



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
Fair Work Act 2009

DEPUTY PRESIDENT O'NEILL

AM2023/21

s.157 - FWC may vary etc. modern awards if necessary to achieve modern awards objective

**Modern Awards Review 2023-24
(AM2023/21)**

Melbourne

10.00 AM, WEDNESDAY, 21 FEBRUARY 2024

Continued from 07/02/2024

PN1

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Good morning everybody. It's nice to see such a small intimate gathering. So we will get underway. I will just run through the appearances as I understand them and so if I miss anyone, please let me know. And apologies in advance for my inevitable butchering of names along the way.

PN2

So I understand we've got Ms Crnjac from the Department of Social Services.

PN3

MS I CRNJAC: Yes.

PN4

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Biddlestone for the SDAEA.

PN5

MS K BIDDLESTONE: Yes, thank you.

PN6

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Munoz for the AMWU.

PN7

MS B MUNOZ: Yes. Thank you, Deputy President.

PN8

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Abousleiman for the CEPU Electrical Division.

PN9

MS Y ABOUSLEIMAN: Thank you. That's correct.

PN10

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Peldova-McClelland for the ACTU.

PN11

MS M PELDOVA-MCCLELLAND: That's correct. Thank you, Deputy President.

PN12

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Bhatt for the Ai Group.

PN13

MS R BHATT: Yes, Deputy President.

PN14

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr Robson for the ASU.

PN15

MR M ROBSON: Yes, Deputy President.

PN16

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr Miller for the AHEIA

PN17

MR M MILLER: Yes, Deputy President. And with me also is Ms Cathy Pugsley.

PN18

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes. And Ms Wischer for the ANMF.

PN19

MS K WISCHER: Thank you, Deputy President and I'm accompanied by Ms Palmer.

PN20

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes. I should have mentioned I am aware of where there are multiple representatives. I've just identified the person that I understand to be taking the lead for this morning.

PN21

Ms Lyons for Master Grocers Australia.

PN22

MS A LYONS: That's correct. Thank you Deputy President.

PN23

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Wells for the National Tertiary Education Union.

PN24

MS WELLS: Yes. Thank you, Deputy President.

PN25

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms McRobert for the CPSU New South Wales.

PN26

MS A MCROBERT: Yes. Good morning, Deputy President.

PN27

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Butters for the Australian Hotels Association.

PN28

MS M BUTTERS: Yes. Thank you, Deputy President.

PN29

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr Arndt for Business New South Wales and Australian Business Industrial.

PN30

MR J ARNDT: Thank you, Deputy President.

PN31

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Goldthorpe for the Club Managers Association Australia.

PN32

MS S GOLDTHORPE: Thank you, Deputy President.

PN33

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Delpiano for the Mining and Energy Union.

PN34

MS E DELPIANO: Yes, Deputy President.

PN35

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Shaw for Clubs New South Wales.

PN36

MS N SHAW: Yes, thank you. And also Clubs Australia, Deputy President.

PN37

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Orr for the United Workers Union.

PN38

MR L ORR: Thank you, Deputy President.

PN39

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Tinsley for the Australian Chamber of Commerce.

PN40

MS J TINSLEY: Yes. Thank you, Deputy President.

PN41

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: And Mr Liley for the CFMEU.

PN42

MR J LILEY: Yes. Good morning, Deputy President. It's the CFMEU.

PN43

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Sorry. I've been overlooked (indistinct) this morning. There we go. Now, did I miss anybody in that roll call? All right. Then we will get underway. There are three matters that I wanted to cover off in the mention this morning. And they are (indistinct) some information about the survey of employers on workplace flexibilities that has been referred to in the statements. Secondly, to discuss the timetable and the dates and location for the consultation process and thirdly discuss the consultation process itself.

PN44

So they are the matters that I wanted to cover off this morning. Once we've dealt with those matters if there are any other matters that parties want to raise then please let me know.

PN45

Now before we go through each of those one by one, I just wanted to reiterate a couple of points about the process that we are all embarking on in the statement of the President Justice Hatcher of 15 September it sets out there in the purpose of

the consultation, namely, to discuss the issues raised in the discussion and research papers and submissions made in response.

PN46

And following consultation, the timetable for the overarching process was finalised and that was directed at allowing for completion of the entire review by way of a final report by the Full Bench on or about 28 June 2024. So in other words, it's not an open-ended process.

PN47

Now, we will go through the three issues. If you wish to speak to any of them, perhaps we might give it a try if you raise your virtual hand, that might be an orderly way of dealing with that. And I'm sure, as I note, that there has been various correspondence about ways and queries about the process and making suggestions about it. So I've read all of that material that's been published, but if I miss anything, please raise that with me when we get to the relevant item.

PN48

So firstly, the survey of employers. Now, this was mentioned in the statement of the Full Bench of 24 November which indicated that the Commission intended to undertake a survey of employers to gather information about variations to award provisions that may assist in offering greater flexibility to employees in balancing work (indistinct)

PN49

Now, that survey is intended itself to be part of the consultations to provide to the Full Bench for consideration in preparing the final report. So it's not envisaged or intended that it's a piece of research for the parties to make submissions in response to.

PN50

The report is not expected to be finalised before April in any event. And it's also helpful to know perhaps that it's not a quantitative piece of work. It's a qualitative piece of work is what is intended. So it's intended to have discussions with survey participants canvassing working from home arrangements and barriers to workplace flexibilities undertaken by a third party provider. And the purpose is to elicit qualitative data in some of those discussions.

PN51

So the survey questions haven't been finalised yet and so that's why in the directions for the mention today, there is an opportunity if anyone has any particular suggestions about topics or questions that they would like to see covered in the survey, there is an opportunity if anyone has any such suggestions today.

PN52

So that's what I wanted to share in relation to the employer survey. Is there anyone that has any suggestions or has any issues that they want raised regarding that? Ms Bhatt, you're first with your hand up.

PN53

MS BHATT: Thank you, Deputy President. And the Deputy President of course knows that to some extent the correspondence that we filed on 15 February canvassed certain issues in respect of the survey. And the explanation that the Deputy President has provided as to when the survey is likely to be complete and when the report is likely to be published and what the intent of the survey is, deals with some of the points that we raised in that correspondence. So we take that point and thank the Commission for that clarification.

PN54

It might be, and I say this really only to foreshadow this rather than to seek any opportunity at this stage. One the report is published, depending on how the consultation process for this stream of the review is tracking and specifically whether the consultation conferences are complete or not, we might seek an opportunity to say something about the survey, depending on what its results are and what bearing we apprehend that it might have on observations, for example, that the Commission might make in its report about various proposals that are before it. But I really just sign post that at this stage in light of the comments that the Deputy President has made.

PN55

So far as the issue of topics or questions are concerned, taking into account the proposition that it is intended that the survey will be primarily qualitative rather than quantitative in nature, I would ask they're really president that we are given a short window, for example, until the end of this week to file a note with the Commission with any suggested topics.

PN56

I am regrettably just not in a position to be able to identify those during the proceedings today. It might be there is nothing in particular that we look to advance, but if there is anything that we are given that short window to do so.

PN57

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I don't have any difficulties with anything that you've put forward Ms Bhatt. Indeed, myself, when I first read about there being a survey I had assumed it would be a quantitative piece of work. So I appreciate that you may well have all had a similar view and not had an opportunity to Think about it from a qualitative perspective.

PN58

So, yes, if anyone wishes to put forward any suggested topics they can do so and it just to (indistinct) my chambers by the end of the week. And, yes, we will see how the consultations progress. But depending on the time or if they want to raise something about the survey, I am certainly not going to stop that.

PN59

MS BHATT: Thank you, Deputy President.

PN60

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: All right. Ms Peldova-McClelland.

PN61

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: Thank you, Deputy President. Yes, I wanted to raise a few points about the survey, which some of my colleagues from unions might wish to expand on. So thank you for clarifying the process on the purpose and that we have an opportunity until the end of the week. That is greatly appreciated.

PN62

On the survey for employers, unions do have some concern that there's a little bit of an imbalance in the approach being taken as obviously the survey is only on employees and there is no equivalent process for workers or unions, and we are alive to the fact that there may be very different things about what flexibility looks like.

PN63

So we just request that the survey of employees, and this may well be the intention, is balanced, including relevant work, relevant research about workers' views around flexible work in the (indistinct) review and by considering the submissions of the unions in response to the discussion paper and survey results.

PN64

So similarly to Ms Bhatt, we would also foreshadow an intention to be able to comment on the survey and in addition to be able to provide some de-identified examples of real life industrial situations that have been brought to us by our members regarding those issues. So that's the first point that I would wish to make.

PN65

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: So just in relation to that, we might just deal with it as they come through. Again, I don't see any difficulty with that. The Full Bench will have the benefit of all of the written material including the submissions and we will come to the (indistinct) submissions shortly and it may well be that a number of union parties wish to include particular examples in their submissions and there is nothing inappropriate about that.

PN66

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: Thank you, Deputy President. So moving on, the Commission has indicated that one of the survey topics will be barriers to workplace flexibilities and we would just say we may expand on this by the end of the work, but there should be a focus on what the opportunities for flexible work practices are beyond working from home.

PN67

Third point is that we think that the (indistinct) view as stated in his correspondence to the Commission last year that the review shouldn't result in any reductions in entitlements for award-covered employees is relevant. And not those parameters to be communicated to survey respondents when they are answering the questions.

PN68

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I will take that on board and will convey that through the staff involved in preparing the survey.

PN69

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: Thank you, Deputy President. We just also wanted to note a slight concern with only collecting qualitative data without quantitative data, that contextualises the responses. So we are concerned that without questions that establish industry award coverage and relevant terms and conditions, there won't be a context and a proper understanding of the quality of responses that employers provide.

PN70

So we just wanted to flag that concern with the Commission today. And that that may affect the weight that is able to be given to those responses.

PN71

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: All right.

PN72

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: And finally we note that the small business reference group was consulted in relation to the survey. And we think it would be appropriate if parties were provided (indistinct) to proposed survey questions and content before they are finalised and distributed, given we have only had the opportunity during this meeting to have input.

PN73

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I will take that on notice and feed that into the process.

PN74

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: Thank you, Deputy President.

PN75

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Was there anyone else that wanted to be heard in relation - sorry, Ms Tinsley.

PN76

MS TINSLEY: Thank you, Deputy President. So I have no issues with anything that - sorry, only one thing. No issues with the submissions put forward by Ms Bhatt. And generally comfortable with those propositions put forward by Ms Peldova-McClelland, except for the aspect around including that reference to no worker being worse off, including that reference in the survey results.

PN77

Obviously, employers don't want to see workers going backwards. That's not the intention. I think the issue here is issue around scope and this not being a relevant consideration for this stream. And it also being a consideration that is actually a dispute in the relevant stream being making awards easier.

PN78

So I think in terms it would be highly contested, Deputy President, to include such a - inappropriate to include such a reference in the survey.

PN79

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: All those comments will be fed into the process. I am not giving any commitment as to the outcome of those considerations to any of the issues raised but they will all be taken into account.

PN80

Ms Bhatt, did you have your hand up again?

PN81

MS BHATT: I was just going to add to what Ms Tinsley has put. I think the statement from the President that announced the commencement of the review made very clear that that parameter that the ACTU has just referred to applied to only one stream of the review, as Ms Tinsley said, and that is making awards easier to use. It doesn't apply to the review at large and, in fact, in those circumstances the inclusion of a note to that effect in the survey might be misleading.

PN82

As we understand it, the Commission has not confined itself to only considering matters of that nature in this part of the review.

PN83

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Now, the second issue is the timetable and the dates and location for the consultation process. So, as you know, the current directions provide for the filing of submissions in response to the discussion paper that was published in late January on 12 March. And several parties have sought an opportunity to make submissions in reply and I propose to amend the directions to do so.

PN84

So my suggestion or inclination was to provide for reply submissions by 25 March. I just put in a plug there that it will be helpful if reply submissions are able to identify and ideally narrow where there is disagreement or where there is fertile ground for a potential agreement. So if I can just make that plug.

PN85

So with the opportunity to make reply submissions, as a consequence I would vacate the dates of 21 and 22 March as proposed consultation dates and in their place what I am proposing is Wednesday 3 April and Thursday 4 April and Monday 9 April and Tuesday 10 April.

PN86

The consultations I would anticipate would be in person but with the capacity to participate remotely if requested. And in terms of location, my preliminary view is to hold them in Melbourne, but I'm open to hearing any views about whether any part of them should be held in Sydney.

PN87

My understanding is that there is 14 organisations that have indicated their intention to participate in the consultation process and we will just quickly run through those in case I have missed anyone. And they are the HSU, the AHA, the ASU, the CFMEU, the UWU, the ACTU, the PSA, the Ai Group, ETU, SDA,

AHEIA, ANMF, FAA and the AMWU. Have I missed anyone from that alphabet soup?

PN88

MS LYONS: Yes, Deputy President. Master Grocers Australia Ltd.

PN89

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Okay. And Ms Tinsley (indistinct)

PN90

MS TINSLEY: Yes, Deputy President. The Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

PN91

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: All right. And Mr Arndt?

PN92

MR ARNDT: Business New South Wales and ABI.

PN93

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms McRobert?

PN94

MS MCROBERT: Yes. Thank you, Deputy President. Just to clarify that in the federal system, we are the CPSU CPSF rather than the PSA.

PN95

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes, you're right. Thank you. Ms Delpiano?

PN96

MS DELPIANO: The Mining and Energy Union would also intend to be a part of those consultations. Thank you, Deputy President.

PN97

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Wells?

PN98

MS WELLS: The National Tertiary Education Union. Thank you, Deputy President.

PN99

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: And Ms Shaw?

PN100

MS SHAW: Yes. Club Australia. Thank you.

PN101

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Walton?

PN102

MS T WALTON: The Transport Workers Union.

PN103

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Thank you. Ms Peldova-McClelland?

PN104

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: I understand there are a few unions that wrote to the Commission in the last few days. Most of them on this call have indicated their intention to participate but I think an additional one is the AWU.

PN105

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: All right. Okay. I think that's everybody. So that's what I am proposing in relation to the timing and location of the consultations. Is there anyone that wishes to say anything about that, Ms Bhatt?

PN106

MS BHATT: Deputy President, we are grateful for the opportunity to file reply submissions and we (indistinct) that that will help distil, as the Deputy President says, areas where there might be scope for agreement, whereas others where there perhaps clearly isn't. We continue to have some concerns about the timeline. I think one of the issues we raised in our correspondence is that we'd seek an opportunity to deal with the literature review in the submissions that are currently due on 12 March, but we don't anticipate that that will be practicable, given the time frames.

PN107

The second issue I'd raise is that I think the reply submissions, Deputy President, you indicated would be due on 25 March, which is just under two weeks from the existing deadline to file the first round of submissions. If there is scope to delay that, even by a day or two, I think that would give us a little bit more time. Potentially there will be quite a volume of material that's filed, given the number of parties that appear to have an interest in this matter.

PN108

The other issues I would raise, just briefly, is in relation to the location of the conference, Ai Group's representatives are based in Sydney and so to the extent - and I understand that it is true of a number of other parties appearing today too.

PN109

So to the extent that the Commission is at all inclined to perhaps list some of the conferences in Sydney, we would be very grateful, but ultimately we will appear in person wherever they are listed. Apart from that, I don't have any other concerns about the timeline. Again, I just note that we had hoped that the Commission would be inclined to adopt a different approach that would allow more time.

PN110

One of the concerns that we have is obviously the demands that the various streams of the review are cumulatively now placing on our resources, as well as a number of other matters that are on foot, such as the MUA's review and the delegate's rights matter.

PN111

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I really do appreciate that, Ms Delpiano. It is a challenging timeframe with a fairly confined opportunity in order to refine a report and that may stretch out a bit and it may be that the consultation has to take a little longer. My rationale for settling on 25 March was really just to give the parties an opportunity to have Easter. Because if it's a couple of days later, say 27 March, then we are basically - you only have two days to consider the material before the consultations start. So that was the balance, but I will hear from others and consider that. Ms Peldova-McClelland?

PN112

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: Thank you, Deputy President. As you are aware we shared some of the same concerns as has been outlined by Ms Bhatt regarding the timetable and, in particular, (indistinct) being able to deal with the literature of the (indistinct) submissions. We are also grateful for the opportunity to file replies, perhaps we could include in those replies anything relevant about (indistinct) review.

PN113

In regard to the timeline for the replies, that is tricky balance, and I would defer to the ACTU as affiliates on their preferences there. I don't have a strong view either way. It would be helpful to have the extra time, but it would also be lovely to have Easter.

PN114

We also noted in our correspondence to the Commission that we were a little apprehensive about all of the issues being able to be dealt with within four days and wondered if it might be prudent to list the matter for some additional days. If we don't need them, fantastic, but if we do they are there.

PN115

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I might come to that in a moment when I talk through what I suggest in terms of how we deal with the consultation process. So I might just part that last issue for then.

PN116

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: Thank you.

PN117

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is there anyone else that has a view about Easter, the additional time? No. Why don't I do the classic approach and split the difference, and provide an additional day? So I will shift it to 26 March.

PN118

Now, in terms of the discussion process, I mean it is very clear that the discussion paper raises a number of meaty issues to be dealt with in four days. And I mean, at the same time, the consultation itself includes the written submissions and the five submissions so that material - all that written material will be available for the Full Bench in preparing the final report.

PN119

My suggestion in terms of the process at this stage on the four days is for each day to have a morning and an afternoon session. So the morning session have run 9.30 to 12.30 and an afternoon session 2.00 to 4.30. So my suggestion is that day one deals with - the morning session with question 1 and question 2. So that relates to part-time employment and individual flexibility agreements. And the afternoon deal with facilitated provisions and working from home. So that's questions 3 and 4.

PN120

In relation to question 5 which is the right to disconnect, it's my intention to not include that in this consultation process in light of the significant developments in the form of legislative change that has taken place. And it's also my understanding that in light of the arrangements under the legislation that there will be separate proceedings initiated to deal with that question of (indistinct), so I am proposing to not cover that in this process.

PN121

Then day 2, the morning would be question 6 and 7, the minimum payment periods and span of hours. The afternoon, questions 8 and 9. The notice of rosters and availability of guaranteed regular hours. And then the morning of day 3, questions 10, 11 and 12, overtime, TOIL and makeup time, on call and recall to duty and travel time. And the afternoon, covering questions 13, 18, 14 and 17. So that's annual leave, ceremonial leave and personal carer's leave.

PN122

And then in the morning of the fourth day, question 15 and 16, so that's the definition of immediate family and unpaid carer's leave, with the afternoon being question 19, which is other variations to modern awards.

PN123

So my logic there was, yes, there's a number of issues that this raises. Firstly, it's a challenge and I don't think we can be too prescriptive, because until we see the submissions and where there are more or fewer or more or less complex proposals to vary the awards, it's a bit impossible to definitively have a sense of how long is needed.

PN124

But I've heavy-loaded the front end of it, is the suggestion, so that we've got a little more time at the end of day 4 if the discussions spill over, if you like. And I suggest and I'm open to setting aside an additional day of 11 April, the Thursday, if that's necessary. I'm not inclined to list that at this point, because of the adage of a task takes exactly as long as you have to undertake it. So if I was to set aside 20 days, I'm sure we could discuss all of the issues and it would take exactly 20 days.

PN125

So I'm keen to keep a pretty tight timeframe, but with that additional day if that proves necessary and when I say 'proves necessary' what I have in mind there is to deal with any further discussions about potential award variations where there is or is likely to be a level of agreement.

PN126

So that's my thinking there. And the other thing, it is a really tight time frame and I really do appreciate that. But it's also helpful to bear in mind that this isn't a case. It's a discussion process and it's about hearing from you about suggestions for potential award variations and discuss them informally so that everyone has a better understanding of them. Matters can be clarified and talked through, and potential issues identified and discussed.

PN127

So, yes, just making that point. So that's my thinking and suggestions in relation to how we conduct the consultations, but if there's different alternatives, I'm happy to hear them.

PN128

Ms Tinsley, you are first off the mark.

PN129

MS TINSLEY: Thank you, Deputy President. So I think in terms of your approach, it is certainly sensible and one that we are supportive of. And the point I'm making is perhaps an obvious one, but I do note that unlike some of the other streams, the questions are asking for specific variations. And I have noticed even some union submissions in other streams, there's been issues raised without a specific variation actually, but you can put it forward.

PN130

So if I may, I might suggest that perhaps we keep it flexible as you've suggested already, but perhaps if there is no specific proposal noting everyone's time and lack of resources are quite stretched at the moment, that we only list a particular topic for discussion on a particular day if there are specific proposals being put forward as opposed to a general discussion about potential issues. Thank you, Deputy President.

PN131

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have to say that has some potential merit in my mind, initially at least. Anyone else want to say anything? Ms Bhatt?

PN132

MS BHATT: Just briefly, Deputy President, as you say it is difficult to be (indistinct) at this stage, before the mentioned material has been filed. Can I suggest that once the material is filed, if the parties have any suggestions as to how the program that's just been proposed to us might be altered, that we're given that opportunity.

PN133

I just have in mind, for example, there's a question that relates to part-time employment, which I think might be question 1. And subsequent there is another question about the issue of availability and guarantee of regular hours, which I think is question 9. It's possible, at least conceivable that there will be some overlap between the issues that arise between those two questions, depending on the approach adopted by the parties in responding to them. And so it might

become apparent that actually there is merit in dealing with those two issues together. But to some extent, we just don't know until the material has been filed.

PN134

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I don't think I need to make a formal direction allowing that, but certainly you are welcome to put forward any such suggestions at that time. Hypothetically, it might be that when the material comes in there are only proposals put forward in relation to four awards. And it might be better to do with them on an award basis, rather than an issue basis. But it remains to be seen. Ms Peldova-McClelland?

PN135

MS PELDOVA-MCCLELLAND: Thank you, Deputy President. I think what's been discussed is sensible. The initial - as you've outlined, dealing with the questions on particular days, but with an opportunity to go back and revisit that, should the materials indicate that another approach would be more efficient.

PN136

Just responding to what Ms Tinsley raised, I think that's been an issue for all parties in other streams, not just unions is my understanding. So I'd be hesitant to say that we can't discuss things unless there are specific variations being put. Perhaps we can devote less time to them. But I would be hesitant to say that they can't be discussed during the consultations at all.

PN137

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I am not intending to issue a direction banning or permitting, but the discussion paper does seek submissions about particular variations, and it seems to me that that is by far the best use of our time, is to discuss concrete proposals. Otherwise, even 20 days isn't going to be anywhere near enough. We will need the rest of the year and I don't think that anyone is going to be seeking that, but your comments are noted. Mr Robson?

PN138

MR ROBSON: Thank you, Deputy President. I note your comment about listing these matters in Melbourne. If there is any way to consider at least a day in Sydney, that would be helpful just with managing the travel for my office. Thank you.

PN139

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Ms Bhatt has made a similar request, and I am minded to accede to that request. And either the first two days or the second two days would be in Sydney. So I will advise accordingly.

PN140

MS BHATT: Thank you.

PN141

MR ROBSON: Thank you.

PN142

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: All right. They were all the matters that I wanted to raise. Are there any other issues that parties wanted to raise?

PN143

MS PELDOVA-MCLELLAND: Just to respond to the last conversation around consultation listings. I think in some other streams - and we did foreshadow this at the beginning of the mention as well that the opportunity to attend remotely if the consultation is in a city where one resides. So we would appreciate that opportunity.

PN144

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: All right. If there is nothing further, I look forward to spending a great deal of time with you all and the Commission is adjourned. Thank you.

ADJOURNED INDEFINITELY

[10.45 AM]