

**Supplementary Budget Estimates 2017–18**

**Environment and Energy Portfolio – Monday, 23 October 2017**

<b>Question No</b>	<b>Program: Division or Agency</b>	<b>Senator</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Proof Hansard Page or In Writing</b>	<b>PDR Number</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Corporate: PAAI</b>	<b>Moore</b>	<b>Sustainable Development Goals - Interdepartmental committee</b>	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> I will be talking to PM&amp;C later this morning about their coordination of the domestic side. To the best of your knowledge, Mr Cahill, is information out of those processes and how it's going being made public in any way? Out of those meetings, is there a statement that actually tells people what's going on?</p> <p><b>Mr Cahill:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	Pages 12–13	SQ17-000653
<b>2</b>	<b>Corporate: PAAI</b>	<b>Moore</b>	<b>Sustainable Development Goals - Community submissions</b>	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Right. And the other thing out of that: is the process calling for community submissions going to be automatically made public as they come in? Or is there going to be a filtering process for people to assist, whether they should be made public? It says in your website that the idea is that you'll gather them and then they will be annually released in some form of compendium and we'll follow up on how that's going to operate later. I'm not sure how that will happen. But is it like a committee process, where people put in their submission, someone looks at it and then it goes public? Or is it going to be all held together until a certain date and then everything put out?</p> <p><b>Dr Bacon:</b> I'd have to take the logistical details on notice. But the intention certainly is to gather those case studies from a wide variety of organisations and then release them as a compendium. But I would need to take the logistical details of how we're actually receiving them and the timing of putting them together on notice.</p>	Page 13	SQ17-000654
<b>3</b>	<b>Corporate: PAAI</b>	<b>Moore</b>	<b>Sustainable development goal agenda –</b>	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Thank you. And I have one last question, and this can go on notice. It's about interaction between the department and overseas departments, where</p>	Page 13	SQ17-000656

			<b>interaction with overseas departments</b>	you already have very close relationships over a series of interactions and conventions. Can you tell me on notice what interaction there is with your counterparts overseas on the sustainable development goal agenda—a comparison of what they've done, how they're doing it, how they define what goes under what goal and all those things? If I can get any general feedback from the department, I'd like that, and some time in the future, through Senator Urquhart, we may ask for a briefing from the department on that. <b>Dr Bacon:</b> I'm happy to take that on notice. <b>Senator MOORE:</b> Thank you		
<b>4</b>	<b>Corporate: CSD</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Messages from the Secretary</b>	To all Departments and Agencies: Please provide the messages (if any) sent to staff (on the most recent occasions) of Christmas/New Year, Easter and Ramadan by the Secretary of the Department at the relevant time.	Written	SQ17-000707
<b>5</b>	<b>Corporate: CSD</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Enterprise Agreement</b>	To all Departments and Agencies: In the most recent Enterprise Agreement negotiations, was/were any side-agreement/s, protocol/s, arrangement/s, agreement/s entered into? If so, please provide a copy.	Written	SQ17-000708
<b>6</b>	<b>1.1: BCD</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>List of threatened species funded</b>	<b>Senator URQUHART:</b> Could you provide an itemised list of threatened species funded under the Abbott and Turnbull governments, including the title, the location, the description and the amount funded? I'm happy for you to take that on notice. <b>Mr Lang:</b> Certainly.	Page 51	SQ17-000657
<b>7</b>	<b>1.1: BCD</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Funding for threatened species project</b>	<b>Senator URQUHART:</b> Can you explain how the total figure was arrived at? The \$228 million: what was the methodology used and what was it based on? Was it based on projects in a certain area or for a certain species? <b>Mr Lang:</b> That investment quantum has been based on our large programs, like Green Army, 20 Million Trees	Page 51	SQ17-000658

				<p>Program, the National Landcare Program and the National Environmental Science Program, and the contributions the projects under those programs are making to threatened species outcomes.</p> <p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> I'm happy for you to provide more detail on notice on that one too.</p>		
8	1.1: BCD	Urquhart	Threatened species funding	<p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> Who gets consulted on where the funding is finalised?</p> <p><b>Ms Jonasson:</b> On the final decision? The minister makes the final decisions.</p> <p><b>Mr Knudson:</b> It might be helpful if, for the various programs that the acting commissioner has already laid out, which make up the funding that has gone towards threatened species, we come back to you on notice with what the consultation process was for each of those programs and who the decision maker was.</p>	Page 52	SQ17-000659
9	1.1: ICCEI	Rice	Number of trees cleared in Australia	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Moving on to the 20 Million Trees policy briefly. In the period 2014 to 2020 we've had the government paying \$70 million to plant 20 million trees—correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Do you know how many trees have been cleared in Australia during that six-year period, while we've been paying that amount of money to plant 20 million trees?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> I don't, no.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you take that on notice and give us an estimate?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> Yes.</p>	Page 54	SQ17-000660
10	1.1: BCD	Rice	EPBC listed species	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Of those 4.4 million planted so far, how many have been of EPBC listed species or communities, or in identified critical habitats for EPBC listed species?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> I don't have that number, but certainly those threatened ecological communities and those species have</p>	Page 54	SQ17-000662

				<p>been targeted. We've been encouraging that through the program guidelines—they are the species targeted through the funding.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But you haven't quantified it? You're not monitoring that?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> I don't have the answer here in front of me.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So you are monitoring it, but you haven't got the answer there?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay, but do you know whether you are actually monitoring how much is going into EPBC areas of particular species?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> Yes, we know which species are proposed to be planted.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So you will be able to give me that statistic?</p> <p><b>Mr Costello:</b> I will do my very best.</p>		
11	1.1: HRM	Chisholm	<p><b>Process for appointing the CEO and Chair - GBRMPA</b></p>	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Minister, will you commit to having an independent process for appointing the CEO and chair?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I'm happy to take on notice your question as to whether Minister Frydenberg has anything that he needs to add about the type of process that might apply. You've just heard that a process of considering the recommendations is underway. From that, how they're effected will be a matter for future decisions of government.</p>	Pages 22–23	SQ17-000663
12	1.1 BCD	Whish-Wilson	<p><b>Tasmanian Special Species Management Plan 2017 – Consultation</b></p>	<p>Was the Department consulted by the Tasmanian Government regarding the Special Species Management Plan?</p>	<p>Written Also page 39 of Hansard</p>	SQ17-000719
13	1.1 BCD	Whish-Wilson	<p><b>Tasmanian Special Species Management Plan</b></p>	<p>Does the Department believe the Plan provides adequate framework to manage Matters of National Environmental Significance?</p>	<p>Written Also page 39 of Hansard</p>	SQ17-000720

			<b>2017 - Framework</b>			
<b>14</b>	<b>1.1 BCD</b>	<b>Whish-Wilson</b>	<b>Tasmanian Special Species Management Plan 2017 - Impacts</b>	Has the Department assessed the impact of the Plan on Matters of National Environmental Significance? Has the Department assessed the impact of the Plan on World Heritage Areas?	Written Also page 39 of Hansard	SQ17-000721
<b>15</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Hinch</b>	<b>Dugongs and turtles</b>	<b>Senator HINCH:</b> I have a couple of questions, probably for Ms Parry or Mr Moore. Do we know how many dugongs are slaughtered in Queensland every year? <b>Ms Parry:</b> I would have to take that question on notice. <b>Senator HINCH:</b> I would also like to know about sea turtles. Under native title, how many dugongs and sea turtles are slaughtered every year in Queensland. <b>Ms Parry:</b> I will also take that question on notice. Another part of the department manages the turtle and dugong protection plan. We will try to get those answers for you today. If not, we will take that question on notice.	Page 27	SQ17-000664
<b>16</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus conservation project</b>	<b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> The other thing that I want to ask you about, staying with the platypus, are the comments from the Threatened Species Commissioner. It was in your answers—maybe that was when it came up last May—that San Diego Zoo put about half a million dollars into a platypus conservation project. Are you directly managing that, or does that come through Taronga Zoo? Can you give us a bit more information about how this project is being carried forward. <b>Mr Murphy:</b> I'm probably not the right person to answer that aspect. <b>Mr Lang:</b> The project you're referring to is a project captured in the Threatened Species Prospectus. It essentially involves San Diego Zoo providing money directly to Taronga Zoo as a project. I can't advise whether or not that project has been initiated at this point. I can take it on notice.	Page 36	SQ17-000666
<b>17</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	<b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Do you mean that, for San Diego	Page 37	SQ17-000667

			<p><b>conservation project</b></p>	<p>Zoo to hand over the half million for this conservation project, it could only happen after the platypus have gone to San Diego?</p> <p><b>Mr Lang:</b> No. In fact it's independent of the platypus arrangement.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> That's what I'm trying to work out. It's independent, and San Diego Zoo is talking about putting in half a million for platypus conservation. How do you intersect with this project? Is it just up to Taronga Zoo, or do they engage with the platypus experts in Australia—zoologists who have worked on them for many years?</p> <p><b>Mr Lang:</b> That's correct. The project was a project in the threatened species prospectus. We looked at all the projects considered for the prospectus and established that this one had a lot of merit for its conservation value. Beyond that, it's a project that San Diego Zoo is investing in with Taronga Zoo.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> The way you answered the question then, you judged it for its conservation value. I wasn't hearing that you're intersecting with the zoologists who work in this field outside Taronga Zoo. Is that the case?</p> <p><b>Mr Lang:</b> I would have to take that on notice to be sure, but my understanding was that it was a project involving a range of conservation scientists working on platypus.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> If you could provide details of how it's working in Australia, that would be good. Where is it up to? Has the \$500,000 been handed over to Taronga Zoo?</p> <p><b>Mr Lang:</b> Could I take that on notice, too, please?</p>		
--	--	--	------------------------------------	---	--	--

18	1.4: BCD	Whish-Wilson	Tasmania's giant kelp forests	<p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> Thanks. Tasmania's giant kelp forests were listed in 2012 as a threatened community. I wanted to know if there had been any survey work or anything else done on that. This committee heard evidence earlier in the year that they had been severely impacted in the last couple of years by storm activity, starfish and warming waters. So I wondered if there had been any activity there.</p> <p><b>Mr Latch:</b> I am unaware of any of those surveys being undertaken, but certainly we can take it on notice.</p>	Page 38	SQ17-000668
19	1.4: BCD	Rice	Radio interview with former Threatened Species Commissioner	<p><b>Mr Lang:</b> I think Mr Andrews was in fact referring to a published proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences. The study, which was looking at the relative threat factor for mammals as a group, found that the primary threat factor for mammals was actually feral cats, followed by foxes, fire, habitat and climate change, in that order.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So it wasn't an internal report at all?</p> <p><b>Mr Lang:</b> If I understand correctly, this is a published report.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Do you have the details of what that report was?</p> <p><b>Ms Jonasson:</b> The National Academy Of Sciences. We can make the reference available to you on notice, if you like. But perhaps, if we provide you with the transcript, you might be able to point us to the part of the interview you're referring to.</p>	Page 41	SQ17-000669
20	1.4: HRM	Whish-Wilson	State of conservation report	<p><b>Ms Callister:</b> You're basically talking about two issues here. One is the state of conservation report. The World Heritage Committee made a decision at its last meeting to look at reviewing its existing policy that it has around dealing with climate change and management of World Heritage properties in the face of climate change. That process is actively underway in the intersessional period.</p>	Page 31	SQ17-000670

				<p>We would expect that something would come back to the next meeting that will look at how the World Heritage Committee system more broadly might be looking at building resilience for—</p> <p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> Any idea when that will be? Could you take that on notice and let us know? I'm just looking for timelines that I can follow on this issue.</p> <p><b>Ms Callister:</b> There's actually work happening intersessionally at the moment. A workshop was held in Germany last week, which is where our colleague Mr Oxley has been. That work is actively happening and being managed by the World Heritage Centre. We expect that that will continue intersessionally and that there will be a formal agenda item at the next World Heritage Committee meeting.</p> <p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> Ms Parry, did you say 25 out of 29—</p> <p><b>Ms Parry:</b> I will double-check that number for you. It's either 21 of 25 or 25 of 29, but it's safe to say it's three-quarters.</p> <p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> Okay, but there are 29 listed reefs. Could we get an idea by that stage as to whether those other 29 reefs—they may be in several countries or just a few—will be submitting similar state of conservation reports for their reefs? Will they be going through a similar process to what you're going through for the Great Barrier Reef?</p> <p><b>Ms Callister:</b> We can check that and provide you with that information.</p> <p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> That would be very useful for me, thank you.</p>		
21	1.4: HRM	Moore	<b>Decision on the former Parramatta Female Factory precinct</b>	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> I'm sure they have. The other one is the Parramatta Female Factory. Can either the department or the minister confirm that the Australian Heritage Council has submitted to the minister's office its recommendations for the 2017 National Heritage List, including the final</p>	Page 34	SQ17-000673



				<p>assessment of the former Parramatta Female Factory precinct?</p> <p><b>Mr Williams:</b> Yes, I can confirm that the Australian Heritage Council has provided its advice to the minister, and the minister will make a decision on that in due course.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Can the minister tell me what 'due course' means?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> What due—</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> What 'due course' means.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Due course.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I understand the minister will make a decision on this matter shortly. That's a matter for Minister Frydenberg. I'm happy to see if there's any additional information that he or his office can provide for you.</p>		
22	1.4: HRM	Moore	Correspondence regarding the proposed development at the former Parramatta Female Factory precinct	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Has the minister received any correspondence, recommendations or requests from the New South Wales state government, or UrbanGrowth, regarding the proposed development at the former Parramatta Female Factory Precinct?</p> <p><b>Mr Williams:</b> I can't answer that question. I'll have to take it on notice.</p>	Page 34	SQ17-000675
23	1.4: HRM	Moore	Statutory time frame for decision – Parramatta Female Factory precinct	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> The question, I think, is: from the information you have before you, did people raise the issue of the impact the proposed development would have on potential World Heritage listing? I'm not asking whether you agree with it or not; I'm asking you whether that information and those concerns were relayed through the process to the minister?</p> <p><b>Mr Williams:</b> Yes. All of the results of-the consultation processes that have taken place have formed part of the advice that's gone to the minister.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Is there a kind of standard decision-making time frame for this process?</p>	Page 35	SQ17-000676

				<p><b>Mr Williams:</b> There is a statutory time frame set down in the legislation.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> What is that statutory time frame? You can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Williams:</b> I will take that on notice.</p>		
24	1.4: HRM	Rhiannon	World Heritage listing – consultation with New South Wales	<p><b>Mr Williams:</b> The issue with the Royal National Park is that the state has a number of roles to play there, both as the government of the state in which the place is situated and also the place owner and manager. It is their responsibility about whether they're going proceed to nominate such a place for world heritage listing.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Have you done anything, written or verbal, to ask the New South Wales government where the process is up to and whether they're going to submit their proposal; or do you just wait for the New South Wales government?</p> <p><b>Mr Williams:</b> We have consultations with all state governments on a regular basis about the places that they are proposing to put forward for nomination for World Heritage listing, and that is the case with New South Wales about places within New South Wales that they may be wanting to work on nominations for.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Can you take on notice the date of that meeting when you had those discussions. And was Royal National Park and the associated reserves raised in that discussion? If so, what was the outcome.</p> <p><b>Mr Williams:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Can you put those three aspects on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Williams:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Thank you.</p>	Pages 37–38	SQ17-000677
25	1.4: HRM	Urquhart	Recommendation for national heritage listing of	On what date did the Minister receive the recommendation from the Australian Heritage Council for national heritage listing of the Parramatta Female Factory Precinct?	Written	SQ17-000712

			<b>the Parramatta Female Factory Precinct</b>			
<b>26</b>	<b>1.4: HRM</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Statutory timeframe</b>	What is the statutory timeframe for the Minister to make a decision regarding nominations for national heritage listing once a recommendation is received from the Australian Heritage Council?	Written	SQ17-000713
<b>27</b>	<b>1.4: HRM</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Decision on national heritage listing for the Parramatta Female Factory precinct</b>	Will the Minister make a decision on national heritage listing for the Parramatta Female Factory precinct before the end of the 2017 calendar year?	Written	SQ17-000714
<b>28</b>	<b>1.4: HRM</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Decision on national heritage list nominations - extension</b>	Under what circumstances can the Minister extend his decision on national heritage list nominations beyond the 90 working day period outlined in the Australian Heritage Council's guidelines for the national heritage list process?	Written	SQ17-000715
<b>29</b>	<b>1.4: HRM</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Decision on national heritage list nomination - notification on website</b>	In a letter from the Minister received by the Federal Member for Parramatta on 18 September 2017, the Minister stated that if nomination for national heritage listing were extended by the Minister, a notification would be published on the Department of Environment and Energy's website. If 90 working days has elapsed since the Australian Heritage Council's recommendation, why has there been no notification?	Written	SQ17-000716
<b>30</b>	<b>1.4: HRM</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Recommendations from NSW State Government or Urban Growth Development Corporation</b>	Has the Minister received any recommendations, reports or advice regarding the Urban Growth Development Corporation's development application (DA/1124/2016) and national heritage listing application for the Parramatta Female Factory Precinct from the NSW State Government or Urban Growth Development Corporation?	Written	SQ17-000717
<b>31</b>	<b>1.4: HRM</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Decision on national</b>	Following an announcement by NSW State Minister for	Written	SQ17-000718

			<b>heritage list nomination - notification on website</b>	Planning, Rob Stokes in November 2015 approving Urban Growth Development Corporation's application to amend the Local Environment Plan for a high density residential development at the Parramatta Female Factory Precinct, the Department of the Environment and Energy updated information on its website about the assessment for the Parramatta Female Factory Precinct, changing the completion date from 2017 to 2019. Can the Minister explain why the completion date was extended on the Department's website? On what date was the completion date changed to 2019 on the website?		
<b>32</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	The Platypus has been listed as "near threatened" by the IUCN since 2016. This is based on recognition that local population declines and extinctions have occurred. Recent observations indicate that the situation for the Platypus has worsened since the above IUCN report: a. Will the Minister direct the Threatened Species Scientific Committee to consider urgently whether the Platypus should now be listed as 'Vulnerable under the EPBC Act?	Written	SQ17-000732
<b>33</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	The IUCN Red List determines that "There has been no robust assessment of the population size of the Platypus either nationwide or for the key states in the species' geographic range", despite recognition of decline and localised extinctions.: a. What effort has the Department made to map absence of this species across its former range given its "near threatened" status as recognised in the 2016 report, pending the outcomes of the Platypus Conservation Initiative (which are still some years away)?	Written	SQ17-000733
<b>34</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	Given the species' dependence on suitable stream and riparian environments for its survival and breeding, and that climate change forecasts include more frequent and	Written	SQ17-000734

				severe droughts, as well as more extreme flooding events, both of which are major threats to the Platypus, what is being done to urgently incorporate consideration of the platypus with regards to alteration of riverine habitat and flows?		
<b>35</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	Destruction of habitat is a major cause of species decline, particularly the construction of dams and impoundments and damage to riparian vegetation associated with agriculture in the case of the Platypus. Please explain what the government funding is being provided to stop destruction of habitat, particularly for threatened species.	Written	SQ17-000735
<b>36</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	Please list all applications, expressions of interest, and export of each Australian species to overseas zoos over the past 10 years.	Written	SQ17-000736
<b>37</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	In a reply to my previous question about the export of Platypuses to San Diego Zoo I was advised that San Diego Zoo had invested \$500,000 in Tasmanian devil science in Australia. Please detail what that research money has been spent on and the outcomes for Tasmanian Devils in the wild.	Written	SQ17-000737
<b>38</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	It has been reported that the \$500,000 San Diego Zoo intends paying to import Platypuses for its displays is to go towards a Platypus eDNA project: a. How will this practically improve conservation of Platypus populations given destruction of habitat continues and is facilitated by all levels of government?	Written	SQ17-000738
<b>39</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	With regards to the proposed eDNA Platypus project: a. How much government funding has been invested in or promised to this (or other) project?	Written	SQ17-000739

				<p>b. What is the evidence this project will provide practical on-ground benefits to Platypus conservation across the species known range and habitats?</p> <p>c. What proportion of any funding is going towards protection of habitat, mitigation of key threats and reduction of unnatural mortality in the wild?</p> <p>d. What are the stated objectives and outcomes of this project?</p> <p>e. What is the specific auditing process and key performance indicators for this project?</p> <p>f. Was there a tender process for this project? If not, what are the credentials and expertise of the researchers delivering this project?</p>		
<b>40</b>	<b>1.4: BCD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Platypus</b>	<p>In previous Senate Estimates the Department advised that no Australian wildlife is exported to overseas zoos on novated leases. However the former Threatened Species Commissioner Gregory Andrews was recently reported as saying Australia should consider leasing its rare and endangered wildlife as “ambassadors for conservation” to raise money.</p> <p>a. Is the leasing of Australia’s rare and endangered wildlife to overseas zoos under consideration by the Australian government? Will the government support any such proposal?</p> <p>b. Have any proposals to do so been discussed with any government representatives?</p> <p>c. If so, is it proposed that leased animals (particularly Platypuses) will be repatriated to Australia when a lease expires or is terminated for example due to default of conditions?</p> <p>d. Given the high animal welfare risks and suffering suffered by animals moved and exploited for human use, what is the government’s response to the treatment and use of animals already threatened with extinction in such a commercial arrangement?</p>	Written	SQ17-000740

41	1.4: BCD	Rhiannon	Kangaroo exports	<p>I was previously provided with details of all exported kangaroo products until 22 March 2017. Details included Product category; species; quantity or unit, permit number; purpose and type; grant and acquittal dates.</p> <p>a. Please provide those updated details from 22 March 2017 until the present.</p> <p>b. Please include all permit acquittals since 1 July 2013 where that information has been updated since my last request in March 2017.</p> <p>c. I previously requested the information to be provided in excel spreadsheet but was given the information in a non-manipulable pdf format. Please provide the previous and updated data in an excel spreadsheet format.</p>	Written	SQ17-000741
42	1.4: BCD	Rhiannon	Kangaroo exports	Please advise how many establishments export kangaroo skins or non-meat products.	Written	SQ17-000742
43	1.5: OoC	Chisholm	Land clearing	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Was there a successful prosecution of an area of clearing in Victoria recently?</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> I will take that on notice, but not that I recollect.</p>	Page 57	SQ17-000678
44	1.5: OoC	Rice	Investigations into land clearing	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I will continue along the lines of some of Senator Chisholm's questions. You said that there are five investigations underway into clearing in the Great Barrier Reef catchments but that you haven't had any recent prosecution and you've got two properties under investigation.</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> Two from the original remaining 59 that we looked at a little while ago. In addition to that, there are five in total. And, currently, on an Australia-wide basis, we have a number of other investigations as well.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you tell me what area of land in total is covered by those five that are still under investigation?</p>	Page 58	SQ17-000679

				<b>Ms Collins:</b> I would have to take that on notice.		
45	1.5: OoC	Rice	<b>Investigations into land clearing</b>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I have been informed that in 2015-16 there was 158,000 hectares of deforestation and bush clearing in catchments within the Great Barrier Reef catchment. Could you take on notice confirming whether that was or wasn't the case—and then the comparison with how much of that clearing you are investigating.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> It might be helpful if we are taking it on notice to have a source.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I haven't got that source here. I can certainly take it on notice myself to forward it to you.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> It is the Queensland state government's SLATS report.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Right.</p> <p><b>Mr Tregurtha:</b> We can take that on notice, but what I would take on notice would be the amount of clearing that was referred to the department as a result of the actions referred to us in Queensland, or in the Great Barrier Reef catchment if that is what you are particularly interested in.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Yes, and then how much you are investigating and looking at under the EPBC Act.</p>	Page 59	SQ17-000681
46	1.5: OoC	Rice	<b>Land clearing in Queensland</b>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can I move on to clearing in Queensland more broadly, again following up Senator Chisholm's questions about the number of investigations. In May, 54 properties had been investigated: 46 were notified they did not trigger the federal environmental protection legislation, six were referred and two were being investigated. What proportion of those initial 54 properties were located in the Great Barrier Reef catchments?</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> I would have to take that specifically on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> You'll probably need to take this on notice as well: what's the aggregate area of Queensland clearing that's now been investigated?</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> I would take that on notice as well.</p>	Page 60	SQ17-000682



47	1.5: OoC	Rice	Investigations in Queensland land clearing	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Under those 54 properties. The 158,000 hectares was just within the Great Barrier Reef catchment. So, of the total area of clearing in Queensland, what hasn't been investigated by you? My sources tell me that your attention is being confined to the area where there are high-value agriculture permits. Would you agree that that's the case?</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> No, I wouldn't agree. The 54 properties and the 59 permit holders that we referred to were ones that had been provided with high-value agriculture permits, but we also have investigations outside of those permits.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> How many investigations in those areas outside? So the 54 were all high-value agriculture permit areas?</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> Those were, yes. And I would have to take on notice the number that were outside of those.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So there are additional ones outside those 54 that are being investigated?</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> Yes, there are.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> How many more, then, in addition to those?</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> We've got a number of investigations right across Australia, so I haven't got the exact number just for Queensland.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay. Can you take that on notice, then?</p> <p><b>Ms Collins:</b> Yes.</p>	Page 60	SQ17-000683
48	1.5: ESD	Rice	Properties under investigation	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay. One of the properties that were referred to you, King Vale, I'm told, has had no further action since the suspension of the referral period last year. What's the current status of the King Vale referral?</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> That proposal is one where the proponent has sought to provide further information to the department. We received some further information a little over three weeks ago, and the department's currently examining that.</p>	Page 61	SQ17-000684

				<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Is that one of the two that are being investigated, or is it within those six that were referred?</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> That project's not subject to an investigation, because it was referred under the EPBC Act. Once a project is referred under the EPBC Act, there's a complete prohibition on the activity being taken until there's a regulatory decision made on the project.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you give me the details of the six referrals? I'm told that there were six properties that have been referred, and the two being investigated.</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> There are a number of properties that have been referred—and, when we talk about properties, they are referrals related also to a requirement for a permit under the state vegetation act. A number of them are properties associated with agriculture. There's one dam.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Perhaps you could take it on notice and provide all the details of those.</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> We could provide the details on notice.</p>		
49	1.5: ESD	Siewert	Yeelirrie project	<p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> Will the documentation be released prior to the court case? With your assessment process, will there be anything done publicly before the Supreme Court case is resolved?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> That may well depend upon the timing of how all those things come together. It would depend upon when we conclude our assessment work in relation to the project, and in light of where the WA court proceedings are up to and where the EPA are up to with their assessment and any conditions they may put on it. I just don't have clarity at the moment as to how those two things may come together in a timing sense and how that may pan out.</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> Could you perhaps take on notice, because I think it's going to be complicated process, to explain the Supreme Court case. It's complicated around where the ministers made decisions. Could you perhaps take on notice to explain to me the process—that is, how the Supreme Court case could potentially impact on the minister making a decision that is potentially directly</p>	Page 63	SQ17-000688

				<p>contrary to a decision that's already been made in the state, including an appeal process? Are you following me?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> Yes, I think so. As I understand it, you're looking at how the outcome of the WA court proceedings feeds into their decision and how that feeds into our decision.</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> Into the federal decision, yes. I think it would take quite a long time to explain that, so can you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> Yes, happy to.</p> <p><b>Senator SIEWERT:</b> Thank you. In terms of the threat of extinction, as you have articulated, to the subterranean fauna, of which there are multiple species—11, I understand?</p> <p><b>Mr Manning:</b> It's something of that nature. I could check.</p>		
50	1.5: ESD	Di Natale	<p><b>Adani – Environmental Background</b></p>	<p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> Did that include the findings of the independent committee established by the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forests that said that Adani had violated the conditions of its environmental approval for another project, destroyed mangroves, obstructed waterways, allowed salinity intrusion into ground water and constructed an airstrip without approval? Was that one of the things that was considered?</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> I would have to take on that notice that particular allegation. There was a range of information that was considered about Adani's environmental history in India, including relating to port operations in India. To be safe I would need to take that particular report on notice to confirm it.</p> <p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> What about the finding from the Indian National Green Tribunal that stated that Adani Enterprises was liable for failing to clean up after a coal ship sank? Are you aware if that was one of the issues that was considered? Obviously, there was a fine of almost \$1 million there.</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> Given the volume of information that the</p>	Page 66	SQ17-000689

				<p>minister considered, I think it would be preferable for me to take that on notice so that we're providing you with an accurate answer.</p> <p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> What about with regard to the Adani Group's ties to tax havens like the British Virgin Islands and Cayman Islands? Was that also considered as part of the application?</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> Again, there was a very large amount of information that was considered by the minister in the course of making that decision. That included large reports that were referenced by environmental non-government organisations, a number of which were publicly available, and those reports included a large number of specific facts or factual claims within them. They included information about the sort of historical background to the company, information from the Ministry of Culture in India on the company, the environmental policy of the company, various annual reports of the company separate to reports by the Indian government relating to Adani. But again, the volume of information that was considered by the minister was very substantial in that case so, for very particular factual matters, it would be preferable for me to take it on notice.</p>		
51	1.5: ESD	Di Natale	Adani – Existing Habitat	<p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> How much of the existing habitat will the mine destroy? Is it like for like? Are we talking 31,000 hectares?</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> No, it's not like for like; it's a magnitude larger than the predicted impact of the species.</p> <p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> Do you have an estimate about what we're talking about?</p> <p><b>Mr Barker:</b> I don't have that before me. I'd have to come back to you with that figure.</p>	Page 67	SQ17-000691
52	1.5: ESD	Siewert	Meeting with Mining Executives	<p>Has the Minister met in person with any of the Mining Executives of Vimy Resources regarding the assessment of the Mulga Rock, Wiluna or Yeelirrie uranium mine</p>	Written	SQ17-000709

				<p>projects?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If so, who did he meet with?</li> <li>• When did he meet with them?</li> <li>• Are their minutes or records of those meetings?</li> <li>• Can you provide copies of those documents?</li> </ul>		
<b>53</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Siewert</b>	<b>Mulga Rock Project</b>	<p>The Minister's decision on the Mulga Rock Project is significantly different to previous Ministers' decisions on the Wiluna Uranium Project and the Kintyre Uranium Projects – why is it that the Minister has decided to remove significant conditions on setting environmental triggers and criteria, requiring environmental management plans for further approval, setting conditions around mine closure and rehabilitation standards and omitting the involvement of the Office of the Supervising Scientist?</p>	Written	SQ17-000710
<b>54</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Siewert</b>	<b>Correspondence regarding the Mulga Rock Uranium Project</b>	<p>Did the Minister receive letters from my former colleague Scott Ludlam dated 1 February on the Mulga Rock Uranium Project, specifically regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buffel Grass</li> <li>• Sandhill Dunnart</li> <li>• Seismic activity</li> </ul> <p>Were those letters referred to the Department of Environment?</p> <p>Has the Department of Environment given advice on any of those three matters? If so, what was the advice?</p>	Written	SQ17-000711
<b>55</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Whish-Wilson</b>	<b>Kelly Channel Discharge, Macquarie Harbour – Technical Capacity of Waste Lining</b>	<p>Will the Department assess the technical capacity of the waste lining? In other words: will it work?</p>	Written	SQ17-000722

<b>56</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Whish-Wilson</b>	<b>Kelly Channel Discharge, Macquarie Harbour - Assessment of Waste Lining</b>	Will the Department assess the likelihood and implications of a failure or break in the waste lining?	Written	SQ17-000723
<b>57</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Whish-Wilson</b>	<b>Kelly Channel Discharge, Macquarie Harbour – Fish Waste</b>	Is the Department aware of any other situation where fish waste is collected under fish pens for the purposes of being transported away?	Written	SQ17-000724
<b>58</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Whish-Wilson</b>	<b>Kelly Channel Discharge, Macquarie Harbour – Site Stress</b>	Is the fact that the proponent is looking to transport waste away from the site an indication that Macquarie Harbour is under stress?	Written	SQ17-000725
<b>59</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Whish-Wilson</b>	<b>Kelly Channel Discharge, Macquarie Harbour - Operations</b>	Do you think it is good environmental practice to prolong operations at a site by introducing a waste transfer system? Wouldn't the precautionary principle call for the reduction or halting of operations?	Written	SQ17-000726
<b>60</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Whish-Wilson</b>	<b>Kelly Channel Discharge, Macquarie Harbour - Proponent</b>	Will the Department take into account the proponent's track record in Macquarie Harbour in considering this referral?	Written	SQ17-000727
<b>61</b>	<b>1.5: ESD</b>	<b>Rhiannon</b>	<b>Draft bilateral agreement with New South Wales</b>	Noting that the Minister for Environment and Energy gave notice of his intention to develop a draft bilateral agreement with New South Wales under section 45 of the EPBC Act on 14 September 2017: a. Has the Department considered the agreement against each and all of the standards of the Commonwealth's Environmental Offsets Policy? b. Is the Department satisfied that each and all of the standards of the Commonwealth Environmental Offsets	Written	SQ17-000730

				<p>Policy have been met by the draft bilateral agreement?</p> <p>i. Please provide details of how each standard has been met.</p> <p>c. Please detail <i>how</i> the Commonwealth considers that draft bilateral agreement will deliver overall conservation outcomes that improve or maintain the viability of the specific protected matter – particularly given that a minimum of 90% direct offsets and maximum of 10% other compensatory measures will be permitted?</p> <p>d. Does the Department agree that Biodiversity offsets result in net loss of biodiversity?</p> <p>i. How does this match the aim of offsets to improve or maintain the viability of the specific protected matter?</p>		
62	1.5: ESD	Rhiannon	Shoalhaven motorcycle development	<p>With regard to the – Shoalhaven Motorsports Complex at Yerriyong near Nowra NSW (NSRF200095 Motorcycling NSW Limited):</p> <p>a. What threatened species have been referred to the Department under the EPBC Act?</p> <p>b. Has the threatened Leafless Tongue Orchid <i>Cryptostylis hunteriana</i> been referred to the Department under EPBC Act?</p> <p>c. Where is the process up to if any threatened species have been referred under the EPBC Act?</p>	Written	SQ17-000731
63	1.5: ESD	Sterle	Statement of Reasons Request	<p>The Environmental Defenders Office wrote to Minister Frydenberg on 19 December 2016, but no response has been received. Why has there been no response? When can they expect a response?</p>	Written	SQ17-000785
64	1.5 OoC	Urquhart	Land clearing in Queensland	<p>When Senator Chisholm asked in May budget Estimates about the application of the EPBC Act to land clearing in Queensland, the response was that 54 properties had been investigated, and 46 were notified that they did not trigger</p>	Written	SQ17-000743

				<p>the federal environmental protection legislation. 6 were referred, and 2 were being investigated.</p> <p>a. What number of properties have investigations concluded on?</p> <p>b. What's the aggregate area in number of properties where a prosecution or compliance action has been taken?</p> <p>c. What are the six referrals referred to, given there have only been four referrals in the last two years?</p> <p>d. What is the status of the 2 investigations referred to in the response?</p> <p>e. What proportion of the 54 properties were located in Great Barrier Reef catchments?</p> <p>f. What aggregate area of Queensland clearing has now been investigated?</p> <p>g. One of the properties that was referred, Kingvale, has had no further action since the suspension of the referral period last year. What is the current status of the Kingvale referral?</p>		
65	1.5 OoC	Urquhart	<b>Trees cleared in 2014 - 2020</b>	How many trees have been cleared so far in Australia during the six year period 2014-2020 in which the government has been paying \$70 million to plant 20 million trees?	Written	SQ17-000744
66	1.5 OoC	Urquhart	<b>Tree clearing</b>	After how many years could most trees planted today under the 20 million trees policy be bulldozed without consequence?	Written	SQ17-000745
67	1.6: ESD	Urquhart	<b>Food Waste Strategy</b>	<p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> I want to talk about the Food Waste Strategy. The government announced in I think April this year that there was a desire to develop the National Food Waste Strategy. It has now been over six months. What is the status of that strategy? What funding will be allocated to it, other than the summit in November?</p> <p><b>Ms Farrant:</b> The Commonwealth has been undertaking broad range consultation with states and territories, the food industry and a broad range of stakeholders to develop a</p>	Page 85	SQ17-000692



				<p>strategy. At this stage, the minister, is intending to launch that strategy at a summit scheduled for 20 November this year.</p> <p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> So at the moment the only funding that is allocated is the summit in November. Is there any other funding?</p> <p><b>Ms Farrant:</b> At this stage, the department is contributing around \$200,000 in supplier expenses toward the development of the strategy and for the summit.</p> <p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> Can you breakdown that \$200,000?</p> <p><b>Ms Farrant:</b> I don't have a breakdown of those costs. I will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> That's all I have, thank you.</p>		
68	2.1: ICCIED	Urquhart	<b>Trees cleared in Australia 2013 - 2017</b>	<p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> How many trees have been cleared so far in Australia during the period 2013-17?</p> <p><b>Mr Sturgiss:</b> I think it is best to take that on notice. We report estimates—</p> <p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> You do keep that information, though?</p> <p><b>Mr Sturgiss:</b> We report estimates of the hectareage of forest that has been cleared. We can provide that and translate that into the number of trees. That might take some analysis.</p> <p><b>Senator URQUHART:</b> I assume you would have the number of trees per hectare.</p> <p><b>Mr Sturgiss:</b> We can work something out.</p>	Page 92	SQ17-000702
69	2.1: ICCIED	Leyonhjelm	<b>International Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	<p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> What are the percentages of world greenhouse gas emissions for China, India, Russia and the US?</p> <p><b>Ms Milnes:</b> I don't have those figures in front of me, but they're a good portion.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> Fairly substantial? Would they be over 50?</p> <p><b>Ms Evans:</b> I think we'll have to take on notice to get the</p>	Page 93	SQ17-000703

				<p>specific figures, or perhaps we can get them before the end of the session and can provide you with them. But I can tell you that under the Paris Agreement we have something in the order of 85 per cent of global emissions covered by the Paris Agreement. And even if you include the USA, given that they have announced their withdrawal, the agreement still covers 72 per cent of global emissions. But I don't have that broken down by country. If we can get that we will.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> If we can just think about China for a moment, has the most recently reported annual change in emissions by China been a rise, or a fall?</p> <p><b>Ms Evans:</b> Again, we'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> Do you have that information for any country at the moment?</p> <p><b>Ms Evans:</b> No, not with us at the table. We hadn't anticipated answering by country. But it is available. We would just need to bring it together for you.</p>		
70	2.1: ICCIED	Leyonhjelm	<b>Reduction of International Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	<p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> Yes. But of all the countries that emit more than Australia—and bearing in mind that there must be quite a lot of them, if Australia's contribution is 1.3 per cent—can you tell me how many are increasing their annual emissions and how many are reducing them?</p> <p><b>Ms Evans:</b> Not here at the table, I'm afraid. Again, we didn't come armed with that information. But it is available, so we can provide it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> All right. I heard you refer to the Paris accord earlier. Of all the commitments of signatories to the Paris accord, how many are commitments involving a reduction in overall emissions between the reference year and the target year?</p> <p><b>Ms Evans:</b> Again, we'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> So, you knew how much Australia's contribution to it was. Do you know by how much greenhouse gas emissions worldwide are increasing at the moment?</p> <p><b>Ms Evans:</b> I am sorry; we haven't come prepared for this</p>	Pages 93–94	SQ17-000704

				<p>particular line of questioning. All the kinds of things you're asking are available through the reports to the UNFCCC, but we haven't come with it to hand.</p> <p><b>Senator REYNOLDS:</b> Is someone listening—one of your staff—and available to track down the information for you?</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> I think we've got someone onto it.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> Suppose Australia was to cease emitting global greenhouse gas so we all go 100 per cent nuclear or something like that, would global emissions continue to rise, assuming all the other signatories to the Paris accord do what they said they were going to do—and I suppose that's a fairly risky assumption? If they do and the other countries that aren't signatories to the Paris accord continue to do what they are doing now, what would be the net effect on global emissions?</p> <p><b>Ms Evans:</b> Even if you look at the current Paris Agreement, all of the commitments put together, the overall picture is that there is still an expectation that there will be an overall increase in emissions for some time. The structure of the agreement is such that it says there is an expectation that countries will ratchet up their effort as time goes by, but the existing commitments certainly would still see a continued increase in greenhouse gas emissions but less than the increase we would have seen had there not been those commitments made.</p> <p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> I'd be grateful for those figures, whether you get them this time or take them on notice that would be handy. If you get them while this session is still going then I have some follow-up questions, otherwise I might come back to them next estimates.</p>		
71	2.1: ICCIED	Wong	<b>Reducing Emissions in the Electricity Sector – Work by Department</b>	<p><b>Mr Archer:</b> I've generally been involved in work in the department in relation to work on how you might go about reducing emissions in the electricity sector. That includes work that we have done in support of the minister once the advice was received from the Energy Security Board.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> What was that work?</p>	Page 100	SQ17-000705

				<b>Mr Archer:</b> I'd prefer to take that on notice, in terms of going into the specifics.		
72	2.1: ICCIED	Leyonhjelm	<b>International Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Projections to 2030</b>	<p><b>Senator LEYONHJELM:</b> Just a quick summary of questions on notice. A quick Wikipedia has generated some figures on the emissions of other countries. The most recent figures that I've been able to find are for 2015. So we now have China, India, Russia. China is 24 times Australia's emissions, India is 5.5 times Australia's emissions, Russia is four times. And others are at lower ratios to Australia from that. So the question on notice would be: what has the history of those countries been in terms of their emissions? And I'm hoping that you would have something not too far different from table 6 in the document that has just been circulated—or as close as you can get to that. I appreciate some of them don't have data. Also, on notice, please: what are their projections to, say, 2030, which is when Australia has given commitments, I think. If you could possibly do that for me to allow comparisons, that would be appreciated.</p> <p><b>Ms Evans:</b> Happy to do that.</p>	Page 101	SQ17-000706
73	2.1: CCD	Urquhart	<b>Emissions arising from deforestation</b>	<p>Noting that 9% of Australia's emissions per year arise from deforestation and the government has paid over \$1.4 billion on emissions abatement for vegetation projects alone under the ERF:</p> <p>a. Is the Department convinced that the ERF is the most cost effective way to reduce emissions from deforestation? Has it considered any alternatives?</p> <p>b. How many trees have been cleared so far in Australia during the period 2013-2017?</p> <p>c. Has the government assessed whether it would be a more efficient use of taxpayer money to enforce the EPBC Act to regulate deforestation and land clearing, rather than pay \$1.4 billion for vegetation projects under the ERF?</p> <p>d. Does the Department do any checking to see whether</p>	Written	SQ17-000746

				they are paying more for emissions abatement than the value of a property? If not, why not? e. Is it possible that after the vegetation contracts run out, or if the property changes hands, these trees could be bulldozed without consequence?		
74	2.1: CCD	Urquhart	Abatement in different sectors	Are the costs of abatement in different sectors a relevant input into the allocation of abatement across the economy?	Written	SQ17-000747
75	2.1: CCD	Urquhart	Consultations between departments	Has the Department consulted with other departments (Treasury, Agriculture, Transport, Industry) in the implications for those sectors of the economy if the energy sector is expected to cut its emissions in line with national targets (26-28% off 2005 levels by 2030)?	Written	SQ17-000752
76	2.1: CCD	Ketter	Energy policy	Is it economically efficient for each sector of the economy to adopt an abatement task that is proportionally the same as the economy wide abatement task?	Written	SQ17-000786
77	2.1: CCD	Ketter	Energy policy	What should determine the relative contribution of sectors to the national emission reduction task? Is it abatement costs in each sector?	Written	SQ17-000787
78	2.1: CCD	Ketter	Energy policy	What would the economic consequence be if sectors are set abatement tasks that do not reflect the comparative cost of abatement between sectors – consequences for income, jobs, taxes etc...?	Written	SQ17-000788
79	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Timing of Decisions	<b>Senator WONG:</b> In early September, was there any discussion about sending this idea to the ESB? <b>Mr Heferen:</b> I have to take that on notice.	Page 104	SQ17-000655
80	4.1: Energy	Di Natale	National Energy Guarantee – Modelling Undertaken	<b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> Are you aware of any modelling that's been done by the AEMC or anyone else to justify the claim of \$110 to \$115? <b>Mr Heferen:</b> That's a double-barrelled question there. I'm aware of a lot of modelling the AEMC has done—	Page 107	SQ17-000661

				<p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> To justify the \$110 claim—</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Senator, please let Mr Heferen actually finish the answer.</p> <p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> He's not answering the question. He's studiously avoiding the question.</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I've tried to answer the question.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Please continue, Mr Heferen.</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> May I speak?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> You may.</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> Thank you, Chair. The AEMC has done a lot of modelling on a range of issues. I'm not aware of it all because they do a lot of work for both the Commonwealth and others and internal work for themselves. What I understand of this figure is that it's an assessment. Given all the modelling they've done—and I know of some of it; I don't know it all and I certainly don't know of the price increases—they would have come to this conclusion.</p> <p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> Is there any specific modelling to come up with that number?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I would have to take that on notice.</p>		
81	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Abatement Assumptions	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> The senator might have asked this while I was out of the room. Do you even know the assumptions on which the potential, possible price effect is based? Do you know what the abatement assumption is? Do you what the low-emission assumption is? Do you know what the reliability assumption is? Do you have any knowledge of the bases?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> The abatement assumption is the one provided, so there'd be that 26 to 28 per cent reduction.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> No, that is not an abatement assumption. That's a whole-of-economy abatement assumption; it's not an abatement assumption for the sector, is it?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> On that I'll have to take it on notice. Because the other key assumptions—</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> What do you know about the assumptions? First I will ask an open question: what do you</p>	Page 108	SQ17-000665

				<p>know about the assumptions underpinning that price assessment?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Do you know anything about the assumptions underpinning it?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Mr Heferen's taken it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Okay. But do you know anything about it? Has the department been provided with any assumptions that underpin those figures?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Is that no?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I personally haven't, but I'm reluctant to say we haven't on the basis that it has been provided, so I'll take that on notice.</p>		
82	4.1: Energy	Di Natale	National Energy Guarantee – Wholesale Market	<p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> I want to go to the wholesale power market, which basically lets you buy or sell power through derivatives and futures. What role is there going to be for market trading and spot prices if all the trades have to have been in bilateral contracts with the retailers?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> As the letter explains on page 2, where it goes through the spot market versus the longer term contracts, it is the case that, more and more, the wholesale spot market tends to be just the order for dispatch, rather than final prices paid. Most prices paid are determined by the bilateral contracts that already occur or the contracts through the ASX. How much this would change that, I would have to take on notice and seek advice about from the AEMC.</p>	Page 108	SQ17-000671
83	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Timing of advice from the Energy Security Board	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> You tell me when the government first decided to ask the ESB for advice. How long prior to 3 October was the decision made? You tell me. You are the minister.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> We have canvassed what the department—</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> No, I am asking, 'When did the</p>	Pages 110–111	SQ17-000672

				<p>government first decide?' Do you know?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I am happy to take it on notice and ascertain if the minister had conversations prior to 18—</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> No, it's not a chat. It was a government decision to ask for advice, a decision which was not given effect until 3 October. At any time prior to 3 October, did the government actually decide that they were going to ask the ESB for this advice? And, if so, whom?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Senator, I am sorry that you seem to be dismissive of the fact that the government was willing to engage in policy discussions and analysis with the ESB, but we make no apologies for doing that and doing that at meetings—</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> That's boringly ridiculous, seriously.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> that the minister had with the ESB, that the Prime Minister had with the ESB and possibly in other discussions.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> That's not what we are asking. The government decision to seek formal advice on which you then based a national policy—that is what I am asking about. I am not asking about a chat that went, 'We think this is a good idea; let's have a cup of tea.' I am asking about a formal decision by government to ask for formal advice from the ESB. We know it wasn't formally requested on 3 October. I am giving you an opportunity to tell me the decision was actually made earlier than that and not only 13 days before the Prime Minister made the announcement.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I will happily take on notice whether there is a formal decision the likes of which you speak, but it is very clear, from the evidence given, it would seem, at PM&amp;C as well as the evidence given here—</p>		
84	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Cabinet Process	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> I would like know, did this go to cabinet? Did the NEG go to cabinet?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Senator, you well know that—</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Untrue. Whether something went to cabinet has been asked and answered, including the dates</p>	Page 111	SQ17-000674



				<p>on which something went to cabinet. What is certainly not permissible is questions about cabinet deliberation—which I would like to ask, but I won't because it would be boring. Did it go to cabinet at all, this massive policy?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Senator, the issue went to cabinet. As to further details, I'll be taking those on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Fine. You were happy before, Mr Heferen, to reference coordination comments in relation to other policies. Were coordination comments sought and provided in respect of the NEG?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I'm sorry, Senator. The minister's answer has effectively precluded further discussion.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> It's fine for him to talk about coordination comments in relation to another answer, but you don't want any answer in respect of the NEG—is that right? Was there any advice across government about the NEG?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Senator Wong, I am going to make sure in provision of information about cabinet processes that we stick by the rule book. Now, I have confirmed the matter was discussed by cabinet and obviously agreed.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> When?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Do you know? Were you there?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I think I have got a pretty good cabinet attendance record—</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> I am glad to hear it.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> As I said, I'm going to take the process questions on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> It was reported publicly as being considered on 16 October. Was it only considered on one occasion?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p>		
85	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Drafting of Letter	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Who drafted the letter seeking formal advice that was sent on 3 October? Was that departmentally drafted?</p>	Page 112	SQ17-000680

				<p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> The letter you refer to at 3 October?  <b>Senator WONG:</b> Yes.  <b>Mr Heferen:</b> I will take that on notice.  <b>Senator WONG:</b> Can I have a copy of it?  <b>Mr Pratt:</b> We will take that on notice.  <b>Senator WONG:</b> We have the answer to it, so it would be useful to get the question.  <b>Mr Heferen:</b> Yes.  <b>Senator WONG:</b> You don't recall if you were involved in drafting it?  <b>Mr Heferen:</b> I am sure some of my staff would have been involved in—  <b>Senator WONG:</b> Mr Chisholm, were you?  <b>Mr Chisholm:</b> No, I wasn't involved in drafting the letter.  <b>Senator WONG:</b> Was the letter drafted in Mr Frydenberg's office, in the PMO, in PM&amp;C or in the department?  <b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Mr Heferen has taken that on notice already.</p>		
86	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Briefing Provided by Department	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> So you have some written briefing apart from that? No? Mr Heferen? Apart from that, was there anything prepared by the department for consideration at that meeting, or were you asked to look at what the ESB was going to present?  <b>Mr Pratt:</b> I don't recall the exact details. We'd have to take that on notice. There was an awful lot of briefing material provided to the minister both from ourselves and from the ESB members.</p>	Page 113	SQ17-000685
87	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Formal Request for Advice	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Then Mr Frydenberg formally requested advice of ESB? Was the possibility of getting formal advice discussed at the meeting of 28 September?  <b>Mr Pratt:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. But close to the point of the final request, it was clear that it was going to happen at some stage. It may have been before the 28th; I don't actually recall.</p>	Pages 113–114	SQ17-000686

88	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Meetings Prior to Announcement	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> .....You might want to take this on notice. Apart from what I have in the chronology, were there any other meetings between Mr Frydenberg and the ESB between 8 August and 13 October? Do you know? You didn't turn up with that?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> Obviously, there's been a reference to an 18 September meeting during the course of our discussions.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Take on notice the full chronology, but are there any other meetings that you know about that we haven't discussed?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> They seem to cover the key ones.</p> <p><b>Mr Pratt:</b> From the top of the head, no. I will caveat that by saying that this is a chronology developed by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. They have different perspectives to the ones that we have. I'm not aware of any others, but we'll correct that on notice if we have to.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> You gave me one which was 18 September. I understand that. I'm asking, in addition: can you recall any others between Minister Frydenberg and the ESB?</p> <p><b>Mr Pratt:</b> I'm saying no.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> You'll take it on notice to confirm. Fair enough.</p>	Page 123	SQ17-000687
89	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – ESB Meetings	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> .....Does the department have any knowledge of the ESB meeting with any other members of the government or staff? If so, when and who, in that relevant period?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I'll have to take that on notice.</p>	Page 123	SQ17-000690
90	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Copy of Advice from ESB to the Minister	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Did you receive a draft copy of the ESB's advice before you got the final advice?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I did receive draft advice—a draft copy. One of the issues here, as I mentioned before, is the ESB has no staff. One thing we did endeavour to do was try to ensure</p>	Page 123	SQ17-000693

				<p>that errors around—</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> When did you get that?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> You got final advice on 13 October. Are we talking days, hours or weeks before that? It can't be weeks, because it was only commissioned on the 10th. At some point in that 10-day period you got draft advice, is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> You don't remember or you don't want to tell me?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> How many versions did you get? Did you get it more than once?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> What changes did you seek and at whose request?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Did you discuss the draft advice with Mr Frydenberg or his advisors before you responded?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WONG:</b> Why?</p> <p><b>Mr Heferen:</b> I would not like to mislead, and I think in this case I need to take that on notice.</p>		
91	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Annual Percentage Point Growth in Renewable Energy	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> What is the annual percentage point growth in renewable energy currently over the last few years? Is it 10.5 percentage points in 2010 to 23.5 percentage points in 2020, so 13.5 percentage points in 10 years between 2010 and 2020—is that right?</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> I think we have to take the annual percentage growth on notice.</p>	Page 124	SQ17-000694
92	4.1: Energy	Wong	National Energy Guarantee – Pro Rata Contributions	<p><b>Senator WONG:</b> I think Ms Evans said that the Prime Minister used the phrase 'pro-rata' in his press conference. Are you looking at a contribution from the energy sector to</p>	Page 126	SQ17-000695

				the abatement task that's above its pro-rata contribution? Is that going to be modelled? <b>Mr Archer:</b> I would have to take that on notice.		
93	4.1: Energy	Rice	<b>Dispatchable Power Under the National Energy Guarantee</b>	<b>Senator RICE:</b> I note that biomass is included under your definition of dispatchable power. Do you have any expectation as to what level of potential take-up there would be for biomass under the NEG? <b>Mr Chisholm:</b> We could take that on notice. From recollection, the mix of biomass in our energy mix is pretty limited, certainly compared to a number of other countries. The Finkel review provided a discussion in its report about the prospects for biomass. <b>Senator RICE:</b> There was about a paragraph on biomass in the Finkel report. <b>Mr Chisholm:</b> Yes, but from recollection—and I could take it on notice to check—my understanding is that Dr Finkel did not consider it was likely to provide a huge proponent of our future energy mix.	Page 130	SQ17-000696
94	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	<b>Cost of abatement</b>	Can you compare the broad cost of abatement in the electricity, agricultural, industrial sectors? Is it the case that electricity has a relatively low cost of abatement, due to the continued falling cost of renewable energy and other technologies?	Written	SQ17-000748
95	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	<b>Proportional share</b>	If it is the case that electricity costs of abatement are relatively low, does it not follow that electricity should do more of the national abatement task than its strict proportional share?	Written	SQ17-000749
96	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	<b>Electricity costs of abatement</b>	If it is the case that electricity costs of abatement are relatively low compared to other sectors, but the electricity sector is limited from doing more than its proportional share, what would that mean about the (whole of economy) costs of meeting our emission reduction obligations?	Written	SQ17-000750

97	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	Electricity costs of abatement	Would those costs be higher than they need to be, because relatively cheap electricity sector abatement would need to be replaced with more expensive abatement in other sectors?	Written	SQ17-000751
98	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	Letter from the Energy Security Board	<p>The letter from the Energy Security Board to the Government outlining the NEG policy states that renewable energy generation is expected to be between 28 percent and 36 percent by 2030 under the NEG, when designed to deliver the Government's 26-28 percent emission reduction targets. In contrast, the Finkel Review projected renewable energy to make up 35 percent by 2030 under a business as usual scenario, which the Review Panel pointed out did not meet the Government's emission reduction targets.</p> <p>Can you explain why under the NEG, 28 percent renewable energy is sufficient to deliver the Government's targets, but the Chief Scientist said 35 percent wasn't sufficient to deliver those same targets in his report?</p> <p>Is it that the assumptions driving the 28 percent result are that emission reductions are coming through the purchase of overseas permits, not a change in the domestic energy sector?</p>	Written	SQ17-000753
99	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	Security mechanism in the NEG	<p>Is the security mechanism in the NEG an approach that has been tried overseas; in particular, are you aware of similar approaches having been considered in Europe, both on an EU wide basis and in individual countries (UK, Italy and Belgium)?</p> <p>What was the record and experience of these examples?</p>	Written	SQ17-000756
100	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	Dispatchable generation	What is meant by 'dispatchable' generation under the security mechanism?	Written	SQ17-000757
101	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	'Dispatchable'	Previously, AEMO has defined 'dispatchable' as being able to be delivered within 15 minutes when needed. Is this the	Written	SQ17-000758

			<b>definition</b>	definition that will be used under the NEG?		
<b>102</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Dispatchability of Baseload Coal</b>	Is baseload coal dispatchable, even though it cannot easily ramp up and down; certainly not within 15 minutes?	Written	SQ17-000759
<b>103</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Compliance - Retailer's licence</b>	As the documentation on the NEG stands, the only enforcement mechanism mentioned is a removal of retailers licence for non-compliance with the NEG. This means that a covered entity, which could be a energy retailer or a large energy user like an aluminium smelter, could lose their licence and be closed due to having an emission intensity above the specified baseline. Is this correct?	Written	SQ17-000760
<b>104</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Fines or other incentives</b>	Does the Government contemplate fines or other incentives to ensure compliance in the mechanism? In which case, covered entities would be fined for having emissions above a specified baseline. Is this correct?	Written	SQ17-000761
<b>105</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Timing of Technical decisions</b>	When will the Government make these types of technical decisions?	Written	SQ17-000762
<b>106</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Impact on Market Power</b>	Is the department aware of concerns about the NEG enhancing the market power of the big three vertically integrated energy companies, at the expense of smaller more innovative retailers?	Written	SQ17-000763
<b>107</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Competition concerns</b>	Is it the case that an explicit and standardised market for emission reduction units, which would mean an explicit carbon market under the NEG, would help address some of these competition concerns?	Written	SQ17-000764
<b>108</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Meetings between the Government and the electricity retailers</b>	When was the department first made aware of the two meetings that the Government had with the electricity retailers?	Written	SQ17-000765

109	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	Department's involvement in the Government's announcement	To what extent was the Department involved in the development of the Government's announcement regarding electricity retailers?	Written	SQ17-000766
110	4.1: Energy	Urquhart	Proposals to regulate retail electricity prices	What is the department's view of proposals to regulate retail electricity prices, such as the Basic Standing Offer in the Victorian Thwaites review?	Written	SQ17-000767
111	4.1: Energy	Abetz	National Energy Guarantee – Savings	The Department recently announced the new National Energy Guarantee. Can the Department confirm that savings over 2020 – 2030 are anticipated to be in the order of \$115 per household per annum?	Written	SQ17-000768
112	4.1: ESED	Abetz	Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – International Standards	<p>These questions relate to the Department of Environment and Energy proposal to regulate LED Lighting under the Equipment Energy Efficiency program through the implementation of minimum energy performance standards (MEPS).</p> <p>Is it true that the proposed MEPS on LED lamps will not align with other major economies such as the EU or US in terms of standards, the attributes to be regulated, and implementation timing?</p>	Written	SQ17-000769
113	4.1: ESED	Abetz	Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – International Standards	Can the Department provide a comparison between the proposed product attributes to be regulated in Australia versus those mandated by regulations in the EU and US?	Written	SQ17-000793
114	4.1: ESED	Abetz	Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Cost Regulations	Is it true that the proposed Australian MEPS on LED lamps will be the highest cost regulations in the world due to the fact that manufacturers and suppliers will need to undertake considerably more product testing, administration and product registration than operators in other major economies?	Written	SQ17-000770
115	4.1: ESED	Abetz	Equipment Energy	Can the Department provide a regulatory cost comparison	Written	SQ17-000794



			<b>Efficiency Program – Cost Regulations</b>	between existing EU and US regulations compared with the proposed Australian MEPS on LED lamp?		
<b>116</b>	<b>4.1: ESED</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Performance Variation</b>	Is it true that international performance standards for LED lamps (i.e. IEC 62612 Self-ballasted LED lamps for general lighting services with supply voltages > 50 V - Performance requirements) allow -20% variation from rated efficacy to tested efficacy to allow for component performance variation, and that such a tolerance is not acknowledged or accommodated in the Australian LED lamp MEPS proposal?	Written	SQ17-000771
<b>117</b>	<b>4.1: ESED</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program - NEMA</b>	Is it true that the US National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) check of more than 50 lighting laboratories shows a variation of more than +4% in the efficacy result of the same LED lamp and that such a variation is not acknowledged or accommodated in the Australia LED lamp MEPS proposal?	Written	SQ17-000772
<b>118</b>	<b>4.1: ESED</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program -Savings</b>	Is it true that consumers will be financially advantaged after just 8 months of using an equivalent LED lamp, yet proposed Australian LED lamp MEPS will mandate what is essentially a 15 year product guarantee (i.e. 15,000 hour mandatory product lifetime)?	Written	SQ17-000773
<b>119</b>	<b>4.1: ESED</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program -Savings</b>	Isn't such a provision straying into the consumer protections area that is essentially the domain of the ACCC and the Australian Consumer Law?	Written	SQ17-000795
<b>120</b>	<b>4.1: ESED</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program -Savings</b>	Is it true that overseas manufacturers won't provide such a product lifetime guarantee and that this will leave Australian supplier businesses open to significant product liabilities?	Written	SQ17-000796
<b>121</b>	<b>4.1: ESED</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program</b>	Is it true that for suppliers to conduct their own such testing would take close to 2 years and that this would impede the LED lamp market which currently updates LED lamp	Written	SQ17-000797

			<b>-Savings</b>	products every six to ten months?		
122	4.1: ESED	Abetz	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Safety Standards</b>	Is it true that regulating photo-biological safety in LED lamps rated greater than 50V will duplicate existing electrical safety standards and regulations?	Written	SQ17-000774
123	4.1: ESED	Abetz	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Peak Body</b>	Is it true the peak body for lighting equipment suppliers (Lighting Council Australia) has asked that any Australian regulatory standards/determination development process include the three pillars of the Standards Australia process – i.e. balance, transparency and consensus – and so far this assurance has not been provided?	Written	SQ17-000775
124	4.1: ESED	Abetz	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program –Promoting LED Lights</b>	Referring to various Department of Environment and Energy websites, the Department actively promotes the use of LED Lights as the “most efficient lighting technology you can buy for your home”. Is it true that the proposed MEPS for LEDs policy will raise industry costs by \$80,000,000?	Written	SQ17-000776
125	4.1: ESED	Abetz	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Production Costs</b>	In light of the savings offered by LED lights, does the Department consider that the pursuit of a policy that will raise industry production costs is inconsistent with other policies aimed at increasing LED usage in households?	Written	SQ17-000777
126	4.1: ESED	Abetz	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Environmental Benefits</b>	Has the Department undertaken any modelling of the reduced environmental benefits—eg through energy use or carbon emissions—arising from increased LED lighting costs for households and businesses under proposed MEPS for LEDs regulations? If not, why not?	Written	SQ17-000778
127	4.1: ESED	Abetz	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Energy Bills</b>	Is it true that up to 15% of household energy bills are related to lighting?	Written	SQ17-000779
128	4.1: ESED	Abetz	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program</b>	Is it true that more efficient LED lighting can be 70% more efficient than older technology?	Written	SQ17-000798

			<b>– Energy Bills</b>			
<b>129</b>	<b>4.1: ESED</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Energy Bills</b>	What savings could a family in a standard three-bedroom home with older generation lighting expect to realise upon upgrading to LED lighting?	Written	SQ17-000799
<b>130</b>	<b>4.1: ESED</b>	<b>Abetz</b>	<b>Equipment Energy Efficiency Program – Energy Bills</b>	How do these savings arising from lighting compare to the expected savings under the National Energy Guarantee?	Written	SQ17-000800
<b>131</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>McAllister</b>	<b>Finkel Review – Cost</b>	How much did the Finkel Review cost? How was this funded?	Written	SQ17-000783
<b>132</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Urquhart</b>	<b>Projected Renewable Energy Generation</b>	The Finkel Review projected 35 percent renewable energy generation by 2030 under a business as usual scenario, in which Australia failed to meet the Governments emission reduction targets. Would you expect a policy designed to meet our Paris emission reduction targets to generate a greater share of renewable energy than 28 percent by 2030?	Written	SQ17-000781
<b>133</b>	<b>4.1: CCD</b>	<b>Ketter</b>	<b>Energy policy</b>	If we are concerned with maximising the efficiency of meeting our emission reduction targets, should the electricity sector contribute more to the national abatement task than its strict proportionate contribution to total emissions, or put another way, should it do more than the 26 to 28 percent emission reduction we have signed on to nationally?	Written	SQ17-000789
<b>134</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Ketter</b>	<b>Energy policy</b>	The NEG puts an added obligation on retailers to meet emission intensity reduction targets. This is a new constraint being placed on businesses. Would you agree that any constraint like this, if it is binding and changes behaviour, involves a shadow price which tells us the cost of meeting such a constraint?	Written	SQ17-000790
<b>135</b>	<b>4.1: Energy</b>	<b>Ketter</b>	<b>Energy policy</b>	Would you agree that in the context of emission reductions, this cost can be thought of as a shadow carbon price, and it will be reflected within the contracts that will be traded	Written	SQ17-000791

				between retailers?		
136	4.1: Energy	Ketter	Energy policy	Is it correct to call the NEG a (de-facto) form carbon trading market mechanism?	Written	SQ17-000792
137	4.1: PAAI	McAllister	“Powering Forward” Campaign	<p>How much has the Government allocated for their “Powering Forward” energy policy communications campaign?</p> <p>Please provide a breakdown by forms of communication (TV, Radio and other broadcasting, Internet (advertising and website) and a breakdown over time (forward estimates).</p> <p>How is the “Powering Forward” campaign being paid for?</p>	Written	SQ17-000784
138	ARENA	Urquhart	Levelised Cost of Electricity	What are your estimates for the Levelised Cost of Electricity from: wind power, utility scale solar PV, Solar thermal, in 2020, 2030, 2040?	Written	SQ17-000780
139	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Dastyari	Various questions from the public	<p>So I have three questions. How many members of the Illuminati work at the Bureau of Meteorology and what is your relationship with this shadowy organisation? To what extent does George Soros direct your day-to-day activities? How often does the Bureau of Meteorology meet with NASA to doctor scientific evidence and when is your next meeting?</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> I'll be happy to take those questions on notice.</p>	Page 16	SQ17-000697
140	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Whish-Wilson	Longer-term projections	<p><b>Senator WHISH-WILSON:</b> When we talk about climate, we have short-term forecasts and we also have longer-term projections. Could you let us know: are you involved with longer-term projections? By that I mean greater than three or six months.</p> <p><b>Dr Johnson:</b> Yes, we are. We provide forecasts which then merge into projections and outlooks over a time continuum. All of those are available publicly on our</p>	Page 17	SQ17-000698

				<p>website. I would be happy to provide you them. It's quite a rich picture that spans a number of phenomena. I would be happy to provide you with all of those things. As you know, Senator, every two years we also issue a <i>State of the climate</i> report in collaboration with the CSIRO. It basically describes what we've been observing and also makes some statements about future projections based on the observed data.</p>		
141	Climate Change Authority (CCA)	Roberts	Cost-benefit analysis	<p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Last question—you've been very helpful so far: do you do cost-benefit analysis on the advice you give when it comes to climate policy—and, presumably, that sweeps into energy policy?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> For some of the reviews, we do do cost-benefit analysis, and we are looking to do some for the emissions reduction—</p> <p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Can you take it on notice to provide the list of policies that you do use cost-benefit analysis on.</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> Certainly.</p> <p><b>Senator ROBERTS:</b> Thank you.</p>	Page 49	SQ17-000699
142	GBRMPA	Chisholm	Budget allocation for the monitoring of bleaching	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> In terms of the authority's ability or plans to monitor or assess the mortality from bleaching for the next two years, can you give us an update on what GBRMPA has planned in that regard?</p> <p><b>Dr Reichelt:</b> We've been working closely in the last few months with the Australian Institute of Marine Science, on whom we rely heavily for the big-picture survey work that that organisation's been doing since the mid-1980s. They do an annual survey. The quick response that we initiated in 2016 gave us a very good, comprehensive picture. But we found that what was in our report that we did midyear changed significantly after six months, so the effective mortality occurs practically over a whole year because of physiological stress and post-bleaching trauma, like coral disease. Even the corals that survive can be depleted physiologically. We're moving our thinking now to a more</p>	Page 24	SQ17-000700

				<p>annualised approach where we'll rely on the high-quality, long-term monitoring program of AIMS and use that as our primary source of the state of the reef coral systems.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Specifically, how much money and resources are being allocated to this task over the next two years?</p> <p><b>Dr Reichelt:</b> I think I would have to take that on notice. Because it's integrated into our monitoring of seagrasses, dugongs, turtles and other strandings, I don't have a figure here specifically broken out for the state of coral and likewise The Australian Institute of Marine Science could answer questions about what they are budgeting for. But it's very substantial. I would expect it would be \$4 million or \$5 million.</p>		
143	Director of National Parks	Reynolds	Ningaloo Reef	<p><b>Senator REYNOLDS:</b> As a Senator for WA, and regarding which populations might be more resilient to higher temperatures, have you got any information on the Ningaloo Reef? I understand anecdotally, from going up there locally, that they think their particular corals are more resilient. I don't know whether that is fact or fiction. I am happy for you to take it on notice, if you like, but I would be interested to find out more.</p> <p><b>Dr Reichelt:</b> I could direct you to the people who would know the detail of that.</p>	Page 27	SQ17-000701
144	Director of National Parks	Whish-Wilson	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Renaming	<p>Why is the government seeking to rename fifty-eight existing "Commonwealth marine reserves" to "marine parks"? What is the rationale for this?</p>	Written	SQ17-000728
145	Director of National Parks	Whish-Wilson	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Renaming – Consultation	<p>Has there been public or stakeholder consultation on this change?</p>	Written	SQ17-000729
146	Snowy Hydro	Carr	Yarrangobilly Caves	<p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Because this is running quite close to the Yarrangobilly caves, isn't it?</p>	Page 7 24/10/17	

	<b>Limited</b>			<p><b>Mr Whitby:</b> No, I wouldn't say that. It is about five kilometres.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Five kilometres? But it runs right through the ridge, doesn't it?</p> <p><b>Mr Whitby:</b> No, as I said, it's about five kilometres distance from Yarrangobilly caves.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> You had a look at that, have you?</p> <p><b>Mr Whitby:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> You've had consultants in to look at that?</p> <p><b>Mr Whitby:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> What have they told you? No danger at all to the caves?</p> <p><b>Mr Whitby:</b> Indeed.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> You can assure the committee that that is the case?</p> <p><b>Mr Whitby:</b> That's my understanding, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Could you take that on notice, please?</p> <p><b>Mr Whitby:</b> Sure.</p>		
147	<b>Snowy Hydro Limited</b>	<b>Carr</b>	<b>Pumped Hydro Usage</b>	<p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> You indicate that you currently operate the largest pumped hydro in the country. In fact, you've had facility since 1973, haven't you?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Have you undertaken any analysis as to whether or not that existing capacity is sufficient or insufficient?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> The truth is that we hardly use it because of the thermal base load, and we've got to release so much water each year to the farmers, and that release of water has enabled us to meet all of the projected contractual position for Snowy. I can say, though, that, at the time of the drought of 2007, it was enormously valuable for Snowy to have that available to them to meet the demand patterns that were on it. Without that pumped hydro, Snowy would've been in a difficult financial position.</p>	Page 16 24/10/17	

				<p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> How much have you actually used in the last decade?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> I'll have to take that on notice and come back to you.</p>		
148	Snowy Hydro Limited	Carr	Prime Minister's Trip	<p><b>Mr Broad:</b> I've been involved in all the trips the Prime Minister has made to the Snowy—yes.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> And were you involved in the transportation of the Prime Minister's entourage?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> I was involved in the transportation of the Prime Minister and his staff around the Snowy.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> I see. And how were they transported?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> We took an aerial view from T3 of where the pumped hydro scheme would go. We flew out of Talbingo up to Beautiful Lake and then we reached over the top to Tantangara, showing the proposed line of the scheme. We came back over T1 and T2, which are existing underground power stations, highlighting the minimal environmental impacts of those stations and how it works. We showed him from an aerial perspective, as we've done for many other visitors from all sides of the political spectrum and all businesses who wish to participate in the scheme. We've done exactly the same—</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> You chartered an aircraft, didn't you?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> Chartered a helicopter—yes.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> What was the cost of that?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Thank you.</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> It's a local helicopter.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> I'm sure it is. You didn't have to bring one in from Sydney or Melbourne?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> That's good. So, what was the cost of that and what was the company?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> Yes, I'll take it on notice.</p>	Page 18 24/10/17	



				<p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Thank you. And the same on the 28th, if you would. Were there any other costs associated with the visit?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> Other than a morning tea, no.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> No other transport costs?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Thank you. If you could, would you take those on notice for the trips on both the 16th and the 28th?</p>		
149	Snowy Hydro Limited	Carr	The 91 Report	<p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> .....You mentioned today in the evidence a couple of times that there have been three other reports into this project. It's obviously a project of some significance to the corporation. Three goes at this have been rejected, you say, because the costs didn't work out in previous times. I've sought those reports. Are they available?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> The 91 report—you asked for that report and you asked for the particular part dealing with this. I thought we had provided it.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> You have provided that?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> My recollection is we have.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Thank you, Mr Broad. I'm asking the question. You have provided that bit. And you said there were two others. What are the other two?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> There was an original note. I'll give you that note from Sir William Hudson to the government of '66. I'll show you that note. It's a beautiful note.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Is that available now?</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> I'll make it available to the committee.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Thank you. It's just that, when we approached the Library, we were told this was still commercial-in-confidential. I couldn't possibly believe that would be the case.</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> I think the whole report still is, because there are still commercial matters in how we operate, but as to the particular part in the report you are after, we'll make</p>	Page 19 24/10/17	

			<p>that available to you.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Whatever you can. They are of historic interest now rather than commercial, surely.</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> They are. Some of it goes to the heart of how we operate today, would you believe.</p> <p><b>Senator Birmingham:</b> But obviously the nature of the energy market has changed dramatically since then.</p> <p><b>Senator KIM CARR:</b> Mr Broad, perhaps I should explain. I think this is a very, very worthwhile proposition. The question is: we've got to get it right.</p> <p><b>Mr Broad:</b> I agree.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--