

PDR No	QoN Number	Question Submitted By	Group Responsible	Subject	Full Question Text	Spoken/Written	Hansard Page	Question Date	Responsible Minister
SQ17-000441	Si-1	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Private sector component of external revenue	Senator KIM CARR: What I want to know is: of the \$80 million, how many of those are actually private companies and how much are the UN and various other government agencies? Mr Munyard: I don't have those figures on me. Senator KIM CARR: But what we can say with certainty is that only \$87 million—with certainty—of the \$484 million is actually the private sector? Mr Munyard: No, the feel would be higher than that. Senator KIM CARR: How much higher? Mr Munyard: I would have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: You do that. It's important to get a precise figure, because, when Dr Marshall talks about the private sector market forces, what we're actually talking about here is a very small percentage of the external revenue that is actually the private sector. These are all other government agencies—public agencies. Dr Marshall: But some parts of our business are far more exposed to the private sector—for example, Minerals, because they work primarily with the private sector—whereas other parts, such as Land and Water, work primarily with government departments or the World Bank. Senator KIM CARR: I'm happy to concede that. But the whole notion about you being a market-facing agency is nonsense. You're dependent upon public investment, whether it's through the states and territories or it's through various other government agencies. You are not a private consultancy firm, no matter how much you try to be. Dr Marshall: I don't think we've ever aspired to be a consultancy firm of any kind, but I think you'd have to agree that working with foreign governments to the practical extent is almost indistinguishable from working with foreign companies, possibly harder—Senator KIM CARR: If you can give me the precise figure on what exactly the private sector component of the external revenue is, I'd appreciate that.	Spoken	58	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000442	Si-2	Brockman, Slade	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Reproducing existing studies	Senator BROCKMAN: One issue that's always interested me, and I'm happy for you to take this on notice if you don't want to answer it here today—I'm sure you're aware of some of the reproducibility studies that have gone on where they've looked at previous scientific work, tried to reproduce it, haven't been able to or have had significant failure rates. There has been some in psychology research, which has shown 60 per cent plus, and some in much more basic research, which probably surprised people more, where in preclinical drug research they were finding 50 per cent plus failure to reproduce. Obviously, that can work both ways; you could have false positives as well as false negatives. I'm wondering if CSIRO has given any thought to this issue and whether it devotes any of its funding towards the issue of reproducing existing studies? Dr Marshall: Senator, everything that CSIRO publishes of a scientific nature, when we publish scientific results, goes through, essentially, a two stage process. It is almost like the three layers of defence in health and safety, for example. It goes through a rigorous internal review first, before it's released, and then it's reviewed rigorously, externally, prior to publication. If you'd like a little bit more detail on that, the head of Science Excellence is here at the back. I can have him just briefly give you details. Senator BROCKMAN: If you could take that on notice and just take me through that issue. Thank you.	Spoken	61	1/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000443	Si-3	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO submission to the Australia Climate Science Capability Review	Senator KIM CARR: Dr Marshall, CSIRO participated with the Academy of Science in the Australian climate science capability review—that's correct, isn't it? Dr Marshall: I'm aware of the academy's review. I'm not exactly sure which parts of our organisation participated, but perhaps, if it is important, Dr Mayfield can answer that. I'm aware of the review—if that serves the purpose of the question. Dr Mayfield: I am also aware of the review. In terms of our participation, I would have to take that on notice, but it would have been an opportunity for some of our scientists to participate as individuals, as well as to make other representations. Can I say, our chief scientist, Dr Anita Hill, was made a fellow of the Academy of Science this year, so we are very proud of her. Senator KIM CARR: Congratulations. So, are you telling me you're not certain of CSIRO's involvement? Is that what you're saying to me—you're not certain of what the involvement was? Dr Mayfield: In terms of formal CSIRO involvement, at this point in time, I would have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Did you write a submission? Dr Mayfield: I can just check. Dr Marshall: We'll get Dr Jack Steel to answer these questions. Dr Steele: I believe there was a formal submission from the CSIRO. I make the observation, as well, that a number of our scientists would have participated in the academy's deliberations in relation to this, and we have an expectation that those scientists, as they do that, do that as individual scientists as well as keeping in mind the CSIRO. Senator KIM CARR: But you did write a submission. Dr Steele: There was a submission, I believe. Senator KIM CARR: Can I have a copy of it? Dr Steele: Sure, no problem at all.	Spoken	61-62	1/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000444	Si-4	Macdonald, Ian	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	One-degree fall in the sea surface temperature	Senator IAN MACDONALD: Rather than answering on notice, if you wanted to send the appropriate person round just to explain to me, I'd be interested in the impact of this one-degree fall in the sea surface temperature in parts of the Barrier Reef—and certainly in the Coral Sea, which I assume has a big influence on temperatures on the Great Barrier Reef. Could you, as a question on notice, perhaps give me a note on that, and perhaps privately, if you could send someone around to explain the impact of those lowering temperatures. Dr Mayfield: We'd be very happy to arrange a briefing with the appropriate scientist.	Spoken	68	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000445	Si-5	Carr, Kim	Office of the Chief Scientist	Cost of Finkel Review	Senator KIM CARR: I'm wondering if you could tell me how much your review cost. Dr Finkel: I don't know. Senator KIM CARR: Who does? Dr Finkel: It was all funded by the Department of the Environment and Energy. I was invited—not necessarily as the Chief Scientist—to chair it, and a panel was put together. I personally, of course, got no remuneration, because I'm a full-time employee of the government. The task force was put together from, primarily, staff from the Department of the Environment and Energy. There was an expression of interest that went out, and others came in as well. That task force was around 15 people. So the cost of the task force, the cost of the modelling from Jacobs—we also got some security and reliability engineering modelling done by the Melbourne Energy Institute—and the cost of a single trip overseas to meet the jurisdiction regulators in a number of European and American jurisdictions all would have been covered by the department, and then there was the domestic travel to do the consultations. Senator KIM CARR: Sure. So you don't have an idea of a budget at all? Dr Finkel: No. CHAIR: I think Dr Finkel's answered that question and it's probably better placed to a different committee. Senator KIM CARR: Can you take that on notice? Dr Finkel: I'll take it on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you.	Spoken	81	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000446	Si-6	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Distribution of material on science awards	Senator KIM CARR: You recently distributed some material on science awards. Was that distributed through the industry department's networks or was that sent out through you—Senator Cash: I'd have to check for you. Senator KIM CARR: Is anyone else able to help me with that? Mr Schwager: I would have to check the exact distribution. I don't have the detail in front of me as to what was done on that particular occasion.	Spoken	83	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000447	Si-7	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Distribution of media material	Senator KIM CARR: How often is it the case, Minister, that material is distributed through your employment media advisers, and how often is it the case that material is distributed through the Industry, Innovation and Science media office? Senator Cash: I'd need to take that on notice.	Spoken	83	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000448	Si-8	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Minister's Office staffing	Senator KIM CARR: I just don't want to be confused. Is there a former departmental officer in the chief of staff's role? Mr Schwager: No. Senator KIM CARR: And there was a departmental officer acting in that capacity? Mr Schwager: Yes. Senator KIM CARR: Up until when? Mr Schwager: Relatively recently, there was a period—I'd have to check the exact dates, Senator. I don't have them. Senator KIM CARR: After Minister Sinodinos went on leave, was there a change in the staffing arrangement? Ms Weston: I think there was a period where the chief of staff was on leave, hence the acting arrangements. I don't think it really related to Senator Sinodinos's leave. Senator KIM CARR: How many personal staff are in Minister Sinodinos's office? Mr Schwager: I can get that information. Senator KIM CARR: We have a list of those people. I assume I can get that from a government directory, but is that list still operating? Mr Schwager: I would have to check that, actually.	Spoken	84	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000449	Si-9	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	NISA measures requiring legislation	Senator KIM CARR: Thank you, Mr Wilson. Ms Kay, you mentioned there were three items requiring legislation. Ms Kay: Yes. Senator KIM CARR: With a story? What were those three? Ms Kay: Those were access to company losses. Legislation was introduced into the House on 30 March this year on that. Similarly with intangible asset depreciation, legislation was also introduced into the House on 30 March. And then there is bankruptcy and insolvency reforms. Senator KIM CARR: Where's the legislation at for them? Ms Kay: Legislation for those is being prepared by the Treasury, so you'd need to direct any further questions to them. Senator KIM CARR: But it hasn't been introduced yet? Ms Kay: Not as yet. Senator KIM CARR: For the two pieces that were introduced on 30 March, what stage are they up to in the House of Representatives? Ms Kay: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: But they haven't gone through the House of Representatives? Ms Kay: Not as yet.	Spoken	95	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash

SQ17-000450	Si-10	Carr, Kim	Portfolio Policy and Innovation Strategy	Release of the Government's response to the 3F's review	Senator KIM CARR: Who's responsible for the management of this program, ministerially, now? Which of the ministerial officers is responsible for this program? Senator CASH: I am. Senator KIM CARR: I see. In the previous estimates Minister Sinodinos said that the government's response to the 3F's review would be released by the end of the year. Is that still the case? Senator CASH: As I'm advised, the government is currently considering its response to the review's recommendations and we will provide our response in due course. Senator KIM CARR: Minister Sinodinos was quite specific. He said, 'Yes, they would be provided by the end of the year.' Senator CASH: I'll take that on notice to see if that's changed at all.	Spoken	97	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000451	Si-11	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	R&D Tax Incentive audits and claims	Ms Clough: No, we do have specific things that we look for. I'll give you an example. It might be based on a company's history in the program. If, for example, the ISA board has made a finding that R&D activity for a particular income year has been found to be ineligible, that might be a flag for any future applications for registration that a company might put in. Senator KIM CARR: Right. So how many audits have been undertaken in the year 2016-17? Ms Clough: I think we'd have to take that one on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Sure. I expect that. If you could, please, can you give me a breakdown by the type of sector and how many investigations are currently underway? Ms Clough: I'll take that on notice, Senator. Senator KIM CARR: Because, if there are concerns—and you've indicated some of the areas—there's some discrepancy in the claimed amounts—how widespread are these concerns? Ms Clough: The concerns are really drawn from both administration agencies' experiences. It is not something the department of industry does alone. We work very much with the Australian Taxation Office. They also have their own processes for identifying those companies for the tax claims which are more risky than others. I don't have those details. That's something that you would need to ask the Australian Taxation Office. Senator KIM CARR: Could you take them on notice, please. I'm also interested—you gave me some figures for 2015-16 in regard to the offset; do you have those same figures for 2016-17? Ms Kosciuk: Yes. And I would just like to correct the record. You were talking about targets before; I was really talking about forecaster targets. In our PBS we have ones for the past year, for 2016-17, and that is the 19.2 billion, and that does relate to the figures that I provided to you before. So there aren't any future targets or current-year targets. Senator KIM CARR: Alright. Thank you for that. Ms Kosciuk: Apologies about that. For the 2016-17 income year, which is incomplete, we have 3,285 registrations to date. And did you ask about the refundable? Senator KIM CARR: Yes. Ms Kosciuk: And the refundable is 3,050. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Are you able to give to me the breakdown, say, for claims over a million, over two million, over three million? Are you able to do that? Ms Clough: No, Senator. We would have to take that one on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Of course. Yes, take it on notice, please. How many claimed under a million? Ms Kosciuk: I'd have to take that on notice. It's a growing part of the program.	Spoken	98-99	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000452	Si-12	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Market sounding for elements of the NMI	Senator KIM CARR: Did the department conduct a market sounding in 2015 to sell off elements of the National Measurement Institute? Dr Smith: I will ask Sue Weston to answer that. Ms Weston: Over recent time, there have been a number of activities to look at the sustainability of the National Measurement Institute. One of those was market sounding. Senator KIM CARR: Market sounding did occur? Ms Weston: Yes, it did. Senator KIM CARR: What elements of the Measurement Institute were considered for sale or disposal? Ms Weston: I will ask my colleagues to give you the detail, but there were a number of our analytical services areas that were looked at. I will ask Dr Warrington to answer. Dr Warrington: The areas in scope for the markets-only exercise were our analytical chemistry and microbiology services, including specialist services. Senator KIM CARR: What's the nature of the market sounding then? Dr Warrington: It's an investigation of whether there are alternative delivery models for those services where the private sector would take up some or all of the delivery. Senator KIM CARR: So privatisation? Dr Warrington: A range of options from full privatisation to government owned but commercially operated—so a range of different operating models. Senator KIM CARR: And who was consulted about the privatisation? Dr Warrington: There were a selected series of existing providers, dominantly commercial. Senator KIM CARR: Would you advise the committee who they were? Dr Warrington: There was a list of six or seven. It may be easier if I provide a copy of the market sounding report on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, that will be very good. Thank you. And, if you could, who actually undertook the market soundings? Dr Warrington: The agency that oversaw the market sounding process was KPMG. Senator KIM CARR: Right. I take it that was a consultancy, was it? Dr Warrington: That's correct. Senator KIM CARR: How much did that cost? Mrs Urquhart: Senator, that was \$141,349.13, GST inclusive. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you for providing the report.	Spoken	100	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000453	Si-13	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Ministerial approval of NMI Market Sounding	Senator KIM CARR: Sure. I understand the problem. But, Minister, was it a government decision to initiate this process? Senator CASH: In relation to? Senator KIM CARR: The privatisation of the National Measurement Institute. Senator CASH: I think it was the possible transition of the NMI to ANSTO—is that what you are referring to? Senator KIM CARR: No. I want to know about the privatisation, this market sounding. Who took the initiative? It was a government decision? Mrs Urquhart: Senator, the department undertook the initiative to do market sounding to test private sector interest in the analytical services that the National Measurement Institute offers. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. But the department does not go off and sound out the market for the privatisation of one of its department's divisions without ministerial approval. Is that the case, Ms Weston? Ms Weston: I need to confirm the record, but I feel fairly confident that we would have briefed the minister on that. Senator KIM CARR: Of course you would have. Who was the minister at the time? I know there have been a few. Ms Weston: Sorry, I will need to take that on notice for the exact timing. Senator KIM CARR: Yes. If you would, please. Can you tell me whether or not that went to cabinet? Ms Weston: I'll take that on notice, too. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you.	Spoken	101	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000454	Si-14	Carr, Kim	National Measurement Institute	NMI Statement of Expectations	Senator KIM CARR: There's been a statement of expectations issued to you? Dr Warrington: That's correct. Senator KIM CARR: When was that issued? Dr Warrington: I believe in 2016. I should know that answer. Senator KIM CARR: There's nothing since that time? Dr Warrington: That's correct. So there has been no update to the statement of expectations that was originally issued by the secretary—that's right. That's the former secretary. Senator KIM CARR: Is that publicly available? Dr Warrington: I would have to take that on notice to be sure whether we have— Senator KIM CARR: All right, but could you provide a copy of that statement, please. Dr Warrington: Certainly.	Spoken	101-102	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000455	Si-15	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Valuation of the Lindfield site	Senator KIM CARR: Madam Secretary, has the department or any of the agencies within the department sought or received a valuation on the Lindfield site? Dr Smith: I'd have to ask one of my colleagues for that. I can't answer that question. Ms Weston: The Lindfield site is managed by CSIRO, so the department wouldn't have done a valuation— Senator KIM CARR: You're not aware of any valuations? Ms Weston: I'd have to take that on notice. But obviously we continue to work with our landlord, who's CSIRO, in relation to that site, in terms of our property relationship. Senator KIM CARR: So you're not aware that there's been any valuation on that site? Ms Weston: Unless my colleagues have a view, but I don't think I have that knowledge. Dr Warrington: I'm not personally aware. I know CSIRO are actively considering their use of the site, and we continue to work closely with them, but I'm not directly aware of a recent valuation. Senator KIM CARR: Can you confirm that they've received a valuation, with the value of the site being a billion dollars? Ms Weston: I haven't heard that number. I'm certainly happy to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. But the department has not sought a valuation. You say you work closely with the CSIRO, but you have not sought a valuation? Ms Weston: Not to my knowledge. Senator KIM CARR: If you could take on notice— Ms Weston: I will take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: whether the department or any of its agencies, including the CSIRO, has sought a valuation or received a valuation.	Spoken	103	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000456	Si-16	Xenophon, Nick	Industry Growth	Consultation with South Australian Government regarding innovation lab	Senator XENOPHON: Closely related to those questions about the Victorian government, can you also provide details of the consultation you've had with the South Australian government, the level of cooperation between the two governments and provide details of any documents, correspondence or emails that relate to the innovation lab and where that lab may be in South Australia. Dr Richards: We'll take it on notice.	Spoken	107	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash

SQ17-000457	Si-17	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Growth centres travel allocation	<p>Senator KIM CARR: There are some other questions on notice regarding the growth centres, because the answers I got back were only half answered, particularly around who the consultants were—BI-132: I'll put that back on notice as there's a series of questions there. The food and agribusiness: there's travel—\$352,000; I'm interested to know further details on that. Nine people are employed in the growth centre—that's \$40,000 per person. What's the travel allocation—can you indicate that for me, please? So I'll ask a series of questions on those, if I could. Mr Lawson: We'll take those on notice, but I know the FIAL growth centre has a large engagement in export promotion, and so—Senator KIM CARR: So it's international travel? Mr Lawson: there will be international travel involved in it.</p>	Spoken	109	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaela Cash
SQ17-000458	Si-18	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Government's response to the Senate inquiry into the automotive industry	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The government's response to the Senate inquiry into the automotive industry was released after a return to order. The final report was tabled in 2015 and it took some time for the government to respond—as I say, only then following a return to order. Was the response to the Senate report prepared by the department? Dr Richards: It was an interdepartmental response. There were several departments with responsibilities. Senator KIM CARR: There would have been a response prepared by the department? Dr Richards: We coordinated that IDC. Senator KIM CARR: When was that delivered to the minister's office? Dr Richards: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you—and the date on which that was delivered, and the date on which it was finally cleared by the minister's office. Page 3 of the response says: 'The government will review the administrative regulations that impact on businesses in an ongoing, such as re-registering for the ATS, or changing registration categories from a Motor Vehicle Producer to an Automotive Services Provider ... In previous estimates I have asked questions regarding this matter and I've been advised there's no need for changes to the regulations. Is that still the advice the department is providing? Do the MVPs need to change, in terms of their status, now that they're obviously moving into R&D? Are there any regulatory changes required for them to be able to be registered as service providers? Dr Richards: No, we were looking at some administrative changes to reduce the burden on the information collected as part of that but no changes to the regulations. Senator KIM CARR: So what changes are you looking at? Dr Richards: The information that's collected in terms of a re-registration proposal and the like, as to what information the department needs to collect to allow the minister to make a decision on those. Senator KIM CARR: When will that be available? Dr Richards: We're taking some advice at the moment on that. We don't have a timetable on the delivery of those administrative changes. Ms Facey: There is no barrier to them applying as service providers. They can still apply. I think my colleague is talking about trying to improve the process, rather than it being a barrier. Senator KIM CARR: I appreciate that, but the question goes to when will you have the regulatory changes available, or implemented—presumably they're disallowable and all those matters—when will you intend to publish those changes in regard to the administrative arrangements which you say lessen the burden in terms of data collection? Dr Richards: The administrative arrangements are the guidances provided by the department, not the regulation, so there is no change to legislation required. Senator KIM CARR: When will those changes you are proposing be available to the companies? Dr Richards: We don't have a timetable on that at the moment. We are working through those. Senator KIM CARR: How long do you think it will take? You have been working on this for a while now? What's the holdup? Dr Richards: We are taking advice on some of that guidance material. It's not a lengthy period but we can take that on notice and come back with an answer. I'll need to work with my colleagues—Senator KIM CARR: Mr Richards, this has been known for a while. I have been asking questions about this for a couple of years, so why hasn't it been done? Dr Richards: I thought the questions were on regulatory changes. Senator KIM CARR: I have been asking about the regulatory changes required for service providers. You say they're not necessary. You then go on to say there will be changes to the administrative arrangements to lessen the administrative burden. So you have been thinking about this for some time, and you have been saying this for some time—is that not the case? Dr Richards: We have been looking at ways to simplify the application process, but that doesn't change the regulations. Senator KIM CARR: No, but you are changing the reporting requirements? Dr Richards: Of information provision to enable us to make a decision. Senator KIM CARR: And you have been thinking about that for some time—is that correct? Dr Richards: Yes. As with any legislation, you'll continually look for—Senator KIM CARR: So it requires legislation? Dr Richards: As with the implementation of any legislation, you will look at ways to reduce regulatory burden in responding to that. Senator KIM CARR: Are you telling me that it requires a legislative change? Dr Richards: No. Senator KIM CARR: So what's the hold-up in getting the administrative change? Mr Lawson: There is no hold-up. It's simply a matter of making sure that, if we reduce the guidelines and simplify Senator KIM CARR: I want to go to the issue that has been given some publicity in recent times, and that's the amount of support that General Motors received through the automotive programs. Between 2001 and 2012, various reports have cited a figure of \$1.836 billion. Does that concur with your records? It's certainly the figure that was published in the Productivity Commission reports. There it is there; yes. Mr Lawson: So the Productivity Commission—are they publishing Holden or the automotive producers? Senator KIM CARR: No, specifically on Holden. Dr Richards: The number was drawn from the submission that Holden made to the Productivity Commission. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, it is, and it concurs with Holden's submission. That's a figure that's been used. Does that concur with the figures that you have? Ms Facey: You would be aware of the confidentiality provisions. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, I know that. That's why I'm not asking you how much they got. I'm asking you: what is publicly stated? We understand exactly the difference. The published figures have been repeated regularly of late, and I'm just asking: does that match your records, that figure? Are you familiar with that figure of \$1.836 billion? Ms Facey: We'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. You've mentioned the Productivity Commission inquiry which puts the figure, around that time, at around that figure. Are you able to advise the committee on the published sources that are available to the department on the taxation paid by General Motors during the same period? Can you confirm, for instance, in the Productivity Commission submission, that General Motors said they paid \$1.4 billion in tax revenue to the Commonwealth government in that same period? Can you confirm that? Dr Richards: No. Mr Lawson: We would need to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Mr Lawson: Taxes are paid by companies and individuals to provide for the overall government services, not just—Senator KIM CARR: I understand that. I'm making a separate point. The figure that has been used in public debate is \$1.86 billion in public assistance. I'm saying that the revenue from General Motors was \$1.4 billion to the government—1.8 from the government, 1.4 back. But that doesn't include import duty credits, which were around, on their supply material, \$1.4 billion in their own right—a further \$440 million in revenue to the government. So what I'm going to put to you is: is it the case that the amount of money that General Motors received during this period was roughly equivalent to the amount of money that General Motors paid to the Australian government in taxation. Senator IAN MACDONALD: Are you able to answer that? Senator KIM CARR: From public sources that are available—Mr Lawson: I think we'd also have to look at the tariff income that consumers paid on the protection to General Motors. Senator KIM CARR: General Motors didn't get the tariff. Mr Lawson: No, but they can raise their prices as a result of the tariff. But they paid the tariff on their imports. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, they paid the tariff on imports, but that was payment to the government. General Motors did not benefit, in terms of cash payments, as a result of the five per cent tariff, did they? CHAIR: Senator Carr, are you suggesting that maybe we should have not taxed? Senator KIM CARR: No, I'm making the point that the claim has been made in attacking the automotive industry about their level of support of \$1.8 billion, which is the figure claimed. I'm not citing the confidential figures that have been provided; I'm saying the public figure of \$1.8 billion that is available through the Productivity Commission was in fact roughly equivalent to the amount of money General Motors paid to the Commonwealth. So, regarding the claims that are being made about assistance to the company when measured against revenues paid Senator KIM CARR: At previous estimates, you suggested 60 to 70 companies were likely to draw upon the program. Do you still hold to that view? Ms Facey: Our estimates haven't changed. We expect that 20 to 25 companies will remain eligible but that 60 to 70 participants in total have forecast activities that could form the basis of an ATS claim. Some of those may choose to apply in the national interest. So those figures haven't changed. We are expecting the annual business plans to come in next month. Once we've analysed them, we'll have the firms' projections from the start of 2018 out to the end of the scheme. Senator KIM CARR: Can you give us a breakdown once the business plans are in? Ms Facey: Yes. By the time we've analysed them, it will be early in the new year, but we can take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	110	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaela Cash
SQ17-000459	Si-19	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Review of administrative changes impacting the automotive industry	<p>Senator KIM CARR: There are some other questions on notice regarding the growth centres, because the answers I got back were only half answered, particularly around who the consultants were—BI-132: I'll put that back on notice as there's a series of questions there. The food and agribusiness: there's travel—\$352,000; I'm interested to know further details on that. Nine people are employed in the growth centre—that's \$40,000 per person. What's the travel allocation—can you indicate that for me, please? So I'll ask a series of questions on those, if I could. Mr Lawson: We'll take those on notice, but I know the FIAL growth centre has a large engagement in export promotion, and so—Senator KIM CARR: So it's international travel? Mr Lawson: there will be international travel involved in it.</p>	Spoken	111	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaela Cash
SQ17-000460	Si-20	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Funding received by general motors	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The government's response to the Senate inquiry into the automotive industry was released after a return to order. The final report was tabled in 2015 and it took some time for the government to respond—as I say, only then following a return to order. Was the response to the Senate report prepared by the department? Dr Richards: It was an interdepartmental response. There were several departments with responsibilities. Senator KIM CARR: There would have been a response prepared by the department? Dr Richards: We coordinated that IDC. Senator KIM CARR: When was that delivered to the minister's office? Dr Richards: I'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you—and the date on which that was delivered, and the date on which it was finally cleared by the minister's office. Page 3 of the response says: 'The government will review the administrative regulations that impact on businesses in an ongoing, such as re-registering for the ATS, or changing registration categories from a Motor Vehicle Producer to an Automotive Services Provider ... In previous estimates I have asked questions regarding this matter and I've been advised there's no need for changes to the regulations. Is that still the advice the department is providing? Do the MVPs need to change, in terms of their status, now that they're obviously moving into R&D? Are there any regulatory changes required for them to be able to be registered as service providers? Dr Richards: No, we were looking at some administrative changes to reduce the burden on the information collected as part of that but no changes to the regulations. Senator KIM CARR: So what changes are you looking at? Dr Richards: The information that's collected in terms of a re-registration proposal and the like, as to what information the department needs to collect to allow the minister to make a decision on those. Senator KIM CARR: When will that be available? Dr Richards: We're taking some advice at the moment on that. We don't have a timetable on the delivery of those administrative changes. Ms Facey: There is no barrier to them applying as service providers. They can still apply. I think my colleague is talking about trying to improve the process, rather than it being a barrier. Senator KIM CARR: I appreciate that, but the question goes to when will you have the regulatory changes available, or implemented—presumably they're disallowable and all those matters—when will you intend to publish those changes in regard to the administrative arrangements which you say lessen the burden in terms of data collection? Dr Richards: The administrative arrangements are the guidances provided by the department, not the regulation, so there is no change to legislation required. Senator KIM CARR: When will those changes you are proposing be available to the companies? Dr Richards: We don't have a timetable on that at the moment. We are working through those. Senator KIM CARR: How long do you think it will take? You have been working on this for a while now? What's the holdup? Dr Richards: We are taking advice on some of that guidance material. It's not a lengthy period but we can take that on notice and come back with an answer. I'll need to work with my colleagues—Senator KIM CARR: Mr Richards, this has been known for a while. I have been asking questions about this for a couple of years, so why hasn't it been done? Dr Richards: I thought the questions were on regulatory changes. Senator KIM CARR: I have been asking about the regulatory changes required for service providers. You say they're not necessary. You then go on to say there will be changes to the administrative arrangements to lessen the administrative burden. So you have been thinking about this for some time, and you have been saying this for some time—is that not the case? Dr Richards: We have been looking at ways to simplify the application process, but that doesn't change the regulations. Senator KIM CARR: No, but you are changing the reporting requirements? Dr Richards: Of information provision to enable us to make a decision. Senator KIM CARR: And you have been thinking about that for some time—is that correct? Dr Richards: Yes. As with any legislation, you'll continually look for—Senator KIM CARR: So it requires legislation? Dr Richards: As with the implementation of any legislation, you will look at ways to reduce regulatory burden in responding to that. Senator KIM CARR: Are you telling me that it requires a legislative change? Dr Richards: No. Senator KIM CARR: So what's the hold-up in getting the administrative change? Mr Lawson: There is no hold-up. It's simply a matter of making sure that, if we reduce the guidelines and simplify Senator KIM CARR: I want to go to the issue that has been given some publicity in recent times, and that's the amount of support that General Motors received through the automotive programs. Between 2001 and 2012, various reports have cited a figure of \$1.836 billion. Does that concur with your records? It's certainly the figure that was published in the Productivity Commission reports. There it is there; yes. Mr Lawson: So the Productivity Commission—are they publishing Holden or the automotive producers? Senator KIM CARR: No, specifically on Holden. Dr Richards: The number was drawn from the submission that Holden made to the Productivity Commission. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, it is, and it concurs with Holden's submission. That's a figure that's been used. Does that concur with the figures that you have? Ms Facey: You would be aware of the confidentiality provisions. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, I know that. That's why I'm not asking you how much they got. I'm asking you: what is publicly stated? We understand exactly the difference. The published figures have been repeated regularly of late, and I'm just asking: does that match your records, that figure? Are you familiar with that figure of \$1.836 billion? Ms Facey: We'd have to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. You've mentioned the Productivity Commission inquiry which puts the figure, around that time, at around that figure. Are you able to advise the committee on the published sources that are available to the department on the taxation paid by General Motors during the same period? Can you confirm, for instance, in the Productivity Commission submission, that General Motors said they paid \$1.4 billion in tax revenue to the Commonwealth government in that same period? Can you confirm that? Dr Richards: No. Mr Lawson: We would need to take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Thank you. Mr Lawson: Taxes are paid by companies and individuals to provide for the overall government services, not just—Senator KIM CARR: I understand that. I'm making a separate point. The figure that has been used in public debate is \$1.86 billion in public assistance. I'm saying that the revenue from General Motors was \$1.4 billion to the government—1.8 from the government, 1.4 back. But that doesn't include import duty credits, which were around, on their supply material, \$1.4 billion in their own right—a further \$440 million in revenue to the government. So what I'm going to put to you is: is it the case that the amount of money that General Motors received during this period was roughly equivalent to the amount of money that General Motors paid to the Australian government in taxation. Senator IAN MACDONALD: Are you able to answer that? Senator KIM CARR: From public sources that are available—Mr Lawson: I think we'd also have to look at the tariff income that consumers paid on the protection to General Motors. Senator KIM CARR: General Motors didn't get the tariff. Mr Lawson: No, but they can raise their prices as a result of the tariff. But they paid the tariff on their imports. Senator KIM CARR: Yes, they paid the tariff on imports, but that was payment to the government. General Motors did not benefit, in terms of cash payments, as a result of the five per cent tariff, did they? CHAIR: Senator Carr, are you suggesting that maybe we should have not taxed? Senator KIM CARR: No, I'm making the point that the claim has been made in attacking the automotive industry about their level of support of \$1.8 billion, which is the figure claimed. I'm not citing the confidential figures that have been provided; I'm saying the public figure of \$1.8 billion that is available through the Productivity Commission was in fact roughly equivalent to the amount of money General Motors paid to the Commonwealth. So, regarding the claims that are being made about assistance to the company when measured against revenues paid Senator KIM CARR: At previous estimates, you suggested 60 to 70 companies were likely to draw upon the program. Do you still hold to that view? Ms Facey: Our estimates haven't changed. We expect that 20 to 25 companies will remain eligible but that 60 to 70 participants in total have forecast activities that could form the basis of an ATS claim. Some of those may choose to apply in the national interest. So those figures haven't changed. We are expecting the annual business plans to come in next month. Once we've analysed them, we'll have the firms' projections from the start of 2018 out to the end of the scheme. Senator KIM CARR: Can you give us a breakdown once the business plans are in? Ms Facey: Yes. By the time we've analysed them, it will be early in the new year, but we can take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	112	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaela Cash
SQ17-000461	Si-21	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Applications to Automotive Transformation Scheme	<p>Senator KIM CARR: There are some other questions on notice regarding the growth centres, because the answers I got back were only half answered, particularly around who the consultants were—BI-132: I'll put that back on notice as there's a series of questions there. The food and agribusiness: there's travel—\$352,000; I'm interested to know further details on that. Nine people are employed in the growth centre—that's \$40,000 per person. What's the travel allocation—can you indicate that for me, please? So I'll ask a series of questions on those, if I could. Mr Lawson: We'll take those on notice, but I know the FIAL growth centre has a large engagement in export promotion, and so—Senator KIM CARR: So it's international travel? Mr Lawson: there will be international travel involved in it.</p>	Spoken	113	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaela Cash

SQ17-000462	SI-22	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Job losses in the Automotive sector	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Minister, you claimed on ABC radio that the job losses in the automotive sector are expected to be significantly less than was initially thought. What's the basis of that claim? Senator Cash: You would need to provide me with the transcripts so I could actually review what— Senator KIM CARR: I'll put it to the department. Has the department re-evaluated its assessment on job losses in the automotive sector now? Senator Cash: Again, I'd need to see actually what you're referring to. Could you provide me with a transcript so I could actually read it? Senator KIM CARR: Now I've asked the department. Senator Cash: Dr Richards? Dr Richards: Initially, the department forecast at the time of the announcement of closures was around 27,500 job losses. We've been working with the states and their reconnaissance of the individual firms. We think that is now 8,000 across the manufacturers and the supply chains. Senator KIM CARR: So 8,000 in total. What's the basis of that? Dr Richards: That's based on the work that has been done with the state governments and their discussions with the individual businesses. Senator KIM CARR: Could you take it on notice the basis of that claim? I notice in South Australia, the South Australian automotive taskforce, there is being claimed now that 75 per cent of the companies in Australia, as a result of the state government programs, are likely to survive. Can you say if you can indicate what the basis of the assertions are? I know that in Victoria there are significantly—with the LIFT program they're only talking of hundreds of jobs, not thousands of jobs. That doesn't go to the question of automotive job losses in Western Australia or Queensland. What is the basis of your forecast? Dr Richards: We've taken advice from the state governments. We can take it on notice. Mr Lawson: My understanding is that state governments had a very detailed process of engaging with the individual companies to find out their expectations. They provided us with that advice. It is companies' expectations. Senator KIM CARR: Sure, but you'd be able to provide some assessments on that. Senator XENOPHON: And any documents you relied on. Mr Lawson: We'll take that on notice</p>	Spoken		2/11/2017 0:00	Michaela Cash
SQ17-000463	SI-23	Xenophon, Nick	Industry Growth	Benchmarks for manufacturing assistance funds	<p>Senator XENOPHON: I have a supplementary question for you to take on notice. In respect of the funds that have been discussed in the course of the last 45 minutes or so, can you provide on notice the details of the feedback mechanisms, mechanisms to determine the success and the outcomes, in terms of how many jobs might have been created, economic activity and flow-on effects? I think it's been done previously with some other funds. In other words, what are the benchmarks or the KPIs to measure the effectiveness of these targets? Mr Lawson: We'll take that on notice</p>	Spoken		26/10/2017 0:00	Michaela Cash
SQ17-000464	SI-24	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Alleged conflicts of interest on NAIF board	<p>Senator KETTER: I draw to your attention a comment that the Deputy Prime Minister made when asked about Ms Way-McPhail's alleged conflicts of interest. He said: If there's a claim that there's a conflict of interest and the conflict of interest is against the law, then of course we're going to check that out. ECONOMICS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE He made that comment to The Guardian on the 29 May this year. You told me earlier that the minister hasn't investigated anything. Ms Walker: I can't speak for what the minister may or may not have done. That's not a matter for me. Senator Scullion: What you say is pretty self-evident, Senator. There are two principles to what is declared. First of all, if you have a conflict of interest, some conflicts of interest are declared in quite a normal way of doing business. There are other conflicts of interest which are unlawful, which are usually undeclared conflicts of interest while remaining on the board. I think what the Deputy Prime Minister referred to is a pretty common practice with any board member. But, as I said, if you can put some context around what you're talking about—I understand you may only have the information to ask in principle—we'd certainly be able to give you a more detailed answer if there was some sort of context about a particular person or a particular conflict that you're referring to. Senator KETTER: My question's not so much a matter of opinion or context; it's about— Senator Scullion: The process. Senator KETTER: Has an investigation occurred? Senator Scullion: Fine, thank you. Senator KETTER: I think, Minister, you've confirmed that there's been no investigation. Senator Scullion: Well, you've only said, in terms of the Deputy Prime Minister, that he made a comment. Is there a conflict of interest, and is it unlawful? But we don't know about whether or not an investigation has been conducted, unless you give us some particular point about where the conflict was asserted or— Senator KETTER: These conflicts of interest have been fairly well ventilated in the media, and there have been articles about this particular issue. Senator Scullion: And, I understand, rigorously exposed through the process. Thus far, despite deep questioning, quite clearly the efficacy of the NAIF's conflict of interest process has remained untarnished. Senator KETTER: Okay. I don't really want to get into a debate about that. Senator Scullion: I accept that. Senator KETTER: It's a question of fact: has an investigation occurred? Minister, are you able to categorically tell me— Senator Scullion: No, I am not able to provide anything without any further context, unless the officers can assist me with the question. Has an investigation taken place? I think we've answered by saying: yes, we've trailed through that at different estimates processes. Perhaps if there are any additional things that haven't been provided— Senator KETTER: I'm talking about alleged conflicts of interest that have been well ventilated in the media, and this was a comment that was made by the Deputy Prime Minister back on 29 May. So my question is: has there been an investigation in relation to those matters that he was asked about back then? If you can't tell me tonight, I'm happy for you to take that on notice, but I'm interested to know. Senator Scullion: Certainly. Perhaps they can just take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	116	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000465	SI-25	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Dates and Locations of NAIF Board Meetings	<p>Senator KETTER: I'm happy to move onto another subject, and that is the question of board meetings of the NAIF. Can you tell me how many times now the board has met since its inception? Ms Walker: Thirteen times. Senator KETTER: What were the dates and locations of those meetings? Ms Walker: I don't have that with me. Ms Belletini: I can tell you the locations if you like, Senator. Senator KETTER: Yes. For all 13? Ms Belletini: Certainly. So they've had meetings— CHAIR: That's probably worth taking on notice. That's a very extensive list and we are trying to move through. Senator KETTER: I'm happy with that.</p>	Spoken	118	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000466	SI-26	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF Board remuneration	<p>Senator KETTER: I'm also after how much each member of the board is currently being paid. Ms Walker: We can provide that, but that's rem tribunal—independent decisions on remuneration. It's in the annual report. Mr Lawson: It's on the public record. Ms Walker: It is on the public record, because it is rem tribunal.</p>	Spoken	118	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000467	SI-27	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF Board member letter of resignation	<p>Senator KETTER: Did Ms Pitkin provide a letter to the NAIF when she resigned? Ms Belletini: Ms Pitkin would have provided her resignation notice to the responsible minister. Senator KETTER: Minister, can we have a copy of that letter on notice please? Mr Lawson: We'll take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	119	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000468	SI-28	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF Board travel	<p>Senator KETTER: Can you tell us how much each board member has claimed for travel? Is that something Ms Belletini might have? Ms Walker: Ms Belletini may have that data. Ms Belletini: I may have to take that one on notice. Senator KETTER: While you're doing that, could you also find out what the total amount claimed for travel is to date.</p>	Spoken	126	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000469	SI-29	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF board and staff in Northern Australia	<p>Senator KETTER: Thank you for that. This is probably another one that you might want to take on notice. How many days were each board member and each senior member of staff in northern Australia? Ms Walker: We'd definitely need to take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	127	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan

SQ17-000470	SI-30	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Security arrangements for NAIF board members	<p>Senator KETTER: Thank you for that. I will move onto another topic, which is the issue of security arrangements for board members. On 19 June this year, Ms Warburton spoke at a conference in Cairns. A NAIF spokesperson confirmed to the NAIF that Ms Warburton was accompanied by private security on that occasion. I think the quote from the NAIF spokesperson was, 'Given some of the recent protest events, we were advised to have appropriate security in place in the interests of everybody attending the conference.' My question is: is it normal for NAIF board members to be escorted by private security? Ms Walker: It is when there is a security concern. On that occasion, the advice that we had was that we should get security. Senator KETTER: Can you tell me roughly how many occasions you've engaged security? Ms Walker: We have engaged it on other occasions. For the whole board, it was two occasions. Ms Belletini: Yes, a total of two occasions. Senator KETTER: And that was for the whole board on those two occasions. Ms Belletini: Correct. Senator KETTER: On the occasion that I was referring to, media were blocked from recording the speech that was given by Ms Warburton. My question is to the minister. Do you think that it's appropriate that a government body should be using private security to block the media from reporting its actions? Ms Walker: I don't know that the private security blocked the media. That would be my answer to that. Senator Scullion: Again, you're asserting something around a circumstance that I'm not sure the officers at the table would be able to discern. Could you provide some more information? What's been said so far is that security is provided appropriate to a risk assessment about that security. That's the usual turn of events. Senator KETTER: I've been fairly specific. It was 19 June. It was an event. My understanding is that media were blocked from recording Ms Warburton's speech. Are you saying that's not correct, Ms Walker? Ms Walker: I don't know if they were, but I don't think it was to do with NAIF. Ms Belletini: Ms Warburton's speech is available on NAIF's website. The speech she gave at that event is publicly available. It was also reported in the media that she was at that conference and that she did provide an address. The security support that Ms Warburton had at that event did not directly block the media attending. We would have to take that on notice. That was not a decision of the security to block that. Ms Walker: I'm not aware of that suggestion. Senator IAN MACDONALD: It wasn't a decision of NAIF, anyhow. Ms Walker: No, not at our suggestion, that I'm aware of. Senator KETTER: There have been reports that it was blocked. You're categorically telling me that that's not the case? CHAIR: That's not at all what they just said. They said that they couldn't confirm that that was the responsibility of either the NAIF or the security organisation. Senator Scullion: If there's any other detail, I wonder if they could be asked to take it on notice? CHAIR: I think that would be perfectly reasonable. Senator KETTER: The question is, was security blocked? Can you take that question on notice? Senator Scullion: Was security blocked? Senator KETTER: Sorry. Was media blocked from reporting? Ms Walker: I don't know whether media was blocked. Senator Scullion: I think we have the question quite clearly. As we've indicated, we'll take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	127-128	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000471	SI-31	Watt, Murray	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF expenditure on private security	<p>Senator WATT: Righto. Could you take on notice how much the NAIF has spent on private security? Ms Belletini: Yes.</p>	Spoken	133	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000472	SI-32	Watt, Murray	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF security advice	<p>Senator WATT: And you mentioned before that you received advice indicating that security was required, when it was engaged. Where did that advice come from? Ms Belletini: I have to take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	133	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000473	SI-33	Watt, Murray	Corporate	Date of ministerial changes	<p>Senator WATT: Okay. I've got some questions that might range across both the ONA and the NAIF. I'm just trying to remember the exact date that Senator Canavan stepped down as the minister for northern Australia. Does anyone know that? My recollection was that it was in September. It doesn't really matter. Ms Talbot: It was 25 September. Senator WATT: That was the day he did that press conference and announced— Ms Talbot: Yes. Senator WATT: I wasn't clear if there was then a delay before formally—so 25 September? Ms Talbot: That's right. Mr Lawson: We might have to take that on notice. Senator WATT: Sure, but let's work with that. Ms Talbot: Sorry, it was July. Mr Lawson: And I think then the DPM was sworn in on the 27th. Senator WATT: So he stepped down on the 25th; the Deputy Prime Minister was sworn in on the 27th. Mr Lawson: We might have to confirm that.</p>	Spoken	133	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000474	SI-34	Watt, Murray	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF meetings with Senator Canavan	<p>Senator WATT: Roughly. Ms Walker, has any member of the NAIF board or any of your team met with Senator Canavan since he stepped down as minister? Ms Walker: We were here for the Facing North conference. I saw Senator Canavan at that event and I saw him when we were here for the event last week— Senator WATT: Leaving aside events, where there are other people present, have you or any of your team or the board met with Senator Canavan since he stepped down as the minister? Ms Walker: I would have to check, but I don't think any of my team have. I'm not aware of any occasions.</p>	Spoken	133	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000475	SI-35	Watt, Murray	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Changes to the NAIF act	<p>Senator WATT: For the sake of completeness, I'd need to go back and look at the transcript to see exactly what has been said. But it does sound like some work is being done around possible changes to the NAIF act or mandate. Could you take on notice my request to provide copies of that advice if that's being worked on. Mr Lawson: We wouldn't take on notice providing policy advice— Senator WATT: Why don't you take it on notice, and you might need to come back with an immunity claim.</p>	Spoken	136	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000476	SI-36	Xenophon, Nick	Resources	Standards of reporting for oil and gas reserves	<p>Senator XENOPHON: My final question on notice to the minister is, given what ASIC has said about this—this is the answer to question on notice number 117 at the budget estimates—has the government undertaken any work, or will it undertake any work, to look at having higher standards of reporting for oil and gas reserves in this country? Senator Scullion: Just to get you right: is that a question you asked on notice and haven't got yet? Senator XENOPHON: No, I'm asking it now for you. Senator Scullion: I'll take that on notice.</p>	Spoken	137	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000477	SI-37	Xenophon, Nick	Resources	ACCC gas inquiry	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Yes—in 10 seconds or less. Given the ACCC's recent gas inquiry and their ongoing investigations into the issue of gas markets in Australia, have they contacted NOPTA for information about gas reserves? Mr Waters: There has been an approach. The approach to— Senator XENOPHON: Can you take that on notice? I would be surprised if they have. Mr B Wilson: AEMO have certainly talked to NOPTA in forming their forecasts—the Australian Energy Market Operator. Senator XENOPHON: Yes—I know who it is. Mr B Wilson: I'm not sure about the ACCC. Senator XENOPHON: I would be surprised if they haven't, but if you could— Mr Waters: This sits into our role as being an advisor, as opposed to being the decision maker in the regime. When there is an approach made through government, then we, to the extent of confidentiality requirements, provide that kind of information. Senator XENOPHON: The ACCC have pretty board powers if they want to exercise them to get information. Mr B Wilson: There's also a difference between production contracts and the reserves. ACCC certainly have all the production contracts. That's what they were looking at for their forecast for next year and the year after. Reserves is a longer term matter. They may not have been interested in that particular aspect. Senator XENOPHON: If you could take that on notice. I'm sorry if I excited you earlier with those questions.</p>	Spoken	141	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan

SQ17-000478	SI-38	Ketter, Chris	Office of Northern Australia	Second annual statement on the Government's progress in developing northern Australia	Senator KETTER: Thank you very much for that. I'd like to ask questions of the Office of Northern Australia. My questions relate to the requirement for the second annual statement on the government's progress in developing northern Australia, which, as you would understand, Mr Coffey, was set out in the white paper of Northern Australia as an expectation. Did the ONA help prepare material for the minister's second annual statement? Mr Coffey: Yes, we did. Senator KETTER: Last Tuesday, that speech wasn't given in parliament, was it? Mr Coffey: Last Tuesday, the minister provided a statement to a function in Parliament House. Senator KETTER: To a function? Mr Coffey: That's correct. Senator KETTER: That wasn't the expectation or the commitment that was given, was it? It was supposed to be a statement to parliament. Mr Coffey: That's right. Every year there's a commitment to provide a statement to parliament. That will be provided to the parliament in the coming weeks. Senator KETTER: Can you explain why that speech wasn't delivered in parliament? Mr Coffey: That's a matter for the government and for the leader of government business. Senator Scullion: Perhaps I can throw a bit of light. I attended. The Deputy Prime Minister indicated that I was a bit late, which I forgive him for, but I did attend. Certainly, if you're looking for why you would deliver a speech to a whole bunch of people who were really interested in this matter, rather than to parliament, I suspect the answer lies in that area. Senator KETTER: That's not really in the spirit of what was supposed to happen. There's a certain amount of gravity that goes with giving a report to parliament. Senator Scullion: Indeed, and I understand that the officer has just indicated that there will be a statement to parliament. Senator KETTER: This year? Mr Coffey: Yes, that's correct. Senator KETTER: I'm curious as to why in your publication, Our North, our future: white paper on developing northern Australia, you indicated that the 2017 annual statement was delivered on the 17 October? Mr Coffey: Yes, that was the intention, but it didn't occur. As I said, it will occur in the coming weeks. Senator KETTER: I take it that that was printed before the speech was given? Mr Coffey: That's correct, yes. Senator KETTER: So you're not suggesting, Mr Coffey, that a speech to a function or a cocktail party in Parliament House is a substitute for a report to parliament I take it? Senator Scullion: I understand that both things are occurring. I was there for a very entertaining speech by one of your colleagues and by the Deputy Prime Minister. That was given as a speech. And a statement—no doubt a dry statement that was reflected in here—will actually be provided to parliament in due course. Senator KETTER: Can you tell us when that second report will be given? Senator Scullion: I can't, but we can take that on notice. Senator KETTER: Could you also provide on notice any documents that were provided to the ONA relating to the second annual statement? Mr Coffey: Provided by the ONA? Senator Scullion: To. Senator KETTER: Provided by the ONA. Senator IAN MACDONALD: By or to? You said to. Senator KETTER: Let's do both. Mr Coffey: We'll perhaps take those on notice and sort that out.	Spoken	145-146	26/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000479	SI-39	McCarthy, Malarndirri	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	NAIF Staffing	1. How many staff are currently working for NAIF? 2. Where are staff based? 3. How many of staff are based in Northern Australia? 4. How many Efic staff working for NAIF are based in Northern Australia? 5. Is NAIF subject to the decentralization agenda? 6. Have you made the case against being decentralized? Please provide those documents?	Written		31/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000480	SI-40	McCarthy, Malarndirri	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Work Efic is undertaking for NAIF	1. Can you please detail the work Efic is undertaking for NAIF? 2. Has the amount of work Efic is doing for NAIF increased since last financial year? a. Are you able to detail how much that is? 3. You told the Senate inquiry into the NAIF that Efic did 8225 hours of work for NAIF in 2016-17. That's the equivalent of around four full time staff. Is that right? a. This was in NAIF's first year. What were the outcomes of that work? b. Was most of that work setting up systems for NAIF?	Written		31/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000481	SI-41	McCarthy, Malarndirri	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Indigenous Engagement Strategy for NAIF projects	1. Is it still a Mandatory Criteria that NAIF only funds projects that have an Indigenous Engagement Strategy, correct? 2. Please supply the written NAIF policy that details what such an IES must involve. 3. Are these engagement strategies going to be made public? 4. How are you going to ensure the companies do what they say they would do under an IES? 5. What penalties will there be for breaching the agreement around an IES?	Written		31/10/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000482	SI-42	Abetz, Eric	Corporate	Secretary messages to staff	To the Industry Department Secretary and Industry Agency Heads: Please provide the messages (if any) sent to staff (on the most recent occasions) of Christmas/New Year, Easter and Ramadan by the Secretary of the Department or Agency Heads at the relevant time.	Written		31/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000483	SI-43	Abetz, Eric	Corporate	Enterprise Agreement negotiations	To the Department and Agencies of the Industry portfolio: In the most recent Enterprise Agreement negotiations, was/were any side-agreement/s, protocol/s, arrangement/s, agreement/s entered into? If so, please provide a copy.	Written		31/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000484	SI-44	Whish-Wilson, Peter	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility Investment Decisions	1. What is the process for determining breaches of NAIF's Investment Mandate? 2. How does NAIF determine whether a project is unlikely to proceed, or only at a much later date or with limited scope, without NAIF financial assistance? 3. Does NAIF consider public statements by a project proponent in its assessment against this criterion? 4. Does NAIF consider that any project's commencement prior to NAIF funding indicates that a project is proceeding, and therefore does not meet this criterion? 5. Has NAIF sought legal advice or ministerial advice in relation to this matter? 6. How does NAIF determine whether a loan can be repaid or refinanced? 7. Does NAIF internally assess risk of non-repayment, and does any part of this assessment process involve third parties (e.g. consultants)? 8. What level of risk of non-repayment is acceptable for any given project, and does this vary from project to project; or does NAIF have set thresholds or benchmarks across any project (e.g. required rates of return on assets or projects), and if so how are they determined? 9. How does NAIF determine whether a project will provide public benefits? 10. What is the detailed methodology that NAIF uses to determine whether a project will provide public benefits? 11. How does NAIF determine what constitutes a reputation risk to state, territory or federal governments? 12. What other government agencies (state, territory or federal), organisations or individuals does NAIF expect to consult with on the issue of potential reputational risk, and is any consultation mandatory? 13. Is NAIF able to seek third party advice when determining any potential risk? 14. Has NAIF any concern in this regard on a specific project, is NAIF likely or required to provide advice or brief the Minister or others in the department? 15. Can the Minister direct you to disregard identified risks to NAIF's Investment Mandate, such as reputational risk to state, territory or federal governments? 16. Does NAIF consider a project proponent's broader historical financial record, environmental and human rights record across all jurisdictions, both federal and international, in determining whether a potential reputational risk exists? 17. Does NAIF consider a project proponent's history of tax avoidance, including the use of tax havens, to be a potential reputational risk to state, territory or federal governments? At 2017-18 Supplementary Budget Estimates, NAIF CEO Laurie Walker said "the decisions that the board makes don't necessarily take into account opinions of other people." 18. When determining whether a decision would damage the Commonwealth government's reputation, does NAIF consider: a. Simply the views of the minister or other government agencies? b. The views of foreign leaders? c. The views of prominent business people? d. The views of the Australian public? e. Has NAIF sought legal advice in relation to this matter? If so, please provide this advice. 19. What is the process for NAIF to receive and consider new information about a project proponent after the initial assessment against the Investment Mandate is made? 20. Has NAIF indicated to the Adani Group that it will receive funding from NAIF? 21. Is NAIF aware of reports that Adani Group Chairman Gautam Adani's informed Indian business publication Livemint that "The [Carmichael rail line] project will be funded by internal accruals, NAIF	Written		2/11/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000485	SI-45	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Resources	National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator	1. Is there a fit and proper person test when awarding offshore oil and gas permit? 2. What vetting is done by NOPTA with or for the Joint Authority or Minister to ensure a company is a safe operator before awarding titles? 3. Did NOPTA or the Joint Authority have with the Norwegian Petroleum Safety Authority and/or what independent investigations were done before awarding the Great Australian Bight petroleum exploration title transfer from BP to Statoil in June this year to ensure that Statoil was a safe operator?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan

SQ17-000486	SI-46	Hanson-Young, Sarah	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	APPEA consultation methodology to standardise titleholder engagement practices	1. Did NOPSEMA ask or commission APPEA to undertake the consultation methodology; or did APPEA volunteer to develop it? 2. How long did the work take from commencement to NOPSEMA's decision that APPEA's work was unacceptable? 3. Did NOPSEMA pay APPEA or a consultant identified by APPEA any money to deliver the work or any reasonably associated work, or to cover any expenses by APPEA or any person employed or contracted by APPEA associated with the work? 4. How many NOPSEMA staff had any engagement with the work? 5. How much money has been spent on this to date, including staff hours? 6. How many staff were tasked to this project? 7. Are APPEA or representatives of its members involved in the new taskforce to deliver the work APPEA was unable to appropriately deliver? 8. Is it usual for NOPSEMA to seek industry expertise to deliver elements of its regulatory responsibilities, such as stakeholder engagement methodologies? 9. Why did NOPSEMA not have the internal expertise or resources to undertake this work itself in the first instance?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000487	SI-47	Hanson-Young, Sarah	National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA)	Environmental Impact Assessment Reference Case Project	1. What are the outputs of Environmental Impact Assessment Reference Case Project? 2. Why is this project necessary? 3. How were the project participants, NERA and Greenlight Environmental Ltd, selected? 4. How many other organisations are participating in the project and who are they? 5. Is funding being provided to any other organisations to participate in this project? 6. How long will this reference case work take? 7. How much is it anticipated to cost in full and how many staff resources are required? 8. Does NOPSEMA have the capacity and expertise to do this work itself? 1. Does any office use a private security for indoor or outdoor premises? 2. How many are the contracts with? 3. How much does each contract cost? (FY2016-17) c. How often do they visit? d. Please provide an annual cost. (FY2016-17) 2) Have any floral displays or indoor plants or pot plants been hired or leased for display in any offices? a. Who were the contracts with? b. How much was each contract cost? (FY2016-17) 3) What was the total cost of all subscriptions by you and your staff to online news services, newspapers, magazines, journals and periodicals in the past 12 months? (FY2016-17) a. What are these services / newspapers / magazines / journals / periodicals? b. Please provide an annual cost. (FY2016-17) 4) What was the total value of all gifts purchased for use by the NAIF in the past 12 months? (FY2016-17) a. What were the gifts purchased? i. Who were they gifted to? 5) Do you purchase bottled water or provide coolers for your offices? a. What is the monthly cost of this? (monthly average for FY2016-17) 6) Do you provide fruit for your offices? a. What is the monthly cost of this? (monthly average for FY2016-17) 7) What is the total bill for your offices in the past 12 months for: (FY2016-17) a. Taxi hire b. Limousine hire c. Private hire care d. Hire car rental e. Bidesharing services f. Commercial flights g. Charter flights 8) What class of airline flight was most regularly flown by staff and board members? (for FY2016-17) 9) What class did each board member fly most regularly? (for FY2016-17) 10) What class do NAIF staff fly most regularly? (for FY2016-17) 11) What class does the NAIF CEO fly most regularly? (for FY2016-17) 12) What instructions are NAIF staff given around the class of flights they books? 13) How much has each board member spent on travel since the board's inception? 14) How much has each board member claimed in entitlements since inception? 15) How much is each member of the board paid annually? 16) Has the pay of any board member increased, by how much? 17) What bonuses do each board member receive? 18) How much did each board member receive for the first full year of their employment? 19) How much will each board member receive for their second full year of employment? 20) What is the value of the NAIF CEO's salary? 21) What is the value of the NAIF CEO's pay rise? 22) What is the total cost spent on NAIF staffing to date since inception? 23) On how many occasions did the NAIF hire private security? 24) For what purpose were private security hired on each occasion? 25) Where did the NAIF receive advice saying private security was necessary? 26) How much was spent on private security? 27) How many media or public relations advisers are employed in by the NAIF? 28) What is the forecast for the current financial year for the number of media or public relations advisers to be employed and their total cost? 29) What is the total cost of media monitoring services used by the NAIF? 30) How much did NAIF spend on Facebook advertising or sponsored posts in the past financial year (2016-17)? 31) How much has the NAIF spend in legal costs in the past financial year (2016-17)? a. For what specific purposes or matters was legal advice sought? 32) Has the NAIF engaged any consultants to provide the following services or advice in the past financial year (2016-17)? a. Social media i. And the cost of these services b. Photography i. And the cost of these services c. Acting training i. And the cost of these services d. Ergonomics i. And the cost of these services 33) Have any staff who received a redundancy from the NAIF in the last two years undertaken any paid work or provided any paid services for the NAIF? a. What was the nature of these works/services? b. What was the total cost of these works or services? 34) How many redundancies were processed by the	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000488	SI-48	Ketter, Chris	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility (NAIF)	Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility		Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000489	SI-49	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO)	Interim above ground storage of long lived intermediate level waste	(i) There have been repeated assurances by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science officers that long lived intermediate waste stored at any future national radioactive waste facility would be moved for permanent disposal (at a site yet to be selected, through a process yet to be defined) in a period of two to three decades. Given this – (i) Please detail how interim above ground storage of intermediate level radioactive waste at a future national radioactive waste facility provides a superior outcome in relation to public health and safety than interim above ground storage of this waste where most of it currently is – at ANSTO's Lucas Heights facility? (ii) Granted that ANSTO is constrained by law and cannot be a permanent disposal site for intermediate level waste can you please clarify what, if any, legal and regulatory (as opposed to ANSTO's preferred organisational outcome) obstacles there are for continued above ground storage of intermediate level waste at Lucas Heights? (iv) Could you please outline what steps would be required for ANSTO to continue to manage intermediate level waste at the Lucas Heights site on an extended interim storage basis? What authorisations would need to be sought and in what timeframe? (v) What proportion of Australian intermediate level waste is currently managed at ANSTO? (vi) ANSTO has been described (by critics of the planned national radioactive waste facility) as Australia's centre of nuclear excellence, as home to highest concentration of nuclear expertise in Australia and as a secure site with the nation's highest radiological monitoring and response capacity – would you agree with this characterisation? (vii) What role has/is ANSTO playing in relation to identifying a long term approach to management of intermediate radioactive waste in Australia? Are you providing advice on this to other federal departments? Who is doing this work? (viii) I understand that ANSTO are interested in managing any future national radioactive waste facility. Is this understanding correct? Has ANSTO made any formal application or informal expressions of interest to this effect? (ix) What volume of nuclear medicine waste (as opposed to ANSTO waste generated in the production of nuclear medicine) would be disposed of in any national radioactive waste facility?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000490	SI-50	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Australian Nuclear Science & Technology Organisation (ANSTO)	ANSTO's innovation precinct	1. Can you please report on the status of ANSTO's proposed technology and commercial precinct at Lucas Heights? What companies or institutions have expressed interest in the plan? Have contracts or MoU's been advanced or signed? Who with?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash

SQ17-000491	SI-51	Hanson-Young, Sarah	Resources	National Radioactive Waste Management Facility	<p>Have there been repeated calls from community members in the two South Australian regions being considered for the national waste facility (Flinders Ranges and Kimba) for the Department to either host or participate in public forums that include project critics. To date the Department has declined to do so. Why? Will the Department either host or participate in any such forums in the future? •What advice has the Department sought re the possible use of federal government override powers to address the obstacle posed by South Australia's Nuclear Waste Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000 – state legislation that makes this federal action unlawful in SA? Granted that the federal government has override powers in what circumstances would these be used? Has the Dept. sought advice from ARPANSA (the federal nuclear regulator – The Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency) over the implications of any use of override powers? If so, what did they say? If not, why not – given that the state law is there and is a clear project hurdle? •What volume of nuclear medicine waste (as opposed to ANSTO 0 the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation's) waste generated in the production of nuclear medicine) would be disposed of in any national radioactive waste facility? •Can you provide a list of hospitals and medical clinics that would send nuclear medicine waste to any future national radioactive waste facility? •Can you provide a list of sites across Australia that currently hold radioactive waste that will be able to retired from such storage in future as a result of any national radioactive waste facility? •What is the status of the KPMG detailed business case (DBC) examining radioactive waste management options in Australia? When will this be complete? Will it be publicly released in full or part? •If yes, could you precise when? •If not, could you explain why not? •What is the Department current thinking in relation to the configuration and holdings of any future national radioactive waste facility? Is co-location of both low level (for disposal) and intermediate level (for interim storage) radioactive waste still the preferred option? Has a final decision been made in relation to co-location of waste? When is this decision expected and through what process? •Re interim above ground storage of long lived intermediate level waste: (i)There have been repeated assurances by Department officers that this material would be moved for permanent disposal (at a site yet to be selected, through a process yet to be defined) in a period of two to three decades. How confident is the Department of this timeframe, and on what evidence basis? (ii)What steps has the Department under-taken to advance the search for a site/process for the long-term management/disposal of intermediate level waste? (iii)Please detail how interim above ground storage of intermediate level radioactive waste at a future national radioactive waste facility provides a superior outcome in relation to public health and safety than interim above ground storage of this waste where most of it currently is - at ANSTO's Lucas Heights facility? (iv)Given that this is not your strict portfolio area – even though it is directly related to it – could you please outline what steps would be required for ANSTO to continue to manage intermediate level waste at the Lucas heights site on an extended interim storage basis? •Re low-level radioactive waste: (i)There is some confusion over the language used to describe the method by which such waste would be managed/disposed at any national facility – buried/encapsulated/terra-formed – how do you describe this to communities and stakeholders? (ii)Could the Department describe what the status of remediation works at Woomera is? Could you provide the following details: a. Who is doing this work, at what cost and in what</p>	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000492	SI-52	Carr, Kim	Corporate	NISA Advertising Campaign	<p>In a response to a question on notice AI-31 from Additional Estimates in March the Department said that an independent evaluation report for the NISA advertising campaign had been completed. a. What were the key findings from that report? b. Who conducted that report? c. What was the budget for that report? d. When was the report conducted and completed?</p>	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000493	SI-53	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Paper procurement	<p>In response to QON F98 the Department of Finance advised that the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science only procures 31.1 per cent Australian made copy paper. Please provide an update to that number for 2017-18 financial year so far. The Department of Finance QON F98 also shows that the Industry Department's copy paper is now purchased from Austria, rather than Brazil, Indonesia and Thailand – three countries that have had dumping duties imposed by the anti-dumping commission. a. Did the findings of the Anti-Dumping Commission have anything to do with the change in the Department's purchasing arrangements? b. Does the Department have any intention to change its own procurement practices with regards to Australian made recycled copy paper to bring it in line with other Departments?</p>	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000494	SI-54	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Women's advisory roundtable	<p>In relation to the women's advisory roundtable announced by Minister Sinodinos in February, please advise the following: a. How many women the Department has approached so far to be part of the panel. b. How many men the Department has approached so far to be part of the panel. c. How many people have self-nominated for a position on the panel. d. What process the Department has used to identify potential panel members. e. Whether the Department currently has a shortlist of potential members, and if so, how many women and men are on the list. f. Summary of the feedback from women who have been approached and turned down positions. g. The date the first offer was made to a potential panel member. h. The date the last offer was made to a potential panel member. i. Whether positions on the women's advisory panel are remunerated, and if they are, the level of remuneration. j. What measures have been used to attract women to these positions. k. How many women are expected to make up the panel. Please provide a breakdown in terms of women from research, the private sector and government. l. Who signs off on potential panel members now that Minister Sinodinos is on leave. m. How many candidates have been referred to the Minister's office for approval and on what date they were referred. n. Who will chair the panel now Minister Sinodinos is on leave. o. When the first meeting of the women's advisory panel is scheduled to take place. p. How often the group will be required to meet per year.</p>	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000495	SI-55	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Grant to Vodafone in Tasmania	<p>8. In relation to the \$4 million grant that the Commonwealth awarded to Vodafone in Tasmania. Please advise: a. An update on the status of that program, including whether the company has fulfilled its part of the agreement. b. How many jobs have been created as a result of that grant. c. How much of the \$4 million has been paid to Vodafone, and if only a portion, whether the Department expects that the entire amount will be paid to the company. d. If money is expected to be withheld, what portion of the \$4 million will be paid. e. Whether any money will be required to be paid back to the Commonwealth by Vodafone? If so, how much and for what reason. f. Whether the original agreement included a commitment by Vodafone to create and sustain 1500 jobs at their Hobart Call Centre. i. Whether this job target has been met? If not, when was this agreement changed and what was the updated jobs commitment. g. How many jobs Vodafone had to create to fulfill the funding agreement. h. How many workers are currently employed at Vodafone's Hobart Call Centre?</p>	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000496	SI-56	Carr, Kim	Portfolio Policy and Innovation Strategy	National Energy Guarantee	<p>In relation to the government's recent announcement of the National Energy Guarantee, please advise: a. What role the Department had in the development of that policy. b. What advice the Department provided to the energy department regarding the impact of the proposed policy on Australian industry. c. When was the Department told about the new energy policy? Who has replaced Minister Sinodinos on the Energy Security Board? Were they in that position when the National Energy Guarantee was being developed? If not, who represented the interests of industry on that Board?</p>	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000497	SI-57	Carr, Kim	Portfolio Policy and Innovation Strategy	Energy prices and manufacturing	<p>11. What work has the Department done to engage with Australian industries that are struggling with rising energy costs? a. Has any survey and analysis work been undertaken? If so, when? b. Has the Commonwealth done any analysis to better understand energy usage by industry? c. Has anyone in the Department prepared an analysis of potential co-investment options for industries that wish to reduce their energy consumption? d. If so, has the Department provided any policy advice to the Department of Energy or the Energy Security Board about co-funding opportunities for heavy energy users who want to reduce their consumption? e. Has the department sought clarification on what the new energy policy means for industry's future emissions reduction requirements? If so, what was the response? f. What consultation with industry is now planned following the announcement? 12. Has the Department had any representations from manufacturing companies struggling with energy costs who are considering either closing or reducing their operations in Australia? a. How many? b. What industries? c. What are you doing about it? 13. Please provide a list of meetings held on the topic of energy prices in the last six months between: a. Ministers Sinodinos and manufacturers b. Cash and manufacturers c. Boundy and manufacturers</p>	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000498	SI-58	Carr, Kim	Economic & Analytical Services	Tender for venue hire	<p>Regarding the tender contract number CN3460720 published by the Department for venue hire and related services which totalled \$14,725.00. Please advise: a. How many other tenders were received b. The purpose of the contract c. Whether alcohol was provided as part of the contract. If so, please provide the quantity, brand and price. d. What was on the menu. e. How many guests attended. f. The list of attendees.</p>	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan

SQ17-000499	Si-59	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Senate Estimates training	How much did the Department spend in 2016-17 financial year on training officials for estimates? a. How many officials participated in those training sessions? How often were they run?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000500	Si-60	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Indoor plants	What is the total budgeted spend for indoor plants for the Department of Industry?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000501	Si-61	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Building compliance with National Construction Code	1. Is the Department aware of any Commonwealth employees that are currently working in buildings that are non-compliant with the national construction code? a. If so, which buildings and how many people are affected? 2. Has the Department undertaken any work to determine whether buildings that are owned or leased by the Department of Industry or its agencies comply with the national construction code? 3. Is the Department aware of any buildings – either owned or leased by the Department or its agencies – are clad in aluminium composite cladding with a polyethylene core?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000502	Si-62	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Pens	What is the total budget for pens? Please provide a breakdown for blue, red and black pens.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000503	Si-63	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Coffee Machines	What is the budget for coffee machines in the department?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000504	Si-64	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Land400 tender and local content analysis	1. Has the Department undertaken any analysis of the potential supply chain for the LAND400 project? 2. What engagement has the Department had with Defence to ensure maximum local content is achieved? 3. Has the Department offered any assistance in identifying the supply chain for the project? What was Defence's response?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000505	Si-65	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Total number of staff in department and portfolio agencies	Please provide a breakdown of the Department's total number of staff, by Division, Portfolio Agencies and APS level. Please include a breakdown of both APS and non-APS employees.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000506	Si-66	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Appointment of the Department's new Secretary	What role did Minister Sinodinos play in the appointment of the Department's new Secretary, Dr Smith?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000507	Si-67	Carr, Kim	Portfolio Policy and Innovation Strategy	Anti-dumping policy unit	Regarding the anti-dumping policy unit within the Department of Industry, please advise the following: a. What is the staffing profile for the Department's anti-dumping policy section? b. How has this changed over the past 5 years? Please provide a breakdown. c. What is the budget for those officials over the forward estimates? d. What is the level/rank of these officials? Provide a breakdown. e. What qualifications are anti-dumping policy officials required to have to gain employment in the Department? How does this differ from the Anti-Dumping Commission? f. What engagement do Departmental officials have with the Anti-Dumping Commissioners? How regular is that engagement? Is this formalised? Regarding the Department's current anti-dumping policy consultation process, please advise: a. How many submissions were received in stage 1 of that process. b. How many have been received as part of stage 2. c. When the process is expected to be completed. d. Who has the Department invited to participate. e. Whether the results will be made publically available. f. The amount of funding that has been allocated to this process. g. How many Department officials are involved in the process. h. Whether any consultants have been engaged in the process? i. If so, at what cost? ii. Who was engaged?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000508	Si-68	Carr, Kim	Portfolio Policy and Innovation Strategy	Anti-dumping policy consultation process		Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000509	Si-69	Carr, Kim	Portfolio Policy and Innovation Strategy	US tariffs on steel and aluminium imports	1. In July it was reported that Minister Cormann and the Prime Minister had arranged an exemption for Australian manufacturers from harsh tariffs the US is considering imposing on foreign steel and aluminium imports. What work is the Department doing to prevent Australia becoming a dumping ground for excess steel from China, should the US proceed with their import tariffs? a. Has there been any communication to the Department that this agreement with the US remains in place? b. What engagement has the Department had with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade on this matter? c. What has been the advice from DFAT? d. What engagement has the Department had with the Anti-Dumping Commission on this matter? What advice has the Department provided to the Anti-Dumping Commission?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000510	Si-70	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Australian Industry Participation Authority	1. Please provide a breakdown of the funding profile of the Australian Industry Participation Authority since its establishment. 2. How many AIP plans were completed in the 2016-17 financial year? 3. How many AIP plans have been completed to date this financial year? 4. Please provide a breakdown year on year of approved AIP since 2013. 5. How many implementation reports have been submitted to the Department in the financial year 2016-17? How many have been submitted to the Department in the present financial year? 6. How many times have implementation reports not been submitted to the Department within the 14 months of contract execution? What is the process when this occurs? Are there consequences? 7. Aside from the submission of implementation reports, what other measures does the Department have to audit compliance with AIP plans? 8. How many audits has the Department conducted on compliance with AIP plans? What was the result of those audits? 9. The Department's response to question on notice B1-137 stated "if there is no benefit to be gained from the preparation of an AIP plan an exemption from the requirement will be granted". How many times have firms applied for an exemption from the AIP requirement, and how many times was this granted? 10. How does the Department determine if there is no benefit and at what stage of the tender process is this determined?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000511	Si-71	Carr, Kim	Australian Building Codes Board	Employees working in non-compliant buildings	Is the Australian Building Codes Board aware of any Commonwealth employees that are working in buildings that are non-compliant with the national construction code? a. If so, which buildings and how many people are affected?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000512	Si-72	Carr, Kim	Australian Building Codes Board	Expert report into compliance and enforcement problems in the building industry	On 30 June 2017 the Building Ministers' Forum agreed to commission an expert (Professor Peter Shergold AC and Ms Bronwyn Weir) to look into the compliance and enforcement problems in the building industry. Please advise: a. When their report is due. b. A summary of their findings, if available. c. Whether the report will be publically available. d. The process for selecting Professor Shergold and Ms Weir as the experts. e. Whether they have been remunerated. f. The value of each of their contracts.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000513	Si-73	Carr, Kim	Australian Building Codes Board	Building Regulators' Forum	In relation to the newly established Building Regulators' Forum, please advise: a. How many times they have met since 13 July. b. The governance arrangements for the Forum.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000514	Si-74	Carr, Kim	Australian Building Codes Board	Website for non-conforming building products	Regarding the one-stop-shop website for non-conforming building products, please advise: a. How many hits the site has had since July 1. b. A summary of feedback the Building Ministers' Forum has received in relation to the site. c. The amount of complaints the site has received from the public about a building product or material. d. The amount of enquiries the site has received from the public about a building product or material. e. Whether any advertising has been done to promote the site. If so, when and at what cost.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000515	Si-75	Carr, Kim	Australian Building Codes Board	Implementation plan for the Senior Officers' Group report	In relation to the implementation plan for the Senior Officers' Group report, please advise: a. Whether the plan has been finalised. b. Why the plan was delayed. c. Whether it required check off from the Ministers' office. d. If so, what date it was given to the Ministers' office. e. Whether it will be publically released.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000516	Si-76	Carr, Kim	Australian Building Codes Board	Use of PE cladding	In relation to the recent communique from the last meeting of the Building Ministers' Forum: "All Ministers agreed that they will use their available laws and powers to prevent the use of aluminium composite cladding with a polyethylene (PE) core for class 2, 3, or 9 buildings of two or more storeys, and class 5, 6, 7 or 8 of three or more storeys, until such time as they are satisfied that manufacturers, importers, and installers, working in collaboration with building practitioners, will reliably comply with: • the newly established standard setting test against which fire retardant cladding products are deemed to be reasonable for use in high rise settings; and • an established and implemented system of permanent labelling on cladding products to prevent substitution." Please advise: a. Whether the Building Ministers agreed to prevent the use of PE cladding even if alternative performance based solutions are satisfied. b. How this statement will address concerns previously raised by the ABCB that fraudulent or counterfeit products will still end up on Australian buildings.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash

SQ17-000517	SI-77	Carr, Kim	Office of Innovation and Science Australia	ISA role in Biomedical Translation Fund	What role does ISA play in the administration of the Biomedical Translation Fund (BTF)? Please also advise: a. How ISA conducts the selection process for eligible applications? b. How many recommendations has ISA provided to the Fund's Programme Delegate regarding the technical merit of eligible applications? c. How many times has ISA recommended approving eligible recommendations and how many times has it recommended rejecting eligible recommendations? d. How many eligible applications has ISA been asked to provide advice and/or recommendations on to date? e. What is the staffing profile within ISA that is tasked with providing advice and/or recommendations on eligible applications to the BTF? f. How many times has the Programme Delegate of the Fund sought the advice of ISA on the following matters: i. changes in the structure of a Licensed Fund ii. the application of sanctions against a Fund Manager or investor iii. the suspension of funding in relation to a Licensed Fund iv. the termination of a Licence; and v. any matters that, in the Programme Delegate's opinion, relate to a Licensed Fund achieving vi. the policy objectives of the BTF Programme g. Has ISA provided the Programme Delegate with any advice on whether the BTF is meeting its objectives? If so, what was that advice? h. Has the Programme Delegate been required to relay the advice of ISA to the Minister? i. How many BTF applicant interviews has ISA conducted as part of the merit selection process?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000518	SI-78	Carr, Kim	Office of Innovation and Science Australia	2030 Strategic Plan	In relation to the development of ISA's 2030 Strategic Plan, please advise: a. Why the Plan has been delayed – given on 19 September ISA Chair, Bill Ferris, told an AFR Innovation Summit that it would be delivered 'in less than 3 weeks'. b. Whether the plan is still expected to be delivered in the fourth quarter this year. c. Whether issues were raised by the board about the plan. What these issues were. d. Whether Minister Sinodinos had seen the plan before he went on leave. e. Whether delays on decisions around the R&D Tax Incentive impacted the delivery of the Plan. f. How many submissions were received before the cut-off date. g. How many submissions have opted to remain confidential. h. How many submissions will be made public. i. How many submissions have opted to remain confidential.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000519	SI-79	Carr, Kim	Office of Innovation and Science Australia	Meetings with Assistant Minister Laundry	1. Please advise how many meetings Mr Day has had with Assistant Minister Laundry since Minister Sinodinos went on leave. a. When did this occur. b. Did he provide feedback on the 2030 Plan? What was the nature of that feedback?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000520	SI-80	Carr, Kim	Office of Innovation and Science Australia	Staff profile in the Office of Innovation and Science Australia	1. Please provide a breakdown of the staff profile in the Office of Innovation and Science Australia. a. What is the current staff profile of the 2030 Strategic Plan unit within ISA? b. How many consultants remain engaged on the Plan. c. How many people from across government are currently on secondment at ISA? i. Please provide a breakdown from what Departments they have come from.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000521	SI-81	Carr, Kim	Office of Innovation and Science Australia	Contract with Howard Partners	Regarding the \$425,000 contract ISA had with consultant group Howard Partners, please advise: a. What communication was issued to people wanting to participate in the public sessions that were run by the firm? b. Whether a document schedule was ever publicly issued prior to the sessions taking place. If so, how was this document distributed? c. Please provide a complete list of public sessions the firm ran, including how the invitations were communicated (copies of these documents, if available); how many people were invited to attend, which organisations were invited to attend; any feedback that the Department received about the sessions that were run by Howard Partners; details of when the invitations were issued. d. Why Howard Partners was not engaged in the final preparation of the Plan.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000522	SI-82	Carr, Kim	Office of Innovation and Science Australia	Contract for McKinsey	Regarding the \$500,000 contract for McKinsey, please advise: a. What the contract was for. b. The start and end date for the contract. c. What impact the delay of the release of the final plan will have on the contract with McKinsey. i.e. will the contract need to be extended to accommodate the 'tidy up' of the final Plan? d. Is there a budget for extending the contract? If so, how much is the delay expected to cost.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000523	SI-83	Carr, Kim	Office of Innovation and Science Australia	2030 Strategic Plan advertising and other media	In an answer to questions on notice AI -146 ISA advised that the budget for advertising and other media around the release of the 2030 Strategic Plan was \$10,000. Has that figure changed in the 2017-18 budgets? How much has now been allocated to advertising and media around the release?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000524	SI-84	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	Innovation patents	In relation to innovation patents, please advise the following: a. How many active innovation patents are currently in force. b. What is the average cost of an innovation patent? How does this differ compared to a standard patent? c. What is the cost to IP Australia of administering the innovation patent system? d. Is there an innovation patent unit in IP Australia? What is the staffing profile of that unit? e. How many innovation patent applications have been filed this year? f. What will be the impact on industry when the system is abolished? Have you done any modelling? g. What is the process for the abolition of the innovation patent? Please include: i. When it will be abolished. ii. What will happen to the patents that are currently mid-term? iii. What will happen to SMEs that are currently in the application process? h. Please provide a breakdown of the number of innovation patents issued each year since 2013, and the number of firms that have filed more than one innovation patent. i. How the abolition of the innovation patent system will advance innovation policy in Australia.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000525	SI-85	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	Australian patents	Please provide the number of Australian patents that have been granted this year. a. Provide a breakdown showing the type of patent –standard and innovation patents; the field of research to which the patent applies; the industrial application of the patent (for example, computer sciences, biological materials, biopharmaceutical products or medical devices etc.)	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000526	SI-86	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	Revenue from patent application fees	How much revenue was generated in FY 2016-17 from patent application fees?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000527	SI-87	Carr, Kim	IP Australia	Applications for patents	How many applications for patents were received and rejected?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000528	SI-88	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Review of the National Trade Measurement Regulations 2009	1. Referring to the review of the National Trade Measurement Regulations 2009, Part 4 – Packaging, and the second consultation that closed in late June. How many submissions did the Department receive in total? a. How many were from consumers? b. How many were from organisations representing consumers? c. How many were from companies? d. How many were from organisations representing companies? 2. In 2017 Budget Estimates hearings the Department indicated that this review was prompted by some requests from European cosmetics companies who did not want to re-sticker makeup for the Australian market, and some Tasmanian craft brewers who wanted more flexibility for their bottles. Officials said they had estimated the regulatory cost to cosmetic companies was \$3.6 million. Did any of these companies provide a submission? a. Will submissions be made public for this second round of consultation? b. Were results of the consultation were conclusive? What conclusion do they lead to? c. What happens next? Does the Department now intend to amend the Regulation or not? Will the consultation process conclude with no change? 3. This review of the measurement labelling rules was established in 2015, and this is the second consultation round. What is the quantum of Departmental resources that have gone into reviewing this particular regulation? What staffing levels are devoted to the reviews? What is the total spend?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000529	SI-89	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Industry Growth Centres	1. How much money remains in the industry growth centres? Please provide a breakdown. 2. In QON BI-132 the Department advised that a total of 59 people are employed across all six growth centres. Please advise whether the 59 people employed across the growth centres include: i. The Chair and the MD ii. Consultants or contractors? If so, how many? iii. Ongoing and non-ongoing employees? If so, how many? iv. Casual employees? If so, how many? v. Please advise how many staff are allocated to the media units in each growth centre. 3. On 13 August 2017, the Department published a tender number PRI 00003800 for public relations services for the Industry Growth Centres. Please provide the details of that tender including: a. What services are to be provided b. Whether that tender process complete c. The value of the contract d. The name of the successful tenderer e. Start and end dates for the contract f. Whether the establishment of the stand-alone Facebook presence – a requirement of the contract – has commenced. The Department's definition of what is considered a sufficient social media 'presence'? i.e. is this based on engaging a certain number of followers? How will this point be measured? g. What the Department considers is a 'critical mass of followers and influencers'? h. What social media platforms will the firm be responsible for? Will it include twitter/instagram? 4. How much has the Department budgeted for media advertising for the six growth centres? 5. How successful has the Advanced Manufacturing Growth Centre been in soliciting industry contributions? How much money has the centre attracted to date?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash

SQ17-000530	SI-90	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	Biomedical Translation Fund	1. In relation to the Biomedical Translation fund, please advise the following: a. The breakdown of policy responsibility between the Department of Industry and the Department of Health. b. Governance arrangements for the fund. c. Profile of staffing in the Fund's units within each department. d. How many companies have sought investment from the BTF to date? e. How many have been approved. Please provide a breakdown of industry sector. f. How many companies are currently under consideration? g. What was the process for selecting the three fund investment managers? h. What is the average time it takes to assess applications? i. How many applications have failed to meet the eligibility criteria of the Fund? j. How many applications have reached the merit assessment stage? k. How many licensing rounds have been conducted? l. How many applicants were shortlisted in each licensing round? m. How many applicants have been offered a license under the BTF Programme? n. How many written offers have been made? o. How many licensing rounds are scheduled for the financial year 2017-18? 2. Does the Department of Industry provide any support – either policy or financial – aimed at attracting investment in clinical trials? Please provide details. a. What engagement has the Department of Industry had with the Department of Health on the topic of clinical trials? Please provide details. b. Please provide a breakdown of Commonwealth funding for clinical trials over the past five years. c. Has the Department done any modelling on the impact of the proposed cap to the refundable component of the R&D tax incentive on clinical trial investment? If so, please provide details.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000531	SI-91	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	The Business Research and Innovation Initiative	1. In relation to the Business Research and Innovation Initiative please advise the following: a. What criteria were used to decide the five policy and service delivery challenges for grants under this program in 2016? (measuring pyrethroid surface residue; assessment of information products; digitally enabled community participation in policy and program design; transparency of water-market information; national sharing of information on child safety) b. What officers and/or agencies chose these categories? c. How many applications were received? d. Were applications received in all five categories? Please provide a breakdown. e. How many applications were successful? In which categories? f. Did any of the successful applicants receive a further grant for prototype development? If so, what was the value of each grant? g. If prototype grants were made, how many and in which categories? h. Who were the successful applicants? i. Was the program continued in 2017? Did it have the same budget as in 2016? j. Have the successful projects influenced policy or departmental procedures? Please provide details. k. Did any SMEs receive early-stage financial support under the program? What were they?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000532	SI-92	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Discretionary grants	Please update the discretionary grants spreadsheet provided in response to Question on Notice no. BI-138 from the 2016-17 Budget Estimates, to provide budgeted, committed and non-committed funding from 2009-10 to 2020-21 for all identified programs and any other discretionary grant programs that may be established.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000533	SI-93	McAllister, Jenny	Corporate	Department and Agency staffing	For each department and agency in the portfolio please provide as at 30 June 2017: 1. # of state 2. # of headcount of people employed as a. Labour Hire, b. Contractors, or c. Outsourced staff, d. # and the value of each of these contracts for the 2016-2017 financial year.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000534	SI-94	McAllister, Jenny	Digital Strategy and Operations	Staff access to IT and security systems	For each department and agency in the portfolio please provide as at 30 June 2017: The total number of people who have a log in to the departmental IT system, and the breakdown by category of these log-ins (permanent, non-ongoing, casual, labour hire, outsourced, contractors, and any other category that has access to the system). The total number of people who have a security/access pass into your departmental buildings, and the breakdown by category of these pass holders (permanent, non-ongoing, casual, labour hire, outsourced, contractors, and any other relevant category). A list of organisations/companies that have staff who can log into your departmental IT system.	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000535	SI-95	McAllister, Jenny	Corporate	Department and agency service delivery functions	For each department and agency in the portfolio: Does any part of your agency/department have a service delivery function, or which has face to face interactions with the public? If yes: 1. Do you provide staff with training on how to deal with client aggression or customers experiencing mental illness? 2. Please provide the dates and locations that training has been run over the last 5 years. 3. How many of your staff have received this training? How many in the last 2 years? 4. Who provides this training?	Written		3/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000536	SI-96	McAllister, Jenny	Digital Strategy and Operations	Projects with the Digital Transformation Agency	For each department and agency in the portfolio: As at 31 October 2017: 1. What projects are you undertaking in conjunction with the Digital Transformation Agency? 2. For each project: a. What criteria are you using for assessing success? b. What is the role of the DTA in the project? c. What is the timeframe for completion?	Written		7/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000537	SI-97	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	CRC 19th selection round	1. When will the 19th selection round interviews be held? 2. Is this later than previous rounds? 3. Is this three months later than initially advertised? 4. Will the 19th round CRCs commence in July 2018 or another date? 5. How will the Department ensure CRCs will start on the mandated date? 6. When is it anticipated successful CRCs will be advised next year? 7. How much later is this than in previous rounds? 8. How much time will that give new CRCs to establish Boards and appoint officers?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000538	SI-98	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	CRC Advisory Committee Membership	1. What is the current total membership of the CRC Advisory Committee? 2. Is this more or less than in previous years? If so, how much more or less? 3. Why has the membership changed? 4. Was the old Committee consulted about the need to make the changes? 5. Was there any saving from the reduction in Committee numbers? If so, how much?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000539	SI-99	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	CRC Advisory Committee resourcing	1. How has the Committee workload changed in recent years? Has it increased with the advent of CRC-PS? 2. Has the Committee made any comment or complaint about the increase in workload? 3. What resourcing or secretariat support is provided to the Committee? 4. Has the Committee indicated that this may now be sub-optimal – or should be increased? 5. Has the Committee ever indicated that lack of support is a factor in the delays in announcement of successful CRCs?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000540	SI-100	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	CRC Advisory Committee remuneration	1. How is the Committee remunerated? Is it a set fee, or is it time-based? 2. (If it is time-based: has the increased work-load diminished or eliminated any save?) 3. How often was the Committee required to update its share of the in-coming Minister's brief to accommodate changes in Minister?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000541	SI-101	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Growth Centre input into CRCs	1. In assessing applications, the Board "may seek advice from industry (including growth centres), government and the research sector on any aspect of an application." Can you advise how many times the Board sought advice from Growth Centres and when? 2. Have all approaches to Growth Centres for advice been met with a response? If not, how many were not responded to?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000542	SI-102	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	CRC for Developing Northern Australia	1. The CRC Instrument provides that the CRC Advisory Board must follow precisely detailed selection criteria and processes. Were followed to the letter in relation to the Northern CRC? 2. Has the Northern CRC finally appointed a permanent Board? 3. Does the Northern CRC operate in the same manner as other CRCs – and subject to the same rules? 4. Did the Department conduct a round of CRC-PS on behalf of the Northern CRC prior to the CRC's establishment, with the funding coming from the general pool, rather than the Northern CRC's budget? 5. If yes, does this confer privileged status on the Northern CRC compared to other CRCs? 6. Is the Northern CRC effectively allowed to double-dip, not having to compete for funds like the other CRCs?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000543	SI-103	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Business Services	Budget announcement of increased funding for advanced manufacturing	Can you provide any advice on progress with allocating the \$20 Million for CRC Projects into advanced manufacturing research projects which opened for applications in July?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000544	SI-104	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO paper procurement	1. What proportion of your paper supply does the CSIRO buy from Australian companies? 2. What proportion is sourced from overseas? 3. Last estimates the Department of Finance advised that in addition to itself, the Departments of Employment and Foreign Affairs and Trade have both changed their paper procurement policies so that they now purchase only Australian made paper. Has the CSIRO received any advice from Finance or Industry to change its procurement practices? 4. Have your paper procurement practices changed to reflect changes to the Commonwealth procurement rules? 5. How does your paper procurement interact with findings from the Anti Dumping Commission of dumping of paper from Indonesia, China, Thailand and Brazil?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000545	SI-105	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	National Science Strategy	1. Is the Department engaged in any work on a national science strategy or additional national science statement? 2. If so have any working groups or inter department committees been established? When? What is their membership and what dates have they met? 3. Has the Department consulted any stakeholders? If so how many and who?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash

SQ17-000546	Si-106	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Space Capabilities Review	On 13 July, the Government announced its review of Australia's space capabilities by an expert reference group to be chaired by Dr Megan Clark and to report by the end of March 2017. Can you advise: a) Is the review proceeding according to this timetable? b) Has there been any change to the group membership? c) Is the review making progress on all of the matters listed for the group's attention?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000547	Si-107	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Space agency	On 25 September, the Minister announced that the Government would establish a space agency. a) Was this an interim recommendation of the group? b) Has the group any other interim announcements? c) Apart from the support of the expert reference group, what other policy processes did the Government go through before the announcement? d) Did the space agency proposal go to Cabinet? e) Did it go to ERC?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000548	Si-108	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Space agency - administrative arrangements	1. Will the space agency be administered with the Department or be setup as a separate body? 2. Has there been any progress on the development of the agency's charter of operation mentioned in the release?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000549	Si-109	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Repeal of Australian Astronomical Observatory Act 2010	Is it still the intention to proceed with the repeal of the Australian Astronomical Observatory Act 2010? When does that need to take place to meet the 1 July 2018 handover.	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000550	Si-110	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Outsourcing of the Anglo-Australian Telescope	1. The new domestic arrangements will see the outsourcing of the AAT to an ANU led consortium. Is that right? a. Have there been any changes to the membership of the consortium? b. Will the government be handing over the assets to the consortium? Leasing operations to the consortium? Some other arrangement? c. What arrangements have been made for the staff? Has their union been consulted? If so, on what dates?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000551	Si-111	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Australian Astronomical Observatory instrumentation capability	1. The second element is the outsourcing of the AAO's instrumentation capability based in Sydney. Who will be taking this over? a. What level of funding do you understand will be made for the operation of this site from NCRIS? b. Will the government be handing over the assets to the consortium? Leasing operations to the consortium? Some other arrangement? c. What arrangements have been made for the staff? i. How many staff at North Ryde will transfer? ii. Who will be their employer? iii. Has their union been consulted? If so, on what dates? d. How was consortium selected? Was there some sort of process seeking interest? A tender process? e. Who were the stakeholders consulted?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000552	Si-112	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	New Australian Astronomical Observatory Reference Group	In regards to new arrangements for the AAO is there a reference group in operation or planned to be formed? Who will be on it?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000553	Si-113	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Department's astronomy capability	1. What capabilities will remain with the Department. How many staff? 2. Will any jobs be lost as a result of this process?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000554	Si-114	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Research Infrastructure Investment Plan	1. What progress has been made towards the development of the Research Infrastructure Investment Plan promised in the budget? 2. Has an interdepartmental committee been established? 3. Who represents the Industry Department on this Committee? 4. Is the Education Department still leading this effort? 5. How often has this committee met? 6. Have any proposals been to Cabinet or the ERC? 7. Is it still the plan to have a response prepared by the end of this year, as flagged by Senator Sinodinos in June?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000555	Si-115	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO staff by functional area	Please breakdown the number of staff in each business unit by functional area (ie. Research scientists, research support staff, research consultants etc) since 2013-14 by both headcount and FTE. Also please provide a breakdown of the above reporting instead the percentage of male and female staff members.	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000556	Si-116	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO external revenue forecasts	Please provide the external revenue forecast for each business unit in 2016-17, plus actual external revenue by business unit in 2016-17. According to the 2016-17 Science, Research and Innovation Tables in 2012-13 the allocation to the National Measurement Institute was \$9.5 million. For 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 it was \$7.5 million. In 2016-17 and across the forward estimates it is \$7 million. What is the reason for the fall in appropriations or allocations to the NMI? Is this reduction in government expenditure on the NMI a reason why it has sustainability issues?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000557	Si-117	Carr, Kim	National Measurement Institute	National Measurement Institute appropriations	According to the 2016-17 Science, Research and Innovation Tables in 2012-13 the allocation to the National Measurement Institute was \$9.5 million. For 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16 it was \$7.5 million. In 2016-17 and across the forward estimates it is \$7 million. What is the reason for the fall in appropriations or allocations to the NMI? Is this reduction in government expenditure on the NMI a reason why it has sustainability issues?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000558	Si-118	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO Innovation Fund	Why was the name of the CSIRO Innovation Fund changed to Main Sequence Ventures?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000559	Si-119	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO review of science prioritisation and implementations processes	In regards to the final report of the Review of CSIRO's Science Prioritisation and Implementation Process: 1. Did CSIRO accept all of the recommendations of the review? 2. Please outline your response to each recommendation and actions taken to date to implement recommended changes	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000560	Si-120	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	RV Investigator	In regards to figures for the RV Investigator in the annual report: 1. Apart from the 180 days funded via the government appropriation, who funded the additional days? 2. Why were only 7,707 scientist days delivered compared to 9,600 possible? 3. Why was only 26 percent of time allocated to CSIRO researchers on the RV Investigator?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000561	Si-121	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	CSIRO membership of industry associations and forums	How many memberships of industry associations or forums does the CSIRO hold? Please list them	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000562	Si-122	Carr, Kim	Corporate	Department market sounding	Has the Department conducted any reviews or market soundings of any of its functions since 2013? If so, please list the date, the review/market soundings, costs and conclusions	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash , Matthew Canavan
SQ17-000563	Si-123	Carr, Kim	Science and Commercialisation Policy	KPMG contract for market soundings	In reference to the contract referred to on Page 100 of the committee transcript, how was KPMG chosen to conduct it, and for how many days of work were they paid?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000564	Si-124	Carr, Kim	National Measurement Institute	NMI Services for Government	Please list the services the National Measurement Institute provides for government	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000565	Si-125	Carr, Kim	National Measurement Institute	NMI external revenue	How much external revenue did the NMI earn in 2016/17, and how much is forecast in 2017/18?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000566	Si-126	Carr, Kim	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Lindfield	Has the CSIRO sought or received a valuation on Lindfield? a. What is that valuation? b. Why was it sought? c. Who conducted the valuation? What did the valuation cost?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000567	Si-127	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Anti-Dumping Commission Funding	In response to question on notice BI-129, it was advised that funding for the Anti-dumping Commission (the Commission) was set at \$12,111,000. Has this figure changed, if so provide an update. How much funding has been allocated to the Commission over the forward estimates? How does this compare to previous financial years? Please provide a breakdown of your annual funding since 2012-13.	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000568	Si-128	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Anti-Dumping Commission Staffing	1. How many FTE are allocated to the Anti-dumping Commission this year? Have your staffing levels increased or decreased from the 3.6 FTE staff that were employed by the Commission in May this year? 2. Has the Commission needed to hire any additional investigators this year? Please provide a breakdown, including whether they were retained. 3. How many consultants, service providers or contractors are currently employed by the Commission? Please provide a breakdown of the budget for each category.	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000569	Si-129	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Appealed decisions	1. How many decisions made by the Commission were appealed by affected parties in the 2016-17 financial year? How many decisions have been appealed to date in 2017-18? Please provide a breakdown. 2. How many decisions made by the Commission have been appealed since 2014? Please provide a breakdown of appeals and whether they were successful or not.	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000570	Si-130	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Number of measures currently in place	Please provide an update to QON BI-129, question 8 relating to the number of measures currently in place.	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000571	Si-131	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Dumping of excess steel from China	In July it was reported that Minister Cormann and the Prime Minister had arranged an exemption for Australian manufacturers from import tariffs the US is considering imposing on foreign steel and aluminium products. What work is the Anti-Dumping Commission doing to prevent Australia becoming a dumping ground for excess steel from China, if the US proceeds with their import tariffs? a. Has the Anti-Dumping Commission engaged with the Productivity Commission about this matter? Please provide details of that engagement. b. Has there been any communication between the Department of Industry and the Anti-Dumping Commission confirming this agreement with the US remains in place? c. What engagement has the Commission had with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade on this matter? d. What has been the advice from DFAT?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000572	Si-132	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Consultation on reforms to the anti-dumping system	Regarding the consultation process the Department of Industry is running on reforms to the anti-dumping system, please advise: a. What role the Anti-Dumping Commission is playing in the process. b. How many officials from the Commission have been assigned to support that process?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash

SQ17-000573	Si-133	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Anti-Dumping investigations	1. How many ongoing investigations are currently on the Anti-Dumping Commission's books? Please provide a breakdown since 2014. 2. Please provide a breakdown on the type of investigations currently on your books, for example, new investigations, reviews, duty assessments etc. a. Please provide a further breakdown showing the type of product. 3. What qualifications are required for employment as investigators at the Anti-Dumping Commission?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000574	Si-134	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Changes to dumping margins	Please provide an update to the table in QON BI-1 from Budget Estimates 2017 for all changes to dumping margins as a result of reviews undertaken by the Commission for 2016-17 financial year, and for the 2017-18 financial year to date.	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000575	Si-135	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Information shared with Australian Border Force	How many times did the Commission and Australian Border Force shared information about potential instances of non-compliance and circumvention in 2016-17?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000576	Si-136	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Preliminary Affirmative Determinations	How many times since the Customs (Preliminary Affirmative Determinations) Direction 2015 has the Commission made a Preliminary Affirmative Determination (PAD) that has resulted in the Commonwealth taking securities?	Written		8/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000577	Si-137	Carr, Kim	Anti-Dumping Commission	Anti-dumping duties	1. How much money has been collected from dumping and countervailing duties as a result of measures that have been imposed by the Anti-Dumping Commission? Please provide a breakdown since 2013. 2. In comparison to the dumping/injury period, please provide a breakdown since 2013 of the volume reduction (by percentage) of commodities imported after: a. An investigation was initiated b. Duties were put in place 3. Please provide a breakdown of the volume reduction from the countries subjected to duties compared to the total volume reduction in imports of the commodity over the past 12 months.	Written		14/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000578	Si-138	Carr, Kim	Industry Growth	Consultation with Victoria	Senator KIM CARR: Can you also provide us with details of Victoria's ongoing consultation. The advice that I have contradicts the evidence you've just provided. You said you spoke to them yesterday. What's the formal consultation?	Spoken	107	26/10/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash
SQ17-000579	Si-139	Carr, Kim	AUSI - Innovation Programmes	Industry sector breakdowns	Could you please provide industry sector breakdowns for both the non-refundable and refundable components of the R&D Tax Incentive for 2016-17?	Written		20/11/2017 0:00	Michaelia Cash