

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Inquiry into workplace surveillance

Melbourne – Tuesday 3 September 2024

MEMBERS

Alison Marchant – Chair

Kim O’Keeffe – Deputy Chair

Anthony Cianflone

Wayne Farnham

John Mullahy

Dylan Wight

Jess Wilson

WITNESSES

Danae Bosler, Assistant Secretary-by-Appointment,

Wilhelmina Stracke, Assistant Secretary, and

Oscar Kaspi-Crutchett, Researcher, Victorian Trades Hall Council.

The CHAIR: Welcome to the public hearings for the Legislative Assembly Economy and Infrastructure Committee's Inquiry into Workplace Surveillance. All mobile telephones should now be turned to silent.

All evidence given today is being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the Parliament's website. While all evidence taken by the Committee is protected by parliamentary privilege, comments repeated outside of this hearing, including on social media, may not be protected by this privilege.

Witnesses will be provided with a proof version of the transcript to check. Verified transcripts and other documents provided to the Committee during the hearing will be published on the Committee's website.

Thank you for your time today. We really appreciate it. I will just introduce the Committee for you, and then we will head over to you, maybe with some opening statements or remarks about your submission, and then we can jump into some questions, so thank you. I am Alison, Chair and Member for Bellarine.

Kim O'KEEFFE: I am Kim, Member for Shepparton. Welcome.

Anthony CIANFLONE: I am Anthony, the Member for Pascoe Vale.

John MULLAHY: John Mullahy, Member for Glen Waverley.

Dylan WIGHT: Dylan Wight, Member for Tarneit.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Excellent. I am Wil. I am Assistant Secretary at the Victorian Trades Hall Council. This is Danae.

Danae BOSLER: Hi, Danae Bosler, Assistant Secretary-by-Appointment.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: And I am Oscar, and I am a Researcher at Victorian Trades Hall Council.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Oscar is the brains of the operation, just so we know. I will kick off with a statement and then we are all happy to take some questions.

The CHAIR: Perfect.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Thank you, first off, for this opportunity to talk about what we think is an incredibly important issue. The Victorian Trades Hall Council is the peak body for the Victorian trade union movement. Between us we are 40 affiliated trade unions representing just over 500,000 workers in the state. I am going to kick off with a quote. We did a survey of workers before we did our submission, and I am going to kick off with a quote from one of them. This is from a retail worker:

We are called when data or sales are 'down' to ask why we aren't selling more ... If staff are seen on camera resting or standing in the store, even if everything's been cleaned and put away, it's noted to our manager ... Our work expects lots of overtime (lots), but if we sign in, 1min after lunch, we lose 15mins of pay. Sign in app doesn't work half the time and we get in trouble for 'not signing in', even if we can provide counter evidence ...

... There is no 'rest' times ... "No time to stand," ...

... the cameras are not deterring theft ...

Victoria was once a world leader in striving to protect workplace privacy. In 2005 we hosted the first inquiry in the world specifically focused on workplace surveillance and employee data rights. Today we lag behind the ILO conventions and the European Union as well as our neighbours in the ACT and New South Wales with some of the weakest workplace privacy regulations in Australia. Our laws are frozen somewhere between the late 80s and the early 2000s. Meanwhile the capabilities of workplace surveillance technology are approaching the realm of science fiction. Highly sensitive information is being collected in vast quantities that, if collected in any other context, would be subjected to the utmost protection. Due to covert surveillance being totally legal in Victoria, it is not possible to know the full extent of the problem. Workers are kept in the dark; government is kept in the dark. Overwhelmingly there is no consultation, no disclosure and no meaningful consent when surveillance is introduced in a workplace.

The Privacy Act offers workers very scant protection against intrusive surveillance and has done nothing to stall the proliferation of surveillance practices. It permits the collection of information directly related to

employment, but this has been interpreted broadly. There is no common-law tort of a right to privacy. Victoria's 2006 workplace privacy amendment is also very narrow. Without express legislative requirements, it is functionally up to employers and employers alone to determine what the appropriate level of monitoring is. Consequently we are seeing surveillance being used for all sorts of illegitimate purposes: threatening workers for going on breaks, making invasive inferences about workers' personal lives and intimidating union members and delegates. Surveillance methods of all kinds are being used by employers in more contexts and for more purposes. The volume of data being collected about workers is unprecedented, and its use remains entirely opaque. Surveilling your workers has never been easier. These technologies are now cheaper, more readily available, easier to use and more precise and intrusive.

Surveillance has shifted from monitoring for security concerns and to spot issues in production lines to now monitoring human performance and human behaviours. Algorithm management and automated decision-making require constant data collection. The tendency is towards collecting as much information as possible regardless of whether it is necessary, relevant or able to be securely stored—facial expression analysis, for example. Employers use software like this in job interviews to evaluate the personality and disposition of candidates. This software often massively discriminates against people with disabilities that significantly affect facial expressions and voice. A bad rating on one of these systems can eliminate your chance of getting a job with any other employer using the system.

Employers have made it clear they cannot be trusted to regulate themselves. Workers across the state are facing unacceptable, sometimes traumatic, uses of surveillance at work. As demonstrated by our survey, unregulated surveillance has caused work intensification with no increase in pay; stress proliferation; anxiety, paranoia and exhaustion; extreme pressure for workers not to exercise their rights and claim their entitlements, exacerbating existing harms facing marginalised workers and women workers; and damage to workplace culture and the psychosocial work environment. These technologies are inflicting harm on some of the community's most vulnerable workers. They allow for rights violations and predatory exploitation, and we urge the government to adopt our proposed Privacy in Working Life Act so that human rights, dignity and privacy can be restored to Victorian workplaces.

The CHAIR: Thank you so much, and thanks for a really comprehensive submission. It is fantastic to have some real-life examples of what is happening and occurring right now in our workplaces, so thank you for that. We will head straight into some questions. I might go to Kim first.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Yes.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Thank you. That was an excellent presentation. It is very on par with what we are hearing today, but I really like your personable approach to it. As you have mentioned, your submission mentions that workers are often unaware of their employers' surveillance practices. What measures should the Victorian Government put in place to make workplace surveillance more transparent? I know that seems like an obvious question, but I am really interested to hear it from your perspective.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: I think our perspective is always consultation is a really important requirement, and it is certainly a requirement particularly, for instance, in the ACT Act. But for us consultation needs to be meaningful, and it needs to be consultation about what are the reasons why we are using this surveillance. Is it necessary? Is it proportionate to whatever it is that we are trying to achieve in this process? What are we using, what are we collecting, how long are we collecting it for, is it intermittent or is it going to be ongoing, where is the data going to be stored, how is it going to be stored? It is not just enough, in our view, to say, "We're going to be doing some surveillance. Has anyone got any problems with that?" We would say people need real information about what that is. We would say a key measure of transparency is talking to the workers about what that is.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Thank you. Just on that, obviously from the workplace and from the employee.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Yes.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Yes, both sides—you need both sides to hear.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: That is exactly right. Everybody needs to be talking about what this is, why it is happening, so why is it necessary, is it reasonable and what is it that we are doing.

Kim O'KEEFFE: And your point that often staff are not considered is very much apparent in your submission, so thank you.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: I do not know of any case of workers—like, when we did a survey, it certainly told us that over 50 per cent of workers were saying, 'Yes, we think we're being surveilled.' That is probably either by way of keystroke or some other kind of pretty obvious technology, but there are all sorts of forms of technology that workers are unaware of.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Anthony.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Thank you, and thanks for the submission. It is probably the most, dare I say, comprehensive that we have received, so well done to the team and to Oscar.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Yes, well done, Oscar.

Anthony CIANFLONE: But look, I just want to ask and actually draw the Committee's attention to page 45 of the submission. It gives a really good outline of the difference between the legislation in New South Wales and the ACT and what we are lacking in Victoria. I think that is really stark in terms of how you have contrasted that, so thank you. My question is around the vulnerability of workers or workers at risk. In terms of workplace surveillance, which sectors of workers would you say are the most at risk of being surveilled in terms of their health, wellbeing and psychosocial wellbeing, and how can we through potential recommendations to change the laws, whether it is through your Act or other means potentially, move into that space to protect those vulnerable workers?

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Well, it is actually difficult to tell you which industries and sectors are doing this, because we do not actually know. That is the point. We do know, for example, that retail is obviously one of the sectors where there is data around who is doing what and what is happening out on the floor. Logistics is one, for example, so with warehousing it is, 'Are you continuously doing the work?' We know that those sectors are some of the ones where workers know that it is happening, but there are lots of other sectors where people do not know. What we know is that, for example, workers who come from marginalised and excluded communities would say they are already often subjected to increased workplace pressure around performance and those kinds of things, so we would say the issue with surveillance is that those cohorts of workers are then put under increased pressure around that. We also know, for example that some sectors like retail work are dominated by women, so it is likely that women are more subjected to this kind of surveillance.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Yes. I like how your submission also touches on a few different examples across a few different sectors and the types of surveillance. We have heard a lot, pretty much today, I think it is fair to say, around white-collar type surveillance, but in terms of blue-collar and trade types of surveillance, there is one example there about a truck driver, through Toll, being monitored through a red laser beam onto his face based on certain sorts of biometric conditions. So the health and wellbeing impacts of that technology literally imposing itself on the worker is a whole other dimension of this discussion as well, as opposed to just literally monitoring and surveilling workers.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Which is that issue around work intensification. People feel that pressure and consequently there is this kind of constant pressure to keep meeting and then exceeding because we know we are being monitored.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Yes. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Very good. John.

John MULLAHY: We have all heard of examples of places like Amazon where people have had to take cartons all around with them so that they do not stop working. We even had evidence in our prior committee report with regard to road safety behaviours and gig economy workers. How does workplace surveillance lead to work intensification, and what impact can that have on workers?

Wilhelmina STRACKE: I think first off it leads to a pressure to perform, a pressure to consistently meet targets. For instance, call centre workers would say to you, 'We get monitored for the number of calls that we take regardless of the complexity of the call. I know that if I'm going to go and have my meeting, my regular

catch-up, with the manager, they're going to say, "Well, your call numbers are down, so you need to do better on that." That is even in circumstances where it might be that that worker has had much more complicated calls that they have had to deal with. So there is this constant pressure, and that worker then feels pressure to keep pushing through and pushing along with things. With work intensification, essentially what surveillance does is it increases the pressure on workers to consistently perform to data targets that are set and that continue to increase because everyone keeps pushing.

Danae BOSLER: Can I just add on that: we are not opposed to increased efficiencies and all that kind of stuff. Work intensification is not being linked to improvement in pay and conditions at that point. That is the point: it is not evolving, it is not keeping up.

The CHAIR: Can I just build on that, if you do not mind if I jump in: there is evidence that productivity is going down because of that pressure.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: As a result, yes.

The CHAIR: Can you talk a little bit about that or what you are seeing?

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Certainly the survey told us that, for example, other workers have said morale goes down significantly because people do not feel like they are trusted. They do not feel like they are valued, and they become effectively a data point in terms of a set of numbers, and no-one performs well when they are seen purely as a data point. We would say productivity goes down when worker morale goes down, and introducing surveillance of this kind, particularly when it has not been explained why it is necessary, why they are doing it, what they are hoping to achieve through it, what data is being collected and how it is being stored—none of those things engender trust.

The CHAIR: Okay. Dylan.

Dylan WIGHT: Thank you. Thanks so much for the submission. As everyone has said, it is incredibly comprehensive, probably the most comprehensive that we have got so far as part of this inquiry. There is obviously a survey within that submission that Trades Hall has undertaken. I know that individual unions have undertaken their own surveys as well. Are there really common themes, like common threads throughout those surveys, both in terms of surveillance being used and then how it is affecting workers as well? Then, just on the back end of that, we have heard consistently through evidence today about how important consultation is and lining ourselves up with the ACT and New South Wales in that respect. From your point of view is consultation enough or is some sort of access to that data, which is essentially data that you are generating or however you are being surveilled, really important to include as well?

Wilhelmina STRACKE: I think we start with the premise of consultation, because consultation means the workers at that workplace can actually engage in that conversation—what data is going to be collected, how it is going to be stored, what do we have a level of comfort with. Our view is consultation is an ongoing process. We do not start and say, 'We're going to do some things, thanks for that,' and then we do some other things and we do not talk about it. Consultation should remain, as it is, for instance, in the occupational health and safety regime, ongoing. We need to be then going back and saying, 'We're collecting some of this data, potentially this is what the data is telling us is happening,' for example. Consultation is the best protection, we think, for all of this—that is, for workers to be engaged in an ongoing conversation. That is also how you get to proper and meaningful consent, right—everyone has that.

The common themes that come through: first off, our data says around 20 per cent of workers have no idea whether they are being surveilled and just over 60 per cent tell us, 'Yes, we know there's some kind of surveillance happening.' In terms of whether they were given the opportunity to opt out of any kind of surveillance, 99 per cent of workers tell us, 'No, we were given no opportunity.' What that tells us is that if any consultation has happened, it has not been meaningful, because they do not feel like they have had any opportunity to opt in, opt out, or look at what that looks like.

We know that at the moment what people understand to be surveillance is predominantly video surveillance, but we also know that there are lots of forms of surveillance out there that people know nothing about, so they are not going to report that to us. In terms of a conversation about what they were going to do and what the methods of surveillance were, over 80 per cent of workers say they do not know. Workers are saying, 'We

know we're being surveilled,' but they do not know what form that takes. And what they tell us in terms of comfort levels is that they are extremely uncomfortable about the surveillance that is happening. Again, that tells us there has been no meaningful conversation about it at all.

Dylan WIGHT: All good. Thank you.

The CHAIR: I think you might have been in the room for the last witnesses. They were talking about a definition of a workplace and when work is being undertaken. Obviously the lines have been blurred a little bit and more people are working from home. A lot of us might be on the move: we can travel and work. We can do a whole lot of things now with our work needs. I suppose I would like to understand what you think a good definition might look like in terms of legislation about a workplace.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: In terms of a workplace?

The CHAIR: Yes.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: We would say, similar to the Occupational Health and Safety Act, anywhere work is being performed. So wherever that happens, that is a workplace.

The CHAIR: Okay. Can you give us some examples of maybe AI being used in the workplace or being used to monitor?

Danae BOSLER: Thank you so much for this question. I was actually at Parliament House yesterday because the federal government is undertaking an inquiry into the digital transformation of workplaces, so I presented on behalf of Trades Hall at that yesterday. Oscar did a 40-page submission for this one. He also did a 40-page submission on AI, so if you would like us to submit our 40 pages on AI, we will submit it to you as well.

The CHAIR: Yes, please.

Danae BOSLER: I would say I would disagree with the person who spoke just previously and said surveillance and AI can sit separately—they cannot. AI needs to be fed by surveillance. Like for AI to function, AI is a machine that needs to be constantly fed, data needs to be constantly imported into it and that data is overwhelmingly collected by surveillance, whether it is video surveillance through to keystrokes—the full spectrum. What workers are reporting back to us about AI is the only way they figure out that AI might be happening in their workplace is because they have picked up on the possibility of surveillance happening in their workplace and that is what is triggering it. Employers are absolutely not disclosing how they are using AI, the ways in which they are using it. I am deeply concerned and we are concerned about surveillance because of how it is going to feed AI algorithms. AI algorithms are a black box that are proving to be deeply discriminatory towards women, young people, people of colour, and that is what the evidence is showing around the world. So we would love to do an additional submission on the impact of AI.

The CHAIR: You are more than welcome to do that, so thank you. And then in terms of that collection of data, are you seeing any evidence of it being then used to either discipline or to dismiss?

Danae BOSLER: Absolutely. It is being used, and we have had it reported to us when we have talked about it. Some of the recommendations we have made to the federal government are around the way AI can be used in recruitment processes, in decision-making processes, in hiring and firing processes—it is completely unacceptable that a machine is making those sorts of decisions. Intervening and monitoring—there are stories from call centre workers. There was an incredible story from a call centre worker yesterday where she watches her name just go down the list of the rankings. Workers are ranked on how their calls are going, which is purely done from voice monitoring, then the AI algorithm measures, and if a client has used a word that the algorithm did not like, her rating just goes down the list and she may not get a shift the next week.

We have seen AI and surveillance used on 18-year-old women in retail settings and stuff like that where the video monitors them remotely and if they are even seen as resting or standing around for a moment, they get given text message bumps or they get intervention—not even from their boss, just from some other monitor that is intervening with them. So it is pretty incredible, but yes, surveillance is absolutely feeding AI.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: And AI is feeding surveillance. The two things are, in our view, inextricably linked.

The CHAIR: Thank you for that. We appreciate it.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Great work. Wow. How should the workplace be defined to ensure that all workers and work situations are covered by surveillance laws?

Wilhelmina STRACKE: The Occupational Health and Act effectively says the workplace is wherever work is being performed, so we would say wherever work is being performed, then that is the workplace for the purposes of surveillance.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Then we have the people working from home; it is still being performed from home. Then it becomes the other people in the house and other issues that connect to that, but it is still their workplace or workspace.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: That has always been the case. For instance, the Occupational Health and Safety Act says if you are working from home then that is your workplace and the obligation from the employer extends to that place.

Kim O'KEEFFE: And those within that environment are impacted.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: And those within that environment, that is right.

Kim O'KEEFFE: Then that is a lot of work that does need to be done.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Yes, remembering that this is effectively about surveilling workers, and the Surveillance Act that we have at the moment talks about how you cannot record people in private conversations, so there is already some protection around if something is picked up. But of course that is a question for employers then to deal with. If the way that they are surveilling workers is picking up private conversations, then they are already breaching a law, and I do not know that they know that. Who knows what data is being collected, because we have no idea. So the whole point about a workplace surveillance Act like this, the one that we are proposing, would mean that employers would have to turn their minds to questions like that, and that is actually good for them too.

Kim O'KEEFFE: We have heard a bit of that background today in regard to the issues around that.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Well, that actually picks up what I wanted to talk about. We heard evidence earlier on from the Business Council of Australia strongly recommending that we wait for federal legislation to be reviewed and the process through that committee to come to fruition, to proffer recommendations before we as a Victorian parliamentary committee pursue this inquiry any further, essentially. Obviously at the same time the business council is also saying that its members, who are largely national members, already supposedly adhere to higher standards when it comes to this space with legislation in New South Wales and the ACT. So inherently, from what I gather, those standards in some way, through their members, may be being applied already in Victoria. But in terms of your experience of employer transparency in terms of how the data is being collected, stored, disseminated but also, more importantly, proactively, what is your experience around employer transparency in that regard? I have tried to go through most of the submissions, but what examples—even just one—do you have of an employer proactively talking to staff about how they intend to monitor and surveil their workplace? Are you aware of any examples?

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Gosh—I am not allowed to swear, am I? It is a very difficult question. The answer is we have got no examples of employers proactively going and talking to workers about the surveillance that they are implementing. So that is a problem. As I understand it, the review that is happening is of the Privacy Act, the current review. The Privacy Act deals with a very different set of circumstances. The Privacy Act is about my medical data, for instance, whether that is available to me and the circumstances in which it is available to me and that kind of thing. That is a very different set of circumstances to whether AI is going to watch an 18-year-old retail worker in the workplace and then send her a text if she is not busy cleaning or doing whatever, if she is just having a moment to herself. So in my view, any change to the Privacy Act is not going

to pick up on this. It is really important that we in Victoria—we need to step up. We are behind; we are lagging other states at the moment in this work. We need to be proactive—no point waiting.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Just to be clear, not one example do you have of an employer proactively talking to staff or workplaces, as far as you are aware, about what they intend to do?

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: We did have some respondents in the survey say that an employer gave a brief overview with some kind of notice about what was going to happen in terms of a new surveillance system, but in terms of a genuinely bilateral conversation with meaningful consent and full information, out of 367 survey responses I could not see that.

Anthony CIANFLONE: Thank you.

The CHAIR: John.

John MULLAHY: Obviously with all these different changes over the last five years I was interested in what impact workplace surveillance has had on the balance of power in the workplace and specifically with collective bargaining.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: Interesting. In terms of the power dynamic, it just reinforces an existing power dynamic, I think, and it exacerbates a power imbalance. If workers do not have access to the information on which they are being judged, on which they are having their performances managed, that creates a situation where any insecurity workers may feel is exacerbated significantly. In terms of collective bargaining, I cannot think of an example where this has impacted on what is collectively bargained for.

Dylan WIGHT: Has anyone tried to bargain it into an EBA?

Wilhelmina STRACKE: I do not know that anyone has tried to, but we always negotiate for consultation. The question is whether or not—like, historically, I do not think this has been seen, certainly not by employers, as a significant change for which they need to therefore come. So where bargaining has happened, you bargain for consultation processes, but generally it needs to be regarded as a significant change for that to happen, and I am not sure that an employer bringing in a new app which checks keystrokes or whatever it is has considered that to be a significant change.

Dylan WIGHT: I think it was just before you that we spoke about consultation clauses, in particular in modern awards, and whether that catches this. The advice was that it does, but it is ‘What is significant change?’ I guess.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: The notion of what consultation is—to be frank what a lot of employers understand consultation to be goes from here to Geelong in terms of our understandings. As I say, we would say (a) consultation is an ongoing process, so you do not just say, as Oscar has just described, ‘We’re doing a thing. There we go,’ but you continue to talk about what the thing has resulted in, why it is necessary and all of those kinds of things. Consultation: historically, employers have often understood consultation to be ‘We’ve made a decision and now we’re going to tell you about the decision’ as opposed to ‘We’re considering a thing. What do you think about the thing? What’s your input into the thing? How can we get to a point where we are all comfortable with the thing?’ We would say that latter version of consultation, yes, would be a version that we are much more comfortable with, but it is not the version that happens, even in workplaces where consultation is part of an enterprise or an industrial agreement.

Danae BOSLER: Can I also speak to one of our excellent affiliates, FSU, who have done an enormous amount of work in this space, because they are in the finance sector. Their national secretary there I think has spoken at length about AI and surveillance feeding AI. As soon as that is found in the workplace, it should automatically trigger bargaining renegotiations to recommence. If that is found to have been a major impact, it should trigger bargaining negotiations to recommence. There should be variations to the Fair Work Act such that workers should be able to take protected industrial action if AI and surveillance feeding AI has been found to impact upon their work. Surveillance that contributes to AI, again, should be banned from interfering with all industrial relations activities that occur in the workplace, and that should be clearly specified as well—monitoring, emails about union business, predicting how people are going to vote on EBAs because it is filming who they are talking to and who is attending meetings and going in and out of meetings.

Dylan WIGHT: I should not laugh at that.

Danae BOSLER: It is legitimately happening; FSU and I think the NTEU could provide feedback on that. The workplace surveillance that is happening in universities is just off the charts.

Oscar KASPI-CRUTCHETT: If I may add as well, I think it is important to remember that the first stage of any collective bargaining practice is workers talking to one another and thinking, ‘Hey, this is a little bit unsafe, what we’re being asked to do,’ or ‘This is inconsistent with how other people doing this work are getting paid.’ And if all communication in a workplace is completely monitored and everyone is aware that there is that third party listening, then that very critical first step of workers speaking to one another and building a shared recognition of their conditions—that cannot happen. So I think surveillance definitely restructures the power distribution in workplaces, for sure.

The CHAIR: Do you have any further questions?

Dylan WIGHT: No, I have probably passed my full time.

The CHAIR: I am mindful of time, and I think we could probably keep going all afternoon. But can I just, because it is a little bit topical at the moment, go to wearable devices. I have seen reports of supermarket workers having to wear some body cameras now. I just want your thoughts on: how do we manage this kind of new space, and what are the effects on workers?

Wilhelmina STRACKE: I think we would start always with: has consultation happened? Do we know why? Is it necessary? Does it deal with an issue that has to be resolved? What is the data that is being collected? Where is it being stored? We will always go back to: were the workers consulted about that? I cannot speak for those workers about whether that is or is not a good thing, because if it is about protecting workers and that is the conversation that they have, and they have had that in the workplace, that is a different thing to this being purely about making sure that those workers do not take a break at times that do not suit the employer—‘You can’t go off to the toilet now because this is a peak period,’ or ‘We don’t have enough people on the floor. You can’t do that now.’

Danae BOSLER: I was going to add really quickly that it is this full spectrum from when they are wearing wearables and if their productivity slows down, they get beeps and their manager comes out—that is one level—through to, again, it is all about the consultation with the workers. And I know, being a former mayor as well, when there was an introduction of cameras for parking inspectors at our local council, that went through a process with the relevant union as well. And they could be switched on and off; workers had control over when they were used, and they were used for the safety of workers. It is all about the engagement with workers so that they have some control. And it took months for implementation, the consultation process that sat around it. It is all part of the consultation with workers on that one.

The CHAIR: Any other questions?

Kim O’KEEFFE: No. That was great.

The CHAIR: Thank you so much for your time. It is really appreciated. And if there is anything further you need to add to the Committee, you are more than welcome to submit further submissions.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: We will give you the submission into AI.

The CHAIR: Perfect. That will be wonderful.

Wilhelmina STRACKE: We will get that to you. Another 40 pages for you to work through.

The CHAIR: Good work. Thank you so much.

Witnesses withdrew.