



**POLICY COSTING REQUEST – DURING THE CARETAKER PERIOD FOR A
GENERAL ELECTION**

Name of policy:	Mental Health
Person requesting costing:	Senator Milne
Date of request to cost the policy:	30 August 2013
<i>Note: This policy costing request and the response to this request will be made publicly available.</i>	
Has a costing of this policy been requested under Section 29 of the Charter of Budget Honesty (i.e. from the Treasury or the Department of Finance and Deregulation)?	No
Details of the public release of this policy (Date, by whom and a reference to that release)	Quality Mental Health. Senator Penny Wright, 27 August http://greensmps.org.au/quality-mental-health-care
Description of policy:	
Summary of policy (as applicable, please attach copies of relevant policy documents):	http://greens.org.au/sites/greens.org.au/files/Greens-Mental-Health-Package.pdf • Investing \$150 million, over 3 years, to establish a National Institute for Mental Illness Research. • Increasing funding for the Mental Health Nurse Incentive Program by \$70 million per year, on top of current budget commitments. • Reinstating the option of six extra sessions of psychological treatment in exceptional circumstances under the Better Access initiative, costing \$141.6 million over 3 years. • Providing grants of up to \$50,000 to mental health NGOs through re-establishing the NGO Capacity Grants Program, capped at \$7.5 million over three years. • Establishing a National Suicide Prevention Campaign and improving the collection of data relating to suicide with an investment of \$38.3 million over 3 years.
What is the purpose or intention of the policy?	To improve the level of mental health services in Australia.
What are the key assumptions that have been made in the policy, including:	
Is the policy part of a package?	No. There is also a rural mental health policy

**PBO POLICY COSTING REQUEST – DURING THE CARETAKER PERIOD FOR
A GENERAL ELECTION**

If yes, list and outline components and interactions with proposed or existing policies.				
Where relevant, is funding for the policy to be demand driven or a capped amount?	All these policies are capped amounts except the Better Access initiative which is demand driven.			
Will third parties (for instance the States/Territories) have a role in funding or delivering the policy? If yes, is the Australian Government contribution capped, with additional costs to be met by third parties, or is another funding formula envisaged?	No			
Are there associated savings, offsets or expenses? If yes, please provide details.	No			
Does the policy relate to a previous budget measure? If yes, which measure?	No			
If the proposal would change an existing measure, are savings expected from the departmental costs of implementing the program?	No			
Will the funding/program cost require indexation? If yes, list factors to be used.	No			
Expected impacts of the proposal				
If applicable, what are the estimated costs each year? If available, please provide details in the table below. Are these provided on an underlying cash balance or fiscal balance basis?				
Estimated financial implications (outturn prices) ^(a)				
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Underlying cash balance (\$m)	-	-178	-182.1	-186
Fiscal balance (\$m)	-	-178.5	-182.6	-186.5
(a) A positive number for the fiscal balance indicates an increase in revenue or a decrease in expenses or net capital investment in accrual terms. A positive number in the underlying cash balance indicates an increase in revenue or a decrease in expenses or net capital investment in cash terms.				
What assumptions have been made in deriving the expected financial impact in the party costing (please provide information on the data	See previous PBO costing for assumptions.			

**PBO POLICY COSTING REQUEST – DURING THE CARETAKER PERIOD FOR
A GENERAL ELECTION**

sources used to develop the policy)?	
Has the policy been costed by a third party? If yes, can you provide a copy of this costing and its assumptions?	PBO costed Better Access policy on 26 July. Note current proposal starts from 1 July 2014.
What is the expected community impact of the policy? How many people will be affected by the policy? What is the likely take up? What is the basis for these impact assessments/assumptions?	Better mental health outcomes across the community.
Administration of policy:	
Who will administer the policy (for example, Australian Government entity, the States, non-government organisation, etc.)?	Australian government
Should departmental expenses associated with this policy be included in this costing? If no, will the Department be expected to absorb expenses associated with this policy? If yes, please specify the key assumptions, including whether departmental costs are expected with respect to program management (by policy agencies) and additional transactions/processing (by service delivery agencies).	An additional \$1m in departmental funding for DHS is allocated in the original costing to cover the extra administrative work. This cost has been built into the total cost of expanding the Better Access Program.
Intended date of implementation.	1 July 2014
Intended duration of policy.	Ongoing
Are there transitional arrangements associated with policy implementation?	No
List major data sources utilised to develop policy (for example, ABS cat. no. 3201.0).	
Are there any other assumptions that need to be considered?	No
NOTE:	

**PBO POLICY COSTING REQUEST – DURING THE CARETAKER PERIOD FOR
A GENERAL ELECTION**

Please note that:

- *The costing will be on the basis of information provided in this costing request.*
- *The PBO is not bound to accept the assumptions provided by the requestor. If there is a material difference in the assumptions used by the PBO, the PBO will consult with the requestor in advance of the costing being completed.*