Evaluation of the Nationwide Assessment of CCTV in ECEC Settings

Final Executive Summary Report

Australian Government Department of Education on behalf of all governments through the Child Safety Reform Group

23 September 2026

—

KPMG.com.au

Acknowledgement of Country

KPMG acknowledges Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the First Peoples of Australia. We pay our respects to Elders past, present, and future as the Traditional Custodians of the land, water and skies of where we work.

At KPMG, our future is one where all Australians are united by a shared, honest, and complete understanding of our past, present, and future. We are committed to making this future a reality. Our story celebrates and acknowledges that the cultures, histories, rights, and voices of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People are heard, understood, respected, and celebrated.

Australia's First Peoples continue to hold distinctive cultural, spiritual, physical and economical relationships with their land, water and skies. We take our obligations to the land and environments in which we operate seriously.

We look forward to making our contribution towards a new future for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples so that they can chart a strong future for themselves, their families and communities. We believe we can achieve much more together than we can apart.

kpmg.com/au/rap

Inherent Limitations

This Executive Summary Report has been prepared as outlined with the Australian Government Department of Education in the scope section of the engagement letter / contract executed on 15 December 2025. The services provided in connection with this engagement comprise an advisory engagement, which is not subject to assurance or other standards issued by the Australian Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and, consequently no opinions or conclusions intended to convey assurance have been expressed.

No warranty of completeness, accuracy or reliability is given in relation to the statements and representations made by, and the information and documentation provided by Australian Government Department of Education stakeholders consulted as part of the process.

KPMG has indicated within this Executive Summary Report the sources of the information provided. We have not sought to independently verify those sources unless otherwise noted within the Executive Summary Report.

KPMG is under no obligation in any circumstance to update this Executive Summary Report in either oral or written form, for events occurring after the Executive Summary Report has been issued in final form.

Third Party Reliance

This Executive Summary Report is solely for the purpose set out in the engagement letter / contract and for the Australian Government Department of Education's information and is not to be used for any purpose not contemplated in the engagement letter / contract or to be distributed to any third party without KPMG's prior written consent.

This Executive Summary Report has been prepared at the request of the Australian Government Department of Education in accordance with the terms of KPMGs engagement letter / contract executed on 15 December 2025. Other than our responsibility to the Australian Government Department of Education, neither KPMG nor any member or employee of KPMG undertakes responsibility arising in any way from reliance placed by a third party on this Executive Summary Report. Any reliance placed is that party's sole responsibility.



Executive summary

This is an Executive Summary of the Evaluation of the Nationwide Assessment of CCTV in ECEC Settings. The full evaluation report contains the definitive findings and considerations.

The Department of Education engaged KPMG to undertake an Independent Evaluation of the Nationwide Assessment of CCTV in ECEC settings. The purpose of this Evaluation is to examine the appropriateness, effectiveness, scalability, and future direction for CCTV in ECEC settings, based on evidence from the Nationwide Assessment and from this evaluation.

Background

Australian Governments have committed to improving the safety, health and wellbeing of children in early childhood education and care (ECEC). Highly publicised failures to protect children in ECEC settings have significantly eroded public trust and confidence in the sector and made child safety reforms an urgent national priority.[1] In response, Governments across Australia are implementing a suite of reforms to ensure children's wellbeing and safety are at the centre of all ECEC services and providers. Among these reforms, Education Ministers are considering the use of Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) in ECEC settings as one potential tool to strengthen child safety.

However, there is limited domestic evidence regarding the effectiveness and safety of CCTV in ECEC settings to reduce harms. The introduction or expansion of CCTV also raises ethical, privacy, and legal considerations, as well as potential unintended impacts on the achievement of broader priorities, including universal ECEC provision and workforce stability and sustainability. To inform this policy decision, Education Ministers agreed to conduct a nationwide CCTV Assessment in up to 300 services (the Assessment) across Australia and guided and overseen by experts including the Australian Centre for Child Protection.[2] The final number of participating services was 309. The Assessment was managed by the Department of Education (the Department) on behalf of all Australian Governments. The Department engaged the Nous Group (Nous) to design and implement the Assessment. KPMG was selected as the independent evaluator to conduct the Evaluation component of the Assessment. The approach for the Assessment was endorsed by the Child Safety Reform Group (CSRG) in February 2026. The approach to the independent evaluation of the Assessment component of the project (the Evaluation) was built upon the Assessment Framework and Parameters.

Evaluation purpose and scope

The Evaluation assessed whether CCTV can be used as a safe and an effective tool to safeguard children in ECEC settings by:

- Deterring, detecting, and responding to incidents, issues and risks of harm to children
- Aiding regulatory monitoring and compliance activities
- Enhancing trust and confidence of families in ECEC services and providers through its potential effects on educator behaviour and workplace culture.

The Evaluation scope did not include making any recommendations or considerations related to future models, whether mandatory, targeted or voluntary.

[1] Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare 2025, *Prioritise safety and learning for children in childcare,* accessed on 12 August 2026: Prioritise safety and learning for children in childcare; SNAIC – National Voice for our Children 2025, *Federal Government introduces new childcare safety legislation – SNAICC in the News*, accessed on 12 August 2026: Federal Government introduces new childcare safety legislation-SNAICC in the News.
[2] Department of Education 2026, *National CCTV assessment*, accessed on 12 August 2026: National CCTV assessment - Department of Education, Australian Government.

©2026 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation. Document Classification: KPMG Confidential. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Evaluation methodology

A mixed-methods approach was developed to evaluate the Assessment, drawing on a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. The perspectives and experiences of stakeholders were the main source of primary data collected as part of this Evaluation. To gather this information, stakeholders were engaged through various methods, including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, surveys, and service and provider site visits.

The findings in this report are presented in line with the four key evaluation domains:

Appropriateness	Sought to assess whether the use of CCTV in ECEC services and providers is suitable and justified for the intended purpose of maximising child safety in balance with broader risks from its introduction. It considered alignment with legal, ethical, and privacy standards, as well as appropriateness across different service types and contexts.
Effectiveness	Sought to examine how well CCTV achieves its intended outcomes, such as deterring, detecting, and responding to child abuse, supporting compliance, and improving trust. It also explored potential trade-offs and unintended consequences, including impacts on educational quality and wellbeing.
Scalability	Focussed on testing the assumptions and feasibility of scaling CCTV in ECEC services and providers. It considered the adaptability of better practice standards, sustainability, funding and resourcing implications, and equity considerations for regional and rural services and priority cohorts.
Future direction	Focusses on providing a holistic assessment and presentation of lessons, insights and recommendations from other domains of inquiry to support Ministerial advice on the future policy direction for use of CCTV in ECEC settings.

Limitations and considerations

The purpose of the Evaluation is to assess and provide independent judgement on whether CCTV improves child safety in ECEC settings. The Evaluation elicited feedback from a broad range of ECEC sector stakeholders, including both Assessment participants and non-participants, through interviews, survey responses, site visits and written submissions. In analysing and synthesising this feedback, it was recognised that stakeholders differed in their level of involvement, influence and interest in assessing the impact of CCTV on child safety relative to the broader ethical, privacy and legal considerations associated with its use in ECEC settings. As such, evaluation findings and considerations for officials were developed with this in mind, and stakeholder feedback was assessed through a critical lens.

While a tailored evaluation approach was designed to ensure the Evaluation objectives were met, it is important to note some limitations and considerations. These include:

- **Selection bias:** All services had already implemented CCTV prior to participating in the Assessment.
- **Evaluation and Assessment timeframes:** Timeframes for advice by Ministers did not allow sufficient time for ethics approval, limiting engagement with priority cohorts, including First Nations communities, and preventing engagement with children. The short Assessment timeframe also limited the ability to assess longer-term outcomes or sustained changes.
- **Data quality and completeness:** There was a reliance on secondary data sources to supplement the primary evidence base, primarily through data collected by the Nous Group during the Assessment.
- **Representativeness of stakeholder views**: Consultation captured a range of perspectives but may not have represented the full spectrum of views.

©2026 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation. Document Classification: KPMG Confidential. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

- **Survey data:** Survey results reflect responses from a large sample with varying levels of experience and awareness of CCTV. A survey response rate has not been assessed due to the nature of the mailing list which consisted of an unknown number of recipients.

Further detail on limitations and considerations can be found in Chapter 1: Introduction within the Final Evaluation Report[3].

[3] KPMG - Evaluation of the Nationwide Assessment of CCTV in ECEC Settings – Final Evaluation Report – 23 September 2026

©2026 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation. Document Classification: KPMG Confidential. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Evaluation findings

A summary of the Evaluation findings is provided below. Considerations related to these findings can be found in the Final Evaluation Report.[4]

It is important to note that this summary should not be generalised to First Nations children, families, educators, communities or ACCO-led services, as the Evaluation was not able to consider issues of cultural safety, acceptability, or the differential impacts of CCTV for these groups. Any anecdotal findings related to First Nations perspectives are presented separately within the Final Evaluation Report in Chapter 2: Findings, with the need for further consultation captured as one of the considerations for officials outlined in Chapter 3: Considerations for officials.[4]

Overarching findings

In addition to the Evaluation findings identified by domain, there are several Evaluation findings that intersect across all four evaluation domains and therefore should be considered in the context of all findings. These overarching findings include:

- **Stakeholders do not have a shared understanding of the intended purpose of CCTV in ECEC settings:** The Evaluation showed significant diversity in stakeholder views on whether the primary function of CCTV should be as a deterrent; as a mechanism to support investigations; as a monitoring tool; or as a broader child safety measure. Many stakeholders also entered the Evaluation's consultation process with an ingoing assumption that CCTV would be used as a substitute for appropriate supervision. This information asymmetry has led to deep concerns from services and providers who do not have CCTV about how this technology would operate in practice, which highlights a need for greater clarity and the need to fill any information gaps.
- **Stakeholders hold divergent views on the extent to which CCTV-related risks can be mitigated:** The Evaluation showed significant variation in stakeholder understanding of CCTV-related risks, including as they relate to privacy and consent, data storage, access and retention, cyber security, impacts to workforce, and operational responsibilities for services and providers. The strength and volume of feedback on these issues was much higher through the Evaluation compared to the Assessment, which is again indicative of the information asymmetry that exists and highlights a need for clearer information on degree to which these risks can be mitigated.
- **Support for CCTV is strongly influenced by experience:** Across the sector, those with direct experience or exposure to CCTV are generally supportive of CCTV systems. Data collected through the Assessment, surveys, focus groups and case studies also support this finding, with few stakeholders expressing regret post-implementation of CCTV.

Findings by domain

The table below provides an overview of the key findings by Evaluation domain. Considerations related to these findings can be found in Chapter 3: Considerations for officials in the Final Evaluation Report. [4]

Table 1: Summary of findings by domain

Domain	Key Finding
Appropriateness	**The Evaluation identified divergent views on the appropriateness of CCTV in ECEC settings, particularly between participating and non-participating services. Across stakeholder groups, however, there was a consistent view that appropriateness is highly context dependent, with stakeholders consistently emphasising the need for clarity of purpose, strong safeguards, and comprehensive guidance. Evidence from the Assessment supports these findings.**
	1. **Perceptions on appropriateness of CCTV vary:** There was consistent feedback and agreement across services and providers participating in the Assessment that CCTV can be an appropriate tool to support child safety. However, there was strong

[4] KPMG - Evaluation of the Nationwide Assessment of CCTV in ECEC Settings – Final Evaluation Report – 23 September 2026

©2026 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation. Document Classification: KPMG Confidential. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Domain	Key Finding
	consensus that it should not be relied upon as a primary safeguard and is most effective when used as a supplementary support within a broader suite of child safety supports and measures. Conversely, for services outside of the Assessment, most management personnel and staff consulted with for the Evaluation opposed the use of CCTV as a child safety measure in ECEC settings. 2. **Stakeholders question the value of CCTV:** Key differences in opinion between Assessment and non-Assessment management and staff included concerns that CCTV is a reactive policy measure, that there is limited evidence that it improves child safety, and that its use may impact the privacy rights of both staff and children in ECEC services. Stakeholders proposed that alternative measures would be more appropriate for further investment and support (e.g., improvements to staffing ratios). 3. **Appropriateness depends on context:** There is a consistent view that the appropriateness of CCTV use in ECEC settings is entirely context dependent, influenced by service type, location, capability and safeguards in place, with stakeholders expressing greater acceptability where CCTV is implemented with clear governance arrangements (e.g., placement, access, retention, and privacy/cyber safeguards), rather than as a standalone installation. CCTV policy will need to flex to suit diverse services, providers and cohorts. 4. **Gaps in existing frameworks to support CCTV:** There were mixed views regarding the appropriateness and suitability of current frameworks to govern and guide the appropriate use of CCTV in ECEC services. Specific areas of focus identified by stakeholders included a need to introduce explicit legislative provisions and policy expectations to set the right parameters for CCTV use, and to address inconsistences across jurisdictional legislative and regulatory approaches.
Effectiveness	**The Evaluation found mixed evidence that CCTV can support earlier detection of reportable incidents; however, it is effective in supporting post-incident review. In addition, most stakeholders agree with the use of CCTV as an investigative tool, emphasising that it should not replace direct supervision. Families and caregivers were generally more likely to perceive CCTV as enhancing child safety than services and providers who have little or no experience with CCTV. Notably, educators working in services with CCTV are generally supportive, stating it does not impact how they interact with children and provides a sense of protection. These findings are broadly aligned with those of the Assessment.** 5. **CCTV is useful for investigations, but-to-date, there is less evidence to support its use as a first line of defence in detecting child safety incidents:** The value of CCTV as a tool to support earlier or more comprehensive detection of reportable incidents, issues and risks is mixed. The Evaluation found that CCTV is most effective in supporting post-incident review, particularly risk-based, but its ability to support proactive detection (e.g., live monitoring) is limited by technology infancy and uptake as well as value perceptions amongst service providers. Without exception, all stakeholders cautioned that in-person supervision should remain the primary monitoring measure within ECEC settings, citing operational limitations. 6. **Many educators who lack experience working in CCTV-enabled services believe it will impact their interactions with children:** There were divergent views between ECEC services who have CCTV versus those who do not regarding the impact of CCTV on educator-child interactions and the learning environment. For ECEC services with CCTV, the majority of educators did not view CCTV as materially changing how they perform their day-to-day-role. Conversely, for ECEC services without CCTV, stakeholders felt that the presence of CCTV would discourage educators from displaying normally appropriate behaviours. 7. **Families seem to broadly support CCTV as a child safety measure:** Based on available qualitative, quantitative and anecdotal evidence, parents and caregivers are broadly supportive of CCTV use in ECEC settings. While parents and caregivers

©2026 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation. Document Classification: KPMG Confidential. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Domain	Key Finding
	generally perceive CCTV as enhancing safety, they continue to seek greater clarity regarding how CCTV data is managed and governed.
Scalability	**The Evaluation found the feasibility of CCTV implementation to be entirely context dependent, with factors such as service type and location having a greater influence than service or provider size. While challenges to broader implementation exist, they are likely to be surmountable should the sector receive clarity regarding the purpose of CCTV in ECEC settings, accompanied by capability support and clear guidance on its use. This aligns with findings from the Assessment.** 8. **Implementation feasibility is entirely context dependent:** The feasibility of implementation across service types, sizes and locations is variable and entirely context dependent. Any potential scaling of CCTV in ECEC settings will need to be informed by a strong understanding of the unique implementation challenges faced by different types of services and providers. The Evaluation found that certain service characteristics may lead to high administrative, technical, and operational burden. This is relevant to services in regional, rural and remote areas, smaller, standalone and community-governed services, as well as OHSC services. 9. **Bounded models seem most plausible:** The most plausible future models are bounded models focused on overt recording in non-private areas with clear safeguards, rather than unrestricted surveillance. Clear governance, limited purpose, privacy-sensitive placement and defined review protocols are consistently identified as minimum conditions for safer use. 10. **The cost of CCTV depends more on system selection than the service type:** The costs of installing, maintaining and monitoring CCTV were less influenced by ECEC service type than the number of cameras, age of the service (i.e., building and layout), and storage options. Smaller providers were more likely to report financial and resourcing constraints in implementing CCTV.
Future Direction	**Readiness for broader CCTV implementation varies across the sector, with many stakeholders highlighting the need for stronger evidence of child safety benefits. Stakeholders also expressed concerns related to capability, readiness and resourcing gaps across the sector. This is broadly reinforced by key findings from the Assessment.** 11. **Stakeholders emphasised the need for stronger evidence of child safety benefits:** There were mixed views on whether CCTV in ECEC settings should be expanded. Many stakeholders noted that, in the absence of robust evidence demonstrating a clear impact of CCTV on child safety outcomes, decisions regarding broader implementation or scaling may be premature. 12. **There are barriers to expansion for a large proportion of smaller providers and those in regional areas:** Provider size and scale are important factors influencing implementation feasibility. Large providers are better positioned to implement due to availability of technical support, and funding and resourcing availability, while smaller providers, including those in regional areas, face more significant barriers. 13. **There are significant capability and readiness gaps across the sector:** Key capability and readiness gaps can be stratified at the provider and sector level. Key gaps relate to: governance and policy capabilities, privacy, consent, and compliance readiness gaps, technical infrastructure and cybersecurity capability gaps, workforce acceptance and training capability gaps, and funding and sustainability readiness gaps. A summary of provider and sector gaps by capability can be found at Table 10 in section 7.3 of the Final Evaluation Report.[5]

Source: KPMG (2026)

[5] KPMG - Evaluation of the Nationwide Assessment of CCTV in ECEC Settings – Final Evaluation Report – 23 September 2026

©2026 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation. Document Classification: KPMG Confidential. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Alignment to the Assessment and closing observations

Overall, and where evidence is available and aligned to the KEQs, the Evaluation supports the Assessment's key findings and considerations for officials. Table 2 below provides a high-level summary of alignment and potential difference only.

It is, however, important to note that while the Evaluation and the Assessment were commissioned to generate a robust evidence base to inform broader policy decisions regarding the use of CCTV in ECEC settings, they were designed for different purposes. The Assessment focussed on data collection and assessment of CCTV use and efficacy at the services participating in the Assessment. The Evaluation was responsible for providing independent judgement regarding how CCTV can improve child safety, and the conditions in which it could safely be scaled. Any alignment between findings should therefore be interpreted within this context, with the detailed rationale set out in the report.

The Evaluation confirms the need for greater clarity regarding the purpose of CCTV in ECEC settings, alongside strengthened sector guidance on privacy, governance and technical requirements. In the longer term, further consideration of legislative and regulatory requirements may be necessary, including the potential for greater harmonisation across jurisdictions to enable a nationally consistent approach to the implementation, management and oversight of CCTV in ECEC settings.

The Evaluation has also found that perspectives are generally more positive within CCTV-enabled services, with fewer concerns expressed by participating services and providers and stronger acceptance by staff. This is consistent with findings in the Assessment. Data from both the Assessment and the Evaluation also indicates that parents and caregivers are broadly supportive of CCTV as a child safety measure, provided privacy and governance arrangements are strong and clearly communicated.

The Evaluation supports the Assessment's findings in relation to risks associated with current use and recommends a two-stage approach to mitigate these risks, which is further detailed in the considerations for officials.

A final reflection from the Evaluation regarding capability uplift

Through the trial, participating services would have experienced a significant capability uplift not experienced by other services and providers across the sector. Access to privacy impact assessments, identification of compliance gaps, and Communities of Practice have provided greater awareness and understanding of best-practice for CCTV use and associated risks. Consequently, the capability demonstrated by participating services should not be considered representative of the broader sector, nor should it be treated as a benchmark.

Table 2: Assessment and Evaluation findings[6]

Assessment Finding	Evaluation Finding
Key Finding 1: CCTV is a valuable tool, but there is no strong basis for a mandatory requirement to have it installed in all ECEC settings	Evidence obtained from the Evaluation supports this finding, with stakeholder perceptions on appropriateness varied but consistent agreement that it is entirely context dependent. Stakeholders also questioned the value of CCTV.
Key Finding 2: CCTV can contribute to child safety, but its value is highly dependent on the type of harm concerned and whether the goal is prevention, detection or response.	Evidence obtained from the Evaluation supports this finding, with mixed evidence that CCTV can detect reportable incidents; however, it is useful for post-incident review. Stakeholders consistently emphasised the importance of defining CCTV's purpose.

[6] The Nous Group - Nationwide Assessment of CCTV in ECEC settings - Draft Detailed Findings Report - 9 August.pdf.

©2026 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation. Document Classification: KPMG Confidential. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Assessment Finding	Evaluation Finding
Key Finding 3: CCTV delivers value through two distinct but complementary use cases: event-driven review, which supports incident detection and response, and proactive review, which supports prevention, organisational learning and continuous improvement.	The limited evidence available to the Evaluation does not challenge nor contradict this finding.
Key Finding 4: AI-enabled CCTV may improve the efficiency of footage review by services, but its child safety benefits are limited and are dependent on knowledgeable implementation.	Evidence obtained from the Evaluation supports this finding. However, the relatively early stage of the technology's adoption, and varying perceptions on value amongst service providers, may be limiting to its current validity (noting this may shift over time).
Key Finding 5: RAs generally regard CCTV footage, where available and of suitable quality, to be a valuable additional source of evidence.	Evidence obtained from the Evaluation supports this finding, with broad agreement amongst RAs regarding CCTV's effectiveness in supporting post-incident review and investigations.
Key Finding 6: Many ECEC services lack the technical capability required to ensure CCTV systems are fit for purpose.	Evidence obtained from the Evaluation supports this finding, with many stakeholders expressing concerns related to capability, knowledge, readiness and resourcing gaps across the sector.
Key Finding 7: The governance maturity required to support safe and compliant CCTV use varies considerably across the sector.	Evidence obtained from the Evaluation strongly supports this finding, with stakeholders consistently emphasising the need for explicit legislative provisions and policy expectations to set the right parameters for CCTV use, and to address inconsistences across jurisdictional legislative and regulatory approaches.
Key Finding 8: CCTV appears more likely to support, rather than undermine, a strong safety culture when implemented with effective leadership.	Evidence obtained from the Evaluation strongly supports this finding, with stakeholders overwhelmingly calling for clarity on the purpose of CCTV in ECEC settings in addition to capability support and clear guidance on use.
Key Finding 9: Variation in regulatory settings creates, at times, complexity and uncertainty for ECEC services.	The evidence available to the Evaluation is supportive of this finding.
Key Finding 10: The CCTV market is becoming increasingly diverse, creating both opportunities and challenges for ECEC services.	Evidence obtained from the Evaluation supports this finding, with stakeholder viewpoints identifying the importance of standardising CCTV use within the ECEC sector to minimise the inadvertent challenges and risks.

©2026 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation. Document Classification: KPMG Confidential. Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

