

PRIVATE SUBMISSION BY AN INDIVIDUAL WHO WORKS IN A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY THAT CAN HAVE CONTACT WITH CHILDREN, OVERSEAS

I was unable to put a submission in from my place of work so have decided to put in a submission as a private citizen at the last minute. I apologise for the fragmented nature of my response.

1. Should there be a national WWCC?
 - a. There should be a national WWCC that can also cover Australians (including/in particular Australian and State Government personnel) in international settings. Currently government personnel are not screened at all for work they may do with children in their work. A number of Federal agencies send staff to work in country for short missions and longer term missions. International Children should be safe from Australians as well.
 - b. This should be modelled on the **UK CEOP International Child Protection Certificate System.**
2. What features should be included in any national scheme?
 - a. As above, it should cover government employees working overseas and it would be beneficial for it to cover international or Australian based NGOs working in the development context.
3. If there is no national scheme, should there be minimum requirements for each state and territory scheme?
 - a. Minimum requirements would be advantageous to an extent but not as effective.
4. How long should any clearance be granted for?
 - a. A clearance wouldn't need a use by date if the system has notification mechanisms. This is wholly dependent on the set up around criminal record checks. Is it a statement you provide to employers or is it something employers apply for on your behalf?
5. Should a person be able to commence work before the check is completed?

- a. It would work better if they could, let people sign stat decs before commencement but ensure they are supervised. This requires child safe organisations to be in place.
6. How should child-related work be defined?
 - a. Look at the risks, if a child safe organisation deems they want an applicant to have a check, then they should be able to get one.
7. How should child-related sectors and roles be defined?
 - a. What about child focussed organisations? There needs to be a definition for that too. Who should, at a minimum, be a child safe organisation? What organisations are predators targeting. Use some evidence to determine these answers.
8. Are current exemptions for a WWCC adequate or appropriate – in particular, should a WWCC apply to those:
 - a. living in the homes of children in out-of-home care? Yes, they should apply
 - b. parent volunteers? Yes, they should apply
9. What records should be included in the check? For example, should the check include juvenile records?
 - a. No juvenile records for certain types of convictions. This could be modelled on the current spent convictions concept of 'serious crime' and incarceration of over 3 years (or equivalent)
10. How should an appeal process operate?
 - a. Through an ombudsman at the federal level.
11. What issues arise from the current regime of records that result in automatic barring of a person from working with children?
 - a. Only those instances where current views would deem that conviction out of line with current attitudes, such as an 18 yr old charged and convicted of sex with a 17 year old who they then go on to marry.
12. The adequacy of the risk assessment process.
 - a. No details on the risk assessment process. Need to understand what institutions are targets, not just positions/roles

13. To what degree should the WWCC minimise the need for institutions to establish clear processes for responding to inappropriate behaviour of staff in child-related positions?
 - a. It should not. Child safe organisations require all layers of protection to be in place. Adding one does not take away the need for the other.

14. How should the effectiveness of any existing or proposed WWCC be evaluated and / or monitored?
 - a. This is where your risk processes would come in....