

addendum

in the matter of

The corrupt business of Australian Government funded CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES

causing torturous harm and deprivation and a violation of natural living right
to innocent children and innocent family of the nation of Australia
by forcible removal of children and family separation **without necessity**

About

The following report shows the evidence of corruption and the effect of torture and harm
and human right violation to children and family
done by the named Child Protective Services (see annexure a)

Evidence shows

1. traumatic voluminous forcible removals done by 'gestapo like'
seizure of children to separate them from family to force
'business engagement' to profit a business model
therefore
done to achieve a strategic objective to maintain business
continuity and not the preservation of family or proven
protection of children,
done by force and coercion and causing fear by the threat of
gunpoint and causing child and family separation trauma
done by proven year on year excessive reported numbers of
removal of children and interacting with families for business
services without proven necessity or any benefit that fails to
show family preservation or returns as a business focus or as
an improving number yet with increasing exorbitant funding
2. the act of ambush and seizure and withholding of children by
forced separation from their biological families for a
government business advancement
3. serious proven physical and psychological harm to children in
their system of 'care' , and causing elongated torture by
deprivation due to the intentional prolonged separation of
children from family and siblings and from familiar home and
environment

4. elongated psychological, emotional, and developmental, and intergenerational harm caused by prolonged family separation
5. self regulated statutory child protection removal system
done by
 - non evidentiary standards for intervention;
 - non transparency,
 - self management,
 - conflict of interest, and
 - perjurythereby causing
extreme violation to a civilian population that does cause trauma to children and family
6. conflict of interest in the approval of the removal of children with court jurisdiction
and
7. conflict of interest therefore a malfeasance with business reporting frameworks that are tactically self made to boost business performance and promote business continuity and the renewal of non proven as required procurement contracts
8. no evidence of any benefit shown by separating a child and family nor for elongated separation
up to 18 years of age
with some children stolen at birth
on a self made risk presumption model where there is no tested and verifiable international standard of evidence of any harm or abuse
9. Hearsay evidence and gossip reporting accepted in low level jurisdiction systems as reasons to immediately remove children
we deny that hearsay and risk and presumption of a self made business model that measures its own business performance on the volumes of removals and the rate of removals and permanency above the preservation of family and returning children and acknowledging the foreseeable harm a business causes by intervention without necessity from an independent and international and moral standard is a reason to steal (they phrase this as removal) of a child from a family
we deny this is not named as corruption and a violation to children and family life therefore an act of caused to a civilian mass affecting hundreds of thousands of children and family each year

International law instruments and treaty provisions contribute to this report by establishing that sovereign states are bound by international obligations concerning:

- (i) protection of children and
- (ii) preservation of family integrity;
- (iii) prevention of torture, or degrading treatment;
- (iv) procedural fairness and due process protections;
- (v) accountability for abuses by the named businesses committed under colour of public authority

It is declared this report does engage obligations arising under:

- (a) the Convention on the Rights of the Child;
- (b) the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
- (c) the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture;
- (d) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
- (f) the Rome Statute principles concerning accountability and serious violations affecting civilian population

We deny that the accused systems are not exercising coercive powers over children and families while receiving employment through the above claim and the following evidence

through the provision of the without necessity report

the without necessity report

this report evidences the corruption and elongated and serious harm caused
by corrupt business of Child Protective Services

and colossal numbers of innocent stolen children
and innocent families affected

to fund a multi billion dollar system
designed to steal children and separate families for business profit

Key issue

- a) children and families are being seriously harmed by the named system and converted into economic service units to fund a multi billion dollar government business enterprise
- b) government reporting structures conceal systemic harms through administrative deceptive language
- c) strategic business construct that is by proven by design to separate family and not to preserve family by rewarding and incentivisation business continuity and not showing a decrease in removals or an increase in the return of children
- d) administrative frameworks designed to perpetuate system business and financial expanses
- e) state systems causing harm and torture to children and families in Australia as a civilian violation by colossal numbers of stealing children from families done by ambush and seizure to enact forcible removals at the threat of gunpoint intimidation
- f) audacious media requests for funding without proving a decreasing the number of removals and decreasing family separation nor showing this as a priority over their stated focus of 'permanency' of keeping children separated from their family when it is the returning of children that is required
- g) children and families want to be returned to each other and are being prevented by the systems paid to keep them separated

What is not the issue

we are not talking about the minor percentage of children and families who are in genuine need

we are talking about the disproportionate volumuous number of children removed and families interacted with that funds the multi billion dollar industry causing colossal harm to those children and their families

•

How do they get away with it so far?

The existing system piggybacks on the small number of children that may truly need assistance to self justify a multi billion dollar business

It is audacious such they name their industry a 'protective system' when it is proven as 'a removal system' and not a proven protective system or family preservation system to optimise statute business by self incentive

Self made risk assessments are created by the very agencies that profit from removals, to self justify 'stealing children'

removal are done on a presumption of risk from gossip reporting, opinions of a self incentivized 'case worker' and operated through government mandated 'mandatory reporting' that is tactically designed to suit the 'removal assesment framework' that is not designed on proof and only designed on assumption

The removals are done and are driven by self made and self regulated "risk assessments" that are not grounded in any true risk and are not requiring any prroof of any harm or proven harm but seated in self business opinion of potential, future risk by self made vague assesment to assume every day parenting or nominal day to day issues are a reason for a business to self involve and steal children and separate families

These business assesment and self made risk models are not scientifically tested as either true or beneficial however **not** proven that children and families benefit from state interference and where there is no proven harm or abuse

The children are stolen then kept on hearsay and the presumption of risk on hearsay
There is often no proven harm or abuse
The families are persecuted to achieve keeping the children alienated from them

The REMOVAL BUSINESS have three days from the time they take a child and seek an order from a court system that is by design to approve hearsay evidence to keep children from their families

This forces the families to engage in degrading assessment of their capability by a business model intended to fail the parents

The hearsay is then turned into a contraversion for tactical reporting in a conflict of interest system where the process is approved by the very people paid by to steal, and approve the stealing and keep the child and family separated

More is explained with evidentiary proof in the book
THE CHILD PROTECTION RACKET by Dee McLauchlin
<https://thechildprotectionracket.com/>

Data pre analysis

1. Publicly discussed reporting patterns from subsequent years indicate approximately:
 - (a) 170,000 to 179,000 yearly child protection interactions nationally;
 - (b) therefore hundreds of thousands of children are remaining within care systems annually;
 - (c) substantial numbers of children kept within long-term state care extending for years
2. Public reporting further recorded:
 - (a) approximately 74% repeat-client interaction rates among children receiving services;
 - (b) approximately 95% repeat-client rates among children on orders or within out-of-home care systems
3. Financial Conflict of Interest causing child and family violation

Public reporting records billions of dollars in yearly funding for proposed expenditure throughout Australian child protection and out-of-home care systems via corrupt practice and at the expense of causing inhumane harm and torturous deprivation to children and family to children and family

4. Reporting patterns from 2016 onward, cumulative yearly interactions exceed billions with approximately 11.3 billion provided in the most recent financial reporting (2024) to the businesses of child removal and family separation
5. the absence of transparent reunification and restoration reporting

We do not deny that this does impede proper public awareness regarding

- (a) proportionality
- (b) duration of separation;
- (c) long-term harm to children and family outcomes that are otherwise publicly available by media and public testimony

The publicly discussed child protection practices relies upon

- (a) self made risk assessments;
- (b) case worker bias and assumptions;
- (c) subjective and inadequate professional opinion;

Forensic Reconstruction

Approximately 179000 Children Receiving Child Protection Services:

National estimate of children who interacted with the child protection system during the reporting year through orders, or care-related interventions.

Approximately 50000 Children on Care & Protection Orders:

Children subject to legal child protection orders, including supervision, custody, guardianship, or other statutory interventions at 30 June.

Other categories (nebulous) Children in Out-of-Home Care (OOHC):

Children living away from their parents in foster care, kinship care, residential care, or other approved care arrangements at 30 June.

Confirmed separated population

Approximately **44,900 children** were living away from their parents in OOHC at 30 June 2024.

Additional annual entries

Approximately **10,800 admissions** occurred during the year.

Additional legal intervention population

Approximately **59,900 children** were under orders.

Additional intervention population

Approximately **179,000 children** were within the child protection intervention system.

Therefore:

The confirmed population physically separated from parents at a point in time is approximately 44,900 children, while the broader population subject to child protection intervention is approximately 179,000 children

The harm of the Removal process

Children newly being forcible entered into child protective services or out-of-home care during the reporting year

Stage	Official measure	Main system action	Why this is harmful
First contact	Notification	A concern is reported to the department .	Stalking by government clerks and scrutiny of families before anything is proven.
Screening	Investigation commenced	The department decides whether to investigate .	Proven to intensify fear, stress and is an insult to innocent people
Finding	Substantiation	The department confirms abuse/neglect or risk .	Proven to leave families with trauma even when services are inadequate.
Court/legal control	Care and protection order	The court or department places legal limits on parental care .	Proven to separate children from parents and extended family.
Placement	Out-of-home care	The child is placed away from home for safety .	Separation itself proven to be traumatic and destabilising.
Ongoing	Case management and placement changes	The child remains in the system .	Multiple placements proven to disrupt schooling, identity, and relationships.
Complete exit from statutory interference or involvement	No evidence of true or any numbers	Information to be confirmed by reFreedom of Information request	Reunification or exit does not erase the harm caused by State busies removal and self involvement
Unsubstantiated category	Records retained and used in future risk assessments Keeps the family under surveillance even when there is no substantiation and not deleted		

Excessive removals and patterned data sets

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW):

approximately **179,000 Australian children**

came into contact with child protection systems in 2023–24,

•equivalent to approximately **1 in 32 Australian children affected by the removal system** ,

•including:

•70,100 children on care orders,

•55,300 children in out-of-home care

The AIHW further states:

“Almost 3 in 4 (72%) of the children were repeat clients.”

Evidence of keeping the children despite self published Reunification Goals

evidence shows that if a reunification does not occur in the self made timeframes of the named child removal and family separation systems the child is kept and the parents set up to fail through arbitrary processes of presumptive risk models that are unfounded as protective and are not a scientific risk model then the children and family are separated to the age of 18 years with many babies taken at the birthing table

Official AIHW reporting data shows the contradiction

Indicator	National figure
Children in care 2 years or more (2023–24)	69%
Children in care on long-term guardianship arrangements	81% of long-term care cohort

The risk assessment is on ‘presumptive future risk’ not on any harm or requirement to prove and is managed on a caseworker opinion and the acceptance of such hearsay by the judiciary conflict of interest

these self made presumption of risk are vague and nebulous and a tactical busies advantaged where no evidence is required and no harm or any abuse (and opinion and caseworker lies and fabrication and hearsay is upheld by judicial process) to make 18 year orders to separate family and children

This is causing ongoing colossal harm and immense suffering to children and families with

- ➔ a persistent number of Out of Home Care orders
- ➔ no evidence of reunification data are mandatory returns to original family

However exponential funding increases to 11 billion dollars in a financial year

- ➔ CITING lack of resources
- ➔ yet this is in contrast to business operation contract renewals
- ➔ this is contrast also to the lack of returns of children

Publicly available government controlled data shows extreme and non voluntary systemic interference with Australian children and families for profit

AIHW states approximately 1 in 31 Australian children are subject to the child protection system in the last financial year

In 2023–24, approximately 307,000 Australian children were the subject of child protection notifications, 121,000 became subjects of investigations, and 179,000 children had contact with the child protection system through investigations, care and protection orders and/or out-of-home care.

During the same year, 10,800 children were admitted to out-of-home care and 44,900 children were living in out-of-home care at 30 June 2024.

While public discussion often focuses on children on orders (59,900) or in out-of-home care (44,900), a much larger group of children are subject to investigations, monitoring, family support interventions and other forms of state child protection involvement that do not necessarily result in a court order or formal removal from home.

the government controlled national data does not disclose how many of these children were living away from their original parental home **outside the formal out-of-home care categories**

The key transparency issue

"How many unique children were living away from their original parental home due to child protection intervention at any point during the year?"

That is a different measure, and it is not presented clearly as a national statistic in the annual report and is analysed through the following pages

Australian Child Protection System

Forensic Interpretation of National Data

(2016–17 to 2023–24)

Reporting Year	Children Receiving Child Protection Services	Definition	Children on Care & Protection Orders	Definition	Children in Out-of-Home Care (OOHC)	Definition
2023–24	179,000	AIHW states approximately 1 in 31 Australian children interacted with the child protection system	59,900	Children on care/protection orders nationally	Data not available	Data transparency regarding restoration outcomes and long-term separation outcomes appears limited within publicly available reporting frameworks
2022–23	180,000	Children who came into contact with the child protection system	60,600	Legal child protection orders	45,300	Children in OOHC nationally
2021–22	176,000	Children interacting with the system	61,100	Children on care/protection orders	45,400	Children in out-of-home care
2020–21	175,000	Child protection contact nationally	59,400	Statutory intervention orders	46,200	Children in OOHC at 30 June 2021
2019–20	174,700	National child protection interaction figure	60,000	Protection/custody/guardianship orders	46,200	Children in foster, kinship, or residential care
2018–19	172,000	National system interaction levels	60,300	Children under statutory orders	46,000	Children in OOHC nationally
2017–18	170,000	National child protection contact / involvement	61,300	Court or authority intervention orders	44,900	Children placed outside parental homes
2016–17	168,352	Children who came into contact with child protection systems through the intrusion of investigations, orders, or statute presumption of care involvement	64,145	Children under statute legal supervision or statutory child protection orders	43,100	Children living away from parents in foster, kinship, residential or other approved care

Observation

The national child protection dataset does not provide a clear family-centred picture of what happened to children and families.

Instead, it reports administrative categories such as:

- notifications,
- investigations,
- substantiations,
- care and protection orders,
- out-of-home care,
- service involvement.

In 2023–24

- approximately 179,000 children were reported as having contact with the child protection system,
- approximately 59,900 children were on care and protection orders,
- approximately 44,900 children were in out-of-home care.

The data clearly identifies the 44,900 children who were living away from their parents at 30 June.

However, the national reporting framework does not clearly identify the circumstances of the remaining children within the intervention population.

Questions arising from the data

- Were they living away from parents but outside headline OOHC measures?

The national reporting framework does not provide a single integrated answer

The 179,000 Children

The figure of approximately 179,000 children is frequently described as children who had contact with the child protection system.

The reporting framework does not provide a pathway analysis showing

- where these children were living,
- whether they remained with parents,
- whether they were living with relatives,
- whether they were under supervision,
- whether they were receiving funded services,
- whether they were living away from home,
- whether they later returned home.

Consequently, the figure cannot be interpreted as simply "investigations only," nor can it be interpreted as a count of removals.

It represents a broad intervention population whose detailed outcomes are not transparent within the headline statistics.

Reunification is not the same as return

The reporting framework includes references to reunification.

However, the available data does not clearly establish:

- whether reunification resulted in permanent return,
- whether supervision ended,
- whether orders ended,
- whether state involvement ceased,
- whether family autonomy was restored

As a result, reunification figures do not provide a picture of long-term family preservation outcomes

Can a child be involved without an order?

Yes

- 59,900 children on orders,
- 44,900 children in OOHC,
- 33,300 children commencing intensive family support services.

A child may be:

- case managed,
- monitored,
- receiving family support services,

without being on a any care and protection order so therefore supports the business funding model

Examples can include:

- voluntary care arrangements,
- kinship placements agreed to by parents,
- temporary administrative arrangements,
- guardianship arrangements,
- state- specific legal mechanisms.

However, the national AIHW data does **not** provide a count of how exactly many children are living away from parents without an active order

Interestingly, AIHW reports that **93% of children in out-of-home care at 30 June 2024 were on a care and protection order**, meaning about **7% were not**. That suggests a real population in care without a current order.

Most recent 2023-24 data position

Category	Number	What We Know
Children subject to notifications	307,000	A report/allegation was made regarding the child.
Children subject to investigations	121,000	self declared Child Protective Services conducted a formal investigation.
Children with substantiated maltreatment according to	42,100	self declared Child Protective Services determined abuse, neglect, or harm was substantiated
self declared Child protective services		no evidence required self made risk presumption model
Children with child protection system contact		
A consideration should be made with this number to the parent and families affected	179,000	Unique children involved through investigations, orders and/or OOHC
Both children and families are caused elongated harm and suffering due to the statute interference		
Children on care & protection orders	59,900	Under self made statute originated child protection orders
Children in out-of-home care (OOHC)	44,900	Living away from parents at 30 June 2024
Children admitted to OOHC during year	10,800	New entries into care during the reporting year
Children commencing intensive family support services	33,300	Received intensive family support intervention

This data is by design to deceive

- 44,900 children are known to be living away from parents.
- 59,900 are under legal child protection orders

- Yet 179,000 are counted as having child protection system involvement

that is

any child that is receiving services from the government funded business and is a number that is not proven as not inclusive of children living away from their usual home environment

Forensic Observation

the government public reporting data fails to show any child return data or any family preservation data

The national child protection does not show

- any family preservation,
- any family restoration,
- any permanent return home,
- any long-term family stability,
- any complete exit from state involvement

Consequently,

It also omits the harm caused to the children and families as a result of statute involvement and

It also omits the benefit or the reduction of removals and the reduction of orders made

It also omits the harm caused by the forcible removal of children and

It also omits the harm caused by the prolonged torture of child and original family separation

What the data does show is

- that the child protection system is substantially larger than the Out of Home Care category
- a significant proportion of children who enter OOHC remain there for extended periods,
- 70% of children have been subjected to OOHC for two years or more at @ 30 June 2024

AIHW report on **Reunification:**

- 4,500 children exited care through reunification in 2023–24
- 87% of that 4500 of children reunified in 2022–23 did not return to OOHC within 12 months. However, AIHW's reunification measure tracks whether children return to OOHC, not whether all child protection involvement ends. The published data does not provide a national measure of

returns with no involvement or surveillance

or

how long until the child was removed again

The AIHW data also does not show

- children are routinely removed without evidence,
- removals are based solely on hearsay,
- every investigated child is removed,
- every child receiving services is living away from parents,
- there is deliberate statistical concealment.

Those require legal, court, audit, ombudsman, or research evidence beyond the national statistical tables. An FOI has been requested to each of the business

Is the reporting intentionally obfuscated?

The system publishes many different nebulous categories

The general reader may be misled and misunderstand the scale and nature of intervention and statute business self interference in family life in this nation

the numbers are a pattern data suite year on year in the hundreds of thousands

that is an intentional business formulae and this does profit a multi billion dollar industry

at the expense of the trauma and family separation without any necessity or benefit proven

Yet , where the trauma and harm by the colossal numbers of children and family who are being violated by the Government funded Child protective services industry

is proven

Proven harm caused by child removal and family separation

Witness testimony shows and academic research identifies foreseeable risks associated with parent-child separation including:

For children

- grief
- attachment disruption
- anxiety depression
- educational instability
- placement instability
- loss of family, community and culture

For parents

- complicated grief
- trauma
- anxiety depression
- loss of identity
- social isolation
- increased vulnerability to poverty and homelessness

conclusion

the government owned public reporting data therefore provides their own categories of intervention but does not quantify the population experiencing family separation through their funded child protection involvement

Contradiction in corporate narrative

system claim

reality

“Only proven
harm leads to
intervention”

Majority of investigations are
not substantiated

Children are removed on
presumption

“Removal is last
resort”

OOHC population remains
stable over years

“Families are
returned when no
harm is found”

No national dataset proves
automatic return after
unsubstantiated findings

SUBMISSION 1

evidence of

The Torture and Harm caused to children and families
by statute force removals and strategic and intentional
prolonged separation from their family

Harm to the children

Harm Category	Documented Harm to Children caused by Child Protective Services
Psychological trauma	Attachment disruption, grief, anxiety, depression, PTSD-type symptoms
Educational decline	School instability, disengagement, lower educational attainment
Health neglect	Inconsistent healthcare access within care systems
Justice-system contact	Disproportionate later contact with juvenile and adult justice systems
Identity fragmentation	Separation from family systems and kinship structures

Harm to the children and parents and family by Government Child removal systems

Children abused in Government 'care' increased from 1300 to 1500 since 2021

<https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/child-protection/child-protection-australia-2023-24/contents/safety-of-children-in-care>

Evidence and Witness Testimony

Corruption Whistleblower Newspaper first edition

<https://1drv.ms/b/c/c480d41f90db7fa9/EZtyzhIrRgtKnpPwFLuDM7kBor7YC3cEBHAUPx1zZxM09Q?e=eINbO1>

Further reports of harm to children by Government Child removal systems (Australia and global)

These are representative examples of media documenting harm by child-protection systems and their “care slip” language

Country	Publication / source	What it reports	Harm described	Link
Australia	ABC “Removal of newborns...” video (SA)	Babies removed at birth, often with no warning to mothers	Trauma, “inhumane” treatment, loss of bonding, mothers treated as “editors’ note”	YouTube
Australia	Reddit / whistleblower thread on “Baby removals”	Former staff describe “inhumane” practices and “baby removals” at birth	Culture of removal, poor support, trauma to mothers	Reddit
International	Human Rights Watch – “Children Separated from Families”	Documents needlessly separated families in Australia, US, and others	Poverty, race, disability used as “risk” to justify removal; harm to family integrity	HRW
Australia	“Infants removed by Child Protection” (OzChild type study)	Study shows high and rising numbers of infants removed at birth, especially Aboriginal mothers	Grief, powerlessness, repeat removals, poor support	OzChild / The Kids

These are not isolated cases

they are systemic patterns

corruption submission 2

corruption by Business Incentivisation

Child Protective services have a structural Incentivisation of removing and keeping children and keeping families separated as a business success metric in their 'Performance' Framework

This is a corrupt practice by a measurable divergence between

the success of the institution, and
the wellbeing and restoration of the family unit

1. Corruption by State funded business Incentivisation

the operational and financial performance framework contained within the Australian government reporting architecture for community and child protection services has a performance model that is evidenced to

- structurally incentivises child removal,
- rewards continuation of family separation,
- measures institutional productivity over child welfare,
- fails to include safeguards protecting fundamental human rights,
- creates financial and administrative incentives incompatible with family preservation obligations.

2. Institutional Success Is Measured Independently of Family Restoration

The framework measures business performance by

- service outputs, technical efficiency,
- continuity of service delivery,
- workforce sustainability, permanency and ongoing placements
- expenditure allocation,
- comparative jurisdictional performance,

However, the framework fails to establish equivalent indicators measuring

- increasing reunification rates,
- preservation of biological family units,
- reduction of removals, reduction of intervention duration,
- reduction in institutional dependency

Accordingly, institutional success is formally recorded where

- children remain permanently separated from parents,
- familial structures are destroyed by intentional alienation and fabrication
- psychological trauma increases, thereby seeking more funding
- state intervention expands indefinitely

corruption submission 3

corruption by deception and conflict of interest

Government child protective services business is not proven as protective

Corruption by State Business operational success promotes business expanse that opposes family preservation

Structural Incentivisation of Family Separation Within Government Child Protection Performance Frameworks

The analysis identifies serious indicators of systemic maladministration, institutional conflict of interest, and structural incentivisation mechanisms which reward continued intervention, continued child removal, prolonged family separation and expansion of state-controlled service systems, while failing to measure or prioritise family preservation, reunification, or restoration of the child's internationally protected right to family integrity

Australian child-protection system that are a large-scale intervention apparatus operating through large numbers of children removed absent objectively proven harm;

The analysed framework shows a system structurally focused on measuring the operational success, sustainability and expansion of government intervention systems rather than the preservation and restoration of the family unit

The submission contends that:

- due to the force and fear to achieve the child removal a family separation becomes normalised (a culture of teaching families to feel helpless)
- It is the sole anticipatory administrative response despite their claims it is a 'last resort' and this is evidenced by the numbers and testimony of the people and their conflict of interest processes and
- evidence that their operational dependency is on administrative business productivity and self made and untested business bias interpretation of "risk"

The official key performance indicator for their business success framework measures:

- placement and permanency
- service continuity,
- administrative outputs.

But does not maintain or measure family and child protective service as family preservation, restoration of parent-child attachment,

- successful reunification of family outcomes
- accountability to the foreseeable trauma caused by a business interference and forcible removal by strangers from family life itself

The official government framework itself admitted:

- “Data is not yet available”for the family support indicator.

This is critical evidence that

the system comprehensively measures intervention activity while failing to comprehensively measure preservation of the family

This report analyses the operational structure, stated objectives, financial architecture and performance measurement framework contained within the Australian Report on Government Services relating to government-administered child protection services

a) Absence of reunification and family preservation objective

The absence of mandatory reunification indicators, combined with extensive emphasis on operational continuity, expenditure justification, workforce sustainability and service efficiency, creates a substantial institutional conflict of interest

The framework permits institutional success to be recorded irrespective of whether

- children are unnecessarily removed,
- families are permanently separated,
- trauma is increased,
- human rights protections are diminished.

b) Systemic Corruption by key performance indicator(KPI) framework design

The evidence shows that the framework is designed primarily to measure

- institutional continuity,
 - budgetary efficiency,
 - administrative productivity,
 - workforce sustainability,
 - service expansion,
 - comparative agency performance,
- rather than restoration of children to safe family environments

This creates conditions capable of generating systemic corruption whereby institutional success becomes dependent upon the continuation of intervention itself

The structure of the framework evidences

- abuse of public office,
- misuse of statutory powers,
- unlawful incentivisation structures,
- unlawful profiteering from family separation

2.2 Structural Incentive Mechanisms

The report explicitly states governments use the framework for:

- budgeting, assessing agency resource requirements, evaluating agency performance,

child protection systems are funded, expanded and administratively justified through:

- placement continuation,
- workforce expansion,
- ongoing intervention activity,
therefore incentivising:
- higher intervention rates,
- prolonged case duration,
- expanded removal practices,
- continuation of state dependency.

This constitutes a structural conflict of interest.

2.3 Absence of Human Rights Safeguards

The framework contains no enforceable performance requirement mandating compliance with

- family preservation principles,
- proportionality,
- necessity,
- least restrictive intervention,
- reunification prioritisation

The absence of these safeguards is significant because the removal of a child from family constitutes one of the most intrusive exercises of state power possible outside criminal incarceration

Despite this, the framework contains no measurable indicator requiring proof that

- removal was necessary,
- reunification was pursued diligently,

Instead

Business Self Preservation is put above the preservation of Family and ensuring a child has the right to be with their birth family

corruption submission 4

contravention of international law

to uphold the wishes of child

or

to mandate returns of wrongful removals to the original family
or ensure child and parent attachments are a priority

such data is absent from all business success reporting
on the Government Child and Family services and Government Child Protective Services
Performance business services reporting pages

In practical effect the system measures removals, placements, investigations, substantiations and service activity – but does not actually measure whether families were successfully preserved^{2.4} Indicators of Institutionalised Administrative Self-Preservation
The framework repeatedly prioritises institutional self-preservation systems

- a) Not the preservation of family life
- b) Nor the right of a Child and Human Right systems
- c) Nor adherence of the almighty high law of the Father god the maker of his children

The framework measures whether the system sustains itself effectively, not whether the intervention should cease or the preservation of child and family at either a) b) or c)

This distinction is critical to show corruption

A system that benefits structurally from continuation of intervention possesses corruption risk where

- demand generation benefits the institution,
- reduction of intervention undermines operational growth,
- restoration outcomes reduce service dependency,
- family reunification decreases future funding streams

This is in contrast to the extensive evidence

identifying severe psychological trauma resulting from forced family separation. A government watchdog report found separated children experienced

- “fear,”
- “abandonment,”
- “post-traumatic stress,”
- “heightened anxiety and loss

Conclusive evidence

Where such performance is about institutional preservation with no evidence of care and protection to the child and family this is in contrast to a Business of care with such corruption finding as evidences that it is intended by these business to strategically prolong child and family separation for business continuity and institutional performance that is prioritised at the expense of the immense suffering of children and family

evidence of harm caused to children and family caused

submission 5

Media evidence of the serious harm by government child protective services causes to children and families

What people are saying about child protective services

<https://www.change.org/p/address-child-protection-corruption/feed>

Address child protection corruption

“

I was raised in the system, they destroyed my life, they then took my children away, I have my life story of being raised in the system book I've wrote on preorder on kindle to be released 5th March this year it's called Careless A child in care and the girl the system built... They caused me so much trauma...

[Read full comment](#)

Jade

“

DCJ and DCP are liars

Maria

Case law evidence AUSTRALIA

Supreme Court decisions

Re: Georgia and Luke (No 2) [2008] NSWSC 1387 - Palmer Jlaunch

abuse of power and perjury by Government funded Child protective services

Judge warned society of the danger of the child protective services system in
Australia

no accountability at the business level

**regardless of the finding that intentional fabrication operative model allows
caseworkers to act in perjury**

Georgia and Luke (No 2) [2008] NSWSC 1387

JUDICIAL EVIDENCE of an abuse of power

- 1) Corrupt Childrens Court process following conflict of interest statute arranged removal
- 2) FINDINGS of the corrupt practices of Child Protective Services personnel at Supreme Court and the conflict of interest court system

I respectfully refer to Re Georgia and Luke (No 2) [2008] NSWSC 1387 in which the Supreme Court of New South Wales made serious criticisms concerning the conduct of self declared Child Protective Services in that specific matter

DoCS' officers seek to delay return for further four months by further proceedings
in Children's Court to keep the children as act of malice to parents

Head of Child Removal tried to prevent the Supreme Court process to keep the
children without necessity

Supreme Court intervened in Children's Court proceedings

**Child Protective Services found
to steal children and persecute family
to create long term plans to keep the children**

Case law evidence INTERNATIONAL

Social Workers Have Immunity From Perjury Charges If They Lie To Remove Children From Their Homes

<https://www.inquisitr.com/what-is-the-right-to-lie-case-court-case-claims-social-workers-have-immunity-from-perjury-charges-if-they-lie-to-remove-children-from-their-homes-video/>

court found

**child welfare workers committed “judicial deception” to
facilitate the removal**

Hardwick v. Vreeken or the “Right to Lie” case

**child welfare workers “hid” that the children wanted to go home to their
mother**

Case number 15-55563, also known as *Hardwick v. Vreeken* or the “Right to Lie” case, was heard in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in October

Paperwork filed in the case *Do Social Workers Have a Constitutional “Right to Lie” Case 9th Cir 15-55563*, says a jury found social workers and Orange County liable for the “unconstitutional removal and continued detention” of (childrens names suppressed), then 9 and 6, from their mother, Deanna Fogarty.

The Orange County Register reports that in a lawsuit filed by social workers accused of lying in a court report, failing to disclose threats (made by Child Protective Services to the children),

Caseworkers were also found guilty of withholding information about the girls’ emotional states in foster care. At one point, a therapist wrote to the agency that (child name suppressed) showed signs of emotional regression and was tearful throughout the session, begging to go home and withholding evidence that would have cleared their mother, and filing false reports

The jury found that the girls were removed from their home by caseworkers using a “pervasive pattern of lies and extensive cover-up.” The girls ended up spending six and a half years in foster care, despite their mother’s continual attempts to comply with every request the caseworkers made of her, *The Orange County Register* reports

caseworker evidence against the system they were once employed in

University of Houston's Graduate College of Social Work,
Alan Dettlaff stated

**most, if not all, of the children he
removed from their homes could have
stayed with their families**

“ I vividly remember all the children who
were removed, the pain that caused, the
pain that the families are still
experiencing today ”

<https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2023/09/child-protective-service-cps-social-worker-truth-telling-abolish/>

findings in this report

Corruption evidence in the provided 'the without necessity' report proves

Australian Government funded Child protection services

- a) are not a protective business
- b) are a proven mass removal system
operating without evidence of being protective or
keeping family preservation above system permanency
- c) operate a quota pattern of removals and family separation consistent with
operational sales and financial benefit with an employed judicial approving system
conflict of interest
- d) business performance success measured by

keeping a child in the system and away from family
the rate of removing children
business continuity
- e) absence of acknowledgement of the proven harm and torture they cause to

children and family by 'stealing children'
and
keeping the children deliberately from family
- f) absence of requiring evidence to remove children
- g) absence of any proven benefit of elongated separation of children from original
family
- h) absence of proving majority direct evidence or percentage of proven benefit to
children and family separation by state interference

corruption findings in this report

a conflict of interest system

1 the national data shows a colossal number of removals of children

the data number of children in state care it is high and rising, and funding has increased even as the visible level of acute, proven abuse does not show a matching increase by any evidence or data or reporting standard

2 removal reliant on an unfounded presumption of risk

children are taken on a presumption of risk not due to harm or abuse by self made business models to justify their removal operation

3 removal by self made presumption of 'future' risk assessment are not scientific

The "risk assessment" tools used by child protection departments are business bias designed and are not independent scientific instruments

4 conflict of interest by Financial business dependency on removal of children not by returning them

Government systems receive continued funding through the economical formula of self created supply and demand for business continuity

Their Business performance success measured by the volume of removals and how long children are kept in their system

5 conflict of Interest in self managed processes and business incentivisation to separate family

The report identifies "stability and permanency of placement" as a desirable performance outcome
not how quickly children may return home with a self structured business incentivized performance framework

The same system of administrative self-validation

- conduct interventions
- measure intervention outcomes
- justify continued funding

Rome Statute Law implications

regarding state corruption causing harm and torture to a Civilian population

The International law Convention Against Torture

defines torture as

the intentional infliction of severe physical or mental suffering by or with the acquiescence of public officials for purposes including coercion, punishment, intimidation or control.

International criminal law further examines whether conduct is widespread, systematic, institutionally enabled, and maintained through state mechanisms. The ongoing prolonged separation of children and parents, the prevention of family reunification, the disruption of identity and culture, and the use of administrative child protection frameworks to sustain deprivation of familial association require examination under the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court and United Nations treaty bodies. The large-scale interaction of child protective systems with families, including extensive intervention into private family life and long-term state control over children, raises serious international law questions where systems operate through internally created codes, policies or procedures that fail to establish demonstrable harm while producing continuing psychological suffering and destruction of family integrity. These matters engage principles of natural law recognising the family as a fundamental unit of society, together with international legal obligations requiring states to preserve family unity, act proportionately, protect children from actual harm, and prevent institutional practices resulting in severe and prolonged mental suffering to children and family

The Convention of the Rights of the Child

International law contravention

The prolonged deprivation of the parent-child relationship through systematic child protection interventions engages the protections contained within the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. International law recognises that severe mental suffering, prolonged emotional harm, destruction of family unity, arbitrary interference with family life, and institutional deprivation of parental and filial relationships may constitute cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment where such conduct is knowingly inflicted, maintained through administrative systems, and continued despite evidence of harm. The systematic separation of children from parents without transparent evidentiary foundations, without procedural fairness, and without proof of actual danger to the child constitutes a direct interference with the natural rights of the family protected under international law, civil law principles, and natural justice. Articles 3, 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 37 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child collectively establish the child's right to identity, family, parental care, culture, dignity, participation, and protection from arbitrary separation and degrading treatment. The continuation of removal systems where complaints, reports, judicial criticisms, allegations of perjury, failures of disclosure, and lack of transparency have existed over decades demonstrates knowledge of the resulting harm and suffering caused to children and families.

annexure a

This report is with regard to the following

Government Child Protective ‘services business’ their Principal, responsible agents, successors and assigns and Minister

State / Territory	Child Protection Department (Acronym)	Minister	Principal (Secretary)	ABN (Verified Status)
Commonwealth	Department of Social Services (DSS)	Tanya Plibersek	Ray Griggs	36 342 015 855 (Verified Commonwealth entity)
New South Wales	Department of Communities and Justice (DCJ)	Kate Washington	Michael Tidball	36 433 875 185 (Verified NSW Government entity)
South Australia	Department for Child Protection (DCP)	Alice Rolls	Erma Ranieri	(△ under SA Government Crown structure)
Victoria	Department of Families, Fairness and Housing (DFFH)	Lizzie Blandthorn	Emma Cassar	(△ requires entity-level ABR verification)
Queensland	Department of Child Safety, Seniors and Disability Services (DCSSDS)	Amanda Camm	Michael Hogan	(△ multiple QLD Gov ABNs exist under broader Crown structure)
Western Australia	Department of Communities (Communities WA)	Sabine Winton	Mike Rowe	(△ Crown entity structure varies)
Tasmania	Department for Education, Children and Young People (DECYP)	Roger Jaensch	Sarah Clark	(△ education/child services merged entity)
Australian Capital Territory	Community Services Directorate (CSD)	Rachel Stephen-Smith	Judith Sturman	(△ ACT Gov Crown structure)
Northern Territory	Territory Families, Housing and Communities (TFHC)	Robyn Cahill	Ken Davies	(△ NT Gov Crown structure)

Citation

Statistical evidence and reporting

[Australian Report on Government Services – Child Protection Services](#)



16 Child protection services data tables (Excel - 714.2 KB)

Performance Indicator Framework

<https://www.pc.gov.au/ongoing/report-on-government-services/community-services/child-protection/>

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare – Child Protection Australia 2023–24

<https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports-data/health-welfare-services/child-protection/overview>

<https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/child-protection/child-protection-australia-2023-24/report-editions>

Permanency Performance Framework Indicator

<https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/child-protection/child-protection-australia-2022-23/contents/indicators/popf-indicators>

<https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports-data/health-welfare-services/child-protection/reports>

<https://www.aihw.gov.au/getmedia/e9d81601-14e4-4e7c-a0f9-8276036f27e0/aihw-cws-095-technical-specifications-cpa-2022-23-permanency-outcomes-performance-framework-popf-indicators.pdf>

CFECFW Report on Government Services 2023 to 2024 Child Protection

<https://cfecfw.org.au/report-on-government-services-2023-2024-child-protection/>

NSW Community Grants and Funding

[NSW Government – Grants and Funding](#)

Evidence of Corruption, Harm by Abuse of Power and Perjury findings

<https://www.inquisitr.com/what-is-the-right-to-lie-case-court-case-claims-social-workers-have-immunity-from-perjury-charges-if-they-lie-to-remove-children-from-their-homes-video/>

<https://www.change.org/p/address-child-protection-corruption/feed>

[Re: Georgia and Luke \(No 2\) \[2008\] NSWSC 1387 – Palmer J launch](#)

[Australian Human Rights Commission – Bringing Them Home Report](#)

Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse

resources

Convention on the Rights of the Child – Official UN Text

[Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights \(OHCHR\) – Convention on the Rights of the Child](#)

UNICEF Convention on the Rights of the Child Text

[UNICEF – Convention on the Rights of the Child Full Text](#)

UN Digital Library – Convention on the Rights of the Child

[United Nations Digital Library – Convention on the Rights of the Child Archive](#)

Convention Against Torture – Official UN Text

OHCHR – Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)

[OHCHR – International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#)

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

[United Nations – Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#)

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Official Text)

[International Criminal Court – Rome Statute Official PDF](#)

UN Rome Statute Legal Archive

[United Nations – Rome Statute Legal Archive](#)

Case Matrix Network – ICC Article 7 Commentary

Case Matrix Network – Commentary on Article 7 of the Rome Statute

Evidence and Testimony

Corruption Whistleblower Newspaper first edition

<https://1drv.ms/b/c/c480d41f90db7fa9/>

[EZtyzhIrRgtKnpPwFLuDM7kBor7YC3cEBHAUPx1zZxM09Q?e=eINbO1](https://1drv.ms/b/c/c480d41f90db7fa9/)

annexure b

Freedom of Information (FOI) request letters prepared to complete data set
analysis

The request is for true information and true total figures regarding
CHILD REMOVAL and FAMILY SEPARATION DATA

(1990 - to present)

Freedom of Information Request

INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD
FOR PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY, FAMILY INTEGRITY, AND STATE CARE SYSTEMS

CASE REFERENCE: ITPRC-2026-FOI-001

Issued ORDER FOR THE PRODUCTION OF INFORMATION
DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY MATERIALS

TO THE FOLLOWING RESPONDENT

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITIES AND JUSTICE (DCJ)
New South Wales

ABN: 36 433 875 185

Minister Responsible: Kate Washington
Principal Officer: Michael Tidball

FOI Request Email:
infoandprivacy@dcj.nsw.gov.au

Postal Business Address:
Department of Communities and Justice
Locked Bag 5000
Parramatta NSW 2124

DEPARTMENT FOR CHILD PROTECTION (DCP)
South Australia

ABN Status: Standalone ABN requires confirmation

Minister Responsible: Alice Rolls
Principal Officer: Erma Ranieri

FOI Request Email:
dcp.foi@sa.gov.au

Postal Business Address:
Department for Child Protection
31 Flinders Street
Adelaide SA 5000

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILIES, FAIRNESS AND HOUSING (DFFH)
Victoria

ABN Status: Entity-level ABN requires confirmation

Minister Responsible: Lizzie Blandthorn
Principal Officer: Emma Cassar

FOI Request Email:
foi@dffh.vic.gov.au

Postal Business Address:
Department of Families, Fairness and Housing
50 Lonsdale Street
Melbourne VIC 3000

DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY, SENIORS AND DISABILITY SERVICES (DCSSDS)
Queensland

ABN Status: Multiple Crown ABNs exist

Minister Responsible: Amanda Camm
Principal Officer: Michael Hogan

FOI Request Email:
RTI@cyjma.qld.gov.au

Postal Business Address:
Department of Child Safety, Seniors and Disability Services
Locked Bag 3405
Brisbane QLD 4001

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITIES (COMMUNITIES WA)
Western Australia

ABN Status: Crown entity structure varies

Minister Responsible: Sabine Winton
Principal Officer: Mike Rowe

FOI Request Email:
freedomofinformation@communities.wa.gov.au

Postal Business Address:
Department of Communities
5 Newman Court
Fremantle WA 6160

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION, CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (DECYP) Tasmania

ABN Status: Merged departmental structure

Minister Responsible: Roger Jaensch
Principal Officer: Sarah Clark

FOI Request Email:
decyp.righttoinformation@decyp.tas.gov.au

Postal Business Address:
Department for Education, Children and Young People
GPO Box 169
Hobart TAS 7001

COMMUNITY SERVICES DIRECTORATE (CSD)

Australian Capital Territory

ABN Status: Directorate-level ABN requires confirmation

Minister Responsible: Rachel Stephen-Smith

Principal Officer: Judith Sturman

FOI Request Email:

CSD.FOI@act.gov.au

Postal Business Address:

Community Services Directorate

GPO Box 158

Canberra ACT 2601

TERRITORY FAMILIES, HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES (TFHC)

Northern Territory

ABN Status: Crown structure varies

Minister Responsible: Robyn Cahill

Principal Officer: Ken Davies

FOI Request Email:

foi.tfhc@nt.gov.au

Postal Business Address:

Territory Families, Housing and Communities

PO Box 40596

Casuarina NT 0811

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES (DSS)

Commonwealth of Australia

ABN: 36 342 015 855

Minister Responsible: Tanya Plibersek

Principal Officer: Ray Griggs AO CSC

FOI Request Email:

foi@dss.gov.au

Postal Business Address:

Department of Social Services

PO Box 7576

Canberra Business Centre ACT 2610

ORDERS that the above Respondent provide all records, datasets, policy instruments, procedural manuals, evidentiary frameworks, statistical materials, contractual records, accountability documents, reunification data, and related information specified within

Schedule A of this Order

FORMAL ORDER FOR DISCLOSURE

Freedom of Information Act

With regard to principles of

- i. public accountability, procedural fairness, transparency in State intervention, and the recognised protections contained within international human rights instruments concerning children and families;
- ii. that removal of children from family environments constitutes one of the most severe exercises of State authority;

This order is for the production and disclosure of the following records, datasets, policies, procedural materials, accountability frameworks, and statistical information to be sent within 21 days to the address herewith

Information required

schedule A

Ref. No.	Request for Information / Disclosure Item for all information in all department records since 1990 and no later than the year of 2002 to the date of this request	Date Sent	Date Received
A-001	Total annual number of children removed from their home for each year	_____	Awaiting
A-002	Total annual number of children restored to family homes	_____	Awaiting
A-003	Statistical and evidence of efforts and actual restoration and reunification rates following removal	_____	Awaiting
A-004	Number of children remaining separated following unsubstantiated investigations	_____	Awaiting
A-005	Number of children restored following unsubstantiated investigations	_____	Awaiting
A-006	Average duration children remained in any statute care or any out of home before allegations were deemed unsubstantiated	_____	Awaiting
A-007	Definition and operational distinction between "unsubstantiated" and "not continued" investigations	_____	Awaiting
A-008	Legal and administrative justification for retaining unsubstantiated allegations within government datasets	_____	Awaiting
A-009	Documents showing evidentiary thresholds required before child removal occurs and how these were tested and evidence of who approved the evidentiary standard	_____	Awaiting
A-010	Documents identifying what constitutes "substantiated risk"	_____	Awaiting
A-011	Policies concerning emergency removal powers and	_____	Awaiting

	who has that authority and who approved this	_____	
	Risk assessment tools, algorithms, manuals, and		
	frameworks used in removal decisions and who		
A-012	created them and approved them and by what	_____	Awaiting
	standard were they evaluated and tested before	_____	
	implementation		
A-013	Records identifying how agencies evaluate benefit	_____	Awaiting
	to a child of remaining with family versus removal	_____	
A-014	Evidence relied upon before seeking long-term care	_____	Awaiting
	orders	_____	
A-015	Explanation for care orders sought months or years	_____	Awaiting
	in advance absent final proof of continuing danger	_____	
A-016	Policies concerning restoration and reunification	_____	Awaiting
	obligations	_____	
A-017	Rates of repeated child removals	_____	Awaiting

A-018	Policies explaining causes and prevention of	_____	Awaiting
	repeat removals	_____	
A-019	Number of children aging out of care without	_____	Awaiting
	reunification	_____	
A-020	Definition and operational meaning of "aging out	_____	Awaiting
	of care"	_____	
A-021	Definition and operational meaning of "exit from	_____	Awaiting
	care"	_____	
A-022	Records showing whether children classified as	_____	Awaiting
	"exited" were returned to family homes	_____	
A-023	Placement movement rates and number of placement	_____	Awaiting
	changes per child and incentives for the move	_____	
	Educational attainment outcomes of children		
A-024	removed from home that shows there is not a	_____	Awaiting
	decline	_____	
A-025	Long-term psychological outcomes for children	_____	Awaiting
	removed from family environments	_____	
	List of all the harm caused to children and did		
	occur to children under any state care		
	'arrangement' where the state is employed to have		
A-026	statutory care obligation in their life by out of	_____	Awaiting
	home care, at home care, kin care, foster care and	_____	
	any presumption of care where the child was		
	removed from their home by the statute business		
	All requests from and for children to be returned		
A-027	home to their loving parents and what was done	_____	Awaiting
	with that request	_____	
	All complaints a child has made about the child		
A-028	protective services business and what was done	_____	Awaiting
	with that complaint	_____	
	Rates of self-harm and suicide attempts among		
	children in care and care leavers ; and		
A-029	Rate of death of any child removed from their	_____	Awaiting
	family home	_____	
	Rate of death of any parent or family who had		
	their child removed and not returned		
A-030	Records concerning trauma associated with removal	_____	Awaiting
	and family separation ;	_____	

A-031	Policies governing communication restrictions between children and parents	_____	Awaiting
A-032	Legal basis for blocking telephone communication between children and family	_____	Awaiting
A-033	Legal basis for restricting court access, orders, or proceedings and not serving orders	_____	Awaiting
A-034	Records concerning allegations children were informed they may never see family again	_____	Awaiting
A-035	Policies concerning children's rights under the Convention on the Rights of the Child are upheld	_____	Awaiting
A-036	Records showing whether children are informed of their right to independent legal representation	_____	Awaiting
A-037	Records showing whether children are informed of their right to independent advocacy	_____	Awaiting
A-038	Records showing whether children aged 12 years and above are informed of participation and placement rights	_____	Awaiting
A-039	Policies explaining why assessments focus on parental character rather than demonstrable child benefit analysis	_____	Awaiting
A-040	Financial records identifying entities paid in connection with child removals and placements	_____	Awaiting
A-041	Evidence of Contract renewal process with private providers and non-government organisations involved in out-of-home care	_____	Awaiting
A-042	Policies governing renewal of placement and care contracts	_____	Awaiting
A-043	Documents identifying whether productivity is measured by care volumes rather than reunification outcomes	_____	Awaiting
A-044	Records concerning accountability for wrongful removals and psychological harm and physical and sexual harm caused to children who have been removed from their family to a state care	_____	Awaiting
A-045	Records concerning compensation schemes, reviews, apologies, or findings against agencies	_____	Awaiting
A-046	All information where caseworkers have put unverified information without proof of claim or substantive evidence into an application to remove a child	_____	Awaiting
A-047	Internal reviews concerning failures to restore children to family homes	_____	Awaiting
A-048	Studies or reports concerning systemic harms arising from prolonged family separation	_____	Awaiting

Direction of the Order

Order No.	Direction
O-001	All responsive records shall be produced in searchable electronic form where possible
O-002	Where exemptions are claimed, the responding authority shall identify the legislative basis relied upon
O-003	Partial disclosure shall be provided wherever lawful and practicable
O-004	Statistical records shall be disclosed in complete aggregate form wherever lawful
O-005	The present Order is issued for academic, comparative law, public accountability, and legal studies purposes

All disclosures shall be produced in searchable electronic form wherever practicable.

Where exemptions are claimed, the Respondent Authority shall identify:

- The legislative basis relied upon;
- The nature of the withheld material;
- Whether partial disclosure is possible.

SO ORDERED

Oversight body cc

Email

Office of the Australian Information Commissioner	enquiries@oaic.gov.au
NSW Information and Privacy Commission	ipcinfo@ipc.nsw.gov.au
Office of the Victorian Information Commissioner	enquiries@ovic.vic.gov.au
Queensland Office of the Information Commissioner	administration@oic.qld.gov.au
Office of the Information Commissioner Western Australia	info@oic.wa.gov.au
Office for Public Integrity South Australia	opi@opi.sa.gov.au
Right to Information Tasmania	rti@justice.tas.gov.au
ACT Ombudsman	ombudsman@ombudsman.gov.au
Northern Territory Information Commissioner	infocomm@nt.gov.au