

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES 2021-22 – 14 FEBRUARY 2022

AGRICULTURE, WATER AND THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO

QoN No.	Portfolio QoN No.	Department /Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Transcript Page
1	SQ22-000007	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kim Carr	Antarctic and Science Precinct project - Funding allocation	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I understand that, but I'm particularly interested in the department's role in this matter, because there was an allocation. It was said in the original announcement that there was an investment of \$450 million over the life of the project. Of course, the Antarctic and Science Precinct at Macquarie Point was said to be a key component of the Hobart city deal agreement between the three levels of government. That's correct, isn't it?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: That sounds right. Obviously, the department of infrastructure has a major role here, given their responsibility-</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I'm wondering where I'd find the \$450 million which was allocated for this project in the budget.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: It's not in our budget that I know of, Senator. It's a question of funding into the future. We can check as to where that particular money is.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can someone tell me that? Is there a finance officer here that can tell me exactly where I could find that money?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We can check as to whether there's anything in our current budget, or whether it sits elsewhere. Certainly, my understanding is that a significant part of the concept is the potential relocation of Antarctic Division into the wharf precinct from Kingston, together with the improvements to the wharf precinct, particularly to ensure that a large vessel like the Nuyina can easily tie up alongside.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I want to go to that, because there was nearly a million dollars allocated to KPMG, wasn't there? Nearly a million dollars?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'd have to check that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That's the case, wasn't it? In December 2019?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Okay, we'll need to check that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: KPMG was awarded \$929,500 to undertake an Antarctic science precinct options assessment. Is that right?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I trust you on that, Senator. I don't know that, personally.</p>	56
2	SQ22-000008	Department of Agriculture,	Kim Carr	Antarctic and Science Precinct project - timeline	<p>Senator KIM CARR: ... The minister for infrastructure made a speech recently; he talked about these matters at some length. At a previous estimates hearing we were told that some decisions would be made against these contracts that had</p>	57

		Water and the Environment			<p>already been ordered within a six-month period. That doesn't seem to have happened. Would you say the project is behind schedule?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: It is not for me to comment. What I can say is that we believe there are significant benefits for the interests of our department should it proceed.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Claims were made that the decisions in regard to anchor tenants, for instance, would be made within six months. That hasn't been done. Have any agreements been reached that you or the department are aware of?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I would need to take this on notice and check, to make sure my understanding was accurate.</p>	
3	SQ22-000009	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kim Carr	Antarctic and Science Precinct project - costs	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What assurances, Mr Metcalfe-given that you are an advocate for the project-are there that the scientific capabilities won't be lost in moving the Antarctic Division to this new precinct?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: That is certainly something we would ensure did not occur. We have significant resources out at the Kingston site, which is quite old and dated. The tenancy is coming up fairly soon anyway, with an opportunity to re-establish our presence there, combined with the extraordinary investment the Australian government has made in the icebreaker, which is a globally leading scientific vessel. We have already seen evidence of that on its first voyage. That all underlines the importance attached to science in Antarctica.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Indeed. I am interested to know what the costs are of this whole project.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'll take that on notice. I suspect we will need to redirect that to the department of infrastructure.</p>	57-58
4	SQ22-000011	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kim Carr	Antarctic and Science Precinct project - measures to protect ice core collection	<p>Senator KIM CARR: In terms of the move, what measures have been taken to protect the ice core collection, for instance?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'll take that very detailed question on notice.</p>	58
5	SQ22-000016	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kim Carr	Antarctic and Science Precinct project - MOU regarding the Centre for the Antarctic and Southern Oceans Technology	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The Centre for the Antarctic and Southern Oceans Technology, CASOT, is currently part of the arrangements being proposed at the University of Tasmania. There is no clear understanding about what is happening with that. Do you have any understanding of that?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I can't speak to that. I am happy to redirect any of these questions to the relevant people.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Could we have a copy of the MOU that has been, I understand, entered into between the department, the AAD, CSIRO and the University of Tasmania in regard to CASOT? Can you provide that?</p>	58

					<p>Mr Metcalfe: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Could you provide me with a detailed answer regarding what arrangements have been made to establish the anchor tenants for this precinct and what progress has been made on the request for quotation process that is underway? It is the second phase of the business case in terms of the precinct's options that are being developed following the KPMG report. Is that possible?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you.</p>	
6	SQ22-000020	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kim Carr	Antarctic and Science Precinct project - has BOM been approached	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Mr Metcalfe will take this on notice: the Bureau of Meteorology has been mentioned as a core tenant in this arrangement as well—that is, moving that out of Melbourne. Can you confirm that they have been approached?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I will need to check on that. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, of course. Thank you.</p>	59
7	SQ22-000205	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	EPBC Act - draft changes to legislation and regulation	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG : Has the department been asked to draft new pieces of legislation or any changes to regulations?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: You're aware of the legislation that we've drafted which is in the Senate at the moment, Senator. Again, I'm not aware of any requests to draft—to the best of my knowledge, recollection, I'm not aware of any additional drafting that we've done in relation to the EPBC Act. But, again, I'd need to check with my colleagues and come back to you on that to confirm it.</p>	60
8	SQ22-000023	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Water trigger in the EPBC Act	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have you been asked to do any work on the removal of the water trigger?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Not to the best of my knowledge, no. Again, I'll check that and come back and confirm it with you on notice.</p>	61
9	SQ22-000025	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	EPBC Act - offsets	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I have a final question. Have you already given the minister a briefing on what changes could be undertaken in relation to offsets?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Again, I'd need to double-check that this hasn't come from my staff, but certainly from my perspective not a specific brief at this point that goes to specific changes to offsets.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Thank you.</p>	62
10	SQ22-000027	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Anne Urquhart	Measuring effectiveness of ReMade Australia campaign	<p>Senator URQUHART: So you've almost spent \$9.8 million and there's another \$9.8 million to be spent. How are you measuring the success of the advertising campaign?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: The campaign is being tracked and will be evaluated by a whole-of-</p>	64

		the Environment			<p>government evaluation research agency, Hall & Partners, to measure its effectiveness.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So they are the ones tracking it?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: That's correct, yes. Initial results which are occurring sort of incrementally throughout the life of the campaign show that the advertising is increasing consumer confidence in Australia's recycling system.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: How have they measured that?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I'll have to take the detail of their methodology on notice.</p>	
11	SQ22-000028	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Status of underwater fans	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: With the underwater fans, it's still on the Great Barrier Reef Foundation's website. My understanding is that it is pretty much dormant now and there's no real activity in that area. Is that your understanding?</p> <p>Dr Banks: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: How much money has been spent on that over the last-</p> <p>Dr Banks: I'd probably have to take that on notice. I don't have that information with me. I think that, effectively, it has been suspended, but I'd have to take it on notice to confirm that, because that was a couple of years ago.</p>	66
12	SQ22-000001	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Projects impacting Koala habitat	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: My question is: how did we allow the koala to now be endangered?</p> <p>Dr Locke: There are a range of pressures on the koala population. A significant factor in the up-listing decision was the outcome of the bushfires two years ago and the recommendation that came out of the expert working group that followed the bushfires, and that fed into the work of the Threatened Species Scientific Committee. The bushfire event was very significant in the triggering of this decision, but there has been significant pressure on the koala population for some time.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: How many projects that impact on the habitat of the koala have been given approval since the koala was nominated as 'vulnerable'?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I'm not sure we would have that detail here, but we could take it on notice.</p>	70
13	SQ22-000002	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Lidia Thorpe	Bogong moth	<p>Senator THORPE: That wasn't my question, though. My question was: what is the importance of the bogong moth to the First Peoples of this country?</p> <p>Senator Hume: I think that question was asked and answered. The official said that she wouldn't presume to do that.</p> <p>CHAIR: Do you want to take that question on notice?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I think the best thing that I can say is that of course we are aware that it is culturally significant but I wouldn't presume to want to express that significance here because I'm sure, for different communities, that is something that they would like to explain. I'm certainly happy to take it on notice as well...</p>	73

					<p>CHAIR: It might be useful. Do you want more information on that answer?</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Yes. I understand that you understand that there's some kind of importance, but I think it is important that you understand the importance to be able to make informed decisions about what you do in the department. Is that fair enough?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I do. Indeed, we're aware of the cultural significance to Indigenous Australians of many animals, plants and places in relation to species. The officer at the table may not have the particular knowledge but we do have consultation processes and other ways of trying to inform ourselves.</p> <p>In my opening statement earlier this afternoon I indicated the department have come to the view that we need to do even more. We do some things, but we need to do much more. That is a commitment you have from me.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Thank you. Yes, 230 years is a long time, but we're patient people. So what is your understanding of the cultural implications of the decline of the bogong moth?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We will take that on notice because I believe that information would be held. I don't know if it's necessarily held by the senior officers here off the top of their heads. So let us do that question justice and answer it properly.</p>	
14	SQ22-000003	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Lidia Thorpe	Bogong moth consultation	<p>Senator THORPE: So you haven't worked with any traditional owners about the bogong moth because, are you saying, it hasn't come to the point of extinction as far as the government's concerned? When are you going to reach out to the TOs to talk about our totem?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: The process for the department to look at whether it's threatened commences with it being put on the work plan. That report has relatively recently been released, so it isn't on the work plan yet. I know this is a process answer, but that's the fact of the matter at the moment. I guess the work that the government has done to date has been focused on light pollution-working with communities to make them aware of the impact of light pollution-but we haven't yet got a process in place that is looking at the status and therefore the management that's appropriate for the moth.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: When you say communities, do you include traditional owners in that context, or are we separate?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I would include traditional owners in that context.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Have you spoken to any traditional owners about the bogong moth as part of your process to date?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: In terms of the light pollution work, the initial work has been raising awareness.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: To traditional owners?</p>	74

					<p>Dr Stobutzki: It's been more general than that.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: So there is no specific consultation process that you're having with the traditional owners who have cared for the bogong moth since the beginning of time in this country? Are you saying that you haven't got to that part of the plan yet?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I might be able to help. I think what we are saying is what Dr Stobutzki is describing-the process at the point from when the Threatened Species Scientific Committee agrees to commence work on looking at the status of the species. But, as she mentioned, there has also been research done through the NESP, which is also in our department. It's not in my area. I would need to take on notice who was consulted as part of that work.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Please do that; that would be great. Are there any traditional owners on the committee you just mentioned?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Yes. We have a botanist, Professor Stephen van Leeuwen.</p>	
15	SQ22-000004	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Lidia Thorpe	Bogong moth decline	<p>Senator THORPE: How are you addressing the causes of the bogong decline? To follow up, what measures are you taking to work with farmers along the bogong migration routes to reduce the use of pesticides?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: We would have to take that on notice. I don't think that's work that my area of the department has commenced at this time. As we said, it hasn't quite got to that point with the TSSC. But this is a broader department, so we can take on notice any work that has been done on that matter.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: We're talking about the bogong moth right here, where we're all sitting in a colonised capital. This was a gathering place for clans and tribes to gather and feast on the bogong moth. Are you aware of that?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: Yes.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: So we're at 99.5 per cent decline since invasion. We're not part of a plan. You haven't really talked to the farmers about pesticides-not that you're aware of. So what are you actually doing to address the decline?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I guess the best way that I can answer is that I think that we can take on notice a much more fulsome response for you, and we'll certainly do that, that covers all of these questions that you have raised. We are aware of the research that has been done through the NESP, and, more broadly, we are aware of the fact that there have been significant recent declines, very significant recent declines, in the bogong moth, which is why it's on the radar for the TSSC. I think that there is some hope that a lot of that decline has happened in the last few years rather than iteratively over the whole period. That's my understanding of the research anyway. Please, if you could let us take it on notice, we'll come</p>	74-75

					back to you. Senator THORPE: Thank you	
16	SQ22-000005	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Environment Restoration Fund - projects	<p>Senator URQUHART: I have a couple of questions around the Environment Restoration Fund; then I've got some others on other topics. Can you tell me what the value of that fund was; how much money was committed?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: The Environment Restoration Fund was announced, as you know, in the 2019 budget as a \$100 million four-year program.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Has all of that money been spent yet?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: At this stage, as I understand it-my colleague who is coming to the table can probably provide more detail if needed-\$87.1 million is currently contractually committed.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Around \$13 million may be outstanding?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: Yes, that's right. Some of that has been subject to a recent competitive round associated with the Threatened Species Strategy Action Plan.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Is any of that money being used to fund the Jubilee trees program?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: No. As I understand it, that is a separate program with a separate source of money, with \$15.1 million.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to provide a list of projects that the \$87.1 million has been spent on or allocated to?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I certainly would be able to provide that, but could I do that on notice? I think it will be quite a substantial list.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes, that would be great.</p>	76
17	SQ22-000006	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Impacts of feral deer	<p>Senator URQUHART: I've got three questions on feral deer in Tasmania.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Again, Senator, if you could let us know, we'll do our very best to have the material here.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay. Is the department aware of the proposal by the Tasmanian government to maintain a permanent population of feral deer inside the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage area?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll take that on notice, Senator.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Has the department made any representations to the Tasmanian government on its draft deer management plan?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Has the department done any assessment of what impacts the retention of a permanent population of feral deer will do to the outstanding universal values of the World Heritage area?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Thanks, Senator; we'll endeavour to come back to you on that as well.</p>	77

18	SQ22-000010	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	IPCC - global reefs	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: They use two bleaching events per decade as a cut-off for a decline, from which a coral reef cannot recover. That is the basis of their science, which I think has been used previously by the IPCC in their surveys of scientific literature. They state that 1.5 degrees, to use their own terms, would be catastrophic and there would be no survival at two degrees across various refugia, the world's coral reefs. They typically talk about the 29 UNESCO coral reefs. Do you accept that, considering that is our current Paris target?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I am not familiar with that report. We would have to get our experts to have a look at it to provide that comment.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you could; and take it on notice whether you accept that report is a reasonable basis on which to provide advice. Obviously all IPCC does is review the literature. That is a very recent report. Does it trouble you that the latest research on this is suggesting that, even at 1.5, the result would be catastrophic, not just for the Barrier Reef, but for the world's coral reefs?</p> <p>Dr Locke: There is no doubt that we are deeply concerned about a range of issues to do with global reefs.</p> <p>That is why the government has made such a serious commitment; it's not cheap and it's not easy.</p>	78
19	SQ22-000013	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	The Preliminary Eagle Monitoring and Management Plan	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. The Preliminary Eagle Monitoring and Management Plan-it is intended that the Preliminary EMMP provides sufficient information to facilitate project approvals. Point 4 of the objective is to provide an offset for eagle mortalities that result from projects. Do you know what the current value is or what the offset value is for killing a wedge-tailed eagle?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: That would be a question for our colleagues from the environment assessments division, but possibly also one that might need to be taken on notice.</p>	83
20	SQ22-000012	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Wedge-tailed eagle	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Can I ask you some specific questions about the wedge-tailed eagle, which is one of the ones that have a sunsetting plan? Under the current recovery plan, can you tell us how many eagles have been killed by wind turbines?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I think we'd have to take that one on notice.</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: We'll take that on notice.</p>	83
21	SQ22-000207	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Koala recovery plan implementation timeframe	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Now that the koala is endangered, what's the time frame for the recovery plan to be implemented?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I think Minister Ley is on record as saying that the government intends to implement that plan as soon as possible. She's taken the step of writing to the Queensland, New South Wales and ACT ministers to invite them to jointly make the plan.</p>	83

					<p>Ms Kennedy: So it's very close.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Is there a draft of it?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: The consultation draft is available. That was out for public consultation late last year, but there isn't a draft that we can provide you now of the final that's with the states for consideration. As Dr Stobutzki has said, that's the final step now before the recovery plan can be made.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: There's a federal election before the end of the financial year. Are we going to see the plan in its final draft implemented and costed with funds before June?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: As I said, the Commonwealth process has finished. The minister has agreed to the recovery plan. She has written to her counterparts to invite them to jointly make it. Once they respond then we'll do the final steps.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: What time frame has she given the other states?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: I will have to take that on notice.</p>	
22	SQ22-000015	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Koala recovery plan	<p>Senator URQUHART: I apologise because I was out of the room at another committee when I think Senator Hanson-Young was asking some questions around koalas. If those have been answered, please let me know and I'll go back to the Hansard. The recovery plan for the koala was due in 2015. That's six years overdue. Can you tell me the status of where it's at?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: Senator, we did cover that in quite a bit of detail with Senator Hanson-Young just previously. To summarise, the recovery plan is very close. The Commonwealth has finished our part of that process and it's now with the relevant state ministers to make a decision as soon as possible.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: The uplifting of the decision was during October 2021. Why has it taken months for the minister to list the koala as endangered?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: The Threatened Species Scientific Committee provided its advice by the end of October 2021 and the Minister has 90 business days to consider that advice and bring it into effect.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Have the states and territories seen a copy of the koala recovery plan?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: Yes. It's been developed in consultation with the state and territory agencies.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: When was that provided to them?</p> <p>Dr Stobutzki: They would have got an initial draft prior to the public consultation. Some of them continued to provide comment through the public consultation period and then they had a final draft before we briefed the minister as well.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: When was the final draft provided to them?</p>	84

					Dr Stobutzki: I'd like to take that on notice because I don't want to give you the wrong time.	
23	SQ22-000017	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Dorinda Cox	Murujuga Rock Art Strategy	<p>Senator COX: My next set of questions is about the Murujuga Rock Art Strategy and the World Heritage listing. Can I ask: what is the federal government's strategy in protecting the rock art in Murujuga?</p> <p>Mr Banks: The strategy is actually led by the WA state government. We're involved in the reference group as an observer as the state government has that lead role.</p> <p>Senator COX: Are you funding any independent research in relation to this?</p> <p>Mr Banks: Not that I'm aware of. I don't think so, no.</p> <p>Senator COX: You don't think so?</p> <p>Mr Banks: No. I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	86
24	SQ22-000018	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Dorinda Cox	Exmouth Gulf World Heritage listing	<p>Senator COX: I've only got one more set of questions. This is about the Exmouth Gulf World Heritage listing. How much funding is the federal government providing to the Indigenous ranger program at Ningaloo and the Exmouth Gulf and can you provide a breakdown of funding over the last decade?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I am not sure we have the breakdown here. We'll see if we can find that; otherwise we will be happy to provide that on notice. There are various heritage grants.</p> <p>Senator COX: I am very grateful if you could find it now.</p> <p>Mr Banks: I don't know if I will have it across-</p> <p>Dr Locke: Might need to take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Banks: What I've got is funding for the Shark Bay-Ningaloo Coast. We'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Apologies, I just haven't got the breakdown to know what's going to the Indigenous ranger program.</p> <p>Senator COX: If you could provide it over the last decade, that would be appreciated. Also, have you provided any funding to support cultural tourism in the Exmouth Gulf area?</p> <p>Mr Banks: Sorry, where?</p> <p>Senator COX: Any cultural tourism funding to the Exmouth Gulf area?</p> <p>Mr Banks: Not that I'm aware of, but again we'll just take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator COX: And do you provide any support for cultural heritage surveys and assessments particularly in the Exmouth Gulf?</p> <p>Mr Banks: Again I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	87
25	SQ22-000019	Department of Agriculture,	Anne Urquhart	National Heritage List and Commonwealth	Senator URQUHART: How many National Heritage List and Commonwealth Heritage List nomination assessments with recommendations from the Heritage Council are with the minister for decision? Can you tell me the names of the	88

		Water and the Environment		Heritage List nomination assessments	<p>places and the dates of the assessments?</p> <p>Mr Barker: There are currently 16 places on the assessment plan for the Australian Heritage Council. That is 14 on the National Heritage List and two on the Commonwealth Heritage List. There are six for which the assessments are being finalised and are awaiting a decision by the minister. I understand the minister has made four decisions on listings since last estimates.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What are the names of those places?</p> <p>Mr Barker: It might take me a while if I have to iterate all of them. The ones since last estimates-if you bear with me a moment. The areas that the minister has made decisions on are Moore River in Western Australia and Finnis Springs Pastoral Station in South Australia. Those were decisions not to list the place. There has also been a decision on Cascade Reserve on Norfolk Island, which is a Commonwealth heritage proposal, and a decision on Cooloola Great Sandy Strait.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: That's four. You said six.</p> <p>Mr Barker: Sorry, it was four, not six.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Four that have been finalised?</p> <p>Mr Barker: That's right.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What were the dates of the assessments of those?</p> <p>Mr Barker: I might go through it again so I'm clear, because there are different numbers for different categories.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Could you speak up a little bit, Mr Barker? You are very hard to hear.</p> <p>Mr Barker: Sorry. I might go through the numbers again because we're jumping across a few different categories. There are 14 places currently under assessment for the National Heritage List and two for the Commonwealth Heritage List. There are five national heritage assessments and three Commonwealth heritage assessments that have been completed. They are yet to have a decision made on them. Then there are the four on which decisions have been made that I have just iterated.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: And when were the dates of the assessments for those four?</p> <p>Mr Barker: It might be quicker if I take on notice the details of all the assessments. I have a table that goes through all of that, but there are quite a number of different properties and assessments.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to table that?</p> <p>Mr Barker: I think I can.</p>	
--	--	---------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	--	--

26	SQ22-000021	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	National heritage/Commonwealth heritage places - damage	<p>Senator URQUHART: Right. I guess what I'm asking is this: if I were to say to you, 'How many national heritage or Commonwealth heritage places have suffered damage to their value,' so they've either lost their value or they've suffered some damage to their value over the last 10 years, would you be able to tell me a number, if there are any?</p> <p>Mr Barker: Yes, I can certainly say that no areas have been delisted. That reflects the fact that the values have been maintained-the values for which they were listed originally were maintained.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes, but have any suffered damage to their value?</p> <p>Mr Barker: Certainly, there are some. Obviously, the 2019-2020 bushfires are indicative of that in areas such as the Gondwana Rainforests and the Greater Blue Mountains.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you keep a watch over them?</p> <p>Mr Barker: We do monitor activities and impacts on various areas that are listed on the National Heritage List, the Commonwealth Heritage List and the World Heritage List, but-</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: If you could provide me any further information about that on notice then that would be useful.</p> <p>Mr Barker: Certainly, Senator. There are about 120 places that are on the National Heritage List and almost 400 on the Commonwealth Heritage List. Obviously, there's then the 20 on the World Heritage List. There's some overlap between the World Heritage List and the National Heritage List, but we're talking about a very large number of properties extending over a very large spatial scale and with a very diverse range of values that are protected.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: You can narrow it down to the last 10 years-that would be fine.</p> <p>Mr Barker: I could give you an example of some of the larger properties-for example, the ones that are world heritage listed. We could come back to you with some information about some of those.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes. If you can provide me with some further information on notice then I'm happy with that.</p>	88-89
27	SQ22-000022	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	National heritage management plans	<p>Senator URQUHART: Can you tell me how many national heritage management plans have expired and are pending renewal?</p> <p>Mr Barker: For national heritage properties, I don't have that figure to hand.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you take that on notice and identify which sites fall into that category?</p> <p>Mr Barker: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I've got two more on this, and then I'm done. How many</p>	89-90

					<p>world heritage management plans have-sorry, I just asked you that.</p> <p>Mr Barker: Sorry to interrupt. If you were talking about world heritage management plans-</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: One was national heritage, and the other was world heritage management plans.</p> <p>Mr Barker: For world heritage management plans, again, the department's role is limited to providing advice to property managers around the consistency of their management plans with what are called the world heritage management principles, as set out in regulations to the EPBC Act. I'm aware there are plans for 16 world heritage properties that are in place. Four are in the process of being developed, including for areas like the Budj Bim Cultural Landscape, which was only world heritage listed in 2019, so they're still in the process of developing a management plan-</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Sorry, I'm not quite understanding. Are you saying that there are four world heritage management plans that have expired and are pending renewal?</p> <p>Mr Barker: There are four that are pending development.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: And how many in the national heritage one? Or are you going to take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Barker: I'll take the national heritage one on notice.</p>	
28	SQ22-000024	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Commonwealth heritage management plans	<p>Senator URQUHART: My final question on this is: how many Commonwealth heritage management plans are current, expired or not yet completed?</p> <p>Mr Barker: I'd have to take that on notice as well. We're talking about 387 properties, I think, on the Commonwealth heritage-</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Three hundred and-</p> <p>Mr Barker: It's 387, so I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	90
29	SQ22-000026	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Letter from the Victorian government - RFAs	<p>Senator RICE: Do we have an expected time line for having a draft recovery plan?</p> <p>Ms Kennedy: I don't have a time frame, but it remains a priority for the department.</p> <p>Senator RICE: In terms of public information, we don't seem to be much closer. On a related subject, I want to go to the regional forest agreements and the Commonwealth's responsibility to protect threatened species- particularly the Commonwealth and particularly with relation to Leadbeater's possums. You noted in May that you were writing to the Victorian government, seeking assurances that the Victorian government was meeting their obligations under the RFAs. In October you told us that you'd received a reply on 24 June that the measures outlined in the April 2021 interim protections and management actions report had been implemented. The letter also advised that the Victorian</p>	91

					<p>government was evaluating what permanent predictions would be necessary by April 2022. First of all, thank you for that information, but could you please table a copy of the reply that you got from Victoria?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I haven't got that with me, but we will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Thank you. Could it be provided as soon as possible given that you referred to it in your answer to my questions. With regard to the permanent protections the Victorian government was evaluating, what work has been undertaken beyond the work that was done for interim protections?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I think that's a question for Victoria. We're continuing to work with Victoria. They've told us that they are working on these interim protections. Under the RFA we have annual meetings, and our annual meeting with Victoria is in March, next month. We will be talking to Victoria about those elements at that time.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Do you have an expectation that those permanent protections will be in place by April?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I will have to take on notice. We can respond after we've had that follow-up with Victoria.</p>	
30	SQ22-000031	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Threatened Species Scientific Committee report - Leadbeater's possum	<p>Senator RICE: What I want to know is if you have a Threatened Species Scientific Committee report that I understand to have said that logging in these ash forests in the Central Highlands should cease. You have the most recent paper that was done on conservation of Leadbeater's, which summarised that a moratorium on logging in landscapes where the species occurs is urgently required. I want to table that paper, a paper on protecting Leadbeater's in animal conservation. I'm also going to table four other papers which support the need to cease logging if Leadbeater's are not going to continue hurtling towards extinction. I won't go through the names of them, just for time.</p> <p>Can you take on notice, how you, as the Commonwealth, who have a responsibility to protect Commonwealth- listed threatened species, are taking this information into account? How have the findings of the Threatened Species Scientific Committee been taken into account vis-a-vis your willingness to just accept the Victorian government's assessment that the measures they have taken are in fact satisfactory?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Thanks, Senator, we'll take that on notice.</p>	92
31	SQ22-000033	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Lidia Thorpe	ATSIHP Act sections 9, 10, 12 and 18 applications	<p>Senator THORPE: How many ATSIHP Act sections 9, 10, 12 and 18 applications has the minister received in 2020 and 2021? Furthermore, have you got that broken down by states and territories, and by section?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I suspect we'll need to take that detail on notice, but we'll see what we've got.</p>	92

		the Environment			<p>Dr McEwen: The number of applications that we have received-I have a table of active applications, but I'm not sure I can give you the numbers. We do have the list of active section 9 and 10 applications that I can take you through, if you want to, or I can provide the details of that on notice.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Could you provide details on notice of all applications received between 2020 and 2021?</p> <p>Dr McEwen: Sure.</p>	
32	SQ22-000034	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Lidia Thorpe	Djaki Kundu - correspondence	<p>Senator THORPE: In the case of Djaki Kundu, near Gympie in Queensland, the minister granted an application by TOs to protect the site under the ATSIHP Act. The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads, which is responsible for the works threatening this site of significance, has continued the works at Djaki Kundu. What interaction has the minister of the department had with the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads to ensure urgent stopping of the works at this site?</p> <p>Dr McEwen: I'll have to take some of the detail of that on notice. As I understand it, there is no protection in place at the moment that would prevent those works being undertaken. There are several active applications around that at the moment.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: So basically the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads can just continue to destroy and destruct while they go through the application process. Is that right?</p> <p>Dr McEwen: Under the act, as it stands, there is not a-</p> <p>Senator THORPE: There's no protection.</p> <p>Dr McEwen: There's no protection while the process is being assessed.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: So yes. Can you provide any correspondence with the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads on Djaki Kundu, informing of the ATSIHP Act protection granted-well, it's not granted, but can you provide any correspondence between the department and the Queensland department about what's going on?</p> <p>Dr McEwen: We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator THORPE: Can you also provide any details of meetings held between the minister's office and the Queensland Department for Main Roads and Transport about the protection of this site, including when and where they took place and who was there?</p> <p>Dr McEwen: We can take that on notice.</p>	93
33	SQ22-000206	Bureau of Meteorology	Jenny McAllister	Use of labour hire	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Understood. Thank you. On the staffing arrangements in terms of ongoing employees and non-ongoing employees, I note from your annual report ending financial year 2021 that you had 231 non-ongoing staff.</p>	95

					<p>How many of those positions are engaged via labour hire?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I would have to double-check, but to the best of my knowledge none of those have been labour hire, non-ongoing. If you are referring to APS staff who are non-ongoing, they wouldn't be labour hire staff. We would refer to labour hire staff through our reporting [inaudible] In my previous statement I have given you an indication of what it was on 31 December. It was 437 over the bureau.</p>	
34	SQ22-000032	Bureau of Meteorology	Jenny McAllister	Non-ongoing contracts	<p>Senator McALLISTER: What is the average tenure of your non-ongoing employees? Weeks, months, years?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'd have to take that on notice. I don't have that information on me.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Do you know how many of your non-ongoing employees have been engaged either on a single contract or through rollovers for more than 12 months?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Not of the top of my head, but if that's information that you're interested in we can certainly provide it.</p>	95
35	SQ22-000014	Bureau of Meteorology	Jenny McAllister	Cybersecurity roadmap	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Obviously, any decision to outsource functions, particularly core functions of the kind currently performed by this group, has the potential to have some implication for your governance arrangements and implementation arrangements for cybersecurity. I know that the BOM has a cybersecurity roadmap-it's referred to in your corporate plan-but I can't find a copy of it online. Can you table the BOM cyber security roadmap?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I will have to take that on advice. Matters related to cybersecurity in the bureau are highly sensitive and generally not in the public domain for reasons of [inaudible]. I will take some advice as to whether there [inaudible] or there's another mechanism by which we can make the document available. The bureau is [inaudible] very significant negative cyberactivity in 2015, and [inaudible] the constant attack [inaudible].</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: The reason I'm asking is to understand the extent to which these planned changes in your organisation and operating model are consistent with that plan. I will ask you a different question, which you may also wish to also take on notice: can you please provide some information about the ways in which you intend to secure cyber security of the BOM whilst moving to a significantly greater reliance on internal contractors?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I'm happy to provide you with what material I can, but, for the record, [inaudible] that cybersecurity matters are ranked at very high levels of [inaudible] that we would do in moving the organisation forward to compromise the cybersecurity of the bureau.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Understood. Thank you.</p>	95

36	SQ22-000035	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Reintroduction of potentially extinct species	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I think this question comes under 1.2, and it's an unusual one. The Conversation ran a story this week around potentially cloning a Tasmanian tiger by using numbats. The numbats are a relative of the thylacine. There's a DNA Zoo comment in the article. I'll read it to you:</p> <p>We have come a long, long way in terms of technology development, and I don't see a problem that in the next decade we will have the technology and we will have the know-how to de-extinct or resurrect our favourite species which are long gone.</p> <p>Are you aware of the work by DNA Zoo with regard to the thylacine? And do you have any views on the feasibility of what it says? The Conversation is a fairly serious publication. Some people would be overjoyed at the idea of bringing the tiger back, but I just wanted to get some-</p> <p>Dr Locke: I'm afraid it'll be a quick answer. No, we're not aware of any plans to do that and we haven't got any insights into that technology.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. I might put some other questions on notice on that, because it related to how we might manage the reintroduction of a potentially extinct species. Is this something that you've ever covered at all in any internal discussion?</p> <p>Dr Locke: Not in my experience, but we're happy to look at it and see if there's something we can contribute to those answers.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Do you know if it's been done anywhere else around the world?</p> <p>Dr Locke: No. I don't know off the top my head.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could I just refer you to that article in The Conversation and perhaps ask if you can take on notice if you have any views on the feasibility of this, and whether this kind of thing would be regulated?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Yes, it sort of has been discussed in some sections, I think. We'll certainly look at it carefully, and if the technology is taking us towards that type of potential, then no doubt it raises a range of scientific and possibly ethical and other issues.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: And management issues, potentially, too.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Yes. So, thank you for letting us know about that. We'll look at it.</p>	100
37	SQ22-000036	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Recovery plans for Tasmania devils and giant kelp forests	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Well, that's my first question. My next one-Senator Hanson-Young and I put off our questions-may relate to 1.4. It is in relation to the recovery plan for Tasmanian devils, which are under review at the moment, to potentially just become conversation advice only. Do we have the right people here to ask about that?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I don't think those people are here, but I can have a go at a general</p>	100

					<p>question.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I just wanted to know whether the original plan involved dealing with roadkill in Tasmania. There's a disease-free devil population in the north-west of Tasmania around Woolnorth and Smithton. Disease-free devils have been bred and released. And we've lost 100 Tasmanian devils that we know of that have been logged on one stretch of road there. I understand that the population is estimated to be only 500. And that's just in the last 12 months. I was just wondering whether there was any detail in the original plan. I know there was with facial tumour disease. But were any other risks assessed?</p> <p>Dr Locke: We'll take that on notice and have a look at the plans for you. I think we provided some information previously on this, but I can't remember the details. So, perhaps I could take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I did get a letter back from the minister saying that there hadn't been any funds put into the Save the Devil program since 2018-</p> <p>Dr Locke: But you're asking about the content of the plans.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Yes, the content of the plans, because I understand that the plans are now under review, yet the devils are obviously under significant threat in other areas, apart from facial tumours.</p> <p>Dr Locke: I'm sure we can find that out.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Thank you. And my last question was in relation to the country's first listed threatened ecological habitat, which was Tasmania's giant kelp forests, or south-east Australia's giant kelp forests-basically whether anything was done in the original recovery plan for 2012.</p> <p>Dr Locke: Sure. I can take that on notice.</p>	
38	SQ22-000038	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Proposal to raise the wall of Warragamba Dam	<p>Senator URQUHART: I note that the minister authorised the Australian Heritage Council to assess whether additional value should be listed as part of the Blue Mountains World Heritage status. What is the status of this assessment, and how does it correlate with the time line to inform the government's response to the proposal to raise the wall of Warragamba Dam?</p> <p>Ms Gowland: That's probably not a question that I can answer. That's not part of our-</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Who can answer that?</p> <p>Ms Brown: That group, the heritage division, was on earlier this evening, so they've left. We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay. So there's that one, and the other one is: has the Australian Heritage Council provided advice about the proposal to raise the wall of Warragamba Dam, and, if so, what are the main points of that advice?</p>	102-103

					<p>Ms Gowland: I'm aware that the Australian Heritage Council wrote to the New South Wales government. I'm not aware whether they've written to the Commonwealth government.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Would you be able to take that on notice and follow up with the other one as well?</p> <p>Ms Gowland: Yes.</p>	
39	SQ22-000039	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Approvals - Koala habitat	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Mr Metcalfe, we're now at 1.5, which is where I put some questions on notice to your team in relation to the number of approvals that have been given to clear and bulldoze koala habitat. I'm hoping there are some answers.</p> <p>Ms Brown: I have had staff working on that for some time since you asked the question. It's quite a detailed question. It's not straightforward at all. In order for us to get the accurate information, we'll need to go through project by project. I understand the ACF report had used a number of different sources, so we just want to ensure that the information we're giving you is correct and detailed. We're currently reviewing the ACF report at the moment to consider the findings that they've put forward in that report. I'll have to take on notice those two questions that you asked about the impacts on koalas and how many projects there were for the last 10 years, and also the impacts from the bushfires and what projects have been approved since 2019.</p>	103
40	SQ22-000041	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Koala projects	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Despite the fact that koalas are now found to be endangered on the east coast, that's not enough to guarantee that the minister will take that into consideration for projects that are currently on the desk; am I hearing you correctly?</p> <p>Mr McNee: That is the framework that is set out under the EPBC act in 158A.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: That seems pretty crazy, doesn't it? Perhaps this is a question for the minister more than the department. Minister, is there anything that you can do in relation to this? It seems crazy that koalas are now being found to be endangered, yet if there are projects that are still requiring assessment and approval- or not-this is not taken into consideration. It just doesn't seem right.</p> <p>Senator Hume: I'm not familiar with the specific projects-that would be up to the department-but I can take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: You can see that people would expect it, right?</p> <p>Senator Hume: I can only take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I appreciate that you can take on notice only specific projects, but I'm going to the principle. The koala is now endangered. Surely we now have a responsibility to stop further destruction of their habitat. And if there</p>	103-104

					<p>the ability for the minister to do that, on a matter of principle, it seems right that she does.</p> <p>Senator Hume: I'm sure that the minister will consider that when she makes her determinations.</p>	
41	SQ22-000042	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Dorinda Cox	Sandhill dunnart conservation plan at Mulga Rock	<p>Senator COX: Okay, I'm happy to redirect that. Mulga Rock uranium mine: is that the same, or is that in yours?</p> <p>Dr Locke: No.</p> <p>Senator COX: It's around the conservation plan. Is there an update for the sandhill dunnart conservation plan at Mulga Rock?</p> <p>Dr Locke: We'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator COX: The second part of that question was about the clearing of the native vegetation in that area, because there have obviously been some changes to the early works program for an accommodation village and an airstrip. There's now clearing in that area. Can someone give us an update on why that now includes the native vegetation and when that was changed?</p>	105
42	SQ22-000044	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	MMG's tailings dam proposal	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Thank you, Chair. On 6 January, mining company MMG's tailings dam proposal in Tasmania in the Tarkine, or takayna, was approved by Minister Ley under the EPBC assessment, despite recording the presence of a vulnerable species, the masked owl. The company that did the work for MMG was called North Barker Ecosystem Services, but I understand they didn't undertake the recommended assessment for this species and no conditions for its protection were imposed in the approval. However, advice from Tasmania's experts, as well as MMG's own environmental consultants, noted the presence of the masked owls at the proposed site and recommended the protection of the trees that may be nesting environments. What advice has the minister received from MMG regarding the protection of the masked owl at this site?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: Yes, a decision was made on 6 January in relation to the investigative works for the dam, for which we have now produced a detailed reasons statement that is available on the web. But, effectively, just to give you a bit of a summary of what's in that reasons statement, the Tasmanian masked owl was considered by the department in relation to the investigative works decision. The department considered that, while the action could disturb breeding for the species, in our view it wouldn't constitute a significant action, and that was largely on the basis of the relatively small impact area of those investigative works, which was roughly in the order of 14 hectares out of a total footprint for the project of about 240 hectares, and the relatively short duration of the investigative works. Of course, we-</p>	105-106

					<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Ms Farrant, could I just stop you just on that point. Obviously, the company has been given approval to go ahead and make drill pads of up to 25 metres by 25 metres.</p> <p>Ms Farrant: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Are you referring just to that initial assessment work, or are you talking about the whole project?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: No, this is just for the investigative works, not for the tailings dam itself.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: What happens next? If they go in there and drill these pads, what happens if they choose to put in for an assessment for the entire area to become a tailings dam? Will you need to conduct another assessment?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: They have already put in the referral for the main project-</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That includes the masked owl?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: I'd have to double-check, but I would expect that that would be the case.</p>	
43	SQ22-000046	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Breeding hollows	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Just to be clear, though: that work is going to commence, even though the status of the masked owls at the proposed site has not been properly investigated?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: The investigative works-and the purpose of that is to inform an EIS for the broader project for the tailings dam. So it's very early stages.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Lastly, do you know roughly how many breeding pairs there are? Do we have a population estimate for Tasmania?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: I don't know the answer to that. We could attempt to take that on notice, but we-</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you could, because that would be important to know.</p>	107
44	SQ22-000043	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Recycling Modernisation Fund	<p>Senator URQUHART: From what I understand you're saying, there's a lot of work that's happening. But it's been four years of no improvements to plastic packaging recycling, and that was a commitment made by the Prime Minister. I don't think the government has landed any specific measures to address that complete lack of progress on the plastic packaging by 2025. What are the specific measures? You've talked about a lot of plans, but what are the specific measures that are in place to actually deal with this by 2025?</p> <p>Mr Ryan: There are quite a number of initiatives. A most important one, which Ms Lynch just talked about, is the investment in the Recycling Modernisation Fund, which is the one that's forecast to leverage over \$800 million. What I'd point out, again going back to the data from 2019-20, is that that was right before the RMF was even implemented. We've had a number of projects coming online slowly, but it's a four-year program of investment with the</p>	108

					<p>Commonwealth, states and territories, and industry. Those projects will be rolled out gradually over the next three to four years.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you have something you can table on those specific programs with the date lines on them?</p> <p>Mr Ryan: I can give you some statistics. I can table them and take them on notice, when they come online- each of the tonnages by the different waste streams.</p>	
45	SQ22-000045	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Investment in the waste and recycling sector	<p>Senator URQUHART: That Accenture report was released last year, but you talked about that being 2019- 20, the packaging covenant. Can you tell me what changes the government and the minister have authorised to get the plan back on track?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Yes. I'm happy to give you a high level overview. The government has announced more than a billion dollars' worth of investment in the waste and recycling sector. Not all of that, of course, will be directly relevant to packaging, but quite a lot of it is.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: How much is that? Are you able to provide a breakdown of that?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Perhaps that's something I could take on notice for you.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes. Okay.</p>	108
46	SQ22-000040	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	National Pollutant Inventory - PFAS	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I've just got a couple more questions, but you may well take them on notice, and, if not, they're just a couple of yes-or-no questions. With reference to the National Pollutant Inventory, is PFAS referenced on the inventory at all? I couldn't find it. How is PFAS or any type of PFOS or PFOA referenced on the inventory, if at all?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: I will take that question on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: And perhaps you could also take on notice how it is named on the inventory. Maybe it's not there. If it's not on the inventory, why isn't it recorded on the inventory? Could you also check whether it's considered to be a toxic chemical? Or perhaps you could answer that now.</p> <p>Ms Lynch: Yes, PFAS is subject to controls under a number of different international regimes and conventions. In Australia we have a PFAS National Environmental Management Plan, which provides nationally consistent guidelines and standards for the environmental management of PFAS contamination.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: But those guidelines wouldn't necessarily mean it was listed as a toxic chemical, in terms of its classification, would they?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: It would depend a little bit-</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: On whether it was on the inventory?</p> <p>Ms Lynch: That's right. The Stockholm convention-perhaps it's easier if I take that</p>	111

					<p>on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Yes, if you could take that on notice. Also, what are the barriers to adding PFAS to such an inventory? And I'll give you four or five other ones on notice.</p>	
47	SQ22-000037	Director of National Parks	Anne Urquhart	Funding	<p>Senator URQUHART: Fantastic. Of the \$216 million spend that's committed, you said that you had spent \$8.09 million, and then \$400,000 or whatever is committed. How much has been contracted? Is that the \$400,000?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: No. The \$400,000 is money that we have effectively already spent on a scoping study for the World Heritage centre. I might pass to my colleague, because we have just signed a new contract, I think about two days ago.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: In terms of the amount contracted to be spent from the \$216 million, we have \$23.396 million contracted to be spent.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: When is that contracted to be spent? Over what period of time?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: It's not a single contract, and I don't have the details of the individual contracts handy. But the lion's share of that funding is contracted to be spent over the coming six months. The largest single piece is around a major project to remediate asbestos roofs in Jabiru township and also to remediate housing in the township.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you have a breakdown of that, if you are able to provide that?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: I don't have one today.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: On notice?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Yes.</p>	113
48	SQ22-000030	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	RSV Nuyina - fire doors and alarm settings and systems	<p>Senator URQUHART: Can you give me an update on the fire doors and the state of the alarm settings and systems in place in the unmanned machine area?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: I'll have to take that on notice. It's not something that's been brought to my attention, but I suspect it is one of those faults that have been found during the commissioning process.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: If you could take that on notice, that would be great.</p>	114
49	SQ22-000029	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Peter Whish-Wilson	Social media content	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Why haven't you put anything up on your social media account about the need to radically reduce emissions-</p> <p>Senator Hume: What difference would that make-</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: and put pressure on this government and the Queensland government to stop building new coalmines, stop approving new gas projects-114 currently in the wings-and actually do something about climate</p>	120

				<p>change emissions? Do you feel like you're in a position to do that?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: We feel we are being louder, more vocal and more influential all the time about making a positive difference to the Great Barrier Reef overall. On climate, I'm satisfied that our organisation, within our legal remit, is providing advice where we can and providing information where we can to influence positive decisions, whether they're to do with approvals in the marine park or adjacent to it.</p> <p>In relation to our Instagram account or other social media channels, I would have to check that-it's quite a specific question, as you'll appreciate. I'm aware that Dr Wachenfeld has a Twitter account where he does talk about climate change. I'm certainly aware that we have online channels where we also talk about climate change and the importance of concerted action. As to Instagram, I would have to check those posts.</p>	
50	SQ22-000099	Bureau of Meteorology	Gerard Rennick	<p>Senator Rennick written questions to the Bureau of Meteorology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 1996, when the Bureau converted to custom-made electronic probes for temperature recording, rather than averaging temperatures over one to five minutes as is standard practice around the world from such equipment, did the Bureau start recording one second extrema resulting in a non-standard method of measuring (spot readings) from non-standard equipment (custom-built probes) making it impossible to establish the equivalence of recent temperatures with historical data? 2. How did the Bureau take into account the change in thermometers from mercury/alcohol to platinum resistance thermometers when homogenising data? 3. Could the Bureau provide specifications for the platinum resistance thermometers? 4. Why did the Bureau manipulate thermometers at Goulburn and Thredbo by putting a limit on how low the temperature can go? 5. Could the Bureau explain why putting a downside limit on temperature recordings isn't fraudulent? 6. Why should the Bureau be believed when it says there were the only two weather stations (Goulburn and Thredbo) out of 700 stations where downside limits were placed on thermometers? 7. Given these two stations were detected by external sources shouldn't the entire network be audited by an external auditor on a regular basis to ensure that there has been no further tampering of thermometers by the Bureau? 8. In 2011, the new Australian Climate Observation Reference Network – Surface Air Temperatures (ACORN-SAT) system for calculating the national average temperature removed 57 stations from its calculations, replacing them with 36 on-average hotter stations. Can the bureau confirm this had the effect of 	Written

					increasing the homogenised Australian average temperature by 0.42 degree Celsius, independently of any actual change in the weather?	
51	SQ22-000128	Bureau of Meteorology	Anne Urquhart	Australian Climate Service	<p>Australian Climate Service</p> <p>1. What, if any, objectives have been achieved by the Australian Climate Service to date?</p> <p>2. How many people are employed at the Australian Climate Service?</p> <p>3. What kinds of professions, skills, accreditations, or qualifications are required of those people that are employed to work on the Australian Climate Service?</p> <p>4. The government has said that "The Australian Climate Service will bring together the capabilities of the BOM, Geoscience Australia, CSIRO and the ABS to provide a dedicated climate and disaster risk information service for its customers, the National Recovery and Resilience Agency (NRAA) and Emergency Management Australia (EMA)."</p> <p>a. What information has been provided to NRAA and EMA so far? Can you provide details of that information, including how that information was delivered, who delivered it, the nature of the information and when that information was provided?</p> <p>b. Who are the other customers of the ACS? What information have they been provided?</p>	Written
52	SQ22-000107	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Dorinda Cox	Mulga Rock uranium mine	<p>1. Can you advise on the status of the Sandhill Dunnart Conservation Plan for the proposed Mulga Rock uranium mine in the Yellow Sandplain Priority Ecological Community NE of Kalgoorlie?</p> <p>2. During Vimy's early works programme they began clearing native vegetation in the area for an accommodation village and airstrip, can you confirm whether or not the clearing happened in approved areas?</p> <p>3. Were areas of preferred sandhill dunnart habitat cleared?</p> <p>4. Have there been any site visits, or does the department monitor these types of activity through satellite or engagement with the company?</p> <p>5. Are there any federal intervention points to ensure that the Conservation Plan is in line with the National Recovery Plan for the Sandhill Dunnart?</p> <p>6. Is the National Recovery Plan for the Sandhill Dunnart finalised?</p> <p>7. At what point of the project is the Plan expected to be finalised and approved?</p> <p>8. Does the Federal Department have any oversight of the Plan pre-approval?</p>	Written
53	SQ22-000109	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Sarah Hanson-Young	EPBC Reform pathway	<p>Can the Department provide an update on progress of the EPBC reforms, in particular:</p> <p>1. What if any progress has been made on Stage 2 of the reforms?</p> <p>2. What reforms is the Department currently working on?</p> <p>3. What is happening with Reforms that are either already underway or will be</p>	Written

		the Environment			underway this year? This includes: a. Review of Statutory Committees b. Biodiversity data repository	
54	SQ22-000111	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Regional planning under the EPBC Act	1. During estimates the Department stated they have identified some potential pilot regional planning areas – can you please provide a list of these potential areas, which was referred to. 2. Does the Government plan to use the pilot regional plan to streamline environmental approvals? That is, is the intention to use section 37 of the EPBC Act to accredit the regional plan? a. What mechanisms will be in place to ensure strong environmental protection? b. How will this be different to the strategic assessment process?	Written
55	SQ22-000118	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Olympic Dam Tailings safety	1. What steps have been taken to review the safety and integrity of uranium tailings facilities at BHP's OP operation in northern South Australia following recent heavy rains and flooding? 2. Have additional site inspections been carried out? If so, when, by whom and what were the results?	Written
56	SQ22-000117	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Masked Owls - MMG's tailings dam proposal	1. On 6th Jan MMG's tailings dam proposal in Tasmania (tarkine) was approved by the Minister for Environment under the EPBC. What advice has the minister received from MMG regarding protection of the masked owl? a. Were there any investigations undertaken into the masked owl's status at the site as a result of this? 2. Can the Minister confirm that, in accordance with expert advice her office has received, no works will be carried out by MMG on this referred action until the status of masked owls at the proposed site has been properly investigated?	Written
57	SQ22-000116	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Toondah Harbour	1. Are you able to provide any further updates on progress of the draft EIS for the Toondah Harbour Development (EPBC2018/88225)? Has a draft EIS been submitted to the Department? a. If so, when? Has the Department sought further information from Walker Corporation in relation to the EIS draft(s)? If so, what further information was requested? b. If not, when does the Department expect an EIS will be submitted by the developer? c. When is a draft EIS likely to be published for public consultation? d. Have any officers from the Department met with representatives of Walker Corporation since September 2019? If so, please provide details about who	Written

					initiated the meeting, who attended the meeting, when and where the meeting took place, and what was discussed	
58	SQ22-000115	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	15 fast tracked EPBC assessments	<p>1. Did the Department recommend the Marinus Link, WA MetroNet and Energy Connect projects for fast-tracking under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>a. If "no", why didn't the Department recommend the projects?</p> <p>b. How did the projects come to be on the list for fast-tracking?</p> <p>c. Was the Department provided a reason for the three projects being included on the list? Why were the projects fast-tracked?</p>	Written
59	SQ22-000112	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Recovery planning under the EPBC Act	<p>1. Can the Department provide an update on the progress of the proposed changes to conservation planning, where 185 species and communities listed under the EPBC Act will no longer require recovery plans? Including:</p> <p>2. How many submissions were received as part of the consultation process?</p> <p>a. Have these submissions been made publicly available? If not, why not?</p> <p>b. What proportion of submissions were in favour of the proposed changes? And what proportion opposed the changes?</p> <p>3. Has the Department provided further advice on these proposed changes to the Minister?</p> <p>a. If so, what was this advice - can this be tabled?</p> <p>4. Has the Minister made any final decisions in relation to any of these species and communities, and if so, which ones and what was the decision?</p> <p>5. Are any of the 185 species, as part of the first tranche, that are considered to no longer require recovery plans also on the list of 100 priority species?</p> <p>a. If so, please provide details including how many and which ones?</p> <p>6. When will the next round (tranche) of species, which are proposed to no longer require recovery plans, be announced?</p> <p>a. Where is this up to?</p> <p>b. Will future tranche go through the same consultation process as the first tranche?</p> <p>c. How many species and how many ecological communities as part of the second and third tranche be considered to no longer require recovery plans?</p> <p>7. How many priority species overall do not have recovery plans in force?</p> <p>a. How many of the 100 priority species require recovery plans?</p> <p>b. Of those, how many do not have recovery plans in force?</p> <p>8. How many of the FPAL species which are currently under assessment are overdue for uplisting</p> <p>a. Please list the species and their assessment due date is?</p> <p>b. When will the 2020 FPAL assessment be released?</p>	Written

60	SQ22-000108	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Australia's biodiversity targets	1. A number of parties including the EU and NZ have proposed extinction-related targets including 'zero human-induced extinctions' and 'zero extinctions of known threatened species.' The IUCN and conservation groups have also written to the Australian Government calling for zero human induced extinctions. Has the department considered a 'zero human-induced extinctions target'? If not, why not?	Written
61	SQ22-000113	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	State of Environment Report 2021	1. The next state of environment report is due to be released in early 2022 a. When will it be made publicly available? b. Has the Minister received the SoE2021 report c. Has the Department seen the SoE2021 report d. What is the statutory deadline for this report to be tabled?	Written
62	SQ22-000110	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Koala	1. Can the Department please provide an update on the recovery plan for the koala? 2. Has a final plan been provided to the Minister? a. If so, what date was this provided? 3. When will the Minister make a final decision on the recovery plan? 4. How overdue is this recovery plan now?	Written
63	SQ22-000203	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Lidia Thorpe	Government response to report on Juukan Gorge destruction	1. Has the Government provided a response to the Inquiry into the destruction of 46,000 year old caves at the Juukan Gorge? a. If yes: Please provide a copy on notice. b. If no: i. Who is responsible for providing that response? ii. When will the response be provided? iii. Can it be expected before the election? iv. What is being done to improve heritage protection in the meantime?	Written
64	SQ22-000125	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Staffing	1. Please provide the percentage of staff engaged through labour hire arrangements as a percentage of total headcount. 2. Please provide the total value of labour-hire contracts entered into between 1 July 2020 and 31 December 2021. 3. Please provide the total value of labour-hire contracted entered into in this current parliament. 4. What kind of training do the third party contractors undergo? 5. Who in the department trains staff engaged through labour hire? a. Does that happen all at once? b. Is a staff member in the department required to train the third party contracts? c. Is group training provided?	Written

					<p>d. Is individual training provided</p> <p>e. How frequently is training provided?</p> <p>6. How many hours would be spent on training an individual third party contractor?</p> <p>7. What is the rate of attrition? How many don't complete their work for the duration of their contract?</p>	
65	SQ22-000119	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Regional plan pilot	<p>With reference to the development of a pilot regional plan, department officials said that there were a few locations currently being considered;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are those locations? 2. When will the location be finalised? 3. What are the next steps? 4. Will the Commonwealth to approach the individual state with a proposed location? 	Written
66	SQ22-000138	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Great Barrier Reef Foundation	<p>In 2018, the government provided \$444 million to the Great Barrier Reef Foundation without a tender. To be delivered over six years, the objective of the 'Reef Trust Partnership' was to 'achieve significant, measurable improvement in the health of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area'.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has a significant and measurable improvement in the health of the Reef been achieved? 2. How much pollution has been reduced? 3. What about the impacts of climate change, have they been mitigated? 4. When will the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park take over management of the Crown of Thorns Starfish? 5. The 2020-21 target for the protection of high-value reefs as part of controlling crown-of-thorns-starfish was 70% (annual report, p.27). Why wasn't that achieved? Does the Great Barrier Reef Foundation play a role in this kind of protection? What were the impediments? 6. I understand that a review and update of the Reef Blueprint and a report against action from 2017 was due last year. Where is that up to? 	Written
67	SQ22-000140	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Great Barrier Reef announcement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With reference to the government's Great Barrier Reef announcement of \$1 billion over 9 years, can you tell me how much of that is to be spent over the forward estimates and how much is to be spent beyond the forward estimates? Can you provide a breakdown of funding to be spent year by year over the next nine years? 2. With reference to the \$579.9 million for water quality, how much is to be spent over the forward estimates, and how much is to be spent beyond the forward estimates? 3. The government has said that this funding will assist land managers with 	Written

					<p>improving what quality, can you tell me how many land managers the government anticipates it will work with as part of this program?</p> <p>4. Can you outline how this funding will improve water quality?</p> <p>5. With reference to the \$74.4 million for Traditional Owner and community-led projects, how much is to be spent over the forward estimates, and how much will be spent beyond that? Will the "community-led projects" be led by First Nations groups?</p> <p>6. Of the \$92.7 million for research, how much will be spent over the forward estimates? How much will be spent beyond the forward estimates?</p>	
68	SQ22-000122	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Budget measures for environmental assessments	<p>After decisions were being made late and there was a backlog of assessments, the Minister committed \$25 million in 2019 to go towards "congestion busting environmental assessments" and then a further \$36.6 million in 2020 to "maintain the timeliness" of environmental approvals, and now the Minister has announced an additional \$29.3 million in the 2021 budget.</p> <p>a. Can you confirm that all of this funding is to go towards additional resources for the department so that decisions can be made on time?</p> <p>b. What is the total amount that has been announced on additional resourcing for decisions?</p> <p>c. Of each of these funding announcements, how much has been spent?</p> <p>i. \$25 million</p> <p>ii. \$36.6 million</p> <p>iii. \$17.1 million</p> <p>d. How many additional staff were brought on with these funds in total? Does that figure include staff that may have terminated their employment?</p> <p>e. Have any permanent staff been brought on with this funding?</p> <p>f. When will this funding be fully expended?</p> <p>i. \$25 million</p> <p>ii. \$36.6 million</p> <p>iii. \$17.1 million</p> <p>g. What is the award for a FTE person engaged via labour hire?</p> <p>h. How does that compare with a person employed at the department?</p> <p>i. Over the time that the funding is available, how many people will have been employed?</p>	Written
69	SQ22-000127	Department of Agriculture, Water and	Anne Urquhart	Species requiring a recovery plan	<p>Should the Minister decide that species once requiring a recovery plan, no longer will;</p> <p>1. What will happen to the recovery plans that are already in force?</p> <p>2. Will the Minister be able to make decisions that are inconsistent with those recovery plans now they are no longer required?</p>	Written

		the Environment			<p>3. Of the 676 entities proposed not to have a recovery plan, how many are overdue?</p> <p>4. How many recovery plans are currently overdue in total?</p> <p>5. How many of the 676 entities that are proposed to no longer require a recovery plan have a conservation advice? How many are without a conservation advice?</p> <p>6. How many have recovery plans already in place?</p> <p>7. Recovery plans are required to be revised every five years, is that correct? How many are overdue for revision?</p> <p>8. Legislative instruments for recovery plans sunset ten years after taking effect unless they are remade, how many have lapsed under the Morrison Government?</p> <p>9. How many species have become extinct while waiting for a recovery plan?</p>	
70	SQ22-000139	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threat abatement plans	<p>1. How many threat abatement plans are overdue for review?</p> <p>2. The department, in responding to questions on notice, has said, "The department is developing an approach to review and revise outstanding threat abatement plans". Why wasn't an approach to reviewing and revising outstanding threat abatement plans already in place?</p> <p>3. What is the latest information about progress of the listing of 'Contemporary fire regimes resulting in the loss of vegetation heterogeneity and biodiversity throughout Australia' as a key threatening process under the EPBC Act?</p>	Written
71	SQ22-000124	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threat abatement plans	<p>1. How many threat abatement plans are due for review?</p> <p>2. How many threat abatement plans are overdue for review?</p> <p>3. Are there any plans to develop threat abatement plans for the remaining key threatening processes without a threat abatement plan? If so, which ones and how much will it cost to develop these plans?</p> <p>The Department has said in responses to previous questions on notice that it finally reviewed the Threat Abatement Plan to reduce the impacts on northern Australia 's biodiversity by the five listed grasses and provided this to the Threatened Species Scientific Committee (TSSC).</p> <p>4. Can the department outline who undertook the review of the plan?</p> <p>5. Can the department outline what the TSSC's response was?</p> <p>6. Can the department provide the review to this committee?</p> <p>7. This review was due in 2017 and is now five years, why hasn't it been released?</p>	Written
72	SQ22-000130	Department of	Anne Urquhart	Bushfire Expert Panel	<p>1. The expert panel has wrapped up, was that always the government's intention?</p>	Written

		Agriculture, Water and the Environment			<p>2. The expert panel identified 810 priority species and ecological communities for urgent priority intervention. How many of these species have received intervention? Is one of these species the koala?</p> <p>3. How many priority species won't receive urgent intervention? W</p> <p>4. The expert panel identified five priority actions for immediate implementation. Can you tell me whether these are happening, and to what extent;</p> <p>a. Rapid on-ground assessment for species and communities of concern?</p> <p>b. Feral predator and herbivore control to reduce the pressure on native species?</p> <p>c. Emergency salvage of plant and animal species for ex-situ conservation or wild-to-wild translocation?</p> <p>d. Supplementary shelter, food, and water for animals where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Protecting unburnt areas within or adjacent to recently burnt ground that provide refugia?</p> <p>5. How much assistance was provided by the department to the expert panel? Can you quantify that? (i.e. in hours, or FTE staff members for a certain time period?)</p>	
73	SQ22-000132	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Convention on Biological Diversity	<p>1. How many Australian Government delegates are expected to attend the COP15 meetings in 2022 of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity?</p> <p>a. How does this compare to the number of Australian delegates that attended the 2021 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP26)?</p> <p>2. Will the formal Australian Delegation to meetings of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity include accredited non-government organisation representatives? If not, why not?</p>	Written
74	SQ22-000121	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Landcare review	<p>With reference to the review into Landcare;</p> <p>1. When will this be complete?</p> <p>2. When will it be made public?</p> <p>3. When will the government provide a response to the review?</p>	Written
75	SQ22-000137	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Recovery plans	<p>With reference to the proposed changes to conservation management, i.e. recovery plans;</p> <p>1. When will the Minister make a decision in respect of the species proposed not to have a recovery plan?</p> <p>2. When will the Minister's decision be made public?</p> <p>3. Has the Minister considered the advice provided? If not, when will the Minister consider this advice?</p>	Written

76	SQ22-000131	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Recovery plan for Koalas	<p>1. Why hasn't the government released the recovery plan for the koala?</p> <p>2. When was the recovery plan for the koala provided to the states?</p> <p>3. Why did the government let the National Koala Conservation and Management Strategy lapse?</p> <p>4. Are there any plans to renew the koala conservation strategy?</p> <p>5. Has the department done any modelling on the impacts of climate change on koala populations?</p>	Written
77	SQ22-000133	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Planting trees for the Jubilee Program	<p>In relation to the "Planting Trees for the Jubilee Program";</p> <p>1. From which part of the budget are these funds being sourced? Which program?</p> <p>2. Is this new money or is it being offset from a existing commitment?</p> <p>3. How is this program going to be measured in terms of environmental values? How many trees do you expect to plant?</p> <p>4. The grant guidelines say that each member of parliament will identify potential applicants in their electorate to invite to apply for funding. Did either your Department or the Minister's office inform any MP's about this program prior to the Ministers announcement on 6 February?</p>	Written
78	SQ22-000135	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Environment Restoration Fund	<p>1. How much of the Environment Restoration Fund has been spent? How much has been contracted? How much has been allocated?</p> <p>2. Please table an updated copy of a list of all projects funded under this Fund, including how much has been spent, how much has been allocated, the date they were announced, and the electorate the project is located in as was provided before during Senate Estimates and Questions on Notice.</p>	Written
79	SQ22-000136	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Threatened Species Strategy	<p>1. Isn't it true that a majority of target mammal species in the previous strategy actually experienced a decline in their population, in complete contradiction to the strategy's objectives and purpose?</p> <p>2. Considering the abandonment of the previous strategy and action plan, and the Government's refusal to account for the fact that the previous strategy and action plan failed to meet their objectives, is the delay in producing a new action plan designed to avoid responsibility for those previous failures, and avoid responsibility for addressing Australia's biodiversity crisis?</p> <p>3. In a case where a target was not met for a species listed in the previous 2015 strategy, will they automatically be included as priority species in the action plan? If not, why?</p> <p>4. The announcement of the strategy in May last year included a commitment of \$57 million in funding to support actions under the plan. How much of this funding has been contracted to date?</p>	Written

80	SQ22-000129	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Progress of the State of the Environment report	<p>1. Can the Department provide an update on the progress of the State of the Environment report?</p> <p>2. Has the Environment Minister received a copy of the State of the Environment report? If so, when?</p> <p>3. Can the Department provide an indication of when the State of the Environment report is likely to be publicly released?</p>	Written
81	SQ22-000120	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Funding for pests and weed management	<p>With reference to the government's announcement of \$29.1 million to manage established pest animals and weeds in May 2021;</p> <p>1. Is this funded out of the environment or agriculture portfolio?</p> <p>2. Was this funding re-announced on 19 January 2022? If not, how does it relate to the announcement of \$20 million to get rid of pests and weeds from January 2022?</p> <p>With reference to both government announcements relating to pests and weeds from May 2021 and January 2022;</p> <p>3. How will the funding be allocated over the forward estimates? Please provide a breakdown of funding by year.</p> <p>4. How will the funding be allocated beyond the forward estimates? Please provide a breakdown of funding by year.</p> <p>5. Where will these funds be spent?</p> <p>6. Which organisations have received these funds? Which organisations will receive these funds?</p> <p>7. To date, how much has been spent, how much has been allocated?</p> <p>8. Which pests will be impacted by this funding?</p> <p>9. Which weeds will be impacted by this funding?</p>	Written
82	SQ22-000126	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Townsville port reclamation	<p>Reclamation work is being done for the Townsville Port Authority, including construction of a revetment wall.</p> <p>1. Has the Department been consulted on this work to ensure that it will not impact the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area?</p> <p>2. If yes, what feedback has the Department provided? Have any specific conditions or monitoring requirements been imposed to protect against encroachment into or impacts on the World Heritage Area?</p>	Written
83	SQ22-000123	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Climate vulnerability assessment	<p>At previous estimates, we've asked about the progress of the CSIRO climate vulnerability assessment report and the Climate Change Toolkit for Australia's World Heritage Properties.</p> <p>1. Are those documents publicly available yet? If not, why and when will they be available?</p> <p>2. Have copies been provided to the UN as part of ongoing negotiations on the</p>	Written

					climate assessment process? 3. Will any information about consultation with WH property managers in relation to the Toolkit be made available? Is any follow up review on implementation of the Toolkit proposed?	
84	SQ22-000101	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	The National Plastic Plan	1. The National Plastic Plan includes certain targets that need to be achieved in 2022. Please update on progression towards those targets. What plans does the Government have to resolve these targets if they are not being achieved?	Written
85	SQ22-000204	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Conservation of Australia's Great Barrier Reef	<p>State Party Report on the state of conservation of Australia's Great Barrier Reef - 2022 (SPR) claimed that emissions are on track to achieve a 30-35% reduction on 2005 levels by 2030.</p> <p>The AIMS 2020-2021 Great Barrier Reef Condition Summary (cited in the SPR) references the reef being hit by multiple, widespread stressors including the impact of "numerous severe tropical cyclones" and three mass coral bleaching events between 2014 and 2020.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the \$1 billion pledged earlier this year contribute to mitigating impacts from extreme weather events? 2. How has the \$1 billion spend been risk assessed to determine if any adaptation measures will be sufficient to ameliorate extreme weather in the future? 3. How much of the \$1 billion will be used to dismantle the fossil fuel industry in Australia, given fossil fuels are the primary source of Australia's emissions? 4. The SPR implicitly admits that it will fall short of its 2025 target to reduce dissolved nitrogen, reaching only 48.9% reduction compared to a target of 60%. What factors have contributed to this failure? 5. The report confirms the government will miss its fine sediment pollution target, reaching only 18.7% by 2025 (target is 25%); what factors have contributed to the government failing to meet this target? 6. What message does the government think it sends to UNESCO that the SPR uses a greenwashing term like 'clean' (and is effectively endorsing continued 	Written

					fossil fuel use), while trying to make a persuasive argument that it is serious about tackling climate change?	
86	SQ22-000103	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Swift Parrot recovery plan	1. What is the status of the updated/new Swift Parrot recovery plan, which was open for consultation in 2019? Will it be approved before the current 2011 plan sunsets in April this year?	Written
87	SQ22-000102	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Pacific Ocean Litter Project	1. What progress has been made on the Pacific Ocean Litter Project? 2. What initiatives have been introduced, and how much of the allocation has been spent?	Written
88	SQ22-000105	Director of National Parks	Peter Whish-Wilson	Indigenous ranger groups	1. Has the \$7 million committed to Indigenous ranger groups to undertake retrieval and data collection been made available? If not, when will the money be provided to the ranger groups? 2. What work has been undertaken with that \$7 million investment to date? 3. How much abandoned, lost or discarded fishing gear and marine debris has been collected through this work?	Written
89	SQ22-000104	Director of National Parks	Peter Whish-Wilson	Ghost nets initiative	1. How much of the \$14.8 million committed to the Ghost Nets Initiative has been spent to date, and what outcomes have been delivered?	Written
90	SQ22-000134	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Anne Urquhart	Great Barrier Reef	1. With reference to the \$252.9 million for the Great Barrier Reef Marina Park Authority to manage Crown of Thorns Starfish, how much is to be spent over the forward estimates and how much will be spent beyond that? 2. Will GBRMPA simply take over Crown of Thorns Starfish management from the Great Barrier Reef Foundation? Has GBRMPA had experience managing Crown of Thorns Starfish? Prior to the controversial \$444 million grant to the Great Barrier Reef Foundation, did GBRMPA manage Crown of Thorns Starfish?	Written
91	SQ22-000100	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Peter Whish-Wilson	State Party Report - State of conservation of Australia's Great Barrier Reef	The State Party Report on the state of conservation of Australia's Great Barrier Reef - 2022 (SPR) claimed that emissions are on track to achieve a 30-35% reduction on 2005 levels by 2030. The AIMS 2020-2021 Great Barrier Reef Condition Summary (cited in the SPR) references the reef being hit by multiple, widespread stressors including the impact of "numerous severe tropical cyclones" and three mass coral bleaching events between 2014 and 2020.	Written

- | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To what extent are plans to protect the Great Barrier Reef reliant on favourable weather conditions?2. To what extent are short-term recoveries in coral growth reversible (e.g. if there is a further bleaching event in a short space of time)?3. The SPR notes that 2021 was a "low disturbance" year for the Great Barrier Reef. Further heat waves are likely, with the risk of further bleaching. To what extent is this period of recovery sustainable given the high level of damaging weather impacts, such as bleaching, that are likely to occur in the future? | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|