



The Hon. Robert Borsak, MLC  
Chair  
Parliament of NSW  
[budget.estimateds@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:budget.estimateds@parliament.nsw.gov.au)

Sent by email : [budget.estimateds@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:budget.estimateds@parliament.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Chair

**Subject: Clarification of evidence/transcript for Budget Estimates hearing**

I write to advise of clarifications to evidence given by myself at the Budget Estimates hearing for Legislative Council Portfolio Committee No. 5 – Families and Communities, Disability Inclusion.

**Title of evidence clarification**

Page 5, paragraph 1 of the transcript currently reads as:

***MICHAEL TIDBALL:** There is effectively a protocol in place for that now. Part of our interest is where those referrals are made, hence they are copied to my office and they are reviewed and examined.*

**This should be amended to:**

***MICHAEL TIDBALL:** There is effectively a protocol in place for that now. Part of our interest is where those referrals are made, hence they can be copied to my office and they are reviewed and examined.*

Page 63, paragraph 13 of the transcript currently reads as:

***MICHAEL TIDBALL:** What a great question. I'm not aware of any modelling that we have done. Can I make the point, if I may, that in terms of the work that's recently been undertaken, for example, with alternative care arrangements and high-cost emergency arrangements, that has predominantly been driven by the desire to find alternative placements rather than a relative costing. We've not been doing relative costing, but what we have been doing is looking at the best human outcome in terms of the statutory obligations of the department. For me as secretary, where my functions are prescribed in the care Act, that is the basis and the fundamental setting upon which I proceed. Clearly, cost is something which can vary within government provision and within non-government provision. Cost is affected by controls and policy and reporting obligations, hence some of the work being undertaken by the out-of-home care review. But there is no modelling that we've been undertaking of which I have knowledge.*

**This should be amended to:**

***MICHAEL TIDBALL:** What a great question. I am aware some modelling has been done. Can I make the point, if I may, that in terms of the work that's recently been undertaken, for example,*

*with alternative care arrangements and high-cost emergency arrangements, that has predominantly been driven by the desire to find alternative placements rather than a relative costing. We've not been doing relative costing, but what we have been doing is looking at the best human outcome in terms of the statutory obligations of the department. For me as secretary, where my functions are prescribed in the care Act, that is the basis and the fundamental setting upon which I proceed. Clearly, cost is something which can vary within government provision and within non-government provision. Cost is affected by controls and policy and reporting obligations, hence some of the work being undertaken by the out-of-home care review.*

Please publish my clarifications above. If you need further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at

Yours sincerely,

**Michael Tidball**  
**Secretary**