

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET ESTIMATES 2021–22 – 25 OCTOBER 2021

AGRICULTURE, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO

QoN No.	Portfolio QoN No.	Department /Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Transcript Page
1	SQ21-002285	Bureau of Meteorology	Gerard Rennick	Compliance with Recommendation C4 of independent peer review	<p>Senator RENNICK: The specific question is: why aren't you complying with recommendation C4, which says you need to better clarify whether or not there have been any network-wide changes in the instrument observing practices when you homogenise data?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I might ask Dr Stone to comment here, but, to the very best of my knowledge, we are complying with all the recommendations of the independent review that you're referring to. Again, I'm happy to stand corrected, but I might ask Dr Stone whether he wishes to comment.</p> <p>Senator RENNICK: Peter, I know we've had this discussion. Where I'm going is that we've had parallel runs done of the large and small Stevenson screens; we've had five parallel runs done out of the 112 weather stations that he used for the ACORN homogenisation series. I'm not sure if that includes the entire 700 weather stations or if that five is only out of 112, but that's what I mean-you need the clarity. If you haven't done those parallel runs, you can't clarify, when you're homogenising data, what was the difference between the change of equipment and the difference between the incorrect measurements being taken at the time?</p> <p>CHAIR: Dr Stone, we can't hear you.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Perhaps we can take the question on notice. Dr Stone is our expert in these matters, and I'd rather that we supply Senator Rennick with the correct answer. Hopefully we can get the technology sorted in a minute, but if we can't then we'll take the question on notice.</p>	117
2	SQ21-002286	Bureau of Meteorology	Gerard Rennick	Auditing homogenisation iterations	<p>Senator RENNICK: I'll jump to the next question. Recommendation A6 basically says you need to be able to audit the homogenisation process. Last time in estimates, we discovered that there are up to 500 million iterations at one weather station for the maximum temperature and up to 250 million iterations for the minimum temperature. How on earth is it possible for someone, other than the bureau itself,</p>	117

					to actually audit those homogenisation iterations? Dr Johnson: Again, we'll take it on notice.	
3	SQ21-002387	Bureau of Meteorology	Gerard Rennick	Senator Rennick written questions to the Bureau of Meteorology	<p>1. The IPCC6 reports says that Australia's temperature has increased by 1.4 degrees since 1910. This is based on homogenised data not actual data. I have previously asked if the BOM uses actual or homogenised data when reporting temperature changes in the media and the BOM replied they use actual data. Why is the BOM reporting homogenised data to the IPCC and not actual data, and why is it not disclosing that the data being reported is homogenised?</p> <p>2. Why did the IPCC not use the 2020 data which was approximately 0.3 lower than the 2019 data?</p> <p>3. Does the BOM agree that the homogenised data runs at around 0.5 degrees hotter than the actual data based on page 29 of Trewins 2018 Accorn 2 paper which shows a mean increase of the actual data per decade of 0.08 degrees v a mean increase of the homogenised data of 0.123 degrees per decade since 1910?</p> <p>4. Recommendation C4 of the Independent Peer Review says that tests based on comparing neighbouring station records usually cannot detect network-wide changes. Why is the Bureau using reference stations to adjust for network wide changes such as the change in Stevenson screens, rather than the principle outlined in Appendix 2 of the Independent Peer Review - The Ten Principles for Long-Term Sustainable Climate Monitoring - that says a suitable period of overlap for new and old observing systems is required.</p> <p>I note the answer given in prior QON's is insufficient. The Bureau notes the actual wording of Recommendation C4 of the Independent Peer Review states "The Bureau should better clarify whether or not there have been any network-wide changes in the instrument/observing practices that took place at all stations across large portions of Australia at about the same time [emphasis added]."</p> <p>It then goes on to say." If so, it will be important to demonstrate how these network-wide changes have been addressed. This is important because tests based</p>	Written

					<p>on comparing neighbouring station records usually cannot detect network-wide changes. Why did the Bureau avoid this question – is it because the IPR doesn't agree with the BOM that statistical analysis is sufficient when there is a change of equipment. "</p> <p>Why has the Bureau avoided answering the question?</p> <p>Reference stations cannot detect if there has been a change of equipment? This is correct isn't it.</p> <p>5. Further to Recommendation C4 has the Bureau been able to demonstrate how these network-wide changes have been addressed. How can the Bureau demonstrate using millions of calculations to homogenise data is better than parallel run when there has been a network wide change of equipment?</p> <p>I note the Bureau's previous answer:</p> <p>"The multi-site comparisons enabled by homogenisation create greater statistical power than comparison using a parallel run alone. This, in turn, makes homogenisation a more reliable means of adjusting for changes in the observation network than a parallel run, whether these changes occur at local or network scale. It is important to note that, where parallel run data exist, they are incorporated into, rather than replace, homogenisation analyses."</p> <p>This is not what the independent peer review says – at no point have they said that statistical analysis is better than using a parallel run. In fact, in its 10 principals of long-term sustainable climate monitoring it says a "A suitable period of overlap for new and old observing systems is required". Nowhere does it say that statistical analysis should be used.</p> <p>Why is the BOM contradicting the IPR and why does it continue to manipulate data with assumptions rather than improve actual reporting.</p> <p>6. Recommendation A6 of the Independent Peer Review says the Bureau should</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>include sufficient station metadata within the public ACORN-SAT station catalogue to allow independent replication of homogeneity analyses for individual ACORN-SAT stations. Given the Bureau's comments that millions of calculations are used to homogenise data sets how is it possible that this process can be replicated?</p> <p>The Bureau of Meteorology (the Bureau) has provided sufficient data, metadata and information on methods, including computer source code, to allow others with relevant capability to examine our homogenisation of station records, and to reproduce results.</p> <p>Who has the Bureau provided sufficient data to? Who audits the Bureau's workings and how do they audit hundreds of millions of iterations, where is their report with the relevant details showing that they have actually audited the homogenisation of actual records?</p> <p>7. How is using a reference station of with a correlation of 0.6 accurate – this means there can be variance of up to 40% in the difference between stations?</p> <p>8. Why does the Bureau homogenise data using a moderate correlation as low as 0.6 – this leaves considerable room for error does it not?</p> <p>9. How can the Bureau prove that a moderate correlation of 0.6 is better than the actual recorded data?</p> <p>10. Is the standard deviation from the mean for the Marble Bar the same as the standard deviation from the mean for Port Hedland for every day of each year since 1910? If not, then how can the Bureau make up a set of rules as to what the difference in temperature between Marble Bar and Port Hedland on a daily basis is?</p> <p>11. When homogenising data based on reference stations does the Bureau change</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>equipment at the same time within the homogenised set? If not, how does it detect changes in equipment or the environment?</p> <p>12. Has the Bureau reduced the margin of error that was promised for early 2021 to less than 0.2 degrees?</p>	
4	SQ21-002271	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	EPBC briefings	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have there been any requests for briefings or representations from the Deputy Prime Minister or any of his National Party colleagues to the environment department in relation to the EPBC?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Not that I'm immediately aware of, Senator. I will take that on notice just to confirm that answer for you.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Mr Metcalfe, are you aware-</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: I'm certainly not aware of any. I would expect to be aware if it had occurred, but we can double-check just to make absolutely sure.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: If you could, that would be helpful. I'd also be interested to know whether there have been any representations or briefings sought about the EPBC from Minister Taylor in relation to the environment department?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: The answer is almost definitely no, but we will just double-check to be absolutely sure.</p>	90
5	SQ21-002272	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Additional amendments to the EPBC bills	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: And since the legislation was tabled in the House of Representatives, and has made its way to the Senate, have there been any additional amendments drafted?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Additional amendments?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: The bills are before us; they've been there for quite some time.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: That's right. Since the bills were introduced, the minister has-I will have to double-check this on notice, but my recollection is that Minister Ley did move further amendments, which we would have drafted to support certainly her discussions with senators around enabling the bills to secure passage through the parliament. So that has certainly happened.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: And then those amendments were withdrawn?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Again, I'd have to double-check the precise nature, but certainly we have drafted, or certainly engaged in the preliminary drafting of amendments to</p>	90-91

					support the minister's discussions with senators within the government, on the crossbench and in opposition.	
6	SQ21-002273	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	EPBC amendments - briefing of other ministers or the Prime Minister's office	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Is there any other minister who has been involved in being briefed on the amendments aside from the environment minister?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Sorry, Senator, any other minister who has been involved in being briefed on the amendments?</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Again, I would probably have to check my records. We would make such a briefing available if Minister Ley asked us to brief other ministers. I don't recall briefing any other minister in that way, but that's not say that that hasn't occurred. We can check for you.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have there been any others requests from any other departments in relation to these changes?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Again, certainly when the changes were under development information was provided to other portfolios in relation to the bills and other portfolios would've had an opportunity to seek clarification or provide input. The department, in developing the reform package for the minister, runs an interdepartmental committee, which is the standard forum where we would keep other interested portfolios apprised of what's happening with the reform bills and what's going on in that process. Clearly in those committees there's an opportunity for them all to ask questions.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have any staff or advisers within the Prime Minister's office been briefed in relation to the EPBC reforms?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: That would be a question for the Prime Minister's office in terms of-</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: No, I'm asking about your department briefing-</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I've not briefed any members of the Prime Minister's office directly in relation to the reforms.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Mr Metcalfe, have you had any conversations with staff or representatives from the Prime Minister's office?</p> <p>Mr Metcalfe: Not to the best of my recollection, but I will check. I think the answer is almost definitely no. Again, it's the sort of thing I think I'd remember.</p>	91
7	SQ21-002274	Department of Agriculture,	Dorinda Cox	Juukan Gorge final report -	Senator COX: My question relates to the Juukan Gorge inquiry's final report and recommendations. Who in the Commonwealth will be taking the lead on	95

		Water and the Environment		Commonwealth lead for implementing recommendations	<p>implementing these recommendations, given that they relate to several departments and agencies within the Commonwealth?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: At this point it's fair to say that you're correct: the inquiry relates to a number of different portfolios, and that's something that certainly we'll need to sort through. Right now the environment portfolio has certainly played a major role, given the history of Indigenous protection through the heritage provisions of the EPBC Act and also the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act. But I think it's fair to say, given the wide ranging nature of the report, we are still right now working with our colleagues across government to determine how the response will be led and certainly forming a departmental committee to discuss the recommendations and how they might be taken forward. So it would probably be too soon to say; however, I can take it on notice and come back to you with a more fulsome answer.</p> <p>Senator COX: That would be good, given the recommendation is asking for the Minister for Indigenous Australians to be responsible for cultural heritage matters. Is that the intention?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Indeed-certainly my advice from our minister is that our minister is very concerned that Indigenous heritage matters are dealt with by the appropriate minister in all circumstances. Whether that's the Minister for the Environment in relation to places or the Minister for Indigenous Heritage in relation to other matters, I think that's something we're still working through, but I'm happy to come back to you on notice.</p>	
8	SQ21-002275	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rex Patrick	EPBC approvals - mangroves in Adelaide and St Kilda	<p>Senator PATRICK: This relates to the mangroves in Adelaide and St Kilda. There appear to be a couple of intersections with the EPBC Act, so it involves the Commonwealth government. One of them relates to the seabirds and the salt lakes to the north of St Kilda and there is what was supposed to be a holding pattern that appears to have been breached in some way, which has then gone on to cause a situation in the context of dam walls breaching and leaching into the mangroves, which are also protected. I'm just wondering what you guys have done in both of those circumstances?</p> <p>Ms Calhoun: I don't have a specific project that we have an EPBC approval for. Do you have a project name for that, Senator?</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: It's the EPBC Act, and the number I have here is SA: 2015/7418,</p>	97

					<p>Ridley Land Corporation. They've moved on-it's no longer owned by that particular entity, so there's a new entity-but there have been breaches, and there have letters to the department about it. In fact, I have a letter here from the Conservation Council of South Australia dated 21 April.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I've written to the minister about it. I'm sure you have, too.</p> <p>Ms Calhoun: There have been issues for the state government, but, as far as EPBC approvals, I don't have that detail here. I can take it on notice.</p>	
9	SQ21-002276	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Draft form of the Reef 2050 Plan	<p>Senator GREEN: Okay. On the deliberations with the committee, was any form of the Reef 2050 Plan provided to international parties by the minister during this lobbying on behalf of the Commonwealth government? Was the plan provided to international parties?</p> <p>Dr Locke: We certainly provided some indications of what's in that plan, because, from our perspective, it was essentially complete. I don't believe they were provided a formal copy of the draft, but we can double-check that.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Yes, could you double-check that? Were they given a version of the draft 2050 plan?</p>	99
10	SQ21-002277	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Nita Green	Funding allocated to the Great Barrier Reef	<p>Senator GREEN: How much funding has the federal government currently allocated to the Great Barrier Reef, excluding the foundation money?</p> <p>Dr Locke: The foundation money we would count as part of our contribution, so I don't know if I have a number that excludes the foundation money.</p> <p>Senator GREEN: Well, it's pretty easy maths. If you give us the number, we can take it out.</p> <p>Dr Locke: The overall contribution by the Commonwealth and Queensland governments-</p> <p>Senator GREEN: No. I am asking about the Commonwealth government; I am not asking about the Queensland government.</p> <p>Dr Locke: I was going to get into that. One of my colleagues might be able to provide the exact numbers. Broadly, the figure we talk about is a \$3 billion commitment, which does include the \$443 million to the foundation. And of that \$3 billion, \$2 billion comes from the Commonwealth and \$1 billion from Queensland. But we've previously provided on notice the numbers. We can certainly provide a table of those.</p>	100

					<p>Senator GREEN: So \$3 billion-</p> <p>Dr Locke: It is \$3 billion combined Commonwealth and Queensland, \$2 billion from the Commonwealth and that does include the \$443 million.</p> <p>Ms Perrett: That's right. It is around \$1.6 billion without the foundation.</p>	
11	SQ21-002278	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Mine offset process	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Thank you. I know that Senator Rice is on her way to ask some questions, but just before she gets here-we had an answer before the break in relation to the mine offset process. You thought you'd gotten away, didn't you? You mentioned that this was the third time an offset like this had been approved.</p> <p>Dr Locke: That's correct, Senator.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: So what are the other two mines that this has happened for?</p> <p>Dr Locke: The other two mines are United Wambo and Wilpinjong-and, of course, Mangoola.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Just to be clear: are they all in New South Wales?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I think they are, yes.</p> <p>Ms Brown: Yes, they are.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: In terms of each of these mines which have now been listed and approved as offsets under these new arrangements and these new approvals, what had the requirements for rehabilitation been at the beginning?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I'm not sure if we've got that information with us. We can have a look. From the general brief I've got, for mining projects, the mining act obligations on each of the four is to return land to a safe and stable manner. That's different to this enhanced ecological mine site rehabilitation, which is generating specific biodiversity contributions. I don't really know what state those particular two are in-</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Would you have access to that information, though?</p> <p>Dr Locke: We can look into that, yes.</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Is that information that is considered before you give approval?</p> <p>Ms Brown: I can say that, for United Wambo, the New South Wales and EPBC Act approval provided that the proponent may use up to 20 per cent ecological rehabilitation to meet offset requirements for Central Hunter Valley eucalyptus forest and woodland.</p>	107

					<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Yes, but what I'm trying to ascertain is, before the minister signs off on this type of offset approval, (a) what is the scope of the information that you have such that you understand what the previous arrangements were for rehabilitation that had already been agreed to, and (b) what type of monitoring and compliance is put in place so that you know what's actually going on? Otherwise it sounds to me that, 10 years down the track, these companies, fingers crossed, will be hoping that no-one's really paying attention or remembers what was agreed a decade ago.</p> <p>Ms Brown: I'd have to take it on notice, but we do have conditions in place and we do have processes in place through our post-approval section within the division. It does go out and look at sites and ensures they're meeting the conditions that were agreed to at the time of approval.</p>	
12	SQ21-002279	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Rex Patrick	South Australian investigation into alleged EPBC Act breaches - St Kilda mangroves	<p>Senator PATRICK: In a normal investigation-and I note that AMSA do this with state authorities; they might let the police force in a particular state deal with an issue and then report back to AMSA, who may choose to let them deal with it at a local level or prosecute them at a federal level.</p> <p>Mr Timson: Hypothetically, that could occur.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: So that's kind of the same arrangement.</p> <p>Mr Timson: Hypothetically.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: What's the likely time frame associated with this?</p> <p>Mr Timson: I can't comment on that. It's a South Australian investigation with South Australian agencies, so it would be inappropriate to comment on their behalf.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: You don't have an expectation of this or an experience? Based on your experience of dealing with compliance issues, do these things always take five years, two years or one year, depending on the complexity?</p> <p>Mr Timson: My time frames under COVID are quite off at the moment.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: That's fair enough-actually, no, not if they're doing the lead investigation in South Australia. South Australia is not locked down.</p> <p>Mr Timson: No, I'm saying the time frames for investigations for site visits when there are restrictions et cetera.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure, but your evidence was that South Australia is taking the lead on this. We've fortunately had very little lock down time.</p> <p>Mr Timson: I can take the question on their behalf and ask them how long they</p>	108

					<p>think it may take, but they will probably say what I would say: it's an active investigation, and we don't give time frames on them.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: Sure. I'm not saying to interfere with what they're doing. This is an oversight aspect, saying, if something's happened, I'm quite entitled to ask, 'What are you doing? What are the reasonable time frames to get an answer?' without necessarily going to the detail that may prejudice those investigations.</p> <p>Mr Timson: I wouldn't want to comment on their behalf.</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: But you'll take it on notice and see what you can obtain.</p> <p>Mr Timson: I can ask them and see if they can provide me with some [inaudible].</p> <p>Senator PATRICK: That's very helpful. Thank you very much.</p>	
13	SQ21-002280	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Leadbeater's possum action statements	<p>Ms Campbell: In terms of what I understand Victoria and the Office of Conservation Regulator are doing, these are very general questions. I don't think it will go to what you're looking for, which are the specific actions under the action plan.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Exactly.</p> <p>Ms Campbell: The specific actions.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What I wanted to point out is this document, in fact, does not include the Leadbeater's possum as one of their priority species. Do you have any transparency or any insight into why? Leadbeater's possum is a critically endangered species and acknowledged as being under threat from logging. The recovery plan has not been in existence since 2002, and yet the priority actions do not mention Leadbeater's possums.</p> <p>Ms Campbell: I'm not across that document now. My understanding is that Victoria is doing a lot of actions, including on protection areas that are covering Leadbeater's possum and looking at action statements for Leadbeater's possum. In term of specific actions, I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	110
14	SQ21-002281	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Leadbeater's possum - Victorian protections	<p>Senator RICE: But, Ms Campbell, what I want to go to-I knew about the negotiations that were going on with that clause. The point is that there needed to be that assessment done within six months for listed species, and implementation of all of those required actions within 12 months, so where is it? How is Victoria being compliant with the RFA if there is nothing obvious as to what is being done to ensure the protection of Leadbeater's possums-and other species; it's not just Leadbeater's.</p> <p>Ms Campbell: My understanding is Victoria have interim protections and actions in</p>	111-112

					<p>place until 2022 for Leadbeater's, which they've advised us in writing, and we're continuing to work with them to fully understand the scope of what they're doing, including the detail on Leadbeater's possum.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You're continuing to work with them, but there's no transparency to the community at all?</p> <p>Ms Deininger: We're not across, in detail, what the Victorian government might have released, but I'm-</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you take on notice, as soon as possible, as to what those measures are?</p>	
15	SQ21-002283	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Voting against technical advice of advisory bodies	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: In 2018, the head of Australia's delegation to the World Heritage Committee stated, 'The increasing trend of the committee setting aside the sound technical advice of the advisory bodies on nominations and state of conservation matters is undermining the credibility of the convention.' They also stated: 'During our term on the committee, Australia will be an advocate for upholding the technical integrity of the committee. We will place great weight on the analysis and advice of the advisory bodies.' How many times has Australia voted against the technical advice of the advisory bodies regarding nominations and listing decisions during its term?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I don't think we'd have that aggregate figure here. We would have to take that on notice. But I would say that every property is considered on its merits, and not every property goes to-</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That's okay. We don't have much time. I'm not being rude, but if you could take it on notice-</p> <p>Dr Locke: I'd also just say that they don't always go to a vote. The World Heritage Committee operates by consensus, so very few things are voted on.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: How many times did the Australian government vote against the technical advice of the advisory bodies regarding nominations and listing decisions at this 2021 meeting?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I think, at this meeting, only two properties out of all of them went to a vote. I think that's right. So I don't know what the answer to your question is in relation to those properties, but it's a minuscule number. We'll take it on notice.</p>	113

16	SQ21-002284	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Assistance to other World Heritage Committee delegates - speeches, speaking notes, talking points	Senator WHISH-WILSON: Did Australian officials assist any other World Heritage Committee delegates to write speeches for the debate on the reef listing? Were any speaking notes or talking points circulated by your staff? Dr Locke: I don't believe so, but we could take that on notice.	114
17	SQ21-002287	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Carol Brown	RSV Nuyina Electrical Fault	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noting the recent propulsion faults with RSV Nuyina, is the planned departure of the vessel to Antarctica on 20 December 2021 still going ahead? 2. In the event that the RSV Nuyina is not able to be repaired by then, or it suffers a different mechanical or electrical fault, will a different vessel be chartered instead or will the voyage be postponed? 3. If any other vessel is chartered in place of RSV Nuyina for any reason, will that vessel be chartered directly by the Australian Antarctic Division or will it be chartered by Serco on the AAD's behalf? 	Written
18	SQ21-002289	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Carol Brown	Support Vessel Crewing Arrangements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the RSV Nuyina the only vessel that the Australian Antarctic Division will be deploying this summer? 2. How many additional vessels will accompany RSV Nuyina on its voyages to Antarctica and Macquarie Island over the coming summer? 3. Will these support vessels be crewed by Australian seafarers? 4. How many crew will be required to operate these vessels? 5. Who has primary responsibility for engaging or chartering these support vessels? Is it the Australian Antarctic Division directly or Serco? 	Written
19	SQ21-002290	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	30 by 30 Commitment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you please explain what actions are required of Australia as a signatory to the High Ambition Coalition's (HAC) '30 by 30' commitment? 2. Is it the case that the HAC requires a minimum 30% protection of both land and sea as separate categories, or can the two be aggregated to achieve an average protection of 30%? 3. As part of its commitment is the Government intending on achieving the 30 by 30 commitment by ensuring that each of our land and sea territories reach 30% protection? 	Written

					4. If so, how does the Government intend to lift terrestrial conservation to 30% 5. What are the current levels of marine and terrestrial conservation in Australia?	
20	SQ21-002291	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Carol Brown	Serco and other Operators' Contractual Arrangements	1. Are there any contractual arrangements in place with Serco which compels them to crew the MSV Nuyina with Australian seafarers? 2. Are there any local content requirements for upstream procurement by Serco in respect of their contracts with the Australian Antarctic Division? 3. Are ethical employment standards or benchmarks set out within the contract between the Australian Antarctic Division and Serco? 4. Were there any ethical employment standards or benchmarks set out within the contract between the Australian Antarctic Division and the operator of the MPV Everest vessel, Marine Construction Services? 5. Was there a requirement in the contract with Marine Construction Services that the MPV Everest be crewed by Australian seafarers?	Written
21	SQ21-002292	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Shark Bay World Heritage Area	1. In relation to the project agreement governing funding arrangements between the Shark Bay World Heritage Advisory Committee, the Commonwealth, and the WA Government which is set to expire in the next year- where are you up to with settling a new funding agreement for ensuring the ongoing work of the Committee? 2. Research over the past decade suggests that Shark Bay is at high risk of experiencing extreme marine heat events, air temperature change, and greater storm intensity, and I'm aware that the Shark Bay Heritage Committee is seeking funding to coordinate a cross-agency climate change adaptation strategy, is the Government considering such a funding request? 3. How much does the Government spend each year on climate change mitigation and adaptation in our World Heritage sites?	Written
22	SQ21-002293	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Waste and recycling	1. I'm aware that a ban on the export of mixed plastics began on 1 July this year and that within the ban framework exporters can apply for an exemption. How many applications for an exemption have been made, and how many tonnes of plastics did each application relate to? 2. If there were exemption applications-according to your website no exemptions have been granted. Are you aware of what happened to those plastics for which the owner unsuccessfully sought an exemption to the export ban? 3. The cost-benefit analysis that informed National Cabinet's decision to implement a ban on waste exports stated that there was a reasonable likelihood of low-value	Written

				<p>plastics being sent to landfill following the commencement of the ban. Has the Department sought any feedback from state and territory waste authorities to determine whether rates of mixed plastics going to landfill have increased since 1 July?</p> <p>4. If yes, could you please on notice provide such advice, noting the increase by tonnage.</p> <p>5. Is the Department aware of any waste collectors who have needed to stockpile plastics since the ban came into effect?</p> <p>6. When the Government announced the Recycling Modernisation Fund in July 2020 they said their investment would spark the creation of 10,000 jobs over 10 years. Since that announcement how many jobs have been created?</p> <p>7. Back in March the Government announced it would establish a task force to address plastics in cigarette butts. Has that task force been constituted yet?</p> <p>8. Who sits on that task force? Have is it met?</p> <p>9. Has the Government set a deadline for when they'd like this task force to meet?</p> <p>10. In October last year the Assistant Minister for Waste Reduction issued a press release saying that the Government would accredit the Australian Packaging Covenant as a product stewardship scheme under the Recycling & Waste Reduction Act. Has that accreditation been achieved? If not, what is the reason for the delay, and will this impact the achievement of the APCO packaging targets that form part of the National Waste Policy Action Plan?</p> <p>11. What is the status of the Government's review into the National Environmental Protection Measure (NEPM) on Plastics & Packaging? Has a final report been provided to the Minister? When can we expect a decision on reform to this legislative instrument?</p> <p>12. During the 2019 election the Prime Minister announced a commitment of \$16 million to be spent in the 6 years from 2019-20 to 2025-26 through the Pacific Ocean Litter Project. According to data provided during the April round of estimates only \$1.6 million of that funding envelope had been spent in the first two years, and virtually none was spent in the Pacific. It would appear the project has been significantly delayed. What objectives of the POLP are at risk and what measures has the government taken to ensure Australia is able to make a meaningful contribution to the reduction of coastal and ocean plastic in the Pacific?</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					13. In relation to attachment A from SQ21-001102 can you please provide an updated table of waste & recycling projects with updated data for the period up to 30 September 2021.	
23	SQ21-002294	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Sustainable Procurement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the Department commission KPMG to develop a baseline for the use of recycled content by government and industry? 2. How much did this work cost? 3. Has this project been completed and, if so, what were the outcomes? Are they available publicly? 4. Has the Government acted on the outcomes of the report? 5. In relation to the Department's latest iteration of the Sustainable Procurement Guide, updated in January of this year, that was meant to guide all Commonwealth agencies to increase the use of recycled content in the goods it procures, how many Government agencies have reported that they have established targets for sustainable procurement since the guide was released, and how are you tracking this? 6. Are agencies required to report to you on their procurement activities that align with this plan? If not, how do you measure the success of the plan? 7. Do you plan on auditing how agencies are implementing the practices within the guide, and the results of these practices? 	Written
24	SQ21-002366	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Patrick Dodson	Indigenous heritage protection	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you provide a detailed breakdown of the \$218,018 expenditure on Indigenous heritage protection, including the dates of expenditure? 2. Can you outline the Department's plans for the remaining funds from the \$500,000 budget allocation? 3. When will the partnership agreement with the First Nations Heritage Protection Alliance and associated implementation plan be made public? 4. What further funds will be made available to support and implement the partnership agreement? 5. What is the Government's timeline for reform to existing heritage protections, given it is more than 18 months since the destruction at Juukan and over a year since the Government received the final report from the Samuel Review of the EPBC Act? 6. What changes have been made in the procedures for responding to inquiries 	Written

					from traditional owner groups seeking protection under the ATSIHP Act since Juukan, in both the Department and the Minister's office?	
25	SQ21-002384	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Kim Carr	Tyre Stewardship Australia scheme	<p>1. Has the Minister or Assistant Minister recently met with tyre importers committed to participating in the Tyre Stewardship Australia Scheme from January 2022?</p> <p>a. On what date did these meetings occur?</p> <p>b. Which Tyre imports have committed to participating in the Tyre Stewardship Australia Scheme from January 2022?</p> <p>2. Can the department please advise how many organisations have not yet committed to joining the Tyre Stewardship Australia scheme?</p> <p>3. Has the Minister or Assistant Minister written to the uncommitted or non-contributing members of the Tyre Stewardship Australia scheme?</p> <p>a. For 2020 and 2021 can you please provide:</p> <p>i. Which Minister sent any such correspondence?</p> <p>ii. Who was the receiver (position and organisation) of any such ministerial correspondence?</p> <p>iii. The date on which that correspondence was sent?</p> <p>iv. The date on which a response was received from the organisation?</p>	Written
26	SQ21-002386	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Janet Rice	Victorian Regional Forest Agreements - steps undertaken to ensure compliance	<p>For each of the five Victorian Regional Forest Agreements (Central Highlands, East Gippsland, Gippsland, North East and West Victoria), please outline what steps the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment has undertaken to ensure compliance with the relevant clauses that require the Victorian Government by 1 April 2021 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - undertake a risk assessment for any listed species or community in the relevant RFA region to determine necessary additional interim or permanent protections and management actions, and - where necessary, use reasonable endeavours to implement interim enforceable protections and priority management actions within six months of a species or community being listed or signing of an RFA. 	Written
27	SQ21-002390	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Lidia Thorpe	Djaki Kundu	<p>1. Djaki Kundu is a sacred site for the Kabi Kabvai people of the Gympie region in Queensland who have been trying to protect it from being destroyed by the QLD Department of Transport and Main Roads.</p> <p>a. Given that the Kabi people have extensive evidence of continuous cultural</p>	Written

					<p>significance of the site to them, on what basis did the Minister reject the decision?</p> <p>b. Which cultural heritage evidence has been taken into account with this decision?</p> <p>c. Have the Kabi Kabvai people been directly engaged with?</p> <p>2. The Juukan inquiry final report made it clear that the destruction of First Nations heritage should not happen again, and yet we have examples of Djaki Kundu, the Djab Wurrung Trees, and the proposed destruction of Wiradjuri heritage sites due to the McPhillamys gold project.</p> <p>a. Can you tell me why the destruction of our sacred heritage continues to occur?</p> <p>b. What are you doing to make sure Wiradjuri heritage is preserved due to the McPhillamys gold project?</p>	
28	SQ21-002391	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Public spending on biodiversity	<p>1. Does the Commonwealth government measure public spending on biodiversity?</p> <p>a. If not, is there a plan to?</p> <p>b. If it does, please provide a summary of what is measured at sufficient detail that third parties could confirm calculations.</p>	Written
29	SQ21-002392	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	National Strategy and Action Plan For Environmental Economic Accounting	Can you specify the budget for the National Strategy and Action Plan For Environmental Economic Accounting over its five year period and report on expenditure to date and budget for the remaining two years?	Written
30	SQ21-002393	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Staff employed to administer the following programs	<p>How many staff has the Commonwealth government employed each year, Full Time Equivalent (FTE), from 2011 onwards, to administer the following programs?</p> <p>a. ALA</p> <p>b. Australian Climate Change Science Program</p> <p>c. Australian Marine Parks</p> <p>d. Australian Marine Parks Partnership – Indian Ocean</p> <p>e. Territories</p> <p>f. Australian Marine Parks Partnership – Our Marine Parks</p> <p>g. Biodiversity Fund</p> <p>h. Caring for our Country - Working on Country</p> <p>i. Bushfire Recovery for Species and Landscapes</p> <p>j. Caring for our Country, Department of Treasury</p> <p>k. Caring for our Country, National Wildlife Corridor Plan</p>	Written

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> l. Communities Environment Program m. Environmental Research Facilities program n. Environment Restoration Fund o. Environment Restoration Fund - Bushfire Wildlife Recover Program p. Environmental Stewardship Program q. Expanding Indigenous Protected Areas to include Sea Country r. Great Barrier Reef Foundation s. Green Army t. IMOS u. Improving your Local Parks and Environment v. Indigenous Carbon Farming Fund w. National Environmental Research Program x. National Environmental Science Programme y. National Heritage Trust Special Account z. NHT Agriculture 2030 - Feral pests and weeds aa. National Landcare Programme - Environmental Stewardship Program bb. National Landcare Programme, National Heritage Trust cc. NRM Planning for Climate Change - stream 1 dd. NRM Planning for Climate Change - stream 2 ee. Reef 2050 Plan (Reef Trust) ff. Reef Trust Special Account gg. Sustainable Ocean Action Plan hh. TERN ii. Working on Country 	
31	SQ21-002394	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	EPBC reforms	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The government continues to list the EPBC bills for debate in the senate but runs out of time each week to get to them. What is the plan for these bills? 2. The final report of the Samuel Review was completed a year ago next week. When will the government be releasing a response? 3. When the report was publicly released in January a statement on the review website said: "The Final Report is comprehensive, and the Government will spend the time needed to fully consider Professor Samuel's recommendations, before providing a formal government response." Are you ever going to respond? When? Do you have a deadline? Before the election? 	Written

					<p>4. We have had the biodiversity COP15 this year and again in January. We have COP26 next week. These global conferences relate to the matters raised and addressed by Samuel - why hasn't a response been expedited ahead of these conferences so Australia had more to put on the table?</p> <p>5. What if any progress has been made on Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the reforms?</p> <p>6. What is happening with Reforms that should be underway by now?</p> <p>a. Work on a national environmental offsets register</p> <p>b. Commencement of the Review of Statutory Committees.</p> <p>c. The Minister to convene stakeholder roundtable to commence consultation on further standards</p> <p>i. When and with whom.</p> <p>ii. Is there a proposed timeline for the commencement of consultation on standards – please provide details.</p> <p>7. Regional Planning Pilot - is due to be delivered by 2024 but was anticipate to commence in 2021 - \$2.7 million was announced to support this in the 2021-2022 budget.</p>	
32	SQ21-002395	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	CBD and the Global Diversity Framework	<p>1. Has the minister/has the department been asked to consider a zero extinction target? Why not?</p> <p>2. The Government signed the Kunming Declaration at COP 15. What practical actions will ensue as a result?</p> <p>3. How many of the 10 interim national targets contained within Australia's National Biodiversity Strategies And Action Plans (NBSAPS) were fully achieved? Which targets were achieved?</p> <p>4. With regard to Australia's current 12 objectives in the Strategy for Nature, how will success be measured, given that metrics for success are not clearly written into them?</p> <p>5. Why has Australia proposed to remove the reference to 10 gigatonnes of carbon abatement from target 8 noting that it is the intention of the Rio summit secretariats and science committees that there be greater integration between the UNFCCC and CBD?</p> <p>6. Why has Australia proposed to insert the qualifier 'due to direct human activities' in Milestone A.2 in relation to the aim of reducing the proportion of species that are threatened? Can you define "due to direct human activities"?</p>	Written

					<p>a. Under this proposal would 'direct human activities' include habitat loss due to clearing?</p> <p>7. Why has the Australian government sought to remove the words 'by half' in relation to the target to reduce the negative impact of business on biodiversity in target 15?</p> <p>8. What is Australia doing to advance Australia's capacity to assess, measure, and monitor the state of Australian nature and the impacts the economy is having on it?</p>	
33	SQ21-002396	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Australia's environmental accounting strategy	<p>1. Has the government released, or does it intend to release, a progress report on the National Strategy and Action Plan for Environmental Economic Accounting, given that it is now three years old and foreshadowed delivering various upwards outputs over a five year period?</p> <p>a. If not, why not? If yes, when?</p> <p>b. What progress has been made?</p> <p>c. How close are we to reaching the objectives of the strategy?</p> <p>d. If there is no progress to report: One action in the action plan concerned the application of pilot accounts, saying 'Working directly with policy makers, stakeholders and researchers to have environmental-economic accounting incorporated into decision making processes around environmental issues'. Has this occurred?</p> <p>2. Can you outline any specific decision-making processes that now incorporate information from environmental accounts? If not, why not and when will it occur?</p>	Written
34	SQ21-002397	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Threatened Species Strategy Action plan	<p>1. Have the plans for the recovery of the 100 priority species and communities been costed?</p> <p>a. Who selected the entities on this list for inclusion in this consultation process?</p> <p>b. What were the criteria on which these specific entities were selected for this list?</p> <p>c. When was that decision made?</p> <p>d. What other funding will be allocated to the 100 priority species?</p> <p>2. Did the Minister or the Minister's office have any say or influence in which entities were included on the list for this consultation?</p> <p>3. Will there be further rounds of consultations on other species?</p> <p>a. When will those consultation rounds be happening?</p> <p>b. On what basis or criteria will these entities be selected for consultation?</p> <p>4. How will the department avoid a repeat of the failure of the last Threatened</p>	Written

					Species Strategy if the Action Plan does include costing and fundings for the recovery of the identified priority species and communities?	
35	SQ21-002398	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Recovery planning for threatened species and communities under the EPBC Act	<p>1. In relation to each of the 185 species and threatened ecological communities where the Minister has proposed no longer requiring a recovery plan:</p> <p>a. What consideration has been undertaken as to the current circumstances of threatened species and communities where it is proposed not to have a recovery plan?</p> <p>b. Can the department confirm that that the Committee and the Minister have considered the need for a recovery plan for each of the 185 threatened species and communities rather than simply applied a general policy not to require a recovery plan for species and communities where a recovery plan is currently missing or out of date or otherwise in the too hard basket? Please outline how.</p> <p>2. In cases where there is no current recovery plan or where one has never been prepared despite being required under the Act, how has the TSSC and the Minister gone about informing themselves of the situation and needs of the threatened species or community given the absence of the information?</p> <p>3. How many and which species and communities listed under the EPBC Act where a recovery plan is required do not currently have a recovery plan in force because the recovery plan has sunsetted under the Legislation Act 2003?</p> <p>a. What is the government doing to ensure that the Minister's breach of the requirement under s273 of the Act to have a recovery plan in force at all times is rectified?</p>	Written
36	SQ21-002399	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Ningaloo Reef	<p>1. In regards to Woodside plans to dump decommissioned infrastructure near Ningaloo reef (Reference number: application SD2020/3998). Did the Department seek advice (either internally or externally) on the possible impacts of the artificial reef on Ningaloo? What was the advice and from whom?</p> <p>2. Had the Department formed a preliminary view on the application prior to it being withdrawn? What was the preliminary view?</p>	Written
37	SQ21-002400	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	15 fast-tracked EPBC major projects	<p>1. Did the Department recommend the Marinus Link, WA MetroNet and Energy Connect projects for fast-tracking under the EPBC Act? Why not?</p> <p>2. Did the Minister advise the Department why she had selected the three additional projects?</p>	Written

38	SQ21-002403	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Auditor-General Report No. 47 of 2019–20	<p>1. The Auditor-General Report No. 47 of 2019–20 Referrals, Assessments and Approvals of Controlled Actions under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 recommended that the Department conduct an up-to-date risk assessment of non-compliance with its regulatory regimes (recommendation 2).</p> <p>a. Please update on the progress of the review.</p> <p>b. Has the review been completed?</p> <p>c. What recommendations did the review make?</p> <p>d. How have these recommendations been implemented?</p>	Written
39	SQ21-002404	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Spectacled flying fox	<p>1. The spectacled flying fox (SFF) is listed on the 100 priority species action plan 2021-2026. Will a separate recovery plan be prepared for the species? What action will the government take to monitor the species' population health?</p> <p>2. How does the species' inclusion in that list impact on assessments of actions like the removal of roosting trees and any further dispersal proposals?</p> <p>3. The Cairns Regional Council recently made an application to remove one of the significant roosting trees for the SFF (T5). On 20 October 2021, the assessment timeframe for the referral was suspended until 5 November.</p> <p>a. Why was the assessment deferred?</p> <p>b. What communication has the Dept had with the Qld Dept regarding the removal of the tree?</p> <p>4. CAFNEC has prepared a detailed report regarding reforms needed to protect the SFF, including better recognition of cultural practices. Has the Department received that report and considered any action in response?</p>	Written
40	SQ21-002405	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Dorinda Cox	Sandhill Dunnart Conservation Plan	<p>1. Can you advise if the Sandhill Dunnart Conservation Plan for the proposed Mulga Rock uranium mine has been approved by the Minister or her delegate?</p> <p>2. Has the Department seen a draft of the Sandhill Dunnart Conservation Plan?</p> <p>3. What is the process for the development of the Conservation Plan? Does it require engagement with the Federal Department of Environment?</p> <p>4. Are there any federal intervention points to ensure that the Conservation Plan is in line with the National Recovery Plan for the Sandhill Dunnart?</p> <p>5. When is the National Recovery Plan for the Sandhill Dunnart expected to be finalised?</p> <p>6. In regards to the Yeelirrie uranium mine approval in 2019:</p>	Written

					<p>a. Given the Department's normal procedures are to publish decision notices within 24 hours of receipt, why did it take the Department one week to publish the decision notice for Yeerlirrie mine?</p> <p>b. Did the Department discuss the publication of the decision notice with Cameco prior to publishing the decision notice?</p> <p>c. Did the Department take into consideration Cameco's views in regards to publication of the decision notice?</p> <p>d. Did Cameco express a preference to the Department for when the publication of the decision notice should occur?</p>	
41	SQ21-002406	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area - Water quality	<p>1. In July 2021, during lobbying efforts in advance of the World Heritage Committee meeting, Minister Ley stated in a media release that "The accelerated action on water quality by the Australian and Queensland government means that we are on track to meet our 2025 Reef water quality improvement targets." The latest report card shows only a 25% nutrient reduction towards a 60% target and only a 14% sediment reduction towards a 25% target. The pollutant load reductions needed in the next few years needs to progress at a far greater rate than what has been accomplished to date. What is the Australian Government's strategy for ensuring we will meet the required pollutant load reductions?</p> <p>2. The Australian Government has made no funding commitments for Reef water quality improvement beyond 2023-24, and investment to date is nowhere near what modelling suggests is needed to achieve the water quality targets (around \$4 billion). How is the Australian Government going to ensure Reef water quality funding matches what is required to meet the targets?</p>	Written
42	SQ21-002407	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Great Barrier Reef	<p>1. How many times has Australia not supported the technical advice of the advisory bodies regarding nominations and listing decisions during its term (on the WHC), whether by formally voting against a recommendation, informally indicating opposition to a recommendation, or declining to vote?</p> <p>2. How many times did the Australian government not supported the technical advice of the advisory bodies regarding nominations and listing decisions at the 2021 meeting of the WHC, whether by formally voting against a recommendation, informally indicating opposition to a recommendation, or declining to vote?</p> <p>3. Were any meetings with members of the WHC refused?</p> <p>4. How did Australian officials assist any World heritage Committee delegates to</p>	Written

				<p>write speeches for their debate on the reef listing? What speaking notes, talking points or other documentation was circulated by staff?</p> <p>5. What scientific advice was sought from CSIRO or any other relevant agency on the health of the Great Barrier Reef in relation to preparation for the travel to Europe?</p> <p>6. In Estimates, Dr Locke stated "We're not allowed to propose amendment on our own property, but we certainly did advocate for some very minor changes." To whom did the Department advocate in respect of the amendment to the Great Barrier Reef resolution, and what were the 'minor changes' being advocated for?</p> <p>7. Did the Department provide any draft text to other countries as part of its advocacy? If so, please provide this text.</p> <p>8. The term 'under considerable pressure' was used several times in Estimates to describe the Great Barrier Reef, and distinction was made with the term 'endangered' in that the latter refers to technical criteria set out by the World Heritage Committee. What is the technical criteria for 'considerable pressure', and how is this measured to determine the distinction between when the Great Barrier Reef is 'under pressure' or 'endangered'?</p> <p>9. Was any technical criteria and supporting evidence for the Great Barrier Reef being 'under considerable pressure' provided to other nations on the World Heritage Committee?</p> <p>10. Dr Locke referenced a "fair process" being requested; what are the stages for this process and how has this been agreed with the World Heritage Committee? Why was Dr Locke unable to give a timeframe for establishing a 'fair process' (Monday 25 October 2021, page 115 of the transcript "I can't answer that question")?</p> <p>11. On the 24th June, Senator Hume stated "we fully recognise that the Great Barrier Reef is facing significant pressures from climate change and from other impacts". Does the government acknowledge that the greatest contributor to the climate crisis ('climate change') are the use of fossil fuels such as coal, oil and gas (natural or otherwise)? If so, how does the government believe that continued mining for coal, oil and gas will promote the health and safety of the Great Barrier Reef? Please provide evidence.</p> <p>12. On the 24th June, Senator Hume stated that "the Australian and Queensland</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>governments working with farmers, working with tourism operators, working with traditional owners and working with local communities up and down the reef coast to protect the reef and to support them with a \$3 billion joint investment". What work is being undertaken by the Australian government to work with fossil fuel companies and mining companies to protect the Great Barrier Reef? Has this included advocacy to dismantle fossil fuel mining and production as the most effective way to stop carbon emissions?</p> <p>13. If carbon emissions, and anticipated temperature changes, continue to rise at the current rate that they are, how many more bleaching events are anticipated to occur by 2050?</p> <p>14. What modelling is the Department using to predict further bleaching events by 2100, given the various scenarios outlined by the most recent IPCC assessment report released this year?</p> <p>15. Please provide a full list of names and position titles of people with whom the Minister met on her trip to Europe, via the Middle East and the Maldives – either in-person or virtually or by phone</p> <p>16. Please provide the name of the advisor who accompanied Minister Ley on her trip to Europe</p> <p>17. Did James Isbister, Josh Thomas and/or Minister Ley's advisor have any in-person or virtual or phone meetings with foreign diplomats/representatives of other countries where the Minister was not present? If so, what are the names and position titles of the foreign officials?</p> <p>18. The Spanish Ambassador to UNESCO spoke openly to the media about Spain's decision to oppose the 'in danger' listing for the Reef in exchange for Australia's support for Spain's nomination of Paseo del Prado and Buen Retiro to the World Heritage List, against the advice of UNESCO and ICOMOS. Can you confirm that this was the arrangement made between the Australian and Spanish governments?</p> <p>19. Please provide details on any other arrangements Australia made with World Heritage Committee members, outside of the formal World Heritage Committee session, to secure their support for the amendment to the Great Barrier Reef draft decision submitted by Bahrain?</p> <p>20. Has the Australian Government submitted amendments to the draft UNESCO Policy Document on climate action for World Heritage?</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					21. The AIMS Long Term Monitoring Program data, and coral reef cover report were publicly released on 19 July 2021. When were they provided to the WHC members?	
43	SQ21-002408	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area – fisheries	1. EPBC listed species like dugongs, turtles and sawfish continue to be caught and killed in gillnet and trawl fisheries on the GBR. Since the Qld fisheries observer program was scrapped, there is no accurate data on what is being caught or the impact of catch on populations of protected species. What is the Australian Government doing to assist Queensland to obtain accurate information on protected species interactions with gillnet and trawl fishers?	Written
44	SQ21-002409	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Riley Creek Mine	<p>1. Please confirm the date that the approval for the Riley Creek Mine was varied to remove the prohibition on transporting ore outside of daylight hours.</p> <p>2. The prohibition on transporting outside of daylight hours was designed to protect endangered Tasmanian devils active on roads at night. How would varying these conditions maintain or improve protections for this iconic endangered species?</p> <p>3. The company's proposed mitigation was light fencing (virtual fencing). What evidence was reviewed on the available research relating to the effectiveness of virtual fencing? How was this incorporated into the decision-making?</p> <p>4. Did anyone from the Department visit the steeply undulating, mountainous and windy section of road that makes up the route from Riley Creek to the Murchison Hwy and on to Burnie?</p> <p>5. Please confirm the date on which Venture shipped their first load of ore out of Tasmania.</p> <p>6. Please confirm the date that Venture announced the suspension of mining at Riley Creek, and the reason/s given.</p> <p>7. When did the Department become aware that Venture was due to close?</p>	Written
45	SQ21-002410	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Regulation - Adani - breaches	<p>1. Resources Minister Keith Pitt visited Adani sites three times in past few months for photos and media opportunities boasting about Adani's progress. Does the government have a responsibility to satisfy itself that projects it actively promotes are compliant with environmental conditions?</p> <p>2. In May, the company admitted to breaching permit conditions requiring a wildlife spotter to be onsite during habitat clearing. In August 2021, further allegations were made regarding the company's failure to monitor and minimise</p>	Written

					<p>erosion and sediment runoff, in breach of Qld permit conditions.</p> <p>a. Has the Department made any inquiries regarding these allegations? Have you contacted the Qld Department to determine the extent of any breach and any action taken?</p> <p>b. Given how regularly the company is breaching approval conditions, will the government undertake any monitoring / auditing of the site to assess compliance with Cth conditions?</p>	
46	SQ21-002411	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Environment Assessments (Tasmania)	<p>1. Please confirm how many windfarms are expected to be potentially allowed in line with Marinus project.</p> <p>2. What funding has been specifically allocated for research and recovery actions for the State and Commonwealth listed endangered Tasmanian wedge-tailed eagle, in light of the possibility of increased wind farms and attendant power lines spread across eagle habitat in Tasmania?</p> <p>3. How has the proposed Marinus Link been addressed in current conservation advice to the Department?</p> <p>4. How are the impacts of windfarms considered in terms of accumulation when assessing proposals for new windfarms? If not, what are the reasons?</p> <p>5. What consideration has been given to making black blades mandatory on turbines in Tasmanian windfarms?</p> <p>6. What consideration has been given to making IdentiFlight mandatory at Tasmanian windfarms?</p> <p>7. GPS technology has been routinely applied for many years in other jurisdictions (and countries) to accurately measure eagle movements around windfarms and calculate realistic buffers between eagle nests and turbines. How is the technology been applied in Tasmania? What consideration has been given to it being made mandatory for windfarm management?</p> <p>8. To what degree are Bird Utilisation Surveys (BUS) still the standard for assessing potential impacts of windfarms on threatened birds? How are BUS considered in comparison to GPS technology?</p> <p>9. Please confirm the extent of the buffers applied to eagle nest-turbine distances. What data is being relied upon to support this distance?</p> <p>10. What measure of effectiveness of offsets so far applied for eagle deaths at Tasmanian windfarms have been undertaken and what do those measures</p>	Written

					<p>indicate?</p> <p>11. What information has been provided by TasNetworks in relation to surveys of powerlines and poles for threatened birds killed or maimed by collisions with conductors and electrocutions on poles?</p> <p>12. What survey data is being used to calculate the impact of these power assets on threatened birds and prioritise areas to be made (relatively) bird-safe?</p> <p>13. What discussions has the Department had with the Tasmanian government about decisions on where windfarms should go, and the extent to which this is driven by private landowners?</p> <p>14. What discussions have been had with the Tasmanian government about using dogs for mortality searching at Tasmanian windfarms, since they are far more effective than people at finding dead small birds and bats or pieces of larger birds? What consideration has been given to making the use of dogs mandatory.</p> <p>15. The review of the Threatened Tasmanian Eagles Recovery Plan now 11 years out of date has stalled. How would the review potentially conflict with windfarms currently under proposal, including the controversial Robbins Island and St Patricks Plains developments?</p> <p>16. The Draft Tasmanian Devil Recovery Plan not been ratified in the 15 years since it was drafted. If ratified, what potential conflict might occur with windfarms currently under proposal, including the Robbins Island development where a unique, disease-free population exists?</p>	
47	SQ21-002412	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Larissa Waters	Adani - North Galilee Water Scheme	<p>1. Following the Federal Court decision overturning the decision that the North Galilee Water Scheme was not a controlled action, the action has now been determined to be a controlled action pursuant to the water trigger (s.24D and 24E of the EPBC Act).</p> <p>2. In the course of making the controlled action decision, did the Department ask Adani for more information about how they will manage the impacts of water? Was information provided? Will the public have an opportunity to scrutinise any additional information provided by Adani?</p> <p>3. Has the Department reviewed any internal or public guidelines relating to the application of the water trigger following the court decision?</p>	Written

48	SQ21-002414	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Davis Aerodrome Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the government's current estimate of how much will be spent on the Davis Aerodrome Project up until a final investment decision? 2. In the latest budget, what is the additional funding allocation for the Davis Aerodrome? Is this referenced as not for publication? If so, what reasons have been provided? 3. How does the proposed runway meet the prescribed regulations per the Australian Governments own guidelines and separation distances as published and agreed upon in the document: Environmental Impact Assessment – Australian Antarctic Program Aviation Operations 2020-2025? 4. Section 6.3, Environmental Impact Assessment – Australian Antarctic Program Aviation Operations 2020-2025 pg. 47, states: the following distances will be maintained from concentrations of wildlife (as a minimum) unless closer approaches are specifically authorised; What assessments and procedures must be met for specific authorisation to be approved? 5. Did any scientists or scientific institutions or universities request year-round access to the Aerodrome prior to the project's announcement in 2018? If so please provide the correspondence and the dates received. 6. Referring to the "Future Science Opportunities" published by the Australian Antarctic Division, can the Division indicate whether any participating scientists expressed concern about the environmental impacts of the project during consultations? If so were those concerns specifically noted and are they publicly available? 7. Among the list of "participating organisations" could the AAD please provide information on why SERCO Asia Pacific and AECOM were present at a future science opportunities consultation? 8. Does the Australian Antarctic Division have any documented reports, images, or unedited footage from the last 5 years of operations of interactions between aircraft and wildlife in Antarctica? If so, are they publicly available? 9. What costs for the RSV Nuyina were originally reported before construction commenced? What was the final cost? 10. Which other nations have expressed or might have an interest in accessing the runway? 11. What are the strategic implications of the presence of the runway in the face of 	Written
----	-------------	--	--------------------	-------------------------	---	---------

					<p>growing China interest in Antarctica?</p> <p>12. To what degree would an Antarctic runway become a target in the event of conflict? How defensible would it be?</p> <p>13. If a runway is built, and other nations will want access, who will decide if they can land their aircraft there?</p> <p>14. What plans have been developed in the event that there is a serious accident, but the runway is blocked and torn up with wreckage and debris preventing further landing?</p> <p>15. What other options were explored for the runway (including alternatives)? What consideration, if any, was given to the ski-equipped Hercules aircraft?</p>	
49	SQ21-002415	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	185 species and threatened ecological communities	<p>In relation to each of the 185 species and threatened ecological communities where the Minister has proposed no longer requiring a recovery plan:</p> <p>1. What consideration has been undertaken as to the current circumstances of the Tasmanian devil and humpback whale where it is proposed not to have a recovery plan?</p> <p>2. What consideration has been given for the need for a recovery plan for the Tasmanian devil and humpback whale?</p> <p>3. In cases where there is no current recovery plan or where one has never been prepared despite being required under the Act, how has the TSSC and the Minister gone about informing themselves of the situation and needs of the Tasmanian devil and humpback whale given the absence of the information?</p> <p>4. How many and which species and communities listed under the EPBC Act where a recovery plan is required do not currently have a recovery plan in force because the recovery plan has sunsetted under the Legislation Act 2003?</p> <p>5. What is the government doing to ensure that the Minister's breach of the requirement under s273 of the Act to have a recovery plan in force at all times is rectified?</p>	Written
50	SQ21-002416	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	UNESCO's Operational Guidelines	<p>What is the Australian Government doing to ensure it is complying with UNESCO's Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention and, specifically, Paragraph 172 which invites State Parties to inform the World Heritage Committee of their intention to undertake new constructions which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area?</p>	Written

51	SQ21-002417	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	PFAS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is data on PFAS from river sampling and other recreational water sources across different states and territories shared with the Commonwealth? 2. What are the considered safe limits on PFAS levels in food and water, and how do these compare to the limits set in the European Union? 3. How many PFAS contamination sites have been identified across Australia? 4. What is the criteria for establishing a contamination site? Is it dependent on the historical use of PFAS, or can a site be declared arising from contamination (i.e. leakage from another site)? 	Written
52	SQ21-002418	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	threatened ecological community	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2012 Tasmania's giant kelp forests were declared the nation's first listed threatened ecological community under EPBC law. What efforts have been made to progress a recovery plan given it is estimated only roughly 5% of these forests have survived? 2. Have <i>centrostephanus rogersii</i> (long spined sea urchins) ever been assessed by the threatened species scientific committee as a "threatening process", specifically in relation to the threat posed to survival and recovery of giant kelp forests or other threatened species under EPBC law? 3. Is the Department aware of the concept of the 'Great Southern Reef'? as a national identity reflecting a series of interlinked marine ecosystems sharing temperate ecological values and species, stretching from NSW, down to Victoria and Tasmania and across to South Australia? 4. Billions of dollars are spent on ecosystem restoration and climate adaption measures for the Great Barrier reef, to control crown of thorns outbreaks, re-grow corals, survey, research and protect reefs etc. What funding has the department allocated, or what recommendations around funding has the Department made (if any) towards threats posed to our temperate Great Southern reefs, which are also under immense pressure from invasive urchin barrens, warming oceans and a changing east coast current (to name a few pressures)? 5. Please list details of Commonwealth research funding towards surveying, monitoring and managing invasive urchin barrens in NSW, Victoria and Tasmania. 6. Is the commonwealth able to make significant contributions towards restoring the Great Barrier Reef because of the establishment of GBRMPA (and it is World Heritage listed), but this is not the case for Australia's temperate southern reef system? 	Written

					<p>7. Is commonwealth funding towards researching, monitoring and managing urchin barrens limited because of state jurisdiction to the 3 nautical mile boundary (where many of these barrens occur?)</p> <p>8. Has there been any scientific or other research the department is aware of in regards to urchin barrens in commonwealth waters or in the federal marine park network, other national parks or world heritage areas?</p> <p>9. Is the department aware of risks caused by urchin barrens to other threatened species under EPBC law, such as to the critically endangered red or spotted Tasmanian Handfish?</p>	
53	SQ21-002419	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Atkins House proposal on Maria Island	<p>1. What correspondence has the department had with the Tasmanian government about the Atkins House proposal on Maria Island?</p> <p>2. Is Experience Co progressing the development proposal?</p> <p>3. Who made suggestions that the heritage boundary could be adjusted to facilitate the Atkins House rebuild project?</p>	Written
54	SQ21-002420	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	Robbins Island	<p>Large areas on Robbins Island (TAS) appear to have been systematically cleared since at least 2003 (see attached photos).</p> <p>Photo 2001</p> <p>Photo 2020</p> <p>1. What permits were sought for significant land clearing on Robbins Island?</p> <p>2. Please confirm that Robbins Island is considered 'inshore' in respect of consideration of the presence of Tasmanian devils.</p> <p>3. If considered 'inshore' please explain what consideration this would have for any land clearing.</p>	Written
55	SQ21-002421	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Peter Whish-Wilson	MMG South Marionoak Tailings Storage facility	<p>1. Please confirm whether elements of the MMG South Marionoak Tailings Storage facility were removed from the referred project through a variation approved by a delegate of the Minister.</p> <p>2. Please confirm whether roadworks and trackwork commenced after the referral, and if so please detail how proponents may commence work without an approval.</p> <p>3. Has any prosecution been commenced?</p> <p>4. Have there been any investigation into MMG's actions without approvals?</p> <p>5. Please confirm that works continued for 60 days without approval. What were the reasons for allowing MMG to operate without approvals for 60 days?</p> <p>6. Is it reasonable to conclude that if it were not for the actions of a legally</p>	Written

					<p>responsible civil society organisation like the Bob Brown Foundation, the Department would not have fulfilled its obligations?</p> <p>7. Is it in the spirit of the EPBC Act to allow a proponent, who has been found to breach conditions, to vary their proposals to carve out the very elements that they were in breach on?</p> <p>8. Will MMG be allowed to conduct the roadworks, trackworks and geotechnical drilling without a full EPBC assessment?</p>	
56	SQ21-002422	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Patrick Dodson	Indigenous heritage ministerial roundtables	<p>Senator DODSON: Thanks very much. There were some questions put forward last estimates, at which point I think the department noted that there hadn't been any progress made on the questions. So, six months later, I'm putting forward the same questions. In terms of the heritage roundtable that you mentioned Minister Ley and Minister Wyatt hosted with their state counterparts in September 2020, have there been further meetings, and how many?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: Again, I'm not aware of further meetings at this point. But, as I said, I'll make inquiries with relevant officers when they get here, and I'll come back later in the evening and give you a definitive answer on that.</p>	88-89
57	SQ21-002423	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Sarah Hanson-Young	Southern emu-wren	<p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'm interested in knowing what the minister and the department are doing in relation to the protection of the southern emu wren and the impact on this particular bird given the proposed rocket launch in Whalers Way in South Australia.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator HANSON-YOUNG: Have you seen what an emu wren looks like? They are beautiful, little birds. I'm very distressed that this rocket launch is going to put them at even further risk.</p> <p>Dr Locke: I can understand that, Senator. We have 100 per cent coverage of statutory planning documents-I'm using that language carefully, of course-for the list of threatened species and ecological communities. That does include conservation advices and recovery plans. There are conservation advices in place everywhere where they're needed. What is being discussed and what we've discussed many times is about the backlog of those situations where you need a recovery plan in addition to a conservation advice. We're certainly working our way through that. I couldn't tell you exactly where the emu wren is up to in that process. I do know that we've put a large amount of resources into trying to</p>	104

					address those backlogs. Of course, the Threatened Species Scientific Committee has provided advice on alternative approaches to using recovery plans in all those situations. That's a matter of public record we've covered previously as well. Senator HANSON-YOUNG: I'm happy for you to take on notice exactly where it's up to, although I understand it's due for an uplisting assessment in 12 months time.	
58	SQ21-002435	Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment	Anne Urquhart	Australian Heritage Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the status of the Government mid-point review of the Australian Heritage Strategy? 2. Feedback on the review was due 31 March 2021, since that point has the Department now concluded the review? 3. Is the Government proposing to issue a revised Heritage Strategy and if so, when is it expected to be released? 4. What were the key themes of feedback during the consultation phase? 	Written
59	SQ21-002282	Director of National Parks	Anthony Chisholm	Financial investment in Kakadu	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: So, coming to the \$276 million announcement, is that completely separate to the \$216 million?</p> <p>Dr Locke: There's a \$233 million program.</p> <p>CHAIR: Was that announced-</p> <p>Dr Locke: That's for infrastructure asset repairs across all parks.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Was that announced in the budget?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I'm actually not sure when that was announced, sorry. I will have to get you that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: I was after a table of-</p> <p>Dr Locke: Sorry, Senator. The \$276 million investment in Kakadu was the \$216 million combined with an additional \$60 million to Kakadu under the July 2020 National Parks infrastructure commitment. So that's the \$216 million plus an additional \$60 million, which gives us the \$276 million. Just for your reference, I think the profiles were all submitted at the last estimates hearing.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: So you don't have separate detail on how that \$60 million is being spent?</p> <p>Dr Locke: No, I don't have that with me.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Does that include the \$35 million announced for Jabiru?</p> <p>Dr Locke: I don't believe that includes the \$35 million for Jabiru, but I'm happy to try to make sure you got a proper breakdown.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: So you think that's separate?</p>	113

					Dr Locke: Yes. Mr Metcalfe: It might be more efficient if we take these on notice to respond to them. We weren't asked to have those people here.	
60	SQ21-002288	Director of National Parks	Anne Urquhart	Ocean Leadership Package	<p>1. In relation to the \$100 million Ocean Leadership Package, how much has been contracted to date?</p> <p>2. Do you intend to be able to spend the entire allocation budgeted for the 2021-22 financial year?</p> <p>3. Within the package there is \$10 million to restore and protect threatened marine species. Which species are you targeting and what was the methodology behind selecting these species? When can we expect to see the government's new Threatened Species Strategy Action Plan?</p>	Written