

## Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

## Questions on Notice

Supplementary Budget Estimates 2017-18

Monday 23 and Friday 27 October 2017

## Infrastructure and Regional Development Portfolio

QoN No.	PDR No.	Division	Senator	Broad topic	Question	Hansard page and hearing date or Written	Comments
<b>Corporate Services (5)</b>							
1	431	CORP	ABETZ	MESSAGES SENT TO STAFF AT CHRISTMAS/NEW YEAR, EASTER AND RAMADAN	Please provide the messages (if any) sent to staff (on the most recent occasions) of Christmas/New Year, Easter and Ramadan by the Secretary of the Department at the relevant time.	WRITTEN 31/10/17	
2	432	CORP	ABETZ	ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT	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 31/10/17	
3	451	CORP	MCALLISTER	STAFFING	Please provide as at 30 June 2017: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ASL by state</li> <li>2. Headcount of people employed as <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Labour Hire,</li> <li>b. Contractors, or</li> <li>c. outsourced staff,</li> <li>d. and the value of each of these contracts for the 2016-2017 financial year.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. The total number of people who have a log in to the departmental IT</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 3/11/17	

					<p>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).</p> <p>4. 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).</p> <p>5. A list of organisations/companies that have staff who can log into your departmental IT system.</p>		
4	452	CORP	MCALLISTER	SERVICE DELIVERY FUNCTION	<p>Does any part of your agency/department have a service delivery function, or which has face to face interactions with the public?</p> <p>If yes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do you provide staff with training on how to deal with client aggression or customers experiencing mental illness?</li> <li>2. Please provide the dates and locations that training has been run over the last 5 years.</li> <li>3. How many of your staff have received this training? How many in the last 2 years?</li> <li>4. Who provides this training?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 3/11/17	
5	453	CORP	MCALLISTER	PROJECTS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	<p>As at 31 October 2017:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What projects are you undertaking in conjunction with the Digital Transformation Agency?</li> <li>2. For each project: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What criteria are you using for assessing success?</li> <li>b. What is the role of the DTA in the project?</li> <li>c. What is the timeframe for completion?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	WRITTEN 3/11/17	
<b>Infrastructure Australia (2)</b>							
6	361	IA	O'SULLIVAN	VIADUCT TREATMENT	<b>CHAIR:</b> So fast-forward two years. Can you answer this: at the concept design stage, when you were given whatever it was you were given to assess, did it	12 23/10/17	

					<p>include a viaduct model?</p> <p><b>Mr R Wood:</b> Just to be clear: again, I don't work for Infrastructure Australia.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> All right. I will take the question back to Mr Parkinson. Did it include a viaduct treatment across the Condamine Plains on the alignment that's currently been chosen?</p> <p><b>Mr Parkinson:</b> We'd have to take on notice the detail of what was set out there.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Take that on notice.</p>		
7	362	IA	GALLACHER	BUSINESS CASES	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can I ask a question on notice on that? Can we have the projects for the last 12 months geographically and your assessment of them? So Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, Victoria—the last 12 months of business cases that have come to you, and your stage or rating of those?</p> <p><b>Mr Davies:</b> Can you just clarify the question in terms of the stage?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I will put it very simply. Victoria does not appear to get such an easy run, so I would like you to demonstrate that you're fair and equitable in terms of the taxpayer's investment across every state in Australia.</p> <p><b>Mr Davies:</b> We take the same approach to every project—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I just want it on notice. On notice would be absolutely fine.</p> <p><b>Mr Davies:</b> If you read over the last 12 months, all our assessments are on the website.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Thank you for telling me to go to a website. You come here at estimates, and I am entitled to ask you questions on notice. I would like that assessment supplied on notice, reasonable amount of time, to see what has happened geographically around Australia in terms of assessments.</p>	16 23/10/17	
<b>Australian Rail Track Corporation (3)</b>							
8	467	ARTC	STERLE	INLAND RAIL	Has the ARTC Board sought or will it seek a letter of comfort, guarantee or any other agreement or arrangement with the Commonwealth regarding the commercial risks related to the Inland Rail project?	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
9	481	ARTC	RICE	INLAND RAIL BETWEEN ALBURY AND MELBOURNE	1. Does the Department of Infrastructure have representation on the planning or technical advisory groups/committees which are working on rail track issues between Albury and Melbourne?	WRITTEN 6/11/17	

					<p>2. On the section of track between Albury and Melbourne, what steps are being taken to ensure that the Track Upgrade Project incorporates the higher ride standards required by the Inland Rail Project?</p> <p>Does the Inland Rail unit have representation on the planning or technical advisory groups/committees which are working on track issues between Albury and Melbourne?</p>		
10	364	ARTC	RICE	TECHNICAL REFERENCE GROUP	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Does the federal government have a representative on your technical reference group that is overseeing the development of that program of works?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> The federal government are represented on the steering committee.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> On the steering committee, but not on the technical reference group?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> No. The technical reference group is technical people from ARTC and V/Line.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you tell me who is on the technical reference group?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> I know from ARTC's point of view it's Tony Frazer, who's a well-experienced track engineer. I'd have to get the names for you of those who are represented from V/Line—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So it's ARTC and V/Line, and that's it? They are the two organisations represented?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> There could be somebody from the PTV. I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Thank you.</p>	30-31 23/10/17	
<b>Infrastructure Investment (29)</b>							
11	450	II	RHIANNON	MOOREBANK INTERMODAL	<p>1. Referring to the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment, Table 12.1, please provide the specific method and data points utilised in calculating derivative of 3.31% for M5 west of Moorebank Av EB.</p> <p>2. Please provide:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. The Moorebank Intermodal Terminal Demand Refresh Study Final Draft – Deloitte, June 2014, and Moorebank Intermodal Terminal Project – Detailed Business Case – KPMG Feb 2012.</p>	WRITTEN 3/11/17	

					<p>b. Any and all studies of hard traffic counts for container truck destinations from Port Botany to all points and also specifically for M5 traffic and container trucks currently travelling from Port Botany to Moorebank.</p> <p>c. Evidence for the claim that the minimum daily [13,884+] truck and car movements generated by Moorebank IMT at full build [of 850,000sqm] only account for 3% of M5 traffic and congestion.</p> <p>3. Please advise how much public money has been allocated to:</p> <p>a. Operating Moorebank Intermodal Company so far?</p> <p>b. The exact cost of the Rail Spur Line from the Southern Sydney Freight Line?</p> <p>4. Please advise how much public money has been committed into the future?</p> <p>a. Who is going to pay to duplicate the SSFL?</p> <p>b. Who is going to pay to fix the M5 Bridge and Merge problems?</p> <p>5. Referring to government’s report conducted by Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, The report cited is based on 1,050,000 TEU IMEX, 500,000 TEU Interstate and 850,000 sqm of warehousing, while current capped approvals amount to a total of 500,000 TEU and zero warehousing.</p> <p>a. Is that not 1,050,000 20ft containers and 850,000 sqm of warehousing less than the model the government is promoting?</p> <p>b. Does that not cut almost 90% or 5985 warehousing jobs from the 6800 total?</p> <p>6. Please provide any details of any investigation regarding possible PFAS/PFOA contamination around the intermodal site.</p>		
12	462	II	STERLE	2016-17 UNDERSPEND	Can the Department explain why there will be \$1.8 billion underspend in 2016-17? Can you indicate, by project and program, where the underspend occurred?	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
13	463	II	STERLE	BRUCE HIGHWAY UPGRADE	Can you provide an updated funding profile for the Government’s 10 year \$6.7 billion Bruce Highway Upgrade Program, starting in 2013-14?	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
14	464	II	STERLE	PACIFIC HIGHWAY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much was invested in 2016-17 upgrading this road?</li> <li>• How much will be invested in 2017-18 upgrading this road?</li> <li>• How much will be invested in 2018-19 upgrading this road?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much will be invested in 2019-20 upgrading this road?</li> <li>• How much will be invested in 2020-21 upgrading this road?</li> </ul>		
15	465	II	STERLE	WA INFRASTRUCTURE PACKAGE	<p>Could the Department list all the projects that make up the Government’s \$1.6 billion WA Infrastructure Package?</p> <p>For each of them can you also provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding breakdown between state and Commonwealth;</li> <li>• Construction start date;</li> <li>• Construction completion date;</li> <li>• Funding profile.</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
16	466	II	STERLE	ELECTION COMMITMENTS	<p>Could the Department list all the Government’s 2016 road and rail election commitments?</p> <p>For each of them can you also provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding breakdown between state and Commonwealth;</li> <li>• Construction start date;</li> <li>• Construction completion date;</li> <li>• Funding profile.</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
17	366	II	GALLACHER	STATE AND TERRITORY BLACK SPOT PROJECTS	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can you provide a list of all projects provided by the various state- and territory-based black spot consultation committees over those three financial years, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17? Do you have that information?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> No, we don't have all of that with us today, so we will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Would you have even one year's?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> No; we're really talking about hundreds of projects.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Well, is it 50 projects a year, or 200 projects a year? I think you did mention a number of projects.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Yes, I gave you a number of 302 for 2016-17. But are you asking us for a list of what each of those projects is?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Yes. And I want absolute detail. For argument's sake, the 302 in 2016-17: how many did you do?</p>	33 23/10/17	

				<p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> A total of 157 of those are already underway.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And what's happened to the other 155 or whatever it is?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We'd have to take on notice to give you that detail.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are you saying they were all delayed for weather or something?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Sorry, Senator: I've just realised from my notes that I've actually given you the wrong figure. So, 550 black spot projects were approved in 2016-17; 302 are complete and 157 are underway. Apologies for that. So, you can see from just a year ago that they're already—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> That's 459, so there are about—</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> There's only a small number that aren't already started. But if you would like to have those sorts of statistics, we can provide those for you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Yes. So, on notice, could we have a list of all the projects recommended by the various state and territory based black spot consultative committees over the past three years—2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17? Obviously that would be on notice. And for each of the projects could you provide the following information: the date recommended by the committee, the date funding was approved, the date construction began and the date the project was completed. I would be returning to this particular program every time I came to estimates. I don't think there is any more critical infrastructure spend than the one that actually saves Australian road users, pedestrians and cyclists from being killed or injured. I would really want to see some justification as to why, if any government is allocating \$160 million, we can't get that on the table, because the effect is that fewer people die or are injured. And a nod doesn't get onto <i>Hansard</i>—I'm sorry; I can't read your name that far away! So, I would expect that this is a precursor to a report that I would like to see in February and in March and whenever we come back.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Perhaps I can offer that BITRE has also undertaken reviews of the program. Can we also provide those to you, so that you can see what's actually been achieved or what the problems have been in the past?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Absolutely. I don't want to see newspaper articles that allege that you can't get your money into black spot funding programs. I want to see the evidence that you are doing it and if there is an untoward weather event or an inability to commence a project on time, I think it should be fully transparent, because there's nothing more critical than this investment, in my view.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I will also note that almost all of our road projects are of course in some way assisting with road safety measures as well. We might try to see if we can find you some broader information as well.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> All right. Thank you very much.</p>		
18	367	II	STERLE	HEAVY VEHICLE SAFETY AND PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAM EXPENDITURE	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I want to move onto the Heavy Vehicle Safety and Productivity Program. The government has committed \$171 million to the Heavy Vehicle Safety and Productivity Program in its first three budgets. Can you tell me how much it's actually spent?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> The first three budgets?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, the first three. I have total of \$171 million.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> So, you're after 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17? Those three years?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, please.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> We've got \$530,000 for 2014-15, \$13.86 million for 2015-16, and \$36.64 million for 2016-17.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I will just do some very quick sums. That adds up to about \$50½ million. Am I right in saying the announcement was \$171 million?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We would have to take that on notice. The heavy vehicle programs allocation, I think, going forward, is \$60 million per year. But I believe it was less than that in the previous years.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> It is \$40 million a year.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Right, so you want to come back to me. Is there someone there who can tell me, please?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We can get somebody who can check for you.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> If I'm saying \$171 million, you have to prove me wrong. I will stand by \$171 million. I am not going to cop \$120 million. You need to prove to me that I'm wrong.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We'll get somebody to double-check.</p>	38-39 23/10/17	
19	368	II	STERLE	UPDATE ON PROJECTS FROM THE HEAVY VEHICLE SAFETY AND PRODUCTIVITY	<p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> If you wanted to know the number of projects completed: of the 53 in round 4, 39 have been completed. So about 80 per cent of the projects have been completed. In round 5, which was only announced in September 2016, we've got 11 projects completed.</p>	40 23/10/17	



				PROGRAM	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What are these projects?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> There's a variety of projects all over the country.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> They involve things such as rest stops for trucks and they involve signage, so that truck drivers—I'm sure you're familiar with this—can tell when an appropriate stop is coming up. They also include things such as amendments to spots where trucks are having difficulty getting through—roundabouts and those sorts of things; anything that's a difficulty.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you take this on notice, if you can, to provide information on what all those projects are, the ones that are completed and the ones that are not completed, where they are and all that sort of stuff—you know how it works; all that sort of stuff. But let's get back to the rest bays. I'm very interested if the rest bays. Where I like to hang around like a bad smell is the Kimberley. There are bugger all up there, and with the ones that are there, let me tell you, the caravanners can't wait to sneak into them. So how many of these projects are rest stops? How many are completed? In what states are they? If you have to take that on notice—unless you have a heading there that says—</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> No; we need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> All right. No worries; so we can break that all done.</p>		
66	491	II	STERLE	SAFETY CAMERAS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What about cameras—safety cams? Are they part of this sort of stuff?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Improvements in cameras are actually funded from the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator under funding that was allocated by government to it. So those projects are rolling out progressively at the moment, as well.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> We can get do that later, I suppose.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Service Transport Policy would be able to do that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So there are no camera programs in this—none at all?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Not that I'm aware of. I'm not familiar with the projects being funded.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> It would have to fit the definition of a 'road'.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Yes. Good point!</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No stress. Have we been able to find out how much the actual announcements were—all up?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Can I offer to take that and come back after lunch in relation to that?</p>	40 23/10/17	

					<b>Senator STERLE:</b> You can.		
20	370	II	GALLACHER	BLACK SPOT PROGRAM UNDERSPEND	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I want to go through these figures. We're led to believe that in 2014-15, there was \$48 million promised in the budget and only \$500,000 was actually spent. So, in that year, there was an underspend of \$47.5 million. In 2015-16, there was \$59.1 million promised in the budget and there was \$13.9 million actually spent. So, in that year, there was a \$45.2 million underspend. In 2016-17, there was \$64.4 million promised in the budget and actual spend of \$36.6 million, which was an underspend of \$27.8 million. Cumulatively, that comes up to an actual underspend over three years of \$120.5 million. Are those figures correct, or are you going to knock holes in that?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> As I said earlier, we will come back after lunch with all of the figures that have been asked for and confirm those with you.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> While you're at it, can you look at the underspend on the Black Spot Program? The same questions exist for that program.</p>	42-43 23/10/17	
21	369	II	MCCARTHY	BRIDGES RENEWAL PROGRAM UNDERSPEND	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> In the first three budgets, you committed \$200 million to the Bridges Renewal program and, in the end, you only spent \$88.7 million—less than half the amount promised—according to the budget documents. Can the department confirm what the accumulated underspend on the Bridges Renewal program was over the last three financial years of 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> In 2014-15, nothing was spent. In 2015-16, spending was \$35.7 million. In 2016-17, it was \$52.96 million. That again reflects that same sort of profile—when you open a round, get projects in and then start to roll them out. That is why you get that sort of profile.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Are you referring to 2014-15 with that explanation?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It is also worth noting that that was the commencement of the program. This is a new program.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Very similarly to Ms Hall's earlier answer about heavy vehicles, round 1 opened on 1 July 2014 and closed on 28 August 2014, the announcement was made in February 2015, and then you start to see projects being funded from</p>	43 23/10/17	

					<p>2015-16 onwards. It's a program based on rounds, and it takes some time to assess the projects and select them—and then for ministers to approve them and states to implement them. Keep in mind also that the state governments provide matching funding, so there's often a timing issue with when their budget approvals come in as well.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What then would your accumulated underspend be?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Again, I'd probably prefer to give you those answers formally on notice—if that's okay.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes, please take it on notice to give us the accumulated underspend on the Bridges Renewal program.</p>		
22	371	II	MCCARTHY	BRIDGES RENEWAL PROGRAM – COMPLETED PROJECTS	<p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> One other thing to mention is that just because all the funding hasn't been spent on a particular project doesn't necessarily mean it hasn't been finished. These programs have a final milestone: a post-completion report. The project might be finished on the ground—you'd see it and think it's finished—but then they need to provide a report to the department that satisfies our requirements before we release the final payment. We've actually done quite well in finishing projects, but there's often a little bit of a lag while we do the paperwork in order to be able to make the final payments. It doesn't mean that the program has any less money or that there are any fewer projects being finished. That's just the nature of the program.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Would you like to take on notice confirming that those projects have been completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I can give you the numbers of projects in particular rounds that have been completed as well.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> That would be great. What measures have been put or are being put in place by the department to make sure that in future the money allocated in the budget is actually spent? Obviously we won't know until we see the answer from you in terms of the underspend, but it's important to know what is actually happening there?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Because a number of these programs are actually competitive processes, part of it is about waiting until we actually get the submissions through the rounds to see how those submissions go against the criteria, and then working out from there and making sure that there's matching funding, et cetera. I think that the guidelines that sit around these programs are quite robust, but it's very hard,</p>	43-44 23/10/17	

					<p>therefore, to say that all the funding will actually be expended in that financial year, for the reasons that we've outlined already in regard to the timing of those rounds, how many applications we get. The government has made a commitment to have those programs ongoing now. They made that commitment last year in the budget, and they've allocated the ongoing \$40 million or the ongoing \$60 million for each of those projects. If there is a level of underspend, that funding is then moved to the right, as we've discussed before. So there is no cut in funding to any of those programs. It then allows us to perhaps look at the criteria going forward and how we can actually get greater projects coming forward from states and territories or councils, which is something that we did, for example, for the Bridges Renewal Program when we did the recent round 3.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you're going to provide a list of all the projects which you're currently considering?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Yes, happy to do that.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> That we have approved.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> That you have approved, okay. I notice certainly that you've made an announcement recently in terms of further bridge renewal projects. Can I just ask the status of those in the Northern Territory?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I don't know that we have all that detail because the announcement was only made in September.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What about the previous years?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> The breakdown for the Northern Territory—</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> From memory I think there were only two.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Round 2 of bridges, there was one project in the Northern Territory. Round 1, there were two projects. I'd probably need to seek advice about the number of successful projects in round 3.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> And successful completion?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I don't have the completion by state. We'd have to get that for you.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We can take that on notice and provide it for all the states.</p>		
23	372	II	STERLE	BUDGET FUNDING	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I can ask a couple of questions. Once again, I want to go back to the department's budgeting for the whole infrastructure budget. And at the budget time last year, the government said it had allocated \$9.2 billion to infrastructure programs and projects for 2016-17. But the final budget outcome for 2016-17,</p>	45-46 23/10/17	

					<p>released on 26 September this year—two or three weeks ago—confirmed that you'd actually spent only \$7.4 billion, which I see as an underspend of \$1.8 billion, which is even bigger than the underspend from the previous financial year, \$1.3 billion. So, my question is: what went wrong? What happened? I don't know whether you want to come back after lunch with that or you want to talk about it now; I'm in your hands.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Are you looking for a breakdown of what makes up that difference?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Absolutely, yes. I mean, it's not loose change, \$1.8 billion.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> So, the numbers that you stated in regard to 2016-17: there was a change from what was forecast in the 2016-17 budget to the final budget outcome recently released.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Well, I just said that.</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> I'm just confirming that. There were a number of factors that led to a lower than anticipated spend. As has been discussed at estimates a lot, we pay all our projects based on the achievement of physical milestones. We rely then on those projects to be delivered as expected by the states and territories when they're putting forward their cashflow projections and putting forward when they expect milestones to be met. The forecasts are based on the advice that we get from the states and territories that deliver the projects. Where milestones slip, we don't pay in advance; we wait until those milestones are met, and that often can mean that money will slip from one financial year to the other.</p> <p>There were a couple of other factors in the 2016-17 year. We had a fair bit of money tied up in the Perth Freight Link project. That was expected to go into construction and was subsequently cancelled by the WA government, so that funding had to be reallocated.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That wasn't in the 2016-17 budget?</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> We had significant funds—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sorry—in the 2016-17—</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> Yes. So, we had some funds. On the expectation that Perth Freight Link would go into full construction, there was a substantial amount of money allocated to it. Whilst that money's been allocated to other projects in Western Australia, those projects had different funding requirements. They weren't ready to start as Perth Freight Link was, so that money was moved. There was a process whereby there were savings or underspends realised on a lot of projects, or on a</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>number of projects, through that year that were reallocated to new commitments by the government. That was about—I'd have to go and get the numbers on notice. But basically those projects had funding allocated, expecting to spend it.. They ended up being delivered for less than what was expected. The funding was retained in the program and allocated to new projects. But, again, they had different cashflow requirements, because they were brand new, so we had to adjust the profiles and push the money out into future years.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. On that—and sorry to cut you off; it is that time—you can supply all that information for us on notice to show exactly why it was \$1.8 billion less than what was projected, can't you?</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> We can.</p>		
24	373	II	STERLE	BEEF ROADS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> When we first started talking about the beef roads—this committee supports that; it's great—we didn't know at the time if it was for bridges, widening or a bit of grading. Just to get this right, Ms Garbin, are all those projects the sealing of dirt or gravel roads?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll have to go back and double-check.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I don't want to trap you, because I can't see how you could do that amount of kilometres with \$100 million. That's all I'm trying to say, just so you don't get yourself pounced on by a couple of northern Australian senators. I probably would ask you, would you have any idea how many kilometres of road you're talking about in those projects?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll have to get that on notice for you.</p>	50 23/10/17	
25	374	II	O'SULLIVAN	BLACK SPOT INJURIES AND FATALITIES	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And it gets to be a black spot after someone is killed or injured?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And we can't get the allocated or promised funds into the area where it would save lives and injuries?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I'm sure there's always more we can do, and that's what we should always aim to do.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Is that an actual saving—a black spot only becomes a black spot position when someone is killed or injured as opposed to someone building the case about its—</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> There are criteria. Traditionally, the prioritisation of the black spot</p>	52 23/10/17	

					<p>projects is based on what they call a crash-benefit-cost ratio. Obviously, fatalities really are the ones that get picked up. But also, within the program, states can come forward with proactive or pre-emptive measures if they think there are safety issues growing at a location. So they can get projects agreed to that are proactive measures rather than resulting from—</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> But you can have projects that have a high-accident rate that do not occasion fatalities?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Why don't we get the actual—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Yes, I'd be interested—</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> That's as I understand it.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Sorry, Senator—I'd be interested in a breakdown of what percentage are as a direct result of a fatality or series of fatalities.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Injuries are more expensive.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Or injuries versus—there's pre-emptive status there.</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> We would need to take that on notice, to get a break-up.</p>		
26	375	II	STERLE	<p>WESTCONNEX CONCESSIONAL LOAN</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I just want to talk about the Westconnex and the \$2 billion concessional loan. Could you just let me know, please, how much of that \$2 billion concessional loan has now been taken up and handed over to the New South Wales government.</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I do have that information with me.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Great.</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> The amount that has been drawn down from that loan of \$2 billion totals \$810, 965 million as of 3 October this year.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> While we're at it, can you tell us the interest bill so far on the full amount of the concessional loan—the \$2 billion?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> The interest is capitalised for the first 12 years of the loan, so I don't have what the level of that interest capitalisation is.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You don't have the percentage figure?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I don't have what the dollar amount of that capitalisation is at my fingertips. The loan's drawn down, the interest that is owed on that money is capitalised and then, when the loan is repaid, capital and interest is repaid at that maturity point.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. If you could take that on notice for us, please?</p>	53 23/10/17		

					<p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> Certainly.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And could you let us know what the concessional loan's repayment schedule is?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> The loan repayment is structured in a way that repayment is scheduled to occur only as no repayment for the first 12 years of the loan, then a three-year interest-only repayment until loan maturity, when the loan is repaid and comprises both capital and interest.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do we have a yearly figure for that one?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> Certainly. Up until 2027, there are no repayments. Between 2027 and 2029, it is an interest-only period. After 2029, the loan is repaid.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do we know when that loan is expected to be fully repaid? Is there a set end date?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> We expect that loan to be repaid, essentially, as a bullet repayment post-2029.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> A bullet repayment?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> Yes. It is a single repayment within a 3-year period after 2029.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> But you can take on notice what those actual three figures will come out at and let us know?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I can take that information on notice.</p>		
27	376	II	GALLACHER	WESTCONNEX	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The WestConnex is a huge investment. What are the time savings and what is the toll on this WestConnex?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I don't have the time savings information in front of me. The issues around tolls are ultimately a matter for the New South Wales government. I don't have toll information sitting in front of me at the moment either. I'd need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> But this is where people are saying they're going to pay \$7 to save a minute. Is that the guts of it?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I couldn't comment on whether \$7 to save a minute is correct or not. I just don't have that information.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Who would I find out that information from about how much the saving is?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> The information around tolling is essentially a state matter. The information I have is around how the concessional loan has been structured.</p>	53 23/10/17	



					<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> But part of the business case would have involved how much time is saved and what a likely cost would be. Who would be able to answer that?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> The business case certainly had that information. I'd need to check or take on notice as to whether the public version of the business case talked about the levels of time saving and the toll rates. I don't have that information in front of me.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I would appreciate it on notice, thanks.</p>		
28	377	II	SINGH	HOBART LIGHT RAIL PROJECT	<p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Do you have any information on the status of the Hobart light rail project?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Not at this stage, no.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Nothing at all?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> As far as I am aware, at this stage it has not come to the department. I'll have to take that on notice, but that's my understanding.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Has the Prime Minister's office or the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet contacted the department about the Hobart light rail project?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> I'll just double-check that, but I'm not aware of—</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> I will give you some background. The Prime Minister was in Hobart last year, in November, talking up the idea of negotiating a city deal for Hobart. In that, the Hobart light rail project was mentioned. The Prime Minister said: It enables you to bring communities together in a way you can't really do with alternative forms of transport—a very good example being the Gold Coast light rail. He goes on to say—</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> There have been a range of projects discussed at a very high level in regard to a number of the city deals. It's possible that that Hobart one might have been coming up in conversations related to that. I'll just check with my colleague Sarah Leeming.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> At a recent meeting we had with the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, they said that there was some interest in the community in Hobart light rail, and they mentioned it to us as a possible project that was on people's radar. It's very early days for the city deal. These are just discussions that PM&amp;C have been having with their counterparts, with other state agencies and with the community. I believe the art gallery was particularly interested in that project. But that's the level of discussions. It hasn't come to us for review or</p>	55-56 23/10/17	

					<p>assessment—certainly not for funding. There have just been very early stage discussions, as far as I'm aware.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> So there is no formal process in train at all?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Not for the Hobart light rail, no.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> You say there have been conversations with the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, that it's early days for a city deal?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> That's right. They regularly update us about the progress of various city deals. This conversation was in relation to a potential city deal for Hobart. They keep us informed of their thoughts and what they're hearing from the community. We meet once every couple of weeks. That's the nature of our discussions. You'd expect them to keep the people in the transport portfolio updated about what they're hearing from the community and—</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> I just needed to confirm where things were at, because it's almost one year since the Prime Minister said that there was a need to have a city deal for Hobart. You're saying that, a year on, there is no formal process in train at all?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> City deals are an issue for the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, so it's probably best if you direct your questions on city deals to them. It's not a responsibility of this portfolio. It would be unfair for us to speak for them.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Your department has no involvement with the city deals?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We have involvement with some of the projects once they have actually been agreed as part of a city deal. But the city deal approvals are not part of this portfolio.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> I'm not talking about approvals; I'm asking about a particular project—the Hobart light rail project. You've already confirmed that you've had no formal engagement with such a project. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> That's correct, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Is it correct that money for the development of a business case for a possible light rail project in Hobart was removed from the 2013-14 Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We'd have to take that on notice. I'm not aware of that; I'd have to go back and have a look.</p>		
29	379	II	BROCKMAN	COST BENEFIT	<b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Absolutely. In that post-completion assessment, would	63	

				ANALYSIS FOR YEPPON	<p>consideration be given to what the potential outcome would have been, if the upgrade hadn't occurred when it did, in light of subsequent events?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> My understanding is they look at the business case and have a look at the costs and benefits, so, yes, I would imagine that that is something that they would do.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> So, effectively, they'd have a look at the cost-benefit analysis and, potentially, the cost benefit could actually come back as even more positive than originally thought?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Absolutely. What we do find with a number of our smaller projects is that they actually do have quite a large cost-benefit ratio, so I would be surprised. We don't have the information here, but I'm sure we can provide it on notice with regard to what the original cost benefit analysis for Yeppoon was.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes, we can do that.</p>	23/10/17	
30	380	II	BROCKMAN	JUSTIFICATION OF BUSINESS CASE	<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Just while you're waiting for my colleagues, who are checking on those figures, that's actually an example of a project that has some tunnelling work going on, and they're looking to move soil to various locations at the moment. They're having a few difficulties with finding—</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> That's the airport link</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> locations at the airport, which will be part of the connection. The reason I mention that is that it's an example of something that's actually happened that may result in some time delays at some stage. At the moment it's going fine. I'm conscious that senators were asking earlier about things that might hold projects up.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> To confirm: 2019-20 is the first large payment of around \$100 million, but it's actually 2021, which is another large payment of \$658 million, but that will actually—</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> So we expect the majority of construction to occur in 2021-22?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's correct, noting that a business case has not been provided to Infrastructure Australia at this point. Once the business case has been through Infrastructure Australia, we will be in a better position to understand how those milestones might be best placed.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> From your point of view, what does the business case need to encompass? Given that the project has been funded, what does the business</p>	63-64 23/10/17	

					<p>case need to show or not show—or is the business case merely about timing?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> The government announcement of approval was on the condition of a successful Infrastructure Australia assessment. The government is conscious that that assessment is still to be done, but the business case is assessed in more detail using the criteria that Infrastructure Australia have in their documentation in relation to the process. Does that answer your question?</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Yes, it does. This is just a general question on framing. Have there ever been instances where a business case has never successfully been made by a state government? I assume they'd get there in the end—it might cause delays—but has there ever been a situation, that you know of, where a business case could not be justified?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I can't answer that question. I think that's one we need to take on notice.</p>		
31	381	II	BROCKMAN	<p>BEEF ROADS PROPOSALS FROM WA</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Fair enough. I remembered where I wanted to go with the Western Australian angle, particularly on the beef roads. Out of the entire program, there was only one project in Western Australia. Can you talk me through the application process? Did the state governments need to have projects ready to go?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> For the beef roads, we did quite a number of roundtables with all levels of government and industry to identify priorities from everyone—where they thought the needs were for movement of cattle. We also put all of the priorities through a CSIRO model called TraNSIT. The outcomes of that modelling were shared with the groups, the stakeholders that participated. But then we also needed the local governments and industry to work with the state governments to put together proposals to allow us to formally assess them for funding out of the \$100 million program.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Was there more than one project put forward from Western Australia and only one was up to scratch? Or was there only one project from Western Australia put forward?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> There was more than one proposal from WA. I don't have the exact number of proposals that were received under the Beef Roads program. We can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Yes, please. Could you also explain the balance of spending across the project? Obviously the Queensland beef industry is bigger than the</p>	65 23/10/17		

					northern Western Australia beef industry, but it did seem a little bit odd to me that there was only one project funded out of Western Australia. I'd like to understand why—whether the other projects simply weren't ready to be funded, whether the state government did not put enough oomph behind them, or whether the industry wasn't organised enough to get their applications and so forth submitted in time or in enough detail. I would like to get a bit of an understanding of why more WA projects weren't able to access that funding.		
32	382	II	BROCKMAN	LIVE CATTLE EXPORT ROADS	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Just on that, is there a focus on live cattle export roads in that program?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That was taken into consideration as well.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is there a difference between the live cattle export from North Queensland and the Northern Territory and Western Australia?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I think the modelling was based on the projections of the likely movements of cattle trucks.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So that's one reason that—</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> I accept that, but there was a bit of an imbalance from a Western Australian point of view and I'd just like to understand why that might have come about.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We can get that for you on notice.</p>	65 23/10/17	
33	383	II	STERLE	COMPLETED PROJECTS OF ROUND 4 AND ROUND 5 OF HEAVY VEHICLES	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Also on that, Mr McClure, it would be handy to see what projects have been laid on the table. We've talked about truck bays. I don't see how there could be any excuse for not being able to knock over a truck bay in a day; it's not that hard. We've talked about ring roads; we've talked about bridges—and you are taking that on notice; we said to come back to us. Are there any other simple safety trucking productivity projects like something as simple as putting a damn truck bay in? Are there any other examples you can give us? I know it takes a while to build a bridge, and you've mentioned overtaking lanes. Are there any simple ones?</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> I think some of the money is spent on capacity-type projects where we're strengthening the actual road surface or widening the road surface or strengthening the shoulders on the road—those types of works. If they are being done within the existing road corridor, they generally don't take as long to get up and running.</p>	70-71 23/10/17	

					<p>Often it's about getting approvals—environmental approvals, cultural and heritage approvals—if there is land to be acquired. If you're outside the road corridor, there's a whole ream of issues through the planning and development phase that have to be ticked off. Generally speaking that sort of work is not done until there is certainty of funding. The states wait for the government to tick off on the approval of the project before they undertake that more detailed design work to be bring it to the point they can award a tender.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is it correct that the states all line up and come to you with their wish lists and then sit back and wait for the federals to evaluate them?</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> The projects get developed to a point, and then they'll wait for funding to do the more detailed work.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> In this case, with all the underspend, are there any saddlebags full of lead on the federal side? Who's slowing it down? Does the federal department have a list of projects that are all ready to go, but the states haven't come back or done their bit, or you're still waiting for them to do the finer details—environmental and all that—or is it the other way around, where they're sitting back and thinking: 'It ain't coming. Something's happening over there'?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> In regard to projects, as we're not the owner of any of the infrastructure, obviously we require the states and territories and the councils to come to us with project proposal reports.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I get that.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> In regard to, for example, round 4 of the heavy vehicles and round 5 of the heavy vehicles: I think my colleague might have mentioned this already, but for round 4, for example, there were 53 projects that were approved. Thirty-nine of those are already completed, seven are still under construction and three are in planning. A majority of those projects are already completed, and we can provide you with a list of all those.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You did say that.</p>		
34	384	II	GALLACHER	VALUE CAPTURE	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I'm not being critical of the value-capture principle; I'm just trying to find out where you would ask the question 'Has it been knocked back?' in a project with federal money or where it's been incorporated into a project where it's a success story. Where do you ask those questions? Obviously not here.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I might ask Ms Hall to talk about Gold Coast Light Rail, but that was one example where value capture was actively incorporated. Do you want to</p>	75 23/10/17	

					<p>mention that one?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> When we go through and have a look at the business cases and, post the business case and PPR, all the way through those processes we're looking at understanding what the costs might be and how those costs can actually be paid for, I guess. That happens all the way through. We sit on steering committees and things like that. In regards to Gold Coast Light Rail, my understanding is that that was part of the bid that was put up, because it was actually part of a joint project with the state government and with the city council, and that was the city council's contribution to the project. We try to understand the funding and financing elements all the way through the project, to understand how we can best fund these projects. But, as I said, the critical component for us is to make sure that this is actually a project that needs to be built because it's going to address a critical problem.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps, even on notice, you could give us a couple of projects that have had value capture in them and a couple that have had question marks over the value capture. Is that possible?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We can take that on notice.</p>		
35	385	II	ABETZ	BRUCE HIGHWAY	<p><b>Ms Hall:</b> In regard to the Bruce Highway, it is probably worth mentioning that since September 2013 the funding has actually allowed a 31 per cent reduction in crashes, a 32 per cent reduction in fatalities and a 28 per cent reduction in injuries.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> That's a very good result. We've been told about the major works currently underway. Are there any still in the planning stage?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes, there are quite a number of projects in the planning stage. For example, planning is progressing well on the Pine River to Caloundra section that was committed in the budget this year. There are quite a number of other projects such as the Horton River floodplain project.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> While it's going to vary, do we have any assessment as to how many jobs are being created through this project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Overall for the Bruce Highway, we will have to get that on notice for you. We don't have those numbers at the moment.</p>	77 23/10/17	
36	386	II	WATT	TOOWOOMBA SECOND RANGE CROSSING PROJECT	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Yes, the Infrastructure Investment Division. I have a few questions about the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing project. Can I confirm a few facts to begin with. Just stepping through the various different agreements that lead to this</p>	77 23/10/17	

					<p>project, there's a national partnership agreement between the Commonwealth and the states under which a number of projects, including this one, are funded; that's correct?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> I think that was entered into in 2014; wasn't it?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> There is a schedule of projects for each state setting out the projects for that state and the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing project is one of the projects funded in Queensland pursuant to that agreement and listed in the schedule.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Below the NPA, is there any, if you like, project-specific agreement or memoranda of understanding between the Commonwealth and the state of Queensland for the funding or construction of that project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> There has been one for the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> What's the nature of that agreement?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That was done earlier in the procurement stage, not necessarily for the funding. Whilst the funding arrangements were being sorted, there was an MOU between the two governments.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Okay. So there's one MOU that was signed between the Commonwealth and the Queensland government for the funding of this project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Do you know the date of that agreement?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will have to get that back on notice for you.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> If you could, that would be great. Could I get you to table a copy of that MOU, as well, please?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We will have to take that on notice. As far as I'm aware, because it was actually only for the original discussions prior to funding, I think it has actually expired.</p>		
37	387	II	WATT	MILESTONES AND PAYMENTS	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> If you could table the MOU that was signed in 2014, that would be very useful just so we can see the full picture. And, am I right that this project, the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, would be considered to be an investment project for the purposes of the National Land Transport Act?</p>	78-79 23/10/17	



					<p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> That means it requires a funding agreement and ministerial approval?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> What you're saying is that the funding agreement here is the MOU—or the NPA?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> The NPA.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> What's the federal government's total funding commitment to that project to date?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> It's \$1.137 billion.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's how much you've already handed over?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No, sorry: that's the total amount of the commitment from the Commonwealth.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Do you know how much has been provided so far?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Expenditure to 30 June this year is \$835 million.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Because, obviously, the project isn't complete yet, is it?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Payments that were made to the Queensland government—that's where that money went?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> And they've then contracted another party to deliver the project. Do you have the dates and amounts of the payments that were made to the Queensland government for that project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Not with me today, but we can provide that to you on notice, Senator.</p>		
38	388	II	WATT	<p>MILESTONES AND PAYMENTS – EAMILS AND LETTERS</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Apart from milestones and payments, are there other matters that you reach agreement on at officer level that are then recorded in letters or emails, or it is really just about milestones and payments?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Once the project's approved—because the approval, obviously, sets out how the project's going to be delivered et cetera, et cetera—it goes to just the milestones.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Could you also, please, table any of those emails or letters which have recorded the outcome of those negotiations about payments and milestones? As I say, I'm just trying to really understand the full contractual detail for this</p>	79 23/10/17		

					<p>project.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We'll do our best to do that. Obviously, we'll have to have a conversation with the Queensland government.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> They're joint documents, so we would need to see what it is and how they feel about that.</p>		
<b>Policy and Research (21)</b>							
39	359	PAR	STERLE	NSRF	<p>National Stronger Regions – Bourke Small Stock Abattoir</p> <p>Key Concern: \$10 million of Commonwealth Funding has been approved to support the development and construction of the small stock abattoir in Bourke, NSW. The \$61,203,100 project has raised concerns with local abattoir worker, Matt McPhee, who contends that the government's funding for the Bourke abattoir threatens the sustainability of existing businesses and the people they employ. The Minister has confirmed the assessment did not consider the impacts of these funding decisions on the sustainability other Abattoirs around regional Australia.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many Round 2 National Stronger Regions Fund (NSRF) were provided for the maximum amount of \$10 million. What are these projects?</li> <li>2. Under program guidelines, how is an applicant's funding proposal assessed for competitive neutrality? If not why not?</li> <li>3. In making the decision to fund a project, does the Round 2 NSRF Ministerial Panel receive advice on other business that may be impacted by the grant? If not why not?</li> <li>4. What mitigation measures exist to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on other businesses as a result of grant funding being awarded to a particular business or council?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 24/10/17	
40	360	PAR	STERLE	BSSA	<p>In respect of the National Stronger Regions Fund grant to the Bourke Shire Council to for the Bourke Small Stock Abattoir (BSSA) project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Was an assessment undertaken to ascertain whether the project would have a negative impact on existing abattoirs or agribusinesses across regional Australia?</li> <li>b. Was an assessment completed on the potential for other abattoirs to lose</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 24/10/17	

					<p>business to the BSSA and impact on jobs in other regional communities across Australia?</p> <p>c. How did the department determine that this project was not for profit? If it was for profit would it be considered eligible for funding?</p> <p>d. In approving the grant, did the Minister need to be satisfied that there are enough goats to go around? Is the sustainability of the project dependent on an increasing supply of goats?</p>		
41	449	PAR	RHIANNON	NSRF – YERRIYONG MOTORSPORTS PROPOSAL	<p>With regard to the National Stronger Regions Fund and the \$9.5 million funding provided to Motorcycling NSW’s Yerriyong Motorsports proposal (Round two list of approved projects – NSRF200095 Motorcycling NSW Limited)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the NSRF assess the applicant’s business case prior to approval of the project?</li> <li>2. Was the application short listed in the first instance for funding?</li> <li>3. Of the 430 projects ranked for funding, what was the score and ranking for this project?</li> <li>4. Was the Department aware that the applicants did not have a Development Consent from the relevant consenting body, the Southern Joint Regional Planning Panel?</li> <li>5. How did the application advance in its ranking as eligible for funding when the applicant was clearly a long way from achieving Development Consent for the project?</li> <li>6. Where there any other applications from the Gilmore electorate that were requesting funding and or received a recommendation for approval but missed out?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 3/11/17	
42	459	PAR	STERLE	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN MYEFO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What program/s do the “Community Infrastructure Projects – new announcements” referred to in the Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook 2016 17, page 123 come under?</li> <li>2. If more than one program, please provide the amount attributable to each program for each financial year.</li> <li>3. Do any of these Expense Measures for “Community Infrastructure Projects – new announcements” include Community Development Grants? If so, please provide details of each grant within that program.</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	

43	460	PAR	STERLE	INVESTING IN REGIONAL GROWTH 2016-17	With reference to Budget Paper, “Investing in Regional Growth 2016-17” regarding the Community Development Grants Program, please provide details of the projects and their programs that were funded under the \$15.3 million transfer, as referred to on page 126?	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
44	470	PAR	GALLACHER	DATA COLLECTION FOR HOSPITALISATIONS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The national road safety strategy 2011-2020 specifies a targeted reduction of at least 30% for both fatalities and serious injuries – Can you explain the increases in the BITRE Hospitalisation data and does this data reflect serious injuries?</li> <li>2. Does each state and territory compile the data differently?</li> <li>3. Is this the start of regular count on serious injuries/hospitalisation?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
129	493	PAR	GIUCHUHI	FUNDING FOR FLOODING	The Gawler River Flood Management Authority has made requests for funding to pay half of the approximately \$27 million needed to mitigate future flooding. This request has been submitted to the department with ongoing discussions but no funding grant has been offered. What does the department intend to do to ensure there is no undue loss of life and property come next rainy season?	WRITTEN 14/11/17	
45	378	PAR	BROCKMAN	EVALUATION OF PROJECTS	<p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Okay. Is the Yeppoon flood plain upgrade in Rockhampton you?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's us.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Great. Can I have an update on this project? It was a completed project, is that correct?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct. That's a completed project.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> This was following cyclone damage, is that correct?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> It was already completed when Cyclone Debbie hit.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> It was completed prior. What were the outcomes of that project in relation to the work that was carried out? Was it a successful outcome?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes, it was.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Basically, the road was able to stay open during that time.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> It was able to stay open and provide access during the last cyclone that hit the area.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Has there been any estimate on the financial benefits of that project?</p>	62 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Not that we're aware of.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> Is that sort of post completion look at the benefits ever undertaken by the department?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes, it is done by BITRE, our Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics division. They do post valuations of projects—not all projects.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> How is it determined what projects would be evaluated and what wouldn't? I'm not saying they're not going to get to it, but it would seem to me, particularly with the relatively contemporaneous events that have occurred, that you had something that obviously did have a very big potential benefit to that community. Would that be likely to be automatically assessed in that regard? How do they determine which projects to assess?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will need to double check that, in terms of what the work plan is for projects that we do look to evaluate in the department. We can take that on notice and come back to you with that criteria.</p>		
46	390	PAR	GALLACHER	BBRF	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The National Stronger Regions Fund is now the Building Better Regions Fund. Is that one of your initiatives, Senator Nash?</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we get an understanding of what the total funding is for the Building Better Regions program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Total available funding is \$469 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Funding is \$469 million?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I am sorry, no. I jumped in too quick.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It is \$481 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How much has been allocated in round 1?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> It was \$226 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I had \$226.4 million.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> There is a community investment stream? Is that right? There is money in the community investment stream? It can be disaggregated into the community investment stream—\$6.9 million—and the infrastructure stream, totalling \$219.5 million?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Of the \$226 million, \$219.5 million was allocated to the infrastructure projects stream, and \$6.9 million through the community investment stream.</p>	82-83 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> When will the next round open?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> My intention is to have another round open by the end of the year.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> With the projects that have received funding, was planning approval from their local councils a prerequisite? Was that a criterion?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> No, it is not a criterion. Their application does have to set out their time frames and estimates of when approvals will be received. Also, projects need to be able to start within 12 weeks.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Hang on, if they had to be able to start within 12 weeks, how could they not have planning approval? It would be impossible to do it. It would be more than 12 weeks to get my local garage—</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I am sorry—your question was whether it was a requirement, wasn't it? Many of them may well have an approval, but you asked whether it was a requirement.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So it's not a requirement but it needs to start within 12 weeks? I'll rephrase the question: how many of the projects had planning approval?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p>		
47	391	PAR	CHISHOLM	IPSWICH SHOW SOCIETY PROJECT	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> I am interested in the \$8.9 million of funding for the Ipswich Show Society announced on 10 October. Is that a project under the Community Development Grants Program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Yes. It's being funded under the Community Development Grants Program.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> How come that announcement was made by Senator Hanson and not the minister or a representative of the government?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> The announcement wasn't made by Senator Hanson. She certainly took an opportunity to perhaps create a bit of theatre around it—you can't stop senators from doing that, should they so choose.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How'd she know?</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Are you saying Senator Hanson didn't actually make the announcement?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> She certainly made some comments about it—absolutely.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> So the image of Senator Hanson with a novelty cheque at the showgrounds wasn't actually her making an announcement about it?</p>	86 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Not on behalf of the government.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> So have the government actually made any statement with regard to the money?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I'll need to check that for you—we have an awful lot of projects, Senator. Some we do; some we don't. There's an awful lot of projects that go up.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Has it actually been announced?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I'll need to check that, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> I just asked then if the money came from the Community Development Grants Program, and the department said yes, but you're saying maybe not.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> No, no, I'm not saying maybe not at all, Senator. I'm saying: some of the projects we do announce, some simply are funded and there's no actual announcement that goes with them. It's not unusual. But I'll check and come back to you.</p>		
48	392	PAR	GALLACHER	IPSWICH SHOW SOCIETY PROJECT	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You decided to give Pauline Hanson and the One Nation Party a \$9 million project, and did you give her the okay and say, 'Put your head on a cheque and wave it around.'</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Senator, I don't think you were listening to my earlier answer.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> It is pretty direct, just yes or no.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Let me answer. The normal process was followed for this project. In terms of the funding commitment that was made the normal process of advising the proponent was made then the response came from the proponent, and we're now in the process of getting into the contract negotiations.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Senator Hanson was in Canberra negotiating the resolution of this application?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> No, that is an assumption, Senator. You should not make assumptions in this place, you know that. I'm giving you the information as it relates to the project.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So, did Senator Hanson meet with Senator Cormann about this project?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> That would be a question for Senator Hanson.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Or Senator Cormann.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Or Senator Cormann.</p>	89 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Or you. You are the minister that authorised it and you know nothing.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> As I said, the funding was allocated to this project and the normal process has been followed.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> When this application was applied for, who did it come from?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It's probably best if we take that on notice and come back to you with that detail. We're not sure exactly who it was. The proponent is normally on the application, but we'll double-check that and come back.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. While you're at it, can you, Minister, or the officers at the table tell me: was it accepted the very first time it was applied for or were there a number of applications?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We'll come back to you with that.</p>		
49	401	PAR	GALLACHER	FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENT	<p><b>Senator Nash:</b> When the project funding is determined, sometimes there is an announcement on the ground with proponents. Sometimes it is by way of media release. Sometimes there's not anything at all and it's just the actual process of dealing with the proponents. It's not unusual for any of those particular circumstances to occur.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You say it's not unusual. We've all been on both sides of government and opposition. When you have signed off and the fulfilled your ministerial duties, it's not unusual for a representative senator or member to be advised at the same time as the media, or anybody else or maybe, dare I say, slightly in front of them.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Those officers would have been advised.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So the duty senator was advised?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I will have to check for you, but I would expect so.</p>	90-91 23/10/17	
50	393	PAR	STERLE	FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENTS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Minister, can you tell me of any other situations, in the tenure of the Abbott and Turnbull government, where your announcements have been made by any other senators, bar coalition senators?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I am happy to have the department take that on notice for you, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> For something like that, I will ask you again: do you not know? You don't know of any situation?</p>	91 23/10/17	



					<p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Senator, there are hundreds and hundreds of projects that we do.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No; I will rephrase the question—</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> And I would like to get you an informed response. Off the top of my head, I don't know of a particular project that we can point to at the moment in specific terms but, as I've said, we will take it on notice for you.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What about the department officials at the table: have any of you ever heard of a small party or opposition making announcements on funding grants coming from the government, before the government does?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> As the minister said, Senator, we will take on notice—</p>		
51	394	PAR	BROCKMAN	FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENTS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes. I was asking officials: are you aware of any other announcements being made by opposition or small parties on government grants and projects?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Senator, we will take that question on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's better.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> For clarification, Dr Kennedy, is that just under this government or would that extend back to the community infrastructure grants projects under the previous government? The question you have just taken on notice, was that time limited or was that extending back?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I am happy for the senator to clarify the question if he wishes to.</p> <p><b>Senator BROCKMAN:</b> I would be interested to know if there were any such announcements given under the community infrastructure grants project of the previous government.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We will take that on notice, too.</p>	92 23/10/17	
52	395	PAR	GALLACHER	CDG	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> According to our analysis, the most funding to any electorate in New South Wales has gone to the electorate of the Leader of the Nationals, the Hon. Barnaby Joyce, with around \$17 million in funding, including nearly \$13 million since 2015: Armidale regional airport upgrade, \$3.5 million; replacement of Minneys Bridge, \$220,000; Kolora Hostel and Aged Care Facility, \$500,000; Northern Inland Centre of Sporting Excellence, \$8.5 million—are you confirming that all of those are value for money? And do you agree that it appears that the most funding for any electorate in New South Wales has gone to the electorate of the Leader of the Nationals, the Hon. Barnaby Joyce?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We don't look at funding on an electorate basis. I'm happy to take your</p>	93-94 23/10/17	

				<p>question on notice and see what we can find out, but it's not something we regularly keep.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> There's no point in taking it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I'm not aware of that being the most. But are you suggesting that those projects shouldn't have been funded in those communities? Are you saying to those communities, 'You shouldn't have got that funding'?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> No, I have got no problem at all with enormous amounts being spent in regional Australia.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> That's what it seems like you're saying.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I just think competition and merit based selection is the best value of money for taxpayers in regional Australia. In all of the other rounds, when communities came to me and said, 'We've applied, but we've missed out. What do we need to do?' the answer was, 'You need to go back and do your sums again. You need to get more commitment and a better laid out plan and you need to apply again.' This isn't in that space; that's the only thing I disagree with.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Hang on—you're talking about a whole lot of different programs.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Of course I am.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I'm just trying to clarify so people listening know what you're talking about. The projects that you're referring to in New England, I expect, are across a range of different programs. Or are they out of one in particular? What are you actually referring to?</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> You've given me a project name. You've given me no indication which program it's come out of.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I've named the projects.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Allocating them to a scheme or a funding model is your job, not mine.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> They work differently. If you're talking about them collectively then that's inappropriate. You should be separating them out into their proper programs.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> We're happy to have it taken on notice to see if the Hon. Barnaby Joyce's electorate has received the lion's share of the funding in New South Wales. Are there any uncontracted projects in this program for the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>electorate of New England?  <b>Ms Zielke:</b> We don't keep that information on hand. We can take that on notice for you.                  ...  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So the Community Development Grants Program began in 2013.  <b>Senator Nash:</b> Right.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> We followed it right through. To date, funding of more than \$941.2 million has been committed to 750 projects, including 450 projects from the 2016 federal election. Then we followed that all the way through Ipswich, Townsville and the like, and I gave you a number of projects in the Hon. Barnaby Joyce's electorate.  <b>Senator Nash:</b> Which may or may not have been CDG—that's what we can't clarify.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> But that's something you've introduced. I'm saying, from my argument—  <b>Senator Nash:</b> I know, but I'm not going to let you attribute them to CDG if we can't clarify that.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. We're talking about CDG.  <b>Senator Nash:</b> We've undertaken to take that on notice for you.</p>		
53	396	PAR	GALLACHER	FUNDING OF CDG PROGRAM IN MYEFO	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can you confirm that \$48.6 million was allocated to the CDG program in MYEFO at the end of 2016?  <b>Ms Zielke:</b> That's not a figure that is aligning with anything that we have in front of us.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> It's a comment from Mr Mrdak at budget estimates on 22 May 2017. Take it on notice. Can you provide the committee, on notice, with a total allocation to this program for each year since 2013.  <b>Ms Zielke:</b> We can definitely do that on notice, but would you like me to read them out now?  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> No, on notice is fine. And will there be any additional funding in this program for this year's MYEFO?  <b>Ms Zielke:</b> It's a decision for government.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I take it that \$48.6 million was basically an increase in funding on a budgetary basis, year by year—it's a normal thing, is it, to top it up?</p>	94 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It could be a movement of funds from one year to the next. That happens at MYEFO—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> It's not another underspend?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It can be a range of things, but that amount isn't a figure that looks familiar to us. We will take it on notice and come back to you.</p>		
54	397	PAR	RICE	ACTIVE TRANSPORT	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So no resources from the Commonwealth, full stop. You are saying it is up to the states to do it. Will there be any specific staff with responsibility for looking at cycling and walking at a federal level?</p> <p><b>Ms Power:</b> We monitor these activities as part of other duties. But specific staff dedicated just to these functions—no.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Will there be any staff that will, in particular, have cycling and walking as part of their duties?</p> <p><b>Ms Power:</b> As I said, it will form a role as part of a member of staff's responsibilities; they will not be dedicated to this function.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you tell me which staff it is likely to fall under the responsibility of?</p> <p><b>Ms Geiger:</b> It's an area of responsibility that goes currently to an Executive Level 1. I'd have to take on notice how much percentage of the time of that staff member it is, but we do talk with our state and territory colleagues around matters of cycling, acknowledging that it is largely the responsibility of the states and territories. Regarding the effort that we put into cycling, if proposals come forward from states and territories for cycling infrastructure included as part of a broader infrastructure proposal, it gets considered in that way. So there is still some focus on cycling. But in terms of funding for the Australian Bicycle Council, that concludes at the end of this calendar year. In terms what comes next, that is under consideration, largely, with the jurisdictions.</p>	97 23/10/17	
55	398	PAR	MCCARTHY	REGIONAL JOBS AND INVESTMENT PACKAGE PROGRAM	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Minister or Dr Kennedy, could you give an update on the Regional Jobs and Investment Package program. Has the department assessed the proposals in the regions where applications closed on 15 August?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I will get the officials to run you through the process. But, yes, the first cohort is being assessed at the moment.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> The recommendations have gone to you already, Minister?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> No, the process is still underway.</p>	98-99 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> On 2 August this year you announced a two-week extension of time for applications. What was the reason for this?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> From memory, there were some areas that needed some more time to get their applications in. It seemed to me very sensible to give an extension to make sure they could have a fulsome period in which to put in their project applications.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Does Ms Wall have the number of applications?</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Ms Power:</b> There were six regions comprising cohort 1—Geelong in Victoria; South Coast and North Coast regions in New South Wales; and Bowen Basin, Wide Bay-Burnett and tropical North Queensland regions in Queensland. The applications opened on 31 May and closed on 15 August. A total of 358 applications were received, seeking funding totalling \$391.1 million. As the minister said, the applications are currently being assessed for eligibility and merit. We expect to make a recommendation to the minister and decisions to be made by the end of 2017.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Every application is tabled, or some don't meet the criteria and fall away?</p> <p><b>Ms Power:</b> We received 358 applications.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> But did any have to resubmit?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> You're talking about the extension?</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> As part of the extension, we gave applicants, who had submitted, the chance to continue to work on their application and resubmit. A number did take up that opportunity.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Do you know that number?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I don't have that number with me, sorry.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Yes, of course.</p>		
56	399	PAR	MCCARTHY	REGIONAL JOBS AND INVESTMENT PACKAGE PROGRAM	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Is it the intention of the program that all successful projects will be consistent with the priorities identified in the local plans that the planning committees have developed?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Yes. That's just common sense. When we set this up, we put the</p>	99-100 23/10/17	

					<p>focus for the first time very much on the local community to come up with their plans as to what they saw would take their economies and their regions forward. It was very much a ground-driven process. That is why we've got the three separate cohorts—communities who were rather more speedy at getting their plans together than others. But that's fine; that's the nature of a trial program and that's why we have the six regions in the first tranche.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You may want to take this question on notice. How much is being reimbursed to the planning committees for their travel costs?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I have no idea.</p> <p><b>Ms Power:</b> We would need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you please provide the figures for each of the committees?</p> <p><b>Ms Power:</b> Sure.</p>		
57	400	PAR	GALLACHER	TASMANIAN JOBS AND GROWTH PACKAGE	<p><b>Ms Power:</b> In terms of the status of the Tasmanian Jobs and Growth Package, following the transfer of \$17.5 million to other agencies and a transfer of \$6 million to the community development grants program, the department is delivering \$82.8 million for 30 projects under the Tasmanian Jobs and Growth Package. All but seven projects have been completed under the program with the remainder due to be completed by June 2018.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Excellent. What's the status of the \$6 million grant in the Tasmanian jobs package to the Launceston City Council for the North Bank Precinct redevelopment?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> The project is in progress and is now due for completion by June 2018.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Has the grant been paid or when will it be paid in full to the council? Is it paid at the end of the project or at the start?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I don't have that detail here. I do understand that the project has had protracted planning processes and, based on that, I don't believe we have paid the majority of the \$6 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> If you can take on notice when that grant will be paid in full to the council if it hasn't been paid?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is it true that this project commenced on 6 May 2016?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	100 23/10/17	

58	402	PAR	GALLACHER	STRONGER COMMUNITIES	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I've got questions on Stronger Communities.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> Terrific. Move on.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> There were all these announcements before the election but they haven't been backed with actual spend.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> On 27 September you wrote to MPs to advise them of an extension to the closing date for round 3. What was the logic behind that?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I would say that's pretty obvious, Senator—to maximise the number of project applications coming in. After listening to communities, it was determined that an extension would be appropriate. Did you have all yours in?</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Was the department aware of any confusion amongst MPs regarding the change of process for round three? Do we know if there was any reported confusion about round three?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> No, we have had only positive comments from MPs and their offices with regard to the improvements to the program, especially the IT portal.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. I will rip through these. How many MPs didn't have their EOIs into the department on 27 September? There were 350 I think.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I don't have that detail, Senator, sorry. This was before the extension was given?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> Sorry, I don't have that information with me. I will take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Would you take it on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Wall:</b> I'll take it on notice.</p>	101-102 23/10/17	
<b>Surface Transport Policy (26)</b>							
59	468	STP	GALLACHER	ROAD SAFETY STAFF NUMBERS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are there plans to increase the number of staff in road safety division?</li> <li>2. Have there been discussions with the Minister regarding the level of staffing in the Road Safety Policy and Transport Standards Section?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
60	469	STP	GALLACHER	INQUIRY INTO THE NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the process of the inquiry? Are there hearings? Panels? Is the Inquiry solely based on submissions?</li> <li>2. The report date is early 2018, have we got a specific timeframe? Will the</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	

					<p>report be immediately made public after being presented to the Minister?</p> <p>3. Will the Inquiry be making recommendations?</p> <p>4. Other than the co-chairs who is participating in the inquiry?</p> <p>5. What resources are the department providing to the inquiry?</p>		
61	471	STP	GALLACHER	WORKPLACE ROAD SAFETY	<p>1. Work related road safety is a significant issue for organisations in Australia. Does the Federal Government have a policy position on work related road safety?</p> <p>2. Road safety is one of the highest safety issues for Australian businesses Australian research has revealed that road crashes are the most common cause of work related fatalities, injuries and absence from work. Given that around half of all work related deaths involved a vehicle, what is the Federal government doing to address this issue?</p> <p>3. Workplace Health and Safety act states that a vehicle is classed as a workplace Employers have legal obligations under ‘duty of care’ and need to be aware that work vehicles are as much a part of the workplace as the factory floor, office or workshop. There has been a great deal of work in the area of heavy vehicle safety and compliance, however very little has been done to focus the same level of action on the light vehicle fleet(sedans, vans, utes etc) What does the Federal government intend to do to alter this situation?</p> <p>4. Under the “Chain of Responsibility” legislation, employers must demonstrate that anyone driving a company vehicle is adequately trained and that all reasonably practical steps have been taken to reduce risk. What action is being taken to ensure this level of compliance within the Australian Government fleet and getting that this message is widely promoted by the Federal Government?</p> <p>5. It has been estimated that the hidden costs of a crash involving a work vehicle may be between 8-36 times that of the vehicle repair cost. Legal requirements governing work related driving mean that employers must demonstrate the same structured approach and commitment to this issue as they would to any other area of workplace health and safety. What is the Government’s plans to increase awareness and action on this issue?</p> <p>6. As a society, we would not tolerate this rate of death or injury in any other work place. What does the Federal government intend to do in order to</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	



					<p>increase the awareness on this issue?</p> <p>7. What is the Federal government doing to ensure that anyone with a vehicle from the Commonwealth fleet or driving for federal government work purposes is trained and inducted appropriately?</p> <p>8. What is the federal government doing to promote the issues of work related road safety to every business in this country?</p>		
62	472	STP	GALLACHER	ALPHA INFLATORS	<p>1. When did the Department become aware that Alpha inflators were used in Honda models in Australia?</p> <p>2. Repeat above question for Toyota, Lexus, Nissan and BMW.</p> <p>3. When did the Department provide this information to the ACCC?</p> <p>4. When was this information provided to the public?</p> <p>5. What percentage of Alpha inflators has been replaced since the recall commenced?</p> <p>6. How does this compare to the percentage of non-Alpha inflators that have been replaced?</p> <p>7. How long, on average, does a consumer need to wait between notification of the recall and having their Alpha airbag replaced? If the Department does not require manufacturers to provide this data, why not?</p> <p>8. Why didn't manufacturers tell consumers with Alpha airbags about the increased risk?</p> <p>9. In the US, following regulator action, Honda made an announcement regarding the increased risk associated with Alpha inflators and offered consumers broader remedies (access to hire cars and towing services). Why didn't the Department take similar action in Australia?</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
63	473	STP	GALLACHER	PROCESS AND INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION	<p>1. How many recall progress reports did the Department request and receive from suppliers between July 2016 and June 2017? If none, is this because the Department lacks the power to request these? Would this power be useful?</p> <p>2. Has the Department been proactively updating the ACCC on the recall since 2009?</p> <p>3. How many recall progress reports has the Department prepared since 2009?</p> <p>4. Were these reports shared with the ACCC? If so, when?</p> <p>5. Were these reports made publicly available? If so, when?</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	

64	482	STP	GALLACHER	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTING NEW TECHNOLOGIES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Back to the broader issue of other road safety technologies, how does the department inform themselves in regards to new technologies in the market?</li> <li>2. Do you support any organisations to assist in their introduction?</li> <li>3. If you do can you provide a list of those you assist to us?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
130	494	STP	WATT	NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY PLAN	Is there any Commonwealth funding attached to the National Road Safety Plan and if so, how much?	WRITTEN 28/11/17	
67	403	STP	GALLACHER	AIRBAGS	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Did you seek advice from the ACCC on whether the like-for-like remedy was acceptable under the Australian Consumer Law guarantee?</p> <p><b>Ms Nyakuengama:</b> The ACCC have been involved in the discussions we've had with the manufacturers—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You can take it on notice, if you like.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> We can take that on notice for you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> When did the department inform the ACCC that the like-for-like remedy was occurring?</p> <p><b>Ms Nyakuengama:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. The ACCC is part of a joint working group that we have with the affected manufacturers and were involved in the discussions at the same time as we were. So it wasn't a matter of seeking specific advice or informing them; they were there.</p>	108 23/10/17	
68	404	STP	GALLACHER	AIRBAGS	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So you would have the total number of cars that have been fixed?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Nyakuengama:</b> Yes, as at 16 October.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have you got that the number here?</p> <p><b>Ms Nyakuengama:</b> Yes. There were 2.5 million affected vehicles and 1.29 million of those have now been rectified. That's 51 per cent.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> But they've been rectified with like-for-like airbags?</p> <p><b>Ms Nyakuengama:</b> No, only a small proportion have the like-for-like airbags. I don't have those figures with me.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Very few have like-for-like airbags being put in. It's only where an alternative isn't available.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So can you take that on notice?</p>	108 23/10/17	

					<b>Ms Nyakuengama:</b> That is difficult for us—I don't have those actual figures, the like-for-like, at the moment. Some of them will be in the same recall campaign, and in the middle of the campaign the manufacturer has switched to a new supplier or a new propellant type.		
69	405	STP	GALLACHER	AIRBAGS	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> We're told that consumers in rural and remote areas are receiving remedies at a much slower rate than those in the cities, obviously because there are fewer dealers or there may not be a dealer for that particular model of car that you're driving. It's put to me by the after-market auto repairers that they should be able to do this work, but it's got to go back to the manufacturer because someone won't give them the code to get in the data point and change this. Basically the question is—</p> <p><b>Ms Nyakuengama:</b> That's a matter for the ACCC.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Rural and regional consumers are suffering a much slower rate of remedy. Is that true?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> We don't know. We'll follow up and come back to you on that.</p>	109 23/10/17	
70	406	STP	GALLACHER	AIRBAGS	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are states and territories with higher humidity and temperatures being prioritised for the recall?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Yes. For example, I have one of those vehicles that are under recall. Parts for my vehicle will not be ready until the Northern Territory and North Queensland vehicles up there—because of parts. That's in terms of safety.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Do you have statistical information about that?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> We'll have to take that on notice. It would vary by manufacturer.</p>	109 23/10/17	
71	407	STP	GALLACHER	GUARDIAN SEEING MACHINES	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we go to some other issues. You're aware that there are all sorts of different things happening around the country. Take for argument's sake the trucking company with 350 trucks that wants to put Guardian Seeing Machines technology in their trucks. Is anybody in the department aware of that technology?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Are you talking about the cameras that help with fatigue management?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Unfortunately, a nod doesn't actually get into the <i>Hansard</i>.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Has there been any discussion about perhaps the Commonwealth doing a trial on that on some of the contracts it lets out?</p>	111-112 23/10/17	

					<p>Because that's what the private sector's doing. They're saying, 'We want people to come away to our mine, and back away from our mine safely, and we're putting fatigue-monitoring devices in trucks.' Is there any leadership from the department in respect of that? Do you recommend in the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines that you trial an area which involves transportation and just say in the contract, 'Let's try these machines out'? Do you do that?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I know we have some automated vehicles, heavy-vehicle pilots, going on around the country at the moment that we're involved in with the states and territories.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You have Guardian seeing machines in place?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I'm not sure about whether they're exactly a part of that. I'm happy to come back to you with more information.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have you looked at specifying that contractors use safer technology like Guardian seeing machines?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> No, not specifically. I know that we have also worked with the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator to encourage take-up, but I'd have to come back to you with detail in relation to that.</p>		
72	408	STP	XENOPHON	VEHICLE IMPORTS	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I'll be out of here by there. Finally on this line of questioning, what evidence does the department have to support the view that concessional importing schemes have compromised vehicle safety? That's one of the arguments that's been put up.</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> We did get Newark to do some analysis looking at historically imported vehicles versus current vehicles. I don't recall, off the top of my head, the precise nature of those recommendations. But I'm happy to—</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> You can take that on notice. Obviously, we don't want any vehicles coming into this country that in any way don't meet relevant standards.</p>	115 23/10/17	
73	409	STP	RICE	NATIONAL FREIGHT STRATEGY	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I understand there's been a discussion paper for the development of the national freight strategy, and submissions closed on 28 July—is that the case?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> How many submissions were received?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Over 120.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Were they received from across the board?</p>	118 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> They were received from across the board from some jurisdiction governments, from industry, from individuals, from all sectors of the supply chain.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> From communities affected by freight movements?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I can't recall—we'll take that on notice.</p>		
74	410	STP	RICE	NATIONAL FREIGHT STRATEGY	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But it doesn't sound like there are any from urban Melbourne or Sydney. There are some major issues and they are very well known and very high profile in terms of their engagement with freight issues so I'm surprised that you didn't reach out to them to get their input.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> The panel is due to report to government with a draft report by the end of this year with a final report by March in the new year.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Will that draft report be a public document? Will you be asking for submissions responding to that draft report?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> No, but there are consultations still under way at the moment by the panel.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Right. So can you take on notice whether the panel could engage with local communities in Melbourne and Sydney.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Happy to.</p>	118-119 23/10/17	
75	411	STP	RICE	FUEL	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you outline, then—or perhaps take on notice—what changes to fuel quality are going to be required and why it's going to take longer, why it is not possible to have those changes in fuel quality by 2021?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Don't we import both the cars and the fuel?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> No. We have fuel refineries in Australia still.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I beg your pardon. We are refining our own fuel here in Australia?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> In Victoria, yes. There are four refineries in Australia.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And they're not to international standards?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> The sulphur levels of petrol are higher than best practice overseas. I can give you details of that, Senator, if you want.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Yes, please, if you could give me the details of that and why it's not going to be possible to have that change in place by 2021, given the cars will be available by 2021—why it's going to take us until 2025 to change our fuel standards.</p>	121 23/10/17	

					<b>Ms Wieland:</b> Yes.		
76	412	STP	GALLACHER	ROAD SAFETY	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And a question on notice: can you provide a history, since the disbanding of the former Federal Office of Road Safety, which I think was in 1999, of resourcing from around 1998 to today? I want to see a trajectory of how many people used to be there and how many people there are now, on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I'm happy to take it on our best endeavours in that regard.</p>	122 23/10/17	
77	413	STP	GALLACHER	AUSTRALASIAN NEW CAR ASSESSMENT PROGRAM	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What level of funding do you currently provide to the Australasian New Car Assessment Program?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It's somewhere in the order of \$1 million a year. I will confirm that for you, though.</p>	122-123 23/10/17	
78	414	STP	GALLACHER	FUEL	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I thought our diesel was refined and imported from Korea. Is that wrong?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Sorry, Senator, I'm not able to give you a direct answer to that question. Ms Whelan took on notice to come back in relation to the number of refineries et cetera. We are also happy to come back in relation to what fuels are actually refined in Australia as opposed to what's brought in.</p>	126 23/10/17	
79	415	STP	STERLE	COASTAL LICENCES	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> According to the bill's regulation impact statement, 'The fleet of major Australian registered vessels with coastal licences has declined from 30 vessels in '06-07 to 14 in '15-16.' Is anyone able to give us the names of those 14 vessels and the work or voyages that they are currently engaged in?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I have the ones that have been surrendered, but I don't actually have the current vessel names in front of me. Please bear with me whilst I double-check.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's the 16 that have been surrendered.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I'm sorry, we don't have it with us.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And we don't have any indication of what work or what voyages they are doing, let alone their names?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Not with us.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is that hard to get?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> We can provide that on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> We can take that on notice. For example, the ships moving back and</p>	128-129 23/10/17	

					forth between Tasmania and Melbourne are examples of the ones that are being used in that regard.		
80	416	STP	STERLE	VESSEL SECURITY	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Foreign-flagged vessels—the non-Australian-flagged vessels—in terms of national security. The Senate inquiry looked into the serious risk that these vessels posed to our national security. Did you take that into account when formulating the bill? Sorry, you wouldn't have done it then—since the report came out? Or is the report sitting on a shelf, with cobwebs and dust on it?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> No. The responses that were provided at the inquiry and also to recommendations noted that the agencies such as Immigration and Border Protection, and our enforcement agencies as well, are continuing to focus in relation to that activity; and, of course, we have AMSA that engages with them in relation to operational aspects of compliance activity as well.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Right—because what we did find out in that was that half the time, or most of the time, we don't even know who owns the ship. We don't know that.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Not in the coastal shipping arrangement, no, but we do through other mechanisms.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's right, so that's going. As you said, Immigration and Border Protection were actually alarmed, because they could see that there were organised crime and national security gaps there. So I'm asking: since that report's come out, since all that evidence has come out from the submissions and the inquiry, has the department gone back and said, 'Hang on, we'd better have another look at what risk this could pose?'</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I know we've been involved in discussions with those agencies in relation to it, and they are undertaking further work. I'm not aware of what can be shared, I suppose, in relation to that. If you recall, during the inquiry, the sensitivities in that regard were raised by a number of the agencies. Do you mind if I take that on notice, though, and come back to you if we can give you more information in that regard?</p>	129 23/10/17	
81	417	STP	STERLE	VESSELS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is it correct that no operator of an Australian vessel, such as Bill Milby—we're all well aware of Mr Milby and his North Star Cruises—were invited to attend the meeting on 26 April 2016? Could you confirm or deny that?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I'm afraid I can't do that right now. I'm very happy to take that on notice</p>	130 23/10/17	

					<p>for you, though.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. I believe that Carnival Australia was invited. Can you tell me why the minister would hold such a meeting with a range of participants from—I'll put it this way—foreign operators, but not invite Australian operators?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I'd need to check who was actually on the invitation list for that function and come back to you. But I know that he has been consulting broadly with companies or individuals that want to talk to him about—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And consulting broadly with me and with this committee. He's been very critical all the way through. I think it all started—I won't go too much into it—the first time that the bill was proposed and he was at meeting with you and other officials, but then there were other meetings after that where Mr Bilby and the other Australian operators weren't invited. You said that you're going to check that out. We've gone over this before and raised our serious concerns about the lack of public consultation—although the minister did meet with the foreign operators. You did say you would take that on notice—unless you want to add anything now.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> No; we'll take that on notice.</p>		
82	418	STP	STERLE	VESSELS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes. I'm not Einstein; the Aussie vessels are disappearing. Okay. What about the taxation revenue to Australian governments, then, with option 2? What's the impact there?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Actually, I don't have those figures with me, I'm sorry. I didn't bring the taxation figures with me.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Will you take it on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I'm happy to take that on notice, yes.</p>	132 23/10/17	
83	419	STP	STERLE	SHIPPING INDUSTRY	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sure. But, when you talked about deregulating the Australian shipping industry, Ms Zielke, your words were that there will be 'greater flexibility' for manufacturers to utilise shipping that weren't doing it before—that is, they were either on road or rail. So where are all these ships going to come from?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Can I give you an example. By way of example, we have a company in Queensland that makes mining equipment, and the cheapest way for it to move its goods to areas like Western Australia, for example, is to put it on a ship and move it around the coast to WA. At the moment it can't do that because the only ships that are big enough to carry those goods are international ships, because our</p>	133 23/10/17	



					<p>coastal ships are quite small in comparison. So the international ships can't apply for a licence because at the moment they have to have a minimum of five voyages, and they're not here frequently enough to actually be able to apply for five voyages.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So how are they moving that freight now?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> They're moving it via road, which means they have to take down all the light poles and the street signs, and it's costing upwards of a million dollars to actually move that piece of equipment from Queensland to WA, which means that companies in WA are not going to use that company's services, or have chosen not to use that company's services, because they can get it cheaper from offshore. We have similar arrangements in the gypsum area—it's also an issue—where we've actually got companies in Western Australia receiving goods from Singapore et cetera, because they can't actually move it from Queensland cheaply enough around the coast.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You believe that the bill will make it far cheaper to bring the gypsum from where to Western Australia?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> From around the coast.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> From Queensland?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> Wherever—as in from distances greater than what we can do by road.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How much gypsum is transported from Singapore?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I'm sorry. I know you've asked that of us before and we've provided it, but it was some time back. I'm happy to provide that on notice.</p>		
84	420	STP	STERLE	SHIPPING INDUSTRY	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okey-doke. I want to now refer to the coastal trading green paper developed under the leadership of Maritime Industry Australia Limited, going by the initials MIAL—the peak body that represents Australian based shipping operators and other locally based maritime businesses, in consultation with the broader industry, including the Maritime Union. Provided to government in late 2016, the paper achieved a degree of consensus around policy settings that would provide the industry with long-term certainty and stability. Is it appropriate that a thorough, considered effort—with extensive consultation—by industry to improve the regulation of this key sector has not received a direct reply or feedback from the government?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I know that MIAL have met with the minister and received feedback in relation to their paper in discussions with him.</p>	133 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell me roughly when that was? I don't need the time and the date—recently or back then?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I think off the top of my head about July—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> This is the same minister?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> most recently.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> July this year?</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> But I'm happy to come back to you with those previous dates.</p>		
85	434	STP	RICE	ELECTRIC VEHICLE UPTAKE	<p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> What I'm saying to you is: we're looking at the full range of options that will affect reducing vehicle emissions and we're providing that advice to government. But I just note with you, in terms of the particular issue of fleet ownership, it's largely a state and local government issue, in terms of the volume of vehicles supplied.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Would you see the federal government actually setting targets for electric vehicle uptake?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I think that's a policy question for the government.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay. Minister?</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> I'm sorry. What was the question again?</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Whether the government is considering setting targets for electric vehicle uptake.</p> <p><b>Senator Nash:</b> That I'd need to take on notice for you.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay. What work's been done so far towards harmonising charging infrastructure standards?</p>	121 23/10/17	
<b>Aviation and Airports (9)</b>							
86	477	A&A	STERLE	AVIATION RESCUE AND FIREFIGHTING SERVICE (ARFFS)	<p>At the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee Estimates Hearing on the 23 October 2017, Airservices Australia were questioned about the agreed recommendation to weaken the regulations by raising the threshold for the establishment of an Aviation Rescue and Firefighting Service (ARFFS) from 350,000 passengers to 500,000 passengers per year.</p> <p>At page 141 Mr Harfield states that the threshold for disestablishing an ARFFS at an airport would stay at 300,000 passengers:</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	

					<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can I go to the general thrust of firefighting services, and I'll pick on Hamilton Island because I know that, through the Public Works Committee, we just commissioned a new firefighting service there. However, the federal minister and CASA are supporting a raising of the threshold of airports that require firefighting services to 500,000 a year. That will mean that Ballina, Coffs Harbour, Ayres Rock, Gladstone, Hamilton Island, Broome, Karratha, Port Hedland and Newman will all fall under that 500,000. In some of those areas, you've invested significant amounts of taxpayers' money building new stations—and I know this from the Public Works Committee. Should that weakening of the regulations go through, what will happen? Will you raze these facilities—abandon them and take the firefighters out?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No. With the new threshold of 500,000 to establish a new fire station, there is a disestablishment criterion staying at 300,000 passengers.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So if there's an existing facility, it stays?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> In the supplementary estimates last year, I was asked that very question. I stated categorically that we would not be closing those stations and then I reiterated that at the May estimates, where I was asked a direct question. I stated in <i>Hansard</i> that we would not be disestablishing any of those stations; they will be staying online.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Even though Newman's just under 300,000?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Even if they go under the disestablishment threshold, we will not be closing those stations. I've publicly reiterated that on a number of occasions.</p> <p>The Aviation Rescue Fire Fighting (ARFFS) Regulatory Policy Review Agreed Recommendation 6 states <i>“The ARFFS provider must complete a risk review relating to the possible disestablishment of an ARFFS within six months of the withdrawal of scheduled international passenger air services or the BITRE confirming that passenger numbers have remained below 400,000 for a twelve-month period.”</i></p> <p><b>Question:</b></p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>i. Is the disestablishment trigger remaining at 300,000 passengers per annum as claimed, or is it being changed to 400,000 passengers per annum?</p>		
87	478	A&A	STERLE	<p>AVIATION RESCUE AND FIREFIGHTING SERVICE (ARFFS)</p>	<p>The CASA website has advertised Notice of proposed rulemaking - Post-implementation review of the legislative framework for Part 139 - Aerodromes (NPRM 1426AS) and states in part that the proposed amendments to Part 139 of CASR and the Part 139 MOS aim to:</p> <p><i>“...more closely reflect the Standards and Recommended Practices (SARP) for Annex 14, Aerodromes to the International Convention on Civil Aviation (the Chicago Convention).”</i></p> <p>I also note that in a prior submission to this Senate Committee regarding Annex 17 Airport Security that the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development made a similar statement about the importance of being more closely aligned to ICAO SARPs.</p> <p><b>Questions:</b></p> <p>i. Would you agree that it is important as a signatory of the Chicago Convention, that Australia closely follow the ICAO SARP’s and harmonize with International aviation standards and recommended practices?</p> <p>ii. Why is this same reasoning not being applied to ARFFS in Australia and the review of CASR 139H?</p> <p>iii. How is the weakening of the establishment (from 350,000 to 5000,000 passengers per annum) and disestablishment (from triggers for an Aviation Rescue and Firefighting Service consistent with the above policy to “more closely reflect the Standards and Recommended Practices (SARP) for Annex 14, Aerodromes to the International Convention on Civil Aviation (the Chicago Convention)</p> <p>iv. What happens to passengers onboard a large domestic passenger plane that crashes at an unprotected airport?</p>	<p>WRITTEN 6/11/17</p>	

88	479	A&A	STERLE	AVIATION RESCUE AND FIREFIGHTING SERVICE (ARFFS)	<p>The current CASR Regulations contain the obligation for the ARFFS to respond to any fire on the aerodrome whether it started in an aircraft or not. It is also a very firmly established practice for the past 20+ years that ARFFS will respond to any medical emergencies on the aerodrome. This has provided aerodrome users/owners with a significantly advanced level of safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It reduces the insurance premiums of the airport owners, tenants and users. It has been responsible for saving several very important buildings and installations on the airports.</li> <li>• It overcomes the very strict and likely to get stricter security access into the restricted airside environment.</li> <li>• It has most importantly directly saved many lives over that 20-year period.</li> <li>• It provides immediate response within the chain of survival that the State Ambulance services can due to workloads, security/access restrictions and the requirements for escort into the airside areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does Airservices Australia support the removal of this safety requirement from the new regulations?</li> <li>ii. What has changed to make saving people’s lives and property no longer the ARFFS role when they are obviously the most suitably located and qualified emergency service with full unrestricted access to the airside environments?</li> <li>iii. How does removing this vital function of the ARFFS meet the statement of expectations from Minister Chester that he requires a World Class ARFFS?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	Question i will be answered by Airservices (SQ17-000480) and questions ii and iii will be answered by A&A (SQ17-000479)
89	486	A&A	RICE	FLIGHT CROSS-OVER RISK	In light of proposed changes including to the curfew at Essendon Airport and proposed Tullamarine third runway, has there been a review of flight cross-over risk between Essendon Airport and Tullamarine Airport?	WRITTEN 9/11/17	
90	487	A&A	RICE	RELEASE OF PLANS	What is the anticipated timing of release for the Melbourne Airport Master Plan and Tullamarine third runway Major Development Plan?	WRITTEN 9/11/17	

91	488	A&A	RICE	AIRCRAFT MOVEMENTS AND TYPES	Noting BITRE’s publication of airport traffic data by airport, can you provide aircraft <u>movements and types per runway</u> at Melbourne Tullamarine airport, as used to produce the current ANEF noise contours published in the 2013 Melbourne Airport Master plan?	WRITTEN 9/11/17	
92	421	A&A	RICE	AIRPORT CURFEW	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So you are confirming that it will be noisier for residents at night under the proposed changes?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> There will be new jet aircraft operating during the curfew, but, Mr Phillips?</p> <p><b>Mr Phillips:</b> If I could just clarify: the replacement of new, modern aircraft at a stricter noise standard could actually reduce some levels compared to some of the propeller aircraft that are operating at the moment. It's not actually a like-for-like replacement with the propeller versus the jet aircraft.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Currently non-emergency helicopter and propeller-driven aircraft can operate during the curfew. How noisy are they?</p> <p><b>Mr Phillips:</b> Some of those aircraft might be operating at up to 95 decibels.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But, with the jets landing at night, you are going to allow—</p> <p><b>Mr Phillips:</b> Ninety.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> planes of up to 90 decibels to land at night.</p> <p><b>Mr Phillips:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Presumably there will be more of them than of the propeller-driven aircraft that are currently landing during the curfew hours?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Not necessarily.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But, once you haven't got a curfew and you've got these jets that are clearly interested in landing—what numbers of landings from non-emergency helicopters and propeller aircraft do you currently have?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We'd be happy to take that on notice. I don't have it with me.</p>	136 23/10/17	
93	422	A&A	RICE	AIRCRAFT NOISE	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> All right. You say that 90 decibels is the limit. I understand that a vacuum cleaner is only 70 decibels, so it's louder than that. Basically you are saying that it's louder than somebody suddenly deciding to run a vacuum cleaner in the middle of your bedroom at night. How is that considered to be a reasonable proposition for residents?</p> <p><b>Mr Phillips:</b> The noise certification is effectively a worst-case scenario. This noise</p>	136 23/10/17	

					<p>level is measured with full flaps in operation in landing and full reverse thrust, so it's the noisiest possible landing. The average landing with these aircraft is around 10 decibels lower than that. And that's a volume measured at 120 metres or some precise number of feet.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So you're saying it may be only 80 decibels, 120 metres from where it lands?</p> <p><b>Mr Phillips:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Where are the noise monitors that are in place at the moment?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So the measurement of that 90 decibels will be at 120 metres from where they land. Will there be noise monitors in place?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We'll take that on notice, what the noise measurement arrangements will be.</p>		
94	423	A&A	XENOPHON	AIRCRAFT MOVEMENT	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I am looking at the annual aircraft movements at various airports. For Adelaide, there was a decline from 123,302 in 2014 to 106,070 in 2015. What are the reasons for the decline and do you have the figures for 2016? You may want to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I might need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> But does anyone know why there's been a drop in aircraft movements in Adelaide?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I don't know but I am happy to take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> It doesn't fit in with their airport plan of a gradual increase in aircraft movements.</p>	137 23/10/17	
<b>Airservices Australia (12)</b>							
95	448	Airservices	WHISH-WILSON	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF HOBART AIRPORT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the environmental assessment assume that levels below 60dB are acceptable?</li> <li>2. Does this, in effect, create a baseline background noise level of 60dB for all conditions?</li> <li>3. Does the 60dB assumption discount the level of amenity in rural areas given that background noise in these areas is likely to be much less than 60dB?</li> <li>4. Does Airservices Australia take into account different expectations of amenity</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 3/11/17	

					<p>in different areas?</p> <p>5. What consultation did Airservices Australia undertake with respect to the changes to SIDs and STARs at Hobart Airport?</p>		
96	475	Airservices	STERLE	PFAS	<p>At the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee Estimates Hearing on the 23 October 2017, Airservices Australia were questioned about the continued use of non-CASA approved foams, and whether there is a national management plan to deal with the exposure to ARFFS firefighters to PFAS.</p> <p>At page 165 of the Proof Hansard Airservices Australia CEO Jason Harfield is recorded as stating Airservices Australia is currently reviewing its work health and safety controls:</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> A national management plan around dealing with PFAS?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes. We have a national plan where we're going through preliminary site testing at all our locations, and they are underway. We just released last week the results for the Gold Coast for some off airport testing, and we continue to work with the Prime Minister and Cabinet PFAS task force for the whole-of-government approach, as well as, as mentioned before, continuing to review our work health and safety controls to ensure that they are as effective as possible.</p> <p><b>Questions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What controls are currently in place?</li> <li>ii. If PPE is your primary control, how and when is decontamination required?</li> <li>iii. who will be responsible for reviewing these controls?</li> <li>iv. When did this review begin?</li> <li>v. In terms of the legacy of PFAS contamination, have you tested all ARFF fire grounds for PFAS?</li> <li>vi. Are firefighters still being exposed to PFAS when they train on the ARFFS fire grounds?</li> <li>vii. Is Airservices Australia resisting providing testing information to the firefighters' union who have made four FOI Requests and are yet to be</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	



					<p>provided with the information requested?</p> <p>viii. Why is Airservices Australia not blood testing or health monitoring the firefighters for PFAS?</p> <p>ix. Why is Airservices Australia still using the non CASA approved foam at Darwin and Townsville? Is this a cost-saving measure that is putting the lives of firefighters, and the health of the community surrounding those fire grounds at risk?</p>		
97	476	Airservices	STERLE	PFAS	<p>Mr Harfield stated at page 146 that Airservices Australia was being proactive in its management of PFAS and to mitigate the health risk to firefighters:</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The issue that we have been trying to deal with is how to manage this situation where the science hasn't caught up and to manage it in a proactive way without actually setting precedents that we are not quite aware of. We're trying to be as diligent as we possibly can with the science and what the evidence is around it.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I suppose it gets to the stage now that if the firefighters start developing symptoms that Senator Gallacher talked about that are in America, where does that put Airservices?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We are doing everything we possibly can to mitigate the risk.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I understand that.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We are monitoring the situation all the time and taking advice and continuing to review our protocols and monitoring.</p> <p><b>Questions:</b></p> <p>i. Has Airservices Australia produced any procedures or guidance to the firefighters who continue to work in PFAS contaminated sites, or with non-CASA approved foams?</p> <p>ii. What are the “things” that Airservices Australia are using “to mitigate the risk”?</p> <p>iii. Is Airservices Australia following the National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS) recommendations and advice for industries using products containing PFAS?</p> <p>(a) If so, what NICNAS recommendations and advice is being</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	

					<p>followed and implemented? (b) If not, why not?</p>		
98	480	Airservices	STERLE	AVIATION RESCUE AND FIREFIGHTING SERVICE (ARFFS)	<p>The current CASR Regulations contain the obligation for the ARFFS to respond to any fire on the aerodrome whether it started in an aircraft or not. It is also a very firmly established practice for the past 20+ years that ARFFS will respond to any medical emergencies on the aerodrome. This has provided aerodrome users/owners with a significantly advanced level of safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It reduces the insurance premiums of the airport owners, tenants and users. It has been responsible for saving several very important buildings and installations on the airports.</li> <li>• It overcomes the very strict and likely to get stricter security access into the restricted airside environment.</li> <li>• It has most importantly directly saved many lives over that 20-year period.</li> <li>• It provides immediate response within the chain of survival that the State Ambulance services can due to workloads, security/access restrictions and the requirements for escort into the airside areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions:</b></p> <p>i. Does Airservices Australia support the removal of this safety requirement from the new regulations?</p> <p>ii. What has changed to make saving people’s lives and property no longer the ARFFS role when they are obviously the most suitably located and qualified emergency service with full unrestricted access to the airside environments?</p> <p>iii. How does removing this vital function of the ARFFS meet the statement of expectations from Minister Chester that he requires a World Class ARFFS?</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	<p>Question i will be answered by Airservices (SQ17-000480) and questions ii and iii will be answered by A&amp;A (SQ17-000479)</p>
99	485	Airservices	RICE	NOISE MONITORING	<p>What, if any, noise monitoring is currently active for suburbs adjacent to Tullamarine airport, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gladstone Park</li> <li>Westmeadows</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 9/11/17	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Jacana</li> <li>d. Dallas</li> <li>e. Taylor lakes</li> <li>f. Keilor Downs</li> <li>g. Keilor</li> <li>h. Essendon</li> </ul>		
100	424	Airservices	MCCARTHY	PFAS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What protection do they have while they're currently using the PFAS?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The firefighters have PPE—personal protection equipment—which they use. Plus, there are handling requirements for the foam.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What does PPE do?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> PPE is the gear that they wear—the personal protection equipment.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What guarantee is there that they will not experience issues with PFAS, given that they're still using it?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We have a range of controls and programs in place where we make sure we monitor our work, health and safety requirements.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> But can you guarantee?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Which are there to continually monitor and to ensure minimising the exposure to the foam. And we can provide on notice what those protocols are.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You can't tell me?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I can't tell you off the top of my head what those protocols are.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many firefighters are we talking about in Darwin and Townsville?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I'll have to take it on notice, but for both of those being 24-hour locations, I would say in the vicinity of probably 80, but we'll take that on notice to give you the exact number at both locations.</p>	137 23/10/17	
101	425	Airservices	MCCARTHY	PFAS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So in terms of the Darwin community, what conversations have Airservices had with the residents and organisations around Darwin airport and Townsville airports?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> That would be a matter for the Department of Defence, because they are the owner of the airfield. We are doing the firefighting under contract to Defence.</p>	138-139 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you don't have any communication strategy whatsoever around that?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We've got a communication strategy and work around our other locations. I would have to just take on notice what we specifically have for Darwin and Townsville.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Thank you.</p>		
102	426	Airservices	ABETZ	AIRCRAFT NOISE	<p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> I'll put one question on notice, if I may. Referring to page 9 of the Hobart <i>Mercury</i> of 23 October, headed 'Fury at Flight Path Noise: Peninsula Communities Complain about Racket at Night'. Could you please provide me, on notice, a detailed brief as to the consultations that are taking place in relation to that.</p> <p><b>Ms Hatfield Dodds:</b> Certainly.</p>	139 23/10/17	
103	427	Airservices	RICE	AIRCRAFT MOVEMENTS AT JANDAKOT AIRPORT	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I want to follow up on some questions that former Senator Back put at last estimates about permanent noise monitors being in place to record noise caused by aircraft movements at Jandakot Airport in Perth. Can you confirm that there are permanent noise monitors in place, as suggested in the transcript from our May estimates hearing?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I may have to take that on notice because I don't know. I need to confirm that.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay—</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I just am unaware, sorry.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> You're not going to be able to answer my other questions, then, if you're unaware if there even are the monitors. Do you know when the program of permanent noise monitoring of flight movements at Jandakot Airport began?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No, sorry.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Do you know where the monitors are located?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> And, if these monitors are in place, do you know where the records can be accessed for the noise readings at Jandakot?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I would be happy to take them on notice. I don't have that information with me.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> The other thing is whether there is also consideration being given to</p>	139-140 23/10/17	

					<p>noise monitoring around similar airports such as Archerfield, Bankstown, Moorabbin, Parafield and, in the city of Melbourne, Essendon.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I will take those on notice. However, I do preface it: the majority of those aerodromes will have noise monitoring units in their vicinity, because of their vicinity with the major airports. We'll get you the locations of where our noise monitors are.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Not all of them are closed at the other airports. It's the noise monitoring around the immediate location which is where you've got communities that are directly affected.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes. We will take that on notice and provide those.</p>		
104	428	Airservices	MCCARTHY	PFAS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I just wanted to clarify something. When you spoke about the PPE for Darwin and Townsville firefighters—are they wearing them now?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I'll take that on notice. There was a changeover in the PPE because the PPE that we were using was causing heat stress, particularly in places like Darwin and Townsville—</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When was that taking place?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> That was the PPE we've had for the last few years, but my understanding is—and I'll take it on notice—</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Wasn't there going to be a new rollout?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> That's what I'm saying—I need to take the exact timing of the rollout on notice, but there is a rollout currently going on in changing over the PPE across the country.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> But Darwin and Townsville weren't on that list, were they?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> They were down the end of the list, and I can't recall the exact reason why they were placed at the bottom of the list.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Would you like to take the question on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes. We'll take it on notice and provide you with that reason.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What are the firefighters wearing now in Darwin and Townsville, if it's not the PPE that you were talking about earlier?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> If it's not the new PPE then they've got the previous PPE.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> But you can't confirm that?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Not right at this moment in time. I can confirm it if I can call somebody, but I don't know off the top of my head.</p>	141 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you'll take that question as to what PPE they're wearing on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Correct.</p>		
105	429	Airservices	MCCARTHY	PFAS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So, in Darwin and in Townsville, if they were to use the foam today—are you aware of just how much foam has been used since 2010?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I will have to take that on notice about the amount of time we've discharged foam.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay. Can you take on notice at what incidents was PFAS foam used at Darwin airport since 2010.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> And in, particular, this year—2017—how many times has the PFAS foam been used by the firefighters?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> PFAS related foam, the Ansulite foam, during 2017?</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> And since 2010.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> And since 2010. Will do.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay. Thank you.</p>	145-146 23/10/17	
106	430	Airservices	STERLE	AIRSERVICES IT INFRASTRUCTURE ENVIRONMENT	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I want to quote from an article from itnews.com.au from 20 September. It states that Airservices is currently on the lookout for a partner to shift its current internally managed IT infrastructure environment to the cloud, including core compute and to manage its fleet of almost 5,000 end-user devices. Can you tell us what IT functions you are outsourcing?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> It's an initiative we've called Infrastructure as a Service. We want to put some of our corporate IT servers into data centres—so we don't actually have to own the servers and worry about making sure they are always upgraded. The 5,000 devices are the computers that we use in the organisation. We're just trying to work out a more efficient way of keeping up-to-date and the best way of managing it.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You currently have your own data centres?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, we have a number of data centres ourselves, even a couple here in the building. We want, for redundancy reasons, to buy service space somewhere else.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Will it save money?</p>	147 23/10/17	

					<p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> It will in the sense of maintaining equipment and then starting to use some of the services where you pay by usage rather than having to buy and maintain all the software—and the hardware that goes along with it.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you have a budget line there or something similar that tells you how much you expect to save over a certain of time?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, we do.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What's that?</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> We haven't completed the business case yet. We're going through a market test to understand what the costs are so we can weigh them up against the internal costs.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you have an idea, a preliminary idea?</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> In round numbers, on IT, it is probably in the range of \$10 million to \$15 million per annum.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How long have you been considering that move?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Probably over the last 12 months.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Have you done the security assessment?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> That will be part of it, because that is one of the main issues we have across the board—across all of our systems, including the air traffic control system.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You are working on it, or it is all done?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No, we continue to work on it. It would have to meet certain security requirements before we go down that path.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What are the 5,000 end-user devices?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Off the top of my head, they would be the iPads and the desktop computers that we have across the organisation.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Mobile phones?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I think so, but we can provide the actual detail on notice. But it is those types of devices.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, where you get emails and all that sort of thing.</p>		
<b>Western Sydney Unit (5)</b>							
107	454	WSU	STERLE	WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT RESIDENTS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Of the 1244 Western Sydney residents surveyed, what are the exact numbers of residents surveyed in each of the four region?</li> <li>In the North West region, how many people are from the Blue Mountains,</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	

					<p>how many from Penrith, how many from Blacktown, how many from the Hawkesbury, and how many from the Hills?</p> <p>3. The Inner West region includes residents living in Marrickville, Leichardt, Ashfield, and Burwood. Given Marrickville is located 4km from Sydney’s Kingsford Smith Airport, and 40km from Western Sydney Airport site at Badgerys, ten times the distance, why are these residents included in this survey?</p> <p>4. What percentage of residents surveyed as part of the research live closer to Kingsford Smith airport than to the proposed Western Sydney Airport site at Badgerys Creek?</p> <p>5. In the measures of awareness of Western Sydney Airport, the latest survey shows over 50% of respondents know a small amount, hardly anything or nothing at all about the airport or are unsure. How does that level of awareness compare to when this survey first began?</p> <p>6. Of the Western Sydney residents surveyed, 55% are concerned about noise if the airport operates 24 hours a day, 51% are concerned about general noise pollution, and 48% are concerned about the environmental impact. In response, the report recommends a communications strategy. How is the Department using this feedback to inform the operations planning for the airport and flight paths?</p>		
108	455	WSU	STERLE	NATIONAL AIRPORTS SAFEGUARDING FRAMEWORK	<p>1. Is the Department in discussions with the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure about the how the Western Sydney Airport will adhere to the National Airports Safeguarding Framework guidelines?</p> <p>2. Has the NSW Government adopted the guidelines, particularly around measures for managing impacts of aircraft noise?</p> <p>3. If not, does the Department have any indication of when NSW will adopt the guidelines?</p> <p>4. Which other states have not adopted the guidelines?</p> <p>5. What are the potential consequences, based on the Department’s guidelines, if development around the Western Sydney Airport occurs without these guidelines being in place?</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
109	456	WSU	STERLE	FLIGHT PATHS	<p>1. Airservices Australia has stated that the military airspace in the Sydney basin will have to be reduced to accommodate the Western Sydney Airport.</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	



					<p>Has the Department received advice from the Department of Defence or other agencies on whether or not the military airspace associated with Richmond RAAF base will be reduced?</p> <p>2. The Government announced it was redesigning the flight paths after the release of the EIS, and the Western Sydney Airport Community Update Autumn 2017 shows that flight path consultation begins in 2017, and flight paths will be finalised in 2025.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What consultation of flight paths has occurred in 2017, and who has been consulted?</li> <li>b. What modelling has been done on potential flight path options based on the direction of the runway in current plans?</li> <li>c. What agencies have been involved in the design to date?</li> <li>d. What is the timeline for when draft flight paths will be released?</li> </ul>		
110	457	WSU	STERLE	BLUE MOUNTAINS GAZETTE OPINION PIECE	<p>1. On the 27 September 2017 in the Blue Mountains Gazette, the Minister stated in an opinion piece entitled 'Airport will bring benefits' that "tourism growth generated by the airport will provide significant environmental opportunities for the region". Can the Minister name the significant environmental opportunities he was referring to?</p> <p>2. In the same opinion piece, the Minister stated that "we will continue to consult with the community as this project progresses". What are the ways in which the Minister is consulting with the Blue Mountains community?</p> <p>3. In the same opinion piece, the Minister stated he's committed to protecting the listing of the Blue Mountains World Heritage Area and that the listing will not be impacted on by the Western Sydney Airport. The area is currently 1.03 million hectares. Is the Minister also committed to every one of those hectares being maintained as part of the Blue Mountains World Heritage Listing?</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
111	435	WSU	STERLE	CITY DEAL MEETINGS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Have they been invited to attend meetings on everything to do with the Western Sydney City Deal? Do they sit in on every briefing, every meeting?</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Mr McRandle:</b> I sit on an officials group that's chaired by a deputy secretary in Prime Minister and Cabinet and also, as I say, support Minister Fletcher's</p>	9 27/10/17	

					<p>attendance at that ministerial council meeting as well.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And you're on every meeting?</p> <p><b>Mr McRandle:</b> Well, on the meetings that are relevant, where the agenda covers the transport aspects—that covers quite a large number of the meetings.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps on notice, could we have a schedule of the meetings and the interval between meetings, who attends and how regular they are?</p> <p><b>Mr McRandle:</b> Yes.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Senator, would you like us to go through PM&amp;C and get their full schedule of City Deal meetings, or do you just want our bits that we—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Let's go with what you can provide—the Western Sydney Unit.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Yes.</p>		
<b>Civil Aviation Safety Authority (13)</b>							
112	461	CASA	RICE	FLIGHT CREW FATIGUE RULES	<p>What is the status of the flight crew fatigue rules, under CAO 48.1, currently?</p> <p>a. Have the anticipated changes been delayed? If so, for how long, and why?</p> <p>b. When is it anticipated that these fatigue rules will be in place?</p>	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
113	436	CASA	STERLE	DRONE PENALTY	<p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> You are inconsistent—you being CASA. Let's talk about the fellow who flew the drone down to Bunnings to pick up the sausage. What fine did he get?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I don't know. One of my colleagues would know.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> \$3,000, wasn't it?</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Let's get it out. I'd ask it to be on the record so every Australian can hear it: as long as you are a pilot and it's the first time, you're going to get away with it. Ready kids? All the kids are going to get the drones for this Christmas. There are rules that say you can't do this, but it depends on who you are. There seems to be one rule for one and rules for others. I'm waiting for whoever you can bring up, Mr Carmody, because I really want to know why a pilot can fly a drone over Parliament House and then just get a tap on the toenail. But let's hear what happened to the gentleman who flew his drone down to Bunnings to pick up a sausage.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I haven't got the details. I'm waiting for one of my colleagues, who I</p>	13-14 27/10/17	

					<p>hope will have the details of the offence. We'll have to dig it up.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Dr Aleck will have some details about penalties.</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I regret to say that I don't have these identified by the Bunnings event.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you want me to google it?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I recall—I will confirm this—that that matter did invite an infringement notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> \$3,000 is what was reported.</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> Whatever the penalty was, if that was the case.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> He put it on Facebook that his drone went down, picked up a sausage, came back. You looked at that and fined him \$3,000.</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I believe that was the case, and I'm not doubting it. I'll confirm it.</p>		
114	437	CASA	O'SULLIVAN	<p>DRONE INVESTIGATION</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> I hope you don't mind me interjecting. I wasn't even going to buy into this—I was half asleep here when this started. Do you mind if I return to a line of questioning of Dr Aleck? So far you've indicated that you identified one person and you reflected on the inability to identify others because you weren't aware of their identity. So the one person you spoke to was a member of parliament. Let me ask you, Dr Aleck: surely, question 101 from your investigator would be to the member of parliament, 'Who else was here?' and I assume the member of parliament ought to be able to tell you, with about 80 or 90 per cent accuracy, how many people were here and who they were. My question is very specific: did your investigator ask the individual, the member of parliament who you're about to identify, who else was present and how many there were?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> If our investigator had the opportunity to speak with them—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> If you don't know the answer, Dr Aleck, say, 'I do not know the answer.'</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I do not know the answer, but I can assure you that the question—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> No, there's no need for you to editorialise. I ask you to take on notice, with your investigator, whether they asked the member of parliament about who was there and how many there were. But you're about to identify the member of parliament who was interviewed.</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> The member of parliament whose office was contacted was Michelle Landry and, as I explained, our efforts to interview Ms Landry were unsuccessful at this point.</p>	16 27/10/17		

					<p><b>CHAIR:</b> So we're dealing in months here. How many efforts have been made to engage with Ms Landry over the months?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I'll take that on notice, but Ms Landry was identified only relatively recently. We had misidentified her as somebody else in the frame and that was corrected.</p>		
115	438	CASA	STERLE	DRONE COUNSELLING LETTERS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I'll make a statement here, rather than a question. You ping any other Australian for breaking these rules, and you don't think we're going to come back here and say, 'Here we go again'? You cannot be serious. You are the enforcers. You are the ones who lay down the rules. You are so blinded because politicians or political employees can get away with murder around your rules— defend that.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I'm happy to provide on notice lists of where we've provided counselling letters for similar offences. I didn't realise that, from what Senator Gallacher said, you were after a higher standard. I thought you were after the same standard. We're very happy to provide on notice where we've issued counselling letters as well, if that would help.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Have you had to counsel any pilots for breaking your rules for usage of drones?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I'd have to take it on notice. We've counselled a number of people. As I said, it depends on the circumstance. We've fined a number of people, and it depends on the circumstance.</p>	17 27/10/17	
116	439	CASA	O'SULLIVAN	DRONE INVESTIGATION	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> I'm not done. If you'd like some names, Dr Aleck: the Deputy Prime Minister, Senator Canavan, Mr Perrett, Mr McCormack and Mr Buchholz were there, and I'll have some more for you in the fullness of time. My question to you is did your investigators even interview the operator of the drone?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Did they ask him who else was present or what numbers were present?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I'll take that question on notice. I assume they conducted a normal investigation, which would have involved questions of that.</p>	17 27/10/17	
117	440	CASA	O'SULLIVAN	DRONE INVESTIGATION	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> You're telling me someone started an investigation and interviewed an individual, at least with a view to a prosecution, and didn't record it to the standard that would be required to underpin that prosecution? Are there no notes, no</p>	18 27/10/17	

					<p>contemporaneous record of the conversation, no recording taped, no video or otherwise? Is that what you're telling us?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I will only say that the maximum consequence of such an event was an infringement notice. I'm not aware of matters of that kind.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> That is not the burden of my question. Are you telling this committee that your investigator, confronted with a witness or a potential offender, who you say wasn't totally cooperative, did not record in any shape or form the interview that took place?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I said I don't believe so, but I'll confirm that.</p>		
118	441	CASA	STERLE	USE OF DRONES IN THE PARLIAMENTARY PRECINCT	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Have there been any discussions between CASA, the Department of Infrastructure and/or the Department of Parliamentary Services on the use of drones within the parliamentary precincts and above Parliament House?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> Not to my knowledge, no.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Not to my knowledge.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Not at all?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Not to my knowledge.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's fine. I'll also let you take on notice if someone has had any further conversations between the three bodies.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> To clarify, if something is raised with us, a question would be raised on safety grounds or an agency, like a security agency, would put something forward to us on security grounds.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I have found out since we started this questioning that the Department of Parliamentary Services has the oversight of what goes on over and above here.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Please take that on notice for me.</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> Is that just the question about whether or not we've been in contact?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> It is if there have been any discussions. If there have, then there are another couple of lines of questioning. If so: when, with whom, how many times, what it was about—all that sort of stuff.</p>	19 27/10/17	
119	442	CASA	XENOPHON	STANDARD FORM RECOMMENDATION	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> It is a sensitive issue. The standard form recommendation, as I understand it, is a document relating to adding references to a flight crew licence</p>	24 27/10/17	

					<p>condition. Is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> In reality it's a recommendation that might have many functions. It's a way of combining information to a decision-maker like me, a recommendation for us to take a particular course of action. So it might not be licensing; it could be anything.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Sure, but the normal course is that for the document to be a valid document, it ought to be a signed document—is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Yes, that would be reasonable.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> That's in terms of the appropriateness. My understanding is that a recommendation was made, but it was not signed off. In other words, are you satisfied, and you may want to take this on notice, that the standard form recommendation that I have referred you to is appropriately executed so as to be a valid document?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I'd have to take it on notice. I haven't got the document. I don't know the date of the document.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I'm happy for you to take that on notice, but I've got concerns as to the validity of the document in relation to that. This document relates to Mr James having to take a proficiency check prior to being able to act as a pilot in command of a multicrew aircraft. I've provided you with a copy of that. It's a form signed by Mr Roger Chambers, but my understanding is that it is not properly endorsed. Are you able to confirm that, or do you need to take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p>		
120	443	CASA	XENOPHON	STANDARD FORM RECOMMENDATION	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> So there's a question there: is the standard form recommendation incomplete? I asked you to take that on notice. If it is in some way incomplete or deficient, that may have some bearing on the decision-making process of CASA. It's a technical question, but could you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I'll take it on notice, but if it's a current standard form recommendation, then, as I said before, that's why I'd like to review it. The standard form recommendation that I assume underpins the original decision probably has not changed. Anyway, I'll take it on notice and have a look at it.</p>	26 27/10/17	
121	444	CASA	XENOPHON	DRAFT REPORT	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I'll put this in general terms. There's an issue of process that I'm concerned about. The names of the individuals aren't so key to this. Who was</p>	26 27/10/17	

					<p>authorised to see the draft report, as to the processes involved for that? Can you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Certainly.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Were there any individuals who weren't authorised to see the report who did see the report?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I'll take both of those on notice. The draft report is provided to us to provide comment on, and you would expect my inspectorate—those who are involved in the matter—to be reviewing that report and providing comment.</p>		
122	445	CASA	XENOPHON	STANDARD FORM RECOMMENDATIONS	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Does that relate to documents such as standard form recommendations or not?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I think under the FOI legislation there are some limitations about what goes on there. But anything that we're required to post publicly will be on there.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> So there's no question that these documents that weren't posted publicly should have been posted publicly? Can you take that into account?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> If they were within the category of documents that ought to have been identified then I—</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> If you could take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I will, yes.</p>	26-27 27/10/17	
123	446	CASA	XENOPHON	PEL-AIR	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> It's good to clarify that. I'm almost finished. The Senate inquiry some time ago found that there were a number of points of fault in the Pel-Air incident. It's clear there are a number of impositions on Mr James. Can CASA advise what other officials or what other entities—by title, not name—have had a remedial action placed on them in terms of whether there were multiple points of fault leading to this incident?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Sorry, Senator, can I just clarify that. Are you talking specifically about the Pel-Air incident?</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Yes, I am.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> And whether we have placed restrictions on anyone else?</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I can take it on notice, but I understand the only restriction that was placed would be a restriction placed on the pilot in command, at this stage. I don't believe any other restrictions have been placed on the first officer, but I can check.</p>	28 27/10/17	

					<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> And not on management issues with Pel-Air and their systems?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I don't know whether that leads to any restrictions, but I'll take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> And, on notice, there are issues of air traffic control and weather forecasting, so, if not restrictions, were there recommendations made in relation to improvements of that?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Certainly I'm aware that a number of changes or improvements were made post that accident, but I can provide those responses on notice. I think they've been provided before, but I'm quite happy to provide them.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Okay. On notice, after the release of the report, can you advise the committee of every person who was identified as contributing to the accident directly or indirectly and any action that CASA has taken in respect of those persons. That is something that can be done after the ATSB report.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> We will have to wait for the ATSB report, but certainly.</p>		
124	447	CASA	STERLE	APPROVAL OF DRONE OVER PARLIAMAENT HOUSE	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Mr Carmody, I know you are just going to have a read of that, but I want to be very, very precise here. Dr Aleck, I'm going to ask you, in terms of your investigation and interviewing of Mr Ashby, did your investigators ask Mr Ashby if he sought approval to fly the drone over Parliament House from any government agency, department or body—security agency?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I will take your question on notice as to whether he was asked if he had asked permission, but what we do have in the material in fact that's before me now is that we inquired of the AFP and of the organiser of the event, and no permission was sought of those—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I will come back a couple of steps. Can you tell this committee: did your investigators ask Mr Ashby or did Mr Ashby offer advice or answer your investigators' questions that he sought approval from the AFP to fly the drone?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> That information—I haven't looked all through this yet, but I can't answer that question at the moment. I'm not aware of that, but I haven't looked thoroughly at the materials.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How long would it take you to get that information?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> Whether our investigator asked Mr Ashby that question?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Whether Mr Ashby offered an answer to your investigators that he sought approval to fly the drone over Parliament House on that day from the</p>	28 27/10/17	



					<p>AFP?  <b>Dr Aleck:</b> It shouldn't take long.  <b>Senator STERLE:</b> Thank you. I'll wait for that answer.</p>		
<b>Inland Rail Unit (1)</b>							
125	363	IRU	MCCARTHY	IPFA ROLE WITH THE INTERMODAL TERMINAL DEVELOPMENT	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> John O'Neil, the acting CEO of the IPFA says that he'll be running the intermodal terminals associated Inland Rail. Are you worried that someone with an unusual reporting line, directly to the Prime Minister, will decide where these new freight terminals will be located?  <b>Mr Fullerton:</b> We're heavily involved in that. We've had meetings with them already. We have our own terminal strategy. We think terminals are critical to rail, particularly in Melbourne and Brisbane. We're working with the departments and the financing agency about the future funding and operation of intermodal terminals.  <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you're not worried?  <b>Mr Fullerton:</b> Not worried at all.  <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> And when will construction of Inland Rail commence?  <b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Excuse me, Senator—just on that earlier point—  <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Sorry, which point?  <b>Dr Kennedy:</b> About John O'Neill running the intermodal terminal process, that I think you noted. We're happy to provide you with some information on notice about what the IPFA is doing, but they're not running that as a process—that's not correct. So, we will just check what John has said and what your understanding is and provide you with some further information.  <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You will provide that to the committee?  <b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Yes; what their precise role is in advising around intermodal terminal development.  <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay. Thank you, Dr Kennedy.</p>	27 23/10/17	
<b>National Capital Authority (1)</b>							
126	490	NCA	DI NATALE	LETTER TO CHIEF HEALTH OFFICER	<p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> What information would you require from the Chief Health Officer?</p>	63 27/10/17	

					<p><b>Mr Smith:</b> My letter to the Chief Health Officer was reasonably direct.</p> <p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> Are you prepared to table that information?</p> <p><b>Mr Smith:</b> We can make that available to you. I don't have a copy with me here.</p> <p><b>Senator DI NATALE:</b> Okay. You'll table the information that you requested from the Chief Health Officer. What, in particular, did you request of the Chief Health Officer?</p> <p><b>Mr Smith:</b> It's in my notes, Senator.</p>		
<b>Office of Transport Security (2)</b>							
127	489	OTS	RICE	TRAINING PROTOCOLS	What training protocols are currently in place for airport security officials in relation to transgender and gender diverse people?	WRITTEN 10/11/17	
128	492	OTS	STERLE	SECURITY LEVELS AT AUSTRALIAN PORTS	Has security in every Australian port been elevated to a consistent level?	WRITTEN 6/11/17	
<b>Australian Maritime Safety Authority (1)</b>							
65	483	AMSA	STERLE	SHORT LEAVE FOR SEAFARERS	Is AMSA responsible to ensure seafarers get shore leave?	WRITTEN 6/11/17	