

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport References Committee

Questions on Notice – Wednesday, 14 September 2011 CANBERRA, ACT

Inquiry into animal welfare standards in Australia's live export markets

Question Number	Page No's.	Witness	Question asked by	Answered
1	12	Four Corners, ABC	Senator Back	15/9/11
2	Add. Q's	Four Corners, ABC	Senator Back	27/9/11
3	Add. Q's	Four Corners, ABC	Senator Back	27/9/11
4	Add. Q's	Four Corners, ABC	Senator Back	27/9/11
1	44	LiveCorp	Senator Nash	27/9/11
2	45	LiveCorp	Senator Siewert	27/9/11
3	46	LiveCorp	Senator Xenophon	27/9/11
4	46	LiveCorp	Senator Xenophon	27/9/11
1	57	DAFF	Senator Back	27/9/11
2	59	DAFF	Senator Siewert	27/9/11
3	60	DAFF	Senator Siewert	27/9/11
4	60	DAFF	Senator Siewert	27/9/11
5	60	DAFF	Senator Siewert	27/9/11

**SENATE RURAL AFFAIRS AND TRANSPORT
REFERENCES COMMITTEE**

Inquiry into animal welfare standards in Australia's live export markets

Public Hearing Wednesday, 14 September 2011

Questions Taken on Notice – Four Corners, ABC

1. HANSARD, PG 12

Senator BACK: You may have to take this on notice, but in my examination of the footage—and, Mr Doyle, you as the producer may be able to correct me now or provide this information to the committee—on my estimate there are about 15½ minutes in all of, shall I say, footage in abattoirs in the program. Of that, my figure of footage relating to stunning is about 35 seconds—about three per cent of the time—and footage that I can identify as ABC footage was about three minutes 40 seconds long. There are another 2½ minutes, but I just could not determine whether the footage was that of the ABC or whether it was provided to you. Then, on my estimate, there are about another nine minutes or what I estimate to be 60 per cent. I would appreciate if you could provide the committee with a breakdown of what footage was provided to you and what footage the ABC took.

Mr Doyle: We could do that. In terms of the final program—

Senator BACK: Obviously, we can only go on the final program.

Mr Doyle: We can do that. We will have to take that on notice. As a general point, I think, all up, we are looking at in the realm of probably 15 hours of footage.

2. Additional Questions from Senator Back to Mr Sunderland

In Mr Kerry O'Brien's opening comments of the documentary "A Bloody Business", he referred to the industry scrambling to take action and control the damage. Quote from Mr O'Brien:

"Aware that we were working on this story and having been shown the footage you're about to see, the industry scrambled last week to take action and control the damage."

As presented in evidence to the Senate committee, industry executives were shown only a sample of the footage for a period of two hours on the Tuesday or Wednesday preceding the Four Corners program going to air. They were then interviewed by the ABC ONE working day before the documentary was screened.

In her evidence, Ms Ferguson advised the committee that she believed the executives had access to the footage for 2 days before she interviewed them on Thursday 26th May 2011.

In his evidence to the committee, Mr Cameron Hall confirmed he only had access to view limited amounts of the footage for a period of 2 hours and that Mr Doyle took the material away with him, thus denying Mr Hall and his associates any further scrutiny of the material. He

Can you clarify for the committee what was meant by the statement “scrambling to take action and control the damage” when these industry officials had access to the footage for only two hours in the days immediately before the program went on national television when the ABC **had some EIGHT weeks during which you could have shared this information?**

3. Additional Questions from Senator Back to Mr Sunderland

In the hearing, Senator Back questioned Ms Ferguson on several occasions to establish that she had stated the name of a cattle station from which cattle originated in footage relating to the abattoir at Jalan Stasian.

While Ms Ferguson was emphatic in her responses on several occasions that she had not named the cattle station involved, the transcript will show that she did name it. (Log of transcript after 41 minutes 52 seconds).

The operators of the station have suffered significantly as a result of the station being named in the program. In fact they have received death threats.

The ABC’s code of conduct under HARM AND OFFENCE reads as follows:

“The ABC acknowledges that a public broadcaster should never gratuitously harm or offend and accordingly any content which is likely to harm or offend must have a clear editorial purpose.”

Can you explain what was the **clear editorial policy of the ABC** in putting this sector of the program to air given the considerable harm and offence to the owners of the station in question, as presented in evidence to the committee?

What action does the ABC now propose to take redress the harm and offence suffered? It is surely obvious the owners do not want the name of the station aired publicly again.

4. Additional Questions from Senator Back to Mr Sunderland

I refer you to the segment relating to animals seen shivering in the race prior to slaughter at Jalan Stasian abattoir.

From the history and clinical signs exhibited on the documentary, it is a reasonable conclusion that the animals were suffering from a long recognised and well understood clinical condition called Transit Tetany.

The ABC’s code of practice on accuracy and verification includes the following statements:

"ABC editorial standards and policy requires that reasonable efforts must be made to determine the accuracy of FACTUAL CONTENT."

"It is necessary to verify all material facts using reasonable efforts."

"If it cant be verified by the ABC, then it should be attributed to the source and presented only AS CLAIMS."

"It may not be appropriate to broadcast it unless or until the ABC has verified it."

"The requirement to undertake reasonable efforts to verify the accuracy of facts attributed to others is greater when the information itself is more significant and the source of that information more doubtful."

Was the case in question one in which alternate experts could and should have been called to validate the accuracy of the statement of one person whose qualifications, while unquestioned in her professional discipline, do not extend to veterinary medicine?

Do you accept that the conclusions drawn or inferred from the imagery portrayed in the documentary were of such a nature that further verification from alternative sources should have been sought prior to this segment being presented?

**SENATE RURAL AFFAIRS AND TRANSPORT
REFERENCES COMMITTEE**

Inquiry into animal welfare standards in Australia's live export markets

Public Hearing Wednesday, 14 September 2011

Questions Taken on Notice – Four Corners, ABC

1. HANSARD, PG 12

Senator BACK: You may have to take this on notice, but in my examination of the footage—and, Mr Doyle, you as the producer may be able to correct me now or provide this information to the committee—on my estimate there are about 15½ minutes in all of, shall I say, footage in abattoirs in the program. Of that, my figure of footage relating to stunning is about 35 seconds—about three per cent of the time—and footage that I can identify as ABC footage was about three minutes 40 seconds long. There are another 2½ minutes, but I just could not determine whether the footage was that of the ABC or whether it was provided to you. Then, on my estimate, there are about another nine minutes or what I estimate to be 60 per cent. I would appreciate if you could provide the committee with a breakdown of what footage was provided to you and what footage the ABC took.

Mr Doyle: We could do that. In terms of the final program—

Senator BACK: Obviously, we can only go on the final program.

Mr Doyle: We can do that. We will have to take that on notice. As a general point, I think, all up, we are looking at in the realm of probably 15 hours of footage.

ANSWER:

I understand that this information has already been provided to the committee directly by Mr Doyle. (See attached document)

2. Additional Questions from Senator Back to Mr Sunderland

In Mr Kerry O'Brien's opening comments of the documentary "A Bloody Business", he referred to the industry scrambling to take action and control the damage. Quote from Mr O'Brien:

"Aware that we were working on this story and having been shown the footage you're about to see, the industry scrambled last week to take action and control the damage."

As presented in evidence to the Senate committee, industry executives were shown only a sample of the footage for a period of two hours on the Tuesday or Wednesday preceding the

Four Corners program going to air. They were then interviewed by the ABC ONE working day before the documentary was screened.

In her evidence, Ms Ferguson advised the committee that she believed the executives had access to the footage for 2 days before she interviewed them on Thursday 26th May 2011.

In his evidence to the committee, Mr Cameron Hall confirmed he only had access to view limited amounts of the footage for a period of 2 hours and that Mr Doyle took the material away with him, thus denying Mr Hall and his associates any further scrutiny of the material. He

Can you clarify for the committee what was meant by the statement “scrambling to take action and control the damage” when these industry officials had access to the footage for only two hours in the days immediately before the program went on national television when the ABC **had some EIGHT weeks during which you could have shared this information?**

ANSWER:

The purpose of the Four Corners program was to report on the conditions revealed by the Animals Australia footage and the conditions revealed by our own further investigations in Indonesian abattoirs, involving Australian cattle.

Once we had satisfied ourselves of the facts of the matter to the greatest extent possible, we sought appropriate responses and reaction from a range of individuals and organisations.

All of those individuals and organisations were provided appropriate time and opportunity either to respond to the footage we had obtained, or to talk about their own observations and understanding of how the trade is conducted.

In relation to Mr Hall, I am advised by the program team that the vision was shown to them in the morning of Tuesday 24th May, and the interview was conducted on Wednesday 25th May.

It is certainly the case that the industry had been involved in the trade for a lengthy period of time and had conducted its own investigations and inspections to gain an understanding of conditions, and its actions were taken once the information contained in our story was revealed to them.

Other than that, the significance of the story and the information contained in it is clear.

3. Additional Questions from Senator Back to Mr Sunderland

In the hearing, Senator Back questioned Ms Ferguson on several occasions to establish that she had stated the name of a cattle station from which cattle originated in footage relating to the abattoir at Jalan Stasian.

While Ms Ferguson was emphatic in her responses on several occasions that she had not named the cattle station involved, the transcript will show that she did name it. (Log of transcript after 41 minutes 52 seconds).

The operators of the station have suffered significantly as a result of the station being named in the program. In fact they have received death threats.

The ABC's code of conduct under HARM AND OFFENCE reads as follows:

"The ABC acknowledges that a public broadcaster should never gratuitously harm or offend and accordingly any content which is likely to harm or offend must have a clear editorial purpose."

Can you explain what was the **clear editorial policy of the ABC** in putting this sector of the program to air given the considerable harm and offence to the owners of the station in question, as presented in evidence to the committee?

What action does the ABC now propose to take redress the harm and offence suffered? It is surely obvious the owners do not want the name of the station aired publicly again.

ANSWER

In relation to the answers given during the hearing, the ABC acknowledges that Ms Ferguson was mistaken. She was thinking of another station which was *not* mentioned in the story as there were uncertainties related to properly identifying a tag.

In relation to the station that *was* identified, once we had established that animals from the station in question were being slaughtered at the Jalan Stasiun abattoir on the day of the visit, we contacted the station and asked if they wanted to take part in the program. They declined. Given their involvement in the industry and the fact their animals were being poorly treated at Jalan Stasiun there was no reason not to report that fact. We did the same for each station where we were able to identify ear tags on the animals. The story was about Australian animals and making the connection between specific stations and the scenes in the Indonesian abattoirs was obviously important.

The clear editorial purpose was to identify the facts of the matter clearly, and to make the necessary connections. Nothing in the story suggested in any way that individual cattle stations were directly responsible for the activities of the Indonesian abattoirs.

4. Additional Questions from Senator Back to Mr Sunderland

I refer you to the segment relating to animals seen shivering in the race prior to slaughter at Jalan Stasian abattoir.

From the history and clinical signs exhibited on the documentary, it is a reasonable conclusion that the animals were suffering from a long recognised and well understood clinical condition called Transit Tetany.

The ABC's code of practice on accuracy and verification includes the following statements:

"ABC editorial standards and policy requires that reasonable efforts must be made to determine the accuracy of FACTUAL CONTENT."

"It is necessary to verify all material facts using reasonable efforts."

"If it cant be verified by the ABC, then it should be attributed to the source and presented only AS CLAIMS."

"It may not be appropriate to broadcast it unless or until the ABC has verified it."

"The requirement to undertake reasonable efforts to verify the accuracy of facts attributed to others is greater when the information itself is more significant and the source of that information more doubtful."

Was the case in question one in which alternate experts could and should have been called to validate the accuracy of the statement of one person whose qualifications, while unquestioned in her professional discipline, do not extend to veterinary medicine?

Do you accept that the conclusions drawn or inferred from the imagery portrayed in the documentary were of such a nature that further verification from alternative sources should have been sought prior to this segment being presented?

ANSWER:

On the question of transit tetany, this alternative diagnosis is disputed by all the experts we know who have looked at the extended footage of the scene in question. In addition to Temple Grandin, the RSPCA asked 3 experts to review the footage; they unanimously dismiss the diagnosis of transit tetany and support the view that the animal was afraid. I have briefly quoted from their analyses and the RSPCA has I understand presented the analysis to the committee.

The view we reflected in the program is supported by watching the whole scene just as viewing the whole scene at the Mabar abattoir demonstrates that Senator Back's previous allegations about that abattoir could not be accurate. In that case the Senator claimed the slaughterman stopped kicking the steer who was being abused and was urged to keep kicking in return for money paid by Animals Australia and their associates. The footage makes it clear this did not happen; the slaughterman does not stop and start, no one speaks to the slaughterman during the scene. It is clear the various acts of brutality are aimed at getting the animal that had just broken its leg to move to the box.

Expert analysis sought by the RSPCA as to whether the animal at Jl Stasiun was "afraid" or suffering from transit tetany includes the following comments:

"I ruled out transfer tetany as a cause because the footage did not show a steer that was restless or excited or worsening to the point of staggering....In my view the steer was aware of what was happening around him and behaved in a manner consistent with flight or fight response. It is entirely reasonable to assume the steer may well have been frightened or fearful.

Hugh Wirth

Veterinarian, AM KSJ

"The study animal exhibited many subjective signs of stress consistent with prolonged exposure to the inappropriate, strong and repeated stimuli of other animals being killed and dismembered in close proximity. My assessment is that this steer is extremely stressed (and therefore, his welfare is poor) and the trembling/muscle tremors shown by this steer are a consequence of this extreme stress... The clinical signs of transit tetany also appear inconsistent with the behaviours of steer 3, as far as can be ascertained from the footage.

Dr Carol Petherick (IIAT,Bsc Hons,MSc,PhD)

Senior Research Fellow

ABC – Four Corners Program
Answer to Question on Notice – Wednesday, 14 September 2011

Senator Back asked us to provide a tally of the time that Indonesian abattoir footage was used in our finished program – sourced both from our own camera and Animals Australia. I can't recall precisely what Senator Back's own calculations were but when I went through the program this morning my tally was as follows:

Animals Australia footage at abattoirs:	8 mins 40 secs
Four Corners footage at abattoirs:	7 mins 43 secs
Total footage at abattoirs:	16 mins 23 secs

The full program duration was I recall about 45 mins 40 secs.

**SENATE RURAL AFFAIRS AND TRANSPORT
REFERENCES COMMITTEE**

Inquiry into animal welfare standards in Australia's live export markets

Public Hearing Wednesday, 14 September 2011

Questions Taken on Notice - LiveCorp

1. HANSARD, PG 44

Senator NASH: You just made reference to travelling extensively and not having seen that type of behaviour. Would you mind taking on notice for us—because I think it would be quite useful for the committee—where you have visited and over what period of time, just so we can get a sense of the type of travelling that you have done where you have not come across that sort of behaviour?

2. HANSARD, PG 45

Mr Hall: Very small numbers of cattle went into Egypt after 2002.

Senator SIEWERT: What sort of numbers are we talking about.

Mr Hall: Less than 50,000 cattle a year. I will take it on notice and get you the exact number, but I believe there may only have been one shipment of cattle to Egypt in the 12 months prior to that *60 Minutes* program in 2006.

3. HANSARD, PG 46

Senator XENOPHON: I just want to go to the report prepared for MLA and LiveCorp that Professor Caple was involved in—the May 2010 independent study into animal welfare conditions for cattle in Indonesia. The report was not peer reviewed. Mr Hall, does that cause you any particular concern?

Mr Hall: No, not really. It was an independent review undertaken and funded through the Live Trade Animal Welfare Partnership, which is a partnership funded by industry and government. The report was to come back to that committee and was then placed on the Live Trade Animal Welfare Partnership website.

Senator XENOPHON: Have you had any requests from the RSPCA to provide the source material—the data and the photos—that were used to prepare this report?

Mr Hall: I do not know. I would need to take that on notice.

4. HANSARD, PG 46

Mr Hall: No, we do not. The report is a combination of the individual views of the four people upon inspection of each of those facilities, so it is a combination of those views that go together to build up to that final report. The information contained in those working papers and those sorts of things as I understand it—and we will clarify this for you, Senator—is under the ownership of those individual people who undertook the review.

CHAIR: The professor has already told us he will provide us with some of the working documents. I do not know if you were here for that.

Senator XENOPHON: So, in summary: when you normally do a contract you do not have the right to see the working documents?

Mr Sutton: I will take that on notice.

SENATE RURAL AFFAIRS AND TRANSPORT REFERENCES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into animal welfare standards in Australia's live export markets

Public Hearing Wednesday, 14 Sept 2011. Questions Taken on Notice.

1. Senator NASH: You just made reference to travelling extensively and not having seen that type of behaviour. Would you mind taking on notice for us—because I think it would be quite useful for the committee—where you have visited and over what period of time, just so we can get a sense of the type of travelling that you have done where you have not come across that sort of behaviour? **HANSARD, PG 44**

Australian Livestock Export Corporation Limited records indicate the following travel was undertaken by Mr Cameron Hall titled Business Travel details 2006 – 2011.

2. Senator SIEWERT: What sort of numbers are we talking about. **HANSARD, PG 45**

Australian Livestock Export Corporation Limited analysis indicates the total cattle exports to Egypt during the period were 14,544 head. As background, the sixty minutes program under discussion on Egypt appeared in March 2006, some 10 months after the nearest Australian shipment dated May 2005. It is believed the footage was gathered by Animals Australia as identified by their website in January 2005 some 15 months after the most recent shipment of Australian cattle that were shipped in October 2003. For these reasons, the industry has consistently believed that none of the cattle shown in the lobby groups media were from Australia. The view that Animals Australia selectively uses footage and modifies information to pursue an extreme agenda is based on experiences like these. These actions can significantly harm Australian agriculture exports, working Australians and their regional communities. We enclose the following trade report titled: Australian live cattle exports to Egypt for your information.

3 & 4. Senator XENOPHON: Have you had any requests from the RSPCA to provide the source material—the data and the photos—that were used to prepare this report? **HANSARD, PG 46.**

Senator XENOPHON: So, in summary: when you normally do a contract you do not have the right to see the working documents? **HANSARD, PG 46.**

Australian Livestock Export Corporation Limited does not have a record of any request by RSPCA in relation to this matter. In the event that this request had been made, it would not have been possible to meet their expectations. The contract in questions was between MLA and the consultant. Livecorp has many contract types and the handling of working documents would depend on the purpose and specific contract arrangements.

Document End.

Mr Cameron Hall business travel details 2006 -2011

Date from	Date to	Country
23/03/2011	25/03/2011	China
17/01/2011	26/01/2011	Jakarta - Indonesia
7/11/2010	20/11/2010	Beijing - China
2/05/2010	7/05/2010	Jakarta - Indonesia
9/05/2010	12/05/2010	USA
12/05/2010	13/05/2010	Washington
12/01/2010	22/01/2010	Middle East
1/11/2009	6/11/2009	Indonesia
19/03/2009	26/03/2009	Middle East
24/08/2008	28/08/2008	Jakarta - Indonesia
28/08/2008	5/09/2008	Middle East
18/05/2008	21/05/2008	Dresden, Germany
22/05/2008	25/05/2008	London UK
26/05/2008	31/05/2008	Russia
23/09/2007	29/09/2007	Philippines
6/11/2007	7/11/2007	Thailand
22/11/2007	7/12/2007	Middle East
23/06/2007	28/06/2007	Jakarta - Indonesia
5/03/2007	13/03/2007	Middle East
10/09/2006	19/09/2006	Jakarta - Indonesia
26/06/2006	4/07/2006	Middle East

Australia live cattle export to Egypt 2000

Country	Data	01-Jan-00	01-Feb-00	01-Mar-00	01-Apr-00	01-May-00	01-Jun-00	01-Jul-00	01-Aug-00	01-Sep-00	01-Oct-00	01-Nov-00	01-Dec-00	Total
Egypt	Sum of Total	24,641	11,115	9,706	13,862	20,750	12,701	23,756	7,519	22,841	16,608	17,971	26,081	207,551
	Sum of Value	\$15,178,754	\$7,101,864	\$6,302,758	\$9,343,752	\$13,186,004	\$7,232,883	\$13,791,101	\$4,512,016	\$13,613,065	\$9,956,888	\$12,137,112	\$17,351,144	\$129,707,341

Australia live cattle export to Egypt 2001

Country	Data	01-Jan-01	01-Feb-01	01-Mar-01	01-Apr-01	01-May-01	01-Jun-01	01-Jul-01	01-Aug-01	01-Sep-01	01-Oct-01	01-Nov-01	01-Dec-01	Total
Egypt	Sum of Total	4,347	26,604	21,304	16,766	25,514	5,880	19,508	13,151	21,594	22,062	20,062	6,414	203,206
	Sum of Value	\$3,062,976	\$18,450,821	\$16,315,563	\$11,957,143	\$18,436,449	\$3,526,212	\$13,861,866	\$8,363,504	\$16,298,759	\$19,801,028	\$17,934,623	\$5,750,847	\$153,759,791

Australia live cattle export to Egypt 2002

Country	Data	01-Jan-02	01-Feb-02	01-Mar-02	01-May-02	01-Jun-02	01-Jul-02	01-Aug-02	01-Sep-02	01-Oct-02	01-Nov-02	01-Dec-02	Total
Egypt	Sum of Total	2,643	16,926	2,254	16,498	7,005	16,483	7,220	15,198	15,507	9,464	35,817	145,015
	Sum of Value	\$2,639,133	\$14,562,751	\$1,919,629	\$11,840,226	\$3,782,700	\$9,235,770	\$4,332,000	\$9,196,776	\$9,873,438	\$6,137,271	\$23,311,755	\$96,831,449

Australia live cattle export to Egypt 2003

Country	Data	01-Jan-03	01-Oct-03	Total
Egypt	Sum of Total	4,695	2,888	7,583
	Sum of Value	\$3,209,133	\$1,791,991	\$5,001,124

Australia live cattle export to Egypt 2005

Country	Data	01-May-05	Total
Egypt	Sum of Total	6,961	6,961
	Sum of Value	\$3,828,550	\$3,828,550

**SENATE RURAL AFFAIRS AND TRANSPORT
REFERENCES COMMITTEE**

Inquiry into animal welfare standards in Australia's live export markets

Public Hearing Wednesday, 14 September 2011

Questions Taken on Notice - DAFF

1. HANSARD, PG 57

Senator BACK: Practically, we knew on the afternoon of the sixth. In terms of the changes, could you advise the committee, either now or on notice, what the cost and competitive impact of the proposed regulatory forms will be; in other words, the difference between what costs and impacts would have been prior to 6 June and what they are now as a result of the regulatory reforms that have been put in place? If you are not able to answer it now I would be most appreciative if you could take it on notice.

Mr Morris: Are you specifically referring to Indonesia? You mentioned 'proposed', which—

Senator BACK: I am specifically referring to Indonesia in the first question; that is correct.

Mr Morris: I think we can take that on notice. We have some information on that but perhaps, rather than doing it from memory, we will give it to you on notice.

2. HANSARD, PG 59

Senator SIEWERT: I want to go to an issue that I have asked several witnesses about. I want to find out how many animals were left when the 350 limit was brought in. It was brought in fairly suddenly. We have varying evidence about how suddenly it was brought in. Evidence suggests that it was brought in fairly suddenly and that animals were left because they could not be exported. Do we have any figures on how many animals were left on properties because they did not meet the 350 weight limit?

Mr Morris: We cannot answer that question directly but—

CHAIR: Can you take it on notice?

Mr Morris: I do not think we have the numbers on that. There is an indication that can be gained on the possible impact through looking at the change in numbers between years. For example, in the 2009 calendar year there were 756,000 head exported to Indonesia and then in calendar year 2010, which is when the 350-kilogram weight limit came in, there were only 517,000 head exported to Indonesia. So that is about a 250,000—

CHAIR: 2008-09 was a shit of a year on the Barkley Tableland.

Mr Morris: Correct. There could be a number of reasons why that reduction occurred. The quota did not come in until the beginning of this year, so it was not a quota effect. But one of the impacts we know was the weight limit, which had some influence.

Senator SIEWERT: When we talk about 'suddenly', can you highlight how much notice was given that the 350 limit was being brought in?

Mr Morris: It is a difficult question to answer because I think it was in legislation for some period of time but was—

Senator SIEWERT: It was being ignored, wasn't it?

Mr Morris: A blind eye was turned to it, and then all of sudden they started enforcing it. In terms of notice, I am not aware that much notice was given. But perhaps Ms Evans might have more information.

Ms Evans: I cannot add to what Mr Morris has said.

Mr Morris: I do not believe there was very much notice given.

Senator SIEWERT: How long was it in legislation for?

Mr Morris: We would have to check that. I think it was for some time.

Senator SIEWERT: If you could take that on notice it would be appreciated.

3. HANSARD, PG 60

Senator SIEWERT: I want to pick up on the issue that Senator Back made about Telstra services being disconnected. You can imagine there have probably been other impacts. Have these direct consequences been reported to you?

Mr Aldred: I am not aware that we have had any reports of that nature.

Senator SIEWERT: To be clear: the department has not and nor has Centrelink as the agency that is the contact agency.

Mr Aldred: I cannot speak on behalf of Centrelink. If those things occurred, it is possible that they may have been reported to Centrelink. It is also possible that they would be passed onto the Rural Financial Counselling Service.

Senator SIEWERT: Could you take on notice checking if either of those organisations has been contacted or informed.

Mr Aldred: Certainly.

4. HANSARD, PG 60

Senator SIEWERT: Was there an assessment of the impact of that change on the industry?

Ms Evans: Not formally by us. We talked with the industry about the fact that the weight limit was now being enforced by Indonesia and, as Mr Morris said, had been in place for a while. We will confirm when.

Senator SIEWERT: I meant that time not when the change was first introduced.

Ms Evans: Other than hearing from industry that it was causing difficulties and therefore it was worth our discussing that with the Indonesian government, we did not do a formal assessment of exactly how the impact was playing out on the industry.

Senator SIEWERT: So I am clear, ABARES did not either?

Mr Morris: We will take that question on notice because last time we indicated that it may have been built into the commodities forecasting done by ABARES. As far as I am aware, there was not any more detailed assessment.

5. HANSARD, PG 60

CHAIR: We may have to revisit this to make sense of what has happened. I have read what I can and cannot ask you as I do not want to ask anything that will get my head kicked in. In the process of making the political decision to end the trade, did you as a department consult the other state and territory departments? The states and territories told us the first thing they knew about it was when they read about it in newspapers or heard about it on radio. They said they were not consulted. Did any background consulting happen, even if the political decision got ahead of the background consulting? It seems weird to me that the decision was made without even talking to the states and territories.

Mr Morris: I think you asked us that question last time and we provided on notice that there was consultation with industry around options and so forth during that period.

CHAIR: With industry?

Mr Morris: Yes. I am not aware that there was detailed consultation with the states. We can reconfirm that.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport References Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Public Hearing – Animal Welfare Standards in Australia’s Live Export Markets
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 1

Division/Agency: Live Animal Exports Taskforce

Topic: DAFF advice to Government

Proof Hansard Page: 57

Senator BACK: Practically, we knew on the afternoon of the sixth. In terms of the changes, could you advise the committee, either now or on notice, what the cost and competitive impact of the proposed regulatory forms will be; in other words, the difference between what costs and impacts would have been prior to 6 June and what they are now as a result of the regulatory reforms that have been put in place? If you are not able to answer it now I would be most appreciative if you could take it on notice.

Mr Morris: Are you specifically referring to Indonesia? You mentioned 'proposed', which—

Senator BACK: I am specifically referring to Indonesia in the first question; that is correct.

Mr Morris: I think we can take that on notice. We have some information on that but perhaps, rather than doing it from memory, we will give it to you on notice.

Answer:

The Live Animal Exports Program operates on a fee for service schedule.

Cattle and Buffalo exported by sea to Indonesia are charged at a per head rate based on a tier system previously agreed with industry. The tier based system is linked to the level of complexity of the importing country requirements with a time based fee applied for additional activity undertaken above the prescribed hours if required. The per head and time based rates within the existing fee structure that came into effect on 1 December 2009 have not changed.

The time taken to receive from the exporter and assess a notice of intention and supporting exporter supply chain assurance information for a consignment of livestock for slaughter to Indonesia has increased. It is anticipated that this additional activity will decrease once all relevant parties are familiar with the new regulatory requirements.

Additionally, exporters were previously receiving export transition funding which provided a 40 per cent rebate against the full cost of services. This funding expired for all export commodities as planned on 30 June 2011 and is not related to the new regulatory framework for livestock to Indonesia. Since 1 July 2011 exporters have been required to pay the legislated fees for the full cost of services provided.

A copy of the charging guidelines for the Live Animal Exports Program legislated fees is available on the department’s website - www.daff.gov.au/aqis/export/live-animals/fees-charges/exports

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport References Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Public Hearing – Animal Welfare Standards in Australia’s Live Export Markets
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 2

Division/Agency: Live Animal Exports Taskforce

Topic: DAFF advice to Government

Proof Hansard Page: 59

Senator SIEWERT: I want to go to an issue that I have asked several witnesses about. I want to find out how many animals were left when the 350 limit was brought in. It was brought in fairly suddenly. We have varying evidence about how suddenly it was brought in. Evidence suggests that it was brought in fairly suddenly and that animals were left because they could not be exported. Do we have any figures on how many animals were left on properties because they did not meet the 350 weight limit?

Mr Morris: We cannot answer that question directly but—

CHAIR: Can you take it on notice?

Mr Morris: I do not think we have the numbers on that. There is an indication that can be gained on the possible impact through looking at the change in numbers between years. For example, in the 2009 calendar year there were 756,000 head exported to Indonesia and then in calendar year 2010, which is when the 350-kilogram weight limit came in, there were only 517,000 head exported to Indonesia. So that is about a 250,000—

CHAIR: 2008-09 was a shit of a year on the Barkley Tableland.

Mr Morris: Correct. There could be a number of reasons why that reduction occurred. The quota did not come in until the beginning of this year, so it was not a quota effect. But one of the impacts we know was the weight limit, which had some influence.

Senator SIEWERT: When we talk about 'suddenly', can you highlight how much notice was given that the 350 limit was being brought in?

Mr Morris: It is a difficult question to answer because I think it was in legislation for some period of time but was—

Senator SIEWERT: It was being ignored, wasn't it?

Mr Morris: A blind eye was turned to it, and then all of sudden they started enforcing it. In terms of notice, I am not aware that much notice was given. But perhaps Ms Evans might have more information.

Ms Evans: I cannot add to what Mr Morris has said.

Mr Morris: I do not believe there was very much notice given.

Senator SIEWERT: How long was it in legislation for?

Mr Morris: We would have to check that. I think it was for some time.

Senator SIEWERT: If you could take that on notice it would be appreciated.

Answer:

The Ministerial Decree governing weight limits for live cattle - 'The Minister of Agriculture's Decree Number 07/Permentan/OT.-140/1/2008 concerning the Import and Export Requirement and Procedure of Seed, Breeding Stock and Slaughtered Livestock' - was signed in January 2008.

From 22 May 2010, Indonesia began issuing import permits which included the requirement that animals be a maximum of 350kg on arrival in Indonesia.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport References Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Public Hearing – Animal Welfare Standards in Australia’s Live Export Markets
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 3

Division/Agency: Live Animal Exports Taskforce

Topic: DAFF advice to Government

Proof Hansard Page: 60

Senator SIEWERT: I want to pick up on the issue that Senator Back made about Telstra services being disconnected. You can imagine there have probably been other impacts. Have these direct consequences been reported to you?

Mr Aldred: I am not aware that we have had any reports of that nature.

Senator SIEWERT: To be clear: the department has not and nor has Centrelink as the agency that is the contact agency.

Mr Aldred: I cannot speak on behalf of Centrelink. If those things occurred, it is possible that they may have been reported to Centrelink. It is also possible that they would be passed onto the Rural Financial Counselling Service.

Senator SIEWERT: Could you take on notice checking if either of those organisations has been contacted or informed.

Mr Aldred: Certainly.

Answer:

Centrelink has advised that they are not aware of reports of Telstra services being disconnected.

Further, the Rural Financial Counselling Service has advised the department that it is not aware of any reports of Telstra services being disconnected.

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport References Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Public Hearing – Animal Welfare Standards in Australia’s Live Export Markets
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 4

Division/Agency: Live Animal Exports Taskforce

Topic: DAFF advice to Government

Proof Hansard Page: 60

Senator SIEWERT: Was there an assessment of the impact of that change on the industry?

Ms Evans: Not formally by us. We talked with the industry about the fact that the weight limit was now being enforced by Indonesia and, as Mr Morris said, had been in place for a while. We will confirm when.

Senator SIEWERT: I meant that time not when the change was first introduced.

Ms Evans: Other than hearing from industry that it was causing difficulties and therefore it was worth our discussing that with the Indonesian government, we did not do a formal assessment of exactly how the impact was playing out on the industry.

Senator SIEWERT: So I am clear, ABARES did not either?

Mr Morris: We will take that question on notice because last time we indicated that it may have been built into the commodities forecasting done by ABARES. As far as I am aware, there was not any more detailed assessment.

Answer:

This was previously answered (Question 10, Hansard Page 70) from the Questions on Notice from the Senate hearing of 10 August 2011.

Discussion on the impact of the weight limit imposed by Indonesia on Australian live cattle exports was presented in the June and September 2010 issues of *Australian Commodities* (pages 328-9 in the June 2010 issue and pages 505-6 in the September 2010 issue).

Senate Rural Affairs and Transport References Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Public Hearing – Animal Welfare Standards in Australia’s Live Export Markets
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Question: 5

Division/Agency: Live Animal Exports Taskforce

Topic: DAFF advice to Government

Proof Hansard Page: 60

CHAIR: We may have to revisit this to make sense of what has happened. I have read what I can and cannot ask you as I do not want to ask anything that will get my head kicked in. In the process of making the political decision to end the trade, did you as a department consult the other state and territory departments? The states and territories told us the first thing they knew about it was when they read about it in newspapers or heard about it on radio. They said they were not consulted. Did any background consulting happen, even if the political decision got ahead of the background consulting? It seems weird to me that the decision was made without even talking to the states and territories.

Mr Morris: I think you asked us that question last time and we provided on notice that there was consultation with industry around options and so forth during that period.

CHAIR: With industry?

Mr Morris: Yes. I am not aware that there was detailed consultation with the states. We can reconfirm that.

Answer:

Animal welfare has been the subject of ongoing consultations with states and territories through the Primary Industries Ministerial Council (PIMC). On 14 July 2011 PIMC agreed that Commonwealth, state and territory governments, through the Industry-Government Working Group on Live Animal Exports, would continue to work with industry to monitor and address the impact of the suspension and resumption of trade for live animal exports to Indonesia.

The PIMC also agreed that any future major changes to the regulation of live animal exports on animal welfare grounds would be made after council and industry consultation.