities and Justice, there are currently 17 funded roles within the Office of Community Safety and Cohesion, which works specifically on counter terrorism and countering violent extremism.

As part of a broad work program, staff within the Law Reform and Legal Services Division also provide legal policy advice and legal representation on counter terrorism matters, including applications under the *Terrorism (High Risk Offenders) Act 2017*.

Youth Justice NSW has a dedicated Countering Violent Extremism unit consisting of three staff. This team works towards countering violent extremism in both custodial and community settings across Youth Justice. In addition, over 1,000 Youth Justice staff have been trained in the Radicalisation and Extremism Awareness Program to recognise and report indicators of radicalisation.

In Corrective Services NSW, there are approximately 50 full-time positions across Offender Management and Programs, Security and Intelligence, and Community Corrections with specific functions directed towards counter terrorism and countering violent extremism. There are also a number of custodial staff attached to the High Risk Management Correctional Centre. Further, all Correctional Officers are required to undertake training and support initiatives in counter terrorism and countering violent extremism, including the Radicalisation and Extremism Awareness Program.

Question (p23)

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: **There are three big organisations: Lebanese Muslim Association, Australian Federation of Islamic Councils and the Australian National Imams Council. Have you met with those three big umbrella organisations?**

Ms WALKER: Certainly through the Office of Community Safety and Cohesion, we have been working with those groups. But I can get you the detail on notice of meetings with those groups.

Answer

I am advised:

The Office of Community Safety and Cohesion engages regularly with a number of Islamic organisations, including Lebanese Muslim Association, Australian Federation of Islamic Councils and the Australian National Imams Council. During 2019, the NSW government, through the Office of Community Safety and Cohesion invited Muslim religious leaders, Muslim women and young Muslims to participate in roundtable discussions. This engagement aimed to assist government to understand the challenges for diverse communities, ethnicities and cultures and the barriers that may exist for communities to engage with the government's Countering Violent Extremism program.

Question (p58)

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: **Do we know if there are any applications?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I do not know.

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: Could you take that on notice?

Ms WALKER: Yes.

Answer

I am advised:

As at 17 February 2020, 89 applications for funding under the Government's Community and Small Business CCTV fund had been received, 63 of which had been approved. These approved applications have a total value of approximately \$250,000.

The administration of the Fund is within the portfolio responsibilities of the Attorney General.

In relation to the questions preceding this specific question taken on notice, the NSW Police Force routinely engages with owners and operators of Crowded Places. Places of worship are defined as crowded places under Australia's Strategy for Protecting Crowded Places from Terrorism.

Questions relating to NSW Police Force engagement with owners and operators of crowded places should be directed to the Minister for Police.

Question (p58)

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: **That 60 per cent, did they identify background?**

Ms WALKER: I would have to go back to the report and have a look. We can get that for you on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

The COMPACT evaluation showed two thirds (66%) of young people participating in COMPACT programs reported a greater level of acceptance and respect for others. Data collection for the COMPACT evaluation included interviews and surveys of participants in COMPACT programs. Demographic data collected as a part of this process included age, gender, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status and language spoken at home. The results are publicly available in the appendices of the evaluation report, which can be found online on the Multicultural NSW website at

<https://multicultural.nsw.gov.au/other-publications/compact-evaluation>.

PORTFOLIO: CORRECTIONS

Question (p3)

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: I was just interested in the local area, Brewarrina and Ivanhoe. **Minister, how much money do you expect to save from the closure?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: The retirement of those facilities. Again, these are two of five facilities that are either no longer fit for purpose—and when I say fit for purpose, with respect to ongoing costs, at times, but importantly it is the delivery of services and ensuring that our staff work in safe environments.

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: Minister, it is a simple question: How much do you expect to save?

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: Over the forward estimates?

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: As a result of the closure of Brewarrina and Ivanhoe.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I think we will take that on notice. I do not have the figure to hand.

Answer

I am advised:

As published in the Report on Government Services 2020, the prisoner cost per day for open facilities is \$151.93.

The Brewarrina Centre has a capacity of up to 30 inmates and the Ivanhoe Centre a capacity of up to 50 inmates.

Question (p7)

The CHAIR: I was going to go to your risk management processes. It is good to get a recitation of all the places that did not burn. I take it that you lost no facilities or no significant capability. **If you know the answer, you might also give the Committee some idea of how many of your staff were engaged in Rural Fire Service volunteering.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: A large number of staff are volunteers of the Rural Fire Service. The exact number I would have to take on notice. Risk management mitigation strategies worked effectively. We established a command post over Christmas and New Year, with regular reporting on a two-hourly basis across the State and to me. We were always trying to be a step ahead of what was anticipated to happen, particularly when the state of emergency was declared, which obviously then gives the Rural Fire Service additional authority to force evacuate, which was done very collegially and very proactively. Particularly in relation to the Mannus Correctional Centre I have to say that while we fortunately did not suffer any losses we certainly continued to cooperate very productively with the Rural Fire Service and the local communities. Our premises, particularly in Glen Innes and Oberon, were used as areas for the Rural Fire Service to assemble and to store their vehicles and position their vehicles to fight fires in that particular vicinity.

Answer

I am advised:

Many Corrective Services officers volunteer for the NSW Rural Fire Service and NSW State Emergency Service. Data on the total number of staff involved is not available. However, local management support CSNSW staff in regard to access to flexible working arrangements and access to special leave to enable them to participate.

Question (p11-12)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: Commissioner Severin, I want to go back to the issue we were discussing prior to questions from my colleagues. You referenced the critical incident response report that you have. You said it found that the standards and procedures were consistently applied by your staff. That is good but it was not actually what I asked. **I asked if Mr Abdul Rahman had breached in any significant or insignificant way the terms of his intensive corrections order? Can you give me an answer to that question?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: As I said before, we will seek legal advice. If we are able to give you that advice, we will. The matter is still before the courts.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: That answer leaves me with the impression that there were breaches but you are not prepared to be forthcoming on that.

The Hon. NATALIE WARD: That is not what he said.

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: I did not say that. I said I will take—I am not going to jeopardise a serious case by giving information in a public space that could jeopardise a court case. The matter is before the courts. We will take advice. I am happy to take advice and if we are able to provide that information to you whilst the case is running, then we are happy to do that. But if the advice is no, we will have to wait until—

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: When we discussed this matter previously, you said that you would conduct a report, that the report would take two weeks and you repeatedly said that it would be publicly available. So I do not have a lot of confidence that this new advice you are receiving, that we are ever going to see that or ever see any results from this conversation.

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: Do not get me wrong. I am happy to make the report available to you. It is just the appropriateness of when I make it available to you.

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: You said you would make it available two weeks after—

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: No. I have not seen the exact—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Depending on legal advice, given the ongoing—

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **So how long is it going to take to get legal advice on this matter?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: I will take that on notice.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: Will you give a commitment now to come back to the Committee and give us the legal advice you have received in relation to this matter?

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: The legal advice will be privileged.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **Will you give a commitment that if the legal advice indicates that any part of the critical incident report can be released, perhaps with some elements redacted, that that will be publicly released?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: More than happy to. I am happy to oblige. I am here to cooperate with this Committee.

Answer

I am advised:

Legal advice is being sought. It is not known how long this will take.

Question (p14)

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: No, I am asking the question. You would have immediately taken action to rectify those problems. **Did you or the Department of Corrective Services improve or do anything since then?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: Now you are talking hypotheticals. How do you know there were problems?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Have you implemented all the recommendations? This is the question.**

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: There are thousands of people on ICOs. **We are asking you if you have made any changes based on the report that you have seen, which we have not seen, to give us confidence that that scheme, applicable to thousands of convicted criminals living in the community, is working as well as it can.**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: I will take that on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

No policy or systemic changes were required as a result of the report. Some improvements to practices were made.

Question (p15)

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: Again ICOs are being reviewed. At the request of our department and that of the Attorney General, the Department of Communities and Justice is undertaking a review in addition to all aspects of ICOs.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **When was that review commissioned?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: That review was commissioned—

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I would need to check the date but just prior to Christmas the Attorney General and the Minister commissioned our department to undertake a review of, after 18 months, the operation of the intensive correction order system. I might add as well that in addition to the commissioner reviewing the individual report that you are talking about, I reviewed it. I met with the people who wrote it. I have spoken on many occasions with the commissioner about the general operation of ICOs. There is oversight to ensure that the individual recommendations of that review and, indeed, any other critical incident reviews are implemented. There is an assurance process to ensure that recommendations that are accepted are acted upon. That holds true of this report as well.

Answer

I am advised:

23 December 2019.

Question (p17)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I accept you will not have the name and you may not even have the agency to hand. **Will you take on notice who gave the advice not to evacuate Lithgow Correctional Centre and when that advice was provided?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I have to take that on notice if there is any such thing as reconciling where the advice came from in detail.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **And when the advice was delivered? When the final decision was made not to evacuate or when the issue was considered and the decision was taken not to evacuate.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: The issue was considered throughout the whole fire threat. It is a very continuous process.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Will you provide that detail on notice, Commissioner?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: We will.

Answer

I am advised:

During the 2019/20 bushfires, CSNSW Superintendent of the Fire Safety and Environmental Risk Management Group gave advice not to evacuate inmates from Lithgow Correctional Centre.

The decision was based on advice received from the NSW Rural Fire Service and the Centre's Local Emergency Plan.

A Corrective Services liaison officer was also temporarily stationed at the Rural Fire Service headquarters in Sydney to ensure the timely sharing of critical information.

The situation continued to be monitored throughout the 2019/20 bushfires.

It is difficult to confirm dates as the situation was very fluid and was constantly being reassessed during the 2019/20 bushfire season.

Question (p19)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That is 1,000 less participants in vocational training. **What went wrong and why were there 1,000 less inmates engaged in vocational training in the 2018-19 calendar year than there were in the year before? What went wrong?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I am happy to provide more detail on notice but we have two vocational education training providers. About 30 per cent of the work, I think, is delivered by TAFE and the advice I have is that we had some issues to work through with TAFE in that year. As a former managing director of TAFE, I do not want to be deprecating of TAFE at all. I have not had a full brief on what the issues were but I have had a brief to suggest that the issues were current in 2018-19 are being rectified in the current year and we can expect to see an increase in the number of people undertaking vocational education and training in the current year. But I do make the point that in 2018-19, 1,200 more people undertook vocational education and training than in the last year prior to the changes.

Answer

I am advised:

In the period 1 July 2019 to 30 December 2020, the number of participants in Vocational Training Programs was 2,544, which is consistent with participation in the same period in 2018/19 (2,538).

TAFE NSW does not have the resources, i.e. available trainers, to meet the request for vocational training programs to be delivered in CSNSW. There has also been some impact due to changes in accessing Smart and Skilled subsidies.

Question (p19-20)

Commissioner SEVERIN: —actually much higher than it ever was, and the number that complete is higher than it was before the reform. The people who are enrolled are going to complete. When you look at the point in time—and, again, the detail of which I have to take on notice—they might complete in the following counting period because a course takes time to complete. So we found our data often had too short a period to look at. Even when a course starts in June, you might be in the enrolled number but not in the complete number because the course goes through until September, for example.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: This data is not about completion. **Your obviously cannot complete if you do not participate. They are not even participating. More than half of the inmates enrolled in 2018-19 are not even participating, let alone completing.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: **No, once you enrol you actually participate—again, the detail of which I am happy to take on notice.** We would not enrol inmates in courses—I mean, it might happen if somebody has to transfer very quickly.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Commissioner, I will read to you the answer that the Minister gave to a question taken on notice after the last set of budget estimates hearings. You can then put to the Committee the mysterious explanation of it. The Minister stated:

In 2018-19, the number of inmates participating in vocational training was 4,139. In the same period, 8,440 inmates were enrolled in one or more vocational training programs.

[The Minister returned.]

Commissioner SEVERIN: **Again, the detail of which I take on notice in terms of the explanation of what the enrolment vis-a-vis participation means.** For me, it is about you enrol, you participate and that is the norm unless you actually have to move somewhere, which is not something that would happen to 4,500 people. There are obviously situations where you might enrol somewhere, then you have to transfer somewhere else.

Answer

I am advised:

The question was responded to later in the hearing. Refer to Page 66 of the Transcript:

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: You were querying why there were 8,440 enrolments but only 4,139 people participating and we could not give you a good answer then. The simple answer is participants are unique individuals, enrolments are the number of courses they enrol in, and from that you can conclude that most people enrol in at least two courses. So participants are the number of individual people; enrolments, they are decisions about the courses they take on.

In addition: see Table 1 in attachment 4.

An individual inmate may be enrolled in a number of Vocational Training courses and most inmates are enrolled in at least two courses depending on their work locations. However, a participant is only counted once (i.e. they are not counted as a participant for every course they are undertaking).

Question (p23)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **What percentage of serious sex offenders on parole, or having completed their sentence and now living in the community, are you electronically monitoring?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: The actual percentage details I have to take on notice. However, there has been change in government policy and legislation that requires, as a condition of parole, all serious sex offenders to be subject to electronic monitoring.

Answer

I am advised:

43 per cent. There are 218 serious sex offenders on electronic monitoring out of a total of 509 serious sex offenders on parole as at 26 February 2020.

Question (p24)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **How many, if any, offenders have removed their electronic devices?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: It is 18 out of 1,011. In the 12 months to February 2020 eighteen offenders had removed their tracking device. Of course the system registered that and people responded.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **And so all of those 18 have now been reapprehended and prosecuted?** As the Minister said, there is a breach.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: It is a breach. I would have to take on notice what the response to them removing their devices was.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **Minister, do you have any information on that, for those 18 individuals?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: No, but 18 out of—

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: It is 1,011.

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: That is 1,011 people that in the past would not have been monitored. This is like having a corrections officer following you around 24/7, right? To remove that is very serious and again it is a breach. With respect to the 18 offenders I am happy to take that on notice to get the outcomes as to what that breach of parole resulted in.

Answer

I am advised:

The question was responded to later in the hearing. Refer to page 63 of the transcript:

Commissioner SEVERIN: Every single one of them, to answer the question that we took on notice, has been re-incarcerated.

Question (p27-28)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: They showed dreadful results, and it is part of a pattern here which has seen recidivism rates deteriorate by 25 per cent over the last decade. The Premier comprehensively failed to meet the 5 per cent target of a reduction in recidivism. It is all going the wrong way, Mr Coutts-Trotter.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: The BOCSAR data is the BOCSAR data. The number of hours of evidence-based programs that have been delivered inside prisons have risen very significantly in the last two years. The targeting of the right people is happening as the prison environment changes and it makes it easier to do that. You would take issue with the investment in education, but we see real effect there, getting to people with foundational problems in literacy and numeracy—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Mr Coutts-Trotter, I will allow you on notice to give me any hard data—I repeat: any hard data—that shows an impact on reduced recidivism, and impact on inmates' successful integration in society.**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Okay.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Any hard data that there has been improvement as a result of the \$330 million that has been allocated since 2016.**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: Can I ask—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Can you give me that or can you do it on notice?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: I am happy to do it. The commissioner, I think, has the figures for you now.

Commissioner SEVERIN: These are the figures just on the effort or the improvement that has been occurring since 2016-17 to the last financial year. Just to quote a number or the figures there, the number of programs—this is criminogenic programs—has risen from 371 in 2016-17 to 712.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Commissioner, I do not mean to interrupt, but I was actually talking about outcomes—not effort, outcomes—so **I am not interested in the number of people you have got involved in programs that do not seem to be working. I am interested in the impact on inmates.**

Answer

I am advised:

The benefits of the Strategy to Reduce Reoffending initiatives are expected to be evident during 2020-2021 and beyond. The work being undertaken under the Premier's Priority is expected to further contribute to reducing recidivism.

Evidence of the impact of the Strategy to Reduce Reoffending will come from the findings of robust outcome evaluations. To ensure robust outcome evaluations can be undertaken, the initiatives need sufficient time to be fully implemented and mature. They also need offenders who participate in these programs to have at least 12 months in the community following release from prison to establish if there is an impact on reoffending.

It can take a number of years to evaluate the impact of programs and interventions delivered within a prison or community corrections setting.

The elements of the Strategy to Reduce Reoffending are based on a solid historical evidence base that demonstrates that the CSNSW approach to treatment and supervision can reduce re-offending. Relevant studies are summaries in the attached Table in Attachment 1.

Question (p28)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Are you aware of the fact that there has been an ongoing discrimination-victimisation claim made regarding one of the officers involved in that death which has direct relevance to that officer's conduct regarding Mr Dungay on the day that Mr Dungay died?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I am aware, having been at the findings delivery by the Deputy Coroner, that there was certainly a finding made that there was no misconduct that warranted disciplinary action in the coronial hearing.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That was not my question, Commissioner.

Commissioner SEVERIN: I am aware that family members obviously have a different view in relation to individuals involved. It is not incumbent on me to re-prosecute a matter that has been dealt with in a proper process.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Are you aware that the issues raised in that discrimination complaint have been lodged? Are you aware of any of the issues regarding the alleged conduct of one of those officers being raised in the coronial investigation?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I am not aware of the lodgement of the discrimination claim. I am not aware of that. I am certainly aware, based on the investigation, based on the coronial inquest, of the whole scenario that unfolded on the day.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Will you take that on notice?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I certainly can, yes

Answer

I am advised:

I have received advice about this matter. Issues raised by a member of staff were addressed by senior Corrective Services NSW management.

I understand that a complaint has subsequently been made to an external agency and is in the confidential phase of the process.

Question (p29)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: No. It is a little over 2,000. **In terms of the number of beds for privately operated prisons, what are the numbers of beds, and that includes the newly completed facilities? What are the bed numbers, and the breakdown between public and private?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: Can I take that on notice, please?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Yes.

Answer

I am advised:

Please see Table 2 in attachment 4.

Question (p30)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Well, before we go to the programs can we just get the data? Do you have data on the number of women prisoners on remand who have dependent children? I will ask the same about sentenced women.**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: Can we take that on notice?

Commissioner SEVERIN: I have got some numbers here.

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: There are some numbers, Commissioner Severin?

Commissioner SEVERIN: But they are not—

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: It does not differentiate sentenced women from remanded women.

Answer

I am advised:

Please see Table 3 in Attachment 4.

Question (p34-35)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **Commissioner, how many times has the Special Operations Group been onsite at Parklea since last year?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I would have to take that on notice.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **Could you give us a sense, is it there every day, every week?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Certainly not. What we did do is we had support from the special operations group for a period of time where they were literally, at my request, there for the initial embedding of routines and other processes. We cannot forget that Parklea up until now was a building site of significance. Having the Special Operations Group there was additional insurance. That has ceased a while ago.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **When did that cease?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I need to take the exact date on notice but quite a while ago, a few months ago. Right across the system they assist any of our operations as required.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: Of the \$330 million, Minister, that has been referenced variously out of the 2016 reducing reoffending package, as of June last year only \$156 million of that had been spent. **Of that \$330 million announced in 2016, what is the latest figure of how much has been spent.**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: As of now?

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: Yes.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I am sorry, I do not have that figure to hand but we can provide it on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

Between mid-August to early December 2019, the Security Operations Group (SOG) spent approximately twelve weeks on-site at Parklea Correctional Centre.

Since mid-December 2019, two of the SOG K9 Units were onsite when needed, mainly for screening visitors. Each request can be up to three days a week and this has been a fee for service from Corrective Services NSW.

The K9 Units will maintain this presence at the centre until MTC Broadspectrum's dog handlers have successfully completed their training.

Question (p35)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: Of the \$330 million, Minister, that has been referenced variously out of the 2016 reoffending package, as of June last year only \$156 million of that had been spent. **Of that \$330 million announced in 20176, what is the latest figure of how much has been spent?**

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS: As of now?

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: Yes

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I am sorry, I do not have that figure to hand but we can provide it on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

As at the end of February 2020, \$207 million had been spent on the reducing reoffending package by the former Department of Justice and the Department of Communities and Justice.

Question (p35)

The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE: In response to that, **how many inmates have been taken out to hospital who have self-harmed from these two locations?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I will have to take that on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

In 2018/19, one offender from Surry Hills was transported to hospital due to a self harm incident.

During the same period, six offenders from Amber Laurel Correctional Centre were transported to hospital due to a self harm incident.

Question (p37)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **Which university is doing that and are any time frames available?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Again, EQUIPS, as I mentioned before, is very much part of that story, as it clearly is. We are also looking at drug treatment other than EQUIPS. We have other addiction programs. We had 1,900 participants. A total of 2,976 inmates benefited from a one-to-one brief intervention as well. All of that is part of the cohort that will be evaluated in the context of drug and alcohol misuse.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **Do you have information then, Commissioner, about which university is undertaking that and/or—**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I need to refer to my—

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: That is okay. You could take on notice a time frame for that.

Commissioner SEVERIN: I definitely have to take the time frame on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

The evaluation referred to relates to the Practice Guide for Intervention (PGI) and EQUIPS programs and specifically the relationship between dose-response and re-offending.

That evaluation is being conducted by Swinburne University and the scheduled completion date is December 2020.

Question (p38)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **Do you have a figure or a percentage figure of women who are in that particularly acute situation?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I would have to take that on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

In the past 12 months there were 1,140 women who had mental health interventions by psychologists. Of these interventions there were 68 women in Mental Health Screening Unit and a further 60 in the Mum Shirl Unit with acute mental illness. The rest of the interventions have been state wide and related to sub-acute mental illness.

Question (p39)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Can you remind me, Commissioner, **what the original budget for the construction cost for the facility was? Was it \$700 million or was it \$798 million? What was the original budget for it?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I will have to take the detail of that on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

The contract to build the Clarence Correctional Centre is overseen by Infrastructure NSW.

I am advised the budget for construction is \$798.8 million. This includes \$700 million for the build (this is on budget) and \$98.8million for planning procurement, water and power and road upgrades.

The total cost of the operations contract for Clarence Correctional Centre is approximately \$2.3 billion for the 20 year concession period.

Question (p39)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **I think the whole-of-life contract has got something there of \$2 billion plus, but the actual cost for constructing the project has been variously cited at \$700 million or \$798 million, through statements from the Minister.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: If I can take that detail on notice. I am not disputing the fact that you are right, the figure does ring true, but if I confirm the figure and if it is not entirely accurate, I would much rather take-

Answer

I am advised:

The contract to build the Clarence Correctional Centre is overseen by Infrastructure NSW.

I am advised the budget for construction is \$798.8 million. This includes \$700 million for the build (this is on budget) and \$98.8million for planning procurement, water and power and road upgrades.

The total cost of the operations contract for Clarence Correctional Centre is approximately \$2.3 billion for the 20 year concession period.

Question (p39)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **If you can get those figures: the original budget for the construction, what the current estimated cost will be for the completion of the construction, and then if you could also provide on notice the overall amortised cost of what the contract is, and I think that is in the order of \$2 billion plus. If you can provide it this afternoon that would be great. ...**

Answer

I am advised:

The contract to build the Clarence Correctional Centre is overseen by Infrastructure NSW.

I am advised the budget for construction is \$798.8 million. This includes \$700 million for the build (this is on budget) and \$98.8million for planning procurement, water and power and road upgrades.

The total cost of the operations contract for Clarence Correctional Centre is approximately \$2.3 billion for the 20 year concession period.

Question (p41)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Can you provide on notice what the base rate payment for Serco is anticipated to be in the first financial year of its operation?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I can provide on notice, and I think it is on the public record, the cost that we are contracting to. I cannot guarantee that it is for the first 12 months. If we need to bring more beds online—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I understand that. **Whatever the base fee is.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Yes, I can do that.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Excluding the variables, based upon inmate numbers.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Yes, I can do that.

Answer

I am advised:

Corrective Services NSW does not calculate or report costs per prisoner for individual correctional facilities.

Question (p42)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That is what I am asking you to answer on notice—**where those other beds are: for the ones that are online, when they came online; and the ones that are due to come online, when they will come online.**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes, sure.

Commissioner SEVERIN: We are certainly very happy to provide all that detail, facility by facility.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That would be appreciated.

Answer

I am advised:

Please see Table 4 in Attachment 4.

Question (p42-43)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Sorry, so **is payment for the Clarence facility part of the \$3.8 billion program?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: No.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **So what is the total cost of the program then?**

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Could you give us the breakdown of the capital expenditure on private and public prisons as best you can—what is anticipated for this financial year and what happened last financial year?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Yes.

Answer

I am advised:

Please see Table 5 in Attachment 4.

Question (p43)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **What is the current rate of pay for those workers?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: It is a sliding scale. The minimum is \$15.50 per week, which is an unemployment rate. That goes up—and, again, I will take the detail of the breakdown of that scale on notice— but the rate goes up to about \$45 or \$50.

Answer

I am advised:

Inmate weekly wages vary from \$17.82 to \$70.29. Inmate wages vary based on the type of work undertaken (commercial or non-commercial) and the location or centre (standard institution or remote locations such as camps). An unemployment payment of \$15.50 per week is paid to inmates who are willing and able to work but for whom work is not available.

Question (p44)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **What I am interested in is what is the additional pay rate? What do inmates get paid for working?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I will take that on notice.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **The figures that I had earlier were that it is somewhere between \$24.60, or about \$25 a week additional, up to about a bit over \$70 a week additional.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: And my \$40-odd would be the average. It sounds right but I will take the detail on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

Inmate weekly wages vary from \$17.82 to \$70.29. Inmate wages vary based on the type of work undertaken (commercial or non-commercial) and the location or centre (standard institution or remote locations such as camps). An unemployment payment of \$15.50 per week is paid to inmates who are willing and able to work but for whom work is not available.

Question (p45)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Perhaps—rather than use the term "profit"—**what is the revenue generated by Corrective Services Industries anticipated to be this financial year, what was it in the past three financial years, what was the cost of running Corrective Services Industries and what is it anticipated to be?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Sure.

Commissioner SEVERIN: Yes, we will take that on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

Please see Table 6 in Attachment 4.

Question (p45)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I want to ask you a bunch of questions to do with disability inclusion and what is going on with, particularly, people in prison. Some of this is basic numbers. **Are you able to tell the Committee how many people in the corrective system have a diagnosed disability?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I have to take that question on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

As at 10 March 2020, there are 1,341 (9.6% of the inmate population) inmates with a range of disabilities known to CSNSW State Disability Services. These inmates have 2,079 confirmed disabilities.

As at 10 March 2020 there were 35,409 offenders having some form of community corrections contact, of whom 1,473 or 4.3% are known to have a disability.

Question (p46-47)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That was really getting to my next question which is that—700 is a very small proportion of people who you would identify as having a disability being within the system. **I am interested in those that do have packages and how that is integrating during incarceration. For example, someone with a disability who has their own wheelchair would bring that in. There has obviously previously been EnableNSW. How is that operating post-NDIS and what is the seamless transition, particularly for people who are exiting custody, to ensure that they are not actually left in a hole if they are exiting and their NDIS supports are not lined up? Is there support for prisoners who are in that situation?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: We recognise that there is inconsistency in planning processes, not just for people inside custody but for people generally. The first task is to try and bring some consistency to the planning process. We had a period there in the early maturity of the scheme where, in some areas, NDIA planners would not make a plan while someone was in prison even though we had a release date.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is a significant problem. Has that been resolved?

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I think it has largely been resolved. I could not hand on heart say there are not still occasions where we have to escalate that issue, but I think the NDIA has significantly improved its capability and processes so that planning process is better done. I do not want to be glib about it so perhaps I could take the question on notice and give you a more complete status position of where we think we are on this.

Answer

I am advised:

State Disability Services, CSNSW, prioritises offenders with up to six months left to serve prior to their Earliest Release Date or Latest Release Date, as well as those offenders who are brought to the attention of State Disability Services by internal or external stakeholders (e.g. Public Guardian) and the referral is deemed urgent.

State Disability Services also prioritises offenders with a cognitive impairment as the most vulnerable and least likely to be able to undertake the National Disability Insurance Scheme Access Process independently on release.

Inmates on remand are not a priority for State Disability Services due to the risk that they will be released from custody prior to a) an access request form being completed or b) access being met by the National Disability Insurance Scheme. Once an inmate has been released to the community there is no means of transferring the referral process to another service provider for continuity of care. Thus, if the National Disability Insurance Scheme is not able to contact the potential participant, the process will be abandoned.

Question (p47)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you for that. I look forward to that. **Within the Disability Inclusion Action Plan, which used to be the Department of Justice's, has it been updated since the machinery of government changes?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: No. It is in the process of being updated.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Thank you. My last question really is probably one for Mr Coutts-Trotter. Given that you are redoing your Disability Inclusion Action Plans, which will obviously be across the whole cluster. There was previously, I think, a Justice disability strategy.

Answer

I am advised:

Corrective Services and other justice services will be included in the overall DCJ Disability Inclusion Action Plan (DIAP). Work has commenced to review current DIAPS and to bring them together into a consolidated DIAP for the cluster.

The DCJ DIAP will be available from 1 July 2020, pending any changes required as a result of the NSW Government response to COVID19.

Question (p47)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is okay. Corrective Services only had one thing within that plan, which is to conduct disability awareness training for staff working with offenders in the community. **Are you able to provide the Committee with how many people were trained under that or have been trained under that commitment?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I have to take that on notice. Certainly the training has happened and is ongoing but the exact number -

Answer

I am advised:

In 2019:

- 118 participants attended the full day Disability Awareness Workshop.
- 800 custodial staff attended the Disability Awareness Session of the Custodial Primary Training and equated to 27 groups of new staff.
- Three training sessions were co-facilitated by State Disability Services and National Disability Insurance Agency for Community Corrections Staff (numbers of participants not recorded).
- 15 staff of South Coast Correctional Centre (Services and Programs Officers and Justice Health) attended a co-facilitated session by State Disability Services and National Disability Insurance Agency.
- 66 participants completed the National Disability Insurance Scheme eLearning module.

On average, State Disability Services trains 820 staff each year, including 600 in correctional centres and 220 in the community, to effectively manage offenders with disabilities. This assists with identifying and providing people with disabilities access to services and programs in correctional centres and community locations across the state.

Question (p47)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: There is no trick to it. I am just making sure I am talking to you about the same thing. There is no "gotcha" here. I am just asking you. It is quite a detailed operational policy which really tells your staff about what to do through the screening process as people come into custody. **The first thing I wanted to ask is that there is a lot of—Statewide Disability Services [SDS] is obviously the support staff that are in place. Are you able to tell me how many people are in that unit?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Again, I will take the exact number on notice, ...

Answer

I am advised:

Statewide Disability Services has 17 FTE staff:

- One Senior Psychologist
- Six Psychologists
- One Manager
- One Senior Services and Program Officer
- Six Services and Program Officers
- One Senior Neuropsychologist and
- One Neuropsychologist

Question (p48)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: **Are you able to tell me—you can take this on notice—the services that you used to have, the services that you now have as a result of this and what transitional arrangements, if any, are there?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: From one to the other?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes.

Commissioner SEVERIN: There has clearly has the secretary alluded to, been some implementation issues and issues that we have to deal with the NDIA. It was not as smooth, particularly for that cohort of disabled persons.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: The other point, of course, is that with with (sic) the NDIS only 10 per cent of people with disability actually will get a package.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: That is right.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am assuming that—well, I do not need to assume. Many people within the prison system will never get a package but they still have a disability. My concern is whether previous services that were provided were wider and were able to pick those people up—as I believe they were—and whether we are now creating a gap. If you can come back to me on that, that would be great.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes."

Answer

I am advised:

State Disability Services is the agency lead for the identification and management of offenders with disabilities including the completion of the Access Request Process for participation in the National Disability Insurance Scheme and subsequent planning processes. This is a similar process to that developed for referrals to the former Department of Ageing, Disability and Home Care but now allows for a broader scope of eligibility. From July 2016 to December 2019, State Disability Services completed 817 Access Request Forms for inmates with a cognitive impairment, approximately 90% of these have been successful applications for the scheme.

Of the 493 inmates currently in custody who were known Department of Ageing, Disability and Home Care clients, CSNSW is aware that 109 have received National Disability Insurance Scheme funding. It is not known how many of the remaining 384 actually have National Disability Insurance Scheme funding and have not provided this information to CSNSW; how many have applied for funding and were not accepted on National Disability Insurance Agency (CSNSW has had 92 unsuccessful applications for National Disability Insurance Scheme access), and how many have not consented to submitting National Disability Insurance Scheme access requests.

Question (p50)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: **On the issue of disability advocacy within prison, what access do people in prison have to that, or does it all go through SDS?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Again, the detail of what services they receive or which agencies or other disability interest groups support prisons I have to take on notice. But there is no impediment to an organisation that has a professional relationship with an offender coming in as a professional visitor to see that particular offender.

Answer

I am advised:

Offenders with confirmed or suspected cognitive impairment have access to the Justice Advocacy Service for support as victims, witnesses or defendants in legal matters with police interviews or during court procedures.

Some advocates attend correctional centres to visit inmates such as Spinal Cord Injury Australia.

Question (p51)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: That is sort of person by person. I am interested too about whether you have oversight, a snapshot. **Of those who are in solitary confinement, is there a massive over-representation of people with disability because, to me, that goes to all the other questions I have asked, which are: What support? Are they being identified? I do not know whether there is a problem or not, but there have been problems in schools and a whole range of other places so I do not know why it would not be the case here. I am just wondering whether we can work that out.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I will take that on notice, thank you.

Answer

I am advised:

On 3 March 2020, there were 20 inmates on a segregation order who had a cognitive impairment.

Question (p51)

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: **Can you just tell me how all of that is going to fit together?**

Maybe Ms Walker can tell me.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Can I give you a response on notice?

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: Yes, sure.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Thank you.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: **And with the time frame of when you think that will be completed.**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes, you bet.

The Hon. PENNY SHARPE: I am trying to work out where it is up to but also whether disability organisations will have the ability to have some input into that.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes, of course.

Answer

I am advised:

Corrective Services and other justice services will be included in the overall DCJ DIAP. Work has commenced to review current DIAPS and to bring them together into a consolidated DIAP for the cluster.

The DCJ DIAP will be available from 1 July 2020, pending any changes required as a result of the NSW Government response to COVID19.

Question (p51)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: You are going to give us the details for that—**what the projected outcome is for this year and what the differential was going back to the financial year 2017.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Yes.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: You will provide that on notice?

Commissioner SEVERIN: Yes.

Answer

I am advised:

Please see Table 6 in Attachment 4.

Question (p52)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Commissioner, **could you provide on notice, if there is a policy, a copy of the policy that governs the contracting with third parties as well as a list of the contracts that are currently with third parties for those external suppliers.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Can do, yes.

Answer

I am advised:

Please refer to the attached policy documents in attachments 2 and 3.

Question (p53)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: That is it—Brush Farm at Eastwood. **How many trainees were taken through the academy in the last two full financial years, do you know?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: The detail of that I have to take on notice. There were a lot but we have been full at every time. We also train in the regions obviously. We have a training sub-academy at Tomago. We have been training extensively at Bathurst, at Cessnock, Wellington—

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I will do this in two parts. **Can you tell me the facilities where the training happens for new correctional officers?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I can give you the overall numbers but the breakdown of where they were trained I have to take on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

Primary training is held at the Brush Farm Corrective Services Academy in Eastwood and its regional campus in Tomago. However, Corrective Services NSW has the capacity to undertake training at locations in other facilities including: Mid North Coast, Cessnock, Bathurst, Dillwynia and Wellington Correctional Centres, the Long Bay Correctional Complex and the Mark Simmons Firing Range.

Question (p53)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Commissioner, I might ask you a series of questions. **Could I ask you to provide the answers both about the CSO training, the correctional services officer training, and the community corrections officer training?** They are the two major cohorts that I am inquiring into. You have given the numbers, and I am thankful for that, for the 2018-19 financial year and the budgeted numbers for this current financial year. **If you have them to hand, could you give us the two prior financial years? If you have not, can you take it on notice—**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I do not have them. We can take it on notice.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Again, in respect of each of those categories could you provide us with the actual completion rate, the proportion who completed?** I think you indicated—

Commissioner SEVERIN: No, that was the satisfaction rating. The completion rate we will provide separately.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **Again, for the two categories of officers and for each of those financial years. The last is the retention rate of those officers, if you can—12 months and 24 months in.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Yes.

Answer

I am advised:

Please see Table 7 in Attachment 4.

Question (p54)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **What was the cost of it?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I would take that on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

The CAPEX cost for the Illawarra Reintegration Centre (IRC) refurbishment project was \$4.17m.

Question (p55)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **How many inmates was it planned for?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: It is about 45 on average. Again, the exact number we will provide on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

The Illawarra Reintegration Centre (IRC) had a maximum operational capacity of 60 male minimum security beds.

Question (p59)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: **Could you take on notice providing an updated figure?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: Yes.

Answer

I am advised:

For beds placed in the system since 2013 and currently in operation:

- Operating as two out cells / designed as single cells: 931
- Operating as three out cells / designed as two out cells: 183
- Operating as four out cells / designed as two out cells: 22

Question (p61)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Who is the contract with?

Commissioner SEVERIN: The contract is with a company called Buddi, a United Kingdom-based organisation. We have previously had the equipment contract with Buddi. It now also has the contract for the physical monitoring of the monitors but it is always under supervision of Corrective Services NSW employee.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **What is the value of that contract with Buddi?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I need to take that on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

The value of the contract with Buddi is published on the NSW eTendering website.

The total published value is \$264,875,011 over a potential total period of 12 years. This includes an initial term of 4 years (with two 4 year extensions).

Question (p63)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Yes. Commissioner, I am more than happy if that is provided on notice if it is a long list.

Commissioner SEVERIN: Are you talking about people who remove their anklets or are you talking about people who were on electronic monitoring and breached any other condition of their order?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **My question was directed at whether or not they had breached their order and a notification went through. But if you have any information about people who have removed their anklet that would be useful as well.**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I think that was a question you asked this morning but it was 18—

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: It was 18 of 1,011.

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: I would be interested in the information.

Commissioner SEVERIN: Every single one of them, to answer the question that we took on notice, has been re-incarcerated.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **And the breaches—**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Of their orders?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **—or notifications for breach of their orders?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: I will have to take that on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

Breach notifications were submitted to the State Parole Authority or to NSW Police.

Question (p63)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: On that, can you indicate whether or not that was in accordance with what the expectations were at the time the program was initiated? Lastly, do you have any figures, for example, on what the average cost for monitoring is.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: We do. It is \$41 per offender per day. From memory, people contribute to the cost of their own anklets.

Commissioner SEVERIN: I do not think they do.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Are you sure?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Why don't you take that on notice?

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I am sorry, I should defer to the person who has been doing this for 40 years.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: We will consider that taken on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

The cost to Corrective Services NSW of electronic monitoring is \$41 per day per offender subject to electronic monitoring.

Prisoners participating in work release who are subject to electronic monitoring contribute \$42 per week to the cost.

Question (p63-64)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: Commissioner, I know I asked some questions about women in prison with dependent children, and I am sorry to go back in two bits on this, but **could you provide on notice the number of women in prison with dependent children under five years of age?**

Commissioner SEVERIN: If we have that data.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Women on remand or sentenced who have dependent children under the age of five or women who have children with them in custody under the age of five?

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: I am coming to the next one. My first one was that first category.

Commissioner SEVERIN: If we have that data we will certainly make it available.

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **If you do not have that data could I seek an explanation of why and if you are seeking that data, because clearly knowing that a woman has young, dependent kids not at school age is clearly relevant?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes.

Answer

I am advised:

Please see Table 8 in Attachment 4.

Question (p66)

Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE: **We will get the completion numbers on notice?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes.

Answer

I am advised:

Completion rates are not available for previous periods. Historically there have been issues with TAFE NSW providing evidence of completion to allow outcomes to be recorded by CSNSW.

CSNSW has recently introduced more robust systems for receiving and recording completion.

For the 2019/20 reporting period

- TAFE NSW reported 92% of participants achieved all competencies.
- BSI Learning reported 93% of participants achieved all competencies.

Question (p66)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: I just wanted to go back to the questions that I was asking about the programs to try and reduce reoffending and the prison population overall. One of the things that you mentioned, Mr Coutts-Trotter, was that a barrier to completion of programs was transfer between facilities. **What is the current rate of interprison transfer?**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: I do not know.

Commissioner SEVERIN: We will have to take that on notice.

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: We will have to take it on notice.

Answer

I am advised:

The rate of inter-prison transfer can be measured over a standardised time period. Corrective Services NSW measured the number of inter-prison transfers over a 3 month period for all prisoners who had been held in custody continuously over the last three months.

At 8 March 2020, there was a total of 14,109 inmates in full-time custody. Of these, a total of 10,091 had been in custody for the previous three months. Of those 10,091 inmates 40% (4,029) had been transferred between a centre at least once over that 3 month period.

Within that population of 4,029 there was a total of 8,018 transfers equating to an average of two moves per offender in that period.

Question (p66)

The Hon. ROSE JACKSON: Yes. **If possible, it would be good to receive, on notice, any information or data that you have on how regularly prisoners are moving between facilities. That would be useful.**

Mr COUTTS-TROTTER: Sure.

Answer

I am advised:

Please refer to the answer to the previous question.

CSNSW Reoffending Research and Evaluation Studies (2006 – 2019)

Bureau of Crime Statistics & Research (BOCSAR) outcome evaluations

Program name	Involved authors/agencies	Year	Citation	Findings
Intensive Drug & Alcohol Treatment Program (IDATP)	Ooi (BOCSAR)	2019	Ooi, Evann J. (2019). Evaluating the Impact of the Intensive Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program (IDATP) on Prisoner Misconduct (Crime and Justice Bulletin No. 222). Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.	The outcome of interest is prisoner misconduct, which is captured by the annual number of infractions of prison rules committed by each IDATP participant during their gaol sentence. The main results indicate that prison infractions committed in gaol decreased by approximately 73 per cent in the years after participation in IDATP, among male participants. Additional findings from a supplementary analysis support the main result.
Violent Offenders Therapeutic Program (VOTP)	Rahman, Poynton & Wan (BOCSAR)	2018	Rahman, S., Poynton, S. and Wan, W. (2018). The effect of the Violent Offender Treatment Program (VOTP) on offender outcomes (Crime and Justice Bulletin No. 216). Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. https://www.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/Documents/CJB/2018-Report-Effect-of-the-Violent-Offender-Treatment-Program-(VOTP)-CJB216.pdf	Starting VOTP was associated with significantly lowered probability of general re-offending (by 9 percentage points), general re-offending or returning to custody (7 percentage points) at 24 months free time post release. Similar differences in the probability of general re-offending (9 percentage points) and general re-offending or returning to custody (7 percentage points) were found in relation to completing VOTP.
EQUIPS Domestic Abuse Program	Rahman & Poynton (BOCSAR)	2018	Rahman, S. and Poynton, S. (2018). Evaluation of the EQUIPS Domestic Abuse Program (Crime and Justice Bulletin No. 211). Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.	As CSNSW expected, the treatment effects estimated for offenders who started the 20 session (40 hour) program were not significantly different

<https://www.bocsar.nsw.gov.au/Documents/CJB/2018-Report-Evaluation-of-the-EQUIPS-Domestic-Abuse-CJB211.pdf>

from zero for either general or DV-related re-offending within 12 months of referral. Those we assess to be moderate to high risk of reoffending are likely to require a higher dosage of treatment that is, *more* than one EQUIPS program in order to have an impact on recidivism.

Intensive Drug & Alcohol Treatment Program (IDATP)

Halstead & Poynton (BOCSAR)

2016

Halstead, I. & Poynton, S. (2016). The NSW Intensive Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program (IDATP) and recidivism: An early look at outcomes for referrals (Crime and Justice Bulletin No. 192). Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.

Although rates of re-offending and/or return-to-custody were lower for the matched treatment than matched comparison group at follow-up periods of 6 and 12 months, there was no statistically significant difference in recidivism outcomes. Conclusion: The power of the statistical analyses was severely limited by the small sample of IDATP participants and the ITT research design. The power to detect a treatment impact will improve as more offenders engage with IDATP over time.

Sex Offender Programs

Halstead (BOCSAR)

2016

Halstead, I. (2016). Does the Custody-based Intensive Treatment (CUBIT) program for sex offenders reduce re-offending? (Crime and Justice Bulletin No. 193). Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.

There is some evidence to suggest that completing CUBIT results in a considerable reduction in general recidivism risk. No evidence is found to suggest that CUBIT completion reduces sexual or violent re-offending. However, it is difficult to draw any conclusion from the null results, since the power of the statistical methods employed to detect a treatment impact in this study is limited given the relatively small sample size.

Intensive Correction Orders

Wang & Poynton (BOCSAR)

2017

Wang, JJ & Poynton S. Intensive correction orders versus short prison sentence: A comparison of re-offending. Contemporary Issues in Crime and Justice Number 207

There was a 11%-31% reduction in the odds of re-offending for an offender who received an ICO compared with an offender who received a prison sentence of up to 24 months.

Corrections Research Evaluation and Statistics (CRES) outcome evaluations

EQUIPS treatment pathways for domestic violence offenders

Zhang, Wei, Howard & Galouzis (CRES)

2019

Zhang, Y., Wei, Z., Howard, M., & Galouzis, J. (2019) Evaluation of EQUIPS treatment pathways for domestic violence offenders in NSW. Sydney, NSW: Corrective Services NSW.

Among domestic violence offenders in custody and in the community, participating in EQUIPS Domestic Abuse was associated with significantly lower odds of violent (25% lower) and any (30% lower) reoffending after 12 months compared to matched comparison offenders. Completing EQUIPS Domestic Abuse was also associated with lower odds of domestic violence reoffending (22% lower), violent reoffending (45% lower) and any reoffending (40% lower) after 12 months. Participation in EQUIPS Aggression was associated with lower odds of any reoffending (41% lower) after 12 months. Participation in or completion of EQUIPS Addiction or EQUIPS Foundation was not associated with significant effects on reoffending.

Attachment to QoN – Reduction in Recidivism (p27-28)

Parole Outcomes	Galouzis, Meyer & Day (in press).	2020	Galouzis, J., Meyer, D., & Day, A. (in press). Associations between Characteristics of the Offender, Supervising Officer, and Supervising Office and Parole Outcomes. Accepted for publication by <i>Criminal Justice and Behavior</i> .	This study examined the relative associations between the supervising officer and reimprisonment in relation to characteristics of the setting in which supervision was provided and characteristics of the offender being supervised. Overall, the findings provide evidence of an association between the supervising officer and supervision outcomes, even after offender and supervising office level characteristics are considered. However, this association was only present for non-Indigenous offenders. Community supervision makes a small, but significant, difference to the lives of non-Indigenous offenders following release from prison.
Initial Transitional Support (ITS) service	Morony, Wei, Howard, & Galouzis (CRES)	2019	Morony, S., Wei, Z., Howard, M., & Galouzis, J. (2019). Effectiveness of the Initial Transitional Support (ITS) Service 2014-2017. Sydney, NSW: Corrective Services NSW.	Participation in the ITS in conjunction with standard community case management was not associated with significant differences in reoffending outcomes, compared to a matched sample of eligible offenders who received community case management alone. ITS participation was associated with significantly lower odds of returning to custody among offenders serving community-based orders. There was no effect of ITS participation on return to custody outcomes among offenders released from custodial sentences onto parole.

Other completed research that has informed the model of treatment applied the strategy for Reducing Reoffending

Program category and name	Involved authors/agencies	Year	Citation	Findings
Aggression & Violence				
Domestic Abuse Program (DAP)	Blatch & O’Sullivan (CSNSW), Sweller & Delaney (UNSW)	2016	Blatch, O’Sullivan, Delaney, van Doorn & Sweller (2016) <i>Evaluation of an Australian domestic abuse program for offending males</i> , Journal of Aggression, Conflict & Peace Research, 8 (1) 4-22	DAP enrolment was associated with significant improvements in odds of time to first general reconviction (15 per cent) and first violent reconviction (by 27 per cent) compared to controls. Reconviction rates were significantly lower (by 15 per cent) for DAP enrollees. Programme completion was necessary for significant therapeutic effect; 62 per cent completed the programme.
Domestic Abuse Program (DAP)	Delaney (UNSW)	2010	Delaney, J. (2010). <i>Corrective Services NSW Domestic Abuse Program: An evaluation of recidivism outcomes</i> (Unpublished master’s thesis), University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.	The DAP treatment group had a significantly increased survival time to both general and violent reoffending, compared to population matched controls and to an alternative DV comparison treatment group.
Domestic Violence Perpetrator Program	Sweller (UNSW)	2008	Sweller, T. (2008). <i>An evaluation of a Domestic Violence Perpetrator Program: Determining efficacy through short-term recidivism rates</i> (Unpublished master’s thesis). University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.	Time to recidivism in DAP treatment group and non-treatment groups were similar, while time to recidivism in the alternative non standardised DV treatment group was significantly sooner.
Violence Prevention Program	Ang (UNSW)	2007	Ang, J. (2007). <i>Evaluation of the Violence Prevention Program: Effects on recidivism, overcontrolled hostility and severity of violence in those who re-offend</i> (Unpublished master’s thesis). University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.	Of VPP participants, 73% had at least one reoffence post release, of which 76% were non-violent. Offenders completing the VPP had a significantly lower number of reoffences than non-completers.

<p>Violence Prevention Program</p>	<p>Roman (UNSW)</p>	<p>2006</p>	<p>Roman, I. (2006). <i>Effects of the Violence Prevention Program (VPP) on institutional behaviour and recidivism</i> (Unpublished master's thesis). University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.</p>	<p>VPP participants had a lower rate of total and violent reconvictions and a longer survival time, but these differences were not significant. *The LSI-R significantly predicted total and violent prison misconducts and reconvictions.</p>
<p>Alcohol, Drugs & Addictions</p>				
<p>Getting SMART</p>	<p>Blatch & O'Sullivan (CSNSW), Delaney & Rathbone (UNSW)</p>	<p>2016</p>	<p>Blatch, C., O'Sullivan, K., Delaney, J., and Rathbone, D. (2016), "Getting SMART, SMART Recovery© programs and reoffending", <i>Journal of Forensic Practice</i>, Vol. 18(1) pp. 3 - 16</p>	<p>Getting SMART participation was significantly associated with improved odds of time to first reconviction by 8 percent and to first violent reconviction by 13 percent, compared to controls. Participants attending both programs (Getting SMART and SMART Recovery©), had significantly lower reconviction rate ratios for both general (21 percent) and violent (42 percent) crime, relative to controls. Getting SMART attendance was associated with significant reductions in reconviction rates of 19 percent, and the reduction for SMART Recovery© attendance (alone) was 15 percent, the latter figure being non-significant. In all, 20 hours in either SMART program (ten sessions) was required to detect a significant therapeutic effect.</p>
<p>Drug & Alcohol Addiction Program (DAAP)</p>	<p>Kevin, Furby & Xie (CSNSW)</p>	<p>2013</p>	<p>Kevin, M., Furby, B. & Xie, Z. (2013). <i>Evaluation of Community Offender Services Programs Drug and Alcohol Addiction and Relapse Prevention Three Years Out</i>. CRES Research Bulletin No. 33.</p>	<p>Program graduates had significantly lower rates of re-offending than non-completers, 24 months after completion of order supervision. Program completers showed a lower rate of re-offending than a non-program, matched comparison group.</p>

Sober Driver Program	ARTD Consultants	2010	ARTD Consultants (2010). <i>Analysis of recidivism among Sober Driver Program participants</i> (Unpublished report). Commissioned by the NSW Department of Corrective Services.	SDP delayed re-offending and program completers remained deterred. The SDP treatment group was 44% less likely to re-offend compared with the matched comparison group.
Drug & Alcohol Addiction Program (DAAP)	Furby & Kevin (CSNSW)	2008	Furby, B. & Kevin, M. (2008, July). <i>Evaluation of the Drug and Alcohol Addiction and Relapse Prevention Programs in Community Offender Services: One Year Out</i> . CRES Research Bulletin No. 24.	Program graduates (56%) were significantly more likely to successfully complete legal orders, compared with program withdrawers (37%). Program graduates had a lower rate of recidivism at three months (7% versus 15%) and nine months (14% versus 22%), compared with a matched sample.
Sober Driver Program	ARTD Consultants	2006	ARTD Consultants (2006). <i>Evaluation report on the Sober Driver Program</i> (Unpublished report). Commissioned by the NSW Department of Corrective Services.	The SDP is effective, accessible and appropriate to the drink drive recidivist target group in NSW. SDP graduates are half as likely to re-offend as recidivist drink drivers not attending the program. The program reduces re-offending over and above the effect of sanctions such as fines and licence loss.

Sexual Offending

CUBIT	Woodrow (CSNSW) & Bright (UNSW)	2010	Woodrow, A.C. & Bright, D.A. (2010). 'Effectiveness of a Sex Offender Treatment Program: A Risk Band Analyses', <i>International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology</i> , 20(10), 1-13.	CUBIT effectively reduced sexual and violent recidivism rates. Rates of sexual reoffending over an average of 3.75 yrs. were lower than predicted rates using Static-99 assessment measures (8.5% vs. 26%). Rates of observed reoffending decreased with each Static-99 level of risk decrease.
CUBIT	Fong (UWS)	2008	Fong, J. (2008). <i>Evaluation of a custodial based sex offender treatment program</i> (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Western Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.	Significant differences between three groups in rates of general but not sexual reoffending over 8-year follow-up. Treatment completers committed less non-sexual offences & reoffended non-sexually at slower rate cf. offenders in two comparison groups. Treatment drop outs had higher rates of general recidivism. Treated offenders tended to commit less serious sexual re- offences.

Countering Radicalisation

PRISM (Proactive Integrated Support Model)	Cherney (ARCF)	2018	Cherney, A (2018). <i>Supporting disengagement and reintegration: qualitative outcomes from a custody-based counter radicalisation intervention</i> . <i>Journal of Deradicalization</i> , Winter 2018/19, #17. http://journals.sfu.ca/jd/index.php/jd/article/view/174	The paper examines outcomes from the intervention in relation to the benefits PRISM clients derived from participation and explores different qualitative dimensions of client progress. The responses of PRISM clients are compared against the observations of program staff who work with these individuals. Results provide lessons for how formal interventions can facilitate disengagement and reintegration. Broader lessons for the delivery and evaluation of CVE interventions are identified. Limitations in the study design are also acknowledged
---	----------------	------	--	---

4.1 MARKETING POLICY

Correctional Industry provides a fundamental role in:

- * The rehabilitation of inmates to enhance the opportunity for post-release employment and to reduce inmate recidivism.
- * Effective Correctional Centre management.
- * Reducing the burden upon the taxpayer of providing Correctional Services.

The first priority of Correctional Industries is to sustain the self-sufficiency of the Correctional system wherever this can be realistically achieved. This includes functions such as catering, building maintenance and construction, laundering, landscaping etc.

The remaining inmate workforce participates in the operation of commercial based business units which trade as Corrective Services Industries -CSI. The function of these units is to replicate the disciplines and expectations of community based workplaces to assist inmates to acquire skills and gain and maintain employment upon release.

Unlike Correctional Industries in other jurisdictions, CSI has no mandatory marketbase. Work obtained by CSI arises from the market at large in response to tender invitations and direct requests. Markets which are pursued typically follow functions in light engineering, textile and furniture manufacture. These functions have underpinned the CSI market base over many years.

The process of competing in the market at large is considered essential to ensure that CSI is not given an unfair mandatory advantage and by competing on the open market CSI is continually tested in relation to operating efficiency. It also enables diversification, skills enhancement and greater Industry significance for the skills taught and goods produced.

The pricing of CSI products and services is based on the cost of raw materials, inmate labour and direct overheads of operation. Whilst it is recognised that CSI does not meet a range of overheads met by private sector organisations, this advantage is offset by a range of cost factors integrated within the CSI pricing system, which are unique to operating a commercial business within a Correctional environment.

CSI commissions independent reviews to test costing, pricing and productive efficiency protocols and performance at regular intervals. Reviews to date indicate that providing the approved pricing policy is

employed, CSI does not enjoy a competitive advantage over private sector businesses. The committed implementation of the pricing policy is therefore an important expectation for all CSI staff.

Whilst CSI largely pursues a historical based marketing strategy, CSI nevertheless operates within a dynamic, competitive environment. From time to time, representations are made that CSI operations affect other businesses. It is a reality that because CSI operates within the market at large this automatically results in some effect to other businesses.

However, CSI strives to not unreasonably or unfairly impact upon other businesses. A range of business development controls are in place, which in turn are monitored by the Corrective Services Industries Consultative Council, the operation of which is included within Section 4.5.

In seeking to minimise the impact of Corrective Services Industries on other businesses, the following broad market parameters prevail in relation to business development:

- * A continuation of marketing endeavours over which CSI has an historical presence.
- * An emphasis upon accessing import replacement or off shore manufacturing prevention market strategies.
- * Areas of business endeavour, which would not affect other Australian businesses.
- * Access dominant and growing Industry sectors, where there is already a high degree of competition and marketing competitiveness.
- * Access emerging Industries where there is a high degree of reliance on imported components or whole sector units and the focus is on such imported materials and not local inputs.

The implementation of this policy is monitored by the Corrective Services Industries Consultative Council, details of which are included in Section 4.5.

Issue date: 11/96

4.5 CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL

1. Primary Role:

The primary role of the Correctional Industries Consultative Council (CICC) is:

- To provide confidence to the community at large that the operations of correctional industries in NSW do not unreasonably impact upon other Australian businesses and, in particular, jobs by ensuring correctional industries operating in the public and privately run correctional centres focus their business development activities on:
 - replacing imports by the private sector and or Government Agencies.
 - self-sufficiency (this relates to any products, construction or services required by Department of Justice which the Commissioner deems suitable for CSI to provide),
 - emergency situations in the private sector and Government Agencies,
 - where there is a demonstrated skill shortage in a particular employment field,
 - new work that is not being performed by other Australian businesses.
- To monitor the operations of correctional industries to ensure that the work environment for all inmates meets contemporary expectations in relation to occupational health and safety standards.
- To monitor, encourage and facilitate as far as practicable, inmates acquiring knowledge, skill and basic work competence which will improve their chances of finding employment when they are released back into the community and to encourage and facilitate, where practicable, the certification of inmate skills in accredited programs.
- To encourage, where practicable, post release job placement opportunities to inmates particularly within private sector businesses who utilise correctional industries for the production of products and services.

This is achieved by monitoring and reporting upon the development and operation of Correctional Industries including the maintenance of an effective grievance handling mechanism. **CICC meetings are considered to be confidential and only nominated Council members are to participate in these meetings apart from those occasions where Council requests the presence of people making specific representation or people providing advice on specific matters.**

2. Composition:

Chairperson	Assistant Commissioner, Corrections Strategy & Policy
Member	Assistant Commissioner, Offender Management & Programs
Member	Australian Industry Group
Member	GEO Representative
Proxy Member	GEO Representative
Member	MTC Broadspectrum
Member	Serco Representative
Proxy Member	Serco Representative

Member	NSW Business Chamber
Member	Unions NSW
Member	Unions NSW
Proxy Member	Unions NSW
Member	Community Representative
Member	Community Representative
Member/Secretary	Group Director, Industries & Education CSI
Observer	Director Operations Development CSI
Observer	Director Business Development CSI

3. Appointment:

- i) The Assistant Commissioner, Corrections Strategy & Policy, Assistant Commissioner, Offender Management & Programs and Group Director, Industries & Education are ex-officio Members of the Council. The Assistant Commissioner, Corrections Strategy & Policy and Group Director, Industries & Education fulfil the roles of Chairperson and Secretary of the Council respectively.
- ii) Representatives of the Australian Industry Group, NSW Business Chamber and Unions NSW are subject to nomination by the organisations concerned and appointment approved by the Minister. These are appointed on a staggered basis i.e. 2 appointments each 18 months enabling each representative to serve a term of 3 years.
- iii) The Community representatives are appointed by the Minister following public advertisement.
- iv) The GEO representative is nominated by the Managing Director of GEO and approved by Assistant Commissioner Corrections Strategy & Policy.

The MTC Broadpectrum representative is nominated by Vice President MTC Corrections and approved by the Assistant Commissioner Corrections Strategy & Policy.

The Serco representative is nominated by the Managing Director of Serco and approved by Assistant Commissioner Corrections Strategy & Policy.
- v) The Director Operations Development and Director Business Development maintain observer status to respond to specific requests of the Council.
- vi) The Council may invite or second individual representatives to the Council for the purpose of gaining specific Industry input on relevant issues.

4. Term of Appointment:

The term of appointment, for other than ex-officio members, is for a period of 3 years or such other period approved by the Minister.

5. Qualifications of Appointees:

- i) Members of the Council must have a commitment to Correctional Industry philosophy and to the broader implications to the community of effective Correctional Industry programs.
- ii) Members must have an extensive understanding of and experience in Industry and related industrial issues and an understanding of the likely impact, if any, of Correctional Industry market decisions.
- iii) Members must maintain professional standards of integrity and not engage in any activities which might provide a conflict of interest to their Council responsibilities. All Council members must comply with the Corrective Services NSW Code of Ethics. A copy will be provided to each member on their appointment.

6. Frequency of Meetings:

Meetings will be held each 2 months or of such other duration approved by the Minister.

7. Fees

Fees payable to members of the Council or Representative Organisation are those set by the Premier's Department relevant to members of Statutory Authorities, Consultative Committees and Councils.

8. Reporting Role:

- i) The Council reports directly to the Minister.
- ii) The Council provides minutes of all meetings and, where necessary, recommendations to the Minister.
- iii) Members of the Council have a responsibility to establish lines of communication within their relevant forums in order that the community at large can be apprised of council deliberations.
- iv) The Council provides an annual resume of activities, which forms part of the Annual Report of Corrective Services NSW, to the Minister.

- v) The Council to report on an agreed range of key performance measures linked to the primary role of the CICC.

9. Detailed Role of Council:

- i) Reviews Correctional Industry operations by scrutinising forward business development plans and generic contract opportunities with an annual value of \$50,000 or more. This \$50,000 threshold is to include the costs of any raw materials/consumables supplied by the customer.
- ii) Reviews Correctional Industry operations through the inspection of industries in correctional centres and the review of reports and documents prepared by staff of CSI Corporate, CSNSW Head Office, Regions and Private Sector Institutions covering marketing, sales and Work Health & Safety in the workplace and promotes the continued importance of Correctional Industry programs.
- iii) Where the Council is of the view that a current or proposed business activity will significantly impact upon other Australian businesses the Council shall make appropriate recommendations to the Minister.
- iv) In the case of major business development proposals, embracing private sector involvement, an Industry Impact Statement will be provided to the Council. The questions contained in this Industry Impact Statement are listed under point 12 on pages 6 and 7 of this policy document.
- v) In the case of Government Agencies accessing correctional industry services in emergency or one off situations, an Industry Impact Statement is not required up to a sales value of \$100,000. If the request is repeated the Government Agency must go through the formal CICC business approval process.

In relation to the private sector where there is a demonstrated need to access the services of correctional industries in situations when the private sector business unit has lost the ability to produce its goods and services because of a fire or a flood for example, the private sector business unit in question will have the ability to seek assistance from correctional industries without going through the formal CICC business approval process.

- vi) In the case where CSI, GEO, Serco or MTC Broadpectrum seek approval from the CICC to run a trial on a potential business opportunity to establish if they have the capability to meet the customers needs, the framework contained in point 11 of this policy must be completed and provided to the CICC for consideration.

- vii) In relation to a privately managed Correctional Industry engaging with a Government Agency for a business opportunity where the product or service is being imported an Industry Impact Statement is not required if the business development opportunity does not involve other private sector businesses. However, the privately managed Correctional Industry is required to provide Council with a document from the Government Agency involved confirming that the product or service is currently being imported, should the business development opportunity proceed.
If the Government Agency intends to go to tender for that product or service and it includes the market share that the privately managed Correctional Industry has, an Industry Impact Statement is required should the privately managed Correctional Industry seek to respond to the tender.
- viii) When CSI engages with a Government Agency for a business development opportunity an Industry Impact Statement is not required. However, Council will be notified of pending and held business development opportunities implemented in accordance with NSW Government Procurement Board Direction (PBD 2018 – 03) as follows:
- PBD-2018-03: Approved Procurement Arrangements**
Supply by Government entities
An agency may obtain goods or services directly from any government entity that provides those goods or services in the exercise of its principal functions consistent with the competitive neutrality principles in the Treasury Policy and Guidelines Paper TPP02-1 Policy Statement on the Application of Competitive Neutrality.
- ix) Industry Impact Statements will be held in one location within CSI and monitored every six months to ensure that they still reflect the original intent. Proponents will be required to notify the Council immediately if there is any significant change to the context or content of the original information provided to, and approved by, the Council. Refer to point 12 of this policy for the content of the Industry Impact Statement.
- x) Proponents will be advised that if the Council is not notified of significant changes then termination of the agreement is a possible remedy / sanction.
- xi) In relation to CSI activities Council reviews the development and implementation of CSI's pricing model by ensuring a Competitive Neutrality Review is conducted by CSI every 4 to 5 years. This aims to confirm that CSI and privately operated Correctional Industries do not operate at an unfair competitive advantage in relation to inmate labour and overhead charges when they compete in open markets.
- xii) Reviews all complaints referred and responded to by the Group Director, Industries & Education or privately managed Institutions in accord with the grievance handling

mechanism. The Council will make recommendations in relation to any specific findings of that review.

- xiii) Reviews at each meeting, that the formal grievance handling mechanism is operating effectively.
- xiv) The Commissioner or Minister may refer, for the consideration of the Council, appeals lodged against responses provided by the Group Director, Industries & Education or privately managed Institutions.
- xv) Reviews the operation of Community Employment Programs in terms of the primary role charter.
- xvi) Monitors and reviews the development and operation of Correctional Industry programs within privatised Correctional Centres.

10. Grievance Handling Mechanism

- i) All complaints/representations concerning Correctional Industries are to be directed to the Group Director, Industries & Education in writing to PO Box 1036, Windsor NSW 2756 for consideration. However complaints can be made directly to any member of the Correctional Industries Consultative Council who will provide details of the complaint to the Group Director, Industries & Education for action. As Secretary of the CICC, the Group Director, Industries & Education will either deal with the matter directly or refer it to the CICC for consideration and determination. The Secretary must respond in writing to the complainant advising them of the outcome or if necessary, arrange a meeting to discuss the issues in more detail prior to making a determination.
- ii) Every effort is to be made to resolve issues arising under 10. i) above through direct contact involving the Chairperson, Group Director, Industries & Education or privately managed Institutions and the complainant.
- iii) All matters arising under i) and ii) above are to be reported to the Council at its next meeting.
- iv) If the complainant is not satisfied with the outcome they may appeal to either the Minister or the Commissioner in writing seeking a further determination.

11. Framework for CSI to seek approval from the CICC to commence a trial relating to a potential business opportunity prior to submitting an Industry Impact Statement

- i) Name of Company / Organisation / Business Owner
- ii) Background check on the above.

- iii) Brief outline of the business proposal. For a singular project proposal (non-continuous work), the total cost of the trial must be included, and compared to the estimated overall sales market for that industry if this information is obtainable.
- iv) Reason for requesting the trial.
In relation to this question the proponent requests a trial with CSI based on their inability to source suitable staff, this statement must be evidenced.
- v) How will the trial operate.
- vi) How long is the trial proposed to run for and why?
All trials are approved to run for 6 months.
- vii) Are there any known possible adverse impacts on other businesses in the community if the trial was to proceed? If so, please describe these impacts. Can these adverse impacts be successfully managed? If so, how?
- viii) Are there any known adverse impacts on staff working in the company / organisation / business owner that the proposed trial is being conducted for if the trial was to proceed. If so, please describe these impacts. Can these adverse impacts be successfully managed? If so, how?

In considering these adverse impacts specific reference must be made to any recent organisational changes affecting staff or planned organisational changes affecting staff relating to company / organisation / business owner.

12. Requirements for Industry Impact Statement

The proponent and or CSI/GEO/ MTC Broadpectrum and Serco representative must ensure that all fields within the Industry Impact Statement are completed and accurate. A CSI/GEO/MTC Broadpectrum and Serco representative can assist the proponent in this process.

1. Background to Industry Impact Statement.
2. Name of sole trader; partnership; company, ABN number _____
3. Name of principal/s, director/s.
4. Address of proponent.
5. Whether member of employer association/s. If not, why not?
6. What is the nature of the proponent's business?
7. What is the nature of the Correctional Industry business proposed? Does it service internal/external (Corrections) markets?
8. Does the proposal embrace an import replacement or off-shore manufacturing prevention endeavour and if so, how is this achieved?
9. What is the motivation for utilising a Correctional Industry opportunity?

10. Does the business proposal align with the core business of the proponent and if so, how is this achieved?
11. Who are the competitors of the business proposed (name and nature of businesses)?
12. What effect will the proposed business have on your competitors:
 - a) Market share?
 - b) Employment levels?
13. To the best of your knowledge will this proposal infringe on a competitors patent?
14. A) Profile the local workforce currently undertaking the activity proposed in Question 1. List by:
 - i) Function of role (e.g. operational, manufacturing, admin)
 - ii) Number of permanent employees
 - iii) Number of temporary or casual employees
 - iv) Number of employees on a work related visa (e.g 190, 457, 489)
 - v) Is the local work force employed by proponent or hired by a contractor

i) Function of role	ii) No. permanent workers	iii) No. temporary / casual workers	iv) No. work visas	v) Employed or Contractor
e.g manufacturing				employed

- B) Will this proposal have an effect on the number of workers and/or hours of work?
15. A) What trade unions provide coverage to the industry?

(Where the appropriate Trade Union is not known, the proponent is to contact the Secretary of the CICC on (02) 4582 2401 who will seek this information from Unions NSW to determine if there are any affiliated Trade Unions which would cover the proponents existing business activity)
- B) Are the proponents existing employees being correctly remunerated under the applicable Industrial Award?
- C) If industry award not in use, provide details of mechanism for remunerating employees?
16. Has the proposal been discussed with employees/trade union (provide formal documentation of dialogue covering these discussions). In a business activity where a Trade Union is represented, correspondence from the Trade Union covering these discussions on the proponents proposed business activity with CSI is required.

In relation to this question the proponent is to allow Correctional Industries Consultative Council members to meet with staff of the proponent. The purpose of the meeting is to test the veracity of the Industry Impact Statement re employment matters and to ensure that staff are not going to lose their employment because of the business activity with CSI and to advise staff of the grievance handling mechanism developed by the CICC should they believe that their positions were being threatened because of the activity with CSI. The CICC members will include a representative nominated by Unions NSW and may include a representative from AIG, NSW Business Chamber or Community Representative depending on the proponent and CICC's requirements.

17. How many full time equivalent employment opportunities will the proposed activity provide to inmates?
18. What vocational skills does the proposed business endeavour provide to inmates? Do these skills provide relevance to post release employment?
19. What level of capital structure is required?
20. Are there any other matters which are drawn to the attention of the Correctional Industries Consultative Council which may elicit adverse representations from the community/business or employee groups?
21. Does the proponent agree to notify the Council (through the CSI Group Director, Industries and Education) of any significant changes to the business (i.e. employee numbers, market price, competitors, subcontractors, suppliers)?
22. Does the proponent understand that if the Council is not notified of significant changes then termination of the agreement / operation is a potential sanction?
23. An updated impact statement will be required every 6 months.
24. Name, Position and Signature of proponent.

Issue date: September 2019

CORRECTIVE SERVICES NSW - QUESTIONS ON NOTICE 04 MARCH 2020

Table 1: Vocational Training

Financial year	Total
2017/18	
No of <u>inmates participating</u> in vocational training	5127
<u>Number of course enrolments</u> (indicating one or more Vocational training programs per inmate)	7765
2018/19	
No of <u>inmates participating</u> in vocational training	4139
<u>Number of course enrolments</u> (indicating one or more Vocational training programs per inmate)	8440

Table 2: Operational Bed Capacity Public/Private (@ 18 March 2020)

Prison Operator	Operational Bed Capacity
Public	13,120
Private	2,058
Junee	910
Parklea	1148
TOTAL*	15,178

Table 3: Women Inmates with Dependent children

Legal status on reception	With dependent children	Without dependent children	Total receptions completing an ISQ
Remand	1271	864	2135
Sentenced	339	191	530
Total	1610	1055	2665
Note: * These results are based on receptions who completed an Intake Screen Questionnaire (ISQ) in 2019.			
** Total of 2735 women prisoners received in 2019 and 2665 of them completed the ISQ.			

Table 4: Prison Bed Capacity Program summary (@ 18 March 2020)

PROJECT	# No Beds	Male / Female	First Inmate Date	Forecast First Inmate Date
Berrima	75	M	27 September 2016	
Illawarra Reintegration Centre	60	M	26 June 2017	
Mary Wade	94	F	22 December 2017	
Long Bay (Segregation Cells)	10	M	23 July 2018	
Macquarie CC (Rapid Build Prison)	400	M	20 December 2017	
Parklea Minimum Security	150	M	13 December 2017	
Hunter CC (Rapid Build Prison)	400	M	20 February 2018	
South Coast Minimum Security	200	M	27 August 2018	
Shortland (Cessnock)	330	M	30 June 2019	
Goulburn (HRMCC 2)	46	M	4 July 2019	
South Coast Maximum Security	160	M	5 August 2019	
Junee	480	M	2 January 2020	
Mid North Coast	440	M	18 February 2020	
Parklea Maximum Security	500	M		23 March 2020
Cessnock	240	M		22 April 2020
Dillwynia	248	F		26 August 2020
Bathurst	220	M		27 July 2020
MRRC (Silverwater)	440	M		10 May 2021
Clarence CC PPP	1,700	M/F		1 July 2020
TOTAL	6,193			

Table 5: Capital Expenditure Private/Public Prisons

CAPEX – Prison Bed Capacity Program	FY18/19	FY19-20 (to Feb 2020)
Public Prisons	\$587,699,000	\$288,973,000
Privately Operated Prisons (Junee / Parklea)	\$183,280,000	\$54,145,000

Clarence Correctional Centre is a Public Private Partnership (PPP) delivered by Infrastructure NSW, on behalf of the State, and in partnership with the Northern Pathways consortium consisting of John Holland, Serco, John Laing and Macquarie Capital. The Capex for the prison construction is provided by private equity as part of the PPP.

Table 6: Corrective Services Industries

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	YTD Jan-20 2019-20	YTD Feb-20 2019-20	EST Jun-20 2019-20
Revenue	\$128.9m	\$137.8m	\$153.7m	\$94.0m	\$105.8m	\$148.7m
Costs	\$111.7m	\$125.7m	\$141.1m	\$90.0m	\$102.1m	\$144.1m
Net Contribution	\$17.2m	\$12.1m	\$12.6m	\$4.0m	\$3.7m	\$4.6m

Note: Figures do not include the costs absorbed by the Department such as electricity, water, etc.

Table 7: Correctional Officer Training

Correctional Officer training (10 weeks)			Community Corrections Officer Training (12 weeks)		
	Staff Enrolled	Completed training		Staff Enrolled	Completed training
2016/17	762	702	2016/17	174	159
2017/18	435	373	2017/18	229	219
2018/19	1030	1018	2018/19	221	210

Table 8: Women Prisoners who have dependent children under the age of five

Legal Status	With dependent children under 5	With dependent children	% with children under 5
Remand	168	1271	13.2
Sentenced	38	339	11.2
Total	206	1610	12.8
Note: * These results are based on receptions and who completed an Intake Screen Questionnaire (ISQ) in 2019.			