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**Niran Gunawardena:**

Good afternoon, and welcome to today’s webinar. My name is Niran Gunawardena, and I am from the New Employment Services Division, part of the Department of Education, Skills and Employment. I also have my colleague Warwick Shepherd here to help answer questions.

Before we start, I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners and custodians of the land on which each of us gather, and pay respect to their Elders past, present and emerging. I would also like to extend that respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people participating today.

In today’s webinar, I will be covering three main topics. First of all, a brief summary of the New Employment Services Model, which will replace jobactive in 2022. Second, I’ll provide an update on the New Employment Services Trial, which is testing key elements of the new model. This will include some early findings, as well as some of the impacts of COVID-19 and the bushfires on the trial.

The main part of this presentation will be an overview of the proposed licensing system that will be used to contract providers under the New Employment Services Model.

We will be taking questions at any point throughout the presentation, so feel free to send any through by typing them in under ‘Questions’, and then clicking ‘Send’. We will try to answer questions as we go, but may need to take some on notice. Any questions that are the responsibility of the Department of Home Affairs we will pass on to them for consideration.

Today’s webinar forms part of a series of webinars we are holding with service providers contracted by the Australian Government. While your organisation may not currently deliver jobactive, there will be future opportunities for providers to enter the market under the New Employment Services Model, and you may want to consider such opportunities for your organisation.

All of these webinars are recorded and will be available for download at employment.gov.au/consultation-inform-new-employment-services. There is also a Frequently Asked Questions document on that website which we will be updating over time.

I will now be giving a short summary of the New Employment Services Model. This will hopefully give you a better understanding of the reforms. In March 2019, the government announced that a New Employment Services Model would commence in July 2022. Policy settings for the new model are being tested and refined in the lead up to 2022. The Government is yet to agree to the final model, and an announcement is expected next year, but today I will take you through the current thinking on the proposed model.

So what is the new model aiming to achieve?

The reforms are aimed to achieve several things, including helping more jobseekers into sustainable jobs, particularly the most disadvantaged. Better leveraging digital technology and data. The Australian labour market is increasingly moving online, and digital technology offers smarter ways of doing things for the benefit of all users. Improving the effectiveness of mutual obligations. The new model maintains the key principle of Australia’s welfare system, but seeks to make it more flexible. Jobseekers are to be given greater personal responsibility. Increasing employer engagement with the service. Evidence shows this has declined over time, and having the buy in from employers is critical to the success of the new model. Reducing red tape. Where possible, the reforms aim to remove unnecessary obstacles and streamline processes. Having providers spend less time on administration and more time on servicing jobseekers and employers is a win-win situation. Creating a more efficient and cost-effective model. Jobseekers capable of servicing themselves being supported to do so, and targeting more resources to those who need it most is a good example of this. Improving provider performance with streamlined procurement, allowing for easier renewals for higher performers and non-renewals for low performers.

Further information on the model is available at employment.gov.au/new-employment-services-model.

The model will feature three main service levels. Digital First, Digital Plus and Enhanced Services. Jobseekers assessed as being the most job ready and capable of self-servicing online will be referred to Digital First. This service will enable jobseekers to get on with looking for a job, removing the current requirement of having to meet with a provider, and giving them greater responsibility for moving into work.

The second service level will be Digital Plus. Jobseekers assessed as requiring some additional support to move into work, such as help with their employability skills, will be placed into this service. In addition to self-servicing online, this group of jobseekers may receive some face to face support from a training provider, or access to other services where necessary.

The third most comprehensive service level will be Enhanced Services. Jobseekers assessed as having significant vocational and/or non-vocational barriers to work will be referred to Enhanced Services. They will choose a provider who will help the jobseeker with a wide range of services to address their vocational and non-vocational barriers to work. Enhanced Services jobseekers will be allocated to one of two tiers, depending on the type of servicing they need. Tier one jobseekers are expected to have fewer non-vocational barriers and greater capacity to undertake more intense activities compared to tier two.

The new assessment framework is still being developed, but will have two main components, an initial assessment and subsequent comprehensive assessments. The initial assessment, the jobseeker classification instrument, will determine which service a jobseeker is placed in to. This assessment will assess the risk factors that may result in them becoming long term unemployed, as well as assess their digital literacy and access to online services. Further assessments will occur after a person commences in the service, enabling more individually tailored support to be offered. These comprehensive assessments will have a scope broader than what is captured in the initial assessment, for example, a jobseeker’s career aspirations or their specific experience and skills.

The system will have built in safeguards to ensure jobseekers receive the right support for them. For jobseekers who are self-servicing, reassessments will occur at specific points in time, or based on specific risk triggers to make sure they are getting the support they need, or where there is a change in their circumstances.

One of the key transformational features of the new model is the digital service. It will have many features, and over time additional features will be developed, tested and added to the system. More than just an app or a simple website, it will be available to all jobseekers, not just people on income support. Harnessing the power of data, it will be able to suggest to jobseekers particular vacancies or courses that match their individual characteristics, or provide filters and shortlists to employers looking for suitable candidates.

The digital service will enable jobseekers to look for work or access online training, or build and finesse their resume at a time and place that is convenient to them. The digital service will have a contact centre as part of its rollout. That will enable users to pick up the phone or send an email if they have questions or need help with a particular issue. The platform will also link to other existing players in the employment industry, online job boards, training providers, etcetera, increasing the reach of the service and its effectiveness at connecting jobseekers with employers.

A new flexible activation framework will ensure jobseekers meet their mutual obligations, while letting them choose activities that best suit their circumstances. Digital First and Digital Plus jobseekers will have the flexibility to choose which activities best suit their circumstances. Under the new points-based system, some proportion of their activities must be job search related, while the rest can be made up of other approved activities relating to work experience and addressing vocational or non-vocational barriers. For Enhanced Services jobseekers, early intervention and intensive activities will be the default expectation.

Providers and jobseekers will have greater discretion and choice as to the type and duration of activities jobseekers undertake. Complementary programs, such as Work for the Dole and Youth Jobs PaTH, will remain as important adjuncts to the service offering. The expectation is providers and jobseekers choose to use these as part of their service and support, and that there is much greater diversity in the pathways to employment for jobseekers. H, H, will

Jobseekers will still remain subject to the targeted compliance framework, with penalties to apply when they do not meet their mutual obligation requirements.

The New Employment Services Model is being developed iteratively, and different elements are being tested using a phased approach. The Online Employment Services Trial commenced on 1 July 2018 to test key elements of digital servicing, and this has been expanded over time. In July 2019, the New Employment Services Trial started, with job ready jobseekers commencing in Digital First. The trial is testing key elements of the new model prior to its national rollout. Last October Digital Plus commenced, while Enhanced Services commenced in November. This included introducing the new payments model for providers, and setting up the digital services contact centre to provide additional support to jobseekers who are self-servicing online. In December 2019, volunteer jobseekers began being referred to the Volunteer Online Employment Services Trial. This means jobactive providers were no longer being referred volunteer jobseekers.

As the trial continues, the department will progressively test and trial other key facets of the new model, including the points based activation approach due to be introduced around October this year, and new tools to support the assessment of jobseekers from early next year. Procurement for the new model is expected to occur in mid to late 2021, once the final model design has been agreed by government, and I’ll cover this in greater detail later in the presentation. The various trials are due to conclude in June 2022, while our new model commences in July 2022.

I’ll just check in with Warwick if there’s any questions.

**Warwick Shepherd:**

No. Not at this stage Niran.

**Niran Gunawardena:**

Thanks Warwick.

Now for some more information on the New Employment Services Trial, or NEST as we call it, which is trialling key elements of the New Employment Services Model.

The New Employment Services Trial is operating in two locations. The first is Adelaide South in South Australia, and the second trial location is the Mid North Coast of New South Wales.

On this slide we’ve chosen to present this data as at 15 March 2020, before the NEST caseload began to be affected by an increase in the caseload due to COVID-19. I should also flag that these proportions are simply showing what occurred in the trial, and should not be used for modelling what is going to happen in the new model when it starts in 2022.

Initially the majority of the trial caseload consisted of Enhanced Services jobseekers. Many of these jobseekers are assigned to Tier 1, which has a strong vocational focus. The small proportion of Digital Services jobseekers, that is Digital Volunteers, Digital First and Digital Plus, were mostly new jobseekers to employment services. The transition of jobseekers from jobactive to NEST took place in late 2019. The vast majority, 91%, of these transitioning jobseekers moved in to Enhanced Services. This is primarily due to a small number of jobseekers being eligible for digital services. For example, those jobseekers in Stream A that had been in employment services for 12 months or more were ineligible to remain in Digital Services. In addition to this, jobseekers in the trial eligible for Digital Services could choose to opt out of Digital Services and remain with their provider.

We kept it fairly flexible in the trial to understand the different factors influencing the choice of the jobseeker. These findings will be reviewed and inform the approach taken for transitioning to the new model in 2022.

This year has been very eventful, though on a positive note, it has allowed us to stress test various aspects of the trial, in particular Digital Services. Large parts of both trial regions were affected by bushfires over the summer. Between November and February, this meant contingency arrangements were put in place, impacting the trial as well as other employment programs.

From late March, the increase in social distancing restrictions to help reduce COVID-19 transmission resulted in a very large spike in income support recipients, as many workers became unemployed. These two external factors have meant mutual obligations have been suspended for much of the trial. The NEST caseload has doubled in size, with the overwhelming majority of new entrants being job ready jobseekers moving in to Digital First. Some elements of the trial have been delayed, including the introduction of points-based activation, originally planned for July but moved to October, and some activities available for digital participants. We have incorporated some workarounds to help manage this, including making the employment preparation activities voluntary for example. There’s been fewer job vacancies, as many businesses were unable to remain open. There have been little to no face to face servicing of jobseekers, cancellation of many activities, such as Work for the Dole, and a shift to more phone‑based and online support from providers.

In response to these challenges, there have been some really excellent and positive outcomes, such as the digital platform has coped well with an enormous jump in users. There has been some great flexibility and innovation amongst trial providers, with a focus on engaging jobseekers and getting them to own their employment pathway. We’ve seen greater focus on tailoring the service to the individual, leading to voluntary engagement, and rapid innovation has occurred in various processes and service design to accommodate changes in mutual obligation requirements.

In the coming months, as restrictions ease, we expect many elements of the trial to return to normal, but this may take some time, particularly in some parts of the country, for example, Kangaroo Island.

Despite the upheaval endured in recent months, we continue to gather evidence to inform the final model. Most of the data gathered on the trial to date has been qualitative in nature, so will not reflect the experience of every person in the trial. Some key findings to date include provider staff have appreciated greater flexibility in how they service jobseekers. They also welcome the fact that the trial is rewarding them for progressing jobseekers towards employment, not just employment outcomes.

Some Enhanced Services jobseekers have noticed longer appointment times with their provider, and have welcomed being given greater choice in regards to the activities they do. Digital Services jobseekers like the convenience and flexibility of online services, and appreciate not having to travel to visit a provider. Employers have highlighted that timeliness and accuracy of information of candidates is important. We have also had great feedback from employers taking part in our Virtual Job Fairs and using the Jobs Hub, which is fantastic.

I’ll just pause, check with Warwick. Any questions?

**Warwick Shepherd:**

None at this stage Niran.

**Niran Gunawardena:**

Thanks Warwick.

So I’ll now move on to the proposed licensing system.

In March 2019, the government announced the New Employment Services Model would feature a licensing system. This was informed by recommendations of the Employment Services Expert Advisory Panel, which operated in 2018 and released a report to Government in December 2018.

Many aspects of the licensing system are still under development, and are subject to change. Today’s presentation includes some proposed features and settings, as well as some options. We plan to undertake further consultation in 2020, and the government is yet to make a decision on the final model, so please don’t take the proposed system discussed in this webinar as finalised or settled. There will be a more detailed Discussion Paper, which I will cover more on later, that will give all stakeholders the opportunity to provide input to the licensing system.

The key objectives of a licensing system include lowering barriers to entry and exit, driving quality outcomes for jobseekers and employers, reducing the cost and disruption of procurement. A number of design principles will also help shape the design of the licensing system. Streamlining procurement, responding to local needs, rewarding strong performance, encouraging greater diversity of providers, harnessing specialist expertise, balancing flexibility and market stability.

The first key feature of the system is the panel. Establishing a panel of organisations should increase the overall responsiveness of the model by having a panel of organisations to potentially draw upon where they’re needed, such as where an additional licence is issued or when replacing a low performing provider. The panel removes the need to run a tender exercise every time a new provider is needed. The proposed option is to have a single panel with sub-panels for each of the 51 employment regions covering all of Australia not classified as remote. An alternative option would be to have separate panels for each region.

A Deed of Standing Offer will be signed by each panel member, with selected panel members being issued contractual licences. This means some panel members will not receive a licence, while others may receive a licence for more than one region. The panel would include both generalist and specialist organisations.

The duration of the panel is proposed at six years, with scope for rollovers. Due to the significant time and cost involved in setting up a panel, having the panel last a shorter period, for example less than five years, could increase costs and lead to other inefficiencies. Having the panel in place for a longer period, eg more than ten years, could inhibit the inflow of new entrants and the associated innovation.

It is proposed that panel members would be required to satisfy several criteria on a periodic basis in order to remain on the panel, such as every 12 months. Panel members would also be expected to confirm their ability and willingness to obtain necessary quality assurance and information security accreditation if offered a licence.

New organisations could potentially join the panel through panel refresh processes, where the department identified the need to add to the panel in a particular region for example. Panel refreshes provide the opportunity for organisations that miss out on the initial request for a proposal to join at a later date.

Licences issued under the New Employment Services Model will be contractual licences. This means that they are contracts for services, and not statutory licences, which permit, authorise or regulate certain activities.

The terms of the licences will be enforceable under the law of contract, and licences would be issued under the terms of the new model’s Deed of Standing Offer. The number of licences issued in each region is proposed to be capped to help with market stability, and to ensure services to jobseekers are not excessively disrupted.

Some providers may be servicing areas smaller than an employment region, even from a single site if it was appropriate. There is potential for providers of different sizes, from very large ones to quite small and locally based ones, in what could be quite a diverse market. It would be a managed market, with each provider given an allocated market share of the jobseeker referrals. Tolerance would be used to give some flexibility for providers to go above or below this allocated share. One option being considered is leaving some portion of the market share in each region unallocated and/or providing only a minimum market share to providers. This would make it easier for licences to be added to the region later.

It is proposed that licences be issued for a minimum of three years, which strikes a balance between allowing providers sufficient time to establish themselves in the market, and for the department having sufficient data to reliably measure and act on provider performance. Alternatively, licences could be issued for a shorter period or a longer period, eg two years, four years, or another time period. The department may add or reduce the number of licences in a region at any point, to respond to changes in the labour market for example. One idea being considered is the potential of issuing short term licences in response to short term events, such as a major redundancy.

We are proposing to have two main types of specialist providers in the new model. Cohort specialists and industry specialists.

It is proposed that cohort specialists would only be referred jobseekers that are from the target cohort, for example Indigenous Australians, culturally and linguistically diverse jobseekers, etcetera. This is different to the model prior to jobactive Job Services Australia, which included specialists who were required to service all jobseekers referred to them, both from their target cohort or not. It is proposed that jobseekers would not be compelled to go to a specialist provider if they are eligible, as choice is important.

Having only one cohort of jobseekers will mean a smaller population of jobseekers from which to receive referrals for providers. The department has commissioned independent research into provider financial viability, including in regards to some of the proposed policy settings for specialists.

This is not an exhaustive list, but potential cohorts for specialist providers could include Indigenous Australians, culturally and linguistically diverse jobseekers, refugees, people with a disability, mature age people, homeless people, ex-offenders, youth, people with mental health issues, parents, people with drug and alcohol issues.

The department only intends to have specialist providers operating in locations where there is an identified need for them. It may be that a specialist is only contracted to operate from a particular area where there is a high concentration of a particular jobseeker cohort, as opposed to an entire employment region. For illustrative purposes, this heat map shows the concentration of jobactive participants from a culturally and linguistically diverse background in the Sydney area. You can see the reddish hotspot centred near Fairfield/Liverpool.

The department will be conducting a detailed analysis to inform where specialists may operate, including but not limited to a range of factors, such as income support data, jobactive and other program caseload data, labour market data.

We are planning to consult widely on specialists, including where they should be located, how they should operate, what type of specialists they should be, as well as how they should interact with other cohort specific employment services. This topic will be included in our upcoming Discussion Paper, and we welcome your views on this.

The other type of specialists proposed are industry specialists. These organisations could specialise in either an industry, for example aged care, hospitality, construction, etcetera, in more of a project‑based fashion, for example the Western Sydney Airport, or in some other fashion, such as redundancy specialists. Industry specialists could possibly be able to source jobseekers from the Digital Services caseload as well as the Enhanced Services caseload, to better meet the diverse needs of employers.

The approach to industry specialists could incorporate elements of or integrate existing employer focused programs funded by the government. Due to having different objectives and services from other providers, industry specialists may require a completely different approach, with a separate deed and guidelines, performance measures and/or incentives. They may also need to operate at a larger scale, for example servicing multiple regions, than other providers in order to be viable. Again, we plan to consult widely on this, particularly with employers and their representatives.

So a key feature of the licensing system is rolling licence renewals. This provides a strong performance incentive, as high performing providers would be given greater certainty with regular licence extensions well in advance of their licences lapsing. Extending a provider’s licence would be beneficial for them, as they would have greater financial surety when discussing bank loans, leases for premises and workforce planning. It also allows most organisations to get on with the job of delivering high quality services without needing to worry about major procurement exercises.

The proposed licensing system would also see low performers exited via non-renewal of their licences in most instances. These organisations would typically be replaced by another organisation drawn from the relevant sub-panel.

The primary mechanism for achieving both of these outcomes is the licence review. This would be a regular review conducted by the department, potentially on an annual basis, where the performance of providers would be assessed and a decision reached on whether the number of licences in each region is appropriate. These reviews are proposed to occur around the middle of the year, though key performance data would be released more regularly, for example quarterly.

The first licence review may take place slightly later in 2023 than mid-year. This would allow enough time for robust performance data to be generated, due to the impact of transition, and give providers, particularly new ones, time to become familiar with the various program settings. Evidence from previous programs shows this can take up to a year or more. One option being considered is to make the first review limited in scope, for example, only issuing extensions to the highest performing providers, or only issuing one year extensions. This would reflect the fact that early performance data may not give a strong enough indication of how a provider is going to go after a couple of years.

Under the proposed approach, each licence review would place providers in to one of three performance groupings. High, moderate and low. Alternate options include having more or fewer performance groupings. Under the proposed system, high performers would be offered a licence extension of up to two years, which would result in them having up to four years remaining on their licence. Moderate performers would be offered a licence extension of up to one year, which would result in them having up to three years remaining on their licence. Low performing providers would be in scope for non-renewal. In many instances, we expect their licence wouldn’t be renewed, but there may be circumstances where there isn’t a suitable replacement on the panel, or other reasons resulting in the department choosing to extend their licence by a year.

Assessment of provider performance will be done separately for each employment region that a provider is servicing.

Low performing providers would be given notice well in advance of their licence lapsing, including through regular performance information. Effectively, they would be told they are at risk of their licence not being renewed should their performance fail to improve. On a similar note, extensions would happen well in advance of licences lapsing, giving providers a reasonable level of certainty. This would mean that for most providers, they would typically have a couple of years left on their licence. The department would have the ability to revoke a provider’s licence at any point in time for serious non-compliance, such as gross misconduct or significant under‑performance. The licence renewal process will of course be informed by the performance framework, which is still being developed.

I’ll now step you through some scenarios to illustrate how the proposed licence renewal approach could work. And please remember, this is all subject to change.

So scenario one steps us through a high performing provider. At the start of the model in July 2022, the provider would receive a licence for an initial three years. At the first licence review point, proposed for around September 2023, this provider is assessed as a high performer.

The result of this is that they are offered a licence extension of two years, which means their licence end date moves from 2025 to 2027.

The second licence review would take place in mid-2024, and our example provider is again assessed in the high performance category. This would result in them being offered a one year licence extension to 2028. It is important to note that they are not receiving another two years here, but would have four years remaining on their licence.

The third licence review in mid-2025, the provider is again assessed as a high performer, which results in them being offered another year to their contractual licence. In mid-2026, the fourth licence review sees the same result, and again, another one year extension is offered, this time to 2030.

Please note that this and the other scenarios assume that the panel is rolled over, and services are delivered well beyond the six years.

In this scenario we see what happens to a provider that consistently achieves moderate performance. Again, the provider would receive a licence for an initial three years.

At the first licence review point, this provider is assessed as a moderate performer. The result of this is that they are offered a licence extension of one year, which moves their licence end date from 2025 to 2026. This is one year less than a high performer, assuring them three years remaining on their licence.

At the second licence review in 2024, the provider is again assessed as a moderate performer. They are again offered a one year licence extension, this time to 2027. At the third licence review in mid-2025, they are again assessed as a moderate performer, and receive another one year extension.

The fourth licence review sees the same result, and again another one year extension. Were this provider to improve their performance and jump in to the high performance category, they would be offered a two year extension, not just one year. This difference acts as an incentive.

Our third scenario illustrates what may happen to a low performing provider under the proposed approach. At the first licence review point, this provider is assessed as a low performer. They should already have a good idea of their performance due to the proposed regular performance data releases, as well as up to date reports available to them at all times. For this provider, they do not receive an offer of a licence extension. It is however proposed that underperforming providers would receive ongoing support to improve their processes, and hopefully achieve better performance going forward.

The second licence review in 2024 sees our example provider again assessed in the low performance category. No licence extension is offered, and they are formally notified that they are at risk of exiting in 12 months if their performance does not improve in the subsequent two quarters. Around six months later, confirmation would be given to the provider that their licence will or will not be renewed. In the case of renewal, this would be a one year extension. In the case of non-renewal, the provider is exited from that region and would typically be replaced from the panel. The replacement provider would be issued a contractual licence for an initial three years. There would be a period over several months where all parties would work together to ensure a smooth transition, minimising disruption for jobseekers and employers.

The licensing system proposed offers many opportunities for red tape reduction. By moving to a rolling licensing renewal process, it is anticipated that providers would spend less time and resources on tender applications in the long term. Large business reallocation processes that occur every 18 months under jobactive would not be necessary. The request for proposal would feature simpler, more targeted questions. This would mean each applicant would submit shorter and less onerous responses, and not need to upload as many documents. There is potential to leverage existing government datasets to assess applications, saving applicants from having to provide this data to government again. For example, there are opportunities in linking data from the Australian Taxation Office, the Australian Securities and Investments Commission, and Workplace Gender Equality Agency.

The department is always looking for opportunities to reduce the administrative burden for jobseekers, employers and providers. One of the ways we intend to do this in the new model is by making the deed and supporting guidelines shorter and simpler.

To help inform the development of the licensing system, we will conduct targeted consultations throughout the remainder of this year with a range of selected stakeholders. We intend to consult with employment services providers and their representatives, jobseekers and their representatives, employers and their representatives, the New Employment Services Trial Reference Group, which includes representatives from a number of different sectors, community organisations, government agencies and academics.

We also plan to issue a public Discussion Paper in August this year. This will ensure that all stakeholders around the country have the opportunity to have their voice heard on licensing. The paper will help disseminate what the potential licensing system might look like to the market, effectively acting as a bit of a signal well before the procurement for the new model starts.

Feedback received from the Discussion Paper and the broader consultation process will strengthen the evidence base for the final model.

And now on to timeframes, which I’m sure will be of interest. At this early stage, our best estimates for the key procurement milestones are as follows. Consultation and policy design is currently under way, and will continue throughout this year. The design of the new model, including the licensing system, is expected to be announced in early to mid-2021. We are hoping to release an exposure draft of the request for proposal following the announcement of the new model design, though this is yet to be confirmed.

We expect to release the Request for Proposal in mid to late 2021, with the assessment of responses occurring in late 2021. This means successful panel members and licence holders would be notified by the end of 2021. Following this, we anticipate transitioning from jobactive to the new model in early 2022.

Please note that these are indicative timeframes and are subject to change.

At that point, I would now like to cover off a few more of the questions we received today. Warwick?

**Warwick Shepherd:**

Yep. So we’ve got a couple of questions. One is around specialist providers, and given the challenging nature of servicing certain cohorts, would they receive higher funding or have different performance measures compared to other providers?

**Niran Gunawardena:**

Certainly the operation of specialists, including funding or performance is being considered, and not yet determined. We will be consulting on how specialists could operate in this new framework as part of the Discussion Paper process, so I would encourage people to put forward their views as part of that process.

**Warwick Shepherd:**

Thanks. And then we’ve got another question around jobseekers engaging in language, literacy and numeracy training, and if that would be a payable outcome for providers, particularly for Enhanced Services and CALD or Indigenous specialist providers?

**Niran Gunawardena:**

The final payment model is still to be determined, however under the trial, successful completion of some training can contribute towards progress of jobseekers, and there are some rewards for that. That said, the final payment model is yet to be determined for the full model.

**Warwick Shepherd:**

Alright. Thanks Niran. That’s all the questions we have got. We have one just come in sorry. Are there any eligibility requirements to be a provider?

**Niran Gunawardena:**

That will all be laid out in our Request for Tender documentation. So at this stage I can’t outline exactly what those requirements will be, but do keep an eye out for the tender when it arises in 2021.

**Warwick Shepherd:**

Thanks Niran. So if there are any subsequent questions, feel free to send them through. The email address is future-employment-services@dese.gov.au, and we’ll do our best to any answer any subsequent questions as well.

**Niran Gunawardena:**

Thanks Warwick. So everyone, I appreciate you joining us for this webinar. I hope you got a lot out of it. As Warwick mentioned, in terms of the questions we receive, we will endeavour to answer any additional questions as best we can and make them available on the department’s website in the next week or two. Thank you, and have a good day.

[End of Transcript]