



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

**HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

Reference: Sustainability charter

THURSDAY, 30 MARCH 2006

CANBERRA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INTERNET

The Proof and Official Hansard transcripts of Senate committee hearings, some House of Representatives committee hearings and some joint committee hearings are available on the Internet. Some House of Representatives committees and some joint committees make available only Official Hansard transcripts.

The Internet address is: **<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>**

To search the parliamentary database, go to:
<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

Thursday, 30 March 2006

Members: Dr Washer (*Chair*), Ms George (*Deputy Chair*), Mr Broadbent, Mr Entsch, Ms Hoare, Mr Jenkins, Miss Jackie Kelly, Mr Kerr, Mr McArthur and Mr Wood

Members in attendance: Mr Broadbent, Mr Entsch, Ms George, Mr Kerr, Mr McArthur and Dr Washer

Terms of reference for the inquiry:

To inquire into and report on:

Key elements of a sustainability charter and identify the most important and achievable targets, particularly in relation to:

1. The built environment;
2. Water;
3. Energy;
4. Transport; and,
5. Ecological footprint.

WITNESSES

CROSSLEY, Mr David, Executive Director, Performance Audit Services Group, Australian National Audit Office..... 1

MATHIE, Mr Cameron Warwick, Performance Auditor, Australian National Audit Office..... 1

McVAY, Mr Peter Ian, Senior Director, Australian National Audit Office 1

Committee met at 10.35 am

CROSSLEY, Mr David, Executive Director, Performance Audit Services Group, Australian National Audit Office

MATHIE, Mr Cameron Warwick, Performance Auditor, Australian National Audit Office

McVAY, Mr Peter Ian, Senior Director, Australian National Audit Office

CHAIR (Dr Washer)—I declare open this public hearing of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Heritage inquiry into a sustainability charter. The committee is now starting on a program of public hearings and informal discussions. This hearing is the first of the inquiry. The inquiry was prompted by a recommendation, made by this committee in its *Sustainable cities* report, to establish a sustainability charter that sets key national targets across a number of areas, including water, transport, energy, building and planning.

The committee will be calling a broad range of witnesses during the inquiry but today we will be hearing from the Australian National Audit Office in relation to their *Cross Portfolio Audit of Green Office Procurement*. This may also prompt the committee to hear from government agencies involved in the audit.

I welcome representatives of the Australian National Audit Office. Thank you for coming here today. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that these hearings are formal proceedings of the parliament. Consequently, they warrant the same respect as proceedings of the House itself. It is customary to remind witnesses that giving false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of parliament. Would you like to make any opening remarks?

Mr Crossley—Our purpose today is to provide the committee with an overview of our report, *Cross portfolio audit of green office procurement*. Whilst we are cognisant of both the *Sustainable cities* report and the inquiry into the sustainability charter, the report has some linkages to that that we would be happy to discuss, perhaps after going through our report.

Before I hand over to Mr McVay and Mr Mathie, I think it is relevant to note that our report only covered the government sector; it did not include any real investigations into entities or practices outside of the direct government sector. I think it is also fair to say that our report reflects how the government was going at a point in time. It found generally that there was a great degree of variability, both across agencies and within agencies and across all of the various areas relating to sustainable practices—energy, water, waste recycling, et cetera. So the practices themselves are variable, the agencies are variable and even within agencies there is a great degree of variability. To the extent that this report picks out aspects that we looked at, there are some very good practices in the government sector and there is certainly a degree of improvement that could be made across the government sector. We welcome the opportunity to present you with the findings of the report. I will hand over now to Mr McVay.

Mr McVay—It is certainly my pleasure to present to you some of the key findings emerging from our performance audit, which we tabled last year.

A PowerPoint presentation was then given—

Ms GEORGE—Just before you start: does ‘agencies’ include departments as well? Is that the generic term?

Mr McVay—Yes. ‘Agencies’ includes departments and parts of departments sometimes. I will give you a quick overview. We tabled in December 2005. We looked at 71 different agencies. We looked at 41 that were relevant to the Financial Management and Accountability Act—that is, the core departments of state, agencies and what we call the CAC agencies, which are more offline, but not government business enterprises. So it goes to the Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act as well. We did that to try and get a variety, to see how they are all travelling along. I will go to the objective:

The objective of the audit was to assess and report on the progress being made by agencies:

- in realising value for money from the procurement process, with specific focus on buildings, services and products using whole of life cycle assessments; and
- in the consideration and management of environmental impacts in specifications and contracts.

So there was a very broad scope. I will quickly go through the framework for the government. We looked at building energy efficiencies, where there are mandatory targets of 10,000 megajoules per person per annum, and energy audit requirements. On water there are no requirements. On packaging, the National Packaging Covenant has been signed by ministers and the states, but compliance is still voluntary. We looked at annual reporting requirements, which are mandatory, under section 516A of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. We looked at mandatory ESD sustainability reporting by Commonwealth agencies. We looked at energy efficiency in Australian government vehicles. We looked at waste management, at environmental management systems and at office procurement.

That is just the overview. The starting point is chief executive instructions—that is, what are the CEOs of the different agencies saying in their agencies? Half of the respondents indicated that they did not have instructions or internal policies on whole of life cycle costing, which is a requirement under the procurement guidelines issued by the department of finance. Fewer than half of the respondents had references to minimising environmental impacts and compliance with government policies and targets, even though that is a requirement for reporting under section 516A of the EPBC Act. We recommended that agencies amend their CEIs or internal policies to require purchasing officials to have regard to these matters in future.

One area we thought was important was that there be some sort of target for improving performance. Half the agencies did not have any environmental performance targets at all, and we felt that it was very important in the areas of water, energy, waste and vehicles in particular. We felt that because of the drought situation and the water shortage across Australia it was important, even though there is no policy in the area. On energy there is policy, but some agencies did not seem to recognise that. On waste there is no policy; it is more of a good practice issue. There is policy in relation to vehicles.

Critical to the lack of targets is the slow performance by agencies in implementing environmental management systems. One key issue coming from the audit was that those agencies that had an environmental management system had fewer barriers to green procurement, set more environmental targets, had undertaken more energy- and water-saving

initiatives, had a greater knowledge of waste produced and were more active in recycling. Yet 45 per cent of them had in place an EMS of any sort, and 13 of those had an EMS that covered 100 per cent of their office spaces. Only seven agencies had an EMS certified to ISO 14001, which is world best practice standard. So a very small number are leading edge, which picks up David's point about the variability on performance.

On reporting, which I reiterate is a mandatory requirement under legislation, 41 per cent of agencies surveyed had documented the effect of their procurement actions on the environment, 80 per cent had documented their actions to minimise the impact of their actions on the environment and one of the more positive outcomes was that 11 agencies were now considering triple bottom line reports—which is reporting on environment, economic and social impacts—over the next three years to give parliament a more comprehensive view on how they are going and what impact they are having in their operations.

Mr Mathie—I will take over from there, Peter, thank you. As part of the audit we looked at office equipment and stationery. We looked at things ranging from pencils and paper right through to photocopiers and other printing equipment in the office space. We did a rough calculation and found that the Commonwealth government as a whole purchases about \$20 million worth of paper and that the majority of agencies did not use recycled content paper. A low percentage of agencies gave a preference to environmentally friendly goods. We surveyed them on the amount of recycled products that they used and we found that only 42 per cent of government agencies used recycled products as a preference, 21 per cent gave a preference to certified products and 28.2 per cent gave a preference to goods from environmentally accredited suppliers. On the graph on this slide, we see that around 30 of the 71 agencies we surveyed used virgin paper or 100 per cent non-recycled paper. There were a number of agencies using 40 per cent recycled paper.

Mr KERR—Was there any explanation for that?

Mr Mathie—Generally, cost. We did a graph of cost in the audit report and it shows that the costs generally increase with the volume of recycled paper bought.

On the subject of office equipment and stationery, 63 per cent of the agencies we surveyed used multifunction devices—devices that combine a printer, fax and photocopier in the one machine, 61 per cent used life-cycle costing as a standard procedure in equipment purchases, 55 per cent required energy management options on their office equipment, 83 per cent of agencies enabled these energy management options on their equipment and 24 per cent of agencies had provision for recycling or reuse of IT waste.

The current target for the government motor vehicle fleet—which was to be reviewed by December 2005—required 28 per cent of the entire government fleet to be above 10.5 on the Green Vehicle Guide, which is a department of transport vehicle ranking scheme. Since we introduced the target in 2003, the proportion has decreased from 17.9 per cent in 2003 to 12.5 per cent as at June 2005.

Mr KERR—There must be a reason for that.

Mr Mathie—The audit report goes into that a little. There are a number of reasons. One of the key reasons is the costs involved in smaller cars as opposed to the larger six-cylinder cars.

Mr McVay—There are discounts provided.

Mr Mathie—There are significant discounts given by the large manufacturers on fleet cars, so government agencies tend to prefer the larger cars.

Ms GEORGE—So what motivated the tax office to perform reasonably well?

Mr Mathie—I think the tax office made a conscious decision to move towards greener cars. They have also reduced their fleet quite significantly due to operational changes, as far as I can recall.

Mr McVay—And, as you can see from the chart on this slide, we are actually going backwards. In terms of the target, we are actually worse than when we started.

Mr Mathie—Moving on to waste management—

Mr BROADBENT—What about gas in cars?

Mr Mathie—There was not a high percentage of gas. Gas is not a cost-effective option, according to most agencies. The two-year lease cycle, which most government agencies go for, is too short a period to pay off the additional cost of having gas installed on a large car.

Ms GEORGE—I thought there had been some change in government policy to move towards the use of ethanol mixes.

Mr McVay—Not in government cars, per se, I think.

Mr Mathie—We did not come across any of that in the audit; no.

Mr McVay—A small number of agencies moved towards the Toyota Prius car.

Ms GEORGE—The hybrid car?

Mr McVay—Yes.

Mr Mathie—That is on an individual agency basis, though.

Ms GEORGE—So there is no overall government policy that directs agencies to do X, Y or Z?

Mr Mathie—The 28 per cent target was a voluntary target. And, according to Finance advice, agencies are to move towards it, keeping in mind their fleet needs and things like that.

Moving on to waste management: we looked at two aspects of waste management in the audit—building and construction waste and office waste. In building, construction and demolition, we made a finding that 30 to 40 per cent of waste to landfill is about eight million tonnes nationwide. Agencies spent over \$8 million in waste management, in waste management services. Only 65 per cent of agencies, however, were able to report on their costs of waste management. The National Packaging Covenant, which Peter touched on previously, aims to increase the amount of consumer waste recycled from 48 to 65 per cent and most agencies need to move towards helping to achieve this target.

Out of the 71 agencies, only 16 could specify their actions in assisting the government achieve its national waste reduction targets. The ANAO recommended that agencies develop water use targets and targets for recycled, commingled and organic waste as a way to address this. As the table on the right-hand side of the slide shows, only 20 per cent of agencies were recycling organic waste. Plastic waste was up to about 57 per cent.

On to water conservation: as Peter touched on before, there is no current government policy guiding what agencies should be doing to maintain their water. A DEH estimate is about 19,000 mega-litres per year. We found from the Institute for Sustainable Futures that up to 80 or 90 per cent of water could be reduced in an office environment.

Mr BROADBENT—Who are the Institute for Sustainable Futures?

Mr McVay—It is linked to the University of Technology in Sydney. It is a specialist agency that has been doing work on more sustainable practices, particularly on water.

Mr BROADBENT—They would have to be part of a sustainability charter inquiry, wouldn't they?

CHAIR—We will have to get on to it.

Mr Mathie—Moving on to government energy reporting, we touched on the whole-of-government energy report that comes out every year. There is a current target of 10,000 mega-joules, up to 2002-03. That target has yet to be updated. At 2003-04, 58 per cent of agencies had met this target. We can see an improvement from 35 per cent in 1999-2000, when the target came into play, so agencies are moving forward in reducing their energy use in the office.

Mr McVay—Even though it is a mandatory target. We are getting better at getting towards a mandatory target.

Mr Mathie—In addition to looking at that report, we found that the report on government energy consumption was overstated by some 44 per cent due to a reclassification by the Department of Defence of some of their diesel fuels. We recommended in that case that DEH concentrate on reporting intensities and include caveats to discuss these variations in the reports.

In terms of building energy efficiency, most agencies were doing something. The table on the right of this slide shows that 30 per cent were doing energy plans and strategies, 20 per cent had energy efficient lighting, nine per cent had upgraded their airconditioning, there were timer switchers on 28 per cent of agencies, and there were sensor switches on 22 per cent. However,

most were not complying with government policy in such areas as energy auditing. We made a recommendation that agencies implement more energy management plans, energy audits, energy metering and other energy efficient measures.

Mr BROADBENT—Did this exercise you went through as the Audit Office change the practice in the Audit Office itself?

Mr McVay—Yes.

Mr Mathie—It has, actually.

Mr BROADBENT—Have you got any examples?

Mr Mathie—We are now recycling all our organic waste. We do not have any hard figures, but we are capturing all of our commingled waste—the kind of waste that goes into the recycling bins out the front of your home, like paper, plastic and metal. In terms of energy efficiency, we have recently reviewed our energy use in the building.

Mr BROADBENT—Are you at 20 per cent, like the chart that we saw was, or are you higher than that now?

Mr McVay—I think we are better, actually. Our building is quite energy efficient.

Mr McARTHUR—Who does the audit on you guys?

Mr McVay—The Department of Finance and Administration appoints an auditor to do the audit officer.

Mr BROADBENT—We appointed him yesterday. But that is not the point. I think we should go around there and check, Stew!

Mr McVay—You would be most welcome.

Mr McARTHUR—We will come and have a look!

Mr Mathie—Just wrapping up on energy efficiency, agencies that had gone into doing these energy efficiency practices had demonstrated significant reductions. For example, heating and lighting timers had a 32 per cent reduction on their energy use, compared to two per cent for those agencies who had not undertaken this.

Mr BROADBENT—That is a huge reduction. Has anybody put a value on that?

Mr Mathie—We did not attempt to.

Mr McVay—It is worth noting that some of these measures—in fact throughout nearly all of the areas—are quite cost effective. It costs very little to do some of this stuff, for significant benefit.

Mr BROADBENT—But 32 per cent is a massive benefit.

Ms GEORGE—Just through a simple timing switch.

Mr McVay—One of the overall findings of the audit was that implementing all these measures on a net basis saves money. It does not cost money; there are real savings for agencies.

Mr ENTSCHE—Then they can afford to buy recycled paper.

Mr McVay—That is an area where there is a bit of extra cost. There are savings on most things but particularly energy. The payback is very good.

Ms GEORGE—Part of the problem is that they do not have ready access to consolidated information on these simple measures

Mr McVay—That is certainly part of it as well as going on to talk about some of the barriers.

Mr BROADBENT—We can probably talk about it later. Did you then go back to the other CEOs, via your CEO?

Mr McVay—We wrote to all departments' CEOs about the draft report. They were all advised of the findings.

Mr BROADBENT—But you did not explaining to them what you have done?

Mr McVay—No, just like other agencies do, we report on energy as part of the whole-of-government reporting. Energy use in Australian government operations is always included in the annual report. We have also spoken informally to Environment about some of the things we have undertaken. Part of the problem is some of the older buildings.

Mr BROADBENT—Yes, you cannot do it.

Mr McVay—That is a real constraint. Over time things will improve as they are knocked down or the Commonwealth agencies move out.

CHAIR—If you have finished with energy efficiency, we will move on.

Mr McVay—One of the things we asked agencies about was the barriers that stop them from moving towards more sustainable practices in the office environment. A key issue was the identification of green products being difficult and time consuming, which is an issue of information. The identification of an appropriate range of green supplies is difficult and time consuming. The monitoring of office procurement is not sufficiently precise to know whether green office procurement is happening. It worried us a little that their procurement practices were not really up to scratch, and we certainly did find in some agencies that they could not answer questions about the cost of paper. Their systems were not particularly good in contrast to, say, the tax office, which was very good and could answer these questions very quickly and quite succinctly. The tax office had good practices; other agencies not so good.

Mr McARTHUR—What is your definition of a green product?

Mr McVay—A green product is a relative term. It is not an absolute. Secondly, it has a lesser impact on the environment—less polluting, and less of a downside in waste disposal and so on. There is no absolute in terms of a green product but obviously a photocopier that uses less energy will be better. One that has recycled parts and components will obviously be better than one that is thrown out and ends up on the tip. You are right: it is one of those issues that it is hard to define precisely and it will change over time anyway because what is green today will not be seen as green in 10 years time.

Another worrying one was that budget constraints or processes do not allow green office procurement, even though this might produce longer term financial savings. That has a lot to do with the allocations of capital and recurrent expenditures within agencies. We did suggest that agencies look at that a bit hard, because it is clearly better for the longer term if we can produce savings rather than just look at the short term.

Mr BROADBENT—However, someone has to deal with the budget in the short term. We have all made those decisions.

Mr McVay—Sure. Ten per cent said that it was not a priority in their agency. Many of those were the smaller agencies. We recognise that it is particularly difficult for small agencies—those with 10 or 20 staff—to move forward. There is a small number of those.

Mr BROADBENT—What is an example of a 10 or 20 staff operation?

Mr McVay—I would have to get back to you on that one, but Department of Transport and Regional Services has some quite small agencies. They are very tiny.

Mr ENTSCH—There is one in the satellite meteorology bureau, for example. They only have a very small staff.

Mr BROADBENT—They must be part of a bigger department.

Mr McVay—They fit into a broader portfolio in a department.

Mr BROADBENT—And they do their own procurement?

Mr McVay—In some, they do their own procurement.

CHAIR—Why?

Mr McVay—I cannot answer that question.

Mr BROADBENT—Now, there is a good question.

Mr McVay—I was quite surprised that they were so small. David succinctly summarised the overall conclusion on the audit early on. We identified a small number of better practice examples. However, overall, there were significant shortcomings. Performance by Australian

government agencies as a whole in meeting the government's expectations on office building energy efficiencies are commendable, but performance in motor vehicle emissions, reducing recycling office wastes and conserving water has been pretty variable and, in most cases, pretty poor. Implementing environmental management systems has been slow, and few agencies have met the timetable originally envisaged by the government. The audit identified an absence of specific requirements in waste management and water and identified shortcomings in meeting the government's stated objectives—to wit, the forefront of environmental purchasing practices. Sustainable development has not as yet been fully integrated into Australian government operations. That is a key point in terms of your charter as to how they could move that forward.

We made 16 recommendations in total, and the final recommendation was sought to provide a major strengthening of the sustainability framework for Australian government operations. It was directed to the Department of the Environment and Heritage to achieve best practice in green office procurement in energy, water, waste and procurement practices generally. The department responded very positively to the report and they have agreed to update their website. They are going to look at developing and improving communications with agencies. As an aside, one of the basic problems was agency struggle to find on the DEH website the information they needed to do their job, so DEH has agreed to look at that and look at ways of improving that information. Monitoring and reporting against targets has not been particularly good, and we wanted agencies to take a much stronger position on that. In essence, that is a broad overview of our audit. We would welcome any questions.

Mr Crossley—Do you want to talk specifically about some of the sustainability aspects—perhaps how the report might—

Mr McVay—The final recommendation nests quite nicely with the concept of a sustainability charter. We cover the issue of setting targets, monitoring progress and reporting to parliament on what progress is being made. As David said, it relates to the Commonwealth sector. That is our mandate; we cannot go beyond our mandate. I would certainly commend it to you as a consideration in your sustainability challenge.

Mr BROADBENT—Let us talk money—spending money to save money. Does the government need to allocate some resources in order to save on green issues in the long run? Do we need something to drive this, such as a person, an individual or a process outside of what you are proposing there—targets and things?

Mr McVay—I do not think it is necessarily money. I think it is more in terms of putting in place clear policy directions and requirements for departments to follow as a first step. In some cases, as with paper, it would cost more to recycle paper than otherwise, so there would be an issue there. I think it is a matter of directing agencies in their day-to-day operations to take a stronger account of sustainability objectives, rather than necessarily cash per se.

Mr BROADBENT—What was the driver in your department that kicked off the changes you wanted to make?

Mr McVay—In the Audit Office?

Mr BROADBENT—Yes.

Mr McVay—The audit itself was the driver, by providing information. We adopted a lot of the practices in terms of our own recommendations. There is no requirement for money as such.

Mr ENTSCH—There was a compulsion in relation to recyclable paper, which is clearly an additional cost to the bottom line. That in itself would be an incentive to start looking at other areas for saving, particularly when you have a look at the energy side of it, given that the agencies are usually pretty tight on the budget side of things. If they know they have to spend a few dollars in that area, they would certainly be looking at it. If the requirement is that they have to offset it on other energy savings areas, in green initiatives, it may well be a way of doing it.

Mr BROADBENT—I am in the leadership area. What happened with your organisation was obviously after being confronted with the information from all the departments; you looked at 71 groups. You responded to that in a very positive way. Obviously you take some pride in what is happening within your department because of that. I know you do not have time to do it, but it would have been terrific for all of us had that have been documented in some way. You have the percentage figures but you do not have the dollar figures, do you? To take on what Warren said—and what I am trying to get at here—spending money to save money, or spending effort, energy and time to save money, allows you to spend money.

Mr McVay—Indeed. That is true. And we have some case studies from Defence where they looked at doing that sort of thing. In some cases—for instance with Health, where we looked at waste recycling—they did it at no cost. They just changed their contractual arrangements to look at recycling. It did not cost them anything. It varies with the issue you are dealing with but if you wanted some figures from us we might be able to look at—

Mr BROADBENT—I just thought you would be taking some pride in what you have done; therefore some figures could be put to that. But I am not asking you to go and do it; no way.

Mr McVay—It would be better after a full year, probably.

Mr ENTSCH—Was that on recycled paper?

Mr McVay—I do not think it was! If you like, I could raise that with the Auditor-General.

Mr ENTSCH—You are implementing a whole range of things yourselves, because you certainly would be more informed through this process. But in implementing those changes, did they include recycling paper?

Mr McVay—Not as yet.

Mr Crossley—Not per se. And I think one of the important points you have touched on is the need to focus attention not just on one aspect but on various aspects and to try to balance them up. One of the statistics was the very low rate of agencies which had an EMS in place. That we developed an EMS has, in part, driven our own changes. Doing that across the board makes you say, ‘We might have to spend some money here but, as part of the EMS, we are going to save some money over here.’ On balance, that focuses the attention.

Ms GEORGE—The 71 agencies you refer to: was that a random sample? How did you decide who would be part of the audit?

Mr McVay—It was a stratified sample. What we wanted to do was to capture as many as we could of the larger agencies as well as a sample of the different-sized agencies to try and get a representative—

Mr Mathie—Page 151 has a list of all the agencies.

Mr Crossley—But it was also done to try to get a reasonable amount of the total government procurement spending budget. So the agencies were stratified and chosen to ensure that—

Mr BROADBENT—Did you get anybody who said, ‘We couldn’t give a rats. Go away?’

Mr McVay—They cannot.

Mr BROADBENT—I know they cannot do that to you, but were some keener than others?

Mr McVay—Some were certainly less interested than others; there is no question about that.

CHAIR—Peter, I thought the whole report and your inquiry were excellent. They were terrific. You have certainly motivated all of us—I think I can speak on behalf of all of us—to realise and appreciate that a charter is essential. This is an example of that. Of course, you will lose on some areas but, in the whole picture, the overall savings are going to be immense.

Procurement procedures also need to be looked at. Probably, small departments should not be in that position; they should have procurement done by centralised processes. It also brings up an interesting proposition. We have talked about a commission, as you know. It is up to the government to report on that and, hopefully, they will do so at the end of this month; that is what I have been told. We are going to go ahead with the charter anyway, because we can do that. But we also need to look at what are we do and how we reward our own agencies for performing. We were talking about a National Competition Council policy analogy to reward states. That would be done in cooperation and agreement with states, of course, and according to the charter and on a basis that we all agree upon. We certainly need to not just beat up our agencies but to reward them in some way as well. If we are going to make all these things mandatory—and I think we should—then I think there has got to be a lolly as well as a stick. We have to say ‘Let’s reward you in some way if you are—through good procurement—’

Mr ENTSCH—We do it with the private sector through the Greenhouse Challenge and things like that. Surely to goodness we can get some sort of initiative going within the departments.

CHAIR—Warren, can I go to that. I do not know about joining the Greenhouse Challenge Plus program. Do you know much about that program or should we know much about that?

Mr McVay—It basically is designed to improve the environmental performance, particularly on greenhouse matters, of private sector firms and a small number of Commonwealth agencies, including Defence and others. We have not gone into a lot of detail here. I could come back to you on that.

CHAIR—No, we can find that out. That is something we can do ourselves.

Mr ENTSCHE—It has been very successful and growing numbers, particularly in the private sector, compete in it. There is an annual awards ceremony, which normally is down here, to recognise their contributions. Of course, we publicise the financial benefits as well as their environmental responsibility. They can market themselves as being an environmentally responsible company and they can promote the savings that they have made. A similar sort of thing within the public sector would be very—

CHAIR—It would be good to have champions. You need rewards too. I hate just having punishment and mandatory limits. I think we need to reward people and acknowledge them for doing well. We acknowledge you folk for doing well. In spite of the lack of recycled paper, it is a great document!

Mr BROADBENT—Talking about the inspiration, I am going to take action. I am going to go to Warren's office and turn off 32 per cent of his lights!

CHAIR—I do not think he ever had the lights turned on! We are only being mean to Warren. We are both stirring. Jennie, did you have some questions?

Ms GEORGE—No, I am all right.

CHAIR—Russell, do you have any more?

Mr BROADBENT—That is great, thanks. No.

CHAIR—Gentlemen, could we thank you immensely for a job well done. We really appreciate it. I think it is very professional, and it is very enlightening for us. It also value adds to our thoughts that we need to do something. I am delighted to see in recommendation 16 that the Department of the Environment and Heritage will make their website a little more simplistic, pragmatic and easy to use. We will have a look at that. Did they give you a time frame?

Mr McVay—They did not. I understood it to be fairly soon.

CHAIR—Good.

Ms GEORGE—We could follow up on it with the department.

Mr ENTSCHE—I am sure we could encourage them to do that.

CHAIR—I think it would not hurt us to perhaps go to the department. I think we could say to the department: 'Look, we got this report. Obviously, this must have been a little bit of a shock for you too. What are you doing about it?' We will follow that through. Thank you again for your troubles.

Mr McVay—Thank you.

CHAIR—Could I have a member move that the PowerPoint presentation be taken as an exhibit?

Ms GEORGE—I so move.

Mr ENTSCH—I second the motion.

CHAIR—Thanks.

Resolved (on motion by **Mr Entsch**):

That this committee authorises publication of the transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

Committee adjourned at 11.13 am