

1 **Long Title**

2 Standardising Workforce Cost Estimates Across Australian Jurisdictions: Genomic Testing as a Use Case

3

4 **Short Title**

5 Australian Genomics Labour Microcosting

6

7 **Authors**

8 Dylan A Mordaunt^{1,2,3,4,*} d.a.mordaunt@gmail.com

9

10 **Affiliations**

11 1. Centre for Health Policy, School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Australia

12 2. Faculty of Health, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

13 3. Women's and Children's Division, Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Australia

14 4. Wellington Free Ambulance, Wellington, New Zealand

15

16 * Corresponding Author

17

18 **Abstract**

19 **Introduction**

20 Labour costs are a key driver of healthcare costs and a key component of economic evaluations in
21 healthcare. We undertook the current study to collect information about workforce costs related to clinical
22 genomic testing in Australia, identifying key components of pay scales and contracts, and incorporating these
23 into a matrix to enable modelling of disaggregated costs.

24 **Methods**

25 We undertook a microcosting study of health workforce labour costs in Australia, from a health services
26 perspective. We mapped the genomic testing processes, identifying the relevant workforce. Data was collected
27 on the identified workforce from publicly available pay scales. Estimates were used to model the total cost
28 from a public health services employer perspective, undertaking deterministic and probabilistic sensitivity
29 analyses.

30 **Results**

31 We identified significant variability in the way in which pay scales and related conditions are both
32 structured and the levels between jurisdictions. The total costs (2023-24 AUD \$) ranged from 160,794
33 (113,848 - 233,350) for administrative staff to 703,206 (548,011 - 923,661) for pathology staff (full-time
34 equivalent). Deterministic sensitivity analysis identified that the base salary accounts for the greatest source of
35 uncertainty, from 24.8% (20.0% - 32.9%) for laboratory technicians to 53.6% (52.8% - 54.4%) for medical
36 scientists.

37 **Conclusion**

38 Variations in remuneration levels and conditions between Australian jurisdictions account for considerable
39 variation in the estimated cost of labour and may contribute significantly to the uncertainty of economic
40 assessments of genomic testing and other labour-intensive health technologies. We outline an approach to
41 standardise the collection and estimation of uncertainty for Australian health workforce costs and provide
42 current estimates for labour costs.

43 **Keywords**

44 Health Economics; Microcosting; Economic Evaluation; Health Policy; Health Workforce

45 **Online Short Key Question Summary**

46 *What is known about the topic?*

47 Workforce costs are known to be a significant contributor to the cost of health services and complex health
48 technologies.

49

50 *What does this paper add?*

51 This paper systematically quantifies the variation in workforce costs across five Australian states,
52 demonstrating that these differences are substantial enough to influence cost-effectiveness outcomes for
53 genomic testing services. By identifying key areas of cost variation—such as base salaries, superannuation
54 contributions, and allowances—this paper highlights how jurisdictional variations can contribute to differential
55 health service costs, potentially impacting the affordability and sustainability of health programmes and
56 technologies, across states.

57

58 *What are the implications for practitioners?*

59 We provide reproducible estimates of workforce costs for use by health economists and policymakers
60 conducting economic evaluations. The framework presented in this paper can also be adapted by other
61 professionals in health economics and health workforce planning to assess jurisdictional variations and their
62 implications for resource allocation and service delivery.

63 **Introduction**

64 Workforce costs are the key driver of public health services costs ¹⁻³. Workforce costs are also an important
65 part of the economic evaluation of health services and technologies ^{4,5}. Australia has several different
66 jurisdictions for employing and remunerating health workers, with a large number of resulting policy
67 instruments contributing to cost, such as awards and enterprise bargaining agreements. These jurisdictions
68 include the states and territories, as well as the Australian Commonwealth. Australia also shares a health
69 workforce market with New Zealand. The landscape of worker conditions is complex and can be challenging
70 to assess within the country, let alone in comparison to other countries ^{5,6}. Differences in workforce costs are
71 important in assessing cost variance between jurisdictions and countries, in health policy decisions and in
72 understanding the impact of labour costs on economic evaluation ⁷.

73 Understanding state-level variation in the costs of Australia's public health workforce is important for
74 several reasons. Firstly, estimates of cost directly influence the allocation of resources and the feasibility of
75 implementing health programs across different states. If there's a significant disparity in costs, it raises
76 questions about whether funding is sufficient and equitably distributed to support these initiatives effectively.
77 Additionally, this variation affects the generalizability of economic evaluations, as cost-effectiveness in one
78 state might not translate to another due to these differences ⁸. It's important to differentiate whether these
79 variations represent true differences in the cost of delivering services or if they stem from disparities in
80 bargaining power, administrative efficiency, or other factors ⁸. Such distinctions are important for
81 policymakers, as they could undermine the effectiveness of public health programs ⁹.

82 In the context of costing a complex health service and trying to understand the uncertainty of labour cost for
83 this health service by jurisdiction ¹⁰, we identified a gap in available tools and resources for estimating public
84 health workforce costs. A standardised Australian labour costing tool could be used to support comparative
85 policy research within Australia ⁶ and with other countries ⁵. The application in this particular use case was to
86 undertake a sensitivity analysis of clinical genomic testing by varying labour prices based on the estimated
87 labour costs in Australian states ^{10,11}.

88 Our question was, what is the cost of labour in public clinical genomics laboratories in Australian states,
89 how does this vary and what are the sources of variation? To answer this question, we set about collecting
90 information about Australian public health pathology workforce costs to the service provider, modelling this
91 information and estimating sources of uncertainty for use in a comparative health systems context. Our
92 objective was to define a standardised model for workforce costs across relevant Australian jurisdictions that
93 would allow us to understand the sources of variability within the estimated cost.

94 **Methods**

95 This report follows the relevant sections related to costing studies, of the Consolidated Health Economic
96 Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) checklist, 2022 revision ¹².

97 *Study design*

98 We undertook a microcosting study of health workforce labour costs in Australia. Microcosting is a method
99 that involves disaggregating the component costs of a resource, into small and meaningful components ¹³.

100 *Data collection*

101 Labour type was identified as part of a process mapping exercise undertaken in a micro-costing study of
102 clinical genomic testing at the Victorian Clinical Genetics Service (VCGS) in Victoria, Australia ¹¹. The
103 labour type was then classified based on the position descriptions used in this jurisdiction. Job advertisements
104 were identified on publicly accessible government and recruitment websites, and these were used to help
105 identify the equivalent positions (by labour type) for each state and resulting pay scales and industrial
106 instruments. Data was then collected on the workforce costs from publicly available industrial instruments,
107 such as pay scales, including awards and enterprise bargaining agreements. These documents were evaluated
108 for the components of remuneration and conditions, and sources of variation, such as the amount of annual
109 leave included. Inputs were then extracted and populated into a spreadsheet. An archive of these documents is
110 included as a supplementary archive file.

111 *Study Population and Perspective*

112 The study population included states and territories for which there was a public genomics laboratory, at the
113 time of the study (Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland). The
114 perspective of the study was principally the employer (public health service), and therefore the state. Since
115 public laboratories in Australia are state-operated, we did not consider the national (Australian
116 Commonwealth) perspective.

117 *Time Horizon and Indexation*

118 In this current study, we evaluated the costs in the base year (2023-24). We evaluated these in the context of
119 current value since these costs occurred within the relevant financial year. They are reported in 2023-24
120 Australian Dollars (AUD).

121 *Rationale and description of the model*

122 The model utilises a deterministic range based on the upper and lower limits of the base salary reported in
123 the industrial instruments. Inputs were directly collected where available, or an expert estimate was made. This
124 base cost was then layered with the relevant employment conditions and entitlements (e.g. leave loading). We
125 created an initial single composite estimate for each workforce type, which was a simple mean of the mid-
126 point of each workforce cost range, bounded by the minimum and maximum values across the states for each
127 labour type. We subsequently iterated this to a weighted mean, to proportionally reflect the relative costs from
128 the contributing states with the aim of better reflecting an overall cost for Australia. The weightings were
129 based on the Medicare enrolments, as of December 31, 2023¹⁴.

130 *Analytics and assumptions*

131 A direct comparison of estimated costs and relative costs was undertaken, both overall and disaggregated.
132 Assumptions were made based on practices in the author's employing institution, a public health organisation
133 in South Australia. Rights of Private practice (RoPP) were assumed to have been foregone for medical
134 practitioners. The model assumes that individuals stay at one pay level in a given financial year, that there are
135 no changes in base salary or components in any given year, and that many other aspects of the cost of labour

136 remain static (such as sick leave and penalty levels). Finally, the model assumes that all allowances are
137 completely taken up (such as professional development allowances).

138 *Characterising heterogeneity and uncertainty*

139 Costs were analysed by jurisdiction and employee type, as well as creating a generalised estimate (for all
140 jurisdictions, and thereby for Australia as a whole) and the components of labour costs were presented in
141 disaggregated form. Deterministic Sensitivity Analysis (DSA; Scenario Analysis) was undertaken around all
142 input parameters, including the amount of leave taken, the superannuation contribution, entitlements (e.g.
143 continuing professional development allowance), and on the level of superannuation paid. For these, the inputs
144 were varied stepwise. The base salary was varied based on the inputs extracted from the industrial instruments,
145 from there all other components were varied based either on the full range of inputs collected across all
146 jurisdictions or based on an expert estimate of the range (e.g. sick leave utilisation). The analysis of the
147 superannuation level is based on the interaction between state and Commonwealth policy around
148 superannuation policy settings¹⁵.

149 Probabilistic sensitivity analysis was undertaken by fitting a gamma distribution to the range estimates to
150 create a prior with the method of moments and then optimising using the maximum likelihood estimation
151 method with the SciKit-Learn, Pandas and NumPy libraries¹⁶⁻¹⁸. Monte Carlo simulation was undertaken
152 using 10,000 samples from each distribution, and results were visualised using a histogram and kernel density
153 estimation, with the Matplotlib and Seaborn libraries^{19,20}. Confidence intervals were estimated using
154 bootstrapping.

155 **Results**

156 *Labour type and components*

157 Process mapping identified five different labour types, Laboratory Technician (LT), Medical Scientist
158 (MS), Administrative Staff (AS), Bioinformatics staff (BI) and Medical Practitioner (MP). Twelve
159 components were identified as inputs of the cost of labour modelling: superannuation rate, working hours per
160 week, penalties (such as overtime or weekend penalties), public holiday penalties, private practice loading,

161 attraction and retention allowances, sick leave, professional development allowance, annual leave entitlement,
162 annual leave loading, and base salary. Labour model inputs are detailed in Supplemental Table 1.

163 *Estimates of cost by labour type*

164 Estimates of base case unit cost (cost per hour) for these clinical genomic testing labour types are
165 summarised in Table 1 and detailed by state in Table 2. The estimated weighted mean cost per hour (minimum
166 and maximum values) for laboratory technicians was AUD 99 (AUD 62 - AUD 142), for medical scientists
167 was AUD 134 (AUD 80 - AUD 186), for admin staff was AUD 81 (AUD 55 - AUD 118), for bioinformatics
168 staff was AUD 121 (AUD 80 - AUD 178), and for medical staff was AUD 368 (AUD 263 - AUD 467).

169 *Contribution of labour cost component to overall labour cost*

170 Estimated labour component cost is detailed in Supplemental Table 2 and as a proportion of unit cost is
171 detailed in Supplemental Table 3. In LT, the largest costs were attributable to base salary, at 32.3% (29.0% -
172 39.2%) of the total cost, followed by superannuation at 4.3% (4.1% - 5.0%) and penalties at 3.9% (3.9% -
173 3.9%). MS, AS and BS followed a similar pattern. For PT, base salary remained the largest component 35.3%
174 (27.9% - 45.3%), with superannuation 4.3% (4.1% - 5.0%), following along with leave loading 4.1% (0.0% -
175 6.9%) and professional development 3.8% (2.8% - 5.0%). Professional development was a cost that was
176 considerably different between MP and the other labour types.

177 *Sensitivity analyses*

178 A summary of the DSAs undertaken is presented in Figure 2, Supplemental Table 4, and Supplemental
179 Figure 2. The expected cost (mean, 95% confidence interval) for AS was 89 (88 - 89) per hour, for BS was
180 125 (124 - 126) per hour, for LT was 102 (101 - 102) per hour, for MS was 134 (133 - 135) per hour and PT
181 was 378 (376 - 380) per hour. The results of the PSA are presented in Supplemental Tables 5 and 6, and
182 Supplemental Figures 4 and 5.

183 **Discussion**

184 We conducted a microcosting analysis of clinical genomic testing labour workforce cost, enabling
185 comparison within Australia across Australian jurisdictions and potentially internationally. We found that base

186 salary accounts for the largest component of labour cost, followed by superannuation, and penalties (in all
187 workforces except medical). In medical staff, the third highest cost component was professional development
188 allowance. Pathologist cost was 2.9 times higher than medical scientists, 3.2 times higher than bioinformatics
189 staff, 3.9 times higher than laboratory technicians and 4.7 times higher than the cost of administration staff.
190 Base salary was the most significant contributor to both labour cost and cost uncertainty.

191 *Estimates rather than empirical*

192 We used input estimates for some parameters that were not a part of the pay scales and associated
193 documents, that were based on assumptions or simplifications. An example was the assumption that sick leave
194 resulted in a mean additional cost of 6.5%. This was based on the practice within the primary author's
195 institution, and validated by empirical examples in the area that the primary author operationally manages.
196 These assumptions may not be generalisable and may be sensitive to subgroup differences. The trade-off is
197 model simplicity vs accuracy. To assess the uncertainty around these, we undertook a DSA where we varied
198 the sick leave percentage from 1.0-8.0%, again based on expert estimates that the range can commonly vary
199 between this range, demonstrating that sick leave can be an important cause of cost variance.

200 *Generalisability*

201 The model itself is intended to address a generalisability issue- that is to provide comparative estimates of
202 workforce costs to enable greater understanding, translatability, and generalisability within Australia and in
203 other countries. Built upon, this could be expanded to include other labour types, all states and territories in
204 Australia.

205 *Future Research*

206 Our study assumed that RoPP were foregone in the remuneration arrangements for medical practitioners in
207 public health genomics laboratories. RoPP is a remuneration mechanism where certain workers (particularly
208 medical practitioners) receive an effective performance-based component of their salary, where they share a
209 component of private practice earnings, or undertake work that is entirely private practice. This was
210 introduced in some states to share the cost of labour cost rises with the Australian Commonwealth. In

211 Australian states, this is typically where individuals share a component of the Medicare Benefits Services
212 (MBS) benefit, the Australian Commonwealth mechanism for supporting access to private practice through
213 reimbursement. Our assumption was based on feedback during the study that this was typically foregone in
214 laboratories (typically in exchange for a private practice allowance). Firstly, this is not necessarily the case in
215 all public health pathology laboratories and secondly, this is not the case in non-laboratory health services. Our
216 assumption was made on the basis that public information is not available about the amounts that individuals
217 are paid under the RoPP arrangement. Future work could seek to estimate the amount of RoPP by professional
218 and speciality groups. Similarly, our modelling was based on some non-empirical estimates and assumptions,
219 such as around leave utilisation. Future work could seek to empirically measure rather than assume estimates.

220 We created a model useful for our specific application, however as further costing studies are undertaken,
221 there is an opportunity to build knowledge and refine the approach to estimating workforce costs. To this end,
222 we have provided detailed supplementary tables and the code for estimating uncertainty. We plan to build on
223 this work with future projects, however, encourage others to expand and maintain the models, to increase the
224 accessibility of undertaking comparative cost assessments.

225 *Limitations*

226 Our study made several assumptions. Firstly, we assumed that the labour type was generalisable across
227 Australian jurisdictions. Whilst this may be a safe assumption for medical practitioners, who are registered and
228 regulated health professionals, there may be more variability in the other workforce types. We assumed that
229 workforce cost was based on the public industrial agreements. In most instruments and jurisdictions there were
230 controls identified in the instruments that limited the use of “out-of-instrument” payments, suggesting that the
231 assumption was reasonable. Finally, there are other costs that we have not included- such as insurance. These
232 may be context-specific and the microcosting approach lends itself to adaptation for contexts that warrant
233 inclusion of these costs.

234 *Implications for Policy and Practice*

235 The key implication of this framework and output is a reproducible way to identify bottom-up costs
236 contributing to the labour cost of health services and health technologies, enabling comparative health research
237 within Australia, and overseas. The specific application in this paper was clinical genomic testing, a complex
238 health technology that is rapidly changing and in which automation is already a key consideration.

239 **Conclusion**

240 We undertook microcosting of public clinical genomic testing labour costs in an Australian health services
241 context. We identified that there are five labour types, with 12 components contributing to the estimated cost
242 of labour. To explore the uncertainty in this modelling, we undertook scenario analyses (DSA), which
243 identified that base salary was the greatest source of cost, as well as potential variance and uncertainty. This
244 framework provides a reproducible way for estimated disaggregated workforce costs, that could be built upon
245 or adapted for other economic and policy contexts

246 **Ethics approval**

247 This research did not involve research on human research participants and was therefore exempt from
248 research ethics processes in our institutions.

249 **Data Availability Statement**

250 Data used in this study is provided in supplementary tables, documents and an archive of the original
251 documents, including the publicly available source documents (pay scales, awards and enterprise bargaining
252 agreements). These are not cited individually, as there are a large number and the documents themselves are
253 industrial rather than academic publications.

254 **Conflicts of interest**

255 The author is a medical practitioner in a related discipline. Professor Dalziel is an Associate Editor of
256 Australian Health Review. There are no other relevant disclosures.

257 **Declaration of funding**

258 This research did not receive any specific funding.

259 **Acknowledgements**

260 Professor Kim Dalziel, Professor Zornitza Stark and Associate Professor Ilias Goranitis contributed to the
261 conception and planning of the primary article on microcosting clinical genomic testing, of which the labour
262 costing model formed a part. Professor's Dalziel and Stark contributed to the writing and supervision of this
263 manuscript.

264 **References**

265 1. Hartman M, Martin AB, Benson J, Catlin A, National Health Expenditure Accounts T. National
266 Health Care Spending In 2018: Growth Driven By Accelerations In Medicare And Private Insurance
267 Spending. Health Aff (Millwood)2020 Jan;39(1):8-17.

- 268 2. Parry T, Sherman B. Workforce Health--The Transition From Cost to Outcomes to Business
269 Performance. *Benefits* 2015;31(1):32-8.
- 270 3. Health AIo, Welfare. Health expenditure Australia 2021-22. Canberra: AIHW2023.
- 271 4. Thomas R, Chalkidou K. Cost-effectiveness analysis. In: Cylus J, Papanicolas I, Smith PC,
272 Organization. WH, editors. Health system efficiency: how to make measurement matter for policy and
273 management: World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe; 2016.
- 274 5. Claassen CW, Lindsay B, Riedel DJ, Kafunda I, Mwangi L, Hachaambwa L, et al. Economic
275 evaluations of differentiated service delivery should include savings and ancillary benefits, not only health
276 system costs. *Aids* 2021 Nov 1;35(13):2234-5.
- 277 6. Kuhlmann E, Denis J-L, Côté N, Lotta G, Neri S. Comparing Health Workforce Policy during a Major
278 Global Health Crisis: A Critical Conceptual Debate and International Empirical Investigation. *International*
279 *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2023;20(6):5035.
- 280 7. Kaplan RS, Gallani S. Variance analysis: New insights from health care applications. *Issues in*
281 *Accounting Education* 2022;37(2):27-36.
- 282 8. Hoomans T, Severens JL. Economic evaluation of implementation strategies in health care.
283 *Implementation Science* 2014 2014/12/18;9(1):168.
- 284 9. Bhattarai N, McMeekin P, Price C, Vale L. Economic evaluations on centralisation of specialised
285 healthcare services: a systematic review of methods. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(5):e011214.
- 286 10. Mordaunt DA, Stark Z, Santos Gonzalez F, Dalziel K, Goranitis I. Development of a microcosting
287 protocol to determine the economic cost of diagnostic genomic testing for rare diseases in Australia. *BMJ*
288 *Open* 2023 Nov 29;13(11):e069441.
- 289 11. Mordaunt DA, Gonzalez FS, Lunke S, Eggers S, Sadedin S, Chong B, et al. The cost of proband and
290 trio exome and genome analysis in rare disease: A micro-costing study. *Genet Med* 2023 Dec 30;26(4):101058.
- 291 12. Husereau D, Drummond M, Augustovski F, de Bekker-Grob E, Briggs AH, Carswell C, et al.
292 Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022 Explanation and
293 Elaboration: A Report of the ISPOR CHEERS II Good Practices Task Force. *Value Health* 2022 Jan;25(1):10-
294 31.

- 295 13. Ruger JP, Reiff M. A Checklist for the Conduct, Reporting, and Appraisal of Microcosting Studies in
296 Health Care: Protocol Development. *JMIR Res Protoc* 2016 Oct 5;5(4):e195.
- 297 14. Australia S. Medicare Services: Monthly and Quarterly Statistical Reports (Table 2.2: Medicare -
298 Enrolment Data - Quarterly Enrolments as at December 31, 2023. [cited 2024 20230328]; Available from:
299 [http://medicarestatistics.humanservices.gov.au/statistics/do.jsp?PROGRAM=/statistics/std_standard_report&
300 start_dt=0&ptype=quarter&end_dt=202312&VAR=Services&RPT_FMT=table2.2](http://medicarestatistics.humanservices.gov.au/statistics/do.jsp?PROGRAM=/statistics/std_standard_report&start_dt=0&ptype=quarter&end_dt=202312&VAR=Services&RPT_FMT=table2.2).
- 301 15. Australian Taxation Office. Key Superannuation Rates and Thresholds. 2024; Available from:
302 <https://www.ato.gov.au/tax-rates-and-codes/key-superannuation-rates-and-thresholds>.
- 303 16. Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, et al. Scikit-learn: Machine
304 learning in Python. *the Journal of machine Learning research* 2011;12:2825-30.
- 305 17. Oliphant TE. *Guide to numpy*: Trelgol Publishing USA; 2006.
- 306 18. McKinney W. pandas: a foundational Python library for data analysis and statistics. *Python for high*
307 *performance and scientific computing* 2011;14(9):1-9.
- 308 19. Hunter JD. Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment. *Computing in science &*
309 *engineering* 2007;9(03):90-5.
- 310 20. Waskom ML. Seaborn: statistical data visualization. *Journal of Open Source*
311 *Software* 2021;6(60):3021.

312 **Table 1. Overall Estimates of Public Health Clinical Genomics Laboratory Labour, by Labour Type,**
313 **2023-24 Australian Dollars (AUD \$)**

Personnel type	Mean Labour Cost (Range), Total	Mean Labour Cost (Range), Hourly
Lab technician	196,080 (117,643 - 281,453)	99 (62 - 142)
Medical scientist	260,925 (157,538 - 366,928)	134 (80 - 186)
Admin staff	160,794 (113,848 - 233,350)	81 (55 - 118)
Bioinformatics staff	241,018 (156,865 - 334,774)	121 (80 - 178)
Pathologists	703,206 (548,011 - 923,661)	348 (263 - 467)

314

315

316 **Table 2. Table of Total Costs and Cost Components for Public Health Clinical Genomics Laboratory**

317 **Labour, by Labour Type and Jurisdiction, 2023-24 Australian Dollars (AUD)**

318 ALL, Range and Mean from all categories; QLD, Queensland; NSW, New South Wales; SA, South Australia;

319 WA, Western Australia; VIC, Victoria

State	Personnel type	Labour Cost (Range), Total	Labour Cost (Range), Hourly
VIC	Lab technician	242,302 (203,151 - 281,453)	123 (103 - 142)
	Medical scientist	262,233 (157,538 - 366,928)	133 (80 - 186)
	Admin staff	197,938 (162,526 - 233,350)	100 (82 - 118)
	Bioinformatics staff	259,887 (203,151 - 316,622)	132 (103 - 160)
	Pathologists	755,218 (640,547 - 869,888)	382 (324 - 440)
SA	Lab technician	183,535 (128,458 - 238,613)	94 (66 - 122)
	Medical scientist	248,311 (158,142 - 338,480)	127 (81 - 174)
	Admin staff	149,748 (134,488 - 165,008)	77 (69 - 85)
	Bioinformatics staff	216,414 (156,865 - 275,963)	111 (80 - 142)
	Pathologists	815,461 (707,262 - 923,661)	413 (358 - 467)
NSW	Lab technician	183,452 (141,818 - 225,086)	88 (68 - 108)
	Medical scientist	262,537 (171,514 - 353,559)	133 (87 - 179)
	Admin staff	136,915 (113,848 - 159,982)	66 (55 - 77)
	Bioinformatics staff	230,733 (168,662 - 292,805)	111 (81 - 141)
	Pathologists	637,526 (548,011 - 727,040)	307 (263 - 350)
QLD	Lab technician	169,273 (117,643 - 220,903)	90 (62 - 117)
	Medical scientist	250,634 (166,494 - 334,774)	133 (88 - 178)
	Admin staff	154,022 (115,620 - 192,424)	82 (61 - 102)
	Bioinformatics staff	250,634 (166,494 - 334,774)	133 (88 - 178)
	Pathologists	650,304 (549,076 - 751,532)	329 (278 - 380)

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](#) .


WA	Lab technician	184,009 (148,456 - 219,561)	93 (75 - 111)
	Medical scientist	281,141 (200,677 - 361,605)	142 (102 - 183)
	Admin staff	163,243 (148,456 - 178,030)	83 (75 - 90)
	Bioinformatics staff	223,748 (206,002 - 241,495)	113 (104 - 122)
	Pathologists	803,136 (702,710 - 903,563)	386 (338 - 434)

320

321

322 **Figure 1. Plot of Total Costs and Cost Components for Public Health Clinical Genomics Laboratory**
323 **Labour, by Labour Type and Jurisdiction, 2023-24 Australian Dollars (AUD)**

324 ALL, Range and Mean from all categories; QLD, Queensland; NSW, New South Wales; SA, South Australia;
 325 WA, Western Australia; VIC, Victoria



326

327 **Figure 2. Deterministic Sensitivity Analysis of Labour Costs, by Labour Type and Jurisdiction, 2023-24**
328 **Australian Dollars (AUD)**
329 BC, Base Case; PP, Private Practice Loading; PD, Professional Development Allowance; ALL, Range and
330 Unweighted Mean from all categories; QLD, Queensland; NSW, New South Wales; SA, South Australia; WA,
331 Western Australia; VIC, Victoria. Tornado plot visualising the uniform distribution resulting from varying the
332 inputs. This demonstrates the three inputs with the greatest variance, clearly demonstrating the highest
333 variance with base salary. The values shown are estimated hourly costs based on the mean and range across
334 states.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) .

