

**Industry, Science, Energy and Resources Portfolio Questions on Notice Index Additional estimates 2020-21**

Qn No.	Senator	Subject	Full question text	Department or Agency	Hearing date	Hansard p. no. / Written qn
AI-1	Kim Carr	New ANSTO CEO	With regard to the process of appointing a new CEO to replace Dr Adrian Paterson. a.Was the position advertised? b.How many applications were received? c.Is there a shortlist? d.If so, does it include international applicants? e.Have interviews been conducted? f.If so, is a further round of interviews likely to be needed? g.When is the successful candidate likely to be announced? h.Will the new CEO be employed on the same terms as Dr Paterson? i.If not, what will be the variation in the contract?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/03/2021	
AI-2	Rex Patrick	Walker review recommendations	"Senator PATRICK: This is my final question for NOPTA: the Walker review—you'd be familiar with that—had some recommendations relating to NOPTA. Have those been met or have you fulfilled those recommendations? Mr Waters: That question may well be directed to the task force as opposed to— Senator PATRICK: I thought there were some that were directed at NOPTA. Could you take that on notice and have a look? If you're not aware of them then perhaps they didn't touch on you. Mr Waters: Senator, even though we are part of the resources division as a branch, as is the offshore resources branch, nevertheless we are involved in titles administration and regulatory functions. Where it comes to issues of policy and legislative change or regulatory change, that does not sit inside NOPTA. Senator PATRICK: I'm just looking at the report here. 'NOPTA's power should be clarified so that NOPTA can obtain financial and technical capacity information about the title holder et cetera. Consideration should be given to extending NOPTA's oversight to include the advocacy of titleholder corporate governance arrangements'—those sorts of recommendations. Mr Waters: Yes. Senator PATRICK: I guess if you're saying they affect you but you are not responsible for them maybe I need to go to the department and ask. So I'll redirect. A number of recommendations were made in relation to the Walker review. Has the department accepted all those recommendations and where are you in relation to recommendations that you have accepted? Ms Illman: The recommendations from the Walker review which relate to amendments to legislation and other things like that have been drawn through to the decommissioning framework review and the offshore safety review. Senator PATRICK: Did you accept all the recommendations? Ms Illman: They've been considered as part of those reviews, and the enhanced framework which the department published back in December drew those recommendations into and gave a position on the direction we'll be taking with those recommendations. Senator PATRICK: And that's public? Ms Illman: Yes, it is, published on 14 December. Senator PATRICK: Can I ask you to provide that to the committee or at least alternatively direct my office to where that might be found? Ms Illman: Certainly. Senator PATRICK: I'd be grateful for that. That's it for NOPTA."	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	106-7
AI-3	Kim Carr	Funding for ANSTO of \$238.1 million over the forward estimates	The budget papers (Part 2: Payment Measures, p60) also announce additional funding for ANSTO of \$238.1 million over the forward estimates, "to ensure the long-term safety, quality and reliability of the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation's core operations, including nuclear medicine production, radioactive waste management, and nuclear decommissioning activities". a.The four-year breakdown of this amount shows a significant drop from the projected funding in 2020-21 (\$74.2M) and 2021-22 (\$71.5m) to the projected funding for the third year, 2022-23 (\$45.9m). What is the reason for this drop? b.Is the total amount of additional funding sufficient to achieve the goal stated in the budget papers? c.Did ANSTO make a request for additional funding to Treasury before the 2020-21 budget? If so, how much was requested d.What effect has the pandemic had on ANSTO's operations?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/03/2021	
AI-4	Kim Carr	Defence Trade Controls Act	Have there been any breaches of the Defence Trade Controls Act involving ANSTO?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	29/03/2021	
AI-5	Murray Watt	Boston Consulting	Senator WATT: We might end up asking you on notice to provide a lot more detail, but that is probably enough for the moment. I understand Boston Consulting Group, BCG, and McKinsey have been awarded \$11.75 million in contracts in the past four months. Have those contracts gone out for public tender? Mr Fredericks: Interestingly, the BCG one, as an example, is the one I just discussed on the gas planning. Senator WATT: The east coast gas market? Mr Fredericks: Yes; that is a Boston Consulting one. Senator WATT: What is the value of that? Mr Hanlon: We have gone out to tender for five contracts with Boston Consulting. Four were open tenders, one was a limited tender. With that limited tender we went out to five businesses and asked them to tender for it. We only got two responses, and Boston Consulting was deemed to be the best value for money. Senator WATT: Were all five of those to do with the east coast gas market? Mr Hanlon: No, they weren't. Would you like me to break it down for you? Senator WATT: Again, I might just get you to provide that on notice. Mr Hanlon: Okay.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	37-38
AI-6	Murray Watt	McKinsey Tender	Senator WATT: What about McKinsey? Mr Hanlon: McKinsey—we only had one, which was to do with the COVID task force. I'll just get the details of that one for you. That was a consultancy. The value of the consultancy was \$5.5 million. Senator WATT: \$5.4 million? Mr Hanlon: \$5.5 million, including GST. The actual expenditure against that—that is now closed—including GST, was \$2.7 million. Senator WATT: Did that go to open tender? Mr Hanlon: No. That tender was a direct source. It was for an integrated risk assessment for the demand and supply of medical PPE to support government decision-making as well as analysis on supply chain for non-medical PPE face masks and hand sanitiser. Senator WATT: Did any Australian-based companies lodge an application for tender for any of those? I'm wondering whether the department considered supporting Australian firms as opposed to two big US firms. Mr Hanlon: I'd have to take that on notice. I don't have the list— Mr Fredericks: That's an important question, so we'll take that on notice and come back to you on that. Senator WATT: Thanks. Who authorised those contracts? Mr Hanlon: The contracts—it would have been the relevant division heads at the time. I'd have to come back to you on notice. Senator WATT: You can tell us on notice who, or the appropriate division. Mr Hanlon: If I could, that would be great.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	38
AI-7	Murray Watt	Number of FTE staff in the department	Senator WATT: Agreed. Can you give me the number of FTE staff in the department, say, over the last three years? Mr Fredericks: I can take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	39

AI-8	Anthony Chisholm	Whyalla Steelworks	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Okay. In December 2019, it is reported that the Prime Minister met with Mr Greensill to discuss his proposal for applying his supply chain finance model to the Public Service. It is further reported that in July 2020 the former foreign minister and Greensill employee Julie Bishop secured a meeting for Mr Greensill with the then finance minister, Mathias Cormann. Mr Greensill sought to discuss implementing his finance model for the Public Service. Has the minister for industry ever had a meeting with Mr Greensill? Mr Williamson: Not that I'm aware of, but we're happy to take that on notice for you. Senator CHISHOLM: Has the minister for industry ever received advice from any government agency regarding concerns about Mr Greensill's financing model? Mr Williamson: Same answer: not that I'm aware of, but I'll take it on notice. Senator CHISHOLM: If so, can you take on notice any correspondence or documents that would relate to that as well. Mr Williamson: Sure. Senator CHISHOLM: When was the minister informed about the Whyalla Steelworks financing problem? Mr Wilson: If you mean when the minister was informed by the department, I'd have to take that on notice. Mr Williamson: It would have been shortly after we became aware. Mr Wilson: Yes, it was very soon, but the exact date I can't tell you. Senator CHISHOLM: And I presume you provided some sort of briefing to the minister. Mr Williamson: Yes. We're providing ongoing briefing to the minister on these issues. Senator CHISHOLM: Since July 2020, has the minister had any correspondence with Mathias Cormann, in either his capacity as finance minister or his capacity as a private citizen, regarding Mr Greensill or any of his business interests? Mr Williamson: Not that I'm aware of. We'll take that on notice and confirm. Senator CHISHOLM: Again, can you take on notice if there's any correspondence in that regard as well. Mr Williamson: Sure.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	41-42
AI-9	Murray Watt	Persisting jobs	<p>Senator WATT: I have some questions about the jobs to be created from these funds. I might end up getting my fund and my initiatives wrong, so you can just pick me up if I get them wrong. As I understand it, round 1 of the Manufacturing Modernisation Fund is projected to create 2,600 new jobs. Is that correct? Mr Campbell: The 2,600 jobs was the estimate provided at the time the rounds were opened. Senator WATT: We are talking about the Manufacturing Modernisation Fund? Mr Campbell: That's right—round 1. That's correct. Yes. That's the answer to that. Senator WATT: In fact, you provided that through a question on notice from the October round of estimates. Mr Campbell: Yes. Senator WATT: Did you just say that that was what was expected? Mr Campbell: No, that was what was announced around the round allocations. Now we need to wait and see, from the reporting of the projects upon completion, how those jobs have played out from that. Because of the way the reporting arrangements work, we won't actually know that until we get the project completion reports. But we have had signals through our general pulse tests that we do with the sector that the estimates that we were originally provided with—people say they're on track. But, until we have a large number of project completion reports, we won't be able to provide any additional data. Senator WATT: So you're still reasonably confident that we'll hit 2,600 new jobs as a result of round 1? Mr Campbell: That's right. The jobs that would have been put in the original reports—the jobs attached to those particular projects—we're looking to remain on track with those original estimates. Senator WATT: They're jobs both during and after project completion? Mr Campbell: It's not sufficiently distinguished in the forms, but the way people have generally interpreted that is that it includes the development phase and persisting jobs. Senator WATT: Were there any calculations made as to how many of those jobs were what I think you just called 'persisting jobs'—ongoing jobs? Mr Campbell: I'm not aware of any distinction that was made between the two. Senator WATT: Could you take that on notice, please. Mr Campbell: I can take it on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	47
AI-10	Murray Watt	MMF Project Approval	<p>Senator WATT: So there were about 200 approved? Mr Campbell: Yes, of that order. I would need to check that, but I'm pretty sure it's in that order of magnitude. Senator WATT: When were they approved? Mr Fredericks: I think we need a change in personnel on this one. Senator WATT: Was it in last year's budget or— Mr Campbell: I don't think that particular result could have been reported, so we'll get that for you. Senator WATT: Sorry, I didn't expect that to create such a flurry. CHAIR: Perhaps if someone can find out the date— Senator WATT: Yes, just come back to us on that. But 17 have been completed at this point, and we don't know how many jobs have actually been created at this point. Mr Campbell: Just give me one moment, and I might be able to get that for you. Against that program, I think we had 78. I'll just remind you that these are the small projects, so the jobs attached to those are smaller. But, yes, there were 78 for those 17 completed.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	47
AI-11	Murray Watt	Timelines for 2600 jobs	<p>Senator WATT: So you don't know when we're going to reach the 2,600 new jobs that was claimed to have been created from this fund? Mr Campbell: My testimony is that our pulse surveys to date have indicated that they are on track for that delivery of jobs. Each of those projects will have their own time lines for delivery. I can give you a generic response to it— Senator WATT: So, at some point, you expect that we will reach the 2,600? We wouldn't be there yet, because a lot of the projects have yet to be completed. Mr Campbell: That's true. Senator WATT: But we don't have a time line for when we'll get to 2,600? Mr Campbell: I'd like to take that on notice, to be clear. Senator WATT: The government's announcement was about jobs to be created over the next decade. Would you be confident that we'd get to 2,600 new jobs from round 1 by the end of this decade? Mr Campbell: I wouldn't want to speculate on the timeframes until I actually look at the projects themselves. But they were anticipated to be delivered, if I'm not incorrect on this, throughout the life of that project, and they will all be relatively short-form delivery. But I would need to take that on notice to be clear on that.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	49
AI-12	Rex Patrick	Analysis of Australian Steel Industry	<p>Senator PATRICK: Have you done some analysis on the effect of what would happen if we weren't making that steel? Obviously these things often have a spillover effect in that either there's critical mass and you take away part of that and it creates a disproportionate change or, alternatively, I know in Whyalla there's lots of structural steel companies. Has the department done any analysis on this at any stage? Mr Wilson: In terms of the loss of Whyalla or— Senator PATRICK: I'm not suggesting you've done studies, but you might have done studies to understand the role that BlueScope and GFG play in the economy and from a national resilience and a national security perspective. Mr Wilson: The department is well aware of the structure of the Australian steel industry and the contribution it makes. We understand the various product lines that BlueScope and GFG make. In terms of our overall importance as a steel producer in global terms, we are a very small steel producer. But our producers are quite important to our local market. Senator PATRICK: I think we're about five million tonnes per annum. Mr Wilson: About 5.3 million tonnes a year. Senator PATRICK: I wonder if you could table any analysis you have done. The purpose of that is to make sure that we are informed as to its importance and what hangs off it. Mr Williamson: We will come back to you on notice, Senator.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	51
AI-13	Rex Patrick	Linking projects to GFG	<p>Senator PATRICK: What about some of the other projects that may or may not have government funding around, for example, solar farms and so forth. Are we looking at those? Mr Fredericks: I can help on that. We're very conscious of those. Again, it's important for you to know, to give you some reassurance, that from this portfolio's point of view, that a whole-of-portfolio effort, because we have energy issues within this portfolio. We have some of the significant financial institutions in our bigger, broader portfolio, in Minister Taylor's remit. So we're very, very alive to all of that. Then, of course, for example, the evidence you've heard is that the department of infrastructure is part of the work that we're doing, and they're there for very a good reason. We fully understand what you're saying and why. Of course, the lived lesson of past instances like this is to look for those sorts of options that you're describing. Senator PATRICK: Just on those: if you know some of them, I would appreciate them now. What other linking projects do you see in respect of GFG? This is not about whether they fail or survive, just understanding what projects that you're aware are on the books which link to GFG? Mr Fredericks: I think the one we're most aware of is the South Australian commitment of \$50 million to GFG for part of their transformation. Obviously, we engage closely with South Australia on that. As I say, otherwise we're conscious of those sores of linkages. We understand their potential importance. Senator PATRICK: Could you take them on notice? Mr Fredericks: Yes. Senator PATRICK: That would be helpful. Thank you.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	54
AI-14	Anthony Chisholm	Meetings with Mr Gupta	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: You mentioned the two meetings that the minister had had with Mr Gupta. Can you provide the dates of when those meetings were? Mr Fredericks: I might take that on notice if I could.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	54

AI-15	Jess Walsh	MMS target number of jobs	<p>Senator WALSH: From the department's perspective, there is not a target number of jobs to be created by the \$1.5 billion scheme? Mr Campbell: I don't think anyone has presented it before as a target. It's an indicative estimate of what you might expect to see, based on experience, but we can certainly anticipate, moving into higher value-added areas of the smile curve, to be seeing very strong results across all sectors or succeeders. Senator WALSH: Minister, is that your understanding? Is that how the government views this—that, for this \$1.5 billion scheme, there's no target number of jobs to be created or no projected number of jobs to be created? Senator Seselja: I think the department has talked about a number of projections and what we're about. I can take that on notice in terms of some more detail, if you like, but, in terms of laying out where we expect the strategy to take things, I think the department has outlined that pretty well.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	58
AI-16	Murray Watt	Gaps in the market	<p>Mr Murfett: I might just add: I know some people in industry have spoken around the qualifications that are needed to certify these activities, and one of the other activities that we're undertaking is, for example, doing a workforce analysis to identify the gaps in the market. So we're looking at a range of things—not only the technical point but also: What are the skills that we have and what are the gaps in the market? What might we need to grow so we can continue to grow the space industry here in Australia? Senator WATT: That's sort of what I'm trying to home in on. So, in the interests of time, could you come back to us on notice with what you see as the skills that we have sufficient numbers in, and where there are some gaps and what's being done to address them? Mr Murfett: We'll take that on notice. Mr Palermo: We are working on that, thank you, Senator.</p>	Australian Space Agency	25/03/2021	66
AI-17	Rex Patrick	Grenfell inquiry	<p>Senator PATRICK: Okay. So how do we satisfy ourselves, here in Australia, for a product to go to market? How can builders, architects and, indeed, occupants be satisfied that the products that are being used in their dwellings or their workplaces are, in fact, safe? Just give us the general overview. CHAIR: Sorry, before you start: Senator Patrick, you did put a lot of material on the record then— Senator PATRICK: Sure. CHAIR: which I accept. But, to some degree, the committee and the officials have to take that at face value. So I will allow you some latitude. If you wish to explore any of the issues raised by Senator Patrick, I'm happy for you to do so, but I'm also happy for you to answer that specific question. So please go ahead. Mr Savery: Thank you, Chair. I am aware of the issues that you've raised. We monitor the developments in England arising out of the Grenfell inquiry very closely. That particular set of circumstances is obviously of grave concern. But I do need to caveat that, in the way that you've presented that, the ABCB has quite a limited role. It would only become involved if, for instance, there was a CodeMark certificate relating to that particular product. To that extent, we sought some assurance from JAS-ANZ, which administers the CodeMark scheme, as to whether or not similar issues in relation to that particular product existed in Australia. They, in turn, sought reassurance from the conformity body responsible for those certificates, which is SAI Global. And as far as I recall—and I just tried looking up to see if I could find the response, but I'd have to go looking for it and take it on notice, if that would be of benefit—we were advised that that product was not available or not being used in Australia, and that it had not been certified using the same test environment that was purportedly the case that's occurred in the evidence that's been given at the Grenfell inquiry. I'll go to your broader question, though, about CodeMark and how practitioners reassure themselves of the products they're using in Australia. CodeMark is a voluntary scheme, not a mandatory scheme. In fact, very few products on the Australian market are certified under CodeMark. They're typically sought by manufacturers when there isn't a prescriptive standard available for them against which their products can be tested and certified. Without going into great detail, products that are CodeMark certified typically need what we call a performance solution—they need a unique solution to determine the veracity of their test environment et cetera. That does apply to quite a few cladding products that are available in Australia, a number of which have had their certificates subsequently withdrawn. In some circumstances those certificates don't apply, because states and territories have almost universally banned ACP products from use on buildings, whether they've got a CodeMark certificate or not. More broadly, the way that the National Construction Code is designed to operate—there are literally millions of building products available. If you think about how many building products are potentially in this building, it would run into the millions. We have what we call evidence of suitability. They're part of the governing requirements of the code. On the basis that the states and territories call the code up—because it's not regulation unless it's legislated by the states and territories, but it is—then it's incumbent upon designers of buildings and those people who are responsible for approving building designs to reassure themselves that they have established sufficient evidence that the products that are being used, that are being specified, are fit for their intended purpose. Then there are about five or six levels of potential evidence of suitability. CodeMark is one of them. Senator PATRICK: First of all, I might ask you to provide on notice to the committee that investigative chain you talked about. I'm glad that you've paid attention to that inquiry. I'd be grateful for the chain of correspondence that leads you to the conclusion that there's not an issue here in Australia. Mr Savery: Yes.</p>	Australian Building Codes Board	25/03/2021	68
AI-18	Rex Patrick	CodeMark product	<p>Mr Savery: Through you, Chair: I'd have to first establish—unless you already know the answer to this—that K12 is in fact a CodeMark product. If it's not a CodeMark product, then I can't— Senator PATRICK: If it's not, you can just say so. CHAIR: That's fine. Just come back and tell Senator Patrick— Senator PATRICK: That it's not. It's my understanding it is. Someone has done some analysis of this for me, but my preference, rather than rely on a third party to provide me with some analysis, is for the authority, which is you—I know that you're the supervisor— Mr Savery: We're the owner of the scheme and JAS ANZ administers it. Senator PATRICK: Sure. As the owner of the scheme, with, in some sense, supervisory jurisdiction over the operator—in this particular case, if it is CodeMark certified, I'd like to see your side of the story. We can have a conversation at the next estimates about the differences between your audit of it versus the information that I have. CHAIR: Alright. So you've taken that on notice? Mr Savery: Yes, I have.</p>	Australian Building Codes Board	25/03/2021	69-70
AI-19	Anthony Chisholm	CSIRO budget priorities	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: You gave me a sense of where you're spending more money. What's considered an investment priority? Dr Marshall: We haven't enacted those changes yet. This is just planning. I'm not quite sure how to answer your question. Maybe you could ask me again? Senator CHISHOLM: You said which areas you focus on and have received additional money. I'm trying to get a sense of what areas, as a result, are not receiving as much money or not receiving as much focus. Dr Marshall: You'd probably have to wait until we have our budget finalised before I could answer that accurately. Senator CHISHOLM: Maybe you could take that on notice? Dr Marshall: Sure.</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	25/03/2021	78
AI-20	Anthony Chisholm	Scientists engaged by labour hire	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: How many scientists engaged via labour hire agencies are under the age of 35? Ms Zielke: We have very few scientists engaged through labour hire. The majority of our people who are engaged through labour hire are in more administrative roles or in logistics or those types of activities. I am happy to take that on notice for you, but it may very well be zero.</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	25/03/2021	79

AI-21	Matthew Canavan	CSIRO GenCost Report	<p>Senator CANAVAN: My other line of questioning—it might be to different witness—concerns the CSIRO GenCost report. Dr Mayfield: You're good; that's me. Senator CANAVAN: That's you as well; that's easy, Dr Mayfield. There's a lot of information in this report which is useful. In this report—you might be familiar with it—you make some assumptions around carbon prices in different scenarios. In the high-VRE scenario, what was the carbon price assumed today, or whatever the first year of the model is, and also in 2050? Dr Mayfield: Just for context for the work, it was done for AEMO, in partnership, to try to give them understanding of technology costs both today and into the future, out to 2050, and then to look at scenarios in the system as to how the technology mix may vary as you go forward, based on those technology costs. To take it from a cost that's from today's dollars, which was done by Auricon, you need to apply a future scenario of how the world goes. To do that, we applied the IEA global energy outlook, which has a series of generic assumptions that are based on their best estimates, given that technology costs in the area are really driven by what happens globally, not necessarily in Australia, because most of the change in capacity will happen offshore. We applied those assumptions. I can't answer directly today what the actual numbers were; I'd have to take that on notice. But that's the process that was applied to undertake the analysis. Senator CANAVAN: Just to be clear, I'm looking for the carbon price. I may as well get the carbon prices for every year under the high-VRE scenario.</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	25/03/2021	81
AI-22	Matthew Canavan	Raw modelling on LOCE estimates	<p>Senator CANAVAN: I can look at the Hansard; that's fine. I have a final question. This will have to be on notice. Have the LCOE estimates been calculated in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet or some other more fancy model? How have they been done? Dr Mayfield: With the LCOEs, we have a range of models that we apply. They look at whole of system. They also look at individual technologies, plus the input data that comes from Auricon. It's actually a range of models that are applied that come to the end answers. Senator CANAVAN: I get that, but presumably there's got to be some kind of cashflow or NPV-type calculation done. Can you take on notice and give the committee the source codes for that? I'd be interested in the Excel spreadsheets, and, if you are using a code program, I'd be happy for the code as well, if that could be provided. Dr Mayfield: As opposed to providing the code, which I think may end up not answering your question— Senator CANAVAN: Well, that's alright. I can— Dr Mayfield: it may be better to take you for a walk through the modelling processes and such. Senator CANAVAN: I'm happy to do that too, but I'm really interested in the raw calculations, or the raw modelling, and I can look at it. So, that would be useful. Thank you.</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	25/03/2021	82
AI-23	Matthew Canavan	Information provided to GBRMPA	<p>Senator CANAVAN: Has the work by Dr Apte been published by the CSIRO or by Dr Apte separately? Dr Mayfield: That wasn't a publication. Effectively, it was a report that was provided back to GBRMPA, the organisation that requested the report. It was a report made to them. Senator CANAVAN: Could you take on notice to provide to the committee the information that was provided to GBRMPA? Dr Mayfield: Yes, we can do that.</p>	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	25/03/2021	81
AI-24	Rex Patrick	Reserve estimates	<p>Senator PATRICK: You mentioned the production reports were commercially sensitive or commercial-in-confidence. I think you said confidential. Are they confidential because of a legislative reason, that is, the act requires a report and the act deems it confidential? Mr Waters: In effect yes. The regulations with regard to data management cover these things, and they are permanently confidential. Senator PATRICK: It just seems odd that so much of our resource that is taken out from underneath the sea in any year would be commercially sensitive. I would have thought you wouldn't be able to see through it to work out any sort of cost or much commercial information other than how much was taken, which is of public interest to know these things, I would have thought. Mr Waters: The reports are quite detailed. They refer not only to hydrocarbons extracted but also to reserve estimates and— Senator PATRICK: In the United States reserve estimates are published, and that's a really good thing because even investors then get to see exactly what the company owns. We're at odds with the rest of the world there. Mr Waters: Not entirely. There are different regimes. Some have publication of this data. Some have publication after a period of time and others, like ours, have a permanent confidentiality. Senator PATRICK: Can you direct me to the regulations, on notice? I will examine them and maybe ask some questions later. Mr Waters: Certainly.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	108
AI-25	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour contracts	<p>Senator PATRICK: Yes, thank you. Can you please provide me with the expenditure to date since the Commonwealth took some responsibility for the Northern Endeavour? Ms Gillies: Certainly. The department has entered into a number of arrangements relating to that matter. To date the value of these contracts are \$231.439 million. The expenditure in terms of money out the door is \$86.010 million. Senator PATRICK: They're on AusTender, are they, those contracts? Ms Gillies: They are, yes. Senator PATRICK: Is there just a few that you could provide a breakdown of or is it— Ms Gillies: Certainly. I can break it down by our key activities, if that would be helpful. Senator PATRICK: No, I was actually just thinking by company. Ms Gillies: Certainly.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	108
AI-26	Rex Patrick	Date plans provided to government	<p>Senator PATRICK: Secretary, we've had this discussion before. Advice to government is not something that you can withhold from the committee. I'm happy to perhaps explore this in a slightly different way. This is examining your performance, which is what our role is. I would like to think that there were a number of proposals or at least a couple of proposals that were put forward by commercial entities that were considered and maybe passed on. I'm just trying to understand whether it was a single proposal that was put to government or not. Ms Gillies: Certainly the task force drew from a range of sources to provide a consolidated piece of advice to government. That largely was informed by a piece of work that was done by the existing operator on a commercial restart. We, of course, received a range of unsolicited proposals from industry. There wasn't a formal call for tender for those proposals and there wasn't a formal assessment of those proposals and no feedback was provided to those industry participants. But those proposals certainly inform our thinking, as did the engagement that we did with industry, particularly with APR last year as well. Senator PATRICK: On what dates were the plans submitted to government or presented by the department to ministers? Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: Approximately? Ms Gillies: It was in Q3. Senator PATRICK: Q3? Ms Gillies: Potentially early Q4, but we can take that on notice. Senator PATRICK: Thank you very much. To whom were the plans provided? Was it just Minister Pitt? Ms Gillies: That went to government. It went to cabinet. There was cabinet consideration. Senator PATRICK: It was a cabinet submission or did it go to a minister and the minister then took it to cabinet? They are two different things. There are ministerial briefs and there are cabinet briefs. Mr Fredericks: We'll take that on notice because I do just want to make sure we're okay on the cabinet-in-confidence issue, because you've raised it. Obviously if it was to cabinet then we're in the world of cabinet-in-confidence. But we will take it on notice and get back to you.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	109
AI-27	Rex Patrick	Recommendations to government	<p>Senator PATRICK: I understand that. I've seen ministerial briefs that say, 'We recommend you do this,' and you might have a preferred option and state the reasons why or you might say, 'This option is better for this reason. This is the downside.' Is that what occurred? Mr Fredericks: Now we're going down a pathway around cabinet-in-confidence. In terms of the options that were presented to cabinet— Senator PATRICK: I'm not asking for the deliberations that took place inside cabinet, I'm just trying to work out whether you guys did your job properly. Mr Fredericks: But to be fair, you know that advice to cabinet, which is what you've raised, is cabinet-in-confidence. We do want to assist here. Senator PATRICK: Sure. Mr Fredericks: But we've just got to be careful of this particular issue. We're happy to take that question on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	110

AI-28	Rex Patrick	Northern Endeavour court proceedings	<p>Senator PATRICK: I will just for the sake of the Senate indicate that the Senate does not accept cabinet-in-confidence, only deliberations of cabinet, but nonetheless. Did the taskforce engage with UPS, experts and different departments as you developed that plan? Mr Sullivan: We spoke with the operator of the facility, we spoke with APR and other industry bodies, and we considered the advice of other government agencies. Senator PATRICK: I imagine in any plan that you put to government you would have had to have done an assessment of the material state and engineering state of the Northern Endeavour because obviously that would have an impact on costs and solutions. I presume that was the case? Ms Gillies: Senator, you may be aware that the Commonwealth is party to legal action in relation to the Northern Endeavour, and that question did go to the matter that is currently before the court, so it would be inappropriate for me to comment. Senator PATRICK: What is the question before the court at the moment? Mr Fredericks: Senator, can I assist on this one, because you are close to this matter, but I am conscious that your colleagues are not. We are entering into a sensitive area and we will try to be of as much assistance as we can. Senator PATRICK: Sure, and I don't want to prejudice a court case. Mr Fredericks: Correct. So I want to articulate that. You will be aware—but obviously some of your colleagues won't be—that proceedings have now been brought by a secured creditor of the Northern Endeavour, CCMA, against the Commonwealth. They have been running in the Supreme Court of New South Wales, as the senator knows. They are very broadly defined proceedings. Statement of claim has been lodged. My understanding is that at this stage the pleadings look back over 24 years of the history of the Northern Endeavour. It is fairly and squarely the case that the actions of the Commonwealth will be subject to that litigation. We know that from the pleadings. Issues of legal rights, which you and I had an exchange about last time, obviously are going to be in focus as well as cost issues for the Commonwealth. That is because the relief that CCMA are seeking is essentially to take possession of the Northern Endeavour and/or to secure priority in its capacity to receive funding from the sale of the Northern Endeavour. So the proceedings are broad. It is early in the case. You can assume that they will probably narrow down as pleadings go forward. I am grateful to you, Senator, for raising it. As Commonwealth officials we have to be very careful that we do not prejudice the interests of the Commonwealth in these proceedings and, frankly, the interests of the taxpayer, which I know will be important to you, Senator. The usual way of dealing with this is we will endeavour to provide evidence tonight, to the extent that we can, which is not inconsistent with that issue. In an instance where an official thinks that we have probably gone into territory where we could be prejudicing the Commonwealth, we will take it on notice. That way we will be able to take some advice and it may be that on notice we'll be able to provide the information. Senator PATRICK: The full extent of the question I want to ask does not really go back to the history. The Commonwealth would have needed to understand the state of the FPSO in formulating the advice you gave to government. In support of that advice, did someone do an engineering review of the platform, or did you just rely on some of the reports that had been generated in the past? Mr Fredericks: Senator, that is where we are in a tight spot, to be perfectly honest with you. I am pretty confident that the issue you have just described—the actions of the Commonwealth in how it informed itself before it made a decision which is potentially seen as prejudicial to CCMA—will be front and centre in the proceedings. But rather than leave it at that, we are happy to take your question on notice. We will take some advice to see what information we can provide. Senator PATRICK: That's good. I did this in the water hearings; the Murray Darling Basin Authority is the subject of proceedings in the New South Wales Supreme Court as well. They were very helpful in this regard. You might have to speak to the plaintiffs in relation to this, because I am guessing these are, in effect, documents already in Mr Fredericks: Correct; they are. So the state of proceedings, to assist you, Senator, is statement of claim filed and the Commonwealth has filed its defence and counterclaim. Senator PATRICK: Maybe you could provide the committee with the pleadings. Mr Fredericks: Absolutely. Senator PATRICK: Okay. Mr Fredericks: I am very happy to do that. Senator PATRICK: I do not know enough about the proceedings, so that will be helpful—and also at the next estimates. Mr Fredericks: We'll happily do that. Just to give you fair warning, I am told it is 120 paragraphs and about 35 pages. So we have a lot to get through.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	110-111
AI-29	Jess Walsh	Decommissioning audit	<p>Senator WALSH: Has the government conducted a wider audit of all these sorts of assets and who is responsible for their decommissioning into the future? Ms Illman: That is not a question that the policy department would necessarily answer. It may be one best for the regulator, NOPSEMA. Mr Sullivan: That is a really good question, Senator, as I think you are going as to what is the sort of liability and what this looks like in terms of the future not just with respect to the Northern Endeavour. There are various estimates as to the range of decommissioning and the time frame for decommissioning, but it is in the order of \$50 billion to \$60 billion of decommissioning over the next three decades. The decommissioning process and the review process—the Walker review and then consideration by government—is really complex, but we have to get it right because of the future liability over the next two to three decades. So part of this is recognising that we need to basically keep our regulatory framework as best-of-breed as possible, understanding, though, that we are only just coming into that decommissioning phase. So there is a lot of benefit in looking towards countries like the UK, Norway and others, which are much more mature with respect to decommissioning. Does that help? Senator WALSH: Yes, thank you. The \$50 billion to \$60 billion figure that you just mentioned on future decommissioning; where do you draw that from? Mr Sullivan: It is from an estimate from Wood Mackenzie, from memory. But I can check. I'll confirm that on notice to make sure I have that correct.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	111
AI-30	Matthew Canavan	Financial assessment of company that took over Northern Endeavour	<p>Senator CANAVAN: Just to follow up Senator Walsh's question, was there any assessment of the financial wherewithal of the company that took Northern Endeavour over from Woodside at the time? I know it would be before your time, but presumably the department has gone back and looked at this. Mr Fredericks: I think that question is going to potentially fall foul of our— Senator CANAVAN: Okay. Mr Fredericks: But we'll take it on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	112
AI-31	Murray Watt	Impact on mining jobs	<p>Senator WATT: Looking forward, do you either collect any data or are you having discussions with mining companies that tell you anything about the likely impact on jobs moving forward if the relationship with China is not restored? Mr Trotman: I am not aware of any particular conversations that my team has been having but to be in the fullness of providing you with accurate information, I might take that on notice, just in case some of my team have been talking to individual companies about those particular issues. Senator WATT: Is there anyone here who would be in that position? I know even over the last six weeks my own discussions with mining companies in Queensland tell me that there is quite a level of concern about the risk of if not mine closures then certainly winding back production and therefore the loss of jobs among some of the biggest mining companies active in Queensland. Senator CANAVAN: Why do you always talk the industry down, Murray? Can't you be positive for a change? Senator WATT: Quite the contrary. I'm actually quite— Senator CANAVAN: White flag. Senator WATT: I'm quite concerned about the loss of jobs and it's a shame you're not as well, Senator Canavan. As I say, the conversations I'm having with mining companies in Queensland show that they are quite concerned. Is no-one in your department receiving that feedback? Mr Trotman: No. It's obviously something that we're particularly minded to but, in terms of individual conversations with individual companies, I might have to come back to you on those. I am aware that we undertake regular market intelligence where we talk to particular companies. Companies offer advice to us and also we rely on advice that we receive by the peak industry body, the Minerals Council of Australia. They very well represent their industries and they advise us on the latest market developments. In terms of your specific questions about fears of job losses, as I said, I think I'll take that on notice so that I can come back with a more fulsome answer.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	116
AI-32	Murray Watt	Volume of coal exports	<p>Mr Fredericks: Just to give you some numbers, my understanding is that—take the case of met coal—in the December quarter 2020 exports to India and Japan increased by 15 and 8 per cent respectively year on year. And then— Senator WATT: Have you got volume figures for that as well; what that amounts to in terms of tonnage? Mr Fredericks: Yes, I'll take that on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	117

AI-33	Matthew Canavan	Market share of thermal coal	Senator CANAVAN: Following up on Senator Watt's question on notice, would you be able to provide any data you have on our market share of thermal coal into India that relates to that? I don't think it's published in the Resources and Energy Quarterly. Just to be clear, that's not just our exports to India but as a share of their total thermal coal imports, particularly how that might have changed over the past year. There have been some reports that China has struggled to maintain supply of coal to its industries on the back of the restrictions it has imposed on Australia. Have you got any information on that? Where is China getting its coal from? What is it paying for that? And have they had some issues supplying their power or steel industries? Mr Campbell: We don't have a lot of detail about some of the alternative sources but we have seen a lot of the same reports around some of the problems accessing sufficient supply. It's obviously played into some of the public reporting around access for thermal coal in particular, and some of the issues that we saw around supply to the coal-fired power stations. There are clearly issues at play. The degree to which it's actually been diverted from potential Australian supply from other sources, we don't have that in front of us but we can certainly take that on notice for you.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	117
AI-34	Matthew Canavan	Russian coal exports	Senator CANAVAN: There was a report in The Australian on 7 March this year that the Russian president, Vladimir Putin, met with industry executives to discuss plans to increase Russian coal exports to Asia. They're trying to increase apparently to around 34 million tonnes a year by 2024. Do you follow these issues? Are there competitors to us positioning themselves to take advantage of either restrictions on Australian exports or just to take up the growth that we're seeing in coal demand in the Asian region? Mr Campbell: I don't have in front of me at the moment some of those latest results on the conversations that have potentially been occurring. Mr Karunaratna: I have something to add. We do monitor other nations that are exporting to our markets, and we have seen an increase in some of the latest figures—an increase in exports from Russia and also some of the supply constraints from Mongolia during COVID have eased—and we are seeing increased exporting to China from Mongolia. Senator CANAVAN: If you might take this on notice, if it is thermal and coking coal, what's the average energy content of Russian thermal coal exports? Do you have that figure or you can take that on notice? Mr Karunaratna: I can take it on notice. It is relatively high quality. Senator CANAVAN: So it matches, it can compete with us, to a certain degree? Mr Karunaratna: It is relatively high quality. I'll take on notice just how— Senator CANAVAN: Maybe if you could also, just for completeness, take on notice the average energy content of Australian coal exports as well and compare that to Russia? Mr Karunaratna: Yes.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	117
AI-35	Murray Watt	Northern Australia Advisory Group	Senator WATT: Can I begin with the Office of Northern Australia? Could you take it on notice to table a current organisational chart? The Northern Australia Advisory Group is up and running, and people have been appointed to that role? Ms Long: That is correct. Senator WATT: I am genuinely not having a crack here. We just had a look at the website, and it looks like all the positions on the board are still listed as 'vacant'. I was not sure whether everyone had left or maybe the website just needed updating. So it is up and running and all the positions are full? Ms Long: Yes, it is up and running and there are members as part of the Advisory Group on Northern Australia. Senator WATT: Thanks. Ms Long: Would you like me to let you know who those members are? Senator WATT: Maybe you could just table that for us. Ms Long: Yes.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	118
AI-36	Murray Watt	Replacement CEO of the CRC for Developing Northern Australia	Senator WATT: Thanks. The CEO of the CRC for Developing Northern Australia, Mr Matz, recently announced his resignation. When can we expect to see a replacement for him? Ms Long: I might need to take that one on notice. Senator WATT: Okay. What recruitment costs are expected to be incurred recruiting a replacement for him? Has a tender been put out already to recruit? Ms Long: I would need to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	118
AI-37	Murray Watt	NAIF organisational chart	Senator WATT: ... Let's come to the NAIF. Mr Wade, do you have a current organisational chart for the NAIF? Mr Wade: We do. Senator WATT: Have you got that with you? Mr Wade: I don't have it with me, but we can take that on notice and provide that. Senator WATT: Yes, and table it for us? Mr Wade: Yes.	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	25/03/2021	119
AI-38	Murray Watt	NAIF vacancies	Senator WATT: How many vacancies are there across that 27 at this stage? Mr Wade: They are all filled positions. Senator WATT: How many vacancies are there aside from the filled positions? Mr Wade: As part of gearing up in terms of the NAIF reform, we are adding additional staff in a few areas, one in the investment area, particularly considering the expanded ability to invest in equity. We are adding those resources because to date we have been primarily a debt and subordinated debt financier. We continue to build our stakeholder engagement team; we are looking to add an additional person there. For us, building up that team is really important because it drives that strong connection with the communities we work with, so we can drive the development in those areas as well. That is the thrust of the additional recruitment we are adding. Senator WATT: So two extra roles? Mr Wade: I will take it on notice to give you some more details in relation to that.	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	25/03/2021	119
AI-39	Murray Watt	Notice of resignation provided to minister	Senator WATT: Can I just bring up a few staffing matters before I hand over? Mr McCormick recently announced—and I'm not sure if he's departed already—either his resignation or retirement—I'm not sure what it was—as the chair. How should I characterise that—resign or retire? Ms Long: Mr McCormick resigned as chair and director of the board. Senator WATT: Has he departed? Ms Long: That's correct. Senator WATT: How much notice did he provide the minister of that? Ms Long: The chair resigned effective from 25 February 2021. I would need to take on notice how much notice was provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	122
AI-40	Murray Watt	Commencement of NAIF Chair	Senator WATT: When did he begin as the chair? Ms Long: I believe from the beginning of the NAIF, but I might need to check that one. Senator WATT: Not the initial— Ms Long: No. Mr Wade: We don't know the exact date. Senator WATT: Is it three years or two years? I feel like it was about two or three years ago. Ms Long: We can take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	122
AI-41	Murray Watt	Recruitment costs for NAIF Chair	Senator WATT: Do you have the recruitment costs that were incurred to recruit Mr McCormick as the chair when he became the chair? Ms Long: I would need to take that on notice.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	122
AI-42	Murray Watt	NAIF resignations and redundancies	Senator WATT: Thank you. Mr Wade, how many staff—whether it be executive management or non-executive management staff—have resigned or been made redundant from the NAIF in the last 12 months? Mr Wade: I'll give you a bit of background. When I joined as CEO in January last year a key focus for me was on driving performance and outcomes of the organisation. That meant I did an audit in terms of skills and capabilities within the organisation and a review of the skills and capabilities I needed. That leads to a point where, unfortunately, sometimes there is the inevitable result that existing staff members don't have those skills and capabilities that I need, and also I bring in new skills and capabilities within the business. Senator WATT: Again, can I just get an answer on how many people? Mr Wade: I'd have to take the exact numbers on notice. We've gone through this phase, an organisational restructure, across a number of areas. To give you a bit of context, we've built our stakeholder relations and communications team. Again, that's vital in terms of the way we engage with local communities in northern Australia, and Indigenous communities as well. I have restructured the investment team to have a focus on sector lines. For me, that's really important. We've restructured five key sectors. It is not exclusive, but it matches with development in northern Australia; so that is resources, energy, transport, social infrastructure, agriculture and water as well. Regarding the operations team, as we continue to build, I've had to streamline and refine in terms of how that team operates. I'll take the exact numbers on notice. As part of any driving change program in an organisation, you look at the existing team, but you add additional resources as well.	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	25/03/2021	122

AI-43	Murray Watt	Reports of bullying or harassment within NAIF	<p>Senator WATT: Thank you. Are you aware of any reports within the organisation of bullying or harassment or any other word that we might use to describe that kind of behaviour? Mr Wade: I wish I could assist the senator, but I'm mindful of the protections provided to disclosers under the Public Interest Disclosure Act, including confidentiality in relation to the identity of the discloser and the subject matters of the disclosures. I would not wish to undermine these protections in this forum. I would like to take that question on notice so that I can seek advice and then convey the answer to the committee in writing. Senator WATT: I'm very happy for you to take it on notice. That sounds like there have been some allegations of bullying. Mr Fredericks: Senator, to be fair, there are legal obligations here. I think the sensible course, in everyone's interests, is to give us an opportunity to take that on notice, seek some advice and seek to assist you in that way. Senator WATT: I am honestly not seeking to find out people's names or anything like that. That's none of my business. Are you currently dealing, or is anyone dealing, with any allegations of bullying within the NAIF? Mr Wade: Again, I wish I could assist the senator, but I'm mindful of the protections provided to disclosers under the Public Interest Disclosure Act, including confidentiality in relation to the identity of the discloser and the subject matters of the disclosures. Senator PATRICK: Section 29 of the Public Interest Disclosure Act provides very specific guidance as to what is a PID, and bullying is not a PID. So it doesn't come under the protection that you are suggesting. Mr Fredericks: Senator, that's a fair point, but you are presupposing the nature of this. This is just one of those instances where I think the wise course is to allow the witness to take it on notice. They will endeavour to assist, but it's something that I think needs some legal advice. You may well be right, but the legal advice will tell us. CHAIR: I'd also note that it is a small organisation and in that context the risks are much higher. Senator WATT: I did notice the Ombudsman's report said that there is at least one public interest disclosure which is being lodged regarding the NAIF. Is there only one or is there more than one? Mr Wade: There's only one. That was included in their annual report. Senator WATT: Their annual report just didn't give a number. It mentioned the NAIF among— Mr Wade: I thought it did; sorry. Senator WATT: What I'm looking at mentions the NAIF among a range of other organisations. There are some other organisations where it gives a number, but not for the NAIF and not for some of the others. So there's one. And that's still active? Mr Wade: That investigation has been completed. Senator WATT: Has any action been taken as a result? Mr Wade: Again, I wish I could assist the senator, but I am mindful of my obligations under the Public Interest Disclosure Act. Senator WATT: Okay. To return to Senator Patrick's point—I didn't catch all the words of your answer to me initially—I think you invoked the fact that there was a public interest disclosure as one of the reasons you couldn't answer my question about bullying. If bullying is not something that is the subject of a public interest disclosure, I don't understand why you can't answer a question about bullying. Mr Fredericks: Again, I reinforce the same point. It could be that Senator Patrick is right. In fairness, I think that the witness deserves an opportunity to take some legal advice on that, if required. Senator PATRICK: I'd also point out that section 20, which contains the confidentiality provisions, doesn't prevent you from disclosing what sort of public interest disclosure claim was made. The protection is where you are naming the person or where the level of information that you provide would identify the person. The protection doesn't relate to the disclosure itself. Senator Seselja: Senator Patrick, all of those points will be considered when an answer is given. It's been taken on notice and all of those things will be considered in giving an answer.</p>	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	25/03/2021	124
AI-44	Susan McDonald	Average time for approvals	<p>Senator McDONALD: There's been a range of announcements made about changes to the NAIF. One of them is removing the states and territories as a signatory to the decisions. Something's obviously led to that. What's been the time frame for approvals in Queensland? What's the average length of time it's taken to get a decision signed off in Queensland? Mr Wade: I don't have the exact number, so I can take that on notice. I think it's fair to say that, as we've gone through working with all of the states, there's been some challenges, in terms of working through that model. We've tried to speed it up but there are challenges. The states would admit that it creates an administrative burden. In reality, NAIF originate the transaction. NAIF negotiate all of the terms. Going through the states, of course, they have to go through their processes as well. Senator McDONALD: Could you take on notice the average time it's taken to approve decisions across all of the states and territories? Mr Wade: Yes.</p>	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	25/03/2021	125
AI-45	Rex Patrick	Lloyd's rules	<p>Senator PATRICK: Under the Northern Endeavour safety case, Lloyd's rules are nominated as control measures to prevent a major accident event from occurring. Did the NOPSEMA report issued to Lloyd's on 27 September 2019 conclude that Lloyd's rules, as applied to the Northern Endeavour, were effective as a control measure? Mr Smith: I think you're getting into matters there that could be problematic. I understand that report could well be part of the legal proceedings. Senator PATRICK: If it's part of the legal proceedings, I'm presuming it will be subpoenaed and available to all parties. Mr Fredericks: That's right. We need to allow those legal proceedings to take their course. I think the best approach is to take that on notice. We'll see if we can assist. We'll come back to you on notice.</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	25/03/2021	127
AI-46	Rex Patrick	Continuation of UPS and Lloyds for Northern Endeavour	<p>Senator PATRICK: Another thing that I find really confusing is the prohibition notice that you issued on the Northern Endeavour, notice 755, which states that non-compliance is relating to corrosion issues of the facility that could lead to a major accident event causing multiple fatalities and environmental damage. The notice was closed on 10 September 2020 on the basis that UPS was no longer the registered operator of Northern Endeavour and the facility is no longer regulated under the act's framework. The prohibition order was issued to UPS, indicating they weren't doing their job to a standard that you were happy with. They no longer operate the vessel per se but right now the same people are on board looking after it in lighthouse mode. Again we've got entities before that were found to be deficient in some way now being used in the after case. Can you see how I'd be concerned about that? Mr Smith: I understand the question but once again I think you're getting into issues that could pose issues from a legal perspective, given the legal matter— Senator PATRICK: There's a vessel out at sea right now, and I remember when Senator Canavan was the minister he was expressing grave concern about the vessel. Mr Fredericks: Can I just say that the task force is fully seized of the issues that you're raising when it comes to safety et cetera and has actually been the driving motive of the actions that the Commonwealth has taken. I wish I could say more but I now have to constrain myself. We're again in a world where I could offer more positive evidence but I can't have it both ways, and I won't. The question you're asking, in order to assist you I will take it on notice and we'll be— Senator PATRICK: Thank you for that. I'm trying to discover perhaps the reasoning why the Commonwealth has decided to use Lloyd's in circumstances where there were difficulties prior to the Commonwealth taking charge of the vessel. The same with UPS; they had a prohibition notice issued to them; yet we are still using them. Mr Fredericks: I understand your question. I believe that will be a critical issue in the court proceedings. I'll take it on notice.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	25/03/2021	128

AI-47	Murray Watt	Nganhurra environment plan	<p>Senator WATT: I do have just a couple of questions. When was NOPSEMA first made aware the cessation of operations of the environment plan for Woodside's Nganhurra because of turret mooring was inadequate? Sorry if I didn't pronounce that correctly. Mr Grebe: Sorry, could you repeat the question? Senator WATT: You're going to make me mispronounce it again. Mr Grebe: I think it's called Nganhurra. Senator WATT: What is it, sorry? Mr Grebe: Nganhurra. That's about the only part of the question I heard. Senator WATT: When was NOPSEMA first made aware that the cessation of the operations of the environment plan for that place we're talking about because the riser turret mooring was inadequate? Mr Grebe: When were we made aware that the environment plan was inadequate? Senator WATT: Cessation of operations of the environment plan was inadequate. Mr Grebe: Inadequate in what respect? I don't understand the question, sorry. Senator WATT: In respects that I hoped you might know. I am not the shadow minister for this particular area. Mr Grebe: If I can assist, Nganhurra was a floating production storage and off-take facility operated by Woodside off the north-west of Western Australia. It ceased operations in 2018 and is in the process of being decommissioned. The environment plan was revised during 2019 and 2020 to address issues that became apparent with the condition of the riser turret mooring after the floating production facility left. So there aren't specific dates at which inadequacies, perhaps as you said, came to light. It's over a period of time. Senator WATT: It sounds like I might need to get you to take that on notice just to step us through when you became aware of those concerns that caused you to take that action. Mr Grebe: Yes. Senator WATT: Maybe at the same time if you can tell us on notice what recommendations or directives were put in place to enforce compliance with the project and what the company's response to those new recommendations and directives was.</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	25/03/2021	129
AI-48	Rex Patrick	Findings from review of Lloyd's	<p>Senator PATRICK: But now we've been quite nuanced in that ultimately you need to be satisfied of the safety case. The safety case relies on the class certificate. If you're no longer satisfied with the issue of the certificate, that surely must raise a concern about the safety case. Again, I'm now looking at the other vessels and trying to understand what happened when you've realised there's a problem. Maybe you can take this on notice because of the time: can you provide the actions you took in response to your findings at that review that you carried out of Lloyd's in relation to the other three vessels that I mentioned? Mr Smith: Yes, we're happy to take that and answer it.</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	25/03/2021	130
AI-49	Sarah Hanson-Young	Facility in Napandee	<p>ANSTO (the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation) <a href="https://www.tenders.gov.au/Atm/ShowClosed/0d75755d-5100-42ae-86e9-4eb72486fa36?PreviewMode=False">https://www.tenders.gov.au/Atm/ShowClosed/0d75755d-5100-42ae-86e9-4eb72486fa36?PreviewMode=False</a> According to a statement from the Australian Radioactive Waste Agency - "ANSTO is seeking an engineering partner to support them in progressing from the current generic concept design to a site-specific schematic for the facility in Napandee". 1.Is it possible/appropriate/consistent with government tender practise to lock in such an approach when the specific site has not been secured and is under active contest? 2.How can a site-specific design and development be advanced in the absence of a secured site? 3.What is the status of the contract process. Who is the approved or leading contractor? 4.What provision/ contingency does the contract make for the scenario where this site is not able to be further advanced or secured?</p>	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	1/04/2021	
AI-50	Sarah Hanson-Young	The Australian Radioactive Waste Agency	<p>ARWA - the Australian Radioactive Waste Agency <a href="https://www.sacome.org.au/joint-welcome-for-establishment-of-the-australian-radioactive-waste-agency.html">https://www.sacome.org.au/joint-welcome-for-establishment-of-the-australian-radioactive-waste-agency.html</a> 1. Announcing the formation of the ARWA Minister Pitt stated: "the fact it is independent of existing waste holders will give assurance" – given that ARWA is a unit based within facility proponent, the NRWM Project, is headed by the NRWMP team leader and "works in close partnership with ANSTO" – the major waste producer and holder in Australia – can the Department see why for many stakeholders this claim does not provide assurance? 2.Can you advise on the status of the Australian Radioactive Waste Management Framework initiative? What is the status of the search for an Executive Officer/CEO of the newly announced Australian Radioactive Waste Authority (ARWA) – how is this recruitment being promoted and advanced within Australia and internationally? What budget provision has been made to advance ARWA? 3.Further, on the formation of the ARWA Minister Pitt stated: "...medical waste, along with Australia's historical radioactive waste holdings, is currently spread over more than 100 locations across the country, like science facilities, universities and hospitals". Can you detail how many – and which – of these locations will be able to be retired from use should a national facility be advanced at Kimba?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-51	Alex Gallacher	Building and construction	<p>1.Has a date for the Building Ministers Meeting now been set? If so, when will it be? 2.Has a final Regulatory Impact Statement on the inclusion of mandatory accessibility standards now been provided to the States and Territories? 3.The first Regulatory Impact Statement released last year was criticised by seniors and disability advocates as not adequately considering the significant benefits of accessible housing for people with disability, older Australians and those recovering from injury and illness. a.Can the government confirm that the revised RIS now adequately considers these benefits? b.Does the government have an estimate of the number of Australians that would benefit from accessible housing? c.Does this include seniors, people with disability and those being discharged from hospital? Are these groups expressly considered in the RIS? d.Does the revised RIS consider possible savings to the government in, for example, Aged Care, the NDIS, Health? 4.The recent Aged Care Royal Commission recommended that "[a]s a matter of priority, governments should work together to increase accessible housing, including private rental housing and social and affordable housing, for the ageing population." a.Does the government agree with the Royal Commission that without more accessible housing, the shift to the provision of Aged Care in the home will be very difficult? b.Is the government aware that around 82% of people over 55 have indicated they would rather age at home than in care? c.Can the government confirm that the ageing of the population and Aged Care reforms will be central to the position taken to the Building Minister's Meeting? 5.In February, an open letter was sent to First Ministers from 35 organisations representing people with disability, older Australians, health and allied health organisations calling on all governments to support the inclusion of mandatory accessibility standards in the Building Code a.Can the government confirm that the interests of these groups will be considered in the final position taken to the meeting? b.Can the department confirm whether the Minister has met with any of the signatories to this letter? c.Can the Department confirm whether the Minister has met with any representatives from the building industry on this issue? 6.Has the government finalised a position to be taken to that meeting? Has this issue yet been to cabinet?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-52	Alex Gallacher	Supply Chain Resilience Initiative	<p>In Budget Papers No. 2, p. 120 \$107.2 million was announced for the Supply Chain Resilience Initiative, however there is no breakdown of expenditure over the Forward Estimates. 1.How much of this \$107.2 million has been spent so far and how much of it is future spending? 2.How much will be given in grants and how much will the Department spend administering the initiative? 3.How is this funding being allocated? If it is a grant, what will the selection criteria be? 4.Will applications be assessed in rounds or an ongoing basis? 5.This initiative was announced in last year's budget. When will businesses actually start to receive a flow of funding from it? 6.The Department's website says, 'guidelines outlining eligibility and merit criteria will be made available in the first half of 2021'. When will it be made available? 7.The Department's website also says the purpose of the initiative is to, 'promote better information sharing and collaboration between industry and governments.' What are some of the problems with information sharing by government and industry that need to be addressed?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-53	Alex Gallacher	Technology neutral regional hydrogen export hub	<p>In Budget Papers No. 2 p. 119 the Government committed \$70.2 million over five years from 2020-21 (including \$55.7 million over four years to 2023-24) to support the development of a technology neutral regional hydrogen export hub to boost regional economies. 1.Provide a breakdown of expenditure over the forward estimates. 2.How much of this \$70.2 million has been spent so far and how much of it is future spending? 3.Where will this Hub be based? How will this decision be made? 4.What entities will be receiving funding under this program? Is it government, business or tertiary education?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	



AI-54	Kristina Keneally	Appointments – briefs prepared	1.How many times has the Department prepared a brief for statutory authorities, executive agencies, advisory boards, government business enterprises or any other Commonwealth body which includes a reference to a former Liberal or National member of parliament at a state, territory or federal level. 2.For each brief prepared, can the Department advise: a.The former member. b.The board or entity. c.Whether the request originated from the Minister's office. d.Whether the appointment was made.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-55	Alex Gallacher	Artificial Intelligence	Funding was allocated in the 2018 Budget to development of an AI Ethics framework. The framework was funded through the 2018-19 Budget's \$29.9 million AI investment strategy. 1.What are the key performance indicators for this framework? 2.What are the outcome goals of this framework? 3.What mechanisms are in place to allow for the ongoing alteration and improvement of the framework? 4.How many businesses and Government Departments have subscribed to the framework? 5.How much was spent to develop this framework? 6.Does this framework have continued funding beyond the 2021-22 Budget? 7.Were contracts awarded to any Consultancy firms in the process of developing this framework? Round 6 of the Cooperative Research Centres Program provided \$25 million for AI projects. 1.With the conclusion of many projects in Round 6 of the CRC program, what were the results of this round? 2.What metrics have been used to measure success? 3.Will there be any future rounds focused on AI? If not, why?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-56	Gerard Rennick	GenCost Report	1.The CSIRO claims that the life of coal powered fire plants is based on an economic life of 30 years rather than a technical life of 50 years. The CSIRO claims this is a normal financial sector assumption. This is incorrect, what accounting standard says it is normal practice to model the economic return of an asset on the life of the loan and not the asset? Almost half of Australia's coal powered fired stations are owned by the Qld Government and will be underwritten by the Queensland taxpayer not private banks. Secondly, the life of a loan has nothing to do with the life of an asset with many banks refusing to underwrite coal powered fire stations at all. 2.Why does the Costgen report ignore existing coal powered fire plants and brownfield developments, given they are much cheaper than new builds? 3.Why does Costgen assume new build coal powered fire plants have to buy coal on market when the state government, especially in Queensland already owns hundreds of millions of tonnes of coal resources – especially at Kogan Creek? 4.Why were brownfield sites ignored in the Costgen report given many of the capital costs have already been incurred? 5.Why does the Costgen report assume a high capacity factor for wind of 44% (well above average) and low capacity factor for coal of 60%. (well below average) 6.What does the Costgen report assume the increase in transmission costs will be as a function of the increase in renewable power? For every 10% increase in renewable power generation there will be an X% increase in transmission costs. 7.What does the Costgen report assume the increase in storage costs will be as a function of the increase in renewable power? For every 10% increase in renewable power generation there will be an X% increase in storage costs. 8.Noting the batteries will only provide up to 8 hours of storage are there enough pumped hydro sites on the eastern seaboard to provide sufficient energy storage for the entire NEM? 9.Does the Cost gen report take into account the cost of recycling or waste clean-up? 10.What will be responsible for security services such as frequency control when base load power is shut down and renewables power the majority of the market? Have these costs been factored in and if so how so? 11.What is the estimated life span of a battery in cycles and in years? 12.As base load power diminishes isn't the demand for batteries going to increase exponentially in order to cover every unknown weather possibility. If so, how can the Costgen report say battery costs are going to decrease as a result of learning whilst ignoring the increase in demand? 13.Given the large number of faulty windmills at Coopers Gap windfarm, on what basis can the Costgen report justify wind turbines lasting 25 years or a capacity factor of 44%? 14.Why does the CSIRO taken in account global climate policies to justify a carbon tax rather than adhering to its own government policy of no carbon tax? The CSIRO should be modelling data on Australian government policy, not foreign government policy should it not? 15.Has the CSIRO included a carbon tax in the cost of building renewables which rely on carbon powered energy to create and or transport. If not, why not given it has included it for coal? 16.Why is the CSIRO ignoring small nuclear reactors, given costs are expected to fall significantly before 2030?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	1/04/2021	
AI-57	Gerard Rennick	Climate change theory and greenhouse gasses	says radiation is emitted in all directions? 2.A blanket or likewise a greenhouse stops convection and completely traps heat into a sealed airtight space. Greenhouse gases on the other hand absorb and radiate energy however unlike blankets or greenhouses they don't stop convection. i.e. seal or trap the movement of air. To the extent that GHG's radiate heat downwards they increase the temperature either through radiation or conduction with other molecules, but GHG's don't stop those molecules from rising and therefore cooling do they as they only make up to 5% of the atmosphere. Therefore, why does Larry Marshall describe greenhouse gases as a blanket? 3.Does climate change theory invalidate the second law of thermodynamics? If the lower part of the atmosphere was to get hotter, this would offset the upper atmosphere which would be cooler in accordance with the first law of thermodynamics. i.e. the conservation of energy. The temperature differential would be offset by rising hot air which would seek to reach thermodynamic equilibrium. 4.If CO2 Water Vapour trap heat and the atmosphere stopped heat from escaping wouldn't the earth just get hotter and hotter? 5.Is the atmosphere a closed system or does heat escape from the atmosphere? 6.The troposphere is 16km high at the equator and 10km high at the poles. Isn't this proof that the lower part of the atmosphere (i.e. the troposphere) will expand in order to ensure equilibrium temperature between the incoming radiation and outgoing radiation? 7.Larry Marshall stated the GHG gases heat the earth by 16 degrees. At last estimates I asked "What would the temperature of the earth be if Greenhouse gases didn't exist?" and the CSIRO replied "This is a hypothetical question and physically implausible." So which is it – the increase in temperature caused by GHG's is 16 degree or is it implausible? 8.If CO2 traps heat then why is the dry adiabatic lapse rate the same at the equator as it is at the poles given that CO2 has a greater density at the equator if CO2 trapped heat then wouldn't you expect the dry adiabatic lapse to be slower at the equator? 9.Does the CSIRO have any idea on whether or not there are enough rare metals in the earths crust to meet the worlds energy storage requirements – I note that a Professor Richard Herrington Head of Earth Sciences from the Natural History Museum of London has said that for the UK to meet UK electric car targets for 2050, they would need to produce just under two times the current total annual world cobalt production, nearly the entire world production of neodymium, three quarters of the worlds lithium production and at least half of the worlds copper production. Given that the UK is just one country and car batteries are lucky to last a decade is seems a bit of stretch that will be enough rare earths to meet storage requirements does it not? 10.Given one such rare earth Lithium is a 1% ore body i.e. you have to mine 100 tonnes to get one tonne of lithium and if there was a stripping ratio of 10 to 1 you may have to mine 1000 tonnes to get one tonne is the use of rare earths for storage going to use more energy and produce more greenhouse gases than they purport to save. 11.Given the CSIRO says there is 342 W/m2 of downward welling radiation (DWR) from GHG's and the Australian Academy of Science says there 333 W/m2, doesn't this imply that it's almost impossible to measure a worldwide DWR? Especially given the IPCC says that DWR has only increased by 2W/m2 since 1750! 12.An answer to a previous question "Some sources say that the temperature of the earth without GHG would be negative 18 degrees Celsius or 255 Kelvins or that GHG contribute increase the temperature of the earth's atmosphere by 33 degrees. If that is the case, then why is it that energy budget models show that GHG have a downwelling radiation of around 330-340 watts per square meter, about the same downwelling radiation of the sun which contributes most of the other 255 degrees of heat into the atmosphere? i.e. how is it that the 340 watts per square meter from GHG contributes 35 degrees while the circa 340 watts per square meter from the sun contributes almost 255 degrees" was "The global average temperature response of the Earth's surface to a change in energy input is primarily determined by the rate of upward energy loss by infrared radiation. This closely follows the black-body infrared radiation, which varies as the absolute temperature to the fourth power, according to the Stefan-Boltzmann Law. Hence, the temperature response in degrees Kelvin to a change in energy inputs at the Earth's surface varies as the inverse fourth power of the additional input. This is not a linear relationship. See Box and Box (2015)." Isn't the sun the first and foremost the primary driver of energy in the solar system and convection the major mechanism for the transfer of heat over the earth? 13.An answer to a previous question "Given the atmosphere is almost saturated by water vapor at around 15 microns, what is the relationship between the increase in CO2 in the atmosphere which absorbs and emits around 15 microns and total heat absorbed at that band? If water vapor already absorbs and emits most of the photons at that wavelength how will	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	1/04/2021	

AI-58	Alex Gallacher	Staff employed by CSIRO	Can the CSIRO please provide a break up of the number of staff employed by the organisation and projects by region?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	1/04/2021	
AI-59	Alex Gallacher	RV Cape Ferguson	Background AIMS has two primary vessels that assist in its scientific research of tropical marine environments. The RV Solander (built in 2007) and the RV Cape Ferguson (built in 2000). The institute also has a series of smaller vessels at its disposal. As per the below interaction between Senator Carr and AIMS during Senate Estimates February 2019, the latest information we have is that the Government must make a decision on the future of the vessel by the end of this year. During the 2019 Federal Election Labor committed \$10 million to the refit of the RV Cape Ferguson. It is unknown whether the Government has itself made any progress to fund a refit or commission a new vessel. REFERENCE: Written Question - Senator Carr QUESTION No.: AI-90 1. When will a decision need to be made on a replacement or refit of the RV Cape Ferguson? a. What is the best estimate of the cost to replace the RV Cape Ferguson? b. What is the best estimate of the cost to refit and extend the life of the RV Cape Ferguson? ANSWER A decision by Government to replace or refit the vessel will need to be made before 2022 at the latest. a. The estimated total cost for replacement of the RV Cape Ferguson is \$50 million. b. The estimated cost for a major refit is \$10 million, to extend the operating life of the vessel by about another 5 to ten years. Questions 1.Has the Government provided AIMS with a decision on the replacement or refit of the RV Cape Ferguson? 2.If yes, what is the decision? 3.If no, does it remain the case that a decision will need to be made before 2022 at the latest? 4.What is the best estimate of the cost to replace the RV Cape Ferguson? 5.What is the best estimate of the cost to refit and extend the life of the RV Cape Ferguson?	Australian Institute of Marine Science	1/04/2021	
AI-60	Alex Gallacher	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)	Background: •The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) is a global standard for the good governance of oil, gas and mineral resources. It seeks to address the key governance issues in the extractive sectors. •The EITI Standard requires information along the extractive industry value chain from the point of extraction, to how the revenue makes its way through the government and its contribution to the economy. •This includes how licenses and contracts are allocated and registered, who the beneficial owners of those operations are, what the fiscal and legal arrangements are, how much is produced, how much is paid, where the revenue is allocated, and its contributions to the economy, including employment. •The EITI Standard is implemented in 52 countries around the world. Each of these countries is required to publish an annual EITI Report to disclosing information on: contracts and licenses, production, revenue collection, revenue allocation, and social and economic spending. •Labor has held a policy since 2015 of implementing the EITI with a view to going further and implementing a 'Publish What You Pay' standard which would require more detailed, mandatory reporting. In Australia: •The Turnbull Government announced on May 6, 2016 it will implement the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). This program was piloted by Kevin Rudd and Martin Ferguson from October 2011. •Australia has established a Multi Stakeholder Group (MSG), a requirement of the EITI, who are currently supposed to be in the process of preparing Australia's work plan and candidacy application to the EITI. This process is overseen by the Department of Industry. The timeframe for Australia to submit a candidacy application was late 2017. •Australia is one of the largest financial supporters of the EITI and has provided approximately \$20 Million since 2007 to the initiative internationally. The EITI is also a commitment within Australia's National Action Plan (NAP) for the Open Government Partnership (OGP) and sits alongside other transparency commitments including Beneficial Ownership and Open Contracting. •Since the May 2016 announcement the Government has said nothing in relation to EITI. •In September 2019 the Government released a KPMG EITI Gap Analysis document. <a href="https://www.industry.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-09/extractive-industries-transparency-initiative-gap-analysis.pdf">https://www.industry.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-09/extractive-industries-transparency-initiative-gap-analysis.pdf</a> •Estimates in 2019 showed the KPMG report cost \$130,484.60 and has never been considered by the MSG nor responded to by the government. •The MSG has not met since 14 March 2019. Questions on EITI: 1.Estimates in 2019 showed that the cost of the 2019 KPMG EITI Gap Analysis was \$130,484.60. Given this cost has the report now been considered by the MSG? a.Has the report been provided to the MSG? b.Has any feedback from the MSG Secretariat been sought? 2.How many staff does the department currently have employed performing the functions of the MSG secretariat? 3.When is the EITI multi-stakeholder group (MSG) due to meet next? 4.Is there a forward program for the MSG? a.If so please provide it on notice. 5.What are the day to day functions of the department employees who are engaged to provide secretariat functions for the MSG given there have been no meetings for over 2 years? 6.With the United States set to implement a system of mandatory disclosure of payments to governments for listed and non-listed extractive companies and joining the 27 EU nations, UK, Canada, Norway and Switzerland in having such laws, will Australia as a supporter of transparency and tackling corruption seek to legislate equivalent laws for ASX listed and private extractive companies housed in Australia? 7.In line with the government's policy prior to the 2016 election for Australia becoming an EITI candidate, strong agreement from industry associations and civil society, and the provision ongoing funding to the EITI Secretariat, can the government provide a timeline for Australia becoming an EITI candidate country? 8.Please provide a full list of all the members of the multi-stakeholder group (MSG) since January 2019. This list should include at a minimum: a.the person's name, b.the organisation represented, c.the date of the members appointment, d.the numbers of meetings attended and the numbers of meetings missed. e.If they are no longer a member of the MSG please provide an end date.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	

AI-61	Rachel Siewert	Scarborough LNG development	<p>"STEPS" to support its claims about market demand for LNG that would be produced by the Scarborough project? 2)What global temperature scenario does the Department believe the IEA STEPS scenario is aligned with? 3)Does the Department believe that this temperature scenario is an environmentally acceptable outcome for Australia? 1)Does the Department consider that this temperature scenario is aligned with the objectives of the Paris Agreement? 2)Why did the Department not require the proponent to justify its market demand for LNG in reference to an energy demand scenario that is compatible with the Paris Agreement and an environmentally acceptable temperature outcome for Australia? 3)Why did the Department allow the proponent to justify its market demand for LNG in reference to an global energy market scenario that is up to date, instead allowing the proponent to rely on outdated scenarios? 4)In relation to the advice provided to NOPSEMA by DISER questioned the market demand projections for Scarborough, stating that: "significant uncertainty as to the scale and durability of the demand for imported LNG in developing markets around the world" "The (IEA) have noted that emerging markets in Asia face higher costs for imports than domestically produced gas and imports of coal," she wrote. "I note this uncertainty is not mentioned in the extract of the Scarborough proposal."It is the Department's view that if anything, this uncertainty could suggest a downward influence on LNG demand from emerging Asian markets". How did NOPSEMA consider this advice in its assessment of the project? 5)Is the Department aware that the 2020 updated IEA scenarios that are compatible with the Paris Agreement suggest a lower utilisation of gas and a lower market demand for LNG than is suggested in the previous 2019 scenarios? 6)Has the Department considered the Scarborough project in reference to updated IEA scenarios or sought further advice about its compatibility with updated scenarios or projections for global LNG demand? 7)What is NOPSEMA's projected forecast for LNG demand growth (for Australian LNG) in Japan and China under the STEPS, SDS and NZE2050 IEA scenarios, between 2021 and 2070. 8)Does the Department stand by the comment made in its media release published 2 April, 2020? "Woodside's proposal positions Scarborough gas to play a key role in the future global energy mix. Woodside will be contributing to global efforts to reduce global greenhouse gas levels by actively displacing more carbon-intensive power generation with gas, as a less carbon-intensive source of fuel." 9)Does the Department consider that this statement remains true, give the updates that have been made to IEA energy demand scenarios and other global developments? 10)Does the Department recognise a degree of uncertainty in relation to this statement and the extent it will remain true in the future? 11)According to Woodside, Woodside's 'Native Reforestation Project', in partnership with Greening Australia, is estimated to sequester about 700,000 tonnes of CO2-e over 25 years. In comparison to the total lifecycle emissions of the Scarborough LNG project, what percentage of these emissions does NOPSEMA consider to be "offset" by the Native Reforestation Project? 12)According to the NOPSEMA Statement of Reasons for the acceptance of the Scarborough Offshore Project Proposal, NOPSEMA states that changes to the OPP in response to public comments included "discussion of the proponent's obligations in relation to the EPBC Environmental Offsets Policy." Following these discussions, what new obligations did NOPSEMA impose on Woodside in relation to the offsets policy and where in the OPP are these obligations reflected? 13)In the Scarborough OPP, Woodside state that "Elevated water temperatures have the potential to induce minor physical stress in marine fauna and may result in potential mortality for prolonged exposure. Wolanski (1994) demonstrated that elevated seawater temperatures have the potential to alter the physiological processes of exposed biota." Is NOPSEMA aware scientific literature or studies relating to the impact of elevated water temperatures on marine fauna in Australian waters that have been published since 1994, and, if so, did NOPSEMA communicate this to Woodside during the assessment process? 14)Woodside state in the OPP that "climate change impacts upon Australian receptors cannot be directly causally linked to Scarborough but are instead the result of the accumulation of GHG emissions in the atmosphere". Does NOPSEMA accept that climate change impacts upon Australian receptors can be directly causally linked to global atmospheric concentration of GHG? 15)Does NOPSEMA accept that Scope 1 and 3 GHG emissions from Scarborough will accumulate in the atmosphere? 16)Does NOPSEMA accept that GHG emissions from Scarborough are capable of being distinguished from other GHG emissions in the atmosphere? 17)Does the Department consider that the assessment of the project and the approved OPP satisfy all of the requirements of the EPBC Act? 18)Has there been any communication between NOPSEMA and DAWE or any other party to</p>	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	1/04/2021	
AI-62	Rachel Siewert	CCS at the Chevron Gorgon facility	<p>1)What assumptions are being made about the success of otherwise of the CCS facility on Barrow Island in the government's projections for carbon pollution and in Australia's national carbon accounts? 2) Are any assumptions made about the provision of alternative offsets by Chevron for any shortfall in the operation of the CCS facility? 3)In calculating the Safeguard Mechanism limit that is applied to the Gorgon LNG facility, were any assumptions made about the operation of the CCS facility? If so, what assumptions inform this limit? 4)Does the Safeguard Mechanism limit on the Barrow Island LNG facility reflect the regulatory requirements for CCS at a state level, including the five year rolling average requirement for carbon reinjection and the requirement to provide alternative offsets for any shortfall? If not why not? 5)Does the approved Safeguard Mechanism limit on the Barrow Island LNG facility allow greater carbon pollution than is authorised under State approvals and other instruments including the Ministerial Statement? If so, why? 6)Is the Department aware of limits that have been placed on the operation of the CCS facility by the WA Government regulator? If so, can the department table relevant information and documents? 7)Has the Department been advised, or made its own assessment of what impact these limits or the other operational issues with the CCS facility will have on the amount of Carbon that will be sequestered at Barrow Island? If so, what is the Department's current understanding of this? 8)What implications do these limits, or the other operational issues with the CCS facility on Barrow Island have for any agreements or contracts that are in place between the Commonwealth and Chevron? 9)Has the Department examined the environmental risks associated with the remedies that Chevron is employing to correct the ongoing issues with the operation of the CCS facility?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	

AI-63	Rachel Siewert	Woodside Burrup hub and other LNG developments	<p>1)What assumptions are being made about the Woodside Burrup Hub Development and each of its elements in the government's projections for carbon pollution and in Australia's national carbon accounts? 2)Can the Department describe what emissions scenarios are being considered by the Department for each of the elements of the Burrup hub development, and how these will each; a)affect Australia's total emissions and the targets that have been established under the Paris Agreement? b)Affect global emissions c)Align with global commitments to temperature outcomes under the Paris Agreement. 3)Does the Department assume that all elements of the development will proceed? 4)Does the department assume that the Browse Basin element will proceed? If so, does the Department assume that Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) will be employed by the proponent as stated to shareholders and investors? 5)Does the Department consider that CCS is feasible for the Browse Basin development? 6)What other abatement options does the Department consider to be realistic options for the Burrup Hub development? 7)What assumptions are being made about the Barossa LNG development and the impacts of this development on Australia's emissions and carbon targets? 8)Does the Department consider that CCS will be employed for the Barossa development? In reference to the NOPSEMA assessment and approval of the OPP for the Scarborough project; 1)Is the DAWE aware that the proponent has relied on the 2019 IEA Stated Policies Scenario "STEPS" to support its claims about market demand for LNG that would be produced by the Scarborough project? 2)What global temperature scenario does the DISER believe the IEA STEPS scenario is aligned with? Does the Department consider that this temperature scenario is aligned with the objectives of the Paris Agreement? 3)What global temperature scenario does the DISER believe the Scarborough LNG development is aligned with? Does the Department consider that this temperature scenario is aligned with the objectives of the Paris Agreement? 4)Is DISER concerned that NOPSEMA did not require the proponent to justify its market demand for LNG in reference to an energy scenario that is compatible with the Paris Agreement and an environmentally acceptable temperature outcome for Australia? 5)Is DISER concerned that NOPSEMA allowed the proponent to justify its market demand for LNG in reference to a global energy market scenario that is up to date, instead allowing the proponent to rely on outdated scenarios? 6)Regarding advice provided by DISER which questioned the market demand projections for Scarborough, stating that: "significant uncertainty as to the scale and durability of the demand for imported LNG in developing markets around the world" "The (IEA) have noted that emerging markets in Asia face higher costs for imports than domestically produced gas and imports of coal," she wrote. "I note this uncertainty is not mentioned in the extract of the Scarborough proposal." It is the Department's view that if anything, this uncertainty could suggest a downward influence on LNG demand from emerging Asian markets". Does DISER stand by this advice? Can the Department provide any update to this advice given what is known now? 7)Does the DISER accept that the 2020 updated IEA scenarios that are compatible with the Paris Agreement suggest a lower utilisation of gas and a lower market demand for LNG than is suggested in the previous 2019 scenarios? 8)Has the Department considered the Scarborough project in reference to the updated IEA scenarios or sought further advice about its compatibility with updated scenarios or projections for global LNG demand? 9)Has there been any communication between DAWE and any other party to confirm that the assessment of the project and the approved OPP satisfies all of the requirements of the EPBC Act? If so, can the Department table that correspondence and any documents relevant to this consideration? 10)Does the DISER agree with the comment made by NOPSEMA in its media release published 2 April, 2020? "Woodside's proposal positions Scarborough gas to play a key role in the future global energy mix. Woodside will be contributing to global efforts to reduce global greenhouse gas levels by actively displacing more carbon-intensive power generation with gas, as a less carbon-intensive source of fuel." 11)Does the Department consider that this statement remains true, give the updates that have been made to IEA energy demand scenarios and other global developments? 12)Does the Department recognise a degree of uncertainty in relation to this statement and the extent it will remain true in the future?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-64	Rachel Siewert	OPP for the Scarborough project	<p>In reference to the NOPSEMA assessment and approval of the OPP for the Scarborough project; 1)Is the DAWE aware that the proponent has relied on the 2019 IEA Stated Policies Scenario "STEPS" to support its claims about market demand for LNG that would be produced by the Scarborough project? 2)What global temperature scenario does the DISER believe the IEA STEPS scenario is aligned with? Does the Department consider that this temperature scenario is aligned with the objectives of the Paris Agreement? 3)What global temperature scenario does the DISER believe the Scarborough LNG development is aligned with? Does the Department consider that this temperature scenario is aligned with the objectives of the Paris Agreement? 4)Is DISER concerned that NOPSEMA did not require the proponent to justify its market demand for LNG in reference to an energy scenario that is compatible with the Paris Agreement and an environmentally acceptable temperature outcome for Australia? 5)Is DISER concerned that NOPSEMA allowed the proponent to justify its market demand for LNG in reference to a global energy market scenario that is up to date, instead allowing the proponent to rely on outdated scenarios? 6)Regarding advice provided by DISER which questioned the market demand projections for Scarborough, stating that: "significant uncertainty as to the scale and durability of the demand for imported LNG in developing markets around the world" "The (IEA) have noted that emerging markets in Asia face higher costs for imports than domestically produced gas and imports of coal," she wrote. "I note this uncertainty is not mentioned in the extract of the Scarborough proposal." It is the Department's view that if anything, this uncertainty could suggest a downward influence on LNG demand from emerging Asian markets". Does DISER stand by this advice? Can the Department provide any update to this advice given what is known now? 7)Does the DISER accept that the 2020 updated IEA scenarios that are compatible with the Paris Agreement suggest a lower utilisation of gas and a lower market demand for LNG than is suggested in the previous 2019 scenarios? 8)Has the Department considered the Scarborough project in reference to the updated IEA scenarios or sought further advice about its compatibility with updated scenarios or projections for global LNG demand? 9)Has there been any communication between DAWE and any other party to confirm that the assessment of the project and the approved OPP satisfies all of the requirements of the EPBC Act? If so, can the Department table that correspondence and any documents relevant to this consideration? 10)Does the DISER agree with the comment made by NOPSEMA in its media release published 2 April, 2020? "Woodside's proposal positions Scarborough gas to play a key role in the future global energy mix. Woodside will be contributing to global efforts to reduce global greenhouse gas levels by actively displacing more carbon-intensive power generation with gas, as a less carbon-intensive source of fuel." 11)Does the Department consider that this statement remains true, give the updates that have been made to IEA energy demand scenarios and other global developments? 12)Does the Department recognise a degree of uncertainty in relation to this statement and the extent it will remain true in the future?</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	

AI-65	Larissa Waters	Investigation into coal fraud	Investigation into coal fraud In 2020, laboratory giant ALS disclosed to the Australian Securities Exchange that an internal probe found almost half its export certificates since 2007 had been manually inflated "without justification". Industry sources say the issue is widespread and instigated by coal mining companies. ASIC have confirmed they are making inquiries in relation to this matter, and have conducted raids on ALS and TerraCom. A South Korean coal-fired power company has recently banned the use of ALS in a recent tender for coal on the basis of concerns regarding the alleged fraud. ?When did the Department become aware of the allegation regarding ALS? ?What actions has the Department taken since becoming aware? In particular, has the Department sought advice or undertaken any risk analyses in relation to these allegations to determine: owhat percentage of coal exports over the last 15 years have been tainted by ALS's falsification of export certificates? ohow many Australian coal companies have used fraudulently altered reports? Is the Department aware of allegations against any other coal labs? owwhether lower quality coal leads to higher carbon emissions or worse health outcomes when burned? othe implications of the falsification are for projected global carbon emissions? ohow exaggerated Australia's coal quality results have been since 2007? ?What steps has the Department taken to ensure this fraud is not repeated? ?Has the Department had meetings or other contact with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade regarding the allegations or any ongoing investigation or analyses? ?If the burning of lower quality coal has worse outcomes health than coal of the quality referenced on the falsified certificates, has the Department sought any advice or undertaken any analysis of the cumulative health impacts of the poorer quality coal has been in importing countries such as South Korea? ?Has the National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA) advised of its plans for dealing with ALS's accreditation? ?Considering NATA failed to discover this occurring at ALS laboratories for around 13 years, does the Department have confidence in their ability to accredit labs? Is the Department satisfied that NATA has acted in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding with the Department? ?Has NATA advised the Department on any other steps being taken to assure their accreditation is rigorous enough? Australian Government ministers regularly claim that Australia's coal is cleaner than other countries. Can this statement be supported if the quality of exported coal has been regularly inflated for 13 years?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-66	Larissa Waters	Fracking exploration subsidies	The December 2020 MYEFO committed \$50M to gas companies fracking in the Beetaloo Basin, without details of how the money will be delivered and what criteria will be applied. ?What legal mechanisms will be used to deliver money to Beetaloo gas exploration? ?What criteria will apply? Will companies be required to demonstrate that a project would not go ahead without the subsidy? Or demonstrate that they are "fit and proper"? ?Will Origin and Santos be eligible for funding? Falcon Oil and Gas is 16% owned by a company (Lamesa S.A.) controlled by Viktor Vekselberg, who has been named and sanctioned by the US as a Russian 'oligarch'. ?Is the government aware of Mr Vekselberg's involvement with Falcon Oil and Gas? ?Will Falcon Oil and Gas or its Australian subsidiaries be eligible for any grants or government subsidies available in relation to Beetaloo projects? ?Does the Department have any policies or guidelines prohibiting funds being awarded to companies or related entities using secrecy jurisdictions like the Cayman Islands?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-67	Larissa Waters	Fracking roads subsidies	In January 2021, the Federal Government announced \$173.5M for the Northern Territory Gas Industry Roads Upgrades program to support fracking development in and around the Beetaloo Sub-Basin, through the Roads of Strategic Importance (ROSI) initiative. \$43M will also be contributed by the NT govt. The announcement indicated that the funds would be used to upgrade the Buchanan Highway, Western Creek Road and Gorrie Dry Creek Road. All three roads appear to go directly to petroleum tenements held by Pangaea Resources (EPs 167, 168, 198). These were not included in the key freight corridors or 50 other ROSI priority initiatives on their website. ?Do the announced roads satisfy the ROSI investment principles? If not, what justification was given for not following those principles ?What modelling has been done to demonstrate that these upgrades will improve freight movements on key corridors? ?What consultation was done with key stakeholders, including transport industry, First Nations peoples and pastoralists, prior to making the announcement?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-68	Larissa Waters	Hunter Gas Pipeline	Hunter Gas Pipeline Pty Ltd is the proponent of the proposed Queensland-Hunter gas pipeline from the Wallumbilla Gas Hub in Queensland to Newcastle. A significant shareholder Hunter Gas Pipeline Pty Ltd, Hilton Grugeon, is a Liberal party donor and has previously been found by NSW ICAC to have acted with the intention of evading bans on property developer donations. Garbis Simonian, the managing director and largest shareholder of Hunter Gas Pipeline Pty Ltd, is also a former Liberal donor, via his company Watou Holdings Pty Ltd. Mr Simonian has said publicly that he was in discussions with the government about underwriting the pipeline. ?Has the Federal Government had any discussion with Hunter Gas Pipeline Pty Ltd about the potential for the government to subsidise or underwrite the project? If so, when ere those discussions held and who was present at the meeting/s? ?Is the Department aware of Mr Grugeon and Mr Simonian's relationship with the Liberal party? ?Have any safeguards been put in place to manage conflicts of interest?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-69	Larissa Waters	Beetaloo	A CSIRO/Charles Darwin University study of the stygofauna species that live in the groundwater of the Beetaloo Sub-basin Northern Territory recently found evidence of connectivity between aquifers, including the major Cambrian Limestone Aquifer, and at least 11 new species of stygofauna. The study identified risk of contamination of this aquifer network by pollutants associated with shale gas and recommended a range of comprehensive additional environmental studies. ?Has CSIRO briefed the Federal or NT govt about the research? ?Will any additional conditions be imposed as a result of the research? ?Will CSIRO be seeking funding for the additional studies recommended in the report? ?Has CSIRO CSIRO made any recommendations or requests seeking a moratorium on further fracking activities while the additional research is undertaken?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	1/04/2021	
AI-70	Katy Gallagher	Staffing profile	1.Please provide a staffing profile for the agency as at 1 January 2021 and 01 April 2021 by: •APS ongoing: headcount and ASL; •APS non-ongoing: headcount and ASL; •Labour hire staff; headcount and FTE; and •Other contractors.; headcount and FTE 2.Please provide the percentage of staff engaged through labour hire arrangements as a percentage of total headcount. 3.Please provide the total value of labour-hire contracts entered into between 1 July 2020 and 31 December 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	
AI-71	Katy Gallagher	Working from home	1.How many requests to work from home on an ongoing basis has your agency received from staff since the Australian Public Service Commission published 'Circular 2020/9: Returning to Usual Workplaces' on 29 September 2020? 2.How many of these requests have been rejected and approved? Please outline the reasons that requests were rejected.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	1/04/2021	

AI-72	Malcolm Roberts	CSIRO's 28 October 2020 letter to Senator Roberts	October 2020 letter to me? 3. Is CSIRO aware of the statement about the Gain Function Plots in Marcott's 2013 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2019 letter to me that said: "The results suggest that at longer periods, more variability is preserved, with essentially no variability preserved at periods shorter than 300 years"? 4. Does CSIRO believe the process used in Marcott's 2013 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me can detect any changes with periods of less than 300 years? 5. Can CSIRO see that, on the basis of the Gain Function Plots, the process used in Marcott's 2013 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me cannot detect any changes with periods of less than 300 years? 6. If a daily minimum and maximum temperature are known, can the day's temperature be declared unprecedented by comparing it to the annual mean temperatures for 100 years? What is CSIRO's response to a claim that doing this would be absurd? 7. Does CSIRO agree that the statement in Marcott's 2013 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me that: "Our results indicate that global mean temperature for the decade 2000-2009 (34) has not yet exceeded the warmest temperatures of the early Holocene (5000 to 10,000 year B.P.). These temperatures are, however, warmer than 82% of the Holocene distribution as represented by the Standard 5 x 5 stack, or 72% after making plausible corrections for inherent smoothing of the high frequencies in the stack (6) (Fig. 3). In contrast, the decadal mean global temperature of the early 20th century (1900-1909) was cooler than >95% of the Holocene distribution under both the Standard 5 x 5 and high-frequency corrected scenarios. Global temperature, therefore, has risen from near the coldest to the warmest levels of the Holocene within the past century, reversing the long-term cooling trend that began ~5000 year B.P." Contains the logic that if a daily minimum and maximum temperature are known, the day's temperature can be declared unprecedented by comparing it to the annual mean temperatures for 100 years and is misleading? 8. Does CSIRO expect the apparent warming of the last 100 years to continue? And if so, on what specific logical scientific points does CSIRO expect it to continue? 9. In relation to the Lecavalier 2017 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me, is the Lecavalier 25 year temperature data serially correlated? 10. Does serial correlation effect the interpretation of least square means? 11. What length and rate of warming would CSIRO consider normal when exiting a Little Ice Age and 3 solar minimums? 12. Does CSIRO stand by the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me as supporting a recent unprecedented rate of temperature change? 13. Did CSIRO look in the public domain for prima facie evidence of issues with the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me? 14. Is CSIRO aware that the recent uptick in temperature in the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me occurs only in the Antarctic latitude band and no other latitude band? 15. Is CSIRO aware that the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me disagrees with PAGES 2k 2013 Antarctic reconstruction, which has no uptick in temperature? 16. Is CSIRO aware, in relation to the recent uptick in temperature in the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me, that only one of the 16 proxies in the Antarctic latitude band showed the uptick in temperature? 17. Is CSIRO aware, in relation to the recent uptick in temperature in the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me, that the one of the 16 proxies in the Antarctic latitude band that showed the uptick in temperature was a borehole? 18. Is CSIRO aware, in relation to the recent uptick in temperature in the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me, that while one of the 16 proxies (a borehole) in the Antarctic latitude band showed the uptick in temperature 15 other more reliable proxies (such as ice cores) did not? 19. Is CSIRO aware, in relation to the recent uptick in temperature in the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me, that while one of the 16 proxies (a borehole) in the Antarctic latitude band showed the uptick in temperature, the LawDome Dahl-Jensen 1999 paper did not show an uptick in the original borehole? 20. Is CSIRO aware, in relation to the recent uptick in temperature in the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me, that the error in importing the Dahl-Jensen borehole data was to miss the first data point and to load the remaining data points in the reverse time order? 21. What due diligence did CSIRO do on the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me before submitting that letter in answering my questions from October Additional Senate Estimates? Is CSIRO aware that in submitting its response to my questions for senate estimates that CSIRO misled the Senate? 22. Is CSIRO concerned that the Kaufman 2020 paper referenced in CSIRO's 28th October 2020 letter to me passed peer-	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	9/04/2021
AI-73	Kimberley Kitching	Services Australia	1.Did the department/agency engage with Services Australia in any capacity in the 2019-20 financial year? If yes, please provide full particulars. 2.Has the department/agency engaged with Services Australia in any capacity in the current financial year to 31 March 2021? If yes, please provide full particulars. 3.In the 2019-20 financial year, did the department/agency supply services or information to Services Australia? If yes, please provide full particulars. 4.In the current financial year to 31 March 2021, has the department/agency supplied services or information to Services Australia? If yes, please provide full particulars. 5.Does the department/agency employ technology or apps for users to access its services? If yes, did/does Services Australia have any involvement in the creation, development or ongoing maintenance of that technology or those apps? Please provide full particulars. 6.Does the department/agency receive data, statistics or research information from Services Australia? If yes, please provide full particulars.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	7/04/2021
AI-74	Kristina Keneally	Anthaygra Enterprises	With reference to contract notices CN3759101, CN3678411 and CN3497355, what services are being provided by Anthaygra Enterprises in the period April 2018 to April 2022 at a cost of \$1,681,900.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021
AI-75	Kristina Keneally	Executive Management	1.In relation to executive management for the Department and its agencies, can the following be provided for 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020: a.The total number of executive management positions b.The aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions. c.The change in the number of executive manager positions. d.The change in aggregate total remuneration payable for all executive management positions.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021
AI-76	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial functions	1.In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, can the following be provided: a.List of functions. b.List of all attendees. c.Function venue. d.Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). e.Details of any food served. f.Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage. g.Any available photographs of the function. h.Details of any entertainment provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021
AI-77	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial meals	1. In relation to any breakfasts, luncheons, dinners or other meals hosted by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, can the following be provided: a.List of dates and types of meals. b.List of all attendees. c.Function venue. d.Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). e.Details of any food served. f.Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage. g.Any available photographs of the function. h.Details of any entertainment provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021
AI-78	Kristina Keneally	Departmental functions	1.In relation to expenditure on any functions or official receptions etc hosted by the Department or agencies within the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, can the following be provided: a.List of functions. b.List of all attendees. c.Function venue. d.Itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). e.Details of any food served. f.Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage. g.Any available photographs of the function. h.Details of any entertainment provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021
AI-79	Kristina Keneally	Executive office upgrades	1.Have any furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or the offices of any Deputy Secretaries been upgraded for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided (GST inclusive).	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021

AI-80	Kristina Keneally	Facilities upgrades	1.Were there any upgrades to facility premises at any of the Departments or agencies for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. This includes but is not limited to: staff room refurbishments, kitchen refurbishments, bathroom refurbishments, the purchase of any new fridges, coffee machines, or other kitchen equipment. 2.If so, can a detailed description of the relevant facilities upgrades be provided together with an itemised list of costs (GST inclusive). 3.If so, can any photographs of the upgraded facilities be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-81	Kristina Keneally	Staff travel	1.What is the total cost of staff travel for departmental/agency employees for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-82	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home - follow up questions for the department	1.How many staff does the Department/agency have working in capital cities, including Canberra? 2.Are any Department staff based in rural or regional locations? a.How many? b.What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff? 3.How many staff worked-from-home each month from the Department/agency for the period October 2020 to March 2021? 4.Responding to question 2, the Department reported "a high level of activity" between February to June 2020 compared to preceding months and the same period in 2019, and that overall staff productivity increased while they worked remotely. Reasons for this productivity increase were provided and included time being regained from not needing to commute to the workplace and a greater focus on overall health and wellbeing being made possible. a.How will the Department maintain this high level of activity and productivity increase when the majority of staff return to working from their office? b.How has the Department increased focus on staff health and wellbeing? c.If the Department has staff based in rural/regional areas, has commute time decreased, remained static or increased for these staff? d.What opportunity exists for the Department to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID? 5.For question 3 the Department stated that the total number of personal/sick leave days should not be compared between months and years for 2019 and 2020 because of changes to "the machinery of government" in February 2020. Can the Department provide data and conclusions on whether personal/sick leave decreased, remained static or increased with a work-from-home workforce for each month of the lockdown compared to previous data for corresponding months in 2019 for staff that remained and were not part of the changes during this period?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-83	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home - follow up questions for AIMS	Follow-up questions on notice to QON BI-8: 1.How many staff does the agency have working in capital cities, including Canberra? 2.Are any agency staff based in rural or regional locations? a.How many? b.What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff? 3.How many staff worked-from-home each month from the agency for the period October 2020 to March 2021? 4.Responding to question 2, the agency reported that it has not formally measured productivity changes during the period of staff working from home. a.How does the agency formally measure productivity? b.How will the agency maintain task effort when staff return to working from the office? c.What opportunity exists for the Department to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID? 5.For question 3 the agency provided data which shows a 19.4 per cent increase in personal/sick leave taken during February to September 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this increase in personal/sick leave? a.How will the agency work to reduce the amount of personal/sick leave taken?	Australian Institute of Marine Science	20/04/2021	
AI-84	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home - follow up questions for ANSTO	Follow-up questions on notice to QON BI-8: 1.How many staff does the agency have working in capital cities, including Canberra? 2.Are any agency staff based in rural or regional locations? a.How many? b.What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff? 3.How many staff worked-from-home each month from the agency for the period October 2020 to March 2021? 4.Responding to question 2, the agency reported high productivity and greater focus on organisational objectives. a.How will the agency maintain task effort when staff return to working from the office? b.What opportunity exists for the Department to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID? 5.For question 3 the agency provided data which shows a 32.2 per cent decrease in personal/sick leave taken during February to September 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this decrease in personal/sick leave? a.How will the agency work to maintain the reduction in personal/sick leave taken?	Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation	20/04/2021	
AI-85	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home - follow up questions for CSIRO	Follow-up questions on notice to QON BI-8: 1.How many staff does the agency have working in capital cities, including Canberra? 2.Are any agency staff based in rural or regional locations? a.How many? b.What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff? 3.How many staff worked-from-home each month from the agency for the period October 2020 to March 2021? 4.Responding to question 2, the agency reported productivity has not reduced and may have increased. a.Can the agency determine if productivity did increase? b.How will the agency maintain productivity (or increased productivity if this occurred) when staff return to working from the office? c.What opportunity exists for the Department to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID? 5.For question 3 the agency provided data which shows a 16.4 per cent decrease in personal/sick leave taken during February to September 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this decrease in personal/sick leave? a.How will the agency work to maintain the reduction in personal/sick leave taken?	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	20/04/2021	
AI-86	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home - follow up questions for Geoscience Australia	Follow-up questions on notice to QON BI-8: 1.How many staff does the agency have working in capital cities, including Canberra? 2.Are any agency staff based in rural or regional locations? a.How many? b.What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff? 3.How many staff worked-from-home each month from the agency for the period October 2020 to March 2021? 4.Responding to question 2, the agency reported that it continued to deliver its programs and priorities with a high level of work maintained across programs and corporate functions. a.Can the agency determine if productivity increased? b.How will the agency maintain productivity (or increased productivity if this occurred) when staff return to working from the office? c.What opportunity exists for the Department to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID? 5.For question 3 the agency provided data which shows a 55.9 per cent decrease in personal/sick leave taken during February to September 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this decrease in personal/sick leave? a.How will the agency work to maintain the amount of reduced personal/sick leave taken?	Geoscience Australia	20/04/2021	
AI-87	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home - follow up questions for IP Australia	Follow-up questions on notice to QON BI-8: 1.How many staff does the agency have working in capital cities, including Canberra? 2.Are any agency staff based in rural or regional locations? a.How many? b.What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff? 3.How many staff worked-from-home each month from the agency for the period October 2020 to March 2021? 4.Responding to question 2, the agency provided links to the organisation's Portfolio Budget Statements, Corporate Plan and Annual Report, as well as the Customer Service Charter. a.Can the agency provide a summary of staff productivity across its activities? b.Did the agency's productivity decrease, remain static or increase during the work-from-home period during February 2020 through to October 2020? c.How will the agency maintain productivity (or increased productivity if this occurred) when staff return to working from the office? d.What opportunity exists for the Department to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID? 5.For question 3 the agency provided data which shows a 25.7 per cent decrease in personal/sick leave taken during February to September 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this decrease in personal/sick leave? a.How will the agency work to maintain the reduction in personal/sick leave taken?	IP Australia	20/04/2021	

AI-88	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home - follow up questions for NOPSEMA	Follow-up questions on notice to QON BI-8: 1.How many staff does the agency have working in capital cities, including Canberra? 2.Are any agency staff based in rural or regional locations? a.How many? b.What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff? 3.How many staff worked-from-home each month from the agency for the period October 2020 to March 2021? 4.Responding to question 2, the agency reported greater capacity within the agency due to an increase in work hours and reduction in unscheduled absences, but that it was difficult to draw conclusions on the impact on productivity due to data limitations. a.Can the agency determine if staff productivity increased? b.How will the agency maintain productivity (or increased productivity if this occurred) when staff return to working from the office? c.What opportunity exists for the Department to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID? 5.For question 3 the agency provided data which shows a 15.9 per cent decrease in personal/sick leave taken during February to September 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this decrease in personal/sick leave? a.How will the agency work to maintain the reduction in personal/sick leave taken?	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority	20/04/2021	
AI-89	Bridget McKenzie	Working from home - follow up questions for NAIF	1.How many staff does the agency have working in capital cities, including Canberra? 2.Are any agency staff based in rural or regional locations? a.How many? b.What percentage do capital city based-staff make-up of your workforce compared to rural- and regional-based staff? 3.How many staff worked-from-home each month from the agency for the period October 2020 to March 2021? 4.Responding to question 2, the agency has not commented on whether productivity declined, remained static or increased. a.Can the agency determine if staff productivity increased, remained static or declined? b.How will the agency maintain productivity (or increased productivity if this occurred) when staff return to working from the office, or alternatively, improve productivity if it declined during the work-from-home period? c.What opportunity exists for the Department to decentralise from city locations given staff have been able to work from home during COVID? 5.For question 3 the agency provided data which shows a 140.4 per cent increase in personal/sick leave taken during February to September 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. What are the reasons for this increase in personal/sick leave? a.How will the agency work to reduce that amount of personal/sick leave taken?	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility	20/04/2021	
AI-90	Kristina Keneally	Legal costs	1.What are the total legal costs for the Department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-91	Kristina Keneally	Secretarial travel	1.Can an itemised list of the costs of all domestic and international travel undertaken by the Secretary of the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 be provided including: a.Flights for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the airline and class of travel. b.Ground transport for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials. c.Accommodation for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed. d.Meals and other incidentals for the Secretary as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided. e.Any available photographs documenting the Secretary's travel should also be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-92	Kristina Keneally	Briefings to independents and minor parties	1.Has the Department/agency or the Minister's office provided briefings to independents/minor parties in the Senate or House of Representatives. If so, can the following be provided: a.The subject matter of the briefing. b.The location and date of the briefing. c.Who proposed the briefing. d.Attendees of the briefing by level/position	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-93	Kristina Keneally	Acting Minister arrangements	1.Can the Department provide all leave periods of the portfolio Minister from 24 August 2018 to date. 2.Can the Department further provide acting Minister arrangements for each leave period.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-94	Kristina Keneally	Departmental staff allowances	1.Can a list of Departmental/agency allowances and reimbursements available to employees be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-95	Kristina Keneally	Market research	1.Does the Department/agency undertake any polling or market research in relation to government policies or proposed policies. 2.If so, can the Department provide an itemised list of: a.Subject matter b.Company c.Costs each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 d.Contract date period 3.Can the Department/agency advise what, if any, research was shared with the Minister or their office and the date and format in which this occurred.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-96	Kristina Keneally	Advertising and information campaigns	1.What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on advertising and information campaigns for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. 2.What advertising and information campaigns did the Department/agency run in each relevant period. For each campaign, please provide: a.When approval was first sought. b.The date of approval, including whether the advertising went through the Independent Campaign Committee process. c.the timeline for each campaign, including any variation to the original proposed timeline. 3.Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all advertising and information campaign contracts in each period be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-97	Kristina Keneally	Promotional merchandise	1.What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on promotional merchandise for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. 2.Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all promotional merchandise contracts in that period please be provided. 3.Can photographs or samples of relevant promotional merchandise please be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-98	Kristina Keneally	Collateral materials	1.What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on collateral materials, including banners, publications, maps, charts and high visibility or protective clothing for events, functions, conferences, meetings, press conferences and site visits, including Ministerial events, functions, conferences, meetings, press conferences and site visits for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. 2.For each event or function where the Department/agency expended funds on collateral materials, provide details of the event, including the date and location of each event, and details of the types of materials.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	



AI-99	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial overseas travel	1.Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all international travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 please be provided including: a.Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, together with the airline and class of travel. b.Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. c.Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed. d.Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided. e.Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-100	Kristina Keneally	Ministerial domestic travel	1.Can an itemised list of the costs met by the department or agency for all domestic travel undertaken by Ministers or Assistant Ministers in the portfolio for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 please be provided including: a.Flights for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, together with the airline and class of travel. b.Ground transport for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. c.Accommodation for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials, and identify the hotels the party stayed at and the room category in which the party stayed. d.Meals and other incidentals for the Minister and any accompanying members of the Minister's personal staff or family members, as well as any accompanying departmental officials. Any available menus, receipts for meals at restaurants and the like should also be provided. e.Any available photographs documenting the Minister's travel should also be provided	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-101	Kristina Keneally	Social media influencers	1.What was the Department/agency's total expenditure on social media influencers for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. 2.What advertising or information campaigns did the Department/agency use social media influencers to promote. 3.Can a copy of all relevant social media influencer posts please be provided. 4.Can an itemised list of all Austender Contract Notice numbers for all relevant social media influencer contracts please be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-102	Kristina Keneally	Commissioned Reports and Reviews	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many Reports or Reviews have been commissioned. Please provide details of each report including: a.Date commissioned. b.Date report handed to Government. c.Date of public release. d.Terms of Reference. e.Committee members and/or Reviewers. 2.How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost. 3.The background and credentials of the Review personnel. 4.The remuneration arrangements applicable to the Review personnel, including fees, disbursements and travel 5.The cost of any travel attached to the conduct of the Review. 6.How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level. 7.What is the current status of each report. When is the Government intending to respond to each report if it has not already done so.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-103	Kristina Keneally	Board appointments	1.Provide an update of portfolio boards, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members. 2.What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio 3.Please detail any board appointments made from 30 June 2020 to date. 4.What has been the total value of all Board Director fees and disbursements paid. 5.What is the value of all domestic travel by Board Directors. 6.What is the value of all international travel by Board Directors.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-104	Kristina Keneally	Stationery	1.How much has been spent on ministerial stationery requirements in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-105	Kristina Keneally	Media monitoring	1.What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to each Minister's office for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. a.Which agency or agencies provided these services. b.Can an itemised list of Austender Contract notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided c.What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2020-21. 2.What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. a.Which agency or agencies provided these services. b.Can an itemised list of Austender Contract Notice numbers for any media monitoring contracts in each period please be provided c.What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year FY 2020-21.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-106	Kristina Keneally	Communications staff	1.For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following: 2.By Department or agency: a.How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location. b.How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location. c.How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location. d.How many are graphic designers. e.How many are media managers. f.How many organise events. 3.Do any departments/agencies have independent media studios. a.If yes, why. b.When was it established. c.What is the set up cost. d.What is the ongoing cost. e.How many staff work there and what are their classifications.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-107	Kristina Keneally	Departmental staff in Minister's office	1.Can the Department provide an update on the total number of departmental staff seconded to ministerial offices, including: a.Duration of secondment. b.APS level. 2.Can the Department provide an update on the total number of DLOs/CLOs for ministerial offices including APS level.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-108	Kristina Keneally	CDDA Payments	1.How many claims have been received under the Compensation for Detriment caused by Defective Administration scheme (CDDA) by the Department for each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020? 2.How many claims were: a.Accepted. b.Rejected. c.Under consideration. 3.Of the accepted claims, can the Department provide: a.Details of the claim, subject to relevant privacy considerations b.The date payment was made c.The decision maker.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-109	Kristina Keneally	Congestion busting	1.Can the Department/agency advise how it is "congestion busting" in relation to bureaucratic bottlenecks and regulatory bottlenecks. 2.Have any additional resources been allocated within the Department to achieve "congestion busting" within the department.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	

AI-110	Kristina Keneally	Recruitment	1.What amount has been expended by the department/agency on external recruitment or executive search services in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. 2.Which services were utilised. Can an itemised list be provided.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-111	Kristina Keneally	Staffing	1.How many full-time equivalent staff are engaged at each of 30 June 2019 and 30 June 2020 10 November 2020. 2.How many of these positions are (a) on-going and (b) non-ongoing. 3.How many redundancies have occurred in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. How many were: a. voluntary b.involuntary. 4.How many of those redundancies occurred as a result of departmental restructuring. What is the total cost of those redundancies. 5. What was the total value in dollar terms of all termination payments paid to exiting staff. 6.How much overtime or equivalent has been paid to staff in each of the 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020. 7.How many section 37 notices under the Public Service Act 1999 have been offered in each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020 to date.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-112	Kristina Keneally	Comcare	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, can the Department advise whether it has been the subject of any investigations involving Comcare. If yes, please provide details of the circumstances and the status. 2.Can the Department advise the number of sanctions it has received from Comcare in the each of the periods; 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-113	Kristina Keneally	Fair Work Commission	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Commission within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-114	Kristina Keneally	Fair Work Ombudsman	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many references have been made to the Fair Work Ombudsman within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-115	Kristina Keneally	Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many references have been made to the Office of the Merit Protection Commissioner within the Department or agency.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-116	Kristina Keneally	Public Interest Disclosures	1.For each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020, how many public interest disclosures have been received.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-117	Kristina Keneally	Travel and expense claim policy	1Please produce a copy of all travel and expense claim policies. 2Please produce a copy of all claim forms. If the forms are digital, please provide a screen shot of each section, including all dropdown options.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-118	Kristina Keneally	Declarations of interest	1Please produce a copy of all relevant policies. 2Please produce a copy of the register of declarations of interest as at 10 November 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-119	Kristina Keneally	Declarations of gifts and hospitality	1Please produce a copy of all relevant policies. 2Please produce a copy of the register of declarations of gifts as at 10 November 2020.	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-120	Alex Gallacher	Greensill Capital	1.Has (a) the Minister for Industry, Christian Porter, or his office; (b) the former Minister for Industry, Karen Andrews, or her office; or (c) the Department of Industry, received any communications from Ms Julie Bishop in connection with the commercial interests of Greensill Capital? If so: a.Provide a copy of the correspondence. b.What dates was the correspondence received? c.Did the Minister and/or the Department provide a response to the correspondence? Provide a copy of the correspondence. 2.Has the Minister for Industry, Christian Porter, or his office ever met with Lex Greensill, or a representative of Greensill Capital? a.If so, what date was the meeting held? b.Who attended the meeting? c.Where was the meeting held? d.What was discussed at the meeting? 3.Has the former Minister for Industry, Karen Andrews, or her office ever met with Lex Greensill, or a representative of Greensill Capital? a.If so, what date was the meeting held? b.Who attended the meeting? c.Where was the meeting held? d.What was discussed at the meeting? 4.Has the Department of Industry ever met with Lex Greensill, or a representative of Greensill Capital? a.If so, what date was the meeting held? b.Who attended the meeting? c.Where was the meeting held? d.What was discussed at the meeting? 5.Has the Minister for Industry, Christian Porter, or his office ever met with Ms Julie Bishop regarding Greensill Capital? a.If so, what date was the meeting held? b.Who attended the meeting? c.Where was the meeting held? d.What was discussed at the meeting? 6.Has the former Minister for Industry, Karen Andrews, or her office ever met with Ms Julie Bishop regarding Greensill Capital? a.If so, what date was the meeting held? b.Who attended the meeting? c.Where was the meeting held? d.What was discussed at the meeting?	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	21/04/2021	

AI-121	Kristina Keneally	FOI	<p>1.Please list the number of Freedom of Information Act requests ('FOI requests') received by the Department for the following years: a.2013-14; b.2014-15; c.2015-16; d.2016-17; e.2018-19; 2019-20, and; f.2020-21 to date. 2.For each year above, please provide: a.The number of FOI requests the Department granted in full; b.The number of FOI requests the Department granted in part; c.The number of FOI requests the Department refused in full; and d.The number of FOI requests the Department refused for practical reasons under the Freedom of Information Act. 3.For each year above, please also provide: a.The number of times the Department failed to make any decision on a FOI request within the 30 day statutory period; and b.The number of times a request to the Department resulted in a practical refusal (i.e. no decision was made on the request). 4.For each year above, please also provide: a.The number of times the Department's FOI decisions have been appealed to the OAIc; and b.The number of times has the OAIc overturned – in whole or in part – the Department's decision to refuse access to material. 5.Please provide the staffing (both ASL and headcount) of staff at the Department who work exclusively on FOI requests, broken down by APS level (e.g. three EL1s, four APS6s, one SES) for each of the following years: a.2013-14; b.2014-15; c.2015-16; d.2016-17; e.2018-19; f.2019-20, and; g.2020-21 to date. 6.For each of the years above, please also list the number of officers who are designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Department. 7.In the past 12 months, has the Department seconded additional resources to processing Freedom of Information requests? If so, please detail those resources by APS level. 8.Please provide the number of officers who are currently designated decision makers under the Freedom of Information Act 1982 within the Minister's office. 9.Please provide the number of FOI requests currently under consideration by the Department. Please also provide the number of these requests that are currently overdue in response. 10.Does the department consult or inform the Minister when it receives Freedom of Information requests? If so: a.How many times has this occurred in the past twelve months; and b.Please outline the process by which the Department consults the Minister. 11.Has the Department consulted or informed another Department or agency about any FOI request in the past twelve months. If so, please provide the legal basis on which that consultation occurred (e.g. third party consultation, transfer of request).</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	
AI-122	Kristina Keneally	Departmental equipment	<p>What was the estimated value of all Departmental equipment that was lost, damaged, stolen or written off during each of the periods 1 July 2019-31 December 2019; 1 January 2020-30 June 2020; 1 July 2020-31 December 2020.</p>	Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources	20/04/2021	