

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – BUDGET ESTIMATES – 19-22 OCTOBER 2020

AGRICULTURE, WATER AND THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO

QoN No.	Program/ Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or Written	Comment
1.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Urquhart	Departmental spending on marketing in the last financial year (2019/2020)	<p>Senator URQUHART: How much did the government spend in the last financial year on marketing?</p> <p>Ms Croker: I'm sorry, I don't have anything in relation to marketing costs.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Those are corporate issues, I think, Senator.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay, so we're back previously?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Yes. So, again, we'll have to swap over people.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can we swap or are you able to get that to us during the course?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: If you want to ask the question, I will endeavour to get an answer.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I've got three questions, so maybe during the course of this session you might be able to get that. I'm interested in how much the government spent in the last financial year on marketing.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Sorry, in this portfolio, or this department or—</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Yes, can we specify—in the agriculture part of this department or the environment part of this department or just the department?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: The department, but can you also break it down into those different areas that we spoke about earlier.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: That may take a little time. There could be material in the annual report or whatever, but I'll take that and if I can answer today I will.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay. How much did the government spend in the last financial year on consultants?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Again—</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Again, Senator, the government, the department or aspects of the department?</p>	Page 20-21 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000209

				<p>Senator URQUHART: Well, I would have thought the department was government money, so— Senator Birmingham: The government comprises all departments.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes, but we're talking now to this department; I would have thought that the department officials would know I was talking about this department.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I may have an answer for you, Senator. If you refer to page 134 of the annual report it provides information about consultancies from the department. That's at an overall departmental level; it's not broken down between agriculture and environment. That would take more work to provide.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay, but you're able to do that?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We could. It will probably take a little bit of time; I probably won't have it today. Indeed, on the following page—page 136—there's material there about advertising and market research, again at the overall department level, but it's not broken down any further.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay, so can you provide that? Can you also then provide a list of each contact, the amount that the company was given and the purpose of that spend?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Yes. Page 136 of the annual report, table 22, provides detail of the company, the description of the work and the expenditure. You can indicate from the sort of description of the work whether it was primarily in relation to agriculture or environment—for example: market research for environment and energy. So there is some high-level information reported in the annual report—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: If you can just maybe break that down—</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: but we will try and give you that greater level of detail.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Lovely, thank you.</p>		
2.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Gallagher	Market research	<p>The following questions are addressed to the Department as well as the following agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Meteorology • Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority <p>In relation to contracts for market research:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) How much has been spent to date since 1 January 2020? b) How much has been spent since 24 August 2018? 	Written	SQ20-000448

				<p>c) Please provide a table with all contracts entered into since 1 January 2020 along with the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Total contract value ii. Supplier iii. If it was approved by the Service Delivery and Coordination Committee 		
3.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Advertising and information campaigns	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 2. What advertising and information campaigns did the Department/agency run in each relevant period. For each campaign, please provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) When approval was first sought. b) The date of approval, including whether the advertising went through the Independent Campaign Committee process. c) the timeline for each campaign, including any variation to the original proposed timeline. 3. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in each period be provided? 	Written	SQ20-000531
4.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Board Appointments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide an update of portfolio boards, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members. 2. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio? 3. Please detail any board appointments made from 30 June 2020 to date. 4. What has been the total value of all Board Director fees and disbursements paid? 5. What is the value of all domestic travel by Board Directors? 6. What is the value of all international travel by Board Directors? 	Written	SQ20-000508
5.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services	Senator Kitching	Commissione d Reports and Reviews	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many Reports or Reviews have been commissioned. Please provide details of each report including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Date commissioned. 	Written	SQ20-000507

	Division (CBS)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Date report handed to Government. c. Date of public release. d. Terms of Reference. e. Committee members and/or Reviewers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost? 3. The background and credentials of the Review personnel. 4. The remuneration arrangements applicable to the Review personnel, including fees, disbursements and travel 5. The cost of any travel attached to the conduct of the Review. 6. How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level.? 7. What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to each report if it has not already done so? 		
6.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Customised and special-order furniture and office supplies	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, can the Department/agency advise the quantum spent on customised and special-ordered furniture and office supplies (excluding items such as ergonomic desks and chairs and items required for work, health and safety purposes). Please provide a full breakdown, descriptions and cost.	Written	SQ20-000518
7.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Departmental staff in Minister's office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of departmental staff seconded to ministerial offices, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Duration of secondment. b. APS level. 2. Can the Department provide an update on the total number of DLOs/CLOs for ministerial offices including APS level? 	Written	SQ20-000512
8.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Executive office upgrades	1. Have any furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries, been upgraded for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST inclusive).	Written	SQ20-000515

9.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Facilities upgrades	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were there any upgrades to facility premises at any of the Departments or agencies for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. This includes but is not limited to: staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment. 2. If so, can a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrades be provided together with an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). 3. If so, can any photographs of the upgraded facilities be provided. 	Written	SQ20-000523
10.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Market research undertaken by the department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Department/agency undertake any polling or market research in relation to government policies or proposed policies. 2. If so, can the Department provide an itemised list of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Subject matter b) Company c) Costs for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020 d) Contract date period 3. Can the Department/agency advise what, if any, research was shared with the Minister or their office and the date and format in which this occurred. 	Written	SQ20-000530
11.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Media monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Minister's office for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Which agency or agencies provided these services. b) Can an itemised list of Austender Contract notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided? c) What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the FY 2020-21? 2. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Which agency or agencies provided these services? 	Written	SQ20-000511

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Can an itemised list of Austender Contract Notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided? c) What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2020-21? 		
12.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Ministerial functions	<p>1. In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, can the following be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) List of functions. b) List of all attendees. c) Function venue. d) Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). e) Details of any food served. f) Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage. g) Any available photographs of the function. h) Details of any entertainment provided. 	Written	SQ20-000513
13.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Promotional merchandise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on promotional merchandise for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 2. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period please be provided. 3. Can photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise please be provided. 	Written	SQ20-000532
14.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Social media influencers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on social media influencers for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 2. What advertising or information campaigns did the Department/agency use social media influencers to promote. 3. Can a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts please be provided. 4. Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided. 	Written	SQ20-000534

15.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division (CBS)	Senator Kitching	Stationery	1. How much has been spent on ministerial stationery requirements in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.	Written	SQ20-000509
16.	Corporate: Corporate and Business Services Division	Senator Kitching	Ministerial overseas travel	<p>1. Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020 please be provided including:</p> <p>a. Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, together with the airline and class of travel.</p> <p>b. Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</p> <p>c. Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</p> <p>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</p> <p>e. Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.</p>	Written	SQ20-000533
17.	Corporate: Finance Division	Senator McAllister	Departmental funding allocated by group	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Are any other groups involved in the administration of outcome 1? The departmental expenses in globo doesn't tell us very much about the resources allocated in the structure.</p> <p>Mr Brown: I accept that. The way this particular book is produced is by programs, from that point of view. We would have to get you an internal view of resourcing per organisational structure.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So you can provide that on the basis of this document?</p>	Pages 14&51 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000207

			<p>Mr Brown: I believe we can.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: For example, the division in the Water, Climate Adaptation, Natural Disasters and Antarctic Group, dealing with climate adaptation and resilience, would have some work in this outcome. Also, the drought and bushfire response would have some work in this outcome as well. Broadly speaking, the majority of the funding and effort are across those two groups, Environment and Heritage, and Major Environment Reforms Group. But some parts of that group, Water, Climate Adaptation, Natural Disasters and Antarctic, will also feature in this outcome as well. The reason that we've established that group is that those programs do tend to sit in the middle between agriculture and environment. They are programs that are relevant to both sides of the department, as is water, of course.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you have the percentage for the crossover of that?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think Mr Brown said we'd really need to take that on notice. Depending upon how detailed you want to go, we can provide that. If you could ask exactly what you would like us to do, we would be happy to prepare that.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: We might submit something in writing. But I think as a starting point we would like to understand, in terms of dollar figures, what the allocation of the departmental expenses is across the three groups that you've named—the Water, Climate Adaptation, Natural Disaster and Antarctic Group, the Environment and Heritage Group and the Major Environment Reforms Group.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: So administered and departmental—you are looking for that split?</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Yes, broken apart in that way.</p> <p>...</p> <p>[Further context on page 51]</p> <p>Mr Brown: How much of the departmental funding is allocated to this group? We're still working on those numbers and hope to get them by the end of the day.</p> <p>How much of the administered funding is administered by this group? I will refer again to the PBS. Pages 57 to 63 of the PBS have the administered funding. We're not being difficult. The way our ledger system works, it tracks against the PBS. So we're not going to be able to give you anything different.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Senator McALLISTER: That's okay. The proportion of departmental funding allocated to each group would be appreciated.</p> <p>Mr Brown: Yes, and we're working on that as we speak.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Thank you.</p>		
18.	Corporate: Finance Division	Senator Kitching	Departmental functions	<p>1. In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, can the following be provided:</p> <p>a. List of functions.</p> <p>b. List of all attendees.</p> <p>c. Function venue.</p> <p>d. Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive).</p> <p>e. Details of any food served.</p> <p>f. Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage.</p> <p>g. Any available photographs of the function.</p> <p>h. Details of any entertainment provided.</p>	Written	SQ20-000514
19.	Corporate: Finance Division	Senator Kitching	Secretarial travel	<p>1. Can an itemised list of the costs of all domestic and international travel undertaken by the Secretary of the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020 be provided including:</p> <p>a. Flights for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel.</p> <p>b. Ground transport for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials.</p> <p>c. Accommodation for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed.</p> <p>d. Meals and other incidentals for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided.</p> <p>e. Any available photographs documenting the Secretary's travel should also be provided.</p>	Written	SQ20-000528

20.	Corporate: Finance Division	Senator Kitching	Staff travel	1. What is the total cost of staff travel for departmental/agency employees for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.	Written	SQ20-000524
21.	Corporate: Information Services Division (ISD)	Senator Green	APS Staff Cyber Security Training	1. Have APS staff in the Department/Commonwealth Entity received cyber security training? 2. How many APS staff in the Department/Commonwealth Entity have attended in person cyber security training sessions? 3. Who administers and conducts this training? 4. Does the Department/Commonwealth Entity have a target for the proportion of active users of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's Network that have completed in-person cyber security training sessions? 5. Has consideration been given to making cyber security training mandatory for users of the Department/Commonwealth Entity's Network? a. If so, what was the outcome of those considerations? 6. What other forms of cyber security training does the Department/Commonwealth Entity provide?	Written	SQ20-000356
22.	Corporate: Information Services Division (ISD)	Senator Green	DMARC Implementati on in Commonweal th Government Entities	1. Has the Department/Commonwealth Entity fully implemented Domain-based Message Authentication, Reporting and Conformance (DMARC) on its email domains? 2. Does the full implementation of Domain-based Message Authentication, Reporting and Conformance (DMARC) provide the most effective email domain mitigation against the threat of phishing emails? 3. Has the Department/Commonwealth Entity worked with the Australian Cyber Security Centre to progress its implementation of DMARC? 4. Has the Department/Commonwealth Entity received an appropriation for the implementation of DMARC? 5. Does the Information Security Manual guidance for email gateways and servers recommend "DMARC records are configured for all domains such that emails are rejected if they fail SPF or DKIM checks"? 6. The ACSC's "Malicious Email Mitigation Strategies" provides that "Socially engineered emails containing malicious attachments and embedded links are routinely used in targeted cyber intrusions against organisations." Is the Department/Commonwealth Entity concerned that the low levels of DMARC implementation within Commonwealth government departments	Written	SQ20-000354

				revealed by Proofpoint leaves Australians unnecessarily vulnerable to phishing campaigns spoofing Commonwealth government agency domains?		
23.	Corporate: Information Services Division (ISD)	Senator Green	PM’s Press Conference Warning of Sophisticated State Based Campaign of Cyber Attacks	<p>1. On Friday 19th June 2020 the Prime Minister held a press conference to tell the nation that a “sophisticated state-based cyber actor” was “targeting Australian organisations across a range of sectors including all levels of government, industry, political organisations, education, health, essential service providers and operators of other critical infrastructure.” He further indicated that the purpose of this press conference was to “raise awareness of these specific risks and targeted activities and tell you how you can take action to protect yourself... It is vital that Australian organisations are alert to this threat and take steps to enhance the resilience of their networks. “What steps did the Department/Commonwealth Entity take “to enhance the resilience of their networks” after the Prime Minister’s warning?</p> <p>2. The Prime Minister’s media release about this state sponsored campaign encouraged organisations to “take expert advice, and implement technical defences to thwart this malicious cyber activity.” Were any additional technical defences implemented within the Department/Commonwealth Entity to enhance the resilience of its networks in the face of the specific threat identified by the Prime Minister?</p> <p>3. Were any additional controls or mitigations implemented within the Department/Commonwealth Entity to enhance the resilience of its networks in the face of the specific threat identified by the Prime Minister?</p> <p>4. Was any new staff training initiated to enhance resilience against any phishing attacks targeting staff that may accompany this state sponsored campaign?</p> <p>a. If so, please provide them to the committee.</p> <p>5. Were any internal communications prepared for staff about the threat of the state sponsored campaign identified by the Prime Minister in his June 19th 2020 press conference and what staff could do to maximise the cyber resilience of the Department/Commonwealth Entity’s networks?</p> <p>a. If so, please provide them to the committee.</p> <p>6. Was any additional funding allocated to support additional technical</p>	Written	SQ20-000352

			<p>defences, controls, mitigations or training within the Department/Commonwealth Entity in response to the Prime Minister’s press conference?</p> <p>7. Was advice sought from the Australian Signals Directorate about the cyber resilience of the Department/Commonwealth Entity’s networks in the face of the state sponsored campaign identified by the Prime Minister in his June 19th 2020 press conference?</p> <p>8. Was the Minister briefed on the cyber resilience of the Department/Commonwealth Entity’s networks in the face of the state sponsored campaign identified by the Prime Minister in his June 19th 2020 press conference?</p> <p>9. Was the Minister briefed on any additional steps to enhance the resilience of the Department/Commonwealth Entity’s networks needed in the face of the state sponsored campaign identified by the Prime Minister in his June 19th 2020 press conference?</p> <p>10. Is the Department/Commonwealth Entity compliant with the Australian Signals Directorate’s ‘Top Four’ mitigations as mandated under the Protective Security Policy Framework?</p> <p>11. Is the Department/Commonwealth Entity compliant with the Australian Signals Directorate’s ‘Essential Eight’ mitigations as recommended under the Protective Security Policy Framework?</p> <p>12. What was the Department/Commonwealth Entity’s total spend on the cyber security of its networks during the 2019-2020 financial year?</p> <p>13. What is the cyber security spend as a proportion of the Department/Commonwealth Entity’s total IT spend?</p> <p>14. What is the Department/Commonwealth Entity’s forecast total spend on the cyber security of its networks during the 2020-2021 financial year?</p> <p>15. Has the Department/Commonwealth Entity’s total spend on cyber security increased proportionately to the increased threat identified in the Prime Minister’s press conference?</p> <p>16. On Tuesday 30th June 2020, the Government announced a \$1.35 billion 10-year investment in cyber security. Was any of this funding allocated to the Department/Commonwealth Entity in order to take steps to enhance the cyber resilience of its own networks in the face of the specific threats identified by the Prime Minister in his press</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				conference on 19 June 2020?		
24.	Corporate: Legal Division	Senator Kitching	Fair Work Commission	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency.	Written	SQ20-000521
25.	Corporate: Legal Division	Senator Kitching	CDDA Payments	1. How many claims have been received under the Compensation for Detriment caused by Defective Administration scheme (CDDA) by the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020? 2. How many claims were: a. Accepted. b. Rejected. c. Under consideration. 3. Of the accepted claims, can the Department provide: a. Details of the claim, subject to relevant privacy considerations b. The date payment was made c. The decision maker.	Written	SQ20-000516
26.	Corporate: Legal Division	Senator Kitching	Legal costs	1. What are the total legal costs for the Department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.	Written	SQ20-000527
27.	Corporate: Minister's Office - Ley	Senator McAllister	Minister Ley's speeches and transcripts	Senator McALLISTER: So far this year, the department has spent \$150,000 on media monitoring over four months. Under 'Speeches and transcripts' on Minister Ley's website, there is a blank page. Mr Riley: Correct. Senator McALLISTER: Why is that? Mr Riley: Because the minister's office hasn't requested us to produce any of the transcripts to be published on our website. Senator McALLISTER: Minister Evans publishes his speeches, doesn't he? He's published 12 speeches and transcripts in the same period. Mr Riley: In the figures I have here since 1 February this year for Minister Evans, I have zero. That may have been previous—	Page 26-27 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000212

				<p>Senator McALLISTER: Yes. Minister Littleproud's got 80 speeches and transcripts on his page.</p> <p>Mr Riley: For transcripts for Minister Littleproud for this year, since 1 February, I have 44.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Has Minister Ley not undertaken any media appearances at all, ever, in her role as Minister for the Environment?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: No, I think she undertakes frequent media appearances.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Why does she not choose to be transparent about the content of those appearances?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Minister, do you know why a minister in the government you are part of chooses not to make the content of her appearances public or available for scrutiny?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: The very nature of a media interview is that it is public.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Yes, but when Minister Littleproud gives an interview it appears he puts the transcript on the website. Why doesn't Minister Ley want the transcripts on her website?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I will take that on notice, Senator, but in the end that's a preference, I assume, for different ministers as to how they operate.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: One of the marvellous things about the internet, Minister, is that it lets us find out what our public officials are doing. You put your speeches on the internet. So do many of your colleagues. It is quite mysterious that Minister Ley chooses not to. Perhaps you can ask her why.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We took that on notice earlier.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Thank you.</p>		
28.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Waters	Process of reintegrating staff members coming back to the department from secondment	<p>Senator WATERS: I have one last question before I hand back to my colleague. Last time we were together, I asked about the secondment to the Minerals Council and the fact that a departmental employee had been what we thought was seconded but I think in your QONs you later clarified it was an unpaid leave placement rather than a secondment as such. Is that person back working for the department again, or are they still with the Minerals Council?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: I don't know the answer to that question, but this person will be able to help.</p>	Pages 16&52 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000226

			<p>Mr Knudson: The employee that you're talking about is still on secon—an arrangement with the Minerals Council but is due to come back before the end of the year.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: A bit Freudian there.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Yes, sorry.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: What was the length of the secondment/placement?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I don't recall the exact length of it. But, like I said, it's due to wind up at the end of this year.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Are they still working on the Minerals Council's response to the EPBC review?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: That is a key element of the employee's role.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: What protocols will be put in place once that employee returns to work?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: We can walk through what the arrangements were that were put in place when she went into this arrangement with the Minerals Council but also on her return. I don't have those details at hand, but we can absolutely walk through that.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Are you able to get them before we come back?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Absolutely.</p> <p>...</p> <p>[Further context on page 52]</p> <p>Mr Knudson: ... I think it was Senator Waters as well asked a question about our process for re-integrating the staff member who's currently with the Minerals Council, and I believe, yes, we've got the head of our HR area here. We can either deal with that later when you're asking questions or—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I'd be happy to do that now because I personally have to duck off to another committee momentarily.</p> <p>CHAIR: We are, I think, about to transfer the call to the Greens party anyway.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: So why don't we do that?</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I can't take up the time of my colleague who's been patiently waiting. But if it's a very brief update—</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It is—probably about three sentences.</p> <p>CHAIR: Three sentences—go.</p> <p>Mr Mason: I think the question related to the return of a staff member.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Mr Mason: So on return we would have them update their conflict of interest declaration. We'd make an assessment of that and then, if needed, we would put a range of management plans in to ensure there was no conflict, which could include things such as the staff member not working in the area where there may be a perceived or real conflict.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: It could include that? That would seem to be the bare minimum from my perspective.</p> <p>Mr Mason: We would make an assessment once the conflict-of-interest declaration had been given back to us on their return. Prior to their return we would have determined whether that was the management action. But there would be a range of actions we would be able to use if we needed to.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Can you give me more detail on notice so that I'm not taking up other people's time?</p> <p>Mr Mason: Sure.</p>		
29.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Kitching	Departmental staff allowances	1. Can a list of Departmental/agency allowances and reimbursements available to employees be provided.	Written	SQ20-000529
30.	Corporate: People Division	Senator McKenzie	Working from home	<p>Questions on notice are for all departments and agencies.</p> <p>1. What is the number of public servants working from home for each month from the Department?</p> <p>2. How has the Department measured increased, static or declining productivity and what are the conclusions from that measure?</p> <p>3. What is the number of sick days from the Department with a work-from-home workforce for each month of the lockdown and the corresponding sick days for the corresponding months in 2019?</p>	Written	SQ20-000445
31.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Gallagher	Analysis on costs to engage staff	<p>The following question is addressed to the Department as well as the following agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Meteorology • Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority <p>Has the agency performed any analysis on whether it costs more to engage staff as contractors compared with hiring staff as employees? If yes, please provide this analysis.</p>	Written	SQ20-000447

32.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Gallagher	Expenditure on all contractors	<p>The following questions are addressed to the Department as well as the following agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Meteorology • Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority <p>Please provide the following figures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Expenditure on all contractors for 2019-20 b. Expenditure on all contracts with labour hire firms for 2019-20 c. Headcount of staff engaged through labour hire arrangements as at 30 June 2020 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. In total ii. As a percentage of total staff headcount d. As a percentage mark-up on the cost of the contractor, the maximum and minimum fees paid to labour hire firms in 2019-20 	Written	SQ20-000446
33.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Kitching	Comcare	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, can the Department advise whether it has been the subject of any investigations involving Comcare. If yes, please provide details of the circumstances and the status. 2. Can the Department advise the number of sanctions it has received from Comcare in the each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 	Written	SQ20-000520
34.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Kitching	Executive Management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The total number of executive management positions b. The aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions. c. The change in the number of executive manager positions. d. The change in aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions. 	Written	SQ20-000510
35.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Kitching	Fair Work Ombudsman	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many references have 	Written	SQ20-000522

				been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency.		
36.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Kitching	Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many references have been made to the Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner within the Department or agency.	Written	SQ20-000525
37.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Kitching	Public Interest Disclosures	1. For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020, how many public interest disclosures have been received.	Written	SQ20-000526
38.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Kitching	Recruitment	1. What amount has been expended by the department/agency on external recruitment or executive search services in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 2. Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided.	Written	SQ20-000517
39.	Corporate: People Division	Senator Kitching	Staffing	1. How many full-time equivalent staff were engaged at each of 30 June 2019, 30 June 2020 and at 10 November 2020. 2. How many of these positions are (a) ongoing and (b) non-ongoing. 3. How many redundancies have occurred in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. How many were: a. voluntary b. involuntary. 4. How many of those redundancies occurred as a result of departmental restructuring. What is the total cost of those redundancies. 5. What was the total value in dollar terms of all termination payments paid to exiting staff. 6. How much overtime or equivalent has been paid to staff in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020. 7. How many section 37 notices under the Public Service Act 1999 have been offered in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-	Written	SQ20-000519

				30 June 2020 and 1 July 2020-30 September 2020.		
40.	Outcome 1: Agvet Chemicals Fisheries Forestry and Engagement (AFFE)	Senator Rice	Conclusions of assessments relating to the renewal of RFA's	<p>Senator RICE: Well, I'm pretty sure that's the case. When the RFAs were renewed there was no comprehensive regional assessment undertaken, was there? You relied, instead, on an assessment of matters— that's right, isn't it?</p> <p>Ms Deininger: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes. Why were the conclusions of those assessments of matters virtually identical across multiple jurisdictions?</p> <p>Ms Deininger: I don't have that level of detail to hand, Senator. I'm happy to take that on notice and come back to you. We're also appearing in relation to regional forestry agreements later in the week, on Wednesday.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes, but I'm here tonight so—</p> <p>Ms Deininger: I don't have that information to hand, Senator. I'm happy to take that on notice in relation to the question you've raised.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay. I'm interested as to whether, in fact, the department just decided to rubber stamp the process rather than do that comprehensive regional assessment.</p>	Page 115 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000271
41.	Outcome 1: Agvet Chemicals Fisheries Forestry and Engagement (AFFE)	Senator Rice	Maintaining a comprehensive adequate reserve system	<p>Senator RICE: I'm interested to know what work the department is doing to ensure that it is maintaining a comprehensive, adequate reserve system, given that's what the act says you are meant to maintain?</p> <p>Ms Deininger: Again, I don't have that level of detail because we were expecting questions in relation to that later on in the week, in relation to RFAs. I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>	Page 116 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000272
42.	Outcome 1: Agvet Chemicals Fisheries Forestry and Engagement (AFFE)	Senator Rice	Proportion of reserves burnt over summer	<p>Senator RICE: It's relatively early after the fire, meanwhile logging is continuing in unburnt areas, despite the fact that 20 per cent of the mainland forest burnt in the fires. Do you have any estimates of the land that was burnt as a proportion of the reserves?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: The proportion of the reserves?</p> <p>Senator RICE: What proportion of the reserves were burnt over summer?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: If the question is the proportion of the reserves within the RFA areas, it is quite a narrow subset of the way I have normally thought about the reserves, so I would have to take the fire impact on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you could take that on notice by the reserves within the RFA</p>	Page 116 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000273

				areas, I would appreciate that.		
43.	Outcome 1: Agvet Chemicals Fisheries Forestry and Engagement (AFFE)	Senator Whish- Wilson	Regional Forestry Agreements	1. For each of the last twelve years, what volume of wood product has been exported from Tasmania as woodchips, veneer, unprocessed, or in other forms, and to which countries? In each case, what was the value of those exports? 2. How many listed species under the EPBC act and which live in areas subject to regional forest agreements have: a) seen their status of endangerment improved in the last five years? b) been moved from endangered category to the critical endangered category? c) been moved from the vulnerable category to the endangered category?	Written	SQ20-000425
44.	Outcome 1: Agvet Chemicals Fisheries Forestry and Engagement (AFFE)	Senator Rice	Victorian regional forest agreements	In relation to the Victorian regional forest agreements: 1. What is the status of the major event review? 2. What data and research is feeding into the review? 3. When will it be finalised? 4. Will the review be made publicly available? 5. Is logging in the region covered by the review being restricted whilst the review is underway?	Written	SQ20-000422
45.	Outcome 1: Australian Chief Environment al Biosecurity Office	Senator McMahon	Advice on whether sodium fluoroacetate is a humane toxin	Senator McMAHON: Thank you. Can I take you back to the Felixer grooming trap and the \$1.2 million investment in its development? Has the department taken any scientific advice on whether sodium fluoroacetate is a humane toxin? Dr Box: I might have to refer that question to officers of the Chief Environmental Biosecurity Officer, who are probably better placed to answer that question than I am. Ms Campbell: We might look to get an answer on that before the end of the session. I do not think the Chief Environmental Biosecurity Officer is coming to this session. Senator McMAHON: No worries.	Page 70 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000239
46.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator M.Smith	Feral cat eradication funding	Senator MARIELLE SMITH: Obviously, if the target was 2020, we are certainly not on track for that. Can you tell us what specific federal funding has been dedicated to this initiative? Was there any new funding in this year's budget specifically for feral cat eradication on the island? Dr Box: There's been a range of historic investments in Kangaroo Island over three different programs. There's \$2 million through the Regional Land	Page 65-66 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000592

			<p>Partnerships Program. That goes out to 2023. That's looking at eradication of feral cats from the Dudley Peninsula, the peninsula on the eastern side of the island. There's also up to \$1.5 million through the Environment Restoration Fund. That funding is supporting bushfire recovery and is focused on Kangaroo Island dunnarts on the west end of the island.</p> <p>An amount of \$450,000 has been provided to the Kangaroo Island Landscape Board for emergency pest mitigation and habitat protection following the bushfires. Funding has also been provided to the South Australian government for Kangaroo Island rapid species assessment and immediate risk mitigation, as part of the \$1.5 million bushfire funding that was provided to South Australia under the bushfire package.</p> <p>There are a range of existing investments that relate to feral cat management on Kangaroo Island. Of course, there's the additional \$150 million that's rolling out in phase 2 of the bushfire package. Kangaroo Island is one of the seven regions that will be receiving funding as part of the \$110 million investment in strategic actions to support bushfire recovery in seven regions. They've had a workshop with various stakeholders to look at what might be the best actions to undertake on that island to support recovery of wildlife. Feral cat management has certainly come up as a priority through that process as well. It is quite likely, as part of the investment strategy through phase 2 of the bushfire recovery process, that there will be further work on feral cat management on Kangaroo Island.</p> <p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: Can you tell me specifically, with those historical initiatives that you listed, what funding has been allocated directly to feral cat management on the island?</p> <p>Dr Box: Originally there was \$500,000 of Australian government investment for stage 1 of cat eradication on Kangaroo Island through the NHT, through the South Australian government. There were two additional projects through the Threatened Species Recovery Fund—one project with a value of \$236,500, and a second project with a value of \$65,000—supporting the Kangaroo Island dunnart. Both of those projects also had a role in this.</p> <p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: For the dunnart, that \$65,000 wouldn't have all gone to feral cat eradication; it would have gone to other items as well?</p> <p>Dr Box: So I guess with feral cats being one of the major threats to the Kangaroo Island dunnart—and I don't have the details of that project in front of</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>me—it's quite likely that some of that funding would have supported feral cat management around Kangaroo Island dunnart populations. But I am happy to give you a project description for each of those investments that I've mentioned.</p> <p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: In the interests of time I think it might be best if you could take on notice—I'm interested specifically within those pools of funds that you've listed—how much went to specific practices for feral cat eradication. ...</p>		
47.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator M. Smith	Funding for Felixer grooming traps	<p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: Has there been specific funding dedicated to those Felixer grooming traps? Has that been provided directly under the pools of funding that you listed before?</p> <p>Dr Box: There has been funding provided for Felixer grooming trap commercialisation under the Environment Restoration Fund. Yes, the Australian government has supported the development and deployment of that tool.</p> <p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: Do you have a dollar amount?</p> <p>Dr Box: Certainly. Just one moment. So \$1.2 million was provided to Thylation Ltd to support the commercialisation of the Felixer grooming trap so that they are able to be utilised more broadly for feral cat eradication and control.</p> <p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: And when was that?</p> <p>Dr Box: I don't have the approval date in front of me. The completion date for that project is 14 January 2021. But I can get that information for you.</p>	Page 66 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000234
48.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator M. Smith	Target for feral cat elimination	<p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: Given the original feral cat elimination by 2020 has been well and truly missed, what are the expectations placed on best advice as to when feral cats can be eliminated from the island? One of the experts we heard from suggested it would take 50 years before they are eradicated from the island under current resourcing. What is your perspective based on the advice the department has?</p> <p>Dr Box: I guess I don't have a best estimate about timing but I do know that the island is taking a staged approach to that eradication. Given that it is a very large island and that it is difficult—they are moving from east to west, starting with the Dudley Peninsula—that's really the first stage. And I guess once</p>	Page 67 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000235

				<p>they've done that they can reassess the feasibility and the timing of moving further west across the island. So I don't have an estimate for final eradication.</p> <p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: This was the government's target, not the council's target or the island's target?</p> <p>Dr Box: That's right.</p> <p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: But there's been no assessment or work done to re-evaluate, now that that target has been clearly missed, what is possible and what resources are required?</p> <p>Dr Box: So it is possible that analysis has been undertaken on the island by the individuals who are managing the program but I am not aware of an assessment of the time that might be taken to do that eradication.</p> <p>Senator MARIELLE SMITH: Minister, is that something that you're aware of? Has your government got a target for feral cat eradication?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I'll take that on notice in terms of the position and advice the environment minister may have.</p>		
49.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Number of overdue threatened species recovery plans	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: When was there a recovery plan finalised? When was the last time a recovery plan was finalised?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: My recollection was—and I might ask Mr Richardson to come to the table—it might have been June 2019 but I'll have Mr Richardson correct me on that if I'm wrong.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I actually don't have that information in front of me but I can get it very quickly.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: That would be helpful. How many overdue recovery plans are there?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: Sorry, I am just finding the number. There are—</p> <p>Mr Richardson: There are 172 species and ecological communities which require a recovery plan in place that haven't got them in place. Not all of those are overdue though. I'd need to get that figure on notice. It's a large proportion of those.</p>	Page 68 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000237
50.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation	Senator Urquhart	Wildlife and Habitat Bushfire Recovery	<p>Senator URQUHART: In the faunal extinction inquiry, on 25 August, there was a response to a question on the notice in which the department said that 294 applications were received across both tranches of the Wildlife And Habitat Bushfire Recovery Program but only 19 were successful. Was that a</p>	Page 78 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000245

	n Division (BCD)		Program - number of unsuccessful candidates	<p>competitive grants process? Dr Box: Yes, the Wildlife and Habitat Bushfire Recovery Program was a competitive grants process. It was run in two tranches. I think the 19 projects you referred to might have been the first tranche, because in total now 37 projects have been approved. It was run in two tranches, and there were different priorities for each tranche. The first tranche focused on priority animals and threatened ecological communities, and the second tranche focused on priority plants and invertebrates. Senator URQUHART: Were there some unsuccessful candidates? Dr Box: That's right. Senator URQUHART: How many were unsuccessful? Dr Box: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator URQUHART: Are you able to table the list of the unsuccessful candidates and the reason why they didn't receive funding? Dr Box: I can certainly table the number of unsuccessfuls. I'd have to check whether I can table that additional information.</p>		
51.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator Urquhart	Implementation and monitoring of recovery plans	<p>Senator URQUHART: What percentage of the recovery plans is actually being implemented? Ms Campbell: I don't have that number in front of me. I would have to take that on notice and come back with ones that we know have some actions underway. ... Senator URQUHART: How many implementation plans is the government monitoring? Ms Campbell: I'd have to take that on notice. Dr Box: Certainly, for the 70 priority species under the Threatened Species Strategy, we very carefully monitor action underway for those species and report on action underway for those species and the trajectories of those species at certain points in the Threatened Species Strategy. That's where the Australian government has taken a particular interest and determined a particular priority for those species. That's where we carefully monitor implementation. There are a range of other species which have very active recovery teams who oversee those recovery plans. For those species there's often a good, consolidated view of the ongoing implementation of those plans.</p>	Page 72-73 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000241

				<p>Senator URQUHART: In terms of those teams that you talked about, how many staff are working on recovery plans in the department?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I go to my previous answer about the team in the protected species and communities branch. A large number of officers in that section are working on either recovery plans and conservation advices or the listing.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: How many staff are there?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I can't answer that today. We can try to take it on notice, but I think it will be complex. It will depend on a given day. For example, the officer working on the re-assessment listing of the current species will also be, in parallel, working on the conservation advices for that species.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: But you could get those numbers?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: It's within that branch, for sure, but we can see what we can do on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: What would be the average spend on expenditure for each plan?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I don't have that number in front of me. I remind you that funding from the Australian government is not the only tool, and that for some species it isn't even the most effective tool to manage recovery. Recovery can be from Australian government funding, but it can also be from a range of funding from other partners—state and territory governments, for example.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I'm asking in terms of the government. We're here talking about the budget. Are you able to tell me what is the average expenditure on each plan?</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I could probably take on notice the funding programs that are supporting, and the recovery species that are delivering outcomes for, threatened species. Averaging it might not be useful.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay, if you could do that, that would be great. Chair, I have some other questions, but they are not specifically around endangered species.</p>		
52.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Koalas - recovery plan	<p>The koala, was listed as a vulnerable species requiring a recovery plan in May 2012, and as a vulnerable species, this recovery plan was due to be in place in 5 years, that is by May 2017? Therefore the koala is another species that the Minister is in non-compliance with the EPBC Act, is that right?</p>	Written	SQ20-000411

				Is there even a draft recovery plan for the koala that is available? When is it expected that it will be ready?		
53.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator Hanson- Young	Bushfires funding for wildlife recovery	Can you please provide a table that breaks down the spending so far of the bushfires funding for wildlife recovery. Please list the following: the recipient, the project and the dollar amount funded.	Written	SQ20-000405
54.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator Hanson- Young	EPBC endangered species and EECs	Can you please table a list of all the EPBC endangered species and EECs and whether they are in compliance with the provisions of the Act as to whether they are in place, in force and reviewed within deadlines? The Act clearly states that all recovery plans must be implemented where the species is found in Commonwealth areas. Which species are found in Commonwealth areas and therefore subject to this part of the Act? How many of these species are you explicitly funding and carrying out the implementation of these plans? How can you not know the species that you have primary responsibility for? [Section 269: “the Commonwealth must implement a recovery plan or threat abatement plan to the extent to which it applies in Commonwealth areas.”] The Act then goes onto say that “If a recovery plan or a threat abatement plan applies outside Commonwealth areas in a particular State or self-governing Territory, the Commonwealth must seek the co-operation of the State or Territory with a view to implementing the plan jointly with the State or Territory to the extent to which the plan applies in the 1 State or Territory. Section 284 of the Act says that “The Secretary must include in each annual report a report on the making and adoption of each recovery plan and threat abatement plan during the year to which the report relates.” From the Annual Report: According to your Annual Report, 7 out of the 7 recovery plans that were due to be brought into force this year were not. What were these? And what was the administrative delay noted in the report?	Written	SQ20-000412
55.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation	Senator Rice	Recovery plan for the greater glider	In relation to the recovery plan for the greater glider: 1. When will the recovery plan be finalised? 2. What further information does the Department require to finalise the plan, if any?	Written	SQ20-000421

	n Division (BCD)					
56.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Leadbeaters Possum Recovery Plan	<p>The Leadbeaters Possum Recovery Plan was put in place in 1997 which means it was due to be reviewed in 2002. I understand that it was one of the first plans put in place. That means that the Minister is now in non-compliance with the Act in regards to this species in the order of 18 years. In that time the species has been uplisted to Critically Endangered.</p> <p>- Is this the species in which the Minister is most in non-compliance with her own Act?</p> <p>- Does the Department know of other species in similar circumstances?</p>	Written	SQ20-000410
57.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Obligations in relation to recovery plans	<p>1. How many species or endangered ecological communities that require recovery plans under the Act, currently do not have recovery plans?</p> <p>2. How many of these are you currently working on and expect to be finalised in this financial year?</p> <p>3. Are you concerned that it seems that in the case of all of these recovery plans, the Minister is in non-compliance with her own Act?</p> <p>4. Of the species and EECs that have recovery plans, how many of these are current, and by current I mean they fall within the statutory limit of being reviewed by the Minister at not more than five years after it was put in place? [Act wording. Section 294 part 2: "Each plan must be reviewed by the Minister at intervals of not 10 longer than 5 years."]</p> <p>- How can you not know this?</p> <p>- How are you trying to congestion bust this backlog?</p>	Written	SQ20-000409
58.	Outcome 1: Biodiversity Conservation Division (BCD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Threatened species / Koalas assessment	<p>1. 28 species were added to the priority assessment list commencing on 1st October for assessment date 30th October 2021</p> <p>- In regards to the 28 species (including the Koala) that were added to the priority assessment list for assessment as Endangered with a reporting date of 30th October 2021.</p> <p>a) What additional department resourcing and funding will be given to assist this assessment - to ensure that these assessments will not be extended?</p> <p>b) What is being done as an interim step to ensure these species do not go extinct whilst the assessment is underway?</p> <p>c) How will you ensure land clearing, habitat destruction, in critical (koala)</p>	Written	SQ20-000408

				habitat will not further endanger these species whilst the assessment is underway?		
59.	Outcome 1: Climate Adaptation and Resilience Division (CARD)	Senator Urquhart	Modelling underpinning CoastAdapt	<p>Ms Brunoro: We don't do internal modelling. We generally contract specifically through research institutions such as the CSIRO.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Have you undertaken to have new modelling done?</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: Through CoastAdapt—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay, so that's modelling—</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: There was modelling that underpinned CoastAdapt, and that was undertaken through the Earth Systems and Climate Change Hub.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: And that's been undertaken again since then?</p> <p>Ms Brunoro: I can get you the specific details of that modelling project. It might be best if, in the interests of time, I—</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes, if you want to provide that on notice, that's fine. And can you tell me what resources have been applied to mitigating or avoiding the expected coastal impacts of coastal erosion?</p>	Page 118 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000274
60.	Outcome 1: Climate Adaptation and Resilience Division (CARD)	Senator Urquhart Senator Dodson	Submitted by Senator Urquhart and Senator Dodson - National Waste Data Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the deliverables for the “National Waste Data Project” which has a \$24.6 million funding commitment contained in the Budget? 2. What is the breakdown of costs associated with this project? 3. Will this project be led by the Department or is there an intention to establish a new regulatory body or commission an outside entity to administer and oversee the collection and ongoing function of the project? 4. What progress has the Department made to date on this project? 5. The ‘Experimental National Waste Account’, which is hosted on the Department of Environment website, was established on 18 September 2019, and the web page currently states that it was updated on 7 September 2020. What did that recent update involve? 	Written	SQ20-000326
61.	Outcome 1: Compliance Division (CD)	Senator Waters	New Acland Coal and potential noncompliance in relation	<p>Senator WATERS: West Pit. It's a new pit that they've dug that transcends the limits of the stages 2 and 3 EPBC approvals. The minister made a statement. Back in December I think the minister said that you folk had become aware of the noncompliance, and I just wanted to know whether an investigation is underway.</p>	Page 44-45 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000223

			<p>to the digging of West Pit</p>	<p>Mrs Collins: We did have a look into a compliance allegation about New Acland recently, based on an allegation that we received in December 2019.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: That's the one.</p> <p>Mrs Collins: After reviewing all of the available information we formed a view that the approval holder remained compliant and so we're not taking any compliance action on that one.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Can I ask for some more detail? My understanding is that the physical location of the pit that was dug was outside the parameters of the EPBC approvals; so how did you reach the conclusion that it was in compliance?</p> <p>Mrs Collins: Specifically, I will get the detail on notice, but my recollection is that there are a number of approvals associated with the mine there and that one of the approvals did cover the pits in question. I will confirm that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, please; if you can provide copies of relevant documentation, because that's news to me.</p> <p>Mrs Collins: To the extent that I can, yes.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: In the course of undertaking that investigation did you conduct any site inspections?</p> <p>Mrs Collins: Once again I do not have that information specifically in front of me. I would be surprised if we did, given the year that we've had this year. I've got nothing to indicate here that we went on site but I'll confirm that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Did you conduct any aerial imagery analysis?</p> <p>Mrs Collins: The type of information we normally assess in relation to compliance allegations could routinely include aerial imagery, certainly a request from the approval holder—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, but in this case did it?</p> <p>Mrs Collins: In this case, I would have to take it on notice specifically.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Did you seek a written explanation from New Acland Coal in response to the allegations and did they respond?</p> <p>Mrs Collins: We certainly have regular engagement and that is something that we would normally routinely do. Specifically—sorry, I will have to get you that information on notice. It is normal practice when we receive an allegation to seek information from the approval holder.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>Senator WATERS: If you could provide on notice any response that was provided, if there was one.</p> <p>Mrs Collins: To the extent I can, yes.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Has the department investigated New Acland Coal for any potential noncompliance on any other matters beyond the West Pit issue that we've been covering?</p> <p>Mrs Collins: Not recently. This is the only one that we have recently done.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Perhaps on notice, if you wouldn't mind just cataloguing any previous ones against that proponent.</p> <p>Mrs Collins: Certainly.</p>		
62.	Outcome 1: Compliance Division (CD)	Senator Waters	Spectacled flying fox dispersal - Cairns	<p>Approval was given under the EPBC Act for the dispersal of flying fox from a 'nationally significant camp' at the Cairns Library. The approval was subsequently amended to extend the dispersal period for 90 days. The Cairns Regional Council has declared the controlled action has been completed but continues to disperse flying foxes. There have been numerous reports of heavily pregnant females and newborns present during dispersal, contrary to the approval conditions and code of practice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What reasons were given for the granting of the 90-day extension? Was scientific advice sought before granting the extension? 2. Has the Dept received complaints regarding non-compliance with the approval? If so, how many complaints have been received? 3. Have any investigations been undertaken in response to complaints? 4. What other actions has the Dept taken to satisfy itself that the approval conditions have been complied with? 5. Has the Dept undertaken any monitoring of other camps in the region to determine whether the dispersal program has had a significant impact on the regional population? 	Written	SQ20-000339
63.	Outcome 1: Compliance Division (CD)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Senate Question No. 2022 - Venture Minerals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Senate Question No. 2022, the Department said, Venture Minerals self-reported to the Department in a letter dated 17 July 2019 that they had extracted ore commencing in November 2013. Aside from this letter, was the information relied on by the Department to determine that ore was extracted in November 2013, limited to an ASX announcement dated 26 July 2012 titled "Venture upgrades DSO Resources Base and Delivers a 4mt Maiden Ore 	Written	SQ20-000423

				<p>Reserve” and tax invoice issued by Shaw Contracting (Aust) Pty Ltd to Venture dated 11 December 2013 (FOI 200207 Document 8b), both attached to an email from Venture dated 10 October 2019 (FOI 200207 Document 8)? If not, can the Department specify the other information it relied on?</p> <p>2. In Senate Question No. 2022, the Department said they became aware that Venture Minerals had extracted ore commencing on 27 November 2013 when the approval holder self-reported to the Department in the letter dated 17 July 2019. Where in this letter dated 17 July 2019, does it specify that Venture Minerals had extracted ore commencing on 27 November 2013?</p> <p>3. In Senate Question No. 2022, the Department said, “the Department sought clarification of dates and evidence of operations during the Departments enquiries in 2019.” What evidence of operations did the Department receive in response to its inquiries?</p> <p>4. In Senate Question No. 2022, the Department said they investigated whether the additional 72 pits were an extension of the exploration work. How did the Department determine that the ore allegedly extracted at the Riley Creek mine in November 2013 was extracted as part of exploration activities and not mining activities?</p> <p>5. In Senate Question No. 2022, the Department said they investigated whether Venture Minerals had attempted to recast exploration activity as ore extraction in order to avoid further assessment of its EPBC permits and the lapsing of its LUPA Act permits. What investigations did the Department conduct?</p> <p>6. In Senate Question No. 2022, the Department gathered a range of evidence during the investigation in 2019. Apart from the evidence previously released to the Tarkine National Coalition under FOI 200207, what other evidence was gathered?</p> <p>7. In Senate Question No. 2022, the Department said they did not consider any enforcement action in relation to the provision of false and/or misleading information by Venture Minerals under the EPBC Act. How does this accord with the Department’s compliance policy which states, “When we detect non-compliance, we take action”?</p>		
64.	Outcome 1:	Senator Hanson-Young	Jam Land	1. What is the status of the ministerial review of the Jam Land case? Has it been completed? If yes, what is the outcome? If no, why not and what is the standard timeframe for such a review? When will it be completed? While the	Written	SQ20-000407

	Compliance Division (CD)			<p>review is on foot, is Jam Land required to commence any of the remediation works in the determination? If yes, what works are occurring?</p> <p>2. How many times has a remediation order been appealed? How many remediation orders have ever been made?</p> <p>3. How was the Jam Land remediation area decided? Why isn't it the area that was cleared? What is the status of the land, has it been cropped (both the remediation area and cleared land)?</p>		
65.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator McAllister	Resourcing available for environment assessments	<p>[Page 35]</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: ... I'm trying to understand what resources are available to the department in each of the forward years. We've got specifics about the new measure, because that new measure is in the budget, but we don't have the underlying funding that's provided to the department. So what I can't tell is whether in 2021-22 this additional resource that's included in the budget augments or merely displaces baseline funding for assessment and approval.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Mr Larsen will assist.</p> <p>Mr Larsen: I don't have the figure in front of me, but we can get that figure for you of course. In practice it operates as an augmentation. The additional moneys associated with so-called congestion busting are allocated both in last financial year and in the current budget, the just-passed budget. They're in addition to the baseline funding for the division. That money very largely goes to retaining staff to perform those tasks.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: What I'm requesting specifically, and I think you're taking this on notice, is an indication for each of the forward years in the budget of how much will be available for the environmental assessment and approvals process.</p> <p>Mr Larsen: We can provide that, subject only to the caveat that was mentioned by James Tregurtha in his evidence a moment ago, which is that the supplementation that we received in the current budget, which is in addition to our baseline funding for the division, is of limited duration. It doesn't cover the full forward period, in anticipation that we don't know the position we will be in in terms of the demands on the assessment group, depending, of course, on how the single-touch approval approach progresses.</p> <p>[Page 50]</p>	Page 35 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000215

				<p>Mr Larsen: Senator McAllister asked about the breakdown between assessments which were either solely core assessments or done in accordance with accredited or bilateral arrangements. Of a total of 77 approval decisions in the financial year 2019-20, 27 involved an accredited or bilateral assessment. You said that the annual report previously said 38 out of a larger number, so it was somewhere in the vicinity of one-third. You asked a question about the baseline funding for the environmental assessments division, excluding additional congestion-associated funds?</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I'm happy to have it expressed either way. I'm looking for the baseline funding that you expect to utilise this year and next year.</p> <p>Mr Larsen: We don't have that at this stage. I don't have that figure at this stage for the out years, for the reasons that we have discussed. My colleague Ms Croker would like to respond to a question as well.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I don't really know what the reason is, actually. I understand that you anticipate a change. You might give consideration to providing an explanation. That change isn't going to be in place for the next financial year, one would imagine. I'm trying to understand about the resources.</p> <p>Mr Larsen: The budget just presented allocated a certain amount of money, taking us forward to the end of 2022. That gives us funding which is baseline, plus an allocation for the congestion response. Beyond that, we would revert to our conventional staffing numbers. Senator McALLISTER: I'm just trying to understand what the baseline is.</p> <p>Mr Larsen: I will give you a dollar figure later this afternoon. The baseline is in the vicinity of the cost of around 65 full-time equivalent staff. That baseline has increased substantially to 125, and then more substantially still with the supplementation of funds. We'll come back to you with some specific figures.</p>		
66.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Tasmanian Government changing zoning boundaries in the management	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Are you aware that Tasmanian government officials are on record—and FOI documents have also been provided—admitting to secretly changing the zoning boundaries in the management plan for the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area specifically to allow the Lake Malbena proposal to proceed? Is the department aware of that?</p> <p>Mr O'Connor-Cox: I'm not aware of that. I would have to take it on notice to see if we have been informed of that.</p>	Page 42 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000219

			plan for the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area			
67.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Process of assessing impacts on the population of a species like the wedge-tailed eagles	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Lastly, just to clarify something that you said: if you do that for an individual project, and we have multiple wind farm projects going for development and approval across Tasmania, how do you build a cumulative picture of the impacts on the population of a species like the wedge-tailed eagles? Or do you not do that?</p> <p>Mr O'Connor-Cox: I guess I'd have to take on notice the particular matter that you're raising around the Tasmanian wedge-tailed eagle. But the assessments are on a case-by-case basis and, if they do impact on a particular matter, that is assessed. But perhaps I can take on notice any particular issues with that particular matter and get back to you on that.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: If you would do that, that would be very helpful. I'll get some questions to you.</p>	Page 43 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000220
68.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Status of 15 major projects	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Out of the 15 projects, how many of them have actually applied for environmental approval?</p> <p>Ms Croker: I will go through the major projects list that we have. The majority of them are under assessment with us, but there are at least one or two that are in the pre-referral stage, and that includes the Marinus Link project.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Do you need to take that on notice, to give me a bit more—</p> <p>Ms Croker: Yes, I'll take that on notice, to be 100 per cent sure.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'd like the current status for each of the 15 projects, please.</p> <p>Ms Croker: Yes, I can do that.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: And what level of assessment they're up to and require; thank you.</p> <p>Ms Croker: Yes.</p>	Page 56 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000229

69.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Representations from members of the NCCC regarding the 15 major projects	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Has the department had any representations from or discussions with any members of NCCC in relation to any of these 15 major projects?</p> <p>Ms Croker: No. I would like to confirm that with all of the officials—there are a lot of officials in my department—but not to my knowledge.</p> <p>Mr Larsen: Senator, I should declare that I worked in the NCCC prior to joining the department. I've not discussed Perth Airport or any other project with the NCCC—certainly since my departure. I didn't work on this type of work within the NCCC.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: My understanding is that the NCCC had no role in selecting the 15 projects.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: There have been no representations at all?</p> <p>Ms Croker: Not to my knowledge.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Would you like to take that on notice?</p> <p>Ms Croker: I will take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I think you had better.</p>	Page 64 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000233
70.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Perth Airport upgrades - negotiations with the NCCC	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Has the department had any negotiations or conversations with members of the NCCC in relation to the Perth Airport upgrade?</p> <p>Ms Croker: I'd have to take that on notice to be sure, but I'm not aware of any.</p>	Page 64 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000232
71.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Number of projects being assessed being assessed that have a potential impact on koalas	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could I ask you to take on notice how many projects are currently being assessed that have a potential impact on koalas?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: Yes, I can do that, of course.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Thank you. I'd obviously like to know how many, what their file number is and what their status is. That would be helpful.</p> <p>Mr Larsen: We can do that, Senator.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Thank you.</p>	Page 75 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000243
72.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Green	ANAO report - conflicts of interest register	<p>Senator GREEN: ...I want to ask some questions about the ANAO report; I have had the opportunity to ask similar questions previously. Where are we up to in terms of the conflict of interests register? Just for the officers at the table, I did ask some questions about this at the formal extension hearing on Tuesday 25 August; I am looking for a follow-up. As I understand it, the</p>	Page 47-48 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000225

				<p>environmental approvals area now has a conflict of interest register; is that correct?</p> <p>Ms Croker: Yes, that is correct.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: When did that commence?</p> <p>Ms Croker: I don't have an exact date, but that has been rolled out subsequent to the ANAO audit report being released.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Can you take that question on notice for me?</p>		
73.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Assessments of 15 major projects	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could I get you to take on notice documentation in relation to the selection of these 15 projects? I'd like to know when the 15 were selected, when a draft list was made, any changes to that list, when the final decision was made and by whom? If the minister signed off on it, was that before or after the Prime Minister made his announcement?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: At least in relation to the larger of the projects, it was well before, because with those projects a good number of them were already part of the assessment mix. Proposals had been made, which were being considered by the department. As I indicated, the initial iteration of major projects was at the beginning of the year, before the COVID pandemic. A further iteration, in consultation with other agencies, of course—</p>	Page 55-56 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000228
74.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Representations made to the Minister and the department in	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I return to the 15 major projects list. Have there been any representations from any members of parliament, ministers or other government officials in relation to any of these projects?</p> <p>Ms Croker: You mean representations before the minister approved those projects?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'm asking about any representations to the minister or any representations to the department in relation to any of those 15 projects?</p> <p>Ms Croker: Not to my knowledge.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you please take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Could I just seek to understand the scope of your question, Senator. These are all preexisting, active applications—or mostly, from what I can see. Obviously, there are applications already underway. It is not unusual for there to be representations in relation to applications.</p>	Page 62-63 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000231

				<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: That is fine. I just want to know what representations have been made and by whom.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: For all of them at any time?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes. Considering we are in the middle of an AFP investigation at the moment in relation to some decisions being made and things being fast-tracked. We have allegations before the ICAC in New South Wales in relation to various projects. I don't think it is beyond question—</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Should we count Senator Whish-Wilson's question on Marinus Link as representations?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'm asking about official representations to the department or the minister's office in relation to the fast-tracking of these projects.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Senator Whish-Wilson seemed to be pretty eager to understand where Marinus Link was at. I am wondering whether that is the type of representation you have in mind.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: In Senate estimates, where it's all transparent, I think that's fine. In fact, maybe they're all fine, Minister. But what I would like to know is: who has made representations to the department or to the minister's office in relation to supporting the fast-tracking of any of these 15 projects?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: That refines it nicely. Thank you.</p>		
75.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Urquhart	Environmental assessment congestion busting - updates provided to the Minister regarding the department's performance in meeting statutory timeframes	<p>Senator URQUHART: Maybe I'll kick off, Chair, and I'll just go back to those questions around the congestion busting that I started earlier. I think, Ms Croker, we were advised that you were probably better placed to answer those. We went through the announcement earlier—I'm not sure whether you were listening, but I indicated that it was around 21 November that the minister put out the press release about the congestion busting. When did it come to the attention of the minister that the department was totally underresourced?</p> <p>Ms Croker: Your question was when it came to the attention of the minister?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Croker: That there was—sorry, can you just repeat that?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Underresourcing—that the department was totally underresourced.</p> <p>Ms Croker: We provide regular updates on the work that we're undertaking within the division and the status of how we are performing to the minister.</p>	Page 19 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000208

				<p>Senator URQUHART: The press release was on 21 November. When did it come to the attention of the minister? Was it raised by the department or did the minister come to the department?</p> <p>Ms Croker: The minister did not come to the department. As I said in my previous answer, we provide regular updates to the minister on how we were performing in terms of meeting our statutory time frames. They're published in our annual report every year.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay. Prior to 21 November, what were the dates of those updates to the minister?</p> <p>Ms Croker: I don't have those with me.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Are you able to get them to us today?</p> <p>Ms Croker: I will take that on notice.</p>		
76.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Urquhart	Submitted by Senator Urquhart and Senator Dodson - Parramatta Light Rail	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it correct that under the EPBC Act, a person proposing to take an action that the person thinks may be or is a controlled action must refer the proposal to the Minister for the Minister's decision whether or not the action is a controlled action? 2. With reference to the referral by Transport NSW for the proposed Parramatta Light Rail, on what basis did the Minister for the Environment draw the conclusion that the proposed action was not a "controlled action"? 3. What was the recommendation from the Department to the Minister? Was this recommendation accepted by the Minister? 4. What was the basis on which the Department formed their recommendation? Can you provide any relevant information or documents that establish the Department's proper consideration of this matter and consequent advice? 5. In considering potential impacts this project could have on the Parramatta Female Factory (PFF), did the Minister and/or the Department seek advice from the Australian Heritage Council before making the decision that it was not a controlled action? 6. Can the Department provide all relevant documents, emails and any other communication relevant to the making of the decision to determine this was not a controlled action? 7. What other independent advice did the Department and/or the Minister seek in the decision-making process to determine the proposed action is not a controlled action? 	Written	SQ20-000332

				8. At the time the proposal was referred for a decision the PFF had been assessed by the Australian Office of Heritage for national heritage listing and was being considered by the Minister for national heritage listing. On that basis in particular, why did the Department determine that it was not a controlled action?		
77.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Waters	Browse Basin to North West Shelf Project	<p>The draft EIS for the Woodside’s Browse to North West Shelf Project states (at p53) that the impacts of the project “translate into supplying ~44 years of cleaner energy to global markets. LNG is less emissions intensive than all other fossil fuels and can contribute directly to the global reduction of greenhouse gas emissions when it is used to replace more emissions intensive fuels such as coal.”</p> <p>1. What evidence has (or will) the Department rely on in assessing these claims of market displacement by gas supplies?</p> <p>2. Will recent commitments by Japanese, South Korean and Chinese governments to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 - 2060 been taken into consideration when assessing claims regarding market displacement or predicted export opportunities for LNG produced at the Browse to NWS facility?</p> <p>3. Shell and BP are joint venture partners in the Browse to NWS project. Both have recently made commitments to net zero targets by 2050, despite the Browse LNG Facility being expected to operate until 2065. Will these commitments by the joint venture partners be taken into account by the Department when assessing the viability of the project and any associated financial risks?</p>	Written	SQ20-000341
78.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Offsets	<p>What is the status of offsets committed to under the strategic assessment for Sydney growth centres, including Shanes Park?</p> <p>https://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/pages/f8ab91b2-7295-4ee3-af0d-7771bfc6dabd/files/sydney-growth-centres-program-report.pdf</p>	Written	SQ20-000402
79.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals	Senator Hanson-Young	NSW land clearing - impact on	<p>https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2020/oct/07/nsw-will-allow-land-to-be-cleared-up-to-25m-from-property-boundary-citing-bushfire-concerns</p> <p>a. What engagement have you had with NSW about this?</p> <p>b. Do you have any concerns about the impact of each landowner clearing 25m</p>	Written	SQ20-000404

	Division (EAD)		threatened species	of land on their property could have on threatened species? c. Is there a two-way conversation with states about their response to bushfires and protection of threatened species whilst managing bushfire risk?		
80.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Shark Mitigation	1. When will the Federal Government table their response to the Senate inquiry report into shark mitigation and deterrent measures tabled on 12 December 2017? 2. The shark mitigation and deterrent measures inquiry recommended the Australian Government hold a national summit of shark experts and a national Shark Stakeholder Working Group. Have there been any steps taken towards either of those recommendations? 3. How much funding has been allocated by the Australian Government on research into non-lethal shark mitigation measures? 4. How much funding has been spent by the Australian Government on research into non-lethal shark mitigation measures? 5. Will the Minister consider reviewing the ineffective and lethal shark mitigation measures as a priority agenda item at the upcoming Meeting of the Environment Ministers? If not, what is the Minister doing to ensure state coordination on non-lethal shark mitigation measures?	Written	SQ20-000426
81.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Brandy Hill quarry	What is the Minister's position on the plan to log koala habitat at Port Stephens for the expansion of the Brandy Hill quarry? Does she believe this project should go ahead given the recent decision to assess the koala for an endangered listing?	Written	SQ20-000406
82.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Guildford Wind Farm	1. What factors were considered in choosing the Guildford Wind Farm site? 2. What preventative measures are planned to minimise eagle deaths/incapacitations? 3. What measures of eagle deaths/incapacitations will there be? 4. What feedback will there be from numbers killed/incapacitated to mitigation? 5. How will the effectiveness of mitigation be measured? 6. How are contractors doing Bird Utilisation Surveys for assessment trained and tested for identification and estimates of height and distance? 7. Are GPS equipped eagles being studied on site? If not, why not? 8. Are dogs being used to search for carcasses and if not, why not?	Written	SQ20-000424

83.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Pilbara Environmental Offset Fund	<p>1. Has the federal Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment (Department) recommended to the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment (Environment Minister) that the Commonwealth should allow proponents planning to operate mines and mining infrastructure (including railways and roads etcetera) in the Pilbara bioregion to offset the residual significant impacts of their proposals through contributions to Western Australia's Pilbara Environmental Offset Fund (PEOF)?</p> <p>2. Has the Department recommended to the Environment Minister that the Commonwealth should allow approval holders operating mines and mining infrastructure (including railways and roads etcetera) already approved under the EPBC Act in the Pilbara bioregion to offset the residual significant impacts of their approved actions through contributions to WA's PEOF?</p> <p>3. If the Department has recommended proponents or approval holders be allowed to offset the impacts of their actions through contributions to the WA PEOF, has a memorandum of understanding to enable this been drafted?</p> <p>4. If the Department has recommended approval holders be allowed to offset the impacts of their actions through contributions to the WA PEOF:</p> <p>a. for which projects will approval holders be able to acquit their offset obligations via contributions to the WA PEOF?</p> <p>b. for each project, on what date(s) did the approval holders write to the Environment Minister (or the Department) seeking agreement to acquit their offset obligations in this way?</p>	Written	SQ20-000415
84.	Outcome 1: Environment Approvals Division (EAD)	Senator Rice	Melbourne Strategic Assessment	<p>In relation to the Melbourne Strategic Assessment:</p> <p>1. What risk analyses did the Department undertake prior to its assessment?</p> <p>a. Please provide a copy of any risk analyses completed.</p> <p>2. Has any subsequent risk evaluation been undertaken after endorsement?</p> <p>3. Has the Department briefed the Minister on the risks identified through any risk analyses?</p>	Written	SQ20-000420
85.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection	Senator Green	National waste policy - job creation	<p>Senator GREEN: You can appreciate that it's a little hard to follow, because there's a few different calculations floating out there about how you work out jobs to tonnes diverted from landfill. Are you aware of the National Waste Policy 2018 document?</p>	Page 103 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000258

	Division (EPD)			<p>Ms Tilley: I am.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: That was only two years ago, so it is pretty recent. It says that for every 10,000 tonnes diverted from landfill to recycling there is the creation of an additional 6.4 jobs. If we were to use those calculations, it would mean that for the diversion of 10 million tonnes of landfill we would expect to see an additional 6,400 jobs. Is there a difference between that calculation?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I don't think there is. I won't fact-check your maths, but your reference to the 6.4 is, I think, the difference between the two figures I used. So I think we're saying the same thing. The numbers I referred to are that for every 10,000 tonnes landfilled, that's 2.8 jobs. If that's recycled instead, that's 9.2 jobs. The difference is 6.4. I think we're talking about the same baseline for estimating the number of jobs. I apologise—I didn't capture where your maths ended up and how that is different to ours.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: I might try to find that footnote and come back to it. That's in the National Waste Policy from 2018, and that says that an additional 6.4 jobs are created from 10,000 tonnes.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I think that is exactly what Ms Tilley was just saying. The difference between the two is 6.4. So 9.2 minus 2.8 gives 6.4.</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I'm talking about the bookends, and you're talking what sits in between. But it gets you to the same place.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Gotcha.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: The other thing is that there was a fairly extensive economic analysis that was done, and is publicly available, that underpinned the development of the waste bans and that had lots of analysis in behind it with respect to the economic stimulus and also job creation associated with the package. That's something else that we can make available, if that's helpful.</p>		
86.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Division (EPD)	Senator Green	Breakdown of \$1 billion waste infrastructure investment	<p>Senator GREEN: My last question is just in regards to the Recycling Modernisation Fund. We've spoken about this a little bit today. When the fund was announced, the minister's media release said that the Commonwealth was catalysing \$1 billion investment in waste infrastructure. Can you provide a breakdown of that calculation?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I can. Would you like me to do the tallying up for you now at a high level?</p>	Page 107 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000260

				<p>Senator GREEN: Yes, how we got to \$1 billion of investment into waste infrastructure.</p> <p>Ms Tilley: At headline level or funding announcements, as you flagged, the \$190 million Recycling Modernisation Fund is intended to leverage one for one for one and that's been publicly articulated as at least \$600 million in funding, so there is your \$600 million. The \$100 million for the Australian Recycling Investment Fund, we spoke about earlier. Then there is the \$49.4 million in previous announcements around halving Australia's food waste by 2030, the \$35 million for the national waste policy action plan we discussed earlier, plus the \$24.6 million for the tracking Australia's waste initiative. That gets me, I think, already up to \$785 million or possibly higher. Then there's the \$30 million invested to date through Cooperative Research Centres Projects for innovative solutions for recycling and reuse of plastics, paper, glass and tyres, run by the industry portfolio; the \$20 million for the National Product Stewardship Investment Fund we talked about earlier; an additional \$10 million through the department of industry for—sorry, I've already mentioned that CRC project—the \$16 million in the 2019 election commitment through what's called the Pacific Ocean Litter Project; \$11 million through the Environment Restoration Fund for community campaigns to reduce waste, improve recycling and clean up beaches; and previous investments by the Clean Energy Finance Corporation and ARENA that total above \$100 million for waste-to-energy projects. When you tally those all up—if it's useful, we can do it on notice—you get more than \$1 billion in investment in Australia's waste industry.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: If you could take it on notice so I've got those calculations, then a column next to it that says how much of that funding has been spent, and maybe a third column of when that money that is unspent is planned to be spent. If we can get some time lines around that investment, that would be really helpful.</p>		
87.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Division (EPD)	Senator Green	Impact of the Commonwealth sustainable procurement guidelines	<p>Senator GREEN: ...What increase in both volume and value of recycled content has been achieved under the current Commonwealth sustainable procurement guidelines, which were adopted in 2018?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I don't have a direct answer to that. I do know that the Department of Finance has previously at committee hearings referenced the amount of take up of certain consumables, stationary, et cetera as a result of its whole-of-</p>	Page 106-107 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000259

				<p>government tracking systems. That doesn't go directly to your question about as a result of the 2018 sustainable procurement guide. We as the department don't have any tracking mechanisms across government to see what the impact of the 2018 guidelines might have been, but I think Department of Finance will be able to show you what's happened of late, which is, I guess, influenced by the guidelines.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Those guidelines are only two years old. We're not able to really measure, you're saying, the impact of the overall benefit of having those just yet because we've only had them for two years perhaps? Is that right?</p> <p>Ms Tilley: I can take on notice to try and get you more detail because I'm not the expert at this. For the sustainable procurement guide, you are correct; my advice is it was last updated in 2018. The updates that we're undertaking now are to really improve and build in the ability, the support, the training and the awareness for Commonwealth officers and the decision-making support about how to ensure that they're able to select recycled content products in their purchases. That's the new update since the 2018 version. So what impact the 2018 version, which talked about sustainable procurement not just recycled content, has had, that's a much bigger question. I'd suggest that you ask the Department of Finance if they have got any metrics that look at increases in sustainable procurement since that guide was updated.</p>		
88.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Division (EPD)	Senator Urquhart Senator Dodson	Recycling Modernisation Fund	<p>Recycling Modernisation Fund</p> <p>1. In relation to the Recycling Modernisation Fund, please provide a breakdown of how the \$190 million will be spread across each state and territory.</p> <p>2. Do you have agreement (in principle or otherwise) from all states and territories to enter into funding arrangements?</p> <p>3. Will all the infrastructure projects in each state and territory be on a 1:1:1 basis between the Commonwealth, State and Territory? If not, which projects and which agreements with the respective states and territories will vary from that format/structure and why?</p>	Written	SQ20-000330
89.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection	Senator Urquhart	National Environmental Protection	<p>1. What is the status of the Government's review into the NEPM packaging rules?</p>	Written	SQ20-000329

	Division (EPD)	Senator Dodson	Measure (NEPM)	<p>2. Is the Government considering any changes to the NEPM that would give greater powers to APCO? If so, what kind of regulatory changes are being considered?</p> <p>3. What is the Department's explanation of the very limited achievements that have been secured by the NEPM in respect of ensuring manufacturers comply with their obligation to join APCO?</p> <p>4. In its submission to the Recycling and Waste Reduction Bill 2020 senate inquiry, the CEO of APCO said it was unfortunate the review of NEPM did not happen at the same time as the Product Stewardship Act. Why did this not occur at the same time, especially when you consider that the review of the Product Stewardship Act, was itself delayed by two years?</p>		
90.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Division (EPD)	Senator Urquhart Senator Dodson	Recycle Product Labelling	<p>1. In relation to the Australian Council of Recycling's national labelling audit that was released in August 2020, is the Department concerned by the fact that there are so many inaccurate or otherwise misleading or inadequate labels in the market in relation to providing relevant disposal or recycling information?</p> <p>2. Since this report was released what actions has the Department or the Minister taken (a) to address the poor take-up of the Australasian Recycling Label (ARL) and (b) to address the broader issue of incorrect or inaccurate labelling with respect to disposal/recycling?</p> <p>3. Are there short-term and long-term targets for industry take up of the ARL?</p> <p>4. If not, why not?</p>	Written	SQ20-000328
91.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Division (EPD)	Senator Urquhart Senator Dodson	Rotterdam Convention	<p>1. What is the Departments position on the listing of chrysotile asbestos as a hazardous chemical under the Rotterdam Convention?</p> <p>2. What actions has the Department taken in the last 12 months to pursue negotiations with other signatories to ensure the successful listing of chrysotile?</p> <p>3. Is the Department planning to put forward a proposal relating to chrysotile for consideration at the next Meetings of the conferences of the Parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions which is scheduled for July next year?</p> <p>4. If yes, what is the nature of this proposal? When will it be submitted for consideration?</p> <p>5. Is the Department satisfied that all necessary action is being taken on behalf</p>	Written	SQ20-000336

				of Australia to successfully negotiate for the listing of chrysotile within the Rotterdam Convention framework?		
92.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Division (EPD)	Senator Rennick	Disposal of the renewable energy generators	<p>1. Are there regulations for the disposal of the renewable energy generators such as solar panels, wind turbines and batteries at the end of their useful life?</p> <p>2. Is it possible to recycle solar panels, lithium batteries and wind turbines?</p> <p>3. If so, is recycling happening in Australia? If not, how soon before Australia has the capacity to recycle renewable waste?</p> <p>4. What steps are being taken to ensure that regulation of renewable waste will occur?</p>	Written	SQ20-000416
93.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator McAllister	Agreement between the states and the Commonwealth regarding single-touch process	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Mr Knudson, some of the information you're providing suggests that there is a clear agreement between the states and the Commonwealth about how the single-touch process will work, and indeed on 24 July the Prime Minister announced that there was an agreement to move to a single-touch process. What is the model that the states agreed to at national cabinet?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It is, in effect, to have as many decisions as possible made by state jurisdictions on behalf of the Commonwealth under agreed-to arrangements where we have accredited a state process as having met the Commonwealth standards.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Can you table the process that was agreed at the national cabinet?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: We can certainly table the process, which is laid out in the legislation, for what's required to enter into an approval bilateral agreement, which underpins the announcements out of national cabinet. We're happy to do so.</p>	Page 36 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000217
94.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator D. Smith	Definitional issues with regards to Professor Samuel's interim report	<p>Senator DEAN SMITH: With the definitional issues that are still outstanding, how would the department characterise which of those are the most significant? From the perspective of stakeholders, which three or four of those definitional issues are the most significant—that is, significant in terms of difficulty in bringing to a resolution?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: In terms of the interim standards, we've had some advice back from a range of groups in relation to the application of Professor Samuel's</p>	Page 41 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000218

				<p>interim standards, such as how they would apply and whether that's from a whole-of-systems perspective or an individual, project-by-project perspective. I should caveat this by saying that we're aware that this is information that these entities have also provided to Professor Samuel through his working group. One issue was around the application. I think there's an issue around the interpretation of language in relation to Professor Samuel's standards—the use of terms. This goes to not just whether those terms are in the EPBC Act at the moment, although that is a consideration, but also, where there are terms that require a definition, what they might mean. I would say they are the two key areas of concern that have been highlighted from stakeholders.</p> <p>Senator DEAN SMITH: On notice, could you identify a little more specifically what some of those definitional issues might be? For example, I would categorise 'no net loss versus maintenance and enhancement' as a definitional issue that is significant and one that stakeholders have put on the table. Could you identify for the committee what other ones you think fit into that category?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: We can certainly give you that list.</p>		
95.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Advice provided to the Ministers' office regarding Professor Samuel's interim report	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have you read Professor Samuel's report?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Yes, I have.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So you understand that a key element in that report is that there is not enough enforcement, compliance and independence?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Yes. I am very aware of the conclusions Professor Samuel has drawn from his report. That is his advice to the government.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have you been asked by the minister what could be done to enact those recommendations or proposals from Professor Samuel in relation to independence, enforcement and compliance?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Certainly we have been having discussions with the minister and her office around potential pathways to address some of the conclusions Professor Samuel has drawn from his interim report. But I go back to what Mr Knudson said before, which is that the government does not yet have Professor Samuel's final report and his set of recommendations. So at this point we are having those discussions and we will continue to do so.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Has the minister explicitly requested that the department not provide advice in relation to an independent watchdog?</p>	Page 54 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000227

				<p>Mr Tregurtha: No.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Has the minister asked for advice in relation to an independent watchdog?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I would have to go back and check my records as to whether she has asked us that question at any time in the past, but not specifically to that level of detail.</p>		
96.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator Hanson-Young	EPBC Amendment (Streamlining Environmental Approvals) Bill 2020 - drafting instructions based on Professor Samuel's report	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: ...You mentioned that there were a number of pathways coming out of the Samuel review that would be traversed throughout June and July. That's your evidence to the committee. Why then on 19 June did you give drafting instructions to rehash a 2014 bill?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: As I said earlier in my evidence, it was, is and remains the department's view that, for single-touch approvals or, more technically, approval bilateral agreements to be entered into with states and territories, there were a number of weaknesses in the EPBC Act as it is currently drafted, which were determined back in 2014. Those deficiencies still needed to be remedied in order for that to be successful. As I've said, the government made a very clear indication that it was going to pursue again the single-touch approval mechanism and so the department moved to ensure that we were able to provide the best advice we could.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: There were never any drafting instructions given relating to the actual recommendations in the draft report by Professor Samuel?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: There are no recommendations in the draft report. There's a range of conclusions that Professor Samuel draws, but he doesn't make any recommendations in his interim report. But no—</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Okay. Were there any drafting instructions given based on the draft report by Professor Samuel?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: On the drafting instructions that were provided: as I've already indicated, I'll need to go back and determine exactly what the direction was from the minister's office. I've indicated that I would do that for the committee today, to come back to you with an accurate answer.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: But surely you must know. You were able to tell us very clearly that drafting instructions were to be based on the Tony Abbott 2014 bill. Were there any additional instructions given to be based on the interim report by Professor Samuel?</p>	Page 23-24 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000477

				<p>Mr Tregurtha: I think we talked about that in our question on notice which we provided in relation to the drafting of those instructions. The department noted that we provided initial drafting instructions and that the content and the subject of those drafting instructions were a matter of advice and legal professional privilege between the department and the office.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes, but I'm asking you if there were any instructions given based on Professor Samuel's interim report. I'm not asking you what they were.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Sorry, Senator. I would say—again, subject to me confirming the specific date and time of my conversations with the minister and the minister's office, which I've undertaken to do—that, certainly, with the progression of the drafting and, ultimately, the minister's decision to introduce the bill, there was clearly direction given by the government to do that. The pursuit of single-touch approvals was reinforced by Professor Samuel's recommendations in his review, where I talked about the standards, the devolution component and the strong assurance mechanism which Professor Samuel put in his report. Based on that I would say that, yes, the government is pursuing single-touch approvals based on the recommendations of Professor Samuel's report.</p>		
97.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Meetings and correspondence between Rio Tinto and the department	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: ... We know from FOI documents and previous questions through this committee that Rio Tinto has had meetings in relation to the devolution of powers on at least four occasions dating back to August 2019. Were you involved in any of those meetings or discussions?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: No.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Do you know who was?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'm aware that there were some departmental officials.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Who are they?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I don't have that information in front of me.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Mr Metcalfe, do you know who in your department has met with Rio Tinto in relation to—</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: No, I'm not aware of who was in those meetings.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I can help. I was involved in at least one of those meetings. There have been a range of discussions with, as you would imagine, the whole gamut of stakeholders, whether NGOs, or peak bodies or individual companies. There</p>	Page 32-34 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000214

				<p>is a strong interest in trying to figure out how we can maintain strong standards but also streamline approvals. That's across the board. Rio Tinto is absolutely one of those companies that are interested in these reforms.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'm particularly interested in the engagement that the environment department has had with Rio Tinto in relation to this. I understand that we've just had a year-long review run by Professor Samuel which the department and the government have subsequently ignored. So let's talk about who you're listening to.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Senator, Professor Samuel will provide his final report shortly. The government will respond to his final report.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: When was the meeting that you recall having with Rio Tinto?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I don't recall the dates but it was definitely this year—the one that I'm thinking of. In that we talked about individual projects which were being pursued by Rio Tinto as well as the overall direction of reform that could happen out of the Graeme Samuel review, including devolution and what that could look like.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Was the minister involved in this meeting?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: No.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Was any minister or assistant minister involved in this meeting?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: No. I was the highest-ranking official in that meeting.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Was there any representative from the minister's office in that meeting?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: No.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Any representative from the Prime Minister's office in that meeting?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: No.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: You can only recall one meeting, but you think perhaps there were others?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: That's right. I recall in particular one telephone call with Rio Tinto. I'm very happy to provide—I think you already have it through the FOI and I can indicate which meetings I was at of those.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: That would be helpful, and could I have a list of the other officials in those meetings that would be helpful—if you could take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'd like to know whether in each of those meetings there was the minister present, any other minister or assistant minister present, or any ministerial staff.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I can tell you now for any meeting that I've been involved in with any of those types of stakeholders that the minister and ministerial office have not been involved. But we'll come back and absolutely clarify that for those specific four meetings for you.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you take on notice the number of times you've briefed Minister Morton on these issues, please?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have there been any meetings with Rio Tinto since the release of the interim report?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I don't believe so, but we can take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: As far as you're aware, the meetings were all prior to the report being released?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: You'll get me those dates?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Exactly. To be very clear, I'm not 100 per cent certain on that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Do you know whether there's been any correspondence from Rio Tinto in relation to the legislation that's currently before the parliament?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I'm not aware of any, and the secretary isn't aware of any either.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Has there been any correspondence from Rio Tinto to the department over the last 12 months?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: That's a pretty large possibility so we'd have to come back on notice for that.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Any correspondence that relates to this issue of the devolution of powers and the amendments to the EPBC Act?</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Mr Knudson: I don't believe so, but, again, let us come back to you on notice and clarify that.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: If there were, who would be drafting the response to Rio Tinto?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It would really depend on what issue the correspondence went to.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: You've never drafted a response to Rio Tinto, even though you're the highest ranking member who has been in meetings with them?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: You haven't signed a letter back to Rio Tinto?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I don't recall. I do sign a fair amount of correspondence, as you would imagine, but I wouldn't be drafting that correspondence in the first instance.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Nor I, Senator. But, again, I'd like to take it on notice to be sure. Clearly, Rio Tinto also has a number of projects they've managed through the department. I guess what Mr Knudson and I are talking about is particularly in relation to the reform agenda.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes. When you met with Rio Tinto, did the issue of Juukan Gorge come up?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I don't recall, but I'll check my records and come back to you on notice on that.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have you had any conversation with Rio Tinto in relation to that disaster?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: No, not directly that I recall.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'll go back to Rio Tinto's correspondence. I understand that Rio Tinto wrote to Minister Ley in November 2019 in relation to the EPBC Act. Who drafted the response?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I don't recall but am happy to come back on that.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Who would have, given that it relates to specifically to the EPBC reforms and the one-touch agenda?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It almost certainly would have been staff in my area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Mr Tregurtha: And most likely in mine as well. But in terms of the actual correspondence we would need to go back and check.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: It's not top of mind at the moment?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Not a letter from 2019.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'd like to know when a response was drafted and by who, and a copy of the response if possible.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Understood. We'll provide that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'm wondering when the government first commenced conversations with the WA government about establishing the bilateral approval agreement. Do you know when that was?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I think that would be about 2014.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: When was the most recent correspondence in relation to that?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: There are two things on that: the first would be the decision that came out of national cabinet on 24 July, when all states and territories, together with the Commonwealth, agreed to pursue single-touch approvals. But we have been working since then with WA. We issued a notice of intent—and I have the date here, if you'll bear with me</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It was 7 August.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: We issued a note of intent to pursue a bilateral agreement on 7 August, and my staff have been having meetings and consultations with WA since that time. I think that the most recent was probably on Friday.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have Minister Morton or Minister Ley been involved in any of these conversations?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: The conversations I'm talking about with WA have all been at officials level. Certainly, I've been in a couple of conversations where this issue has come up with WA over the last month or two. In terms of ministers, as I said, the formal decision between ministers that came out of the national cabinet meeting on 24 July.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'd like, on notice, whether there have been any formal conversations and the time frame of those up to today.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

98.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator McAllister	EPBC Amendment (Streamlining Environmental Approvals) Bill 2020 - date of when drafting of instructions commenced	<p>Senator McALLISTER: I'm interested in the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Amendment (Streamlining Environmental Approvals) Bill 2020 and the process by which that was developed.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'll just get the right people. This falls within Mr Knudson's area of major environmental reforms.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I'm trying to understand the process by which this bill was brought to the parliament. When was the decision taken to initiate work on a piece of legislation?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: The department commissioned some drafting through the Office of Parliamentary Counsel on 19 June.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Just to clarify, that's 2020?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Yes, Senator.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So 19 June 2020. How was it communicated to you that that advice would be required?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Well, there are a couple of things there. The independent reviewer for the EPBC Act presented to a senior officials group, which had representatives from all states and territories, on 4 June 2020. He noted in that discussion that his broad architecture for the review, which is borne out through the interim report, was one of national environmental standards, a devolved pathway for environmental assessments and approvals and then a strong assurance mechanism at the back end of that. So that was something the independent reviewer communicated on 4 June. Following that, on 15 June, the Prime Minister addressed the Committee for Economic Development of Australia and talked about the government's objective to streamline Commonwealth and state processes to a point of single-touch approvals. Those two things gave the department a clear recognition that that was the government's intended direction. Indeed, we were aware from prior work undertaken on approval bilateral agreements that the department has done in the past, a number of years ago, that there were a number of issues in the EPBC Act that needed to be resolved, so the department basically commissioned some work to commence on drafting, given those two things.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: When did you start? So we have a time line that commences on 4 June and runs through to 19 June, when you provided drafting instructions. When did you commence developing the drafting instructions?</p>	Page 21 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000210
-----	---	---------------------------	--	--	---------------------------------	-------------

				As you'd be aware from the bill, a lot of those drafting—I would say that the answer to that question is 2014 or 2013, because a lot of the things that were introduced were effectively the same as the bill that was introduced back I think in 2014. I can't remember the exact date, but I can get you that on notice.		
99.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator McAllister	EPBC Amendment (Streamlining Environmental Approvals) Bill 2020 - consultation with the Ministers' office	<p>Senator McALLISTER: When did the minister's office start talking to you about updating the 2014 bill?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'd have to take that on notice, but I think it's fair to say that there's been constant discussion around the EPBC Act and the need—if approval bilateral agreements which are provided for in the EPBC Act were to be pursued—for the act itself to have those amendments made. I'm happy to take it on notice and see what we can find, but I would expect that that discussion has been continuing since 2014.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I feel as though there's an unnecessary avoidance of an obvious question. There's a very public and prominent review underway by Professor Samuel. There's disclosure or a briefing about his work to senior officials. I'm trying to understand when the department took the decision to initiate legislation on this question. It's a pretty straightforward question. I understand there's been an ongoing policy discussion about reform, but a specific decision was taken which was that a particular kind of reform would be pursued and that you would seek Parliamentary Counsel's assistance in preparing legislation to that end. When was that decision taken?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I can certainly review our records and determine when I provided the final approval—it would have been in June—to seek that. I don't have that date with me today, but I can certainly review my records and give you that date on notice. I'm very happy to do that.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Did the minister's office request that legislation be prepared for introduction prior to you submitting the instructions to Parliamentary Counsel?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: As I said, Senator, the Prime Minister addressed the committee and talked about the government's objective to streamline Commonwealth and state processes—</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: You're not answering my question. I understand that that happened. My separate question is: did the minister's office make this request of you?</p>	Pages 22-23&52 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000211

			<p>Mr Tregurtha: Again, Senator, I don't have the details. I don't recall having a specific discussion. There were a range of potential pathways coming out of Professor Samuel's presentations during June and July to the government. I'd have to go back and check my records, which I'm happy to do on notice, to determine whether there was a specific instruction in relation to the bill that was introduced or whether it was a more general indication. Clearly, the government had to take a decision to introduce that bill. That would be a matter for the minister and the government as to how they determine that would take place. But I'm certainly happy to review my records in terms of direction from the minister's office or the minister.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Is your evidence to this committee, Mr Tregurtha, that the first time you had confirmation that the government sought this bill was when the Prime Minister gave a speech to CEDA?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: No, Senator.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: You said that you'd check your records. Would you be able to check those records and provide the information to this committee before the end of the day?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I'll do my best, Senator.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: You noted that Professor Samuel had provided a number of briefings about his work and that there were different pathways available to the government as a consequence of those briefings. You had a briefing on 2 June from him which indicated that national environmental standards and an independent watchdog would be part of the ultimate framework. Why are those two matters not dealt with in the bill?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Senator, that's a matter for government.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: It appears it's not, Mr Tregurtha, because you can't confirm to me that the government gave you any instructions whatsoever. Your improbable evidence to this committee today is that you can't remember who initiated the process by which drafting instructions were provided to Parliamentary Counsel. I am trying to understand what actually happened internally in a critical window when the reviewer gave a clear direction about his recommendation and the government decided to set off on another path.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I think that, to be fair to Mr Tregurtha, Senator, he has indicated that he wants to give you a precise answer and he's agreed to check his records and come back.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Senator McALLISTER: Minister, can you help us out? What's going on in the department? Are they following the instructions of the government or are they just off on their own jaunt, anticipating your government's needs?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: The department is implementing government policy.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So they did receive instructions from the minister to undertake this brief?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Officials have taken on notice precise questions, such as when requests for drafting instructions were issued and what communications they had around that. But the department implements the policy and decisions of the government.</p> <p>...</p> <p>[Further context on page 52]</p> <p>CHAIR: Senator McAllister, did you want to follow up on a point?</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Yes, I did. Mr Tregurtha took a number of questions on notice in relation to the sequence of events that saw the instructions issued to Parliamentary Counsel to draft reforms to the EPBC Act and I wondered if you had managed to check those records, Mr Tregurtha?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Not any further. I did come back after those questions and give you that time line of how the legislative process worked. I'm happy to go over that again.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I was interested in whether or not the minister provided instructions to you to task Parliamentary Counsel with sprucing up the 2014 bill.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: The minister didn't provide instructions. I said the government took a decision prior to 15 June in order to pursue single-touch approvals and then the department commenced work on reaffirming those legislative amendments.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So just for total clarity, the minister did not request you to do that; that was an initiative from within the department without—</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: The government took a decision to pursue single-touch approvals.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Yes, but there are different ways that you could do that, though, and you took a decision to do a particular thing, which was to take a particular bill in a particular direction.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				Mr Tregurtha: So I understand where you're coming from now, which is the form of the direction the department gave to the Parliamentary Counsel. I'm sure there were discussions with the minister's office about that. Whether there was a formal direction from the minister, I don't know. So I'll continue to follow that up on notice.		
100.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator McAllister	Professor Samuel's interim report - how many drafts seen by the department	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Professor Samuel gave his interim report to the minister on 30 June 2020. That's correct?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Yes.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: And it was published on 20 July?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: That's correct.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Prior to receiving the final interim report, how many drafts of previous versions did the department see?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Sorry, Senator. The question was how many drafts did the department see?</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I have to check my records to answer that more accurately. The department has provided Professor Samuel with a secretariat function. That secretariat function is working directly to Professor Samuel. So, in terms of the provision of drafts, I would probably have to take that on notice in terms of the number to ensure that I give you the right answer, but it could well be none, because my expectation is that when Professor Samuel provided the draft he provided a version to the minister—an information copy; I think it was on 25 June—and it's quite likely that that was also copied to the department. But I'd need to check that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Were draft chapters provided to the minister?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Not that I'm aware of, but I can check that on notice to make sure that's an accurate statement.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Thank you. I understand the explanation you're providing about the role of the secretariat. Was a draft of the report provided to the department, other than those members of the secretariat who had worked on it directly, prior to 25 June?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Again, my answer to that question would be no, but I'd like to take the opportunity on notice just to verify that that's correct.</p>	Page 27-29 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000213

			<p>Senator McALLISTER: In a similar vein, were earlier versions of chapters provided to the department prior to 25 June?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Again, I'd need to take that on notice, because it may be that, where there were particular elements that went to quite technical natures around the operation of the EPBC Act, the reviewer at times sought out advice from the department to ensure that he was properly understanding how the system was working currently and what the obligations of the act were in terms of getting those chapters into shape.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Yes, of course. I'm interested in the conversation that was taking place between the reviewer and the department. Was any documentation provided by the secretariat or Professor Samuel to the department as part of that consultation process?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Sorry, Senator—formally provided by the reviewer or the secretariat to the department? Are you talking about from November last year all the way through? Again, I'd have to take that on notice to make sure I was being accurate. But clearly, if the reviewer was seeking to talk about a specific topic, as I've already said, he's provided those materials to an area of the department to test his thinking. So, in that regard, yes. It might have been a draft of a chapter or a component of an argument where the reviewer has sought a particular conversation. But I'd need to take it on notice to be accurate. That is likely to have happened a number of times in relation to a number of matters where technical advice has been sought, so I can't give you a number or the particular instances or occasions or what the nature of that material is without collecting it all.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So you made data requests to the department. Did you provide material to the department for their response?</p> <p>Mr Edwards: Not wholesome material.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: What do you mean by 'wholesome material'?</p> <p>Mr Edwards: We wouldn't have provided whole chapters or reform recommendations or anything like that.</p> <p>We would have engaged—</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: When you say 'wouldn't have', do you mean 'didn't'?</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Mr Edwards: We didn't. I can be clear on that. There was no provision of chapters or sections of the report internally. What we would do is, again, that we might be engaging with a particular concept, so we might have given them a one-pager or a couple of dot points to say: 'Can you tell us about this? We're thinking about the'—</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: So you did do that? I'm finding the 'would have' and 'might have' a bit difficult. I'm trying to understand the actual process you did go through. So, if you could assist me by just saying, 'We did this,' that would be helpful.</p> <p>Mr Edwards: Sure. By and large, we've provided no written material to the department, but I can't say for sure that we wouldn't have provided a one-pager—</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: 'Didn't'.</p> <p>Mr Edwards: or some explanatory points. I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>		
101.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator Hanson-Young	Warragamba dam	<p>1. There's a number of concerns about the Warragamba Dam raising that you have identified from impact on indigenous heritage sites, not meeting unesco standards and the impact on critically endangered species and ecosystems. How will this project be assessed if the 2014 Abbott Reforms to environment laws pass - will you have any say on whether it proceeds despite these concerns and threats?</p> <p>2. Won't NSW which is a clear proponent of the project be able to do as they wish under their own 'standards' which clearly dont seem to hold up to Federal ones or the UN's?</p>	Written	SQ20-000414
102.	Outcome 1: Environment Protection Reform Division (EPRD)	Senator Hanson-Young	EPBC Review/Samuels	<p>a. What date did Professor Samuel hand his final review into the EPBC Act to the Minster?</p> <p>b. Regulator</p> <p>i. A strong independent regulator was recommended by the Samuel Review. Are you working on a model?</p> <p>ii. What does that model look like?</p> <p>iii. Has any funding been allocated to a regulator?</p> <p>iv. How will regulation be managed in the meantime, particularly if legislation is passed before the end of the year to devolve powers? We've seen through</p>	Written	SQ20-000401

				the ANAO report how poorly it's been handled to date.		
103.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Green	Great Barrier Reef Foundation - amount of funding spent on advertising	<p>Senator GREEN: ... Have the foundation given the department details about how much of the funding they spent on advertising? I assume advertising's a big part of getting that private investment together.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I don't have any specific information in relation to advertising, but we would be happy to take that on notice and see whether that is something that's available in a breakdown that we have. It would be embedded within the administration costs. And generally, as a matter of principle, the department would not be prescribing how the foundation spent the up to \$45-odd million which they're able to spend in the administration of the grant. We would expect them to be deploying those resources to maximise the public impact of the administrative funds that they have available to them.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Sure. And, to be clear, Mr Oxley, I'm not suggesting that the department should prescribe that; I just wanted to understand whether you knew how much had been spent on advertising. If you could take that on notice, that would be helpful—what component of the administration costs is advertising. Is the department aware of reports that the foundation was specifically targeting its Facebook ads to Liberal Party voters?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Not aware of any such suggestion.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Okay. I can table those at another time. If you weren't aware of those reports, could you also take on notice how much funding has been leveraged from this type of advertising or Facebook campaigns. That would be very helpful.</p>	Page 83 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000247
104.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Green	Port expansion in Townsville - minor boundary adjustment being sought from UNESCO	<p>Senator WATERS: Alright. I have just one final, very short chunk of questioning. It's about reclamation works. UNESCO's previously raised concerns about the impact of reclamation on outstanding universal value in general. But specifically, I'm aware that in 2017 an environment group wrote to UNESCO and to the then minister asking about the port expansion in Townsville and whether or not, due to the reclamation works and the level of the low water mark changing, a minor boundary adjustment was going to be sought from UNESCO.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: That's ringing a vague bell. I'd have to take on notice the status of that. The one observation I'd make is that Townsville is one of the four priority</p>	Page 87 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000251

				<p>port development areas in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park where future port expansion will be contained to, rather than multiple additional ports being further developed. But I'll take on notice the specific question about reclamation.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you, and in particular—and I'm sure you can remember this much—whether a minor boundary adjustment has actually been sought by the state party to UNESCO.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes, I'll answer that question as well as whether or not it is seen as something that's been necessary.</p>		
105.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Hanson-Young	Rio Tinto email forwarded to department 25 May	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: How was that information brought to the department's attention?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: The department and I received an email from an adviser in the minister's office, which was forwarding on advice from Rio Tinto of a matter that they expected to be raised in the media in the next 24 hours. The nature of the advice was very high level, such that someone without an understanding of what had transpired would not have understood the import or significance of what was being communicated about.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So Rio Tinto was just covering their backside?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: I believe this was a communication from the minister's office to the department, simply alerting the department to possible media interest.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So the information didn't come from Rio Tinto; it came from—</p> <p>Mr Oxley: No, it was the minister's office forwarding—</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: An email?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: to the department a communication they had received from Rio Tinto indicating that they were expecting that there would be media interest in this issue in the next 24 hours.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: What you're saying is that there wasn't much detail in this email.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: It was light on detail.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Are we able to have a copy of that email?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I can take that on notice.</p>	Page 109 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000262
106.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and	Senator Hanson-Young	Briefing from department on Rio Tinto	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Did the minister ask the department for a briefing on the matter?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: I don't know, Senator. Mr Oxley might know.</p>	Page 110 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000263

	Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)		activities at Juukan Gorge	<p>Mr Oxley: I don't believe so, but I will come back on notice if that's wrong.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I find that pretty extraordinary. It's quite—</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Senator, I—</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: You might be right, Mr Oxley. I just find it extraordinary that a minister wouldn't ask for a briefing on such a terrible event.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Senator, I don't—</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: It doesn't stick in your mind? You can check—I'd like you to check and make sure it's on notice so that you can clarify that, but I find it extraordinary.</p>		
107.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator McAllister	Communique issued by round table meeting of state Indigenous and environment ministers - 21 September	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Did the round table issue a communique? Was there a process outcome?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes, Senator. The round table did issue a communique, and it's a publicly available communique, which we're happy to provide on notice if that would be useful.</p>	Page 112 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000267
108.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator McAllister	Briefing from department on review of the ATSIHP Act	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Was the minister ever briefed about this review—the one that precedes the review she recently announced?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Not so much in terms of this review but more in terms of, firstly, a high-level explanation of the various attempts that had been made, in one form or another, to review the ATSIHP Act or, alternatively, where the ATSIHP Act had been scrutinised externally and recommendations had been made for its updating in one form or another. Two examples would be the Evatt review, which is a very old one now, and a review that was undertaken more recently by the Productivity Commission.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I see. And when did she seek that advice?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: That's advice that we provided to Minister Ley earlier in the year and before the Juukan Gorge destruction.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Do you have a month, roughly?</p>	Page 112-113 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000268

				Mr Oxley: I would need to take that on notice. It was during COVID times, but how far back in COVID times I'm not sure.		
109.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Thorpe	Advice provided to Djab Wurrung people on participating in the process of applying for protection for the DjAb Wurrung birthing trees under the ATSIHP Act	<p>Senator THORPE: Is it possible to see that advice that was given to Djab Wurrung people about how they could participate in that process, because that's not what I'm hearing? There were a lot of Djab Wurrung people who weren't part of any process and they are still camping on the Western Highway to protect that part of the country.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I'll come back on notice and give clarity about exactly what we can provide. Certainly, in terms of the process that we undertook, I'm very happy to provide an explanation of that process, which would have included not just the Djab Wurrung people represented through their legal representation but also would have taken account of any advice that had been provided by the Eastern Maar Aboriginal Corporation, I think it is, off the top of my head.</p>	Page 114 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000270
110.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Urquhart	Submitted by Senator Urquhart and Senator Dodson - Parramatta Female Factory	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the National Heritage Listing of the Parramatta Female Factory and Institutions Precinct include the whole of land parcels Lots 1 & 2 DP862127? 2. Are buildings C104, C104A, C107, part C109 and C111 that are the subject of Development Application 443/2020 included in the National Heritage Listing of the Parramatta Female Factory and Institutions? If not, what is the basis for this determination? 3. In a letter dated 3 September 2020 addressed to the member for Parramatta, the Minister advised that the three buildings included in the first phase of redevelopment works do not form part of the National Heritage listing for the Parramatta Female Factory and Institutions Precinct and that referral under the EPBC Act is not required in this instance. What was the basis from which the Minister formed this determination? 4. Can you provide documents that confirm this? 5. Did the Minister and/or the Department seek advice from the Australian Heritage Council before making the decision that a referral under the EPBC Act was not required in this instance? 6. Will the Minister provide all relevant documents, emails, and any other communication relevant to the making of the decision that the referral under 	Written	SQ20-000333

				<p>the EPBC Act is not required in this instance?</p> <p>7. What other independent advice did the Department and/or Minister seek in the decision-making process to determine that referral under the EPBC Act was not required in this instance?</p> <p>8. Can you provide documents confirming that the proposed works will not notably alter, modify, obscure or diminish the national heritage values of the Parramatta Female Factory and Institutions Precinct?</p>		
111.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Urquhart Senator Dodson	Submitted by Senator Urquhart and Senator Dodson - Aboriginal Heritage	<p>1. How many legally valid applications for intervention under the ATSIHP Act have been lodged with the Minister for the Environment since 2013?</p> <p>2. Are there any guidelines in relation to the maximum number of days the Minister and the Department has to process, consider and decide on the outcome of an application?</p> <p>3. How many applications have taken longer than the prescribed time to be finalised?</p> <p>4. What is the average processing time for a legally valid application?</p> <p>5. How many days has the Ministerial decision-making process for each legally valid application taken in the last 10 years?</p> <p>6. Of those, how many have taken longer than what is suggested within Departmental guidelines?</p> <p>7. In relation to the Butterfly Cave West Wallsend Site, is the Department aware of any intention by a developer to progress a development approval that may encroach upon the ATSIHP protection zone? What communication has the Department had with the developers? Can you please table a copy of any relevant correspondence?</p> <p>8. What is the standard procedure for when the Department or the Minister is made aware of an intent to breach the protections of a declared site?</p> <p>9. The Budget includes \$2 million for a project called “reducing the backlog under the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act”. Can you please provide further detail as to nature and details of this backlog?</p> <p>10. What communication, if any, occurred between the offices of Minister Ley and Minister Wyatt prior to the destruction of the Juukan rock shelters on 24 May 2020?</p> <p>11. Mr Brad Haynes, Vice President of Corporate Relations at Rio Tinto has told the Joint Standing Committee Inquiry that the company contacted the Minister Ley’s office on 22 May 2020 and provided a brief on the situation.</p>	Written	SQ20-000335

				<p>What was the content of that communication and can a copy of any records be tabled with the Committee?</p> <p>12. Was the Minister briefed explicitly on the laying of explosives around the site and any consequences those explosions may have had for the Juukan rock shelters?</p> <p>13. Why, having received a briefing from Rio Tinto on the issue, did nobody from Minister Ley's office return the call from the PKKP lawyer?</p> <p>14. Why did the Minister come to the view that it was too late to protect the sites without any reference to the PKKP?</p> <p>15. How many applications have been made for declarations under sections 9 and 10 of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act 1984? How many of those applications have resulted in declarations? How many were declined and for what reason?</p> <p>16. How many applications have been made for sites with Indigenous heritage value to be added to the National Heritage list under the EPBC Act? How many of those applications have been successful? How many have been unsuccessful and for what reason?</p>		
112.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Waters	Murujuga Rock Art	<p>In January 2020, the Australian government submitted a nomination for World Heritage listing for the Murujuga Cultural Landscape (prepared in collaboration with the traditional custodians. The nomination will not be able to be considered by the World Heritage Committee until 2022.</p> <p>1. What are the plans in place to protect the Murujuga Rock Art (including the recently discovered underwater heritage) from the impacts of mining and gas extraction in the short, medium and long term?</p> <p>2. Has the Department undertaken any assessment of whether the World Heritage values of the Murujuga Rock Art will be deteriorated before 2022 as a result of resource projects?</p>	Written	SQ20-000343
113.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade	Senator Waters	Reef Restoration and Adaptation partnership	<p>The Reef Foundation Work Plan 2020-21 confirms support for a tenfold increase in the scale of a cloud brightening trial in the Great Barrier Reef. The 2010 UN Convention on Biological Diversity has ruled that “no geoengineering activities should be carried out” until a global agreement on geo-engineering has been made, other than for “smallscale experiments” in controlled settings.</p>	Written	SQ20-000345

	Division (HRWT)			1. As a member of the RRAP, has the Department sought or received any advice regarding the project's compliance with the CBD? Are you satisfied that the proposed cloud brightening projects are consistent with the CBD?		
114.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Urquhart Senator Dodson	Submitted by Senator Urquhart and Senator Dodson - Conservation of National Heritage Listed Sites	<p>1. The recent ANAO audit of the Departments management of the EPBC act said "In relation to national and international heritage, the most recent State of the Environment report stated that while heritage places generally remain in good condition, there have been 'significant impacts' on natural heritage values and 'substantial impacts' on Indigenous and historic heritage, including the destruction of significant sites through resource extraction or development". Has the Department provided the Government with options to improve the monitoring and protection of national and international listed heritage sites? If so, what were these options and when were they presented to government?</p> <p>2. In the 2020 Budget there is \$33.5 million allocated to upgrade national and world heritage sites. Can you please provide a description for each site/project, how much has been allocated, and any state or territory contributions associated with each project?</p> <p>3. How was each site selected? Was it made based on Departmental advice and recommendations, and/or advice from the Australian Heritage Council, or with the assistance of independent analysis? If so, can this be provided?</p> <p>4. Does the Government keep records of the outstanding maintenance requirements contained within the management plans for each nationally and internationally listed heritage site? If yes, what is the total value?</p>	Written	SQ20-000331
115.	Outcome 1: Heritage Reef and Wildlife Trade Division (HRWT)	Senator Hanson-Young	Wildlife Trade	<p>1. Has the department been asked to do any work in relation to increasing efforts domestically and internationally to combat the illegal trade of wildlife?</p> <p>2. We know the PM had called for china to ban wet markets, but given wildlife trade is a threat not just to humans through the transfer of zoonotic disease like coronavirus but also biodiversity, extinction and is just plain cruel, isn't there a role for the environment department?</p>	Written	SQ20-000413

				<p>3. Have you briefed the Minister about the issue this year at all? What about encouraging her to make a call on the international stage?</p> <p>4. The agriculture department considered opening borders to imported parrots. Did you have any input into that? Were you consulted before the consultation even began? What was your advice about it?</p> <p>5. Are you aware of any other species where the agriculture department is considering allowing their importation?</p>		
116.	Outcome 1: Minister's Office - Ley	Senator Green	Number of meetings between the Minister and the special reef envoy	<p>Senator GREEN: ... In the report released by the special envoy for the reef, there's a list of meetings, public meetings or meetings of special consequence, and there are five meetings with the minister. Is that how many times the reef envoy has met with the minister in the past six months, or have there been more meetings between the minister and the special reef envoy?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I do not have an answer to that question. We could ask the minister's office or the envoy and undertake to possibly come back with a response.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Okay, perhaps you could take that on notice.</p>	Page 84 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000248
117.	Outcome 1: Minister's Office - Ley	Senator Hanson-Young	Communication between Ministers' office and PKKP	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I understand that the WA department of environment gave evidence on the same day Minister Ley was contacted about the issue, on 20 May, by the PKKP, who have also said that they had contacted the minister's office twice on that day—not just once but twice. That's what the PKKP say in their submission. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: I read out paragraph 220(a) before—contacted the office, explained the circumstances and flagged the possibility of an application. Paragraph 220(c) says:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • later on the same day ... followed up Minister Ley's office chasing up on the promised return call (which was never returned). <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Why wasn't the phone call returned?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: It's not for me to speak for the minister's office. I don't know.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: This is a pretty big deal. We've had Minister Birmingham identify that the government was even prepared to support an inquiry into this issue. The minister's office hasn't given you an explanation for why that phone call wasn't returned?</p>	Page 109 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000261

				<p>Mr Larsen: It's not for me to comment on what the minister's office did or didn't do.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: No—but has the minister's office given you an explanation?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: No, not beyond what's in the public domain.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have you asked the minister's office for their version of events?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: No.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Minister Birmingham, what's your understanding of why that phone call wasn't returned?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I don't have background to that. I can take on notice what transpired there. I'm not aware of the nature of the message that was left. I can only assume that that message didn't convey the gravity of the situation, such that the call wasn't dealt with in the way that people would expect it to be dealt with now. That's an assumption on my part, but I'll take it on notice to see what further information can be understood.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Thank you—if you could take that on notice, I'd appreciate that.</p>		
118.	Outcome 1: Minister's Office - Ley	Senator Hanson- Young	Date of meeting between Minister Ley and the PKKP	<p>Mr Oxley: If I may: I've just been reminded that Ministers Ley's office did ask the department whether the department had had any role in regulatory decision-making in relation to the matter, the answer to which was no. So there was an inquiry about whether the Commonwealth had had a role in any way in relation to the destruction of the shelters, and the answer to that question was no. I would also note that, to my understanding, subsequently Minister Ley had a meeting with the PKKP—the traditional owner group.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: When did that occur?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I don't have in my head the date on which that happened, but I recall from the media discourse around it that the minister had had a discussion with the PKKP.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you take that on notice? I'd like the date.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Yes, of course.</p>	Page 110- 111 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000264

119.	Outcome 1: Minister's Office - Ley	Senator Hanson- Young	Briefing from Rio Tinto	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Did the minister herself ask for a briefing from Rio Tinto?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: I don't have any knowledge of that.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you take that on notice, please, Minister.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Yes.</p>	Page 111 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000265
120.	Outcome 1: Minister's Office - Ley	Senator McAllister	Minister's Office processes for filtering calls of importance	<p>Senator McALLISTER: That's very useful. I don't mean to cut you off, because that is actually a very useful explanation. But say a group of people ring again and they are told by the minister's office that James will call them back, and they ring again and James never calls them back. Would anything be different if all of this unfolded in exactly the same way tomorrow? Would anything have changed in the way that the minister's office would deal with that desperate communication?</p> <p>Mr Larsen: I would hope that if it were a professional acting on behalf of an entity or individuals, and possibly if it were a lawyer, that individual would have sufficient familiarity with the act and the processes under it. So I think it's not one single point of failure.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: The checklist to which Mr Larsen referred is on the department's website. The practice is that where contact is made, and where the person making the contact is inquiring specifically in relation to the protections that may be accessed under the ATSIHP Act, they are then referred to this checklist—or referred to the department if they're wanting to make an application verbally, because there is a capacity to make an application verbally, rather than in writing, under the ATSIHP Act.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: In addition to what we've taken on notice in relation to Senator Hanson-Young's questions, I'll take your comment and question on notice as it relates to the minister's office. I have no doubt that they will have reflected on what occurred there, obviously, and the terrible end consequences. As you would appreciate, the environment minister's office receives many, many phone calls and not all of them are particularly helpful, well-informed or otherwise. I don't know the context in terms of the detail of the message and the nature of information that was shared on this occasion. That's why I took it on notice from Senator Hanson-Young as to the extent to which it may or may not have been preventable at that stage—clearly, the end result was a failure.</p>	Page 113- 114 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000269

				But, obviously, the minister's office are aware, now that the call has been made, and I'm sure they will have reflected on that. In responding to Senator Hanson-Young's question they will be able to add any additional information that deals with your point as to what they've done to deal with the processes necessary to filter the calls of importance.		
121.	Outcome 1: Trade Market Access and International Division (TMAID)	Senator Urquhart Senator Dodson	Submitted by Senator Urquhart and Senator Dodson - Pacific Ocean Litter Project	1. What is the current status of the Pacific Ocean Litter Project (POLP)? 2. What milestones have been reached since the project was established in 2019? 3. How much money has been expended through the POLP in the years 19-20 & 20-21? 4. Please provide a breakdown of the major expenses incurred for the POLP in the years 19-20 & 20-21.	Written	SQ20-000337
122.	Outcome 1: Trade Market Access and International Division (TMAID)	Senator Hanson-Young	Leaders Pledge Australia	Leaders Pledge Australia didn't sign onto - https://www.leaderspledgefornature.org/Leaders_Pledge_for_Nature_27.09.20.pdf a. Political leaders participated in the United Nations Summit on Biodiversity in September 2020, representing 76 countries from all regions and the European Union, and they committed to reversing biodiversity loss by 2030. Why didn't Australia sign the pledge? b. Were you approached by the summit organisers? c. Did you approach the summit organisers? d. Have you had any discussions since then about making the commitments that the EU, UK, Canada, New Zealand etc have all been so willing to make? e. The pledge is very comprehensive - everything from biodiversity loss, land, freshwater and ocean degradation, deforestation, desertification, pollution and climate change and involvement of indigenous peoples. Why won't Australia commit?	Written	SQ20-000403
123.	Outcome 2: Australian Antarctic Division (AAD)	Senator Urquhart	Summary of program and operational funding - Antarctic program	Senator URQUHART: Putting the Nuyina purchase to one side, can you provide a summary of program and operational funding for the Antarctic program over the last decade and a summary of personnel numbers across the same period? If it's easier to take that on notice I'm happy for you provide that during the course of the day.	Page 23 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000240

				<p>Mr Ellis: I can give you the overview that you asked for, including numbers. If it's not sufficient, then we can always come back and provide that separately on notice if required. In 2016, the government announced the Australian Antarctic Strategy and 20 Year Action Plan. That included a range of significant funding initiatives for Antarctic activities—around \$2.8 billion: \$1.9 billion for the construction and delivery of and operation of the Nuyina; \$45 million for the overland traverse capability and its first major project, drilling a million-year ice core;</p> <p>\$200 million in additional funding for operations in the Antarctic Division, which was designed to operate these new capabilities; more than \$450 million over the next 10 years to upgrade our Antarctic research stations; \$77 million for the development of a final proposal for the Davis aerodrome project, so a year-round aviation capability; and \$50 million dollars for the rebuild of Macquarie Island project. During that period of time, we've been expending against that capital funding, and those projects have been progressing very well. They've been subject to quite extensive external review, particularly by the Department of Finance, and I'm confident those projects are on track. Our staffing numbers currently stand with an ASL cap of 422, and those numbers have continued to increase—422 in 2019-20 and 447 for 2020-21. That's additional to the staffing required to operate the RSV Nuyina, particularly the science technical activities. Is that sufficient, Senator? Would you like any more detail?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: That's fine for now. If you can maybe add a bit to that, I'm happy for you to take that on notice. Specifically, you talked about the various projects and how they're progressing—maybe a bit of detail around the progression and the status of where they're at.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Certainly. We'll provide that on notice.</p>		
124.	Outcome 2: Australian Antarctic Division (AAD)	Senator Abetz	Stations in each country	<p>Mr Ellis: There are nine different countries that operate in the area that was designated as the Australian Antarctic Territory. They are—and hopefully I can get all of these—the Republic of Korea, Germany, China, Russia, Belarus, India—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: You're up to six.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Japan, Australia of course—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: But Australia's not one of the nine?</p>	Page 23-24 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000242

				<p>Mr Ellis: Yes, we are one of the nine.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: We are? In that case we're just missing one country. It's not a memory test. If you can provide that to us on notice—unless Mr Metcalfe knows.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I was just wondering whether the United States is there or whether they are elsewhere, Mr Ellis.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: The US, yes. Thank you, Secretary.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Well done, Mr Metcalfe. He is on top of his brief—exceptionally well done.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: They're at the South Pole of course, which is—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: I'm with you. They're the nine countries. There are 16 bases, did you say?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Sixteen stations, including—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Are you able—and, if you aren't, take it on notice—to tell us how many stations each of those countries has?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: In the interests of accuracy, I can provide that on notice, because I'm bound to make an error in trying to guess those.</p>		
125.	Outcome 2: Australian Antarctic Division (AAD)	Senator Abetz	Inspections and official visits - countries and stations	<p>Senator ABETZ: With the inspections and official visits that you did, are you able to split them up in relation to the countries and the stations—and take that on notice as well, rather than trying to do a memory test now.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: I am very happy to provide that on notice.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ: Are we confident that all nine nations that have a station in our claimed territory—are we satisfied that they are all abiding by the letter and intent of the convention?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: The inspection regime gave us an opportunity to visit two of the Chinese stations, the Indian station and two of the Russian stations, and actually spend days on site at those stations looking at the operations there. The inspection team was satisfied at the conclusion of the inspection of the stations that that there was no evidence of those nations breaching any of the Antarctic Treaty protocols. There were minor issues to do with commerce or environmental activities, but overarchingly there was very strong compliance with the Antarctic Treaty guidelines. And certainly at every station we were welcomed into the station. There was no element of the station that we were</p>	Page 24 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000244

				prevented from accessing or seeing or taking photographs of. So my view is there was a very high level of compliance. Senator ABETZ: And the five stations that you didn't visit out of the 17—if you can provide them to us on notice, please. Mr Ellis: I will.		
126.	Outcome 2: Australian Antarctic Division (AAD)	Senator Whish-Wilson	EPBC assessment	Senator WHISH-WILSON: In terms of the EPBC assessment, should I take it from your answer that the AAD is using its internal expertise to assess the potential environmental impacts of this project? Mr Bryson: That's correct. We've got a probity framework in place where we have separated out the two lots of subject matter experts, one to provide advice to the project and one to provide advice to the Environmental Approvals Division, which is looking after the EPBC Act proposal. So then there's a priority wall and an ethics wall between those two components in the organisation. Senator WHISH-WILSON: Are you able to tell us who those individuals are, or provide that on notice? Mr Bryson: I'll take it on notice.	Page 25 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000249
127.	Outcome 2: Australian Antarctic Division (AAD)	Senator Abetz	Stations/operational facilities	Senator ABETZ: ... Can I ask—and take this on notice—my final question: of the nine countries that are operating within the territory that we claim, do any have stations or operational facilities in any of the other 58 per cent of the Antarctic continent? CHAIR: You can take that on notice. Senator ABETZ: Yes. You understood what I was getting at? Mr Ellis: Yes, I understand completely. The answer is yes and we will provide those details on notice. What I will do is send you a map that shows where each of the stations is and the nation that operates it, which will give you a very simple answer to that question.	Page 25 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000246
128.	Outcome 2: Australian Antarctic Division (AAD)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Runway - supplementary options	Senator WHISH-WILSON: As you correctly say, all nations have struggled with this. But my understanding is that the US, when they looked at this, decided to go for ski-equipped vehicles that they can refuel and fly on. Has Australia considered that? And would you really need year-round access to fly to a station that might have 20 people stationed there over winter when you	Page 26 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000250

				<p>could perhaps use a Hercules with that kind of equipment? I understand that that's also a capital expenditure, but surely that would be a lot cheaper than building a massive runway, multibillion-dollar runway.</p> <p>Mr Ellis: As part of the process of developing this option, a very broad range of options were examined, including ski-equipped aircraft, additional ice runways and gravel runways. To meet the requirements of the Australian Antarctic Program, recognising that we're operating one of the world's largest Antarctic programs, to meet that requirement to provide year-round access, to meet the cargo capabilities that we are forecasting and to be able to deliver the science projects that we have to, ski-equipped Hercules are an excellent supplementary option but they don't have the capacity to meet our needs going forward. Those options were examined. In fact, as recently as last season we continued to look at those as supplementary or emergency options. But the question is really whether they provide the long-term capability that this program needs to meet its operational science and safety requirements.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Are the analyses you did there available for us to have a look at?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: I'll have to—</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Yes.</p>		
129.	Outcome 2: Australian Antarctic Division (AAD)	Senator Whish-Wilson	Runway estimated cost and time frames	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That'd be great. I'm sorry if Senator Urquhart already asked you this earlier, but are you able to give us an updated estimate of the cost of a runway?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: At this stage we are still in that analysis process. And clearly with COVID-19 the resources and teams we are able to deploy for this season are less. We don't have a final determined cost of that project and it's still under development—recognising that we are required to come back in 2022 with a final funding decision, so we're still in the development phase. It would be much too early to speculate on the cost of the runway.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Are you able to provide specific time frames that you're planning to meet with respect to providing, for example, estimates of cost?</p> <p>Mr Ellis: Yes, we can provide a project time line.</p>	Page 26-27 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000252

				Senator WHISH-WILSON: Perhaps I could get that timetable from you on notice.		
130.	Outcome 2: Australian Antarctic Division (AAD)	Senator Brown	Nuyina and the Marine Science Program	<p>1. When did the Australian Antarctic Division (AAD) first become aware of the delays to construction of the Nuyina that could potentially prevent it being delivered on time and the consequent impacts on the ADD shipping task and implementation of the Marine Science Program?</p> <p>2. When did the AAD know with certainty that the Nuyina would not be delivered in time to carry out the ADD shipping task to Antarctica and implementation of the Marine Science Program?</p> <p>3. In light of the delay in the construction program and knowledge that the Nuyina would not be delivered in time to carry out the ADD shipping task what steps did AAD take to secure a contract with P&O Maritime who had the Australian flagged and Australian crewed vessel the Everest tied up in Hobart?</p> <p>4. Given the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and the massive loss of jobs across the country, did the AAD place any consideration on the priority of employing Australians in the Marine Science Program and what steps did the AAD take to ensure Australians would be employed in its shipping task?</p> <p>5. Was the Minister aware that the AAD was proposing to introduce a foreign registered and foreign crewed vessel to the Antarctic program while an Australian flagged and Australian crewed vessel might have been available?</p> <p>6. What discussions did the AAD have with P&O Maritime to secure an extended contract for the Australian registered and Australian crewed Aurora Australis?</p> <p>7. In the event the Aurora Australis may not be available, what steps did the Minister responsible or the AAD take to secure Australian seafarers for employment on the vessel the Everest given it was a likely available interim replacement vessel?</p> <p>8. Did the AAD make any approaches to P&O Maritime to secure the services of the experienced officers and crew of the Aurora Australis for the Everest given they had the necessary experience and continuity of service to the AAD to ensure a qualified, safe and experienced crew?</p> <p>9. What steps has the AAD taken to ensure that the qualifications of the foreign crew of the Everest are vetted?</p>	Written	SQ20-000276

				<p>10. What steps has the AAD taken to ensure that the officers and crew of the Everest have the experience in operations in Antarctica and to ensure the safety of all who travel to and from Antarctica?</p> <p>11. Alternatively, did the AAD make any approaches to Serco to secure the services of the Australian officers and crew of the delayed Nuyina to crew the Everest?</p> <p>12. What steps has the AAD taken to ensure that Australian laws, industrial instruments, wages and employment standards are being complied with on the Everest?</p> <p>13. Given the requirement to keep the Antarctic COVID-19 free, what human biosecurity risk mitigation/assessment has been undertaken with respect to the potential higher risk that use of a foreign vessel employing foreign crew poses?</p> <p>14. Why did the AAD go out to tender for a replacement vessel to fill the service gap between end of service by the Aurora and the arrival of the Nuyima in December 2019, before it was known that there was a delay in the new ship?</p>		
131.	Agency: Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Hanson- Young	Briefings to government departments or agencies - temperature rise	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Given that 4.4 degrees of warming is catastrophic for civilisation, to say the least, have any government departments or agencies specifically sought briefings from the BOM in relation to this?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Again, similar to my earlier answer, there is dialogue right across government, as with our scientific partners like the CSIRO. We brief colleagues right across government around our work. Those briefings are extensive and longstanding.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have you briefed the department of agriculture?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: We're in regular contact with our colleagues in the department on all sorts of matters. Is there a particular subject? Our climate work is well integrated into the business of the department. We work closely with the relevant parts of the portfolio on the outcomes of our work. I know the portfolio also draws heavily from agencies like CSIRO, and obviously partners of ours in that regard.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I understand the significance of CSIRO. I guess I'm thinking more about those other government departments that have responsibilities for forecasting and planning for the future of all Australians, whether that's Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Home Affairs, or the impact of this on our tourism industry. Has the Minister for Trade asked for a briefing in</p>	Page 12 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000222

				<p>relation to this? I'd like a sense of who you've briefed. If you need to take that on notice, I'm happy for you to take that on notice. I'd like a comprehensive list. If they haven't asked for a briefing, that's fine. I just would like to know.</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Given that you mentioned Agriculture, I can confirm that we have very regular extensive discussions. Indeed, in terms of agriculture production, one of the key areas of government focus is through firstly the Future Drought Fund. There were announcements from the drought minister recently in relation to the formation of a series of hubs around Australia to focus research and innovation, given the fact that we can expect droughts in the future, and of course being aware of the overall trend of warming and drier conditions across much of the continent. Some 15 research and development corporations that sit within the portfolio are very focused on this as part of their overall work. Mr Johnson can talk more broadly about government, but I can assure you that adapting to changing climate, climate adaptation, which we discussed last night, is a significant focus for us.</p>		
132.	Agency: Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Hanson- Young	Temperature forecasting timeline	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: If you need to take my final question on notice you can. I'd be keen to understand what the BOM's forecasting timelines are that you believe we're facing. The world is currently 1.1 degrees warmer, and for Australia that is 1.4 degrees. How many degrees do you think we will hit in 2030—you might have that; it is only 10 years away—or 2040 and 2050 under the pathway we're on? Do you have those figures to hand?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I don't have it right in front of me, but we could get it to you quite quickly, just for the sake of accuracy.</p>	Page 13 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000224
133.	Agency: Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Green	Briefings since publication of the severe weather outlook	<p>Dr Johnson: We provide a comprehensive whole-of-government service to brief the relevant portfolios and ministers on the upcoming risks, and also I will brief the cabinet.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Would you be able to take on notice, if you don't have the dates already, the briefings that you have been able to provide since the severe weather outlook was published to the cabinet and then also to the Minister for Emergency Management—sorry I got the wording mixed up before—and the Minister for Infrastructure? Also, I was wondering whether there's any engagement with Treasury in terms of the responsibility for insurance under</p>	Page 5-6 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000206

				Finance as well. If you could take that on notice? Dr Johnson: I'd be happy to do that.		
134.	Agency: Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Rennick	ACRON data, peer review and record keeping	<p>1. Does the BOM consider it best practice to follow the World Meteorological Organisations guidelines?</p> <p>2. The margin of error on observational data is still not reduced to that recommend by the Independent peer review in 2011. Why has this taken almost 10 years for the BOM complete?</p> <p>3. The 2011 Independent Peer Review recommended that the BOM specify statistical uncertainty values when calculating Australian national temperature trends and also specify error bounds and confidence intervals along time series. Why did the BOM release the ACORN data without such important quality assurance indicators?</p> <p>4. I note the Independent Peer Review states the ACORN-SAT data set was the world's first national scale homogenised data set. If Australia was the first country to homogenise data on a national basis then how can the BOM claim (as per previous QoN) that homogenisation is a consistent process across all major meteorological organisations?</p> <p>5. The independent peer review said "it would be prudent to adopt 3 thermometers to allow a continuous check of whether a sensor is going out of calibration, particularly in remote location where isolated sites may carry a heavy weight within the data. Why does the BOM not adopt this practice?</p> <p>6. Can the BOM please provide workings on all prior parallel runs between small and large Stevenson Screens? What sites were these tests conducted at? Over how many months were these runs conducted? What was the monthly temperature and variance of these tests?</p> <p>7. In a prior QoN the BOM stated that ACORN made another 966 adjustments to take into account the latest science and new data. Given the Buisan study on Stevenson screens was released in between the two ACORN reports which showed a difference between Stevenson screens of 0.54 degrees, why didn't the BOM adjust or be prepared to do more parallel runs with Stevenson screens given the large difference in findings between the Buisan study and prior parallels by the BOM?</p>	Written	SQ20-000427

				<p>8. Given the BOM has acknowledged it has destroyed records relating to observational practices and processes, how can it homogenise data if no records relating to that data were destroyed?</p> <p>9. What records were destroyed by the BOM? What weather stations and years did the records relate to?</p> <p>10. When will evidence of the BOM obtaining permission from the National Archives to destroy records be made available?</p> <p>11. Given the BOM destroyed records, why should the public trust any amendments prior to 1973 when documents relating to observation practices and processes were destroyed?</p> <p>12. In a previous QoN I asked; "In the private sector, companies are required to keep records as per the Corporations Act. I note that as per the APS Values and Code of Conduct in practice require employees to 'document significant decisions or actions consistent with the Archives Act 1983 and to a standard that will withstand independent scrutiny'. As a Senator, how can I scrutinise the BOM's practices if the BOM have destroyed records?" The BOM's reply was "The Bureau maintains appropriate records." This did not answer my question. Can you please detail the reasons why records relating to observational records were destroyed?</p> <p>13. In a prior QoN I asked; "On page 9 of the 2011 Observations practices the BOM states the differences in recorded temperatures between the large and small Stevenson screen were less than 0.1 degree. I note in February 2015, the International Journal of Climatology released a research paper from Buisan and others, who conducted a test between the two screens for a year from 2011. https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/joc.4287. In Table 2 of that report the mean difference between the large and small Stevenson screen was shown to be 0.54 of degree, with a peak monthly mean difference in the summer month of July of 0.92 of a degree. The average air temperature for winter months was 11 degrees and summer months 21 degrees for an average of around 16 degrees. Australia has an average temperature of around 21 degrees so if anything, the variation between screens in Australia would be higher than 0.54 degrees would it not?" The BOM replied, "No". Could the BOM please expand on this answer and explain its reasoning.</p> <p>14. In regard to Stevenson screens why is there so much difference between the Buisan parallel run and the BOM's parallel runs?</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>15. In terms of percentages, has the amount of redundant data (i.e. missing records) increased or decreased since the introduction of automatic weather stations? If the redundancy has increased why has the BOM moved towards a process that statistically generates less accurate records? 16. What is the recommendation from the World Meteorological Organisation as to how long temperature readings should be?</p> <p>17. Can the BOM please explain why the USA average their readings over 5 minutes and take readings every hour, rather than just twice a day as the BOM does? Which process is more accurate?</p> <p>18. What does the World Meteorological Organisation recommend as to how often temperature readings should be?</p> <p>19. If a thermometer breaks down, what is the average time it takes for the BOM to detect this and how long does it take to repair?</p> <p>20. In a previous QoN I asked; "What's the longest time period a thermometer has been out of action?" and the BOM replied "It has not been possible to determine this in the time available". Can the BOM now answer this question and if not why not? If not, when will this be available?</p> <p>21. What are the six outstanding recommendations from the 2011 peer review yet to be completed by the BOM?</p> <p>22. In regard to the BOM's homogenisation of temperature records at Marble Bar in 1923/1924, on what basis did it change these records and why are the changes so inconsistent given weather conditions were consistent? If it's due to equipment, then why were the changes to daily records so inconsistent? i.e. some were homogenised upwards and some downwards? Why would a change in equipment produce such a large amount of volatility? Can you please detail the justification for this answer?</p> <p>23. To how many decimal places does the USA, Canada and Great Britain record the temperature? To how many decimal places does the World Metrological Organisation recommend the temperature is measured to?</p> <p>24. Why doesn't the BOM itemise the cost of homogenising data?</p> <p>25. Given the ACORN series is a regressive process i.e. it homogenises historical records, when will the BOM complete the process of homogenising historical records? If there is no set date of completion, could the BOM please</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>explain what the outstanding issues with the BOM data set are and why they need to be further homogenised?</p> <p>26. On page 23 of the 2011 Observation practices the BOM stated that between 1908 and 1938 there is little evidence to suggest a well-defined and traceable temperature system was in place. If this is the case, why include data from that period at all in the ACORN series?</p> <p>27. In regards to Recommendation C7 of the 2011 Independent Peer Review, has the BOM determined and documented the reasons why the new data set shows a lower average temperature in the period prior to 1940 than is shown by data derived from the whole network and by previous international analyses? If so, could the BOM please provide the documentation?</p> <p>28. On average how long does it take for the BOM to detect if the equipment in the field is malfunctioning?</p> <p>29. In regard to page 16 of its Observation practices, how does the BOM achieve standardisation using 4 different varieties of probes? Has a parallel run been conducted to ensure the different probes give the same result?</p> <p>30. Have parallel runs between mercury thermometers and PRT thermometers been carried out? If so, at which weather stations and how long was the length of each test. Was there any systemic difference between the two?</p> <p>31. Are thermometers calibrated in the field?</p> <p>32. Why does the BOM believe it is not necessary to test calibration in the field when the Independent Peer Review said it would be prudent to do so?</p> <p>33. Given the independent peer review did not rate the observing practices of the BOM, and confidence intervals are not provided for the ACORN datasets why should Australians trust the Bureau's observational information?</p> <p>34. Recommendation C3 of the Independent Peer Review says both the raw and homogenised data should be analysed with the same gridding and trend analysis method to identify the effects of data homogenisation. Has the BOM done this and if so, could proof be provided of the reconciliation between the two datasets?</p> <p>35. Furthermore, as noted on page 7 of the Independent Peer Review and identified by the Bureau's 2005 Basic Observing System Study, the surface temperature observation network fails to meet the internationally recommended minimum spatial density through much of inland Australia. Recommendation B2 suggested the BOM invest in a limited number of</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>additional observation stations in remote Australia to enhance the robustness of the ACORN set for trend analysis. Has this been done and if so, what stations are these? If not, why?</p> <p>36. In a previous QoN I asked "In January 2019 – the BOM released a tweet and held a media conference saying that Noona had recorded a new all-time record – the highest minimum ever. Given Noona has only operated since 2017, how can the BOM be sure that it was the hottest minimum ever given the BOM only had two years of data which is not statistically significant? Most people would assume the BOM was talking about the last 110 years not the last 2 years. Why didn't the BOM disclose that the figures weren't statistically significant?" The Bom replied "On 18 January 2019, the Noona AWS recorded an overnight minimum temperature of 35.9 degrees. At the time, it was the highest minimum temperature ever recorded at a Bureau of Meteorology site, anywhere in Australia." Why does the BOM issue media releases for data that is not statistically significant?</p> <p>37. On the last QoN I asked, "On page 21 of the Trewin 2018 report the BOM states that "an instrument with a faster response time will tend to record higher maximum and lower minimum temperatures than an instrument with a slower response time." The BOM then states that in Summer there were increases of up to 0.4 degrees at 15:00 for variations in response time. The BOM claim these differences were negligible because the BOM has a 0.3 degrees threshold for station specific adjustments. Isn't 0.3 degrees too high as a threshold given the WMO require a +/-0.2 degree margin of error?" and the BOM replied "No.". Monosyllabic answers do not suffice. Please explain your answer.</p> <p>38. In a previous QoN I asked; "On page 20 of Trewin 2018, variations were recorded in the move to AWS. Why does the BOM consider variations as high as 0.22 degrees for maximum and 0.16 degrees for mean temperature as insignificant? Both these figures are greater than 10% of the change in temperature in the last century (regardless of which database is being used) and as such should be regarded as materially significant." The BOM replied "No. The difference mentioned is of two observations both with uncertainties, therefore a wider tolerance is used before adjustments are applied." If uncertainties are too high, then isn't this a reflection of the BOM's poor change management processes?</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>39. USCRN stations are equipped with three independent thermometers which measure air temperature in degrees Celsius. The station's datalogger computes independent 5-minute averages using two-second readings from each thermometer. These multiple measurements are then used to derive the station's official hourly temperature value. Given the USA can record the weather hourly using three thermometers averaged across 5 minutes why does the BOM only record the weather twice a day using one thermometer using one-minute averages?</p> <p>40. In a report entitled 'Techniques involved in developing the Australian Climate Observation Reference Network – Surface Air Temperature (ACORN-SAT) dataset' (CAWCR Technical Report No. 049), Blair Trewin explains that up to 40 neighbouring weather stations can be used for detecting inhomogeneities and up to 10 can be used for adjustments. Why does the BOM believe they can guesstimate the temperature in the past based on reference stations up to hundreds of kilometres away rather than the actual observation that was recorded? 41. Why did the BOM insert cards into Goulburn and Thredbo weather stations that limited the amount of downside readings below -10 degrees? Has the BOM audited all 700 other weather stations to ensure this isn't happening elsewhere? Has this been externally audited?</p> <p>42. Has the analysis promised in the response to the recommendation D3 in the peer review 2012 been published? If so, could a link please be supplied?</p> <p>43. Could the BOM please provide the evaluative scores applied by the International Peer Review on the page 17 of their report?</p> <p>44. As per page 24 of the Observations report, "While it is possible to provide a calibration certificate for each probe with a likely 95% uncertainty of <0.02 °C using either tabulated or polynomial coefficient corrections, no calibration data were used for field PRTs." Currently there is no method to incorporate these coefficients into the AWS for routine measurement process, as a fixed resistance to temperature conversion is part of the system firmware." Can this statement be explained in further detail please?</p> <p>45. As per the BOM Measurement uncertainty of weather observations document. Air temperature uncertainty remains between 0.3/0.4 degrees. WMO guidelines require 0.2 degrees. Soil temperature remains at 0.5 and do not measure below negative 10 degrees. WMO guidelines require 0.2 degrees</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>uncertainty and to record down to negative 50. The BOM does not state its sea surface temperature uncertainty. The WMO guidelines require this to be given at 0.2. Why has the Bom achieved a total of 0 WMO weather observation uncertainty guidelines, and allowed most to be over double the required guidelines?</p> <p>46. Has a statistician been employed by the BOM as per the 2017 Technical Forum recommendation? If so, when and why didn't a statistician review the 2011 ACORN data set?</p> <p>47. Has the BOM made the pre-1910 historical climate data available on the Bureau's website, and developed appropriate communication materials to promote this development as an adjunct to ACORN-SAT in providing a more complete description of Australia's long-term temperature record and to place ACORN-SAT in a broader historical perspective? I note this was a recommendation of the TAF.</p> <p>48. Has the BOM finalised and published the fact sheets for all 112 ACORN-SAT reference stations following appropriate quality control processes as per the TAF recommendation? If not, why not and when will this be completed?</p> <p>49. How does the BOM undertake targeted and active consultation with expert statisticians about the Bureau's work plan on understanding and communicating uncertainty, recognising the disciplinary differences between meteorologists, climatologists and statisticians in describing and estimating uncertainty, with a view to optimising the Bureau's approach by adopting appropriate methods from each of these disciplines?</p> <p>50. Has the BOM utilised a universal text-based format such as CSV for providing both raw and adjusted data?</p> <p>51. Has the BOM prepared CSV files for the 112 ACORN-SAT stations that contain time series of maximum and minimum temperature records together with the relative contribution (such as a relative weighting or similar) to the Australian average temperature record?</p> <p>52. Has the BOM consolidated all downloads of raw and adjusted data using links on a single web page?</p> <p>53. Has the BOM developed a framework for standardising metadata information so that adjustments made on the basis of metadata are seen as both transparent and objective?</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>54. Has the BOM performed a comparative analysis south-eastern Australia to assess whether the inclusion of pre-1910 data is worthwhile in attempting to understand current temperature patterns?</p> <p>55. Can the BOM provide the specifications for each of the electronic sensors (PTR) that it has used in official weather stations public, including their time constants?</p> <p>56. Can the BOM provide the reports that establish this equivalence, between the electronic sensors (PRT) now used to measure temperature and the mercury thermometers that were traditionally used in its official weather stations?</p> <p>57. Can the Bureau explain why at Rutherglen, and most other official weather recording stations, there is no overlapping/parallel data to ensure a demonstrated equivalence in measurement between the original mercury thermometer and the new electronic sensor (PRT)?</p> <p>58. Can the Bureau confirm that the original IT system put in place back in 1996 did average the one-second readings from the electronic sensors and was put in place by Almos Pty Ltd, who had done similar work for the Indian, Kuwaiti, Swiss and other meteorological offices that all average over one minute?</p> <p>59. What dataset does the BOM use when reporting record maximum and minimum temperatures – observations or homogenised?</p> <p>60. I note that the BOM says the highest temperature for NSW is 49.7 degrees at Menindee Post Office in 1939. Yet the ABS says the highest record is 50 degrees at Wilcannia in 1939. I also note that BOM says the lowest temperature in Victoria is -11.7 degrees in 1991 at Falls Creek whereas the ABS says the lowest temperature is -13 degrees at Mount Hotham in 1931. Why do the BOM records not agree with the ABS?</p> <p>61. Why does the BOM not report Wilcannia at being the hottest temperature in NSW and Mount Hotham as being the coldest temperature in Victoria.</p> <p>62. Given your claim that media almost exclusively report station data, then why is the BOM not including station data for the purposes of reporting record maximums and minimums.</p> <p>63. Given that the ABS has different data relating to records than the BOM, the TAF recommended the BOM employ a statistician and no confidence intervals were used on the BOM models would it not make sense for statisticians at the ABS to take ownership of the BOM dataset given they have a much better</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				understanding of statistical quality assurance in regards to datasets than the staff in the BOM climate division? 64. Why did the ABS stop reporting temperature data?		
135.	Agency: Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator McKenzie	East Sale RAAF Base	<p>1. Can the Bureau please explain what issues with local radio weather reports from East Sale RAAF Base in Gippsland, which have been provided on-air for the past 40 years, have led to the decision to stop local radio weather updates from Base meteorologists?</p> <p>2. Did the RAAF raise any concerns about the meteorologists providing these weather forecasts on-air to the Gippsland community?</p> <p>a. Was time spent by the meteorologists on the broadcasts, instead of forecasting for defence aviation, a factor?</p> <p>3. Did BOM consult with the Gippsland community as part of the decision-making process?</p> <p>a. (If yes) What was the response received from the community?</p> <p>b. (If no) Why not?</p> <p>4. Is the information the meteorologists use for local forecasts the same that is used for defence aviation forecasting?</p> <p>a. (If yes) How come this information cannot be provided to civilians via local media, then?</p> <p>b. (Continue from yes) Is there not greater value in the information if it can be used for dual purposes, being local weather information and defence aviation forecasting?</p> <p>c. (If no) How different is the information provided for local forecasting to defence aviation forecasting?</p> <p>d. (continued on from no) So, can this information not be shared for dual purpose broadcasting, which has the additional benefit of providing greater value from the data?</p> <p>5. BOM Chief Customer Officer, Peter Stone is quoted in an ABC article from 13 October saying that Melbourne and Sydney bureau offices are better equipped to provide information to the public, via the media, about the weather. Can you please explain why the ability to provide this information is better fulfilled by a metropolitan forecaster located outside of the region they are forecasting for, than a forecaster located in the region?</p> <p>a. Can the Melbourne and Sydney Bureaus provide the specific local weather</p>	Written	SQ20-000432

				<p>information that is relied upon by Gippsland listeners like farmers, who use the local forecast information for production decisions such as when to spray crops so that issues of off-target spray drift, for example, are minimised?</p> <p>6. How do forecasts from the East Sale RAAF Base support emergency services during times of crisis, such as the bushfires earlier this year?</p> <p>a. Will there be diminished capability to provide this localised support by stopping forecasts from the Base?</p> <p>b. (If yes) How will BOM overcome this shortfall in providing critical information like this during an emergency?</p> <p>7. There are a number of significant long-term service outages experienced by BOM weather stations on Rundle Island, Herron Island, and Gannet Cay. Some stations were offline for approximately 10 months in 2019. These outages create significant safety issues for local fisherman and maritime navigation generally. What plans does the BOM have to either bring these services back online permanently, or to find suitable alternative locations?</p>		
136.	Agency: Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Senator Rice	Climate Change in Australia Technical Report	<p>Drawing on Table 7.8.1 in the Climate Change in Australia Technical Report, are any measures available for converting cumulative FFDI into estimates of dangerous fire weather conditions?</p> <p>If so, please provide measures of high fire danger days (FFDI>12) or dangerous fire weather conditions for the scenarios outlined in Table 7.8.1.</p>	Written	SQ20-000419
137.	Agency: Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)	Senator Waters	Possible submission from GBRMPA to the ANAO review into the Great Barrier Reef Foundation partnership	<p>Senator WATERS: I'm conscious of the time. I have two more minutes and three more questions. The ANAO is currently reviewing the GBR Foundation partnership. Will GBRMPA make a submission into that ANAO investigation or review?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: We haven't been approached about that. If we were, we'd happily participate.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I think it's an opt-in rather than, 'We'd like to be asked.'</p> <p>Mr Thomas: We might take that on notice and consider that. Thank you.</p>	Page 93 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000254
138.	Agency: Great Barrier Reef	Senator Waters	Staffing numbers breakdown	<p>Senator WATERS: I will take that funding issue up with them. How are the GBRMPA funding levels generally?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: In general? Our operating budget this year is \$95.353 million.</p>	Page 93 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000253

	Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)		per year since 2016	<p>Senator WATERS: That's less than I remember it being a few years ago.</p> <p>Mr Thomas: No. It's actually higher, I believe. On trend it's actually been rising pretty consistently year on year for the last couple of years.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Would you mind providing on notice for me, please, Mr Thomas, let's say since 2016, given that was the first severe bleaching episode in recent memory.</p> <p>Mr Thomas: I can give you each of them from 2015-16 onwards. These are rounded up: \$51 million; \$61 million; 2017-18 was \$76 million; 2018-19 was \$79 million; 2019-20 was \$91 million; and this year is \$95.353.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: That doesn't accord with my recollection of staffing numbers. So, perhaps on notice given the time, could you do a similar comparison of staffing numbers.</p>		
139.	Agency: Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)	Senator Waters	Paper on coral decline from ARC Centre for Excellence for Coral Reef studies	<p>Senator WATERS: That's fine. I know that's outside your jurisdiction. Last question: I asked the department whether a briefing had been provided on that recent Senate inquiry, and they said that your organisation had done one and had provided that both to them and to the minister. Any chance we could see that?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: We don't tend to reveal our advice to ministers—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: No? Okay. I thought I'd try—</p> <p>Mr Thomas: but we did provide a summary advice to the minister on that.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Were there any recommendations contained in that?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: No, I don't believe so.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: In the dissenting report by the government senators, there was a desire to establish an office of scientific review. Is GBRMPA doing any work on that?</p> <p>Mr Thomas: No, we're not.</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: Senator, I'm sorry—I fear there may have been some crossed wires. We provided a brief to the minister on the recent paper out of the ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies on the coral decline.</p> <p>That was what we did. But in terms of—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: You are quite right. I have conflated them in my doctor's scribble. I'm not even a doctor!</p> <p>Dr Wachenfeld: Right. I believe there were some talking points provided to the minister about the Senate inquiry report, and we had some input into that—</p>	Page 94 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000255

				<p>Senator WATERS: Okay, so you did work on some talking points— Dr Wachenfeld: but they're two different things. Senator WATERS: Thank you. I appreciate the clarification. In that case, is there a possibility of getting a summary of the Terry Hughes paper, given that's not a politically charged document and is just facts? Mr Thomas: Perhaps not the one we provided to the office, but we could provide a summary to you, Senator, I'm sure. Senator WATERS: Thank you very much. That's my time, unfortunately.</p>		
140.	Agency: Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)	Senator Rennick	Key performance indicators	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the key performance indicators relating to the health of the reef? 2. Is there a central database of data that reports these KPI's by individual reef and coral type and shows year on year changes? 3. If there is no central database, is there a plan to develop one so that KPIs can be analysed, understood and checked for quality assurance? 4. Which government department is responsible for consolidating and managing all the government funded GBR research including observations, data and quality assurance indicators? 5. How much has coral cover on the Great Barrier Reef declined between 1995 and 2020 and by what percentage? 	Written	SQ20-000417
141.	Agency: Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)	Senator Rennick	Farm runoff	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there data that demonstrates that farm runoff has increased across the reef and that this runoff is killing coral? If so, how much coral has been killed by farm pesticides and could you please provide data that demonstrates this? 2. Is there a link between Crown-of-thorns starfish and farm fertilizer? If so, could you please provide data that demonstrates this? 3. Have coral growth rates slowed in the last century due to farming? If so, could you please provide data that demonstrates this? 4. Have coral growth rates increased or decreased since 2005 and by what percentage? Could you please provide data to demonstrate your answer? 	Written	SQ20-000418
142.	Agency: Parks Australia Division (PAD)	Senator Urquhart	Marine parks - compensation for licensees	<p>Senator URQUHART: On what basis was the compensation figure determined for each of the licensees when Australia's marine park network was being finalised? How much was spent on compensation? How many licensees received compensation? And what fisheries were they? Ms Farrant: I can tell you some of that for sure. Out of the \$35 million</p>	Page 96 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20-000256

				<p>fisheries assistance and user engagement package, 516 grant offers were made; 441 of those were accepted, and the total expenditure was \$9.5 million. I don't think I have with me the list of exactly who that went to, but we can certainly take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes, if you could provide that.</p> <p>Ms Farrant: Absolutely.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: And what fisheries? That will be picked up if that information as well.</p> <p>Ms Farrant: Yes. That's right.</p>		
143.	Agency: Parks Australia Division (PAD)	Senator Hanson- Young	\$233 million for national parks - operational costs for projects	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Out of the \$230 million, how much is being spent on administration of these projects, as opposed to paying people to get out and do the work? In your modelling, you must have had to model that.</p> <p>Mr Dyason: Yes, we have modelled that. I don't have the figures on me right now. There are operational costs for the department to employ staff to roll the money out, but the rest of it will hit the ground.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Could you take that on notice? I'd like to know how much is for the administration.</p> <p>Mr Dyason: I certainly could. We can get that back to you.</p>	Page 99 19/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000257
144.	Agency: Parks Australia Division (PAD)	Senator McMahon	Kakadu	<p>All questions relate to Kakadu unless specified otherwise.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Of the \$216 million previously committed to Kakadu, how much has been expended and on what projects? 2. Of the additional \$234 million allocated in the budget how much is to go to Kakadu and for what purpose? 3. What were the circumstances that led to the removal recently of the Director, Assistant Secretary and Park Manager? 4. Over the past 10 years how many Directors, Assistant Secretaries and Park Managers have there been? 5. Have any previous Directors or assistant secretaries had votes or threats of votes of no confidence against them and if so, who and how many? 6. Have there ever been any assistant secretaries that were either Indigenous or female? 7. Has the NLC been proactive and helpful in managing the park? 	Written	SQ20- 000275

				<p>8. Have there been any previous or ongoing issues of joint management of Kakadu and if so, what are they and when do they date from?</p> <p>9. If the previous Director and Assistant Secretary were considered unfit to continue in their roles, why were there only issues with Kakadu and not any other parks?</p> <p>10. Uluru and the CLC work well with Parks Australia, why is it that they do and Kakadu and the NLC don't?</p> <p>11. Are there any stakeholders that have issues with the Kakadu Board of Management and if so, who and what are the issues?</p>		
145.	Agency: Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (SHFT)	Senator McAllister	Breakdown of funding	<p>Senator McALLISTER: Thank you for joining us. I was hoping that you would be able to talk me through the \$60 million allocation in the budget to the trust. In particular, I'd like to understand how much of that is to be allocated to Cockatoo Island and how much to other activities.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms Darwell: The \$50 million that has been allocated to the harbour trust is directly in response to recommendation 21 of the independent review of the harbour trust. The funding is broken down into three separate allocations. The first relates to funding to support further strategic planning on Cockatoo Island and North Head, including the development of a refreshed master plan for Cockatoo Island and the rehabilitation plan for North Head. The second category relates to a backlog of capital works determined on the basis of heritage priority, safety priority and community amenity. The third category relates to core repairs and maintenance work across our trust, and that would include matters such as road repairs, sewer repairs and the like. I think you asked about the specific allocations between Cockatoo Island and North Head. There are some preliminary allocations, but we will need to do some additional costing work to finalise those allocations. Included in the work, for example, on Cockatoo Island is maintenance work on fire safety, work to the industrial precinct and work on the cranes.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: I will direct this to officials, just because of some of the IT challenges. The budget papers show \$40.6 million over four years. Is that the correct number? Is that the number that you're using?</p> <p>Mr Bover: The number that you cite from the budget papers, the \$40.6 million, reflects the additional appropriation funding that will be provided to the</p>	Page 18-19 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000236

				<p>Harbour Trust. The Harbour Trust has also been given authorisation to draw from \$23 million which it has held since 2006, in fact, from the sale of properties at Markham Close soon after its establishment. That \$23 million is supporting a mixture of things: (1) it's supporting the priority capital works that Ms Darwell spoke about, but (2) it's also enabling the trust to provide its tenants with rental relief and other support during COVID and to support the trust's operations whilst it's experiencing COVID impacts on its revenue.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: What's the drawdown, again? Can you repeat the number?</p> <p>Mr Bover: There's \$23 million of cash that the harbour trust has held, and it's been authorised to draw down all of that. Approximately \$14 million of that is for rent relief support and to support the trust's operations whilst its revenue is impacted by COVID. The balance, the \$9 million, is for the priority capital works, the repairs, the backlog that Ms Darwell spoke about earlier.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: From a budget management perspective, does the drawdown happen in this financial year? And is it expected that it then is expended in a single financial year, or is it able to be drawn down now and then expended across multiple years?</p> <p>Mr Bover: The trust has flexibility in terms of when it draws it down, and the budget treatment would reflect when it intends to expense the funds. Ms Darwell might have further information in terms of the profile that it's given to that money in terms of its expenditure.</p> <p>Senator McALLISTER: Ms Darwell, can I ask you to provide on notice the breakdown? I think you indicated that further costing work is required for some of the projects, but in contemplating the \$40.6 million that you have over the forward estimates, plus the \$9 million that you have available for backlog, can I ask you to provide on notice a written document indicating a breakdown of those funds across the three priorities that you mentioned in your earlier answer and the profiling of that expenditure across the four years?</p> <p>Ms Darwell: Certainly.</p>		
146.	Agency: Sydney Harbour Federation	Senator McAllister	Allocation of funding	<p>Senator McALLISTER: The allocation in the current financial year is a payment that is really front-end loaded. You receive \$25.1 million this year. Are you in a position to expend \$25 million before the end of June next year?</p> <p>Ms Darwell: Some of those funds, if I recall correctly, include payments in</p>	Page 20 20/10/2020 Spoken	SQ20- 000238

	Trust (SHFT)			relation to capital works for Platypus and 10 Terminal. They were projects that were already underway. We are certainly contemplating works for Platypus in the coming financial year and we're consulting with the community in relation to 10 Terminal for those works. I might just confirm that on notice, if I may.		
147.	Agency: Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (SHFT)	Senator McAllister	Breakdown of the allocation of funding across the priority areas	<p>1. Breakdown of the allocation of \$40.6m (measure outlined in BP2, page 54) across each of the 3 priority areas identified by the Executive director, and the financial year in which planned expenditure occurs in each area.</p> <p>2. A breakdown of the allocation of \$23million drawn down from the Trust's capital account as referenced by the Executive Director, and the financial year in which planned expenditure will occur.</p>	Written	SQ20-000266

