



Policy costing request—during the caretaker period for a general election

Name of policy:	Reversing Coalition and ALP cuts to FTB
Person requesting costing:	Senator Richard di Natale
Parliamentary party:	Australian Greens
Date of request to cost the policy:	1 July 2016
<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 (ie from the Treasury or the Department of Finance)?	No
Details of the public release of this policy (Date, by whom and a reference to that release):	http://rachel-siewert.greensmps.org.au/content/media-releases/greens-re-affirm-opposition-coalition-cuts-family-payments-system
Description of policy	
Summary of policy (as applicable, please attach copies of relevant policy documents):	<p>Maintaining the current Family Tax Benefits (FTB) system as legislated at 22 Feb 2016, with the exception of reversing the FTB specific measures in the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Social Services and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 - changes to calendar timing for how FTB-A is calculated for families with teenage kids and the extended freeze on indexation of the FTB-B primary earner income limit and the FTB-A and FTB-B supplements.○ Social Services and Other Legislation Amendment (2014 Budget Measures No. 6) Bill 2014 - FTB-A – limiting large family supplement, removing the per-child add-on, removing the per-child add-on, reducing the primary earner income limit, stopping indexation of the energy supplement.○ Social Services Legislation Amendment (Family Payments Structural Reform and Participation Measures) Bill 2015 - cutting FTB-B for parents with youngest children aged 13+
What is the purpose or intention of the policy?	To maintain a tax and transfer system that supports those families that require financial assistance.

What are the key assumptions that have been made in the policy, including:	
Is the policy part of a package? If yes, list the components and interactions with proposed or existing policies.	Interactions with other components of the inequality package – in particular, the decision to reinstate the energy supplement
Where relevant, is funding for the policy to be demand driven or a capped amount? If a capped amount, are the costs of administering the policy to be included within the capped amount or additional to the capped amount?	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?	-
Are there associated savings, offsets or expenses? If yes, please provide details.	Yes, see <i>Description of Policy</i> box
Does the policy relate to a previous budget measure? If yes, which measure?	Yes, see <i>Description of Policy</i> box
If the proposal would change an existing measure, are savings expected from the departmental costs of implementing the program?	-
Will the funding/program cost require indexation? If yes, list factors to be used.	Indexation changes as in the relevant budget measures.

PBO Policy costing request—during the caretaker period for a general election

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)				
	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20
Underlying cash balance (\$m)	-1,235	-2,575	-2,895	-2,930
Fiscal balance (\$m)	-690	-1,620	-2,070	-2,915
(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 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?	-			
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?	591,000 families receive family tax benefits according to the latest Department of Human Services Annual Report			
Administration of policy:				
Who will administer the policy (for example, Australian Government entity, the States, non-government organisation, etc)?	Department of Human Services			
Please specify whether any special administrative arrangements are proposed for the policy and whether these are expected to involve additional transactions/processing (by service delivery agencies).	-			
Intended date of implementation:	1 September 2016			
Intended duration of policy:	Ongoing			
Are there transitional arrangements associated with policy implementation?	-			

PBO Policy costing request—during the caretaker period for a general election

List major data sources utilised to develop policy (for example, ABS catalogue number 3201.0).	-
Are there any other assumptions that need to be considered?	-
NOTE: <i>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.</i>	