

Budget Estimates May 2018

Environment and Energy Portfolio – Monday 21 and Tuesday 22 May 2018

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	Comment
1	Corporate: CSD	Senator Rice	Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender	<p>Senator RICE: I want to start off with some questions about the department's implementation of the Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender. I've been asking questions of the Attorney-General's Department over the last couple of estimates about how various departments are going with implementing the sex and gender guidelines, which acknowledge that not everybody wants to identify as male or female and that their gender may not be congruent with the sex that they were born with. Can you tell me what steps the department has taken to implement these guidelines, which were meant to be implemented by July 2016?</p> <p>Ms Goodwin: We have updated two of our systems or two of our primary forms of collecting personnel data—our eRecruit application form and personal particulars on onboarding, which is in our SAP system. They are both compliant with the guidelines by providing the option to select an 'X' for gender. There are currently two employees who have chosen 'indeterminate' as their gender.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Before doing that, did you undertake a full review of all of the legislative, regulatory or policy requirements that may be required to comply with the guidelines?</p>	Page 8 Monday 21 May	SQ18-00321

				<p>Ms Goodwin: In terms of a full review, I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay. Do you know whether you have undertaken any review of what was required in relation to the collection of sex and/or gender information?</p> <p>Ms Goodwin: We'd be relying on the Attorney-General's Department for their advice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: They would have provided advice. It's whether the department has then undertaken a review of your own operations.</p> <p>Ms Goodwin: Yes. In terms of a review, I actually can't answer that now, so I'll take that one on notice.</p>		
2	Corporate: CSD	Senator Rice	Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender – Advice to Staff	<p>Senator RICE: Have you provided clear and accessible information to departmental staff on how sex and gender information can be changed on personal records—public records that the department is responsible for compiling?</p> <p>Ms Goodwin: I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	Page 8 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000322
3	Corporate: CSD	Senator Rice	Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender – Advice to Agencies	<p>Senator RICE: In terms of what assistance you've provided to those agencies with regard to the sex and gender guidelines, is that what you said you were going to take on notice, Ms Goodwin?</p> <p>Ms Goodwin: Yes, that is correct; I'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 9 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000324
4	Corporate: CSD	Senator Moore	Staff Redeployed – HR Processes	<p>Senator MOORE: There is no particular program around that particular number of people being redeployed? It is a large number, even within your department. I forget the figures but you put them on record earlier. Sixty in one particular process is a lot of people to relocate. Was there a particular HR process around that or is it just expected that natural processes will follow?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: No, there is an actual strategy to redeploy people.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: That is what I would have expected.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: The relevant division is working very</p>	Page 23 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000326

				<p>closely with other divisions to place people as their work is no longer needed in that division.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Is it possible to get any information about the levels of those people, the genders of those people and the ages of those people?</p> <p>Ms Goodwin: Yes, we can take that on notice.</p>		
5	Corporate: CSD	Senator Patrick	Travel expenditure – tickets and value spent	<p>For FY 16/17:</p> <p>1. Please provide details of the Qantas/Virgin split for official travel in terms of:</p> <p>a. Total number of tickets</p> <p>b. Total value spent for official travel?</p> <p>2. In the event there is a disparity of greater than 65/35 in the split (either way), please provide a detailed reasons for the split in the context of a lowest practical fare policy.</p>	Written	SQ18-000471
6	Corporate: CSD	Senator Patrick	Travel expenditure – Qantas Chairman’s Lounge	<p>For FY 16/17:</p> <p>3. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from only the Qantas Chairman’s Lounge?</p> <p>a. Could you please provide a breakdown of the travel for each of those individuals between Qantas and Virgin?</p>	Written	SQ18-000472
7	Corporate: CSD	Senator Patrick	Travel expenditure – Virgin’s The Club	<p>For FY 16/17:</p> <p>4. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from only Virgin’s The Club?</p> <p>a. Could you please provide a breakdown of the travel for each of those individuals between Qantas and Virgin?</p>	Written	SQ18-000473
8	Corporate: CSD	Senator Patrick	Travel expenditure – Memberships from	<p>For FY 16/17:</p>	Written	SQ18-000474

			Qantas Chairman's Lounge and Virgin's The Club	5. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from both the Qantas Chairman's Lounge and Virgin's The Club?		
9	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Moore	Sustainable Development Goals – Meeting data and Themes	<p>Senator MOORE: I am interested to see, between the last estimates and now, the operations of those committees, how often have they met and your involvement from environment—</p> <p>Dr Bacon: Yes.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Because you have been taking a genuine lead, as a department, in this area. I would also like to find out whether at this stage there's any indication that there will be people from your department at the UN meeting in July because it does have a twofold focus: it has got the general SDG but it has also got a very serious environmental focus—this particular meeting. Is there an expectation that people from your department will be there?</p> <p>Dr Bacon: Maybe to start at the top with your question, of the groups that currently convene across the whole of government in relation to the SDGs generally and particularly in relation to preparation of the voluntary national review, there have been regular meetings of all of those groups at different levels over the last several months as we have been working on compiling that report. The deputy secretaries group has met on a number of occasions, the first assistant secretaries group, whole-of-government group, has been meeting and there have been regular meetings between the officer-level groups, particularly the group that is looking at data and how we actually generate that baseline data and present that as part of our first voluntary annual review. I can take on notice, if it's helpful—</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Please do, yes.</p> <p>Dr Bacon: How many times those groups have met.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: That would be very useful, and if</p>	Page 6 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000328

				<p>any particular themes have come out of those meetings. As you know, there are no minutes out of those things; so that would be very useful. I will be following up with other departments about that data one, which is central.</p> <p>Dr Bacon: I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: That would be great.</p>		
10	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Moore	Sustainable Development Goals – Indicators	<p>Dr Bacon: Yes, that work is at an early stage. At this stage we have focused our efforts on collecting that baseline data against indicators that we're able to report on for our voluntary national review. That has actually been a very extensive exercise. As you're aware, I think there are around 55 indicators that relate to environment and energy but only 24 of those have agreed methodologies in place and I think we've provided some detail to you, on notice, about the international working group and the different tiers of indicators—</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Yes, you have; and that is continuing as we speak?</p> <p>Dr Bacon: That work is continuing. So very much the intention and the plan is that, when we do our baseline data reporting, we're at this stage anticipating that we'll be able to include data on up to 12 of the indicators. That's comparable to the United Kingdom that reported on 12 indicators in the environment and energy space. Also the United States reported on nine indicators. So we're in the same ballpark as like countries.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: It's about mid-range, is it not? Are there some countries that have reported on more?</p> <p>Dr Bacon: I would have to take on notice other countries.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: That's fine; take it on notice. We talked before about it being comparable with other nations with which we operate.</p> <p>Dr Bacon: Yes, it is comparable; that's correct.</p>	Page 7 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000334
11	Corporate:	Senator	Sustainable	<p>Senator MOORE: I have just one last question. We</p>	Page 7	SQ18-000335

	PAAI	Moore	Development Goals – Green Climate Fund	<p>will talk in between and look at the questions on notice. On the issues around the green climate fund, which I know is a DFAT program, I know that your department also works in that space. Is that your area as well, Dr Bacon, in terms of research and interaction?</p> <p>Dr Bacon: No. I probably need to take questions about that on notice.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Okay, I will put them on notice. It is just to see in terms of the current status and the interaction between the green climate fund and the SDGs and making sure that link is actually put into our system. From your answers to the previous questions, in terms of that type of work, you would be moving towards having an SDG basis for the way you operate across the board? I'm asking questions about the green climate fund and how it operates. Already the department would be looking at doing work around the SDG components there?</p> <p>Dr Bacon: We will, across the range of our policies and programs, be looking at the SDGs and how they're relevant in the design and the delivery of those policies and programs. There are a number of examples that we could provide of how we're doing that in practice.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: I'll put that on notice.</p>	Monday 21 May	
12	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Moore	Sustainable Development Goals – Requests for Public Speaking	<p>Senator MOORE: I lied; I've got one last question and it can go on notice. It is for the departmental secretary and also the minister: can I get, on notice, whether you've had any public request to speak and participate on behalf of the department and the government around anything to do with the SDGs? That would be very useful.</p>	Page 8 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000336
13	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Chisholm	Great Barrier Reef – Media Campaign	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: How much has been identified to be spent on the campaign?</p> <p>Dr Bacon: As I mentioned before, the guidelines for information and advertising campaigns have quite a strict and stringent process to be followed, and we are at a reasonably early stage of that process. So we do</p>	Page 14 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000337

				<p>need to be following those guidelines and those processes to determine exactly what kinds of communication activities are going to be best value for money and best meet the needs of the community and the outcomes that are intended.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Sure; I understand that. But you start with a dollar figure, and surely you have that dollar figure that you are starting with.</p> <p>Dr Bacon: It is probably best for me to take on notice, Senator, kind of precisely what the allocations of funding might look like over subsequent years. As I said, we are quite early in the process in terms of scoping out exactly what would be the best use of public money in terms of communication activities on the reef.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: I am just after what the next financial year's is, to start with. Surely you would have that, given the work you've been doing?</p> <p>Dr Bacon: I might need to take that on notice, Senator.</p>		
14	Corporate: PAAI	Senator Moore	Sustainable Development Goals	<p>A request for the portfolio department with responsibility as a lead agency for particular Sustainable Development Goals(SDG), to provide information around any public speeches referring to the SDGs, any plans to include the SDG agenda in annual reports, on the department's website and in work plans for the coming year.</p>	Written	SQ18-000470
15	1.1: BCD	Senator McKim	Giant Freshwater Crayfish- Recovery plan	<p>Mr Richardson: I will just repeat your question quickly. You're asking about the giant freshwater crayfish recovery plan and the implementation of that plan and where we are up to with that?</p> <p>Senator McKIM: That's right.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Senator, you'd be aware that the plan was finalised in August 2017. It was a cooperative endeavour between ourselves and the Tasmanian government and partners in Tasmania. It's a fairly new plan, so I'm not sure I can give you a lot of detail about</p>	Page 72 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000347

				<p>the actual elements of it that are implemented, but certainly our Tasmanian partners, which include the Tasmanian government and various forestry bodies down there, are all, I guess, part of the solution, part of the implementation of that plan. But I haven't got an update on where things are up to at this point in time.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: You are right: it is a relatively new plan. I make the observation that it was some time coming, but, anyway, we are where we are. In that case, would you be able to take on notice for the committee to provide a general update in terms of the implementation of that plan, with a specific breakdown, if possible, as to whether there are any elements that have been completed, whether there are any elements that have been commenced but are yet to be completed and whether there are any elements of that plan that there has been no commencement of as yet?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Of course.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: I appreciate that. Part of the plan, strategy 3, was 'Increase the reservation status and improve the quality of key habitat for the giant freshwater crayfish,' as well as an on-ground action to 'Increase the total area of giant freshwater crayfish habitat that is reserved.' They are quotes out of the plan. The Tasmanian Hodgman government, which has recently been re-elected, has actively sought to reverse the reserve status of 30,000 hectares of formerly reserved giant freshwater crayfish habitat, on my advice. Are you able to confirm that there's been any land or habitat successfully allocated as protected giant freshwater crayfish habitat under the plan?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I can include that as part of the response to the previous question, but I'm not aware of any measures at this point.</p>		
16	1.1: BCD	Senator McKim	Tasmanian RFA review	<p>Senator McKIM: No worries. I wanted to ask some questions about the review of the Tasmanian RFA. I wanted to ask, firstly, whether the department is</p>	Page 73 and 74 Monday	SQ18-000348

			<p>confident that the Tasmanian RFA review last year was undertaken with appropriate thoroughness and diligence?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: The Department of Environment and Energy worked with the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, which led the Commonwealth's engagement on the negotiation of the extension of the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement last year. That agreement was extended and advice was provided to ministers, who took that into account and agreed to extend the RFA.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: So in the department's view, was that review done with appropriate thoroughness and diligence?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: I can't really comment on that. It was done as said: we worked with our Agriculture and Water Resources colleagues and undertook the review and the extension in accordance with the RFA Act, and then the subsequent agreement.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: Okay. Which was the lead agency? Was there a lead agent for the review?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: For the Commonwealth, it was the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, as they have responsibility for the Regional Forest Agreements Act.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: They engaged with your department during that review?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: Yes.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: Did you provide advice to that department as part of the review?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: Yes. We provided advice to the department and worked with them during the course of the review.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: Was there any advice provided by your department that was not accepted as part of the review?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: I can't recall, Senator. There were many</p>	21 May	
--	--	--	---	--------	--

				<p>matters discussed and, as I said, we really worked together on the review.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: Sorry, I just missed the last thing you said?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: There were many matters discussed, I can't recall about specific items. We worked together and it was a Commonwealth position that we arrived at.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: Well, perhaps I could ask you to take on notice whether there was any advice given by your department as part of that review that was not reflected in the final position of the Commonwealth.</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: Okay.</p>		
17	1.1: BCD	Senator McKim	Tasmanian RFA – Logging conservation reserves	<p>Senator McKIM: The federal assistant minister, Minister Ruston, said in September 2016 that extending Tasmania's RFA will—and I will put it among other things; she mentioned other matters—maintain the comprehensive and adequate reserve system. Now, the Liberal government in Tasmania proposes to reverse informal reserves that exist and make them available for logging. It's proposing to log inside longstanding conservation reserves in the Tarkine/Takayna, included those protected by former Prime Minister Howard in the 2005 supplementary forest agreement. Is it the case that the formal tenure for these reserves under Tasmanian legislation at the moment is future potential production forest? Do those reserves actually remain as part of Tasmania's CAR system currently, or don't they?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: Sorry, I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: To be honest, in terms of the national reserve we can take that on notice and double-check that. But in terms of Minister Ruston's comments and the connection to the Regional Forest Agreement, it's probably a question better directed to our colleagues in the agriculture portfolio, who have overall responsibility. We provide advice to them.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: I understand that, and thank you. I'll</p>	Page 74 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000349

				<p>put them to the environment department. But the CAR aspect of RFAs is surely a matter of interest to you I would assume?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Of course—yes it is, absolutely. And we provide advice to our colleagues on that.</p> <p>Senator McKIM: I would like to know whether you've advised your colleagues about the status of those forests and their environmental significance? And, specifically, as I indicated earlier, whether they currently remain part of the CAR system or not. To be frank, I don't understand how they could be considered to be part of the CAR system when the Tasmanian government is going to log them—to be blunt!</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Yes, happy to do that.</p>		
18	1.1: BCD	Senator Urquhart	Threatened Species – waiting for recover plans	<p>Senator URQUHART: How many threatened species are awaiting the development of recovery plans, and how does this number compare to the number of threatened species awaiting recovery plans five years ago?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: In terms of the number now, there are 180 that have a decision to have a recovery plan that don't currently have a recovery plan in force. I'd have to take on notice how that compares with the number five years ago. Just to clarify: the vast majority of those species, if not all of them, do have current conservation devices that do guide recovery efforts for the public.</p>	Page 76 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000353
19	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Number of threatened Species where a plan is required	<p>Senator RICE: So if we were going to have recovery plans to cover off those 180 species in a timely manner, the department would need more resources to do that resource-intensive work? Would that be correct?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: It's not just dependent on resourcing the department. I think the point I was making earlier is that the development of recovery plans requires engagement with a number of people who are involved in these, including our state and territory colleagues and scientists. So it's quite a complex and</p>	Page 78 and 79 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000354

				<p>comprehensive process that's not going to be hurried. It's not going to be done overnight. We want to make sure that we get it right.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So where are the limitations? Obviously you could do more if you had more resources, whether it's at a Commonwealth level or at a state or territory level. Where is the blockage that means we still have 180 species with recovery plans outstanding? Some of them have been outstanding for quite a long time.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: They have. I come to that point. The majority—and I don't have the number in front of me—of those plans are plans for which it was decided to have a recovery plan prior to it being optional. Essentially, before the late 2000s, when the act was amended, all species were required to have a plan, and less than half did. At that point, the states and territories prepared the majority of recovery plans that were then adopted by the federal government. There are two ways a plan can be put in place: it can either be made by the federal minister or it can be adopted as a state and territory plan by the federal minister once the Threatened Species Scientific Committee is comfortable with the plan. The vast majority of those 180 plans are plans for which the states and territories are informing us that they are in the process of preparing. For some of them, we don't necessarily believe that to be the case. There is an option for the Threatened Species Scientific Committee to reconsider the need for a plan for a particular species, or whether they think a comprehensive conservation advice can fulfil the same function. And that is something that the federal government can then do quite quickly. The committee is in the process of considering some of those decisions.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What proportion of those 180 is the threatened species advisory committee considering as</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>to whether a plan is required?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: The majority of them—particularly for the species for which the state and territory governments undertook to prepare plans some time ago but for which we have not seen much progress made.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Could you take on notice, of the 180 species, which are in that category and which ones have been recommended since it became optional?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I can.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So the majority. But, that said, since that time you've still got some outstanding plans. Do you know how many of those plans aren't in that category? Presumably, for the ones that the states and territories are responsible for, it will be determined that they should still have a recovery plan.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, that's correct. The Threatened Species Scientific Committee will carefully examine that question about whether it is warranted to put the effort in to encourage the states to prepare those plans. For a lot of those species we simply don't hold the information that would enable us to prepare a plan. We are reliant on the states and territories for a lot of that work for those species. I'm probably more familiar with the species that we're leading the development of the plan on. That's the reason why I know it's a small proportion, but I can't give you the exact number. There are probably 15 to 20 plans that we're actively working on right now, as a Commonwealth government, to prepare. Those are plans that we will eventually consult on and have the Threatened Species Scientific Committee consider. And once they're comfortable with it, they'll recommend it be made by the federal minister as opposed to being a state plan that's adopted.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Let's go with that 15 to 20.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I did say I'd take that on notice. I will do that.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes, but if we go with that 15.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				Ms Jonasson: Senator, I think we need to take it on notice.		
20	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Time line for decision regarding threatened species plans	<p>Senator RICE: What's the time line on the threatened species advisory committee decisions as to whether a plan is going to be required into the future?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Those are all species for which the committee has already recommended that a plan is required and for which a plan is being prepared.</p> <p>Senator RICE: But for the other ones, what's the time line that we would expect as to a decision on whether those 180 species are going to require a plan?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: There is a process that's underway. I can set out on notice the time frames for those processes. But it's over the next year or two.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Forgive me, but I would like to reiterate that 99.7 per cent of species are covered by a conservation plan and/or recovery plan. Also, the threatened species committee is doing some very important work in aligning the national listing process with the state and territory process, which is going to show some real benefits for our threatened species nationally. They're working very hard with the states and territories to ensure that species that may have been listed in their state can be assessed and might be listed nationally. There are some benefits for that in terms of what we do on cross-jurisdictional issues, ensuring consistent effort is applied across state boundaries, and recognition at a national level. So the Threatened Species Scientific Committee I think are doing some very important work, not only in looking at whether some of these recovery plans are still suitable alongside any conservation advices that may exist but also in looking at ensuring that work that the states and territories have done in their listing processes are well aligned, that the Commonwealth listing is well aligned with them where appropriate, and that species will be managed in a sensible, consistent, coordinated and</p>	Page 79 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000355

				<p>collaborative way across all jurisdictions. So I think there's a lot of very good work going on in this area.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Returning to—and Mr Richardson is taking it on notice—how many plans are still going to be the responsibility, essentially, of the Commonwealth.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Yes, he is.</p> <p>Senator RICE: There are 15 to 20 of them.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I think we said we'd take the number on notice.</p>		
21	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Biodiversity fund – expenditure on recovery plans	<p>Senator RICE: Has funding from the Biodiversity Fund been spent on contributing towards the development of recovery plans?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: No. The Biodiversity Fund, as I understand it—and this was before my time—was a range of programs and it went to the management of contracts and support of staff to manage the contracts that were under that funding arrangement. But, in terms of detail, I might have to on notice, because it is quite an old program.</p>	Page 80 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000356
22	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Landcare funds used for Threatened species	<p>Senator RICE: But, specifically, with relation to the development of recovery plans for threatened species, there are fewer resources going into the development of those plans. What I hear you saying is that, potentially—through landcare funding or other funding—there may be resources that go into the implementation of those plans. In fact, I would like you to take on notice, in terms of the resources going through landcare towards threatened species, could you specify which parts of the landcare funding are actually contributing towards protection of threatened species?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I'm happy to do that. What I would say in terms of landcare is that the process we're rolling out on the Regional Land Partnerships—you would have seen the tender documentation that we released. We're in the tender process, so I am limited in my ability to articulate the funding that has been allocated under that</p>	Page 82 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000357

				<p>tender process, but I can say that it's in the order of \$900 million that is going towards Commonwealth priorities, one of which was very specifically identified as threatened species priorities. Until we get through that process and we have projects from those areas and we've assessed that, I won't be able to give you that detail, but I'm more than happy to when we're able to.</p> <p>Senator RICE: I would like to get that—</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Absolutely.</p> <p>Senator RICE: because we know from previous assessment of programs that were meant to be funding towards threatened species that in fact they were being spent on protection of heritage gardens; it was being misallocated.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I think we've addressed that at previous estimates, and I think that's not entirely correct. There was a transcription error, which the commissioner corrected, at the last estimates in the list of projects that we provided, and the rest of those projects were all identified as having benefits for threatened species.</p> <p>Senator RICE: But you can understand why I want to get the details. You are claiming that there is money through Landcare that is going to threatened species.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Absolutely.</p> <p>Senator RICE: I would appreciate having that information.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I'm happy to provide you with the tender documentation that will confirm that, as well as information on the fund that the Threatened Species Commissioner is managing.</p>		
23	1.1: BCD	Senator Chisholm	Largest Departmental grant	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Last financial year, for instance, what was the largest grant that the department gave?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I'd have to take that on notice. I don't have that from a departmental perspective. Perhaps we could take that on notice and come back to you.</p>	Page 84 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000358
24	1.1: BCD	Senator	Tasmanian birds –	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Can I come back to the</p>	Page 87	SQ18-000359

		<p>Whish-Wilson</p>	<p>Status of recovery plans</p>	<p>three Tasmanian birds? The King Island brown thornbill, the King Island scrubtit and the orange-bellied parrot were estimated the most likely to become extinct. Could I check with you where we are up to with the implementation of their recovery plans, which, I understand, are also part of the King Island biodiversity management plans? For example, could you tell us whether the birds still exist? Last time I checked there were only 50 known individuals for the thornbill.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I don't have that information in front of me. I will take it on notice about when the latest monitoring effort was done, when it was conducted and what it found.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Given this report was very prominent, Mr Richardson, and these birds were listed as the three most likely species to become extinct in Australia, I'm surprised you don't know that.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Senator, as I understand it, the two King Island species, which were identified as the highest risk of extinction, are around both historical habitat loss and the threat that a fire might pose.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: There was big fire in that part of the island.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Indeed. I think that was what lifted it in the expert elicitation—the process that those scientists went through in that nest report. But I don't have information in front of me about the recent monitoring effort on that island and whether it's managed to locate those birds. I know it's been some time since people have seen—I can't remember which species. It is one of those species, but I don't know whether it's been seen recently.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I understand we have had situations where we haven't known species have become extinct, because we haven't been monitoring them. You'll probably have to take this on notice. I've</p>	<p>and 88 Monday 21 May and Page 85 Tuesday 22 May</p>	
--	--	----------------------------	--	---	--	--

				<p>got a copy of the recovery actions for the King Island scrubtit, the King Island thornbill and the King Island orange-bellied parrot. Just for the scrubtit alone, there are 17 different actions under your plan. I can't go through them all individually now, but I would be very interested in getting an idea from you of where we're at with each one of those.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: We're happy to take it on notice. We'd have to consult with the recovery teams, as well as our colleagues in the states and territories, and the community. As I mentioned earlier, it's a collective effort to work on ensuring that these species—</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I appreciate that. In this case you are working—</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: We're very happy to take it on notice and to find whatever information we can...</p> <p>Tuesday 22 May</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I'll certainly put it to Dr Marshall and see what his account of that conversation is. Can I ask some questions on threatened species now. Ms Jonasson and Mr Richardson, after our discussion yesterday about the King Island brown thornbill and the King Island scrubtit, have you been able to go away and update yourselves on those two birds specifically, and could you tell me what recovery plan interventions have been carried out?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: No, I'm sorry; we haven't done any further work on that since last night. I'm happy to take it on notice and come back to you on that.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you take it specifically on notice. My understanding is that your recovery plan called for comprehensive surveys and a decision as to whether intervention such as captive breeding or translocation was required. I can't find whether that decision's been made or those surveys</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>have been done. Can you specifically follow that up for me?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I'm happy to.</p>		
25	1.1: BCD	Senator Siewert	Threatened Species Strategy – Number of WA Animals	<p>Senator SIEWERT: I'm aware that there are a number of species that the Western Australian government has been doing some work on for a while and that then, as I was told, sat on a desk for quite a long time—not in Canberra, I will say, before I am accused of accusing you.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Thank you.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: It was a while ago. The number that are listed for the south-west of Western Australia—have they been in the process for quite a while and this is the culmination of that process, from quite a period of time that was being taken to get them done and from Western Australia to you?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I defer to my colleague. There were a number of species that were listed in the most recent process that were part of the common assessment methodology across Australia, so streamlining and aligning the listings with our state and territory colleagues' arrangements as well.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Ms Jonasson is absolutely correct. The reason why so many of those species were Western Australian endemic species—only found in Western Australia—was that it was part of the common assessment method alignment of species listing for the state and Commonwealth—</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: The common assessment process?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: The common assessment method, yes. Essentially that's where each of the states and territories and ourselves have agreed on the categories and the assessment criteria to be applied and the robustness of the evidentiary basis and all that. Of the 50 species that the assessments were completed for, 48 of those were essentially common assessment method</p>	Page 89 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000360

				<p>species, where the assessment had been completed by one or other state or territory. It so happens that Western Australia is a fair way advanced in that process. They started it before any other state. I haven't got the number in front of me, but a proportion—20-odd—of those were Western Australian species.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Sorry—20?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I should take that on notice. I can get you the numbers.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Yes. We do have a large number of them.</p>		
26	1.1: BCD	Senator Siewert	Number of WA species with recovery plans	<p>Mr Richardson: I'd have to take on notice which species are covered by plans. I might add that when the Threatened Species Scientific Committee make a recommendation to the minister to list a new species, or to change the category of a species through a listing assessment and new assessment, they then finalise and get approved by the minister at the time of that change in listing conservation advice. So each of those species now has very recent—a few weeks old—conservation advice in place.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: I think it's obvious where I'm trying to go here. I want to know whether they're covered by recovery plans. If they've gone up to being critically endangered, I therefore want to look at whether the recovery plan is being effective.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: We can have a look at that.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 90 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000361
27	1.1: BCD	Senator Siewert	Primary threat to listed species in Stirling range	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Okay. I want to go to the Stirling Range in particular and the large number of species there that have been listed as threatened. Most of them are plant species, from what I could tell, which doesn't surprise me, given the high level of endemism and diversity there. Is dieback the threatening process there?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I would have to take that on notice. Just to clarify, are you looking for the primary threat to</p>	Page 90 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000362

				the Stirling Range plants that were recently listed? Senator SIEWERT: Yes. Could you take that on notice? Mr Richardson: Sure.		
28	1.1: BCD	Senator Siewert	Western Ringtail recovery plan	Senator SIEWERT: Thank you. I think Senator Rice is going to be asking about the western ringtail? Senator RICE: I'm not sure whether it's here or in 1.4. Senator SIEWERT: I know you've got a specific set of questions. I'll just note that that's gone up to critically endangered. My understanding is it's gone from endangered to critically endangered? Mr Richardson: I think it's vulnerable. Senator SIEWERT: Sorry, it went from vulnerable to critically endangered. Does it have a recovery plan? Mr Richardson: Yes, it does—a relatively recent one, I believe. Senator SIEWERT: When was the recovery plan for the western ringtail put in place? Mr Richardson: I can find that out and get back to you quite quickly.	Page 91 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000363
29	1.1: BCD	Senator Siewert	Threatening factors for two spider species	Senator SIEWERT: That would be appreciated, if you could. Can I ask about the two spiders that were listed? Are you able to take on notice for those two species—sorry, I've lost them. There was the tingle pygmy trapdoor spider, and there was another species from the Stirling Range. Can you take on notice to provide the threatening factors for those two species, please. Mr Richardson: Of course.	Page 91 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000364
30	1.1: BCD	Senator Siewert	Critically endangered species	Senator SIEWERT: This is what I'm trying to work out is. It's moved to critically endangered. I'm trying to find out the time frame the recovery program has been operating and what have been the key processes that have occurred to lead it to being listed as critically endangered. Ms Jonasson: That's probably a better question to take on notice so we can give you a comprehensive	Page 93 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000365

				<p>response.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: So you can't answer that directly?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: We don't have that information with us today, no.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I couldn't answer that. I'd have to take on notice that more detailed question around what caused it to be so up-listed.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Take that on notice. Obviously it's a pretty iconic species for us in Western Australia. Admittedly, we do have a lot—particularly in the south-west. I'm very concerned to know—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: On 16 August 2017 was when the plan came into force under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. That was a plan that was prepared by the Western Australian government and adopted on 16 August 2017 as a Commonwealth plan.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: At that time, was it then being addressed as a critically endangered species? Does that now have to be reviewed, given it's now just been upgraded?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: It would depend on the threats that were acting on it and whether they are more prominent now than when it was previously listed. That can be part of the question that I will take on notice.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: If you could, that'd be appreciated. Can I ask a broader question, then. Once a species is upgraded, is there an automatic review of the recovery plan? I understand you get the conservation advice, but is there an automatic review of the recovery plan?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: It's not automatic. The assessment leads to new conservation advice. That conservation advice itself identifies actions that should be taken that have been worked out and are current at the time of listing. So it's not automatic but, in preparing that new</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>assessment, we look at a recovery plan. If there's one in place, we look at the actions taken and any information derived from those actions and from the recovery efforts and we look at what's succeeded and what's failed. Some get a review of a recovery plan; some don't. It depends on who's leading the assessment.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: I appreciate that on this one, given it was only towards the end of last year, there's no point asking, 'What went wrong with it?' or 'Why isn't it working?' Is the process now sufficient to address the issue around it now being a critically endangered species?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I'll take that as part of the question on notice.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: Okay. Thank you.</p>		
31	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Impacts of logging on Koalas	<p>Senator RICE: Has the Commonwealth taken any steps to investigate the impacts of logging on koalas, to determine whether accreditation of RFAs under the EPBC Act is warranted?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I would have to take that on notice. I don't have any details with me today.</p> <p>Senator RICE: And can you take on notice whether there is intention of doing that work if it hasn't been undertaken?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Certainly.</p>	Page 95 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000366
32	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	IFOA impacts on arboreal mammals	<p>Senator RICE: Similarly, we've got proposed new logging laws in northern New South Wales, the integrated forestry operations approvals, which would legalise clear felling across coastal forests in New South Wales. What steps is the Commonwealth taking to satisfy itself that the New South Wales approvals, the IFOAs, won't impact on EPBC listed arboreal mammals, including koalas and greater gliders?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I would have to take that on notice and consult with my Agriculture colleagues.</p>	Page 95 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000367
33	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Compliance of NSW RFA	<p>Senator RICE: I'll leave it at that. Similarly, given that there is considerable evidence as to the impacts of</p>	Page 95 Monday	SQ18-000368

				<p>RFA facilitated logging on species like koalas, greater gliders and large forest owls, and we've got a reduction in carbon stores and negative impacts on water supplies, what steps has the Commonwealth taken to investigate the compliance of the New South Wales logging regime, to whether it is indeed ecologically sustainable forest management?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I think the compliance of the RFAs is the responsibility of my Agriculture colleagues. I'm happy to take it on notice anything I can provide you.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you provide any written advice that you have received in relation to that?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I'm happy to provide you with any advice we can, yes.</p>	21 May	
34	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Impacts of logging on koalas	<p>In her report into the declines of koala populations in NSW, the NSW Chief Scientist stated that there was insufficient data to assess whether logging prescriptions to protect koalas work. What steps has the Commonwealth Government taken to investigate the impacts of logging on koalas – an EPBC listed species - in NSW to determine whether the EPBC accreditation is warranted prior to rolling over the RFAs?</p>	Written	SQ18-000508
35	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Approving a rollover of the Regional Forest Agreement	<p>The NSW EPA, and independent scientists have repeatedly found that koalas prefer large trees and mature forests. Given the sharp declines in koalas on the north coast of NSW, what role does the Department of the Environment have in approving a rollover of the Regional Forest Agreement in the area?</p>	Written	SQ18-000509
36	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Koala population decline	<p>The NSW Chief Scientist in her report into koala declines also stated that 'based on the precautionary principle, which is defined under the Protection of the Environment Administration Act (1991), if there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental</p>	Written	SQ18-000510

				damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation'. Given the evidence that koalas prefer large trees and mature forests, evidence of sharp population declines on the north coast of NSW and the lack of data available to assess the efficacy of logging prescriptions, what role does the precautionary principle play in any extension or roll-over of the RFA?		
37	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	Proposed impacts of the IFOA	As far back as 1980, research by the then NSW Forestry Commission in the Eden area found that 'clearfelling eliminates arboreal mammals from the logged area'. Proposed new logging laws (the Integrated Forestry Operations Approvals, IFOAs) propose to legalise clearfelling across coastal forests in northern NSW. What steps has the Commonwealth Government taken to satisfy itself that the NSW IFOA will not impact on EPBC listed arboreal mammals, including koalas and greater gliders? Can the Department provide any advice as to the proposed impacts of the IFOA?	Written	SQ18-000511
38	1.1: BCD	Senator Rice	RFA facilitated logging on forest species	"Ecologically Sustainable Forest Management" or ESFM is defined as the management of forests so that they are sustained in perpetuity for the benefit of society, by ensuring that the values of forests are not degraded for current and future generations. Given evidence as to the impacts of RFA-facilitated logging on forest species like koalas, greater gliders and large forest owls, the reduction in carbon stores and sequestration, negative impacts on water supplies and quality and the contribution of logging to bell-miner associated dieback, what steps has the Commonwealth taken to investigate the compliance of the	Written	SQ18-000512

				NSW logging regime to ESFM and can the Department provide any work or studies undertaken on this matter?		
39	1.1: BCD	Senator Siewert	NLP2 grant funding – LCDC groups	<p>Why has the Department decided that LCDC groups established under the WA Soil and Land Conservation Act 1945 are no longer eligible for NLP2 grant funding?</p> <p>Did the Department raise this issue with LCDC groups prior to the latest round of funding applications? If not, why not? If so, what efforts were made to address the issues of eligibility?</p> <p>Does the Department accept that these groups have been funded by the Commonwealth in the past?</p> <p>Does the Department acknowledge that these are community run organisations?</p> <p>Why has the Department decided now that these groups are ineligible?</p> <p>Does the Department accept that the valuable work these groups do will be undermined by this decision?</p> <p>Does the Department recognise that this decision undermines soil and land conservation work in WA?</p>	Written	SQ18-000530
40	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Grant applications for the National Landcare Program/Green Army	For each grant round over the last five years, how many grant applications were received and how many grant applications were successful? And for each program round, what was the overall total amount of funding requested by applicants and what was the total amount provided?	Written	SQ18-000551
41	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Green Army funding	What proportion of Green Army funding was directed towards participant wages/allowances?	Written	SQ18-000522
42	1.1 BCD	Senator	Threatened Species	How is it decided which Minister will sign off on	Written	SQ18-000555

		Whish - Wilson	Conservation Management – Sign off on approvals between Ministers	EPBC threatened species or approval matters between the junior Minister and Minister?		
43	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Conservation Management – Flora and Fauna	What flora and fauna is most likely to become extinct within the next 20 years?	Written	SQ18-000556
44	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Conservation Management -New discovered species	How does the Threatened Species Committee consider the assessment of newly discovered species?	Written	SQ18-000557
45	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Conservation Management - Fast track an approval	Can the Committee fast track an assessment if a newly discovered species is likely to be considered as threatened?	Written	SQ18-000558
46	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Conservation Management - Strophurus species	Has the Committee considered, or is it planning to the consider, the recently discovered Strophurus species from Queensland?	Written	SQ18-000560
47	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Conservation Management - Antechinus vandycki sp. nov. (Tasman Peninsula Dusky Antechinus)?	Has the Committee considered, or is it likely to consider, the status of the recently determined Antechinus vandycki sp. nov. (Tasman Peninsula Dusky Antechinus)?	Written	SQ18-000561
48	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Conservation Management – species likely to be extinct	What species that are currently listed as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered that are currently likely to be extinct based on no records being seen in recent years?	Written	SQ18-000562
49	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Conservation Management – Vertebrate species population	For critically endangered vertebrate species: what species has recent population estimates available? Are those estimates available?	Written	SQ18-000564
50	1.1 BCD	Senator	Threatened Species	For endangered and critically endangered ecological	Written	SQ18-000566

		Whish - Wilson	Conservation Management – List of critically endangered ecological communities	communities: for which of these are recent extent and/or area figures available? Is a list available? What estimates are available on the decline in area over the last decade?		
51	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Common Assessment Method – Which states are using the listings under the new method?	Of the states that have signed up to the Common Assessment Method: which states have started using this method for new listings and which states have reviewed their listings using this method? Are they obliged now to do this under the agreement?	Written	SQ18-000568
52	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Common Assessment Method - Eastern Quoll not meeting any threatened species requirements	How can the Tasmanian Government consider the Eastern Quoll does not meet any threatened species requirements but Federally the species is listed as endangered? Have Tasmanian agencies and the federal government agencies discussed advancing the mutual assessment of threatened species?	Written	SQ18-000570
53	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threat Abatement Plans - Recovery and Plans	By what date does the Department expect to have achieved compliance with having all recovery plans and Threat Abatement Plans (TAPs) in place that have been recommended by the Threatened Species Committee?	Written	SQ18-000572
54	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threat Abatement Plans - Priority of Threat Abatement	How does the Department prioritise which of the outstanding TAPs and recovery plans to draw up first?	Written	SQ18-000575
55	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threat Abatement Plans - Finalisation of the Threat Abatement Plans	How many TAPs does the Department plan to finalise in the coming budget year?	Written	SQ18-000576
56	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threat Abatement Plans - New recovery plan for Wollemi Pine	Will the Government be drawing up a new recovery plan for the Wollemi Pine now that it has been up listed to critically endangered and the last recovery plan has lapsed?	Written	SQ18-000577
57	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threat Abatement Plans - Recommendations on all possible recovery plans	Is a list all recovery plans and TAPs that have lapsed, or are within one year of lapsing, available? Is it possible to list all recovery plans and TAPs that have not been made despite being recommended by the Threatened Species Committee?	Written	SQ18-000578
58	1.1 BCD	Senator	Threat Abatement Plans	Is a list all organisations or individuals who have made	Written	SQ18-000579

		Whish - Wilson	-Listing on all organisation or individuals on recovery plans	representations or applications to down list species or ecological communities or have requested to delay a listing assessment available?		
59	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threat Abatement Plans - Number of recovery teams	How many recovery teams have been established? For which species are there plans to establish recovery teams?	Written	SQ18-000580
60	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Cat Control -Number of feral cats annually	For the Threatened Species Strategy, are the numbers of feral cats that have been annually controlled in Australia for each of the last 5 years available? Is the spatial area (square kilometres) that has been subject to cat management available? Can the Department provide definitions for cat control, cat management, cat eradication in the document?	Written	SQ18-000581
61	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Cat Control - Update on APVMA approval	Can the Department provide an update on the APVMA approval of the cat bait Curiosity? What has caused the delay? When does the Department expect the approval to be made?	Written	SQ18-000582
62	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Cat Control - Update on commercialisation of the cat bait Curiosity	Can the Department provide an update on the commercialisation of the cat bait Curiosity? How many companies supplied an expression of interest for the commercialisation? When is it anticipated that commercialisation of the product will be achieved?	Written	SQ18-000583
63	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Cat Control - List of: feral cats funded projects	Is a list of any projects the Department has funded to do with feral cats available?	Written	SQ18-000584
64	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Commissioner - social media targets or objectives	What are the measurable social media targets or objectives for the Threatened Species Commissioner? And what progress has been made towards those targets?	Written	SQ18-000585
65	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	Threatened Species Commissioner - Staff and resources for social media purposes	How many staff and what resources are allocated towards this objective?	Written	SQ18-000586
66	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish -	National Reserve System - Guide to expanding the	What strategy does the Department have to guide the expansion of the National Reserve System (NRS)?	Written	SQ18-000553

		Wilson	NRS			
67	1.1 BCD	Senator Whish - Wilson	National Reserve System - Funding allocations	Has the government allocated funding towards expanding the terrestrial NRS?	Written	SQ18-000554
68	1.1 BCD	Senator Di Natale	Indigenous Protected Areas – Progress report	Noting the announcement in March 2017 of \$15 million for new Indigenous protected areas, including Indigenous rangers, to be administered by the Department of Environment and Energy portfolio: Can you provide a progress report on how this money has been allocated? Which projects have been funded and to what levels?	Written	SQ18-000617
69	1.1 BCD	Senator Di Natale	Indigenous Protected Areas – ground activities	What progress can you report in relation to the application of the funds to activities on the ground?	Written	SQ18-000618
70	1.1 BCD	Senator Di Natale	Indigenous Protected Areas – administration arrangements	Can you advise if any changes have been since the announcement to the administration arrangements for the funding? If yes, can you advise of the changed arrangements and provide a rationale for the change?	Written	SQ18-000619
71	1.1 BCD	Senator Di Natale	Indigenous Protected Areas – benefits	What benefits to the program and the funding recipients have been documented as a result of any changed administrative arrangements?	Written	SQ18-000620
72	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef funding – Tender Process	Senator KENEALLY: Thank you, Senator Birmingham, for reading the media release to us. If I could ask the department: was there a tender process or a grant application process for this money? Mr Pratt: No. Senator KENEALLY: Were other groups given the opportunity to know that this money was available? Mr Pratt: The government's decision was to make a grant to the Great Barrier Reef Foundation for this purpose. Senator KENEALLY: Had the Great Barrier Reef Foundation approached the government seeking such a grant? Mr Knudson: I would have to take that on notice; I do not know.	Page 12 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000338

				<p>Mr Pratt: As a general answer, I suspect the answer is yes; the Great Barrier Reef Foundation has sought contributions from the federal government in the past. But this was part of the budget process.</p>		
73	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef funding – Planning	<p>Senator KENEALLY: I am trying to understand how—as Mr Knudson described it—the greatest single contribution from the government to the Great Barrier Reef in Australian history went to one foundation without a tender process, without advertising, without a competitive process and, it would seem, without an invitation from the government to the foundation to apply. I am trying to understand the process that led to this massive amount of taxpayer dollars going to one foundation. Was there any competitive tension? Was there any testing of capacity? Was there any open invitation? Was there any opportunity for any other organisation to put forward a plan? Was there any contest between the foundation and between the authority's capacity to deliver this outcome? How was this decided?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: The Great Barrier Reef Foundation has been around since 2000. They have been very active, obviously, in the space of the reef and in delivering programs on the ground. This will be a significant scaling up of that organisation.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: With the greatest of respect, it seems you cannot answer these questions here today—or you are unwilling to do so. I would like to put all those questions on notice because it appears that the department cannot answer basic questions as to how this massive allocation of money came to go to one foundation.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We are happy to take the questions on notice. The government obviously did due diligence in relation to the foundation. It has a history of engagement with the foundation and believes the foundation is well-placed to lead effort in this regard,</p>	Page 12 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000339

				which is why this injection, with a detailed plan, is being made. We are happy to take the questions on notice.		
74	1.1: HRMD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Great Barrier Reef - Partnership Program	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. We will wait for when we can get some information about the oversight that the government is going to have on this. Could I just ask theoretically, though, who can join the Great Barrier Reef partnership program? Can I join it, for example, as an individual? Can any company or any person join it?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I am certain you can contribute to it, Senator. In terms of membership, we would have to take that on notice and ask the foundation.</p>	Page 16 and 17 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000340
75	1.1: HRMD	Senator Di-Natale	Great Barrier Reef Foundation – Staffing	<p>Senator DI NATALE: What are the staffing numbers on the foundation?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I do not have that at hand but am happy to take that on notice.</p>	Page 19 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000341
76	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef Funding – Due Diligence	<p>Senator KENEALLY: I would like to stay in this theme. Minister, a moment ago you used the phrase 'due diligence' in terms of the government having done due diligence on the foundation. What was that due diligence process?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We're happy to take that on notice for you.</p>	Page 20 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000342
77	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef Foundation – Annual Reports	<p>Mr Pratt: Can I just add that—sorry to interrupt you there—as we have already pointed out, the foundation has been in operation for nearly 18 years, I think, now. We have been working with it for 10 years—</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Can I ask about that, because the earliest annual report on their website is 2011.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I understand the foundation was established in 2000.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Can we please get some confirmation on that, because their website only has annual reports going back to 2011.</p>	Page 20 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000343
78	1.1: HRMD	Senator	Great Barrier Reef	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Does it concern you that potentially there would be no-one from the Great</p>	Page 39	SQ18-000344

		Chisholm	Foundation – Board	<p>Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority on the foundation board? Is that a concern to you, given the responsibility they've got for administering this money?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We can take that on notice and provide you with some details around what the requirements of the board, the membership of the foundation, might need to be. I don't know those off the top of my head. But, as is commonplace for boards of that nature, they are established for a particular purpose, such as supporting the reef. I would expect that there are requirements or objectives laid out about the type of skill sets that need to be on the board. Dr Reichelt obviously brings a number of skill sets. I believe the head of the Institute of Marine Science is on the board as well. So there are a number of skill sets that are clearly valuable and represented on the board, and I am sure that those skill sets will continue to be available. Separately, of course, the government is putting in place the type of normal administrative arrangements about how the funds will be expended. Those arrangements will obviously have the usual high level of government and funding requirements.</p>	Monday 21 May	
79	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef Foundation – Origins	<p>Senator KENEALLY: I am not arguing that point. I am curious as to why the website says that it started with a small group of businessmen. I've heard that it's four. Nobody seems to know their names. It says: ... rather than just talking about it, they took action and followed through on that idea. Thanks to that little idea, the Great Barrier Reef Foundation was created ...</p> <p>You're telling us, as a member of the board, that that's not correct?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: It was a bit earlier. I'm sure they had meetings of various sorts afterwards, but this was in 2000.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Is this a foundational myth?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: I don't know. I'll check on the website and talk to the management.</p>	Page 46 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000320

				<p>Senator Birmingham: I don't know that Dr Reichelt is saying that that nice story of people sitting down and thinking it's a good idea is entirely a myth. It probably aligned with—</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: I'm just wanting to know who these businessmen are.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I'm sure perhaps other work—</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: I'd like to know who these generous, big-hearted, environmentally-minded businessmen are.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Okay; I'm sure that we can, on notice, ask the foundation for further evidence of their long, deep and rich history, as Dr Reichelt has alluded to—</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: And their origins.</p>		
80	1.1: HRMD	Senator Urquhart	Great Barrier Reef Foundation - Funding	<p>Senator URQUHART: So the funding is around \$8 million to \$10 million per year?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: That's the current scale of their operations, yes.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Does that include fees from their member organisations?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Senator, we don't have at our disposal in estimates now detailed information about the ins and outs of the foundation's budget, but we would be happy to approach the foundation and ask them the extent to which they would be prepared to publicly disclose the spectrum of their sources of revenue. I would say they do tend to announce who they're collaborating with on a project-by-project basis. For example, at the end of this month the foundation is intending to announce a new project with a private sector donor, and in collaboration with the UNESCO World Heritage Marine Programme, which is seeking to do capacity-building activity in five World Heritage marine sites, including the Great Barrier Reef and Ningaloo, but also including the Belize Barrier Reef and the coral reefs of Palau. It is actively and continuously generating new</p>	Page 66 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000345

				sources of revenue and investment to do public good.		
81	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef Foundation – Board Member Selection process	<p>Senator KENEALLY: If board members are there because they contribute, does the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority contribute?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority has been, as we've heard, a partner in working with them on different initiatives.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: No, no, no. Mr Oxley just said the board members of the foundation are there because their companies have contributed, so I'm trying to work out if Dr Reichelt—</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Senator Keneally, you're very good verballing individuals. The board members are there, and I think we heard before from Dr Reichelt, who is a board member, bringing a mix of skills to the table, as you would expect of any board—skills across finance, philanthropy, management, marine science, reef management, the whole range of areas you would expect for a longstanding multimillion-dollar foundation in terms of their work. If you want the precise process by which the foundation appoints its board members, I'm sure we can take that on notice and get that information for you.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Yes, we would like that, thank you, Minister.</p>	Page 71 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000346
82	1.1: HRMD	Senator Urquhart	GBR Foundation funding meetings	<p>Senator URQUHART: Can you tell me how many meetings the government had with the foundation specifically about the funding?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Senator, I think we'll need to take that one on notice. There were several discussions over the course of a matter of weeks. I'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 74 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000350
83	1.1: HRMD	Senator Urquhart	Reef 2050 – Investment itemised program	<p>Senator URQUHART: How will the government accelerate the delivery of the Reef 2050 Plan activities when it's providing substantially less funding, even with the new \$444 million?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I'm not sure you heard the answer to the previous question. The government is not</p>	Page 75 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000351

				<p>providing substantially less funding. Additional new resourcing is being made available.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So the \$716 million over five years—is that correct?</p> <p>Ms Callister: I don't have the document in front of me that you're referring to. The information I have in front of me is the actual investment that we're making, which is over \$900 million.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Have you got that itemised by program?</p> <p>Ms Callister: Yes. I do have an itemised program.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: That would be very useful. Is it easily obtained?</p> <p>Ms Callister: I can provide it to you on notice.</p>		
84	1.1: HRMD	Senator Chisholm	Reef 2050 plan – Funding figure	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: The \$716 million that Senator Urquhart refers to was outlined in the Reef 2050 Plan. That was the five years from 2015 to 2020. And then you're saying an extra two years on top of that gets it to \$907 million?</p> <p>Ms Callister: That's right.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: It's not different to the \$716 million. You've just added two more years on it.</p> <p>Ms Callister: As I was saying, the 2015 investment strategy outlined what was anticipated investment. The figures that I just gave you were specifically this department's investment under the range of reef programs that we have sitting with us. I don't have the full set of all the government's investments, but over that period of time, between ourselves and the Queensland government, we anticipate providing in excess of \$2 billion towards the implementation of the Reef 2050 Plan.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: And that's committed funding?</p> <p>Ms Callister: In that \$907 million that I was talking about, some of those funds have been committed to projects and some of them have been allocated but are yet to be committed to projects.</p>	Page 75 and 76 Monday 21 May	SQ18-00035

				<p>Senator MOORE: In what you can give us it's going to have it clear what it has been allocated to, so we'll be able to add it up against which program and in which year?</p> <p>Ms Callister: That's right.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Minister Frydenberg recently announced on 29 April an additional \$500 million for the reef. He said that represents the single largest funding commitment ever. Can you confirm that with the additional \$500 million for the reef programs the overall 10-year funding for actions in the Reef 2050 Plan is now \$2.5 billion? You said \$2 billion.</p> <p>Ms Callister: We're currently going through a process of trying to determine what that figure is, because it's not all this particular portfolio's funding. It also includes a range of funding for other organisations, including the Australian Maritime Safety Authority and the Australian Institute for Marine Science. So rather than give you a one plus one equals two figure, we're going back and confirming what that total funding now is. That process is currently underway.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Will we get that information during the course of the afternoon?</p> <p>Ms Callister: We can't give you that full amount from the other agencies because we're currently in the process of giving you that. What I can give you on notice is the information that's the breakdown of funding from this particular department. What we'll seek to provide you by the end of this afternoon is information on the legal set-up of the Great Barrier Reef Foundation.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: You said you were going through out where the money's coming from and what is being fed into the overall response to the reef. The media releases have come out under Minister Frydenberg's name. His statement was, '\$500 million is the best; now we're going to get to \$2.5 billion.' That's his statements</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>to the community. Surely somewhere we've got every part of the Australian government commitment to this plan, which we've all agreed on and we all celebrate. Is that something which your department has anywhere?</p> <p>Ms Callister: Yes, we have had that and we've done that work. As various parts of the government—both the Australian government and the Queensland government—make new investments, that figure continues to change. What I was saying to you was, since we've made this new investment, we're now going through a process to confirm what that series of investment is and what the overall quantum would be.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Can we get a full snapshot of what money has now been either committed or allocated across this general commitment by the government to the reef? We can get that? Great.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: At the risk of leading to confusion, and I don't want to do that—</p> <p>Senator MOORE: It won't be your fault!</p> <p>Mr Knudson: What I would say is: when the minister was talking about that, what his predecessor had said was that the Commonwealth government and the Queensland government would commit \$2 billion over 10 years. Then this money, this \$500 million, which is new money in addition, is where the minister was saying that's how we get to \$2.5 billion.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Absolutely. I just want to see your figures.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: The real specifics are a little bit more granular than that but that's where the minister's statement would have come from, I would have assumed.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Are you categorically saying it is an additional \$500 million?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: That is absolutely correct.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: So it's new money?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It is new money.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Senator KENEALLY: But the \$2 billion figure represents a quantum of money that's both Commonwealth and Queensland state government?</p> <p>Ms Callister: That's correct. This is where it can get quite complicated. It's important to understand the actual commitment that's been made and what's our understanding of the likely future commitments, if you're looking into the out-years. The \$2 billion figure was an expectation of what the overall funding commitment would be towards the Reef 2050 Plan. The government's now invested this additional half a billion dollars, and we're now going through a process of going back to agencies, including the Queensland government and other Commonwealth agencies, to determine what that overall figure of investment in the Reef 2050 Plan now is.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Allowing for the fact that when decisions are made, that figure will change?</p> <p>Ms Callister: Correct.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: We understand that, but we've got to have a benchmark.</p> <p>Ms Callister: Yes.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Thank you.</p>		
85	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef funding agreement	<p>Did the Great Barrier Reef Foundation approach the government with a proposal or request for this \$444mil grant?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Was there an open grant process? Was there any open invitation? Was there any competitive tension? Was there any testing of capacity? Was there any opportunity for any other organisation to put forward a plan? Did any other organisation put forward a plan? If so, why was the foundation selected over them? Who made that decision? Was there any contest between the foundation and the 	Written	SQ18-000475

				authority regarding who has the capacity to deliver this outcome? j. How was this decided, and by whom?		
86	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Due diligence for Great Barrier Reef funding agreement	What due diligence process was undertaken by the Turnbull government in relation to this grant? a. Will the government table all pre-2011 annual reports from the Great Barrier Reef Foundation in their possession?	Written	SQ18-000476
87	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef Foundation - Partnership	On 21 May, Minister Birmingham said: <i>The government has identified the foundation as an appropriate partner for this record investment.</i> How was that determination made? a. Who made this determination?	Written	SQ18-000477
88	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	KPIs for the GBR funding	What are the key performance indicators (KPIs) for this funding? a. Are they publicly available yet? b. If not, when will they be made publically available? c. How were these KPIs formulated, and by whom? d. Who will monitor whether these KPIs are being met? e. Who will monitor whether this funding is being appropriately spent?	Written	SQ18-000478
89	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Relationship between the department and the Great Barrier Reef Foundation	On 21 May, Mr. Pratt said: <i>The other point was: we have been working with them for 10 years; so we have quite close connections with the foundation. They are a known entity and a known quantity to us.</i> What does the Department understand the origin of this foundation to be? a. Who does the Department understand was a part of the 'small group of businessmen' that is mentioned on the foundation's website?	Written	SQ18-000479
90	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef Foundation_ protection measures	Considering that the government has elected to give the full sum of funds this calendar year, what would happen if the foundation were to collapse at any time during the next seven years? a. Is the money being held in trust? b. What measures are the government using to ensure	Written	SQ18-000480

				that the money would not be lost in this scenario?		
91	1.1: HRMD	Senator Keneally	Great Barrier Reef Foundation – Information on the Board	<p>On 21 May, Minister Birmingham said: <i>If you want the precise process by which the foundation appoints its board members, I'm sure we can take that on notice and get that information for you.</i></p> <p>Will the government provide this information?</p> <p>a. Does the foundation rely on revenue from fees from their member organizations?</p> <p>b. Does the government have a view about the appropriateness of a member organisation, such as a bank, gaining access to, and benefiting from, government funds as a holding mechanism?</p> <p>c. Will these funds be held in an account at any of the foundation's member banks – specifically, ANZ, Bank of Queensland, Commonwealth Bank, Deutsche Bank, Suncorp, or NAB?</p>	Written	SQ18-000481
92	1.2: KTD	Senator Chisholm	Number of staff in the department that maintain data and information'	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Is there anything specific you could add about its use with regard to policy and EPBC Act assessments?</p> <p>Mr Whitfort: I can give you a few examples of how research has been used. It goes broader than the EPBC Act assessments. In terms of threatened species and other things, a range of projects are being done through the program which go to identifying population trends and that sort of thing, which can then go to determining listings or that sort of thing. I don't think I have any specific examples.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: An EPBC assessment officer, when a project is referred, will not only turn their mind to material put in front of them by the referrer or the applicant but also refer to different parts within the department to source whether or not there is additional information that's relevant to that assessment. So in some instances, if there is research into a particular species at a particular geographic area, the assessment officer will turn their mind to that information. The assessment officers within the department will reach</p>	Page 96 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000369

				<p>out to our science areas, to our listed species areas and to a range of other areas to gather the information relevant to their considerations.</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: As Mr Cahill has said, the assessment officer looks in our internal systems to inform what information we have on hand about the species distribution of matters of national environmental significance and threatened species that are relevant to a particular approval. In the division, we have a number of species modellers who update the geographic distribution of species as a result of research that we undertake through NESP but also from information we gather from other science about the prevalence of species across Australia.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: How many staff in the department maintain its data and information? How often is it updated?</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: I'd have to take that on notice. Are you talking just about threatened species or data in the broad?</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: In the broad sense.</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: I will have to take it on notice because obviously we have a variety of different aspects—from marine data, to species, to things like energy data. And that would not just be officers in my division, but officers across the department.</p>		
93	1.2: KTD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Shark Population numbers in WA	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: In relation to white sharks: in answer to question on notice No. 59, on why the minister was able to publicise shark population numbers for the west coast before the report was released, the answer was:</p> <p>Dr Larry Marshall, Chief Executive of CSIRO, provided an informal briefing on the project status to Minister Frydenberg on 7 December 2017, including the preliminary population estimates that were undergoing peer review. Given the status of the estimates, Minister Frydenberg's 23 December 2017 media release noted they were undergoing peer review.</p>	Pages 83 and 84 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000417

				<p>Can I ask a few more questions about this meeting with Larry Marshall, the chief executive of CSIRO? Was he meeting the minister solely on this issue?</p> <p>Mr Whitfort: My understanding is that it was an informal telephone conversation.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Did the minister request this conversation with Mr Marshall?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Senator, I'm not sure that we can answer these questions.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Why not?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: We can't assume or advise on what the minister's intent was.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: These are questions for the minister directly. We're happy to take them on notice, but we don't have visibility of his telephone calls or meetings necessarily.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Did the department see any requests from the minister in relation to a briefing from CSIRO on this subject?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you take that on notice, and whether the department was involved in facilitating any briefing from the chief executive of CSIRO? On the record: I think it's quite extraordinary that someone like Larry Marshall would have a briefing on something like this for the minister, considering all the other things he has to do as head of CSIRO. I would like to know why that meeting was set up and if there was any departmental involvement in it at all. Was there a record, or was anyone from the department with the minister when this phone call took place? Was it a conference call, or was it a private phone call?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: Senator, this is very much a matter for the minister. We will take those questions and see how he wishes to respond.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. Secretary, what are my options here? Should I write directly to the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				minister as well? Senator Birmingham: The department has taken those questions on notice.		
94	1.2: KTD	Senator Urquhart	Science Hubs	Can the department provide a detailed budget breakdown of the National Environmental Science program and each hub? Who are contracts between? When do contracts start and finish? How are contract milestones monitored?	Written	SQ18-000507
95	1.4: BCD	Senator Urquhart	Funding to wetland health	Senator URQUHART: The sorts of examples that Mr Taylor gave earlier. How much funding goes to wetland health? Mr M Taylor: It is probably important to draw a distinction between what we do federally and what the states do. The very large majority of Ramsar wetlands are, in fact, managed by states. So they manage all that. They would be the ones to put the funding towards it; so I could not really give you a global figure, if you like. Senator URQUHART: What about from a federal perspective? Mr M Taylor: From the federal perspective—that money that we put towards wetlands—we do not have a specific program, although more recently there have been announcements made in relation to the second phase of the National Landcare Program which will see funding going directly towards on-ground work to support outcomes in Ramsar sites. That has not yet been announced. I think the rough quantum of that was somewhere in the vicinity of about \$9 million per annum over about three years. I would need to check back on that. It has not yet been formally announced but that was the rough breakdown.	Page 28 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000383
96	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Greater Gliders – details and timeline of strategy	Senator RICE: Thank you. I'll move on to greater gliders. I asked a question on notice about whether there were actions being taken about the impact of	Page 77 and 78 Tuesday	SQ18-000405

			<p>logging on greater gliders, given that's now been listed as a vulnerable species. I was told that there's a National Environmental Science Program project which is looking at 'existing long-term monitoring data and new field based experimental research and radio tracking to strengthen the scientific evidence base of strategies to secure the long-term conservation of these and other species dependent on these forests'. Can you tell me some more about what the time line of this study is going to be?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Sorry, Senator, I'm just trying to locate my question on notice. I apologise. Could you repeat that question?</p> <p>Senator RICE: My question on notice—I was told that there was a project under the National Environmental Science Program's Threatened Species Recovery Hub: project 3.2.2. It outlines a project to analyse 'existing long-term monitoring data and new field based experimental research and radio tracking to strengthen the scientific evidence base of strategies to secure the long-term conservation of these and other species dependent on these forests'. I want to know some more details about that strategy and, in particular, the time line. And when will we get some results from that strategy, which would then feed into the protection of the greater gliders? Meanwhile, greater gliders go from vulnerable to endangered, and probably to critically endangered, while this research is undertaken.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I think we would need to go back to the threatened species hub and get an update on the timetable and the work they're doing on that. I'm happy to come back to you after I've spoken to the scientists about where they're at with that work.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Do you accept that it's important that this work is undertaken and that action is taken in the interim period? Otherwise we're going to see these animals, just like the Leadbeater's possum, on this</p>	22 May	
--	--	--	--	--------	--

				<p>trajectory, hurtling towards extinction. We know what the threatening processes are.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: We do accept it's important, and that's why the project is happening. As I said, I'd really like to get some advice from the scientists that are doing the work on the time frames and come back to you with that. We can also outline some funding that we have also put into the greater glider. There's a whole range of things happening in relation to that. Since 2014, a \$200,000 threatened species targeted project has been funded to deliver habitat improvement by restoring traditional fire regimes and feral animal and plant controls throughout the Mount Lewis, Mount Sturgeon and Mount Windsor national parks. This project has been delivered in partnership with the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service and the Australian Wildlife Conservancy.</p> <p>Senator RICE: I'm particularly interested in the southern population of the greater glider where they are impacted by clear fell logging. Since we were last here, in Victoria there's been a high population density hot spot—the highest population density of greater gliders—being logged by VicForests under the regional forest agreement.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: There have also been a number of 20 Million Trees projects that have been funded. These include projects in the Strzelecki Ranges. Something in the order of \$1.6 million was put into that. Overall we have around about eight projects that total around \$3.5 million that have gone to support work on the greater glider. If I can get to the scientists that are doing the work under this program I can get an update for you.</p>		
97	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Greater Glider – logging in high population density	<p>Senator RICE: Are you aware of the logging of this very high population density hot spot in the logging areas, the Barjarg Flat areas of forest, in the Strathbogie Ranges?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: That's a level of detail I'd be happy to</p>	Page 78 and 79 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000406

				<p>take more information on.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Is the department aware or is anyone at the table aware of what's going on there?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: Yes, we've seen the press reports. That's being managed through our RFA area. Our officers who are associated with that were here yesterday. We don't believe they're here today.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Has there been a response by the federal government? Has the federal government said, 'This is an EPBC listed species—there's logging going on of one of the highest population density hot spots for the greater glider'?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I think the response by the federal government is the significant funding, the \$3.5 million that's been put into—</p> <p>Senator RICE: Meanwhile they keep logging it.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: The arrangements are set out through the RFA arrangements and ensuring that the work that is happening is consistent with the EPBC Act. It is around \$3.5 million, as I mentioned.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Has there been any federal response? Has there been any communication between the federal government and the Victorian government about the logging that's occurring in this hot spot for greater gliders?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: As I think we said yesterday, obviously for the regional forestry agreements the lead Commonwealth agency is the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources. We're happy to take—</p> <p>Senator RICE: I'll be asking questions of the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources over the coming days.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: We're happy to also raise this with the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources to ensure they're aware of it.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Senator RICE: But you are responsible for the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, and this is a threatened animal under your act.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Understood, and that's why I'm saying I'm happy to raise it with the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources as well.</p>		
98	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Western ring-tailed possum – date of updated conservation advice	<p>Senator RICE: Okay. Moving on to the western ring-tailed possum, which has just been uplisted to critically endangered. I know my colleague Senator Siewert was asking some questions about that yesterday. What's going to be the reaction from the federal government in response to that uplisting to critically endangered?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: When you say response, the federal government was the one that uplisted it to critically endangered.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Is there going to be any change to what's going to be happening to the recommendations for management by the federal government?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: There is an updated conservation advice that was released when the species was uplisted. That was early this year or late last year—I'll find that out. But there was also a West Australian government prepared recovery plan that was adopted by the federal government in August 2017, so pretty recently. That would have essentially taken account of the new information available on the species as at that time. In terms of what we will do to respond, it is a species that is listed as threatened. It is a matter of national environmental significance, so it triggers all the governmental responses that any other MNES species triggers, which is to say that it becomes part of the regulatory process we manage. As a matter of NES, it also becomes a target in our funding programs. It becomes a species that will be targeted by our program or its predecessors.</p>	Page 79 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000407
99	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Western ring-tailed possum –	<p>Senator RICE: What does the recovery plan recommend in terms of addressing the ongoing logging</p>	Page 79 Tuesday	SQ18-000408

			correspondence with the West Australian government	<p>of habitat of the western ring-tailed possum? Since it has become critically endangered, have you raised this issue with the West Australian government, who are the people who are undertaking that logging?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: And the people that prepared the recovery plan. I don't believe we've raised it directly with them since the recovery plan was put in place. But it is their recovery plan, in a sense. I'd have to take on notice whether there's been any correspondence.</p>	22 May	
100	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Funding towards programs - impacts of logging on Western ring-tailed possum	<p>Senator RICE: Does the Commonwealth have a role, given that it's now critically endangered under your listings, to actually have a proactive response with the Western Australia government, or is it just leaving it to them?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: What I can highlight for you is that we've mobilised about \$4.1 million for 19 projects that are supporting outcomes for the western ring-tailed possum. That includes a \$1.7 million investment in Western Shield, which is to include feral cat baiting into the state-wide conservation program. The federal government is contributing significant funds to efforts to protect the western ring tailed possum.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Are there any programs to deal with the impact of logging on the western ring-tailed possum's habitat? I understand the critical importance of addressing feral animals and their predation, but is there any funding towards programs to address the impacts of logging on western ring-tailed possum habitat?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I don't have a breakdown of the 19 projects under the \$4.1 million, but I can get further information for you on that.</p>	Page 79 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000409
101	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Threatened Species Scientific Committee – advice rejected	<p>Senator RICE: Moving on to the Threatened Species Scientific Committee generally, I understand that the minister has the discretion to accept the advice of the Threatened Species Scientific Committee on which species, threatening processes or ecological</p>	Page 79 and 80 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000410

				<p>communities should be considered for listing under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. I am interested to know on how many occasions in the past five years has the environment minister rejected the advice of the Threatened Species Scientific Committee?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I'd have to take that question on notice.</p>		
102	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Fire Regimes that cause biodiversity loss	<p>Senator RICE: Moving on to other threats to Australia's biodiversity, changing fire regimes is one of the leading threats. What is the status of the key threatening process nomination for fire regimes that cause biodiversity loss?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: That's a nomination that is on our priority list and is still on our priority list. It has not yet been listed. It's one that we are planning to refresh later this year, assuming the Threatened Species Scientific Committee is willing to do so, but it has not yet been finalised and it's not yet listed as key threatening process.</p> <p>Senator RICE: When is a decision expected as to whether it's a key threatening process?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I can't give you that time line at this point. I'll have to take it on notice.</p>	Page 80 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000411
103	1.4: BCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Threat Abatement Plan for marine debris	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Minister Birmingham, could I ask you about plastics in the ocean, one of the biggest threats to a whole range of different marine creatures and a very serious issue? Any idea of whether the minister will prioritise a threat abatement plan?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: No, Senator, but I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>	Page 83 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000412
104	1.4: BCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	King Island Brown Thornbill – Listing Status	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I also want to highlight that the King Island brown thornbill, at least from my investigation, is still listed as 'endangered' rather than 'critically endangered', despite it not showing up in surveys for a number of years and the report I referenced yesterday. Is the department aware of why it</p>	Page 86 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000418

				<p>hasn't been uplisted to 'critically endangered', or is my information incorrect?</p> <p>Dr Box: My understanding is that the King Island brown thornbill is listed as critically endangered under the EPBC Act, but I can confirm that.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: You're saying it is critically endangered?</p> <p>Dr Box: That's my understanding, but I can double-check that.</p>		
105	1.4: BCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Feral Horses – Listed as a threatening process	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Has anyone or any group ever put up feral horses to be listed as a threatening process under EPBC law?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I'm not aware of it, Senator. I can take on notice if they've ever been nominated.</p>	Page 86 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000420
106	1.4: BCD	Senator Bartlett	Australia's Alpine ecosystems	<p>What is the Department doing to protect Australia's fragile Alpine ecosystems and the threatened species in them?</p> <p>What are the main threats to these Alpine ecosystems?</p> <p>What assistance is the Department of Environment & Energy providing to manage these threats?</p>	Written	SQ18-000455
107	1.4: BCD	Senator Bartlett	Funding for National Parks that cover alpine areas	What level of funding and what types of assistance is the Department putting into protecting national parks that cover fragile alpine areas?	Written	SQ18-000457
108	1.4: BCD	Senator Urquhart	Staff working on the threatened species listing	Can the department outline the number of staff (FTE equivalent) working on the threatened species listing?	Written	SQ18-000502
109	1.4: BCD	Senator Urquhart	Staff working on in the Threatened Species Commissioner's office	Can the department outline the number of staff (FTE equivalent) working in the Threatened Species Commissioner's office?	Written	SQ18-000503
110	1.4: BCD	Senator Rhiannon	Export of kangaroo products	In relation to the export of kangaroo products please clarify the categories and sub-categories of data available from the Department.	Written	SQ18-000504
111	1.4: BCD	Senator Rhiannon	Export permits of kangaroo and wallaby	How many export permits currently exist for <u>each</u> of the three general categories of kangaroo and wallaby	Written	SQ18-000505

			export products	export products: a. meat and meat products for human consumption; b. skins and other body parts; c. non-human consumption meat and meat products;		
112	1.4: BCD	Senator Rhiannon	Data on export of kangaroo and wallaby products	<p>In relation to the export of kangaroo/wallaby products please provide in an excel spreadsheet the following data (<i>Note in November 2017 I was advised that not all permits had been acquitted and entered into the Department's permits database at that time – see Q&A 41, BCD</i>):</p> <p>a. Kangaroo export permit reports from 2013 to the current including as separate categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of species • Product description • Quantity and unit description • Importing country • Source • Permit purpose, type and number • Acquittals <i>and</i> non-acquittals • Acquittal date • Year of export • Issue date • Permit type • State of Origin if possible • All other available information provided in such reports <p>b. If possible, please provide the same for years prior to and including 2012.</p> <p><i>Kangaroo export data</i></p> <p>a. The above request is in relation to acquitted permits, please confirm acquitted permit datasets do not</p>	Written	SQ18-000506

				necessarily reflect the actual years of export? b. If so, can the Department provide the same in relation to export data per year of export please?		
113	1.4: BCD	Senator Rhiannon	Kangaroo product exports - data	Please provide the data for the export of all kangaroo products for each importing country, including each of the following separate categories for 2017 to current, and for the years pre 2005 where available: a. Importing country b. Each product category c. Weight or quantity per category d. Dollar value per entry e. Originating Australian state (if available)	Written	SQ18-000621
114	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Status of the key threatening process nomination	What is the status of the key threatening process nomination for fire regimes that cause biodiversity loss? When is a decision expected?	Written	SQ18-000513
115	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Outcomes of the listing of the novel biota	Has the listing of novel biota as a key threatening process resulted in any abatement action or conservation benefit?	Written	SQ18-000514
116	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Threat abatement plan for novel biota	Given the lack of a threat abatement plan for novel biota or any novel biota priorities identified in that listing, what is the reason for rejecting further nominations for key threatening processes such as that for myrtle rust?	Written	SQ18-000515
117	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Biodiversity decline in Australia	What are the four leading causes of biodiversity decline in Australia?	Written	SQ18-000516
118	1.4: BCD	Senator Rice	Leading biodiversity causes listed as a KTP	Of the leading causes, which ones are being effectively abated through being listed as a KTP and due to actions under a threat abatement plan?	Written	SQ18-000517
119	1.4: BCD	Senator Sterle	Export of native birds	How many Australian native birds were exported during 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18?	Written	SQ18-000611
120	1.4: BCD	Senator Sterle	Types of native birds exported	Provide a breakdown of the types of native birds that were exported for 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18?	Written	SQ18-000612
121	1.4: BCD	Senator Sterle	Exportation of native birds - locations	Provide a breakdown of where the native birds were exported to 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18?	Written	SQ18-000613

122	1.4: BCD	Senator Sterle	Illegal exportation of native birds	Were any of the native birds exported found to be illegally exported? During 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18?	Written	SQ18-000614
123	1.4: BCD	Senator Sterle	Exportation of native birds - Licences	What procedures are undertaken to obtain an export licence to export native birds?	Written	SQ18-000615
124	1.4: BCD	Senator Sterle	Exportation of native birds - ACTP	Is the Department aware that 74 parrots and cockatoos were exported to the Association for the Conservation of Threatened Parrots (ACTP) in Germany which is registered as a zoo and is run by a man by the name Martin Guth? If so, does the Department know what purpose were these birds exported to Germany for?	Written	SQ18-000616
125	1.4: HRMD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Feral Horses - listing	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Thank you. I have just a couple of questions on feral horses. I understand that the New South Wales government is pushing ahead with the listing of the feral horse as a heritage matter, and that's being debated in the New South Wales parliament in the next few days. I presume that this listing would limit the ability for the park to be properly managed. Have the New South Wales government consulted with the federal department on this issue?</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I'm not aware of any conversations, Senator, but I think I'd like to take that on notice just to double-check for you.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Have you reached out to them in any way? You wouldn't need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: Yes, we'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: No, I don't think you would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Jonasson: I haven't personally reached out to them, no. But, in terms of the department or anyone in the department, if I could take that on notice, that would be great.</p>	Page 86 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-00419
126	1.4: HRMD	Senator Whish-	Impacts of feral horses	Senator WHISH-WILSON: Just to be clear, then: are you aware of any natural values or threatened species in the alpine national parks that may be impacted by	Page 87 Tuesday	SQ18-000421

		Wilson		<p>feral horses? I wasn't quite sure if I got that in your answer.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: This is a different circumstance in the sense that, normally, we're looking at someone proposing to do something. This is almost someone proposing not to do something. So—</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you're doing work on recovering certain species in your plan, and this kind of thing has been considered as an impact—I'll give you a couple of examples. The corroboree frog and the mountain pygmy possum are in your plan.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I'm sure that there are species that could potentially be impacted by the brumbies. What I'm trying to point out, though, is that this is unique in the sense that it's a state government saying they're not going to do something, not that they're actively going to do something. If they were coming in and saying, 'We're going to cull a species,' and that was going to have an impact on matters of national environmental significance, that would be more traditional. This is the state government saying they're not going to do something. For legal reasons, because of the uniqueness of this, I'd want to take a look at this in a little bit more detail and come back to you on it.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you could, that would be great.</p>	22 May	
127	1.4: HRMD	Senator Hanson-Young	Great Australian Bight – World Heritage Status	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Has there been any preliminary assessment or work done on whether the Great Australian Bight would meet World Heritage status?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I'm not aware of any such work having been done. Senator, we would generally leave the nomination responsibility to the jurisdiction responsible, noting that in large part we would be the jurisdiction in relation to the Great Australian Bight. But no work has been done. I'm aware of public interest in that prospect.</p>	Page 81 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000413

				<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes. One public issue of concern is whether the potential of oil and gas drilling in the Great Australian Bight may jeopardise a future listing. Do you have any advice on that?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: No, I don't have any advice on that.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Would you be able to take that on notice for me?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes, of course.</p>		
128	1.4: HRMD	Senator Hanson-Young	Great Australian Bight – Management Plan criteria	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: That would be great, thank you. Obviously one of the criteria for World Heritage listing is that the site already has some type of management plan in place. Would you be able to inform us as to what would be appropriate for the Great Australian Bight in order to fulfil that criteria?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I'll take that on notice, Senator. In broad terms it would be looking at what are the overall management arrangements in place for the management of that place. As you well understand, the Commonwealth marine area is a complex system of management with many different sectoral arrangements in place. Oil and gas exploration and development are managed by NOPSEMA; fisheries are largely managed by the Australian Fisheries Management Authority, though some fisheries are managed by the South Australian government under the offshore constitutional settlement, and ditto for Western Australia; and Parks Australia has responsibility for managing the marine parks that sit within the Great Australian Bight. So in looking at the management arrangements we would be looking at whether that suite of management arrangements was adequate to meet any obligations under the World Heritage convention, should the place be found to have outstanding universal value and should it be listed.</p>	Page 81 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000414
129	1.4: HRMD	Senator Hanson-Young	Analysis to measure impact of World Heritage listings	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Great. Thank you. Has there been any work or analysis done to measure the impact on conservation and protection outcomes of</p>	Page 81 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000415

				<p>World Heritage listing— Mr Oxley: I'm not aware. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: as opposed to the economic outcomes? Mr Oxley: I do understand the question. I can't give you specific examples of studies. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So the department has never undertaken that sort of cost-benefit analysis? Mr Oxley: I can't give you a the-department-has-never-done answer. We may well have done such— Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Would you be able to take that on notice? Mr Oxley: We'll have a look back and see if there's anything in there. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: That would be great. Thank you very much.</p>		
130	1.4: HRMD	Senator Bartlett	Cape York possible World Heritage listing	<p>Senator BARTLETT: Excellent. We heard some of the previous questions about possible world heritage nominations et cetera, and I heard all of those answers. I know over many years there's been a lot of talk of the possibility of Cape York being considered for World Heritage listing, on cultural as well as environmental grounds. Is there any movement on that at the moment? Is that one of those things in the pile of possibilities? Mr Oxley: It's one that's in the hands of the Queensland government. My understanding is that in recent times they have been turning their minds to progressing its consideration in consultation with traditional owner groups on Cape York. Senator BARTLETT: So there's been some actual action in that area? Mr Oxley: I can't give any more information than that. I'm happy to take that on notice. If the Queensland government has any further advice, we are happy to pass that on. Senator BARTLETT: Thank you. That would be good. I'm not trying to get state secrets, obviously,</p>	Page 82 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000416

				<p>although if you have any feel free to give them! CHAIR: Table them now, if you could! Senator BARTLETT: Details about what action has been happening would be very helpful.</p>		
131	1.4: HRMD	Senator Bartlett	NSW government bill – protection of horses in the Kosciusko National Park	<p>Does the federal government agree with the NSW government bill to protect horses in the Kosciusko National Park?</p> <p>If the federal government does support this bill is it because you view brumbies as part of Australia’s cultural history?</p>	Written	SQ18-000456
132	1.4: HRMD	Senator Bartlett	Removing invasive animals from alpine areas	<p>Does the government have any short or long term involvement in removing invasive animals from those fragile alpine ecosystems?</p> <p>How is this work undertaken while protecting animal welfare?</p>	Written	SQ18-000458
133	1.4: HRMD	Senator Bartlett	Rehoming of Brumbies	<p>Is the government aware that volunteers run a program to rehome brumbies?</p> <p>Considering this program at present only has capacity to deal with 50 horses per year has any consideration been given to supporting this program so larger numbers of horses can be moved out of the national park?</p>	Written	SQ18-000459
134	1.4 HRMD	Senator McKim	“Geeves Effect” funding allocation	<p>On 16 Feb 2017, Tas Senator Abetz announced \$70,000 for a project named the “Geeves Effect” that demonstrably breaches even Tasmania's weakened Wilderness World Heritage Area Management. What due diligence was undertaken before this funding was allocated to ensure it was appropriately allocated and spent?</p>	Written	SQ18-000518

135	1.4 HRMD	Senator McKim	“Geeves Effect” proposal to Introduce an amendment to the World Heritage Management Plan	The Geeves Effect proposal includes a measure that would introduce “amendment to the World Heritage Management Plan to enable appropriate management of this area”. Do you agree that a consequence of this plan would be to scuttle a key part of the TWHHA Management Plan, which would make commercial development in Tasmania's World Heritage Area easier, thereby threatening the property’s listed Outstanding Universal Value?	Written	SQ18-000519
136	1.4 HRMD	Senator McKim	Lake Malbena and other sites proposed for tourism development	Given the World Heritage Committee decisions and clear recommendations of the 2015 Reactive Monitoring Mission to protect wilderness in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) and restore the Wilderness Zone, how do you explain the excision of Lake Malbena (and other important sites proposed for tourism development) from the Wilderness Zone to a zone of lesser protections that allow private commercial development? Was this a mistake, and if so, will you correct it? If it wasn't a mistake, and given the TWWHA Management Plan was federally endorsed, can you explain why this decision was made, as it appears contrary to the Government's commitments to the World Heritage Committee?	Written	SQ18-000520
137	1.4 HRMD	Senator McKim	Pipeline of tourist developments	Given the World Heritage Committee’s clearly stated position on private commercial tourist developments in parks, reserves and wilderness areas, what are the Turnbull Government’s thoughts, as responsible State Party, on the pipeline of tourist developments lined up for within the TWWHA?	Written	SQ18-000523
138	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	GBRMPA advice on Wombinoos land clearing	Senator URQUHART: What about Wombinoos? Is that in the same process time frame as Olive Vale? Mr Barker: The Wombinoos proposal has been	Page 118 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000377

				<p>referred for assessment under the EPBC Act. It has been determined to be a controlled action, which means it's now going through the process of a more detailed assessment. The proponent provided the department with an initial draft of some assessment documentation. The department has given comments to the proponent on that and asked for some further information, particularly around surveys. For example, on that property, there's an identified population of greater gliders, which are a vulnerable species listed under the EPBC Act. So, in that respect, the questions are about more precisely identifying where that species is on that particular property, and we're waiting for the proponent to come back to us.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Has GBRMPA been asked to comment on that one?</p> <p>Mr Barker: GBRMPA did provide advice at the referral point of that project, as is usual for projects that are in the reef catchment.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: And what was GBRMPA's advice regarding what the impact of that clearing would be?</p> <p>Mr Barker: Sorry, I don't have a copy of that advice in front of me. From recollection, it was to highlight that, yes, there was the potential for impacts on the reef from that clearing proposal.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to provide a copy of that advice or that information from GBRMPA?</p> <p>Mr Barker: We'll see if we can provide that.</p>		
139	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	Breakdown of the 59 land clearing permits in QLD	<p>Senator URQUHART: I understand that the department has investigated 59 permits for clearing in Queensland. How many permits for clearing in the Great Barrier Reef catchments have been investigated by the department?</p> <p>Ms Collins: I'll just see if I've got that information in front of me.</p>	Page 118 and 119 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000378

				<p>Mr Knudson: I suspect that we're going to have to take that on notice, but you're exactly right: there were 59 permits at the beginning, and a subset of those would have been in the reef catchments. We can come back to you and clarify that number—unless Ms Collins has that.</p> <p>Ms Collins: No, I haven't got that in front of me.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: How many permits for clearing in Great Barrier Reef catchments have been assessed by the department?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Again, because we don't have the specific breakdown of the 59 here, we will have to come back to say which of those are in the catchment area and then which ones have been assessed.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: When are you able to come back with that?</p> <p>Ms Collins: We would come back on notice. I understand there are four referrals in Queensland currently under assessment, but I'm not sure which of those are in the catchment.</p> <p>Mr Barker: We have five proposals that are currently under assessment in reef catchments. I can give you the reef catchments here, but it might be better if we provide you with the detail on notice. One of those is a dam rather than a clearing proposal per se, and we have already approved one proposal recently—a smaller proposal.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: One is a dam.</p> <p>Mr Barker: Yes.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: And, of those other four, one has been approved for bulldozing, effectively?</p> <p>Mr Barker: There are five under assessment in reef catchments—two in the Burdekin, one in Herbert River, one in Normanby, one in Burnett Mary—and one has been approved in the Upper Burdekin. That project, however, was not triggered for the Great Barrier Reef; it was triggered on the basis of likely</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>impacts to threatened species, and it was referred by the landholder for that reason. In that particular project, the proponent agreed to avoid entirely clearing the area of that species' habitat. So, in the end, the proponent managed to avoid impacts entirely on the species for which the project was originally triggered.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to provide some more information around those five that you talked about?</p> <p>Mr Barker: Certainly, yes.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I understand that the department has made a decision that only three permits for clearing in the Great Barrier Reef catchments need federal oversight. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I think what you're referring to there, again, is a subset of the 59 that were originally considered. As Mr Knudson said earlier, I think we would need to address that as part of taking on notice those of the 59 which are in reef catchments.</p>		
140	1.5: ESD	Senator Bartlett	Usual practice to provide alternative briefs to the Minister	<p>Senator BARTLETT: Was there was a specific recommendation from the department in that case? I don't know if it's too long ago to recall. Would there have been a specific recommendation from the department, for example, saying: 'No, knock off the Traveston Dam,' and the minister said yes or no? Was that the case? Or were there a couple of recommendations to the—</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: There would have been a recommendation. The department would recommend either, as I said, approval or nonapproval, but usually, if we're recommending something be approved, we do so on the basis of a set of conditions that would be put in place in order to facilitate the project going ahead in a way that is environmentally sound from the perspective of the EPBC Act.</p> <p>The other thing to note in relation to this as well is that, in making the decision, the minister, or his or her</p>	Page 126 and 127 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000379

				<p>delegate, must also consider the economic and social matters around the project. The EPBC Act itself provides for that consideration. At that point in time the department recommends a course of action, but it's entirely open to the minister or their delegate to determine variations to the conditions or take into account various other matters and determine the decision in a way that runs counter to our advice. The department provides that advice, as you said, in the form of a recommendation report and then a decision is made.</p> <p>Senator BARTLETT: Is it usual practice, or does it ever happen, that the department provides two alternatives, two variants of the brief, to the minister, saying, 'You could do this or you could do that'?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: It's certainly not usual practice, but I would have to take on notice whether we've ever provided that to previous ministers. As you know, the act's been in place now for 18 years, so that's quite a long time, and I haven't been in this role for that long.</p> <p>Senator BARTLETT: Perhaps just in the last couple of years—three years would suffice.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'd be happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator BARTLETT: If you did do that in the last three years, if you'd given them this option or that option, that would obviously be on the record, I would assume.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Our recommendation reports are certainly on the record.</p> <p>Senator BARTLETT: So you've taken that on notice, whether that's been done in the last few years, in regards to a referral decision. That's what we're talking about—that last step in the process?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: No, that's in relation to an approval decision.</p> <p>Senator BARTLETT: Approval decision, sorry—not a referral.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Mr Tregurtha: The approval decision is at the point when you determine whether it can just go ahead or it needs formal assessment and approval.</p> <p>Senator BARTLETT: Yes. The referral is way back. It's the approval.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: That's right.</p>		
141	1.5: ESD	Senator Rice	EPBC Referral sectoral breakdown	<p>Senator RICE: How many referrals under the EPBC Act have been made by the agriculture sector, say, in the last 10 years?</p> <p>Mr Edwards: I've got some numbers here. It does get fuzzy over periods of time and about how you breakdown the sector. The figure I have is 78 referrals that we would attribute to the agriculture sector since the commencement of the act.</p> <p>Senator RICE: When was the commencement of the act?</p> <p>Mr Edwards: 1999.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So 70 over the last 18 years?</p> <p>Mr Edwards: Yes. But, I would put caveats around that figure, because, again, you have to distinguish between forestry activities, agriculture, agribusiness and a range of categories. To the best of my knowledge, that's the vicinity that we're looking at.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Does that 70 include farm, forestry and agribusiness activities?</p> <p>Mr Edwards: This is our best distinction between what we would call land-based agriculture in a proper sense. Trying to exclude some of the farm, forestry and large agribusiness developments that's the sort of ballpark we're looking at.</p> <p>Senator RICE: How does that 70 compare with other land management sectors or industries?</p> <p>Mr Edwards: It's relatively small compared to some other sectors. One of the key reasons there, of course, is that states and territories are the main regulators of agriculture activities, such as land clearing and so on. We have a lot of interactions with the agriculture</p>	Page 130 and 131 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000380

				<p>sector. Not all those interactions convert to referrals under the act. But we do know that there's quite a bit of confusion and concern in that sector about when they do or don't need to interact with the EPBC Act. So, the figures are an indication of how many people have gone through to that process, but they're not a great indication of our interaction with the sector.</p> <p>Senator RICE: But can you give me a comparison? We've got 70 compared with how many other referrals under the act?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: There have been over 6,000 referrals since the start of the act. Certainly we would have to take it on notice if you're asking for a sectoral breakdown of all of those referrals, to draw out other sectors. We wouldn't have those figures with us tonight.</p> <p>Senator RICE: But 70 compared with 6,000 is what we're talking about?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: No. Those 6,000 include things like commercial developments, residential developments—</p> <p>Senator RICE: No, but that's the—okay.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: That's the whole pile. So, what I'm saying is that if you were looking for other land based sectors that impact on the land, like open-cut mining, for example, we'd have to take it on notice to see what the balance was across the relevant sectors.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay, if you could, that would be good.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: We're happy to do so.</p>		
142	1.5: ESD	Senator Rice	Number of referrals for deforestation and land clearing under the EPBC Act in 2015-16	<p>Senator RICE: Okay. I just want to draw comparisons. In Queensland in 2015-16 there was 396,000 hectares of forest and bushland that was cleared, 93 per cent of which was grazing for agriculture, killing an estimated 45 million animals, releasing 45 million tonnes of CO2, according to the Queensland government. Can you tell us how many referrals for federal approval for deforestation and land</p>	Page 131 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000381

				clearing for agriculture were made under the EPBC Act that year? Mr Edwards: I'd have to take that on notice.		
143	1.5: ESD	Senator McKim	Lake Malbena proposal – helicopter access	Senator McKIM: Does the proposal before you describe helicopter use for construction as well as to ferry in guests or is it just to ferry in guests or to fly in guests? Mr Barker: I think I will have to take that one on notice. It does include helicopter access for guests but I'm not aware whether it includes helicopters being used for construction of the proposal itself. At this point in this assessment, however, we have sought further information from the proponents. They are yet to come back to us with further information about mitigation and management measures for those impacts. That is something we can ensure is undertaken as part of that stage we are at at the moment.	Page 134 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000382
144	1.5: ESD	Senator Bartlett	KUR World development	Senator BARTLETT: I thought it was just preliminary; I didn't feel it was exhaustive at all. I was just getting started. I thought I would do a revisit in regard to that. Apologies if it should have been asked last night, but it was suggested to me that this was the area: in Far North Queensland, in regard to the KUR-World development, around Kuranda adjoining the wet tropics—does that mean anything to anybody? You can take it on notice if it doesn't. It's whether the department—and, again, the same officers—has considered the potential World Heritage impacts of the KUR-World development. Mr Knudson: That would absolutely be the environmental regulation area. We can definitely take that on notice and come back to you and give you clarification of whether we have a referral with respect to that property, and, if we do, what sort of consultation we've done on that within the department. Senator BARTLETT: That would be good. Throw in some state secrets on that one as well if you'd like!	Page 83 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000422

145	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	Consultation on land clearing	Has the department met with Senator O'Sullivan on land clearing issues? If yes, when?	Written	SQ18-000482
146	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	Agricultural developments listed under the EPBC Act	Can the department provide a list of all projects classified as agricultural developments that have been referred under the EPBC Act?	Written	SQ18-000483
147	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	Habitat cleared for threatened species	Can the department provide an estimate of the total habitat for nationally threatened species cleared in Queensland since 2013?	Written	SQ18-000484
148	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	Land clearing in GBR catchment areas	Can the department provide an estimate of the total clearing in the catchments of the Great Barrier Reef since 2013?	Written	SQ18-000485
149	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	Biodiversity offsets under the EPBC Act	Can the department provide a list of all biodiversity offsets that have been delivered as part of agriculture proposals under the EPBC Act?	Written	SQ18-000486
150	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	Staff working on EPBC Act compliance	Can the department provide the number of staff (FTE equivalent) working on EPBC Act compliance?	Written	SQ18-000487
151	1.5: ESD	Senator Urquhart	Staff working on the Agriculture Review	Can the department outline the number of staff (FTE equivalent) working on the agriculture review?	Written	SQ18-000488
152	1.6: ESD	Senator Keneally	Recyclable packaging	<p>Senator KENEALLY: What does the government's commit to 100 per cent recyclable packaging mean in terms of a substantive change to its current balance of output of recyclable and non-recyclable waste? How are we likely to see that change?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: If I understand your question, you're asking about the commitment to 100 per cent of packaging being recyclable, reusable or compostable and how that changes the current situation?</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Yes. Currently, what is the balance between recyclable and non-recyclable waste, and how will that change?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I don't have the exact figure of non-recyclable versus recyclable with me, but I can take that on notice. I can tell you that on average approximately 65 per cent of packaging materials are recycled in Australia at the moment. So the more we are able to ensure that those materials are able to be</p>	Page 88 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000423

				recycled or reused or composted is a key factor in helping that 65 per cent rate get lifted through the efforts of government with the Australian Packaging Covenant Organisations, as Mr Knudson said, in terms of recycling that product into markets, be they overseas or domestic markets, for recycled products.		
153	1.6: ESD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Imported packaging	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: You may have to take this on notice, but if you know now it would be good. In terms of the scope of the target—the hundred per cent recyclable—does it include municipal or household packaging? I presume it does.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: It includes all packaging.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That includes commercial and industrial packaging, presumably?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Imported items, imported packaging?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'd probably have to take that on notice, to be clear around that.</p>	Page 90 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000424
154	1.6: ESD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Packaging Industry	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: It was my understanding that the packaging industry had already committed to this target previously, a hundred per cent, prior to this meeting. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'd have to take that on notice. I'm not aware, personally, of that precise commitment or where it's been made.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. My understanding was it had already been made, so it was nothing new.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: It may well also depend on who made it. There are a range of groups involved in that sector. So I think I'd prefer to take that on notice to be accurate about our answer.</p>	Page 91 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000425
155	1.6: ESD	Senator Moore	Review of the Waste Management Plan	<p>Senator MOORE: But in terms of the process, the month of December and getting the ministers together, if you're looking at the end of the calendar year to have a public agreed position, which is my understanding of what people are seeking in this, because there's a</p>	Page 94 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000426

				<p>degree of community concern and engagement in this, it's around a four- to five-month process to have the review. Is the review intended to be done by the federal government? Or is it that even who is going to be doing it hasn't been determined yet?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: I think it's probably fair to say that the federal government will lead the review, in consultation with states and territories.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Using a kind of team consultation?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: Yes. We'll bring in a broadbased consultation process with community, industry and other key stakeholders that will have an interest.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: In terms of any costing of the process—where does that funding come from?</p> <p>Ms Farrant: At this stage, I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: We've agreed now at the national COAG level that there's going to be this process, which is good. I'm interested in where the budget would come from. You can take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Farrant: Thank you.</p>		
156	1.6: ESD	Senator Whish-Wilson	2009 Waste Policy – 16 point plan	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I have a couple of questions to finish off from the last few minutes of what Senator Moore was saying. When the committee spoke to you in Canberra, not long ago, you said there'd been a bit of an acceleration in meeting with industry stakeholders; you'd had a few informal—I can't remember the language you used. Have there been more meetings with industry stakeholders since we last spoke?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'd say certainly there's been significant contact with a range of industry groups.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Because they did give us the impression they were trying to knock down your door to meet with you to discuss this. It sounds like you've had a lot more activity. If it wasn't too much work—and I'm happy to have a chat with you after this</p>	Page 94 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000427

				<p>session—the 2009 waste policy, the national plan, about which industry keeps saying, 'That's a good starting point; get on with that'—you've put the assertion up tonight that you have done things in this space, and that is true. Would it be possible to go through the 16-point plan and list for us what you think you have done and whether it's been achieved, for example the definitions and standards. It'd be good to—</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I might take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Would that be a lot of work?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'd say we undertook a review of the national waste strategy in 2012. We'd use that as a starting point.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That was six years ago, so you could go back and look what's—</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'll take on notice, I think, how we might best respond to that. I'm conscious that I don't want to divert our resources.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: No, and I know there's probably a lot of work involved. But the committee will be releasing our report in June.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I understand that. We'll try to be as helpful as we can in terms of giving you an update on where each of those 16 commitments are up to.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Great, thank you.</p>		
157	1.6 ESD	Senator Keneally	Recyclable and non-recyclable waste	<p>What does the government's commit to 100 per cent recyclable packaging mean in terms of a substantive change to the current balance of output between recyclable and non-recyclable waste?</p> <p>a. How will this change be implemented?</p>	Written	SQ18-000489
158	1.6 ESD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Recyclable targets	<p>Re: Meeting of Environment Ministers agreement to a target of 100% recyclable packaging by 2025.</p> <p>How much packaging is currently recyclable? What's the scope of this target? Does it include municipal (household) packaging?</p>	Written	SQ18-000537

				Does it include commercial and industrial packaging? Does it include imported items? What products are covered?		
159	1.6 ESD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Container deposits schemes	During Estimates, Mr Knudson said: I think what we are focused on is making sure that we do work towards national coverage. But because containers are fundamentally a local issue it is best dealt with by state governments. We are making very good progress in that space and we want to continue that to get to a place where ideally we have national coverage. What is meant by the phrase national coverage?	Written	SQ18-000539
160	1.6 ESD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Government support of container deposits schemes	During Estimates, Mr Knudson said: I think what we are focused on is making sure that we do work towards national coverage. But because containers are fundamentally a local issue it is best dealt with by state governments. We are making very good progress in that space and we want to continue that to get to a place where ideally we have national coverage. Does the government support all states having container deposit schemes in place?	Written	SQ18-000543
161	1.6 ESD	Senator Whish-Wilson	National Waste Policy status	What is the status of the 2009 National Waste Policy?	Written	SQ18-000546
162	2.1: CCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Gorgon Carbon and Capture Storage project	Senator WHISH-WILSON: I will ask you about the Gorgon carbon and capture storage project, which was approved under EPBC Reference: 2003/1294. I understand that Chevron has been unable to store the 80 per cent of CO2 emissions from their LNG processing for the Gorgon gas project, as required under their licence conditions. The media has reported	Page 100 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000431

				<p>on this in the last two weeks. I understand the Commonwealth has also indemnified the project by the WA government. This is listed in the statement of risks. I was wondering if the WA government or Gorgon has provided the department with an update as to when this project is expected to be able to capture and store some of its CO2.</p> <p>Ms H Wilson: Not that I'm aware of, but that might have been a question better put to some of my colleagues in earlier outcomes.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Which ones? I was advised by the committee that this is the appropriate place to ask these questions.</p> <p>Mr Archer: From the point of view of tracking Australia's emissions, we certainly have an interest in the efforts of the project to store carbon. I would have to take on notice whether we've received a formal update from the company on the outlook for the commencement of storage. I have in the back of my mind that we have somehow come across information from the company that indicated that that might commence early next calendar year. As I said, we'll take that on notice and confirm what information we do have.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Can you add whether you've received any advice from either stakeholder as to whether the project's likely to be successful, per se. My understanding is that the project releases about five million tonnes of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere annually. That would've been captured and stored had this proposition worked. Are you factoring that into your emissions projections? Is that five million tonnes currently in our emissions or was it assumed that this would have worked by now?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: How many tonnes did you say were being released?</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Five million per annum.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>So about one per cent of the number I was just given—substantial in the perspective of the 1.8 per cent annual increase we saw.</p> <p>Mr Archer: Certainly, in relation to the greenhouse gas inventory, we take information from the national greenhouse energy and reporting system—the information that companies report on their emissions through that system. So my understanding is that we would be picking it up. In fact, yes, we are picking it up. In relation to what we're reporting as our estimates of actual emissions, that would be being reflected in those.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you take that on notice just to be 100 per cent sure of that?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes. I'm quite sure we're happy to come back and confirm that.</p>		
163	2.1: CCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Gorgon Carbon and Capture Storage project – Offset of emissions	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: There is just one thing that I would be interested in as well. Under that same referral, the minimum requirement of 80 per cent is calculated as a five-year rolling average, but, if the amount fell significantly below 80 per cent, Chevron had to report this and take steps to offset these emissions. Could you check whether there's been any attempt to offset those emissions?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes, certainly.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: We know they have flared this gas for three years now without capturing it and storing it.</p> <p>Mr Archer: The matter of the EPBC Act referral does relate to another part of the department, so we'll have to check.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. But, yes, it would be about one per cent of the nation's annual current emissions, so I think that's significant.</p>	Page 101 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000433
164	2.1: CCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Gorgon Carbon and Capture Storage project – Projections	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Just in relation to my last line of questioning around Gorgon, could I ask, Ms Wilson, about those projections you talked about earlier</p>	Page 101 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000434

				that you'll re-adjust in 2018? Given that this is the biggest resources project in the country, and it's five million tonnes per annum, could you also take on notice whether it's currently in your projected forecasts that it would have been captured and stored and, if not, whether it will change your projections? Ms H Wilson: Sure.		
165	2.1: CCD	Senator Urquhart	Sectorial emission reduction report	Senator URQUHART: Right. Can the department provide the sectorial emission reduction required by each sector of the economy over the 2020s, using projected emissions in 2020 as a base in order to meet the pro rata allocation of the national 26 per cent emission reduction target? I'm happy for you to take that on notice. Ms H Wilson: Sure.	Page 102 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000435
166	2.1: CCD	Senator Di Natale	Emissions from land clearing	Senator DI NATALE: Can I ask what the emissions from land clearing have been since the government was elected in 2013? Mr Archer: I'd have to look that up. I don't have that figure in front of me at the moment. Senator DI NATALE: Could you take on notice all land clearing emissions from 2013. Mr Archer: Certainly.	Page 105 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000437
167	2.1 CCD	Senator McKim	Carbon Credits and Tasmanian Forests	How is it that native forest protection from logging – native forests being about the planet's most carbon-rich sequestration banks – remains ineligible for funding from the emissions reduction fund?	Written	SQ18-000528
168	2.1 CCD	Senator McKim	Carbon Credit funding	Is it not perverse that native forest isn't eligible for carbon credit funding but, if you raze that forest and grow new trees in their place - in a landscape that will be much worse than the native forest you've just chopped down at storing carbon - you are eligible for carbon credits?	Written	SQ18-00529
169	2.1 CCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT – draft Final	The draft Final Report states that “GHG emissions from any new onshore shale gas field in the NT [of the size they are considering] would contribute around 5% of Australian GHG emissions...”; and that the	Written	SQ18-000565

			Report - increasing GHG emissions by 5%	likelihood of this risk would be “high”, yet the consequences would be “low”. Do you agree that increasing Australia’s GHG emissions by 5% is a risk of low consequence, particularly given the Commonwealth Government’s stated aim to reduce GHG emissions?		
170	2.1 CCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT - draft Final Report – Future fracking and emissions projections	The draft Final Report states that “GHG emissions from any new onshore shale gas field in the NT [of the size they are considering] would contribute around 5% of Australian GHG emissions...”; and that the likelihood of this risk would be “high”, yet the consequences would be “low”. Are emissions from future fracking in the NT included in the Commonwealth’s emissions projections? If not: is this because the Commonwealth Government does not believe that fracking in the NT is likely to proceed?	Written	SQ18-000567
171	2.1 CCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT - Final Report – cost under the Emissions Reduction Fund	The NT Government accepted all of the recommendations included in the Final Report, including that GHG emissions must be fully offset. Does the Commonwealth Government have an estimate of the cost of offsetting this amount of GHG emissions? How much would it cost if the NT gas industry were to offset these GHG emissions under the Emissions Reduction Fund?	Written	SQ18-000574
172	2.1 CCD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Managed Regrowth and Human Induced Regeneration methodologies – Reviews	Why are reviews being undertaken into the Native Forest from Managed Regrowth and Human Induced Regeneration methodologies?	Written	SQ18-000605
173	2.1: ICCEID	Senator Urquhart	Publication – Australia’s National	Senator URQUHART: When did the department last publish an update of Australia's national greenhouse	Page 95 Tuesday	SQ18-000428

			Greenhouse Accounts	<p>accounts?</p> <p>Mr Archer: We recently published our December quarter inventory update. In fact, we republished it on 18 May to correct.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Sorry, when was that?</p> <p>Mr Archer: On 18 May we republished that to correct.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Did you say 'republish'? What does that mean?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes. We found some minor things that we needed to correct in the original version that we published.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: When was the original one published?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I'll get back to you on that. I don't think I have the date in front of me. Also this year, we published our latest annual <i>National inventory report</i>, which we've also submitted to the UNFCCC. Again, I don't quite have a date for that, but that was published I think last month.</p>	22 May	
174	2.1: ICCEID	Senator Urquhart	Media statement on the latest emissions data	<p>Senator URQUHART: Did the department draft a media statement announcing the release of the latest emissions data?</p> <p>Mr Archer: No, I don't believe we did.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So you didn't draft a media release at all?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Are we talking about the quarterly or the annual?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: The release of the latest emissions data?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I'll probably take that on notice, just because I don't want to mislead you and, again, I'm not sure whether we're referring to the quarterly report or to the annual report.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I'm talking about the Australia's National Greenhouse Accounts, and then there was a press release saying that it was on the</p>	Page 95 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000429

				<p>website. But you don't think the minister put one of them out?</p> <p>Mr Archer: If there was a press release, it would have been the minister who put it out.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: But you don't know that?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I'll have to check, I'm sorry. Again, I'm still not entirely certain of the report we're talking about.</p>		
175	2.1: ICCEID	Senator Urquhart	Australia's emissions data - Country comparison	<p>Senator URQUHART: Do you compare Australia's carbons emissions data with comparable countries?</p> <p>Ms H Wilson: Yes.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What are those countries?</p> <p>Mr Archer: We might have to take that question on notice. There could easily be 10 or 15 countries, I think, which have roughly the same emissions as Australia. I don't think we have the details here with us to run through that.</p>	Page 98 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000430
176	2.1: ICCEID	Senator Whish-Wilson	Gorgon Carbon and Capture Storage project – Reporting	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: In that respect, has the government investigated CO2 emissions from flaring over the past three years by that operator?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I wouldn't say that we've investigated it, but, again, there are obligations on companies to report their emissions.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: So, if they've been flaring the gas and putting that CO2 into the atmosphere, they would be reporting that, and you're confident about that.</p> <p>Mr Archer: That's my understanding, Senator.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: And that would be included in the accounts. So, of the CO2 emissions from flaring, have you any idea what proportion of that would be subject to requirements to store CO2 under that particular EPBC referral?</p> <p>Mr Archer: No, I'd have to take that on notice. Even the proposition that that was a requirement, I would have to check.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: It was indeed, yes. I</p>	Page 100 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000432

				can't really ask you much more if you don't have that information. But if you could just check that that's 100 per cent watertight, that would be appreciated.		
177	2.1: ICCEID	Senator Di Natale	2005 sector-by-sector emissions currently reported in the quarterly accounts	<p>Senator DI NATALE: I'm not sure if I've missed this, but, first up, can the department please take on notice to provide the 2005 sector-by-sector emissions currently reported in the quarterly accounts? That's given that we have now changed the baseline from 2000. I just want to make sure that we get that on the public record to see what we're measuring against. Are you able to do that?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Thank you. I'm interested in talking about the very significant change that occurred in our greenhouse accounts between June 2017 and the next quarterly account in September 2017. There was a very significant shift in that quarter. To what do you attribute that shift?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I'd really have to look at the numbers to see exactly what you're referring to there.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Okay. Perhaps I can just point you to the fact that what we've seen is that all the data to date had shown that pollution was going up. But what we saw in that quarter was that despite the fact our pollution was increasing, we were significantly closer to reaching our emission reduction targets. How do you account for that?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Without being able to look at the precise numbers that you're referring to, I'm not really able to respond to that question.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Well, perhaps, let me be very explicit. Has there been a change in the way that emissions have been calculated between the June 2017 and September 2017 quarters?</p> <p>Mr Archer: We are often refining our methodologies to improve our estimates—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Refining?</p> <p>Mr Archer: of Australia's—</p>	Pages 103 and 104 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000436

				<p>Senator DI NATALE: Is that the word you used? Refining?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes. Refining our methodologies to improve the estimates of Australia's emissions. I don't recall that we made any substantial changes in our approach between those two quarters. When I look at the national inventory totals reported between June and September, they're quite similar numbers. So, again, without being able to look at exactly what you're referring to, I—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: In the June figures it says that we were 9.1 per cent below emissions in 2005. That's under data table 2. Then in the September 2017 figures, it says that we were 12 per cent below emissions in 2005—a very significant drop in our targets, and yet an increase in emissions. I don't understand how that's possible.</p> <p>Mr Archer: I'll have to take that on notice to look exactly at the tables that you're referring to, if you're able to provide that to me today.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: I just don't understand how emissions can go up and we can be significantly closer to meeting our Paris targets.</p> <p>Mr Archer: As I said, I'd have to look at the numbers.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: If you have a look at the graph, if you look at figure 23—</p> <p>Mr Archer: I'm sorry, Senator, which report are you actually referring to?</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: The <i>Quarterly update of Australia's national greenhouse gas inventory: June 2017</i>.</p> <p>Mr Archer: I don't have that in front of me. I've got the most recent report. I don't have the series—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: And then I have the September one, and I'm comparing the two graphs. In the first graph, in the June 2017 quarter, what we saw was a year-on-year increase in emissions, yet in the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>September 2017 report, what we see is a decrease in emissions from 2013 to 2015.</p> <p>CHAIR: Should we provide a copy of that to the witness?</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Yes, I'm happy to. Perhaps that might be an easier way. Are we able to provide that information? Thank you. What I'm getting at is that you say that you're constantly refining, but that looks like more than just refining the way emissions are calculated; it looks like a very significant change.</p> <p>Mr Archer: I would have to go away and have a closer look behind the numbers here. One thing I would need to check, I think, is whether we've switched to reporting on a financial year basis as opposed to reporting for the 12 months to the particular quarter in question.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Isn't it because of the LULUCF changes?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I beg your pardon?</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: I thought it was to do with the LULUCF changes.</p> <p>Mr Archer: The numbers in the tables both include the land sector. So you're suggesting that we've revised it? Just looking at the two tables, my strong inclination is that we're looking at figures that aren't comparable because they're comparing 12 months to different quarters, if you can follow that.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: No, I can't.</p> <p>Mr Archer: For the June 2017 publication, what could be happening is that the annual figures there are the 12 months to June in each year reported, whereas in the other table they're the 12 months to September, which would result in a difference in the figures.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Are you suggesting that it's got nothing to do with the changes to the way that you're accounting and it's simply changing the time period?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I'll take this on notice, but I don't recall</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				that we've made a methodological change that would result in such a significant change in the emissions. I could be mistaken, which is why I want to take that on notice.		
178	2.1: ICCEID	Senator Whish-Wilson	Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT – draft Final Report - Submission	Re: Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the Northern Territory. Did the Commonwealth Government make a submission on the draft Final Report regarding greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from fracking in the NT?	Written	SQ18-000559
179	2.1: ICCEID	Senator Whish-Wilson	Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT – draft Final Report - assessment	Re: Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the Northern Territory. Did the Commonwealth Government assess the draft Final Report regarding GHG emissions?	Written	SQ18-000563
180	2.1: ICCIED	Senator Whish-Wilson	Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT - Final Report – GHG emissions must be fully offset	The NT Government accepted all of the recommendations included in the Final Report, including that GHG emissions must be fully offset. Has the NT Government spoken to the Commonwealth Government about this?	Written	SQ18-000569
181	2.1: ICCIED	Senator Whish-Wilson	Scientific Inquiry into Hydraulic Fracturing in the NT - Final Report – examination re GHG emissions must be fully offset	The NT Government accepted all of the recommendations included in the Final Report, including that GHG emissions must be fully offset. Has the Commonwealth Government examined how this might happen?	Written	SQ18-000571
182	2.2: CCD	Senator Keneally	Work by NCCARF	Senator KENEALLY: Has there been interest from local governments at the frontline of managing climate impacts? Mr Johnston: NCCARF has done a lot of work with local governments over the years. In the context of our discussions through the partnership, I don't believe we've had specific proposals from local governments but NCCARF has done a lot of work with local councils over the year. They continue to work with	Page 111 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000438

				<p>councils with part of the funds that they've been receiving from the Commonwealth.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: I've heard a lot about the discussions that are happening. Is there any evidence of activities that are happening on the ground as a result of all these conversations and all of this research? Are sea walls being built to guard against sea level rise? Are there changes to water management coming in to better guard against drought? Are there changes in heatwave emergency procedures, for example? Are there any examples of concrete work that are happening on the ground that can help actual communities mitigate the risk of climate change?</p> <p>Ms H Wilson: I'm sure there are. Why don't we take that on notice for you. I know there are very tangible examples on the NCCARF website and I'm sure we can collate a whole range of examples for you.</p>		
183	2.2: CCD	Senator Urquhart	CoastAdapt website	<p>Senator URQUHART: Yes, thank you. Can you tell me how many people access the website?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Not off the top of our heads. NCCARF have those numbers. We can get them for you.</p>	Page 111 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000439
184	2.2: CCD	Senator Urquhart	CoastAdapt ongoing costs	<p>Senator URQUHART: It would be great if you could. Can you tell me how much its ongoing costs are?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: That is embedded in the contracts that we signed with them. We'd have to distinguish between the cost of the build versus maintaining. We'll come back to you on that.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I guess ongoing costs would be the maintenance?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Yes, that's right. We will have a look and see if we can pick out that number.</p>	Page 111 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000440
185	2.2: CCD	Senator Urquhart	CoastAdapt staffing numbers	<p>Senator URQUHART: How many staff are responsible for its upkeep?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Again, we would have to talk to Griffith University, because they host it. My understanding is it is in the order of a couple of people, but we will come back to you with an answer.</p>	Page 111 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000441

186	2.2: CCD	Senator Urquhart	CoastAdapt promotion	<p>Senator URQUHART: Is there any promotion that you do for the tool? What, if any, work do you do promoting the tool, the website?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: We certainly, when we deal with other government agencies, talk about CoastAdapt. When, through the partnership, we have discussions with potential funders or people interested in using the services of the partnership, an NCCARF representative comes down and gives a presentation to them on CoastAdapt specifically and on the other things that NCCARF can do.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What about social media? Do you do anything on social media?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Our department? I'd have to check. That comes out of another part. I'd have to look at that. NCCARF does a lot of its own promotion as well.</p>	Page 111 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000442
187	2.2: CCD	Senator Urquhart	CoastAdapt data updates	<p>Senator URQUHART: How often are the datasets and maps updated for the section on sea level rise and future climate information for coastal councils?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: That is a technical level. I don't have that off the top of my head. I'll come back to you on that one.</p>	Page 111 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000443
188	2.2: CCD	Senator Keneally	NCCARF activities or projects	<p>Is there any evidence of activities or projects that are happening as a result of the NCCARF's research and promotion?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For example, have any sea walls been built to guard against sea-level rise? Are there changes to water management in order to better guard against drought? Are there changes in heatwave emergency procedures? Are there any examples of concrete work that are happening on the ground that can help communities mitigate the risk of climate change? 	Written	SQ18-000490
189	2.3: ICCEID	Senator Urquhart	Renewable energy trends	<p>Senator URQUHART: I haven't got a lot in this area, so I will try and move through them as quickly as I can.</p>	Page 112 and 113	SQ18-000444

				<p>There's been a lot made of the falling cost of renewable energy recently. Can you provide an outline on what the trends have been and what you expect to happen in the future with respect to the costs of onshore wind, offshore wind, large-scale solar, small-scale solar, solar thermal and batteries?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: You haven't got a lot of questions, but that's quite a big one!</p> <p>Mr Archer: It's going to be very difficult to get into the specifics of each technology, and I don't have detailed cost information or projections for them in front of me. Certainly that information is available and is often used as assumptions into inputs for modelling of trends in the electricity sector. But clearly the overwhelming trend, pretty much across all of those technologies, has been declining costs over time. Generally, the fall in costs tends to accelerate in the earlier stage of development, and then, as each technology matures, the decline in costs tends to taper off.</p> <p>If we took wind turbine technology, generally what we've seen are improvements in the efficiency of the design of wind turbines but also an increase in size of turbines, so, over time, they've definitely become more efficient. Similarly, with solar PV panels, again, R&D has led to efficiency improvements in the rate at which the sunlight is converted into electricity. More recently, particularly in the Northern Hemisphere, we've seen costs decline in relation to offshore wind farms and offshore wind technologies, and, again, a key part of that has been the deployment of larger turbines over time. In relation to battery technologies, we're probably at an earlier stage in the life cycle of the development of battery technologies, so they tend to be quite expensive at the present time. I guess it's not too bold a prediction to suggest that those costs will come down both as production ramps up, as a simple matter of</p>	<p>Tuesday 22 May</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------	--

				<p>economies of scale, and as a result of improvements in technology as more research is done into them.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: You mentioned declining costs. I suppose in each of those areas it's variable—as you've said, batteries are a bit slower. Do you see the trend continuing down in the future?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Certainly, my general understanding is that we could expect further falls in the costs of those technologies. Again, the rate of falling costs will depend on the maturity of each of those technologies. You can sort of imagine a kind of curve as those costs come down; the declines do tend to level off as the technologies mature. Most of the work that I'm familiar with suggests that we would continue to expect declines across the range of those technologies.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I think you said at the start that you didn't have a lot of detailed information with you, but are you able to provide that to us?</p> <p>Mr Archer: There'd be a lot of information, but certainly we could provide a representative sample of that on notice, I would imagine.</p>		
190	2.3: ICCEID	Senator Urquhart	Renewable energies – new technologies	<p>Senator URQUHART: That'd be great, thank you. Can you give us a quick outline of what you consider to be the most exciting technologies that you're currently working on and what makes them particularly exciting.</p> <p>Mr Archer: I'm not sure my personal views on the extent to which certain technologies are exciting—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Not particularly you, but the department. You might get excited about other things that the department doesn't, but maybe you could give us a departmental sort of overview.</p> <p>Mr Archer: Maybe the way I'd put it is that certainly there are technologies that are more on the frontier in terms of their development and deployment that we're working on. I won't attempt to ascribe any degree of excitement to them. We've heard in earlier sessions about hydrogen technology. Certainly, there does seem</p>	Page 113 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000445

				<p>to be a good prospect that that will have applications both domestically and potentially as an export industry. We're involved in a number of streams of work in relation to research and development on hydrogen, working with both the CSIRO and the Chief Scientist and also working under the banner of the Mission Innovation international initiative, which just this week—I'm not sure if it's happened yet—should be announcing the adoption of a new hydrogen mission innovation challenge, which we've been working on with a number of other countries, which will allow for collaboration at the international level and, hopefully, create further opportunities in relation to our work on hydrogen.</p> <p>There are other technologies that we're involved with. The government in the last budget announced support for a concentrated solar thermal plant in Port Augusta—that's a budget measure from last year's budget—which we're continuing to work on. Leaving aside the specifics of any particular project, concentrating on solar thermal is interesting from the point of view that it is renewable but it also has storage as an inherent component of the project. In that sense, it mitigates some of those concerns around the intermittency of renewables. Those are two examples I would offer.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: If you've got any others tucked away you might want to give them to us on notice—that would be great.</p>		
191	3.1: AAD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Cross department Governance	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. So we've got the Australian Research Council; we've got the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science under 'Jobs and Innovation'; and then we've got the AAD and the department of the environment, which I know had some connections with the gateway funds and the ARC. There are three silos there, in three departments. How are they going to work together? Is that something</p>	Page 113 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000371

				<p>that's going to be dealt with in the new governance model?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: That's the intent.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: How developed is that? When will the stakeholders have some indication of how this is going to work?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: We can't pre-empt a government decision.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: It's being worked on. You're obviously working on it. How close are we to getting some answers on that?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I cannot pre-empt a government announcement on this.</p> <p>Senator Ruston: I'm more than happy to take that on notice for you.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: It's striking that we've got this announcement, we've got the basics of how it's going to be funded—a rough breakdown of the split in funding between the ARC, the SRI and the ASCI—but we're not quite sure how it's going to work. Minister, is it pretty much in place already? I'm wondering if you've put the cart before the horse, so to speak.</p> <p>Senator Ruston: I just said I'd take the matter on notice for you. I'm unaware of the specific details. I certainly wouldn't think we'd put the cart before the horse. We don't usually do such things. But I'll take that on notice and get back to you.</p>		
192	3.1 AAD	Senator Whish-Wilson	Grants structure	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Okay. Minister, you are the government, so you can answer this. When will the community down there know the structure? Will you deliver this before the election?</p> <p>Senator Ruston: I can't; I'll have to take that on notice, I'm just the duty minister sitting in tonight, it's not my portfolio, but I'm more than happy to take it on notice.</p>	Page 114 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000372
193	3.1: AAD	Senator Patrick	Study on Icebreaker operational risks	<p>Senator PATRICK: Maybe on notice could you provide a description of the impact of that decision on</p>	Page 116 Monday	SQ18-000373

				<p>operations. Because clearly you intended to—</p> <p>Mr Bryson: We've done it in the past as well. I did it in 2008-09 from outside the harbour when we had an iceberg in the harbour. It's nothing out of the ordinary for us. We've always had to adapt to those situations in the past.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure, but you identified it as a risk. It was foremost on your mind when you went into the project, and now you find that risk has materialised without being mitigated. From the project's sense, the operator bears the inconvenience or the impact of that.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: We have done a study on that, and I can provide that on notice.</p>	21 May	
194	3.1: AAD	Senator Patrick	Icebreaker operational speed	<p>Senator PATRICK: Another one in relation to cavitation inception speed: you were doing some trials on the propulsion, and obviously CIS has an impact on the speeds at which you can operate the vessel and on sonar systems.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: I can provide that on notice but, as far as I'm aware, it's eight knots.</p>	Page 116 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000374
195	3.1: AAD	Senator Patrick	Equipment contracts for Icebreaker	<p>Senator PATRICK: Finally, you've gone to Kongsberg for most of the remote sensing equipment on board the vessel. Have those contracts being signed? Have you got all the installation negotiations between Damen and Kongsberg sorted out?</p> <p>Mr Bryson: It's a pretty complex arrangement. I might have to take that one on notice. I know that equipment has been purchased and contracts have been signed. But I couldn't give you a definitive answer on what pieces of kit have been bought and what systems.</p>	Page 116 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000375

196	3.1: AAD	Senator Patrick	Icebreaker sound report	<p>Senator PATRICK: You also said you were going to do some analysis of ownership noise and, presumably, flow noise across the vessel in respect of the performance of those sensors. Has that been carried out?</p> <p>Mr Bryson: I believe so. We actually got a sound report last week. I would have to check on that for you. The design phase had all the resilient mountings and everything like that, and all the noise generation from each of the pieces of equipment that were put through a factory acceptance test. That's all been built into what you call the sound book of the ship. That's currently in development. We think we're in a pretty good place at the moment. That was all part of DDR2 and getting that ticked off. I believe we'll have that this week.</p>	Page 116 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000376
197	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	Wind energy produced in 2015-16 and 2016-17	<p>Senator ABETZ: Would you be so kind as to direct it to the appropriate element of the department and then advise as to the amount of wind energy produced in 2015-16 and 2016-17 for South Australia, Queensland and New South Wales? As I understand it, the actual power generated by wind farms decreased in all those three states between those two years. What's the explanation and what is the cost of increasing capacity when the actual yield of energy from these wind turbines is, in fact, decreasing—one assumes because of the weather, the vagaries of the weather, but there may be other reasons as well.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We'll take a look at that, Senator, so far as possible, and indeed look at whether it's regulatory interventions and whether, in fact, it's total quantum versus perhaps generation per turbine, which may also be a variable factor.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: That is why I am not making any assertions; I am asking questions. Because then when we get the answers, hopefully assertions can or cannot be made. Thank you.</p>	Page 38 and 39 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000397
198	4.1: Energy	Senator Di	ESB secondments	<p>Senator DI NATALE: But reports today indicate that</p>	Page 55	SQ18-000384

		Natale		<p>groups like the Business Council of Australia, the Australia Industry Group and, indeed, Origin Energy, have all been approached to be seconded, and to have their salaries paid to write the rules for the energy market.</p> <p>Mr Chisholm: I do know that the ESB is conducting technical working groups with stakeholders.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: No, this is different. This sits outside that.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: As I think Mr Chisholm originally said, on what the ESB is doing, it's probably best to take it up with the ESB.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: In what forum?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: I'm sure that if you asked them to come along they would come along. But we could take that on notice and follow that up.</p>	Tuesday 22 May	
199	4.1: Energy	Senator Di Natale	Conflict of interest policy - ESB	<p>Senator DI NATALE: Who will write this policy, a policy from which they benefit. There's nothing indirect about what I'm saying. I'm being very direct. I'm asking you whether you think that's an appropriate position for the ESB to take and whether you think it's appropriate that somebody from one of the major energy retailers should be employed. We're not talking about consultation—</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: You seem to misunderstand—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Hang on. I'm asking a question. We're not talking about consultation; we're talking about somebody employed within the ESB to write this policy.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: You misunderstand the fact that the NEG places new obligations and responsibilities upon retailers. It's not written for the benefit of retailers. It's written for the benefit of the nation—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Oh, really?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: in meeting the policy obligations and settings of the government and, indeed,</p>	Page 57 and 58 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000385

				<p>of governments across the Federation, and it's made ultimately to put us in a position where we can have the lowest possible energy prices whilst meeting our other obligations. That's what the obligations on the ESB are—to come up with the design principles and settings for that—and the government would expect them to draw upon the most skilled and knowledgeable individuals in terms of the way in which retail contracts are written, to make sure that we have a NEG designed that achieves its policy settings and obligations.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: What conflict of interest policy does the ESB have?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I'll take that on notice, if we are able to source that from them.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Would it be the standard departmental conflict of interest policy?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: The ESB is not a part of the department.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: No, but would they have adopted the same conflict of interest rules as the department?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I have taken it on notice.</p>		
200	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	Emissions target policy – staffing numbers	<p>Senator ABETZ: If I understand the budget papers correctly, there are 1,993 employees in the Department of the Environment and Energy.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: That's our expected ASL cap for the next financial year.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: That is 13 more than the previous year?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: That's 13 more than the estimated actual for this financial year.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Within the portfolio, are you able to tell us how many staff or officials are working on emissions target policy?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I imagine we could. I'd have to take it on notice.</p>	Page 59 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000386
201	4.1: Energy	Senator	Price target for energy	<p>Senator ABETZ: Likewise. Similarly, could you take</p>	Page 59	SQ18-000387

		<p>Abetz</p>	<p>– subset of staff</p>	<p>that on notice for me. Do we have a cohort or a subset of people in the department working on the issue of price for energy and a price target for energy?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: Certainly we have people who would be advising the minister on energy prices. I wouldn't characterise that as working on a price target.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: No. It seems to me that we've got a subset of people working on a specific emissions target and we've got a subset of people working on a reliability target, but what seems to be missing is—</p> <p>Mr Pratt: Can I just clarify: they're working on policy around an emissions guarantee and a reliability guarantee.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: That's right. We've got a reliability guarantee and an emissions guarantee. How about a price guarantee? That is ultimately, I think, what the vast bulk of the Australian people are actually concerned about—price and affordability—and we don't have a special subset in the department for that.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: We certainly have a lot of people working on pricing issues.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Yes, but not a specific subset, and there is no price guarantee that is being worked towards.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: The mission of those two bodies of work is to achieve the lowest price possible whilst dealing with those two issues. That's not the only pricing work that the department has been doing or that is occurring across government. The ACCC has been undertaking a substantial review in relation to retail pricing. As you know and have heard, wholesale prices are some 30-plus per cent lower now than they were 12 months ago, and the government expects that that ought to be reflected in retail pricing. The ACCC's work will be an important input, if we aren't seeing that in retail pricing, into what changes are necessary to make sure those savings are passed on to consumers. That, of</p>	<p>and 60 Tuesday 22 May</p>	
--	--	---------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	--

				<p>course, comes on top of other work, such as the abolition of the limited merits review, the work in relation to gas markets and so on, to also achieve price. So the lowest price possible is an objective not just in those areas but across all of the areas of energy policy.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: I've just consulted with Mr Heferen, and we will detail this on notice, but our judgement is that we have more people working on price than we have on reliability and emissions.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: I'll be very interested to see that when we've got a specific subset working on emissions and on reliability but we don't on price. It's all undoubtedly within the ether within the department, but I will look forward to the imaginative answer.</p>		
202	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	Average retail power bills for households – 2016-17 and anticipated for 2017-18	<p>Senator ABETZ: Yes. Good. Thank you. Do we know what the average retail power bills for households are, state by state?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: Yes. Mr O'Toole can outline them.</p> <p>Mr O'Toole: The average residential electricity bills are recorded by the AEMC in their retail pricing reviews, which are released every year. The last one, unfortunately, was for 2016-17, so we've got only estimates for 2017-18. Would you like the average bill or the average cents per kilowatt?</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Take that on notice. I don't want to delay the committee too long—</p> <p>Mr O'Toole: Happy to provide that.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: by reading that list out. If you could please provide that—what it was for 2016-17 and what it is anticipated to be for 2017-18—that would be very helpful.</p> <p>Mr O'Toole: No problems.</p>	Page 60 and 61 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000388
203	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	The Australian Energy Market Operator – Integrated system plan	<p>Senator ABETZ: What about the grid? Will the grid need to be upgraded?</p> <p>Mr Heferen: The Australian Energy Market Operator was commissioned with doing what's called an integrated system plan—often abbreviated to the ISP—</p>	Page 61 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000389

				<p>and they're publishing that at the end of June. They've gone through extensive consultation with the transmission network providers. The point of that is to say in a future where there may be increasing proportions of intermittent renewable energy, what might be needed for the grid to enhance transmission to ensure security and reliability of supply? Because they're looking into the future, in essence it's genuine forecasting—given the future is unknowable—but they'll do their best guess, or best estimate, of saying, as there's more in large scale solar coming in what does that mean for the optimal transmission lines?</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Tell us what's in the report.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: I'd love to know but I'm not—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: I will have to await an answer for that for when the report is released next month.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: It's scheduled to be in June and, hopefully, it will be on time.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: And on budget. Thank you very much.</p>		
204	4.1: Energy	Senator Keneally	Forecast closure of Liddell – reliability standard under the NEM	<p>Senator KENEALLY: I just wanted to go back to this identified gap the minister has highlighted that could exist if AGL does not commit to the three stages of its plan. In terms of the reliability standard under the NEM—that has not been triggered, has it, as a result of AGL's closure of Liddell?</p> <p>Mr Chisholm: It hasn't closed yet.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Their forecast closure.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: And it isn't scheduled to for another four to five years.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Yes, but the reliability standard goes out 10 years, correct? We discussed this earlier—a 10-year forecast.</p> <p>Mr O'Toole: The reliability standard is basically 0.0002 per cent of delivered energy, so it's done on a year-by-year basis. It's effectively two megawatt hours per 100,000 megawatt hours delivered. Because that</p>	Page 65 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000390

				<p>power hasn't been delivered yet, we won't know if it's breached.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: But there is a 10-year forecast, or a ten-year time line, that the NEM considers in relation to the reliability standard, yes?</p> <p>Mr O'Toole: That they forecast—yes.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Has there been any change to that forecast as a result of the forecast closure of Liddell?</p> <p>Mr O'Toole: We'd have to take that on notice. I'd have to check that.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Thank you.</p>		
205	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	AEMO Reliability and Emergency Reserve Trader	<p>Senator ABETZ: All right. Thank you. On 30 November—and I hope I have the dates right—2017 and 18 January 2018, did AEMO use the Reliability and Emergency Reserve Trader where 14 big industrial users help generate power or cut their usage?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: That is a question for outcome 4, but we'll take that on notice as well.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Thank you. And what was the cost of that exercise on those two days? I believe it may have been \$15 million.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: We'll take that on notice.</p>	Page 114 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000448
206	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	Hornsedale Power Reserve	<p>Senator ABETZ: I have questions in relation to the big battery at the Hornsdale Wind Farm. What is the average wholesale electricity price that the big battery at the Hornsdale Wind Farm dispatches at?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Alright.</p>	Page 114 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000446
207	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	Hornsedale Power Reserve – power output	<p>Senator ABETZ: That's fair enough, and then we can all go home early! How many homes can the big battery at the Hornsdale Wind Farm power, and for how long?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Generally speaking, battery technologies are not providing services that go to the reliability of the electricity supply, which means that there is power when people want to use it. Typically speaking,</p>	Page 114 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000447

				<p>batteries at the present time are deployed across short time frames to ensure the security of electricity supply. The distinction is that things can impact on the electricity grid that affect the voltage of the system. For example, if you have a large source of generation and you have to exit, for whatever reason, batteries are good at coming in very quickly and potentially supplying reasonable amounts of power for a short period of time to allow the grid to continue to operate safely and securely while other technologies, which take more time to come online, can be employed to provide a continuous supply of electricity. The question of how many houses a battery could supply doesn't really go to how they're being deployed at the present time.</p> <p>Mr Pratt: We will attempt to answer your question on notice.</p>		
208	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	NEM rules - coal energy generator vs renewables	<p>Under the National Electricity Market [NEM] rules,</p> <p>Does a coal energy generator need to step aside and allow renewables to sell their power if available, even if the coal generator could deliver at a cheaper price than the renewables?</p>	Written	SQ18-000450
209	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	Energy package - costings	<p>The 2018-19 Budget papers show \$41.5 million for the energy package.</p> <p>a. How much of this on consultants?</p> <p>b. How much will be spent on bureaucrats?</p> <p>c. How much will be spent on lowering power bills for Australians?</p> <p>d. Can you provide a full breakdown of all costs?</p>	Written	SQ18-000451
210	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	Cost of large scale generation certificates paid to wind farms and solar farms	<p>What is the total estimated cost of large scale generation certificates being paid to wind farms and solar farms from 2017-18 up to and including 2029-30 when the subsidies are phased out?</p>	Written	SQ18-000452
211	4.1: Energy	Senator Abetz	Cost of large scale generation certificates	<p>How much is going to foreign owned wind farms and</p>	Written	SQ18-000453

			paid to wind farms and solar farms – foreign owned	solar farms, detailed by company?		
212	4.1: Energy	Senator Stoker	Renewable energy costs verses cost of coal	What capacity of wind farms would need to be built along with Snowy 2.0 in order to produce the same amount of electricity as a modern 1 GW high efficiency, low emissions coal fired generator? What would the combined capital cost be for the wind farms and Snowy 2.0 – including the additional transmission required?	Written	SQ18-000461
213	4.1: Energy	Senator Keneally	The NEM ten year reliability standard forecast	Has there been any change to the NEM's ten year reliability standard forecast with consideration to the predicted closure of the Liddell Power Plant?	Written	SQ18-000491
214	4.1: ESED	Senator Carr	Operations of the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines and the Commonwealth bargaining policy – Snowy Hydro	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I want to deal with that and follow that through for a moment. But, before I do, can I ask Mr Pratt: what is the arrangement in regard to the operation of the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines for a statutory authority?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: That is a matter which would be best directed to the Department of Finance.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I understand that, but what do you understand that to be?</p> <p>Mr Pratt: In fact, I don't know the extent to which the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines apply to a government business enterprise.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Will you take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We have a distinction from a statutory authority.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Okay; that is a fair technical point. Could you take that on notice? Given that, in fact, you are required to have that relationship with the corporation, could you take on notice what you understand to be the operations of the Commonwealth</p>	Page 4 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000391

				<p>Procurement Guidelines and the Commonwealth bargaining policy? Mr Pratt: Yes. Senator KIM CARR: Those two; thank you.</p>		
215	4.1: ESED	Senator Rice	National energy security assessments – liquid fuel assessment	<p>Senator RICE: What are the terms of reference for the inquiry? Mr Sullivan: As the funding for that process is being made available in the budget, we're just kicking that off. In terms of how that will be undertaken and also the process, we've just created an internal project board to help steer that. The first meeting of an interdepartmental committee will happen over the coming weeks. The elements of what will be inside the body of that security assessment will then be worked through in terms of advice to the government and agreeing that. But the funding becomes available from 1 July. Senator RICE: How much funding is specifically on the review for this six-month period? Mr Sullivan: I can give you the 2018-19 total expenditure, which is \$3.8 million, but that will include both the liquid fuel assessment and the first energy security assessment. Senator RICE: What proportion of that is expected to be the liquid fuel assessment? Mr Sullivan: There's some flexibility with that. I'm not trying to obfuscate. That will depend in part—the liquid fuel assessment will set the frame for how the national energy security assessment will be set out as well, so a lot of that is about acquiring data, technical advice, consultancies, undertaking the consultation process, staffing and resourcing. We're currently staffing that up at the moment. In terms of the relative splits, I'll have to take that on notice. We've got some detail on that, but there will be some flexibility as well in terms of how much is spent in the first six months versus how much is spent over the second—</p>	Page 66 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000392

216	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Moore	Benefits of renters sharing solar and batteries – evaluations of projects	<p>Senator MOORE: Mr Frischknecht, I am particularly interested in whether ARENA is working on projects that would assist in providing access to small-scale solar and batteries for renters rather than owner-occupiers. This has been a particularly important issue around discussion across a whole range of areas. Is ARENA working in this space?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Yes, we are. There are a number of projects that we have supported historically. One that was recently announced on solar gardens is a feasibility study with the University of Technology Sydney to look at the feasibility of having either communally-owned or community-leased solar farms that renters or people in apartment buildings that cannot have solar on their roofs can access. There have been other projects that are similar in nature. For example, we did one in Western Australia focused on strata title unit holders—people who are in an apartment building who want to share an asset, whether it is solar or batteries, and how they then allocate the benefits of that and the costs of that.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Are evaluations done when you have done those projects to see exactly how effective they have been?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: I would have to take the details on notice, but the biggest challenge is really regulatory in nature; it is not that somehow the benefits cannot be shared or that it does not work. Technically, there are no issues with either of those aspects.</p>	Page 31 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000393
217	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Moore	University of Technology Sydney feasibility study - timeframe	<p>Senator MOORE: With the project with the university in Sydney, what is the time frame for that? You can take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: I cannot tell you off the top of my head; I am sorry.</p>	Page 31 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000394
218	Australian Renewable Energy	Senator Moore	Benefits of renters sharing solar and batteries –regulatory	<p>Senator MOORE: When you said the main barriers are regulatory, what exactly does that mean? There is a lot of interest in having this kind of project. If you have</p>	Page 32 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000395

	<p>Agency (ARENA)</p>		<p>barriers</p>	<p>identified that this is the major problem, can we find out exactly how that works? Mr Frischknecht: Yes. I can give you a bit of a— Senator MOORE: That would be very useful. Mr Frischknecht: Would you like something on notice or an overview now? Senator MOORE: A little bit now and, if you have more on notice, that would be good. There is a lot of discussion amongst the housing groups and community groups about this issue. If we know about the main problems you have identified already in the projects you have worked on, that would be handy. Mr Frischknecht: Yes, absolutely. One issue is around the retailer of last resort. If somehow the energy system were not to work or if the consumer were unable to pay their bills, what happens, given that electricity is an essential service? Let us say the issue was that the solar no longer worked and it was supplied by a third party; who carries the burden of making sure those vulnerable consumers are still supplied, and who carries the risk from a credit perspective for them not paying, now that they suddenly have an additional burden to bear, if you like? That is one issue. Another one is how you use the networks. There are rules around not being able to string your own electricity wire across property boundaries. Senator MOORE: Good rules. Mr Frischknecht: Yes, there are probably some good reasons for that. In some cases there are very good reasons, and in other cases, where you have two rural properties and neighbours might want to share energy, common sense does not prevail in that case. You can't actually cross the boundary. Let's say you are in a city type location, and you have built a community solar farm outside the city. You have to make use of the network. There are rules around how you do that. A retailer has to be involved, in order to end up having to</p>		
--	------------------------------	--	------------------------	--	--	--

				<p>use the network and have a consumer buy the energy in the end. You cannot just directly participate with a solar farm, for example. And there is the cost of the network, of course, which is very substantial and it is fixed. Even if you are only moving energy a few blocks, you still have to pay transmission charges as if you were moving it across the state, and that obviously increases the cost. That gives you a bit of a flavour for some of the issues.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Can we get some more on notice on that in detail? That would be very useful, because I think there is interest.</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Yes. We are keen to do more work in this area, and we are open for applications.</p>		
219	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Patrick	Review of the paper released by the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies – ‘A lithium industry in Australia’	<p>Senator PATRICK: Lithium can become a dispatchable component from a NEG perspective to any renewable product. Are you aware of a paper released by the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies called 'A lithium industry in Australia'?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: I am not aware of it.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: It suggests that as lithium is a disruptive technology and something we have lots of, particularly in Western Australia, rather than just shipping it offshore—as we typically do with most rocks—and then having the value-add product come in, we could work in all of the five stages rather than just the first stage, which might involve electro-chemical processing. It might involve the development of cathodes and anodes and such things and the construction or production of lithium batteries. Is it within the scope of your organisation to assist in some of those processing stages—you might have to take it on notice, but as a general principle?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: I can certainly tell you that as part of trying to make variable output renewables, like solar PV and wind, reliable in the network, lithium ion batteries are a key enabler, so it is one of the primary</p>	Page 34 and 35 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000396

				<p>forms of storage that we see rolling out in high volume in the network. In the context of lithium being an enabler or key component of batteries it is within our mandate; certainly batteries are within our mandate. How far we go down the supply chain is an open question, but there is no reason why we would not at least consider that. Certainly our sister organisation, the Clean Energy Finance Corporation, has already provided some funding. I believe it is a lithium mine or a lithium processor. You can ask them this afternoon.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I may ask them, but has ARENA done anything in the lithium space?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: We have supported batteries, but not further down the supply chain. We have not supported, nor have we been approached by, a processor or a mine or anything like that. But it is one of our priorities to help energy upgrade exports. So rather than exporting rocks we might export metals, for example, which is related to what you are talking about.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Fantastic. Can I ask you then, perhaps on notice—I will get the name of the paper to you—to have a cursory review of it and come back and suggest to the committee where you think it would be most appropriate that ARENA could become involved from the perspective of your remit. Is that possible?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Absolutely; happy to do so.</p>		
220	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Keneally	Pumped storage versus batteries versus solar thermal – comparison work	<p>Senator KENEALLY: Apologies if I am not being clear. In those comparisons, what I am trying to understand: was there any modelling or consideration of Snowy Hydro and then comparing doing Snowy Hydro as opposed to doing other types of renewable energy—gas, batteries?</p> <p>Mr Kay: No.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: It was not a comparison of that type?</p> <p>Mr Kay: It assumed Snowy taking place with, then,</p>	Page 39 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000398

				<p>the withdrawal of existing generation capacity and being replaced in the modelling by the least cost, and then the implication of Snowy 2.0 in that. Those were the two scenarios.</p> <p>Carbon Credits and Tasmanian Forests</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Senator, if I could be so bold as to ask if you are trying to get at a cost comparison between different forms of flexible capacity?</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: No. I was trying to understand if there was any consideration given to Snowy 2.0 versus, say, for example, a large distributed network of smaller, pumped hydro systems across the country?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Because we have done that sort of work, not with Snowy 2.0 specifically but more generically pumped storage versus batteries versus solar thermal, it is a comparison of various forms of flexible capacity.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: You did that work. When did you do that work?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: I am trying to think if it has been released, but the work has largely been done—very recently. So it would have been roughly contemporaneous with the Snowy 2.0 study. And I do not know the answer whether it is public at this point. But if not, it will be soon.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Can we put on notice when that work was done and when it will be released?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Yes, absolutely.</p>		
221	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Whish - Wilson	Waste to Energy - Forms of solids	What forms of solid waste-to-energy are within ARENA's mandate (e.g. methane capture, pyrolysis, liquefaction, incineration)?	Written	SQ18-000533
222	Australian Renewable Energy Agency	Senator Whish - Wilson	Greenhouse gas abatements benefits	What are the greenhouse gas (GHG) abatement benefits of incinerators (combustion of solid waste to drive a turbine)? Are incinerators considered renewable energy?	Written	SQ18-000534

	(ARENA)			Have you advised the Minister on how a proposal for an incinerator would fit within your mandate?		
223	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Whish - Wilson	Waste to Energy - Calculations from waste to energy facilities	When calculating any GHG abatement from waste-to-energy facilities, would the ARENA take into account alternative destinations for these waste streams, particularly recycling and landfill? In other words: would the ARENA model the GHG abatement 'opportunity cost' of diverting solid waste from recycling or landfill to waste-to-energy?	Written	SQ18-000536
224	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Whish - Wilson	Waste diverted into energy	How would the ARENA account for waste diverted to waste-to-energy that was otherwise destined for recycling? In particular: would the ARENA take into account the offset of extraction and production of virgin materials that would have occurred if that material was recycled; and would the ARENA consider that the calorific value of this waste was effectively 'sequestered' if it was not burnt?	Written	SQ18-000541
225	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Whish - Wilson	Accountability for waste diversion	How would the ARENA account for waste diverted to waste-to-energy that was otherwise destined for landfill? In particular: would the ARENA consider that the calorific value of this waste was effectively 'sequestered' if it was not burnt?	Written	SQ18-000538
226	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Senator Whish - Wilson	Support for an Incinerator	Has the ARENA been approached to support an incinerator? If yes: what proposal(s) has the ARENA been approached about?	Written	SQ18-000540
227	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Moore	BoM Social Media	Senator MOORE: On notice—because it's just one of those questions—could you tell me the resources within the bureau that are focused on this form of communication. We talked about that a couple of estimates ago in terms of the app development and now maintaining it. The other thing is that it's got to be up to date at every moment, because your audience is quite demanding and critical.	Page 51 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000399

				<p>Dr Johnson: Indeed they are. I get a lot of customer feedback.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: So I just put that on notice.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Yes, sure. We're happy to take that.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Thank you very much.</p>		
228	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Patrick	Ceilometers	<p>Senator PATRICK: I have a couple of questions. One might require me, for the benefit of the witnesses, to table something that I can refer to. It's from the report that you supplied in response to a question on notice about the Pel-Air incident. You will recall that at the last estimates there was something—it's really just the one page. It's talking about estimation of cloud bases at the time of the Pel-Air accident, and it talks about the use of a ceilometer. It goes on to say: The ceilometer will function normally in light precipitation, shallow fog—</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Sorry, Senator. Can I just get clarification: are you reading from what you've just distributed?</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Yes, I am.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Could you just point us to the paragraph.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Yes, the second last paragraph. The second sentence says: The ceilometer will function normally in light precipitation, shallow fog and blowing dust or snow. However as these weather phenomena increase in intensity, a point will be reached where the ceilometer can no longer unambiguously identify the cloud base.</p> <p>The way I read that as a layman is that, when the weather's good, the reporting is good, but, when the weather's poor, the reliability of the sensor fails. Of course, you'd understand the significance of poor weather on any flight that were to go to an area relying on such a sensor. It says the fallback to that seems to be to use manual observers, but my understanding is that there has been a decrease in the number of manual observers at a number of sites around Australia. Are</p>	Pages 51 and 52 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000400

				<p>you able to tell me: has the situation changed now with that particular sensor? Have we advanced further as time has marched on, or are we still in the same situation?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: That's a really specific question. I'd want to make sure I give you an absolutely accurate answer, so I'll take it on notice if that's all right.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure. Related to that, I presume the airport operator pays for an observer?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: No, not to my knowledge.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Airservices?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: No.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Or BOM?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: No. As you said, we have an extensive observation network. Many of our stations are fully automated. A number of our stations have both automated and manual observers and some have manual observers on their own. Again, depending on that particular station, I'd need to take that specifically on notice if that's all right.</p>		
229	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Increase in funds paid to consultants	<p>Why has there been a 10-fold increase in funds paid to consultants in 2017 compared to previous years (i.e. the Annual Report 2016/17 indicates on p 124 that \$5.5 million was paid for consultants in 2017. This compares to an amount of less than \$0.5 million paid in each of the years 2014 to 2016)? In answering, please provide a breakdown of who was paid by the Bureau for consulting services in 2016 and in 2017, the amount they were paid, and the nature of the consulting work they were paid to do.</p>	Written	SQ18-000492
230	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Contractors expenditure	<p>Why has there been an \$8 million dollar increase (i.e. p 124 Annual Report 2016/17) in funds paid to contractors in 2017 compared to the years 2014 to 2016? In answering, please provide a breakdown of which contractors were paid by the Bureau in 2016 and in 2017, the amount they were paid, and the nature of the work they were paid to do.</p>	Written	SQ18-000493

231	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Consulting services expenditure	The Annual Report 2016/17 (p 108) declares an expenditure of approximately \$935,000 on 4 new and 2 ongoing consultant contracts in 2016/17. Please detail who was paid by the Bureau for the consulting services identified on p 108 and the nature of the consulting work they were paid to do.	Written	SQ18-000494
232	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Consultant contracts expenditure	Did the Bureau enter into new consultancy contracts worth about \$4.6 million in the second half of 2017? Please explain the discrepancy between consultant expenses detailed on the financial statement (p 124) and the consultancy contracts that have been declared on p 108 of the Annual Report 2016/17.	Written	SQ18-000495
233	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Bureau Female employer breakdown	Of the Bureau employees who are not classified as Administrative Service Officers, what percentage are female?	Written	SQ18-000496
234	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Gender pay gap	What is the gender pay gap in the Bureau? In answering, please detail how the gender pay gap has been calculated.	Written	SQ18-000497
235	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Bureau accident rate comparison	In the 2016/17 annual report the Bureau identifies an accident rate of 24 per 100 vehicles 2016/17 compared to an accident rate of 6 per 100 vehicles in 2015/16. What is the total number of accidents that these rates refer to that occurred in 2016/17 and what is the total number that occurred in 2015/16? What was the classification of the Bureau staff involved in the accidents?	Written	SQ18-000498
236	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Active injury claims under the Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988	How many Bureau employees in total have active injury claims under the Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988?	Written	SQ18-000499
237	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Griff	Long term injured employees	How many long-term injured employees have been placed in work trials with other agencies to assist in rehabilitation?	Written	SQ18-000500
238	Bureau of Meteorology	Senator Griff	Bureau employees early return to work	Please provide the statistics that support the claim (p 99 Annual Report 2016/17) that the Bureau has been able	Written	SQ18-000501

	(BoM)		outcomes	to “achieve early return to work outcomes”.		
239	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Patrick	Review of the paper released by the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies - Lithium	<p>Senator PATRICK: That leads into where I am going with this. Lithium is obviously a great partner to some renewable projects in the context of providing dispatchability—and you were talking to Senator Storer about that previously. It is a disruptive technology. We are finding lithium being used everywhere from submarine batteries to iPads and even power banks. We have seen Tesla selling batteries into South Australia. This paper divides the lithium cycle up into five different stages: harvesting, mining, refining, electrochemical processing, producing cells and assembling batteries. I have a problem with the idea that we seem to dig up rocks and send them overseas to have value added. The committee has a copy of this report. Across each of the five stages, how would a project fit in respect of compliance for funding by your organisation? You suggested that battery assembly wouldn't be a problem. But I wonder whether any electrochemical processing that gets us from lithium hard rock through to batteries would in some way qualify.</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: I am happy to provide you with a more complete answer. Under the act, we are able to invest in renewable energy, energy efficiency and low-emissions technologies. The supply chain around renewable energy is also a complying investment for us. Investing at the early stage of a lithium mine is complying, and financing people with batteries and electric vehicles also is. All the way through that supply chain, I would expect us to be able to play a role. If we saw an opportunity to use our capital, in debt or equity, where we could catalyse some investment on a project here in Australia and drive the uptake of batteries or electric vehicles, at first blush I would see that as complying. But I'm happy to take it on notice and give you a more precise answer because I</p>	Page 42 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000401

				<p>don't quite know the five stages of the document that you are referring to.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Obviously there are people driving this thing, and I think it is quite a significant idea that we could take advantage of. What I am really interested in is where there could be help along each stage so that information is readily available to people who might want to participate in that area.</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: And we would be very supportive of that.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: I would love to put the batteries that flow from that into the electric vehicles that Senator Storer is talking about.</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: Absolutely. We are very supportive of all of that.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Thank you. The committee will provide you with the document that details the five stages, and I would be very grateful for a more detailed answer.</p>		
240	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Non-organic waste to energy	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: My questions are around the waste crisis that we have in the country at the moment. There has been some talk about waste-to-energy projects and the Clean Energy Finance Corporation potentially financing some waste-to-energy projects. I have read through your mandate and I'm aware, when we talk about organic waste, that there is capacity there for CEFC to look at financing this kind of project. But my questions relate directly to non-organic waste—that is, residential, municipal, commercial and industrial material, such as plastic, cardboard, paper and that kind of thing. How would a proposal for a municipal incinerator fit within your remit as it stands now?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: You're talking about non-organic waste?</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: We are looking at a number of waste-</p>	Page 46 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000402

				<p>to-energy projects—in that case, organic.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I've had a look at those, yes.</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: We'd once again have to demonstrate that it was a low-emission technology. That would be something that we would have to look at. Our focus to date has been much more on organic waste and energy than the sorts of products that you're talking.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Has there been any proposal put to the CEFC at various stages for a—</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: Nonorganic? Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Never that you are aware of?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: I speak with only 12 months experience.</p> <p>Mr Powell: Not that we're aware of, but I'm happy to take that on notice and respond.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you could check on that that would be appreciated.</p>		
241	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Waste-to-energy – letter from the minister	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: The reason I raise this issue is that the federal environment minister and the state environment ministers met just a few weeks ago to look at solutions to the waste crisis around the country. I understand the Prime Minister came back from Germany, public statements were made and he was excited about waste-to-energy opportunities. I also believe that the environment minister made a statement that this is the kind of thing the CEFC could look at. But you haven't actually had any formal approaches from the minister?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: No. We did receive a letter from the minister to our chair, encouraging us to work with ARENA and look at what we could do in this sector. I was referring to your more specific request about the incineration point. The minister wrote to us and encouraged us to look at that, and we responded by updating him, and we've been working with the</p>	Page 46 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000403

				<p>department about the various waste-to-energy projects that we've looked at in the past. We are absolutely open to looking at those projects, if they're compliant.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Are you able to provide me with a copy of that letter?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: Yes. We'll take that on notice and provide it to you.</p>		
242	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Incineration of non-organic waste – communication with proponents	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I understand there's a process you have to go through to get financing for the CEFC—the different funding streams—but you haven't even had informal chats or discussions with potential proponents for incineration of non-organic waste? No-one's approached you or picked up the phone?</p> <p>Mr Learmonth: I don't believe so, but we'll take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That would be great. Thank you.</p>	Page 47 Tuesday 22 May	SQ18-000404
243	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Waste-to-energy – forms eligible	<p>What forms of solid waste-to-energy are within the CEFC's investment mandate and would be conceivably eligible for funding (e.g. methane capture, pyrolysis, liquefaction, incineration)?</p>	Written	SQ18-000542
244	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Waste-to-energy - greenhouse gas (GHG) abatement benefits of incinerators	<p>What are the greenhouse gas (GHG) abatement benefits of incinerators (combustion of solid waste to drive a turbine)? Are incinerators 'clean energy'?</p> <p>Have you advised the Minister on how a proposal for an incinerator would fit within your mandate?</p>	Written	SQ18-000544
245	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Waste-to-energy – alternative destinations for waste streams	<p>When calculating any GHG abatement from waste-to-energy facilities, would the CEFC take into account alternative destinations for these waste streams, particularly recycling and landfill? In other words: would the CEFC model the GHG abatement 'opportunity cost' of diverting solid waste from recycling or landfill to waste-to-energy?</p>	Written	SQ18-000545
246	Clean	Senator	Waste-to-energy –	<p>How would the CEFC account for waste diverted to</p>	Written	SQ18-000547

	Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Whish-Wilson	waste destined for recycling	waste-to-energy that was otherwise destined for recycling? In particular: would the CEFC take into account the offset of extraction and production of virgin materials that would have occurred if that material was recycled; and would the CEFC consider that the calorific value of this waste was effectively 'sequestered' if it was not burnt?		
247	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Waste-to-energy – waste destined for landfill	How would the CEFC account for waste diverted to waste-to-energy that was otherwise destined for landfill? In particular: would the CEFC consider that the calorific value of this waste was effectively 'sequestered' if it was not burnt?	Written	SQ18-000549
248	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Waste-to-energy – incinerator	Has the CEFC been approached to fund an incinerator? If yes: what proposal(s) has the CEFC been approached about?	Written	SQ18-000550
249	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Senator Abetz	Improper creation of small-scale technology certificates in QLD and NSW	<p>On 30 April 2018 the Clean Energy Regulator released a statement stating that it has undertaken compliance activities for the improper creation of small-scale technology certificates in Queensland and NSW^[1]. This includes responding to suspected installations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Of unapproved panels</i> - <i>Of systems that have not been installed</i> - <i>Where accredited installer details have been misused.</i> <p>a. Was any fraud found? If so, please provide information including the manufacturer, installer and location of the fraud.</p> <p>b. Have penalties applied for this improper activity? If so, how much and to whom?</p> <p>c. What intelligence was received that fraudulent activity was occurring?</p> <p>Please provide all levels of enforcement involved in the operation.</p>	Written	SQ18-000454

250	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Managed Regrowth and Human Induced Regeneration methodologies - ERF	How much of the existing emissions reduction fund (ERF) portfolio do these two methodologies make up?	Written	SQ18-000606
251	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Managed Regrowth and Human Induced Regeneration methodologies - ACCUs	How many Australian carbon credit units (ACCUs) have been issued and contracted to these two methodologies? What is the value of these ACCUs?	Written	SQ18-000607
252	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Managed Regrowth and Human Induced Regeneration methodologies – Full audit	Has the CER undertaken a full audit of projects that have been issued ACCUs under these methodologies to verify that the abatement claimed has actually occurred?	Written	SQ18-000608
253	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Managed Regrowth and Human Induced Regeneration methodologies – Issuing ACCUs	Has the CER stopped issuing ACCUs to projects under these methodologies?	Written	SQ18-000609
254	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Managed Regrowth and Human Induced Regeneration methodologies – upcoming ERF auction	Will the CER accept applications from projects using these methodologies in the upcoming ERF auction on 6 June 2018?	Written	SQ18-000610
255	Climate Change Authority (CCA)	Senator Leyonhjelm	Submissions – Review of the National Wind Farm Commissioner	Senator LEYONHJELM: Yes, that's what I assumed. As far as I can tell there are no negative submissions—and I'm not necessarily endorsing the negative submissions—and I just want to know why no negative submissions have been published, which is the information I have? If you could take on notice the explanation for that. There may be a perfectly innocent one, but not everybody believes that, so, in the interest of transparency, I'd like to know what it is.	Page 65 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000449
256	Director of National Parks	Senator Siewert	Kakadu Buffalo Farm – Scope of Service	Senator SIEWERT: The letter talks about scope of service, in the second sentence. It talks about the scope of this service 'was outlined through the park manager	Page 27 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000333

				<p>on 21 November 2017'. Is that written down anywhere? What is that scope of service and is it written down anywhere?</p> <p>Dr West: We would probably need to take that on notice since there is a different park manager since that time. And we have not seen any of those notes, if there were notes taken.</p>		
257	Director of National Parks	Senator Siewert	Kakadu Buffalo Farm – Consultation with Traditional Owners	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Thank you for that additional information. In terms of the process we discussed last time, the board was going to be meeting, you were going to be carrying out some consultation, can you update us, please, on what consultation has been undertaken with the traditional owners since the previous board meeting?</p> <p>Dr West: The consultation has partly been taken with the Northern Land Council who obviously work closely with us and with the traditional owners, which is whom we are considering here. I am not quite sure how much actual consultation has taken place since the last board meeting.</p> <p>Mr Gibbs: We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator SIEWERT: You have pre-empted my question. That would be great if you could take it on notice, because we had a bit of discussion last time around how that was going to occur beyond the meeting itself. That would be appreciated. In terms of the ongoing work, in terms of the application, does that include looking at protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage in the area?</p> <p>Dr West: We have not stipulated but we would anticipate that was obviously going to be part of what we do anyway. It is sitting within the park; so obviously cultural heritage would be part of what we maintain all the time.</p>	Page 28 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000332
258	Director of National Parks	Senator Siewert	Kakadu Buffalo Farm – Cultural Heritage Surveys	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Have you done any surveys of the area to have an understanding of what cultural heritage sites currently in the area are covered?</p>	Page 28 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000331

				<p>Dr West: In the buffalo farm area? Senator SIEWERT: Yes. Dr West: I do not know that answer. Mr Cahill: We will take that on notice.</p>		
259	Director of National Parks	Senator Siewert	Kakadu Buffalo Farm – Risk Assessments	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Yes, to assure you that if you agree to his operation and application there are undertakings given. Do you also do a financial risk assessment to ensure that the operation can meet the agreements and commitments that are made from management? Mr Cahill: My understanding is that the assessment is done at an outcome level. So what it is looking at is the conditions of the permit in terms of how many buffalo or take or whatever it is, whether or not the applicant has the capacity to be able to deliver or meet those conditions. That would be a key consideration. Senator SIEWERT: I would take it that means financial capacity? Mr Cahill: That would be whether he can operate sustainably or whether or not there is a condition, if that is the case, it is not to be that there is a trigger to revoke that permit. Senator SIEWERT: And what are the trigger mechanisms? And then is what is the trigger? Mr Cahill: We will take that on notice. Senator SIEWERT: Take that on notice.</p>	Page 28 and 29 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000330
260	Director of National Parks	Senator Siewert	Kakadu Buffalo Farm – Environmental Impact Statements	<p>Senator SIEWERT: Does part of the assessment involve an environmental impact statement? This is my last question, Chair. Mr Cahill: I will have to take that on notice. Again, the level of assessment and rigour will depend on what is the risk associated with operating the farm. Senator SIEWERT: If you could take on notice.</p>	Page 29 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000329
261	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	National Marine Parks - Zones	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That is correct, just for anyone who might be listening. Can you tell me in relation to the 2012 plan under the Gillard government how much extra blue zone has been added and has</p>	Page 30 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000327

				<p>there been any blue zone added where there were previously green zones?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Just to follow the line of questioning, is the question one that relates to what proportion of the 2012 plans permitted oil and gas activities?</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Yes. Too many, in my opinion, but I am interested in how it has changed.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: It was 31 per cent in the 2012 plans, and it is 27 per cent in the 2018 plans.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: So the overall area has decreased then, you are saying?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Correct.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: For blue.</p> <p>Mr Mundy: For oil and gas activity in the blue zones as would have been the case under the 2012 plans.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: And in that decrease, or in the change per se, are there any areas that were under the 2012 plans green zones or yellow zones that now allow access to oil and gas?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: There will certainly be some previously yellow zones which are now blue.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you take it on notice to tell me what they are?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: And where they are exactly?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: Yes.</p>		
262	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	NOPSEMA Consultations	<p>Mr Mundy: Under the new plans, the rules that NOPSEMA has, which instruct applicants on how to consult, have now included the Director of National Parks as a relevant person for the purposes of consultation. So it will be a requirement for proponents of oil and gas activities that they consult with the Director of National Parks and provide those comments and responses to them in their environmental permit application to NOPSEMA to be considered as part of that process.</p>	Page 30 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000325

				<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That is what you provided to me on notice, from my questions at the last estimates. In relation to your response then and on notice, have there been any new consultations occurring between NOPSEMA and the Director of National Parks?</p> <p>Mr Mundy: On the specific—</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: On any specific, on any new—</p> <p>Mr Mundy: I do not have a record of any consultations that have occurred between the director and NOPSEMA, but I can take it on notice to confirm that that is the case.</p>		
263	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Australian Alps National Parks MOU update	Can the Department provide an update on the Australian Alps National Parks MOU?	Written	SQ18-000587
264	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Australian Alp National Parks MOU activities	What activities have been undertaken under this MOU over the last 5 years?	Written	SQ18-000588
265	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Australian Alp National Parks MOU meeting minutes	Can the Department table any minutes from meetings over the last 5 years?	Written	SQ18-000589
266	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Australian Alp biodiversity and threatened species projects	What biodiversity or threatened species projects has the Australian government funded within the Australian Alps over the last five years?	Written	SQ18-000590
267	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Australian Alp National Parks MOU resigning	When is the MOU expected to be re-signed?	Written	SQ18-000591
268	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Australian Alp National Parks MOU NSW Government Bill	Has the NSW Government's Kosciuszko Wild Horse Heritage Bill been raised in this forum?	Written	SQ18-000592
269	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Feral vertebrate pests in National Reserves – Animal welfare	Can the Department provide any documentation on the animal welfare assessments, policies or procedures for ground or aerial shooting of vertebrate pests within Commonwealth National Parks? What firearms are	Written	SQ18-000593

			assessments	used?		
270	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Feral vertebrate pests in National Reserves	Can the Department list the number and type of feral vertebrate pests killed for each year and each reserve and the method used?	Written	SQ18-000594
271	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Feral horse control	Can the Department outline all projects that have received federal funding for feral horse control (either via the national Landcare program or within Commonwealth National Parks)?	Written	SQ18-000595
272	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Threat abatement plans or threatened species recovery - Projects	In relation to the Commonwealth-managed terrestrial national parks (including Kakadu) can the Department list all projects involving threat abatement or threatened species recovery carried out over the last 5 years?	Written	SQ18-000596
273	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Threat abatement plans or threatened species recovery – year by year field activities	Can the Department list the staff numbers by reserve year on year dedicated to field related activities?	Written	SQ18-000597
274	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Threat abatement plans or threatened species recovery; Kakadu – Small mammal populations monitoring	Can the Department table all information in regards to small mammal population monitoring carried out in Kakadu over the last five years?	Written	SQ18-000598
275	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Threat abatement plans or threatened species recovery; Kakadu – small mammal population recovery efforts	What efforts are being made to recover these small mammal populations that have declined in recent decades?	Written	SQ18-000599
276	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Threat abatement plans or threatened species recovery; Kakadu – Fire management	How has the fire management for Kakadu changed over recent years?	Written	SQ18-000600
277	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Commonwealth Marine Reserves – allocated resources	What resources have been allocated for the management of the new Commonwealth Marine Reserves (people, funding, plant and equipment vessels)?	Written	SQ18-000601
278	Director of	Senator	Commonwealth Marine	In the existing Commonwealth Marine Reserves, can	Written	SQ18-000602

	National Parks	Whish-Wilson	Reserves – compliance activities	the Department provide information on the compliance activities carried out in these zones including listing all patrols, warnings issued, and penalties and charges given?		
279	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Commonwealth Marine Reserves – cooperative arrangements	Has the Department established cooperative arrangements for compliance activities with other agencies for the new commonwealth marine reserves?	Written	SQ18-000603
280	Director of National Parks	Senator Whish-Wilson	Commonwealth Marine Reserves – mineral exploration	Is there any difference between the application process for mineral exploration and development for the existing commonwealth marine reserves compared to the new commonwealth marine reserves?	Written	SQ18-000604
281	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Urquhart	Olive Vale clearing proposal	Senator URQUHART: What about Olive Vale? Have you been asked to comment on the Olive Vale clearing proposal? Dr Banks: I am not aware. I would have to take that on notice. Senator URQUHART: Dr Reichelt, do you know? Dr Reichelt: I am not aware.	Page 44 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000323
282	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Senator Urquhart	Wombinoo clearing proposal	Senator URQUHART: What about Wombinoo? Dr Banks: That would be a matter for the department under 1.5 as well. Senator URQUHART: Have you been asked as the department— Dr Banks: I am not aware. I would have to take that on notice, Senator. Senator URQUHART: You haven't been or you don't know? Dr Banks: I don't know. I'd have to take that on notice. Senator URQUHART: Dr Reichelt, do you know? Dr Reichelt: No, I am sorry; I don't know.	Page 44 Monday 21 May	SQ18-000460
283	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Carr	Relevant experts – scientific evaluation of spoil from tunnel	Senator KIM CARR: And where's that spoil going to go? Mr Broad: Primarily in Talbingo. Senator KIM CARR: You've settled on that? Mr Broad: That's our proposal. We've got to test that	Page 8 Tuesday 22 May	

				<p>through the EIS process.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What's the scientific evaluation that you're using to demonstrate the validity of that process?</p> <p>Mr Broad: We have the relevant experts, including the CSIRO, going through that scientific work now.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Who are the relevant experts, apart from CSIRO?</p> <p>Mr Broad: I'll have to take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: If you wouldn't mind.</p>		
284	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Di Natale	Level of renewables modelled to achieve 26 – 28 per cent reduction	<p>Senator DI NATALE: The Snowy 2.0 business case has an internal rate of return of about eight per cent; is that right?</p> <p>Mr Broad: Yes.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: What assumptions have been made about the level of renewables that will allow you to reach that eight per cent return?</p> <p>Mr Broad: It's not renewables per se. What we've done in the modelling, the MJA report, is that we've taken the commitments of the federal government and the various state governments as a given, and modelled 2.0 against them.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: What commitments are they?</p> <p>Mr Broad: The commitments in Paris, the state based regulatory outcomes. We've put those into—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Hang on; let's go through them. When you say 'commitments in Paris', are you talking about the—</p> <p>Mr Broad: The 28 per cent.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: The 26 to 28 per cent reduction?</p> <p>Mr Broad: Yes. Then, by 2060, the MJA model looked at the Victorian model, which I think had renewables going up to 40-odd or something. I can't remember offhand; I'll get you those details.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: I think that's important. You've</p>	Page 11 and 12 Tuesday 22 May	

				<p>modelled it based on the Paris targets, but that doesn't tell us what the mix is going to look like.</p> <p>Mr Broad: We're not into determining the mix. We're just a business saying that with that level of renewables we'll need that much storage, and we model.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Hang on; slow down. That level of renewables?</p> <p>Mr Broad: Can get a 28 per cent—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: What is that level of renewables?</p> <p>Mr Broad: With that level of renewables, if you put 28 per cent on the investment we see coming forward—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: I'm asking you: what is the level of renewables? That was the original question.</p> <p>Mr Broad: As I said I'll come back to you on that. I refer you to the MJA report. It's all in there, but I'll get you the details and send them to you.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: What I am asking is for you to be able to tell us about what the levels of renewables will be—not the Paris targets, but the levels of renewables that you've modelled, to achieve that 26 per cent to 28 per cent reduction. It looks like you might have that.</p> <p>Mr Broad: No, we don't have it available. I'll take it on notice and send it to you. You might want to read the MJA report. It's a very good report.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: No, I'm asking you a question. If you can provide me—</p> <p>Mr Broad: I'll take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Yes, provide to me on notice what level of renewables that you've modelled would achieve those Paris targets.</p>		
285	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Di Natale	Modelling based on the NEG	<p>Senator DI NATALE: But under the NEG we're talking about a 26 per cent target, which is lower than the Victorian target.</p> <p>Mr Broad: We modelled it on the basis of what the</p>	Page 12 Tuesday 22 May	

				<p>states had in place today.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: But that's lower than the national target.</p> <p>Mr Broad: Again I'll get you the details of all of that.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: But this is really critical here, because if your business case is based on emission reductions and the level of mix from state-based schemes which are higher than what is being proposed under the NEG, which is 26 per cent, then your business case is going to be fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>Mr Broad: Just to be clear, Senator, this business case tops out in 2030. Post 2030—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: But we've got—</p> <p>Mr Broad: Post 2030, it tops out. For us, for this 2.0, it doesn't have material impact post 2030 in the business case. In the business case, the eight per cent tops out in 2030. AEMO's projecting, I think, that in 2032 Eraring is going to be retired.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: But the NEG tops out at 2030 with a target of 26 per cent.</p> <p>Mr Broad: In our original modelling, of the MJA—</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Which wasn't based on the NEG?</p> <p>Mr Broad: We didn't have the NEG at that stage. When you put the NEG on top, the economics still stack up.</p> <p>Senator DI NATALE: Hang on. How do you know that?</p> <p>Mr Broad: I am happy to provide those details to you.</p>		
286	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Keneally	Snowy 2.0 – renewable share in 2030	<p>Senator KENEALLY: If I can go back to my question about the renewable energy share in 2030. I asked, according to the modelling in your feasibility study, what was the renewable share in 2030 with Snowy 2.0 in place. I note that I asked a similar question of Mr Whitby and he agreed to take it on notice, because at that point we were talking about the modelling that has already been done for 2040, which I</p>	Page 18 Tuesday 22 May	

				<p>understand MJA has done. I am asking for the 2030 figures. I've asked for them before. Can you please take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Broad: Sure.</p> <p>Senator KENEALLY: Thank you.</p>		
287	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Abetz	Peak selling price – clarification of point of context	<p>Senator ABETZ: You have said to us earlier this morning in evidence, on oath, that \$80 to \$90 was the peak selling price—if I recall correctly—that you were anticipating. Was that your evidence this morning?</p> <p>Mr Broad: Yes.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Thank you.</p> <p>Mr Broad: But again, it's taking things out of context. I am sorry for interrupting.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: It's okay if you do; just don't allow me to do it. Keep answering. I am very flexible. I don't mind interruptions because it assists the flow.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: If it is an important point of context to make you should do so, Mr Broad.</p> <p>Mr Broad: The context is that that price is a signal for new entrants—and I will have to double-check this—0.001 per cent of the time.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: The peak?</p> <p>Mr Broad: Yes.</p>	Page 24 Tuesday 22 May	
288	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Stoker	The re-release of electricity into the NEM	<p>As a pumped hydro project is an energy storage system it will require electricity to pump water to be used later back to the upper dams in the Snowy hydro system, what percentage of the electricity used in this process can then be re-released into the NEM please? If, for example, Snowy 2.0 uses 100 megawatt hours of electricity to pump water back up hill, how many megawatt hours can it then put back?</p>	Written	
289	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Stoker	Power shortfall	<p>On average a wind farm supplying the NEM only achieves an output equivalent to 32% of its maximum capacity in a year whereas a baseload power plant achieves 90%. How does the Snowy 2.0 project contribute to making up this shortfall in output if Australia was to replace more of its baseload</p>	Written	

				generation with wind farms?		
290	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Stoker	GWh of electricity generation from Snowy 2.0	How many GWh of electricity does the business case for Snowy 2.0 assume it will generate over the life of the asset? Are any major capital upgrades required in this time on top of the initial outlay?	Written	
291	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Stoker	Timing of electricity consumption	At what time of the day will Snowy 2.0 consume electricity to pump water back to the upper storage areas for later release? What impact will this have on the price of electricity at that time? If this occurs at night when wind farm output is low, where will Snowy 2.0 source its electricity from?	Written	
292	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Stoker	Timing of electricity consumption – Peak Times	Will Snowy 2.0 only supply electricity at peak times or at any time when wind farm output is low? If so, what impact will this have on electricity prices during periods of low wind farm output?	Written	
293	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Keneally	Renewable energy share in 2030	On 22 May, I asked: If I can go back to my question about the renewable energy share in 2030. I asked, according to the modelling in your feasibility study, what was the renewable share in 2030 with Snowy 2.0 in place. I note that I asked a similar question of Mr Whitby and he agreed to take it on notice, because at that point we were talking about the modelling that has already been done for 2040, which I understand MJA has done. I am asking for the 2030 figures. I've asked for them before. Can you please take that on notice? Can Snowy Hydro Limited please provide these figures?	Written	
294	Snowy Hydro Ltd	Senator Urquhart	Former Snowy Scheme Sites Program	Further to the Former Snowy Scheme Sites Program funded through the 2002 Snowy Water Inquiry Outcomes Implementation Deed, I ask Snowy Hydro to: a) Provide a list of sites in Kosciusko NP damaged by the construction of the original Snowy Hydro Scheme, and the estimated cost of their rehabilitation;	Written	

				<p>b) Provide a list of sites in Kosciusko NP repaired under the NPWS Rehabilitation of Former Snowy Scheme Sites Program;</p> <p>c) Provide expenditure by and remaining trust funds available to the Rehabilitation of Former Snowy Scheme Sites Program;</p> <p>d) Provide a summary of the public benefits accruing from repair of sites in Kosciusko NP under the NPWS Rehabilitation of Former Snowy Scheme Sites Program;</p> <p>e) Provide a list of sites in Kosciusko NP damaged by the construction of the original Snowy scheme that are not yet rehabilitated, and the estimated costs of repairing them.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--