

Supplementary Estimates 2016–17

Environment and Energy Portfolio – Monday 17 October 2016 and Friday 21 October 2016

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
1	1.1: BCD	Chisholm	Program Funding Breakdown	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: What about identifying how much money has been spent since the election and how much is left over in terms of forward estimates?</p> <p>Ms Parry: All the numbers that I have quoted are from 2014 on with the exception of the reef program, which started in 2013, but it carries on until 2017-2018, so all of those numbers I have quoted—I am happy to repeat them again if you like—are quoted from 2014 onwards through the forward estimates.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Is it possible to identify how much money is left in each of those programs?</p> <p>Ms Parry: Yes, it is. Again, I am happy to come back to you on that. The reef program is fully allocated, but we can give you a breakdown of the other programs as at current date.</p>	Page 29 17 October 2016	SQ16-000449
2	1.1: BCD	Chisholm	Reef Trust Funding Allocation	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Have you got a figure on how many farmers have received a grant to provide assistance to improve water quality or change practices?</p> <p>Ms Parry: I can take that question on notice so we can get specifics by phase and how many farmers have participated in our programs. So I am very clear with you in terms of how Reef Trust funding is allocate: we would provide funding to a service provider, and then the service provider would be the face, if you will, of the contact with the farmer. But we do collect that data about how many farmers are interacting with and participating in our programs by phase and by particular allocation.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Once you have made allocations, how do you go back and assess the effectiveness of the allocation that was made and the impact it had?</p> <p>Ms Parry: We use a variety of different mechanisms to assess the performance of our programs. One, we look at take-up rates. Two, we look at cost effectiveness and measurement of our intervention. Again I will use the incidence of the reverse tenders primarily in the wet</p>	Page 30 17 October 2016	SQ16-000364

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>tropics. We have a variety of different monitoring and modelling programs primarily done through our Paddock to Reef, which is our main program run in conjunction with the Queensland government. For instance, early data that has been captured through that program has indicated that there has been 86 tonnes of nitrogen through the phase 1 reverse tender in the wet tropics. That is 86 fewer tonnes of nitrogen applied through the farmers participating in the reverse auction.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: It would be good to get some more information about those grants if possible as well.</p> <p>Ms Parry: In terms of the grants, you are looking for numbers of participants and the type of grants?</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Yes—and the number who applied as well.</p> <p>Ms Parry: Okay, we will take that on notice. Thank you.</p>		
3	1.1: BCD	Waters	Maintenance Dredging Framework	<p>Senator WATERS: We have spoken previously about a maintenance dredging framework. In fact it was about a year ago when you said that the framework was coming and was going to be released in February this year. It is now October and we have not seen it. Can you explain the cause of the delay and when we are going to see that maintenance dredging framework?</p> <p>Mr Elliot: The lead on developing that framework was the Queensland government. We were involved in the workshops that were being conducted around that. I believe the final draft of the framework is either complete or near complete and should be in the public domain in the not too distant future.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Do you have any understanding of why there is a delay? The Reef Plan promised it would be done in February. It is now almost November.</p> <p>Mr Elliot: Having been involved in it but not being the leader, I could not really say why it has not yet been finalised. I can say, though, that they went through quite a robust process in the development of the framework.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Did they note that failure and that missed time frame in the annual report of the Reef Plan?</p> <p>Mr Elliot: I would not be able to answer that question.</p>	Page 38 17 October 2016	SQ16-000459

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Senator WATERS: You did not have any input into the annual report under 'Reef Plan'?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: Yes we did, but I am not clear on that specific point about that milestone not being met.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: There are certainly a lot of milestones that have not been met, and yet the document says that everything is on track. Perhaps the department could reflect on that.</p> <p>Ms Parry: Can we come back to you in our session following this with a specific update on that, noting that that is an action being led by the Queensland government.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: But it is still in the reef plan that the annual report—</p> <p>Ms Parry: Yes, and I will get back to you on the status of that.</p>		
4	1.1: BCD	Moore	Threatened Species Funding	<p>Senator MOORE: I have a series of questions around these issues. Can the department outline how it is calculated that \$208-plus million has been spent on threatened species recovery?</p> <p>Mr Andrews: Yes, I can answer that question for you. That is a compilation of all of the money since 2014—the year that I was appointed as Australia's first Threatened Species Commissioner—</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Andrews: ...An additional \$900,000 of projects were announced by Minister Frydenberg on Threatened Species Day, 7 September—eight or nine projects which I can give you details of, if you want. These are community driven, grassroots projects to support threatened species across Australia. In addition to that, there are some marine species initiatives involving the Nest to Ocean Turtle Protection program, the Raine Island Recovery project and the Turtle and Dugong Protection plan—\$3.791877 million, \$400,000 and \$5 million respectively. The last substantive amount is from the Green Army program, from rounds 1 to 4: \$113.462251 million. The table now adds up to \$210,899,134.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Any cents?</p> <p>Mr Andrews: No.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: You can give that to me in a table?</p>	Pages 84–85 17 October 2016	SQ16-000517

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				Mr Andrews: We can give you that table. We update it and publish it regularly.		
5	1.1: BCD	Moore	Threatened Species Projects	<p>Senator MOORE: If I am asking a question about how a mountain bike wash station or a heritage ship conservation project—both Green Army projects funded in round 1—can be considered adequate threatened species recovery projects, should that question go to you as the commissioner or to the department as a whole?</p> <p>Mr Andrews: I could answer that from the threatened species side. I am not exactly sure—you said two projects from round 1, one to do with mountain bikes and one to do with a heritage ship conservation project? Did they identify that they were supporting threatened species?</p> <p>Senator MOORE: That is my understanding—that they were funded under that heading.</p> <p>Mr Andrews: I will need to get back to you on that. The Green Army projects that we count towards that \$210.899 million figure are ones that have been assessed as contributing to threatened species conservation. There may be a link between the mountain bike and the threatened species; I am not sure about that. But, for every project we count, the applicant is identifying that there is a threatened species outcome and it has been assessed through the department's rigorous processes. My colleague Mr Dadswell can explain how the Green Army assessment works. I do not know those two projects, off the top of my head, so it would be best for me to take them on notice and give you a detailed briefing.</p> <p>Mr Andrews: Senator Moore, are you able to identify the two projects?</p> <p>Senator MOORE: They were identified to me specifically under Green Army projects, in round 1, which was funding mounted by wash station. Another one is for heritage ship conservation project. I do not have the numbers. It is project 27 or project 28.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I suspect where it is likely to go, there, having just picked up that it was a wash station, with the obvious benefits that could be accrued there for minimising the spread of—</p>	Page 85 17 October 2016	SQ16-000365

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
6	1.1: BCD	Chisholm	Threatened Species Projects	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Senator Moore mentioned the mountain bike wash station and a heritage conservation project, what sort of criteria are used to assess those projects? Does it have to have a one per cent benefit to threatened species or 50 per cent benefit? How are they assessed, from a departmental point of view?</p> <p>Mr Andrews: I will let Mr Dadswell answer that question, because his team do the Green Only assessment. Each program has different guidelines and rules for assessment.</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: The Green Army program comprises \$362.8 million over four years from 2016-17. That provides for around 500 projects per year.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: What is that specifically for?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: For Green Army projects. That provides for up to 500 projects per year. Each year the government will call for applications from organisations—these could be land care groups, natural resource management organisations or local government—to submit a project for a Green Army team to come and work on a project for between 20 and 26 weeks. Applications are sought and the criteria are primarily against matters of national environmental significance. So, will a project address and assist with recovery of threatened species? Will it address matters of national and international heritage? Will it improve the state of a Ramsar wetland, for example? Those are the bases upon which projects are supported. When proponents put forward a project they are asked to provide evidence that the stated activities of the Green Army team will contribute to the recovery of or improvement of, for instance, a threatened species outcome. In doing so they would be pointing to things such as a recovery plan, a local management plan that would outline the local condition of that species and the activities to be undertaken. We assess projects competitively, so only those projects that can show and demonstrate that there would be a significant outcome for a threatened species for a local project would be ranked higher than those that are less so and would then be recommended for funding.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: When you say 'significant', it is all based on a judgement rather than a percentage figure or anything like that, in</p>	Page 89 17 October 2016	SQ16-000366

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>terms of the impact it will have?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: We have an assessment methodology and it is comparative, so we look for the stronger projects and projects that do have a strong alignment with those threatened species outcomes. I should add that to date 1,145 Green Army projects have been announced across rounds 1 to 4. To date, 891 of those projects either have been completed or are currently in progress. Some 642 of those projects are contributing to threatened species outcomes. We can take it on notice, but the projects that were referenced by Senator Moore may not be the ones that we are suggesting contribute to threatened species primarily.</p>		
7	1.1: BCD	Chisholm	Green Army Program - Audits	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Moving on to the Green Army program, can the department outline the number of audits that have been undertaken looking at the environmental benefits delivered by the program—and the 20 Million Trees program as well?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: I cannot give you a specific number. I will have to take that on notice. The department takes on a number of audits for Green Army projects. The department audits 10 per cent of all Green Army projects that have been undertaken. In that audit we assess whether the environmental outcomes were achieved or are being achieved for that project. Departmental officers will visit the project and they will inspect the works that are being undertaken. They will also do a post-audit check of the final report on that project to confirm that the environmental outcomes were undertaken. To date we have done well over 50 audits. To date 627 projects have been completed. It is around 10 per cent of those, so it would be a bit more than that. The department also audits 20 per cent of projects for their work health and safety compliance. There the department engaged EY to undertake those audits. There is an exceptionally high compliance rate for Green Army projects on work health and safety matters.</p>	Page 91 17 October 2016	SQ16-000367
8	1.1: BCD	Chisholm	Green Army Projects - Assessment	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Just picking up on the point you made that the minister 'can agree with those if he wants'. Does he take the departmental advice, or is he able to recommend his own?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: The department recommends projects. We provide a list of all the project applications that we have received and set out</p>	Page 92 17 October 2016	SQ16-000369

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>how we have assessed the projects and the reasons why we are recommending those that are put to the minister. I am not aware of a circumstance where we have been asked to implement a project that was not otherwise recommended.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: In terms of the demand for the projects, is it something that demand is outstripping what has been allocated?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: In all project rounds that have been run we have received more applications than the number of that projects have been approved. In the most recent—if I can perhaps just refer to previous project round. So under project round 4 we received 697 applications and 397 projects were approved from that number of applications. So 697 applications received and 397 approved. That was under round 4 of the program.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Is it possible, and you may have to take this one on notice, to get a list of what is being funded and also a map of their locations?</p> <p>Mr Dadswell: Yes, I am happy to take that on notice and provide that. I think in a previous answer to a question on notice we may have provided some details of the breakdowns of where projects have been funded. I am certainly happy to take that on notice.</p>		
9	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Waverley Council Grant	<p>Senator RHIANNON: I would like to ask about the \$1 million grant the Waverley council received under the department's Protecting National Historic Sites Program for the design phase of the Bondi pavilion upgrade. What monitoring do you take once these grants have been made?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: All of our grants are done through program 1.1, so we would have to take that back to get them to answer that one.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: So you cannot answer it now?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: All of the grants administration is done through program 1.1, so even though it is the heritage grants round, all of the contracting and all of the administration is all done in our department through 1.1.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Does that mean that anything that I want to ask on this issue should have been in 1.1?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: If it is about the grant, the conditions of the grant and</p>	Pages 116-117 17 October 2016	SQ16-000376

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>the implementation of the works, yes.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Maybe one general way of explaining the difference between 1.1 and 1.4 is that 1.1 looks at those programs and the spending; 1.4 is very much around the rules—how the rules work, what the outcomes are either for listing species or heritage listing; those sorts of aspects. I am sorry, Senator, but we will come back to you through questions on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Lee has been waiting all day for that!</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: The people are not here.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: They have gone, have they?</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: You have just said something about outcomes. Many of my questions I think would go to outcomes, so let us try in terms of outcomes. Firstly, I understand the \$1 million was awarded for a project upgrade of about \$14 million, is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: As Mr Johnston and Dr de Brouwer have indicated, Wildlife, Heritage and Marine Division, which is primarily responsible for program 1.4, has responsibility for the assessment and listing of heritage places, threatened species, ecological communities, key threatening processes, and then for the making of statutory plans like recovery plans and statutory advices like referral guidelines and conservation advices. We are not responsible for the program management in this division; it is Biodiversity Conservation Division. Any questions that go to the administration of grant programs, including the outcomes achieved under those grant programs, need to be directed to the officers of biodiversity conservation division, who do account to the Senate under program 1.1. I am sorry.</p> <p>CHAIR: Are you able to take the questions on notice.</p> <p>Mr Oxley: We can take any of those questions on notice, of course.</p>		
10	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Burra Charter – Traditional Owners	<p>Senator RHIANNON: Okay. I will try the Indigenous one and then, obviously, move on. The grant application that was successful stated that it had the support from the relevant traditional owners. When such statements are made, what do you do to ensure that that is correct?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I am sorry. I appreciate that the headings of the programs under the outcomes would lead you to have come here</p>	Page 117 17 October 2016	SQ16-000529

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>at this time. You are going to a particular level of detail about an application that, clearly, unfortunately, nobody has. I did just check with Dr de Brouwer. The portfolio budget statements do make it clear that this grant's program sits within 1.1, but nonetheless I can appreciate why on a cursory glance of headings you are here now. I am sorry about that.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: Thank you for tolerating it while I tried.</p>		
11	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Burra Charter	<p>Senator RHIANNON: Thank you very much. I appreciate you explaining it to me. I noted Waverley council's undertaking that the activities within this project will be carried out in accordance with heritage best practice as contained in the Burra Charter and has the written endorsement of an appropriate technical adviser. Do you have copies of that written advice as part of the application?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: Again, we are talking now about the administration of the grants program, so I am sorry but we cannot help in an immediate sense, but we can take that on notice also.</p>	Page 117 17 October 2016	SQ16-000377
12	1.1: BCD	Waters	Yellow Crazy Ants Eradication	<p>Senator WATERS: Sure. Is there a view now that eradication can be achieved in the Wet Tropics World Heritage area?</p> <p>Mr Murphy: I think that is the aim and that is what everyone wants to see. There are yellow crazy ant sites all across Queensland. It is hard to know the extent and at what sites those ants can be eradicated. As I said, the early signs are that the population sizes and the number of nests have reduced in Far North Queensland and, obviously, we are very hopeful that eradication can be achieved with the funding provided.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: What was the reason for the timing of the funding, given that WTMA had been seeking additional yellow crazy ant funding for at least a year—I remember asking about this quite a while ago. When was the funding decision made?</p> <p>Mr Murphy: The decision was made as part of the budget process leading in to the election.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: So it was made in the budget and announced in the course of the campaign?</p> <p>Mr Murphy: That is right.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: The decision was made in the budget.</p>	Page 119 17 October 2016	SQ16-000381

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Obviously budget papers can be difficult to decipher at times, even for the most experienced individual, which I do not claim to be. Was it discernible in the budget papers that that funding had been granted or was it only clear once that announcement was made in the course of the election campaign?</p> <p>Mr Murphy: My memory of the budget papers was that it was not specific to yellow crazy ants, but there was an enhancement to the National Landcare Program in the budget papers. Then during the election, it was followed by an announcement.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: When you say it was an enhancement to Landcare—obviously Landcare is an enormous program—was it only at the point of announcement that it got specifically allocated to yellow crazy ants?</p> <p>Mr Murphy: I am not sure. I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you for doing that. Could you confirm for me the time frames for decision-making, because it goes to caretaker mode, it goes to why there was the long delay and it goes to why it was suddenly announced in the election campaign. I am interested in that but, if you could provide me with the factual dates, that would be great.</p>		
13	1.1: BCD	Duniam	Regional Forestry Agreement	<p>Mr Knudson: Sorry, Senator. I just wanted to add one last thing. In terms of also coming back to you with where this has landed, there is another element at play with the Tasmanian government—obviously, which is the regional forestry agreement. We would have to figure out what the interplay of that is with any other sort of forestry related activity. We can come back and clarify that.</p> <p>Senator DUNIAM: I would appreciate that.</p>	Page 7 21 October 2016	SQ16-000537
14	1.1: BCD	Chisholm	Queensland Tree Clearing	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: I move on to the Great Barrier Reef. On Monday, Senator Waters asked a question of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority about a teleconference that was held between some officials and the World Heritage Committee. Are you aware of that?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Yes, but that is not really under this outcome.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: I am moving on to the Great Barrier Reef. Are you aware of that?</p>	Page 26 21 October 2016	SQ16-000550

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Dr de Brouwer: It was raised at estimates and I am aware of that conversation.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: In terms of this area, is the department aware of what was raised in that conversation with the committee with regard to tree-clearing laws in Queensland?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I have to take that question on notice. The officers who would normally deal with the reef would have that communication with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. They are not here. I will have to pursue that with them and ask them.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: In terms of the land sector initiatives around tree clearing, that would fall to this department?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: It is the same department. This is about the specific methods around land clearing and adaptation in general. Reef-specific and how that is raised with the World Heritage Committee, that would really be done with the heritage people, in outcome 1.4. I will follow it up.</p>		
15	1.1: BCD	Chisholm	Tree Clearing Modelling	Has the Department modelled the impact of Queensland's extensive tree clearing on biodiversity?	Written	SQ16-000373
16	1.1: BCD	Chisholm	Queensland Tree Clearing Modelling	Has the Department provided any advice, as to the impact of Queensland's extensive tree clearing on Australia's biodiversity?	Written	SQ16-000374
17	1.1: BCD	McKim	Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement	What is the status and timelines for the renewal of Tasmania's Regional Forest Agreement (RFA)?	Written	SQ16-000673
18	1.1: BCD	McKim	Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement	The RFA review counts the Future Potential Production Forest Land (FPPF land) as protected. Does the commonwealth view these areas as part of the national reserve system and/or as part of the Collaborative Australian Protected Area Database (CAPAD) protected areas database?	Written	SQ16-000674
19	1.1: BCD	McKim	Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement	If so, what International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) protected area category are they counted under?	Written	SQ16-000676
20	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program -	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. When	Written	SQ16-000623

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Bondi Pavilion	such grants are provided to local councils is there a requirement that details of the work that will be paid for under this grant would be shared with all councillors?		
21	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Monitoring	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. What monitoring is required of these grants?	Written	SQ16-000624
22	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion - Budget	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Has the Department been informed by Waverley Council of the significant cost blow-out in the project's overall budget?	Written	SQ16-000625
23	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Consultation	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Is the Department aware that without consulting with her fellow councillors Waverley Mayor Sally Betts and council officers rejected two relatively modest plans developed with the assistance of the federal \$1 million grant and accepted a separate \$38 m proposal that neither other councillors or the public were aware of?	Written	SQ16-000626
24	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Project changes	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Was this change in the project reported to the Department, and if so when?	Written	SQ16-000627
25	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Fire Safety Works	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Has the Department been informed by Waverley Council that money from the \$1 million grant has been spent on mandatory fire safety works?	Written	SQ16-000628
26	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program -	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade.	Written	SQ16-000629

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Bondi Pavilion – Grant Money	Considering Waverley Council’s grant application contains no indication that Council intended to use the \$1 million federal grant for the purpose of fire-protection and it is on the public record Waverley Council’s meeting 15 December 2015 (page 227 of original papers, page 60 in link) that the money was used in part for that purpose, is this a misuse of the grant money?		
27	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Council Statements	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment’s Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Considering Waverley Council’s successful application for the \$1m grant stated that “ <i>none of the Activities proposed in the Application are required to be carried out by law</i> ” whereas there is a legal obligation on Councils to provide fire protection in buildings they are responsible for, could the statement in the Council’s application be taken as a false statement?	Written	SQ16-000630
28	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Monitoring of monies spent	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment’s Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Given that the Protecting National Historic Sites grant awarded to Waverley Council was the second highest amount provided, is the Department obliged to engage in more extensive monitoring and assessment of the Waverley Council grant or is the level of monitoring and assessment similar to what is undertaken for smaller grants?	Written	SQ16-000631
29	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites scheme	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment’s Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. What is the average size of grants made under Protecting National Historic Sites scheme in 2015 and how many grants were made?	Written	SQ16-000632
30	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion - Progress Reports	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment’s Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. With regard to the monitoring and assessment of the \$1m grant to Waverley Council has the Department received progress reports or any other material relevant to how this grant has been used from Waverley Council? If yes please document what material has been received. If	Written	SQ16-000633

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				no will Waverley Council be asked to report on the use of the PNHS grant?		
31	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Community Support	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Has Waverley Council provided you with evidence that the Bondi Pavilion project still retains the support of the community, as claimed in application?	Written	SQ16-000634
32	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion - Design	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Considering the rules of the Protecting National Historic Sites program require the project to cover 'design and conservation work on Bondi Pavilion' and to cover the historic heritage values of the site, what work has the Department taken to ensure that this is how the money has been used?	Written	SQ16-000635
33	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Lobbying	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Was the Department lobbied to make this large grant to Waverley Council? If so who by? Did the then Prime Minister's office make any representations about this project? Any Waverley Councillors or office bearers?	Written	SQ16-000636
34	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Program	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Is this the largest grant ever made under this program? Is this grant 10 per cent of the program's total three year budget?	Written	SQ16-000637
35	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion – Traditional Owners	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. The application that is the basis of Waverley Council receiving the \$1m grant states that the Council is 'able to obtain the necessary permits and support from the relevant traditional owners'. Did you check the	Written	SQ16-000638

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				veracity of this statement?		
36	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion - La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Considering La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council represents the traditional custodians of the land on which the Bondi Pavilion sits have you been provided with evidence that at the time of the application Waverley Council had sought or received permission from the La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council, as claimed?	Written	SQ16-000639
37	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Have you been provided with evidence that Waverley Council has subsequently sought or received any such permission from the La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council in relation to the design of a proposal developed under the PNHS grant?	Written	SQ16-000640
38	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Have you been provided with evidence that Waverley Council has at any time discussed the design of the proposal developed under the PNHS grant with the La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council?	Written	SQ16-000641
39	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. What due diligence did you undertake to ensure that Waverley Council is able to obtain the necessary permits and support from the relevant traditional owners for the project as they have stated?	Written	SQ16-000642
40	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. What would the Minister do if it was found that the grant was awarded on the basis of fraudulent claims?	Written	SQ16-000643
41	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites	Written	SQ16-000644

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Has the Department determined if the \$38 million plan complies with the Crown Lands Act? If so what is the conclusion? If not why not?		
42	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Has the Department investigated if Waverley council has managed the grant as is required for such a large monetary amount? Has the Department investigated if it was deposited into general revenue or was it handled as required under the Crown Lands Act?	Written	SQ16-000645
43	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Was the Department aware before making this grant that Waverley Council has failed to maintain separate bank accounts for Bondi Beach and Bondi Pavilion as required under the Crown Lands Act – given both Bondi Beach and park are on Crown land and should be managed by a trust - but there is none? If the Department is not aware why did you not investigate the financial management standards of the Council before you made the \$1m grant?	Written	SQ16-000646
44	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Are you also aware that Waverley Council has failed to provide the relevant state minister with the regular annual accounts and reports required under the Crown Lands Act by repeatedly leasing out the park and pavilion for large profit-making events like New Year's Eve parties, and has used the proceeds to subsidise entirely different council activities in unrelated places? Would this information have been considered relevant to the \$1m grant?	Written	SQ16-000647
45	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	With regard to the \$1m grant Waverley Council received under the Department of the Environment's Protecting National Historic Sites program for the design phase of the Bondi Pavilion upgrade. Are you satisfied that the Bondi Pavilion project that received this grant is	Written	SQ16-000648

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>being carried out in accordance with heritage best practice as set out in the Burra Charter?</p> <p>If the answer is yes please details what investigation was undertaken to ensure the project is being carried out in accordance with heritage best practice as contained in the Burra Charter?</p> <p>If the answer is No please detail how it was determined that the project is not being carried out in accordance with heritage best practice as contained in the Burra Charter?</p>		
46	1.1: BCD	Rhiannon	Protecting National Historic Sites program - Bondi Pavilion	Are you aware that Waverley Council has advertised for a consultant to prepare a business case for the proposed upgrade and conservation of Bondi Pavilion, despite the application's reassuring the Minister that "an independent feasibility report [has] determined that with changes to available commercial spaces Council will be able to meet the increased costs and the building will be financially sustainable."?	Written	SQ16-000649
47	1.1: BCD	Urquhart	Flood Remediation	<p>In the past, Green Army and NRM projects have been diverted to assist with disaster repair and remediation in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. In the recent estimates hearing, we discussed this issue, but I would like some clarification:</p> <p>After the mid-year floods in Tasmania, the Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull visited the state and specifically promised federal support for Tasmanian farmers affected by the floods. Could you advise whether the Prime Minister or his office requested that the Department provide extra resources or support to Tasmanian farmers or that existing projects be diverted toward flood remediation and repair activities?</p> <p>Could you advise whether the Minister requested that the Department provide extra resources or support to Tasmanian farmers or that existing projects be diverted toward flood remediation and repair activities? If yes, can you outline the details of the request(s) that were made and how the department accommodated them?</p>	Written	SQ16-000694
48	1.1: BCD	Urquhart	Flood Remediation	In the recent estimates hearing, Mr Costello said that Tasmanian regional NRM bodies used 'some other funding' to 'run workshops and other things on rehabilitation.' Can you provide further detail on the dates, locations, content and funding sources for each of these projects?	Written	SQ16-000695

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
49	1.1: BCD	Urquhart	Flood Remediation	Mr Costello also said that some departmental money was provided to help give farmers advice on rehabilitation. Can you provide more detail on the dates and locations for these sessions? Can you advise the date it was decided to run them? Can you also let me know the number of farmers that participated in these sessions?	Written	SQ16-000696
50	1.2: Science	Waters	State of the Environment Report – Staffing Numbers	Senator WATERS: Thank you. You will take on notice the number of staff, FTE, working on it. That is all the questions I had.	Page 38 21 October 2016	SQ16-000555
51	1.2: Science	Urquhart	Research Funding	Governments often look for alternative sources of research funding. Has the department sought funding from other sources such as public private partnerships (other than with universities) and / or crowd funding? Can we have details of this? What was successful? What wasn't?	Written	SQ16-000717
52	1.4: WHM	Moore	Government Response to Toxic Threat Report	Senator MOORE: I have a question on the report that this committee did on the issue of the toxic threat of plastics in our waterways. The inquiry went over a long time, and I have just checked: the committee's report came down in April this year. I know that it is a difficult thing, but I am just wondering, Minister, can you give us any idea about a government response to that report? Dr Reichelt: Was that a report from the Great Barrier Reef? Senator MOORE: No, it is a report from this committee, and I was just checking— Unidentified speaker: We took a lot of evidence from scientists about the Great Barrier Reef. Senator MOORE: We had a lot from the Great Barrier Reef. That was the one I got to. Minister, is there any possibility of a response as to when the government response will come down? Senator Birmingham: Sorry, I missed the last part there. Senator MOORE: When will a response come down to the particular report? It was called <i>Toxic tide: the threat of marine plastic pollution in Australia</i> . It was a wide report. But I am just raising it with the minister— CHAIR: Would that be a question better asked of— Dr Reichelt: It is not for the marine park authority.	Page 44 17 October 2016	SQ16-000466

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Senator MOORE: No, it is for the minister.</p> <p>CHAIR: We have got management of hazardous wastes, substances and pollutants, or environment regulation.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: It goes across the board.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I am not sure I have an update on that specific inquiry response.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: If you can find out, that would be fine. I just wanted to put it on record.</p>		
53	1.4: WHM	Chisholm	National Heritage Listing - Thompson Square	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: In relation to Thompson Square, at Windsor, has the government given any consideration to an emergency listing on the National Heritage List?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: We have received a letter asking for an emergency listing. We have done an assessment of that and we have consulted with our Heritage Council historic expert pair on that. We will be providing a briefing to the minister probably this week, with a recommendation around how to respond to that one.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: My understanding is that previously Thompson Square had been found to be ineligible. Can you give us an idea of what else was approved for listing around that time?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: I cannot recall when that nomination was considered, so I can take that one on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Just to confirm, there will be something going to the minister soon in regard to a potential listing, is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Soon, yes.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: The second question that Senator Chisholm asked was about what the other approvals for listing were. You said you did not know what year that was. Can you find out and come back to us with that information?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Yes, we will take that on notice and come back to you.</p>	Pages 115-116 17 October 2016	SQ16-000394

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
54	1.4: WHM	Chair	National Heritage Listing – Snowy Mountains Scheme	<p>CHAIR: I just have one quick question, hopefully. I am interested in the announcement of the National Heritage listing of the Snowy Mountains Scheme. I am just interested in the process which led to that being listed and a quick summary of the heritage reasons that led to it being considered so important.</p> <p>Mr Johnston: The Snowy Mountains Scheme was nominated a few years ago for National Heritage listing. The Australian Heritage Council conducted an assessment of that place and found that it would meet National Heritage values for two broad reasons: firstly, for its engineering achievement, in particular some of the significant engineering initiatives that were pioneered in Australia such as rock bolting, and, secondly, for its impact upon multicultural Australia, in particular the use of displaced migrants to build the scheme. Once the Australian Heritage Council had finished its assessment, that then passed to the minister. A couple of years passed where we, as the department on behalf of the minister, were consulting not only with Snowy Hydro in particular but also with the other stakeholders in the area because, whereas the Australian Heritage Council by legislation can only consider the heritage values of a place in doing its assessment, the minister also takes into account social and economic impacts. So, prior to making the recommendation to the minister to list the Snowy Mountains Scheme, we made sure that we got the consent of Snowy Hydro and the other stakeholders in that area, and the minister was able to make the announcement on Friday.</p> <p>CHAIR: A lot of the criteria that you raised or that has been noted about the Snowy Mountains Scheme and is part of that listing would also, I suspect, apply to the Tasmanian hydro schemes. Is that something that has been looked at all?</p> <p>Mr Johnston: To my knowledge the Tasmanian hydro scheme has not been nominated, but we can check that one and come back to you.</p> <p>CHAIR: I am just curious because it similarly had a lot of migrants involved post-Second World War and probably even greater engineering challenges. If you could take that on notice, that would be appreciated.</p> <p>Mr Johnston: Yes, and we will come back to you.</p>	Page 121 17 October 2016	SQ16-000519

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
55	1.4: WHM	Rice	Giant Freshwater Lobster – Recovery Plan Consultation	<p>Senator RICE: Finally, I want to move on to the giant freshwater lobster for which, as I understand it, the revised recovery plan has just been out for consultation. In reply to one of my questions on notice from the February estimates it was indicated that there were a number of regional reserves or conservation areas in the catchment that encompass areas within the range of the giant freshwater lobster. Are these reserves part of the recovery plan for the lobster or are they just coincidental with the populations?</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I apologise. I am going to have to take that on notice. I have not got that in front of me, and I do not know the answer to that question.</p>	Page 124 17 October 2016	SQ16-000391
56	1.4: WHM	Rice	Giant Freshwater Lobster – Recovery Plan	<p>Senator RICE: Also then take on notice—because you probably will not be able to answer it as well—whether you believe there are sufficient reserves in the headwaters when the draft recovery plan notes that clear-fell logging in the headquarters is the major threatening process for the lobster.</p> <p>Mr Richardson: I will take that on notice as well.</p>	Page 124 17 October 2016	SQ16-000393
57	1.4: WHM	Rice	Protection of Forest-Dependent Species	<p>Senator RICE: Finally, in terms of the protection of these forest-dependent species, does the department have a view as to what it is going to mean for these populations if the Tasmanian government go ahead with their proposed expansion of logging into the areas that are currently reserved until 2020? Under the Tasmanian forestry—</p> <p>Mr Oxley: That was breaking news last week, at least from the perspective of the Wildlife, Heritage and Marine Division, and we have not had the opportunity to consider that at this point.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Will you be considering it? Would you assess what the impact of that expansion of logging would mean to the threatened species that you are looking after?</p> <p>Mr Oxley: That is something I will take on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes. I would be interested with respect to the lobsters, the swift parrots, the masked owls and the spotted-tailed quolls.</p>	Page 124 17 October 2016	SQ16-000396
58	1.4: WHM	McKim	ICOMOS /IUCN Recommendation	Last year (2015) the joint ICOMOS/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the Tasmanian Wilderness made a series of recommendations in their report. Tasmanian Environment Minister	Written	SQ16-000677

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			for TWWHA National Parks	<p>Matthew Groom said: The Tasmanian Government together with the Australian Government accepts [and would abide by] the recommendations of the mission's report. Recommendation 11 of this report was: Future Potential Production Forest Land (FPPFL) within the property ... should be granted status as national park. Given this, what steps are you and the Tasmanian Government taking to gazette these new national parks?</p> <p>1. If no steps have been taken so far, what assurances do you have, as the state party responsible for World Heritage Areas, that the Tasmanian Government will implement this recommendation?</p>		
59	1.4: WHM	McKim	Swift Parrot Recovery Plan	What is the current status of the swift parrot recovery team?	Written	SQ16-000682
60	1.4: WHM	McKim	Swift Parrot Recovery Plan	Given the Swift Parrot's recent uplisting to critically endangered, is it the Government's intention to develop a recovery plan?	Written	SQ16-000684
61	1.4: WHM	McKim	Swift Parrot Recovery Plan	What, if any, progress has been made in developing a new swift parrot recovery plan?	Written	SQ16-000685
62	1.4: WHM	McKim	Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area – Management Plan	What is the status of the TWWHA Management Plan, timeline for finalisation, and will the Australian Government endorse and provide their logo for it?	Written	SQ16-000686
63	1.4: WHM	McKim	Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area – Plan Details	<p>What steps is the Australian Government taking to ensure the final management plan meets the World Heritage Committee's decision, and the recommendations of the 2015 Reactive Monitoring Mission, and commitments made to the World Heritage Centre by Government?</p> <p>If no steps have been taken so far, what assurances do you have, as the state party responsible for World Heritage Areas, that the Tasmanian Government will implement this recommendation?</p>	Written	SQ16-000688
64	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Grey-headed Flying Fox Recovery Plans	The Department of Environment and Energy website's threatened species profile for the grey-headed flying-fox states next to 'Recovery Plan Decision' that a Recovery Plan is required for the species.	Written	SQ16-000604

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Does this reflect a decision made under s269AA of the EPBC Act? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If so, when was this decision made? b. If not, what was the decision that determined a Recovery Plan was required and when was it made? 2) Where is the Recovery Plan up to? 3) What is the responsibility of each state to ensure a Recovery Plan is written? 4) Given the listing of a species under the EPBC Act means that extinction of the species is a high risk, what is the Department doing to ensure Recovery Plans are written in a timely manner? 		
65	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Canned lion cub imports – Billabong Zoo	<p>The Australian government recently banned the importation of lion trophies and body parts as a direct response to South Africa’s canned hunting industry.</p> <p>Despite this, a privately owned NSW zoo, Billabong Zoo, has been allowed to import lion cubs sourced from Ukutula South Africa, a breeder exposed in the documentary Blood Lions as being part of the supply chain in the canned hunting industry, with the Deputy Prime Minister celebrating the importation of these animals:</p> <p>Why were permits issued for these cubs given that Australia considers lions as Appendix 1 and are well informed about captive breeding in South Africa?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Why has the government supported the canned hunting supply chain by allowing the importation of animals from a canned lion hunting breeder? b) How does the government reconcile rightly condemning South Africa's predator farms and the cycle of exploitation, yet support the same businesses by allowing importation of cubs from these same operators? c) It has been suggested the cubs are inbred, what has the Department done to check the genetic or physical health of these animals prior to permitting their importation? d) Why are private zoos/theme parks allowed to import Appendix 1 species? e) What parameters are considered with regards to usual habitat and 	Written	SQ16-000605

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>climate conditions – for example the Billabong Zoo is based in Port Macquarie but has a snow leopard which lives in cold climates?</p> <p>f) What lion ecologist is working with this zoo?</p> <p>g) What benefit is to be gained with breeding lions - what conservation value?</p> <p>h) Is there genetic proof that these cubs aren't siblings?</p> <p>i) Who, other than the owners, monitors and regulates the ongoing welfare of these animals?</p> <p>j) Can the Department advise how many predators are in zoos and theme parks in Australia?</p> <p>k) Both Stardust Circus and ZooDoo have bred lions saying it has occurred by 'accident'. When zoos or circuses breed by "accident," what penalties or actions are taken by authorities?</p>		
66	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Tiger importation - ZooDoo Tasmania – Pay and Play	<p>ZooDoo in Tasmania has been breeding white lions and using the cubs for zoo visitors to 'pay and play'.</p> <p>a) Does this breach any permits for keeping lions?</p> <p>b) The breeding of lions and other big cats in Australia by private facilities has no conservation value, why is such breeding being allowed to occur?</p> <p>c) What happens to 'surplus' animals?</p>	Written	SQ16-000606
67	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Tiger importation - ZooDoo Tasmania - DPIPWE	<p>When the Tasmanian DPIPWE were contacted, the response was that they can't keep up with domestic, farmed and wild animals and are out of their depth with regard to exotics:</p> <p>Is there any expectation that the breeding of these lions should raise questions of concern about inbreeding and the welfare of the animals?</p>	Written	SQ16-000607
68	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Tiger importation - ZooDoo Tasmania – Ongoing Welfare	<p>What consideration does the Department make to the ongoing welfare of imported animals that are at risk in the wild?</p>	Written	SQ16-000608
69	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Tiger importation - ZooDoo Tasmania – Emaciated tiger	<p>The tiger as ZooDoo was so emaciated that apparently Melbourne Zoo had their head vet order the animal immediately euthanised, so dire was its suffering.</p> <p>a) Given existing concerns about neglect and animal welfare issues at the facility, what consideration or investigation does the</p>	Written	SQ16-000609

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Department make when applications are made for the importation of exotic species for private zoos?</p> <p>b) It is understood ZooDoo wants to import another tiger. Will the Department consider the aforementioned concerns in its consideration of any such application?</p>		
70	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Tiger importation - ZooDoo Tasmania – Private Ownership	Given that declining wild populations are targeted to reinvigorate breeding stocks for export to the international market and private facilities, why is the Department fueling that demand by allowing the importation of animals for private ownership with little oversight?	Written	SQ16-000610
71	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Kangaroos population estimates – Data	<p>In Feb 2016 estimates I asked why the collated data for the 2014 and 2015 kangaroo population estimates not been posted to the website; and when will it be posted.</p> <p>I was told the Department “will update the information on the website...”</p> <p>There has been no updated collated data published on the website, with just Quota and Take data to 2013 for each state, and Population Estimates only to 2012.</p> <p>A. why has this data not been updated on the website? Is this a deliberate omission?</p>	Written	SQ16-000611
72	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Kangaroos population estimates – By States	<p>When I have requested the above collated data, I’ve been referred to the state’s individual websites. Does this mean the department has not considered the collated data?</p> <p>1) Please provide the following updated collated data for each year: 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 and to current:</p> <p>a) Population estimates for each of the species of commercially shot macropods, in each of the states;</p> <p>b) The shooting quotas for each of those species, in each state, for each year;</p> <p>The Take for each species, <u>male and female</u>, for each state, per year. (note this was only provided for the year 2011 when I last requested the same)</p>	Written	SQ16-000612

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
73	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Kangaroo export licenses	How many export registered businesses are currently in operation for: a) Kangaroo meat and meat products for human consumption b) Kangaroo meat and products for pet food c) Kangaroo skins.	Written	SQ16-000613
74	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Kangaroo export licenses - Permits	How many export permits currently exist for each of the three general categories of kangaroo export products?	Written	SQ16-000614
75	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Victoria “pet food trial” – Victoria’s population estimate	In Feb 2016 I was told there is no baseline kangaroo population estimate for Victoria, yet the government is allowing the commercial industry to shoot Victoria’s kangaroos in a so-called pet food trial. How will scientists be able to track kangaroo population trends if there is no baseline survey data?	Written	SQ16-000615
76	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Victoria “pet food trial” – Victorian data	Previously I was advised that the Victorian Government is using “ten years of annual non-commercial harvest data in the two pet food trial regions” 1) Please clarify, is this harvest data the number of tags issued to farmers or is it the number of kangaroos actually shot (the Take)? a) Am I correct in understanding this means the Australian Government is accepting the Take of kangaroos as a proxy for population estimates in Victoria? b) Please provide a copy of that ten years of harvest data, per zone.	Written	SQ16-000616
77	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Victoria “pet food trial” – commercial businesses	I was told that the three commercial kangaroo businesses allowed to operate in Victoria had a quota of 16,000 kangaroos. a) Please provide details on those localities or regions and the quota (and take if available) for each of those regions. b) Please provide the data for numbers of kangaroos actually shot in Victoria for the commercial industry. c) Previously I was advised the Victorian Government is not providing data for female: male roos shot. Why is the Dept of Environment not insisting on this important scientific data?	Written	SQ16-000617
78	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Victoria “pet food trial” – VIP Pet Foods	Is the department aware that VIP Pet Foods blamed declining numbers of kangaroos in Western Australia for its decision to close its kangaroo processing plant in Perth?	Written	SQ16-000618

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
79	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Federal Code of Practice for killing joeys	<p>The RIRDC's 2014 report <i>Improving the humaneness of commercial kangaroo harvesting</i> found that most kangaroo shooters rarely kill young dependent at-foot joeys , leaving them to die in the field for up to 10 days from starvation, predation or the elements. It also found most pouch joeys are not killed immediately or at all via careful blunt head trauma in controlled situations. This raises concerns about in-field killing of pouch joeys which were found to be swung by the tail against a vehicle or stomped on.</p> <p>In April 2015 I was advised the Australian Government Minister for the Environment had written to ministers in each state and territory in response to the report, asking if the National Code of Practice for shooting macropods should be reviewed, with most responses supporting a review of the Code.</p> <p>a) Where is review up to? b) What is the timetable for reviewing the Code in relation to the findings of the report? c) Have any interim measure been put in place to try to curb the cruelty to joeys when their mothers are shot?</p> <p>How many joeys are estimated to die from the commercial kangaroo industry each year?</p>	Written	SQ16-000619
80	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Kangaroo Survey extrapolation methodologies	<p>I was previously advised the department did not check state kangaroo survey or extrapolation methodologies, transect mapping or actual count data.</p> <p>In Feb 2016 I asked if this was still the case, and the Department advised: "The Department does check kangaroo survey and extrapolation methodologies as part of the assessments of wildlife trade management plans"</p> <p>a) Has the department ever requested the gps'd flight paths of the survey planes and mapped those transects? b) Has the department ever checked whether survey transects are increased from one year to the other? How does this affect the extrapolated densities? c) The scientific method requires exactly the same survey and</p>	Written	SQ16-000620

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				extrapolation methodologies in long term monitoring programs. Please provide details of why the Department accepts continually changing methodologies that inflate kangaroo numbers?		
81	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Kangaroo Survey extrapolation methodologies	The department also advised it “does not generally see the count data, but may request this information if required”. a) Has the department ever requested and checked the actual count data of any kangaroo surveys in any state? b) If yes, when and where, and please provide copies of that data. c) Has the department ever checked the survey data on a shooting zone by zone basis in each state? d) If yes, is the department concerned about the trend of decline in individual zones? e) If not, why hasn't the department ever checked this given its role is to do so? f) Has the government ever plotted actual count data along mapped survey transects? g) Would the department be concerned if actual count data from consecutive survey transects over open farming country continued to show zero counts of kangaroos over a decade – yet population estimates continue to assert high densities of kangaroos in those same areas?	Written	SQ16-000621
82	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Review paper on euthanasia of kangaroo joeys	A review paper, Euthanasia of Kangaroo Pouch Young, Dependent Joeys and Young at Foot, was completed in 2006 by Dr Paul Hopwood, commissioned by the then Commonwealth Department of Environment and Heritage. Please provide a copy of that paper.	Written	SQ16-000622
83	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Parramatta Female Factory Precinct in the National Heritage List – Assessment Timeframe	The Parramatta Female Factory Precinct nomination to the National Heritage List has been unprocessed for a number of years now. Why has the assessment timeframe for its nomination now been increased from finalising in 2017 to 2019?	Written	SQ16-000650
84	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Parramatta Female Factory Precinct in the	This change appeared on the Department's website just 6 weeks prior to the NSW Planning Minister's announced he would approve the UGNSW residential development adjacent to the site. Has the	Written	SQ16-000651

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			National Heritage List - Delays	department ever had discussions with the NSW government about this? Is the Time coincidental given the extraordinary delay that has happened previous to this?		
85	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Parramatta Female Factory Precinct in the National Heritage List – Sale of neighbouring land	Is it a coincidence that the 23 hectares of land next to the Parramatta Female Factory is due to be sold in 2017? What is the Department's response to this and how it affects the heritage values of the site?	Written	SQ16-000652
86	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Parramatta Female Factory Precinct in the National Heritage List - Timeframes	Has the timeframe been extended to facilitate development of surrounding area to start before listing assessment is complete?	Written	SQ16-000653
87	1.4: WHM	Rhiannon	Parramatta Female Factory Precinct in the National Heritage List – Interim Emergency Listing	Why has an interim emergency listing not been granted given the extent of the NSW Government's intention to allow development that will affect the site?	Written	SQ16-000654
88	1.4: WHM	Urquhart	World Heritage Nominations	I note that Environment Ministers agreed in December to progress potential world heritage nominations. What has happened since December? How much funding is allocated to these processes?	Written	SQ16-000700
89	1.4: WHM	Urquhart	World Heritage Nominations	How many staff are fully allocated to World Heritage in the department (other than the Great Barrier Reef work)?	Written	SQ16-000701
90	1.4: WHM	Urquhart	World Heritage Nominations – Cape York	For Cape York. Have indigenous groups been consulted? Which ones? Have they been provided funding to consult within and outside their communities? Would you say the process is traditional owner led or department led?	Written	SQ16-000702
91	1.4: WHM	Urquhart	National Heritage List – Thompson Square	Has the Government given consideration to emergency listing on the National Heritage List of Thompson Square at Windsor in NSW?	Written	SQ16-000703

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
92	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia	What evidence does the department have about the decline of the Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia since the 2012 listing as a threatened ecological community?	Written	SQ16-000399
93	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia	Is this being examined by the Threatened Species Committee or the Threatened Species Committee?	Written	SQ16-000401
94	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia – Current Research	What current research if any is being supported on monitoring or the conservation of the health of our Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia?	Written	SQ16-000402
95	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia – Current Studies	What studies are the department aware of (current or past) on the value of these forests to fishing or other communities (diving/tourism)?	Written	SQ16-000405
96	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Tasmanian Kelp Forests	Can the department confirm if it is true 95% of Tasmania's listed kelp forest community has gone (over the past 80 years)?	Written	SQ16-000407
97	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Tasmanian Kelp Forests – Action Plan	What action (mitigation, conservation) is being taken to save Australia's last kelp forest communities? Have the measures outlined in the 2012 conservation advice been carried out?	Written	SQ16-000409
98	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Tasmanian Kelp Forests – Recovery Plan	Is the Government drafting a Recovery Plan for the Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia?	Written	SQ16-000413
99	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Tasmanian Kelp Forests – Endangered Listing	Will the Government consider revising the listing of this threatened community to critically endangered?	Written	SQ16-000415
100	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Tasmanian Kelp Forest - Reafforestation	In 2012 research into potential "reafforestation" (re generation from source populations) was being considered, did this occur?	Written	SQ16-000417
101	1.4: WHM	Whish-Wilson	Giant Kelp Marine Forests of	Are there any other threats other than climate change to the health and distribution of the Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia?	Written	SQ16-000419

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			South East Australia - Threats			
102	1.4: WHM	Whish- Wilson	String Kelp Beds	The continuing loss of String Kelp beds (<i>Macrocystis pyrifera</i>) in Tasmania has long been known to be underway due to environmental change. <i>M.pyrifera</i> appears to still be listed as Conservation status "Not evaluated" under IUCN 3.1? What has Australia done to progress the nomination of IUCN protection for the species?	Written	SQ16-000420
103	1.4: WHM	Whish- Wilson	Giant Kelp Marine Forests - Communications	What communications has the department had with Tasmanian departments about addressing the Conservation advice from 2012?	Written	SQ16-000422
104	1.4: WHM	Whish- Wilson	Japanese Whaling in the Southern Ocean – Monitoring and Surveillance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What forms of monitoring, observation or surveillance will the Australian Government be undertaking for Japanese Whaling in the Southern Ocean over the coming summer? 2. If not, how will the Australian Government maintain legal options without access to primary evidence of wrongdoing by the Japanese whalers? 3. Will the Environment Department be accessing Border Force (Customs) or Defence assets such as the ice-rated Ocean Shield or Ocean Protector, or AP-3C Orion or P-8A Poseidons for any activities in the Southern Ocean this upcoming summer? 4. What budget allocations have the Government made from the Environment Department in regard to the prevention of Japanese whaling in the Southern Ocean? 	Written	SQ16-000423
105	1.4: WHM	Whish- Wilson	Whale Deaths	How many whales and what species of whales have been caught or killed in shark nets in Australia each year over the last decade? What is the breakdown by geographic region?	Written	SQ16-000429
106	1.4: WHM	Whish- Wilson	Whale Deaths	How many whales and what species of whales have been caught or killed by ship strikes each year over the last decade? What is the breakdown by geographic region?	Written	SQ16-000430
107	1.5: ESD	Waters	Adani Mine	Senator WATERS: ... Can I move on now to a number of other issues. The Queensland government has just listed the Adani mine and associated infrastructure as what is called 'critical infrastructure' under the state development act. Was there any consultation with the authority in that decision-making process?	Page 37 17 October 2016	SQ16-000456

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Dr Reichelt: Not to my knowledge, Senator.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: To the knowledge of anyone else at the table?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: I am just checking. No.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: So no-one asked you whether it should be considered critical infrastructure and hence sped up in the assessment process—</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: No.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: after we have just had the worst coral-bleaching event that the reef has ever seen?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: Correct. I understand the logical linkage, but it would not be a legislative responsibility of ours. I do not know that even the department would have that consultation. Certainly it is outside the legal bounds of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. That kind of industrial decision would not come to us. It would be more likely to do with plans around development of, say, coastal aquaculture and other things where we have a stronger import and do get consulted.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Just while we are on that, did the Queensland government ask either the minister or the Commonwealth department?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Not as far as I know, Senator, but quite frankly that sort of decision to declare something a priority project is wholly a matter for the states in normal circumstances. But we will check on that. Environmental regulation comes later on and we can confirm that.</p>		
108	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	EPBC Act Assessment Resources	<p>Senator URQUHART: Do the states have more resources than the Commonwealth and are they able to do assessment more quickly than the Commonwealth?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I do not think that we will able to comment on what sort of resourcing individual states have, but what I can say is that, for better or for worse, the one-stop shop did bring about a much closer engagement between the states and the Commonwealth. We believe that that has led to efficiencies, strictly from us communicating more regularly on key projects, understanding where their concerns are and them understanding where our concerns are, which leads to much</p>	Page 126 17 October 2016	SQ16-000433

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>better decision-making. That is fundamentally the push behind the conditions policy which says that, if the states adequately address federal matters, then our conditions will be limited, as a default, to one condition saying, 'Apply the state conditions.' That is a direct result of those types of reforms.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I read, in an article in <i>WA Today</i>, about where the state and local governments assessed the wrong parcel of land. Do you have any confidence in the state processes, and how are they audited?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: I did not quite catch that—the role of classing?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Senator Urquhart is quoting or referencing an article, apparently. I do not know if you are able to table the article?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: It is from 22 September, <i>WA Today</i>.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Are you able to table the article?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: It talks about the clearing—oh, yes, I can give you a copy if you want. It says, 'Government approves wetland bulldozing based on environmental study of wrong lot'. Are you aware of that?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: No. I will have to take that on notice and look at the article.</p>		
109	1.5: ESD	Waters	NSW Shark Nets Correspondence	<p>Senator WATERS: ... On the question about sharks: has there been an application yet from the New South Wales government or Premier?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: We have received two sets of correspondence from New South Wales. They have written to us about smart drum lines. We are now looking at a response to their letter. They have, secondly, written to us and indicated that they are looking at their shark mesh approach and that they would like to engage with us further about how the EPBC Act might apply.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Are you able to table that correspondence?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: I will get back to you on that. It has come from another tier of government, so I will have to check.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: In a timely manner?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: I will get back to you within the next week.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: It has not reached the status of a referral as such. Have they flagged—</p>	Page 128 17 October 2016	SQ16-000530

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Mr Cahill: Neither of them are formal referrals.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Have they flagged that they might use the same national security pathway that the Barnett government attempted to use?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: I will take that on notice, but that is one of the matters they have asked us to turn our minds to.</p>		
110	1.5: ESD	Waters	Carnaby's Nesting Season	<p>Senator WATERS: Okay. The Carnaby's nesting season is apparently August to December. Will the baseline surveys completed as part of condition 5 be required for that entire breeding season?</p> <p>Mr Wyndham: I do not have the details of the approval with me right now. I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: We might take that on notice.</p>	Page 129 17 October 2016	SQ16-000435
111	1.5: ESD	Waters	Carnaby's Nesting Season – Assessment Process	<p>Senator WATERS: ... What specific information were you presented with during the assessment process to make the decision that offsets would be appropriate?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: We might take that on notice too.</p>	Page 129 17 October 2016	SQ16-000436
112	1.5: ESD	Waters	Swan Coastal Plan – Offsets	<p>Senator WATERS: Is there any light that you can shed on that tonight—noting that you will get me more detail on notice?</p> <p>Mr Wyndham: There is a statement of reasons for the decision that has been published, and it deals with a range of things—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: It goes to offsets as well, does it?</p> <p>Mr Wyndham: including offsets. Obviously the decision-maker looked at that as part of making that approval.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Did that consideration include the remaining amount of banksia woodlands on the Swan Coastal Plain?</p> <p>Mr Wyndham: Again, I would refer you to the statement of reasons on this decision.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay. I am assuming that they are not terribly full, because I know the person who is looking at this is very across that sort of detail. Is there any additional information you can provide to me about offsets this evening, or on notice, that goes beyond the statement of reasons?</p> <p>Mr Wyndham: I will take that on notice</p>	Page 129 17 October 2016	SQ16-000437
113	1.5: ESD	Waters	Adani Coal Mine	<p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. That is the end of those Roe 8 questions.</p>	Page 129 17	SQ16-000438

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>I have some questions now about the Adani project and a few other projects in Queensland. I have noticed this week that there have been some advertisements for new jobs happening at the Adani site, which is obviously a new development given that they sacked everyone about a year ago. Has Adani commenced any on-ground work under their EPBC approval for the mine and/or the railway projects?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: Not to my knowledge. They have a range of conditions that they must address before they commence operation or any construction activity.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I would just add that it is not unusual for a proponent to undertake some precommencement work, doing the preparation for the actual operation, so that might be going on. If there is any further clarification, we can definitely come back on notice on that. But, as I said, that is not unusual.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay, so they might have done some—what did you call it? Sorry.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Precommencement work.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Would that normally be something that they would need to notify you of?</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Again, it depends. The thing that we are most concerned about is whether that work would have a significant impact. The way the conditions are built, we would have anything that was likely to have a significant impact covered off in the conditions. So, by definition, anything they would be doing beforehand would not be of a significant impact. But, as I said, we are happy to come back on notice on that.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, if you could. I am struggling to recall the detail of the approval, but I am sure those various conditions that were required to be completed include the usual groundwater plans and this and that plan.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: That is right.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: So could you come back to me with an update on where all of those plans are at and what has been submitted to date.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: Sure.</p>	October 2016	
114	1.5: ESD	Waters	Central Hunter	Senator WATERS: I understand that that particular mine is relying	Page 130	SQ16-000439

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Valley Eucalypt Forest	<p>on mine rehabilitation to fulfil a good 56 per cent of their offset requirements for the critically endangered Central Hunter Valley eucalypt forest. I am a bit rusty on the offsets policy, but that does seem like quite a large amount to rely upon mining rehab as an offset.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: I might have to take that one on notice and look at the detail of the degree of offset in that proposal.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay, and whether that is an unusually large amount.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: Yes, I will.</p>	17 October 2016	
115	1.5: ESD	Waters	Upper Hunter Strategic Assessment – Fieldwork and Mapping	<p>Senator WATERS: ... Will the fieldwork and the mapping for the Upper Hunter Strategic Assessment include mapping of the condition of the remnant areas of those two critically endangered communities since all of the remaining patches are considered critical?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: If those matters have been recently listed or changed, there would be an expectation in the strategic assessment that there would have been suitable surveys and suitable fieldwork done to be able to inform any decision or any recommendation we put to a minister.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Would the strategic assessment be able to prohibit any further clearing of the Warkworth Sands woodlands, given that all remaining patches are now considered critical to its survival?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: I would have to take that on notice and look at where the current assessment is at.</p>	Page 131 17 October 2016	SQ16-000440
116	1.5: ESD	Chisholm	New Acland Mine	<p>Senator WATERS: I will move quickly to the New Acland mine in Queensland. I see that it was deferred yet again this week. Why was it deferred yet again?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: There has been an extension granted so that the company can provide additional information for the minister to consider.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: So your department has sought additional information?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: Yes, we have written to them and requested additional information.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: What was the nature of that information?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: It was to address advice from the Independent Expert</p>	Pages 4- 5 21 October 2016	SQ16-000534

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Scientific Committee—IESC advice. Senator WATERS: About? Mr Cahill: About the impacts on the water trigger. Senator WATERS: Can you provide more detail on notice—I am conscious of the time—or, perhaps, if you could even supply that request for further information?</p>		
117	1.5: ESD	Waters	BP Bight's drilling	<p>Senator WATERS: ... Was the department ever provided information about the Bight's drilling program assessment by NOPSEMA? Mr Cahill: I will have Mr Gaddes answer that. Mr Gaddes: I am moving between roles at the moment. I was formerly with compliance and enforcement. NOPSEMA, as you are aware, is covered by a strategic assessment under the act, so they are accredited to undertake our assessment process. Senator WATERS: Yes. Mr Gaddes: We did not get updates from them on the details of the assessment, but we did seek regular updates on the process that they were going through and where it was up to. Senator WATERS: Can you say that again? You did not get assistance but you sought— Mr Gaddes: We did not ask for the technical details of the assessment, but we asked for status updates from NOPSEMA on where the process was up to. We would seek updates around when they had sought more information from BP, or when they had not approved a plan we would get updates of that nature, but we did not involve ourselves in the details of the assessment. Senator WATERS: Are you able to provide the correspondence where you sought the update and any response that you received? Mr Gaddes: We could. Sometimes that was over the phone because they were responses to requests— Senator WATERS: Do you have file notes, perhaps? Mr Gaddes: Yes, we could see what we can find.</p>	Page 5 21 October 2016	SQ16-000533
118	1.5: ESD	Chisholm	Western Australian Planning	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: I have one question in a similar vein to Senator Moore's. It is a concern that we had about—it is a broader question but I will mention a specific case—a state approval in</p>	Page 5 21 October	SQ16-000535

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Commission – Carter’s land	<p>Western Australia, where the WA Planning Commission approved a subdivision where they had not looked at the full parcel of land. The broader question is: is there concern from a federal perspective about the state processes? For example, do you have confidence in the state processes around their environmental approvals?</p> <p>Mr Cahill: It depends what process it was considered under. We accredit some state planning processes, and am sure Mr Tregurtha can add to that. We will look at those and, if they are accredited, we will rely on those processes for assessment, and so we put that through an assessment process, in terms of whether it meets the standards of the EPBC Act. In terms of the specific matter you are referring to, I am happy for that to be passed to us and to see whether it has been dealt with under a process we have accredited.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: The project is the Western Australian Planning Commission, the bulldozing of Carter's land.</p> <p>Mr Cahill: We will look at that and take that on notice.</p>	2016	
119	1.5: ESD	Duniam	Tasmanian Forests Practices Act	<p>Senator DUNIAM: I have just a couple of questions in the Tasmanian context—probably following on a little bit from what Senator Chisholm was asking you. In Tasmania we have the Forest Practices Act that governs how landowners manage their land with regard to the clearance of trees. It has been put to me by a group of constituents in Tasmania that if they want to clear a certain area they have to go through the Forest Practices Act, get permission from the relevant authority in Tasmania and then also go through EPBC approvals processes. Is that the case?</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: The Forest Practices Act, to my recollection, is not one of the processes in Tasmania that is covered under the bilateral assessment agreement that we have with Tasmania. I will need to confirm that for you.</p>	Page 6 21 October 2016	SQ16-000577
120	1.5: ESD	Duniam	Forest Practices Act and the EPBC Act	<p>Senator DUNIAM: The way it was put to me was it was almost a duplication of the process. You have just referred to information being drawn from one process and taken into the other, so I guess there is a degree of overlap there. Are we talking gulfs of difference between the standard of the Forest Practices Act and the EPBC? Do you know?</p>	Pages 6- 7 21 October 2016	SQ16-000536

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Mr Tregurtha: I would have to take that on notice to give you advice on what the size of the gap is between the two.</p> <p>Senator DUNIAM: Sure. The reason I ask this is, obviously, I am a believer in reducing red tape. If you go through one process which is good enough, why do you need to go through another? I suppose, then, it may be a question for the minister. Is it something we could look at to see if we can do away with this extra level of application and the taking up of time of people who just want to get another paddock on their farm.</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: The answer to question is: yes. As Mr Knudson, I think, pointed out, we have over the course of the last few years established far closer working relationships with entities in the states who undertake various forms of environmental assessments. We continue to talk to them about their processes and whether or not they are meeting or a reflective of the standards required at a Commonwealth level. Certainly, from our perspective, if states can make changes that are consistent with the EPBC Act, then that is a valuable thing. It is something where we would be encouraging states to talk to us—and we talk with them—around when they are making changes or improvements to their practices that they try to do so in a way that can help give effect to getting closer to the Commonwealth standards, which of course means that the assessments then match more closely and leaves you in one process rather than two.</p> <p>Senator DUNIAM: Excellent. Do you think it is worth my while writing to the minister and raising this directly with him to progress, maybe, this single—</p> <p>Mr Tregurtha: I think that is a consideration for you, Senator. But, as I said, we continue our discussions with all states and territories around improving the streamlining.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: You have raised it with us, Senator, and we will follow up.</p> <p>Senator DUNIAM: Okay. Thank you.</p>		
121	1.5: ESD	Waters	Gippsland Lakes Dredging Application	<p>Senator WATERS: In relation to the multiple uses of the area, you mentioned ports. I do not have the details in my head or before me, unfortunately, but, hopefully, you will understand my drift. I</p>	Pages 34-35 21	SQ16-000552

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>understand there was a dredging application made that went through the usual approval pathway.</p> <p>Mr Papps: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: My understanding is that the assessment footprint was quite constrained and effectively only looked at the very localised impacts rather than considering the broader impacts on the lake. That seems very odd to me and very wrong. Have I got the wrong end of the stick? If not, is there some intention to revisit that approval decision and to factor in the broader impacts on the lake?</p> <p>Mr Papps: I can only help you in a limited way here because I do not administer the EPBC Act. My recollection is that the dredging, which is a routine process, was subject to a decision under that piece of legislation. I understand it was approved with conditions. I cannot provide you with any commentary on the extent of the area looked at. I do know that the decision was challenged by a local group and reviewed and confirmed. But if you want more detail, I will have to refer you to somewhere else for that.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: I think we should take this on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I am happy with that.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: It is not uncommon that we will get a referral for a certain area of impact, which is the direct impact of whatever is being proposed, and the assessment then looks at the direct impacts in that space but also—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: All adverse impacts, yes.</p> <p>Mr Knudson: the surrounding areas. I would like to come back and confirm what that scope was.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, if you could. Thank you. ...</p>	October 2016	
122	1.5: ESD	McKim	Amendment to the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act	Does the government still intend to pursue the repeal of s.487 of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, which would effectively remove the automatic right of appeal for ENGOs?	Written	SQ16-000690
123	1.5: ESD	McKim	Amendment to the Environment Protection and	If so, have you done any analysis on the additional court costs that will be involved in requiring an additional court determination as to standing before any hearing of the merits of a legal challenge? Many	Written	SQ16-000691

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Biodiversity Conservation Act	of the submissions to the Senate inquiry into the proposal to repeal s.487 raised the concern that this repeal would only lead to more litigation, not less.		
124	1.5: ESD	Rhiannon	Shark drumline approvals NSW - Expansion	Has approval been given to NSW's expansion of its the 'smart' drumline program under EPBC Act?	Written	SQ16-000655
125	1.5: ESD	Rhiannon	Shark drumline approvals NSW – Environmental Impacts	What level of consideration has been given to the environmental impacts of this huge expansion?	Written	SQ16-000656
126	1.5: ESD	Rhiannon	Shark drumline approvals NSW - Outcomes	Have the outcomes and impacts of the existing 'smart' drumline trial that NSW wishes to expand been provided to the Department or Minister? Please provide a copy of the data, and of any reports or interim advice.	Written	SQ16-000657
127	1.5: ESD	Rhiannon	Shark drumline approvals NSW – Marine Environment	What are the possible impacts on the wider marine environment and other species of shark drumlines in general, and of this particular so called 'smart' drumline?	Written	SQ16-000658
128	1.5: ESD	Rhiannon	Shark drumline approvals NSW – Science	Please provide the science that supports this program as effective.	Written	SQ16-000659
129	1.5: ESD	Rice	EPBC Referral for Ellerton Drive Extension – Assessment	Has the department completed its assessment of the proposed Ellerton Drive Extension and its impact on an endangered ecological community and threatened species listed under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act?	Written	SQ16-000593
130	1.5: ESD	Rice	EPBC Referral for Ellerton Drive Extension - Offsets	Why does the department consider it acceptable for a proponent to seek to 'offset' the loss of an endangered ecological community for which less than five per cent of its pre-European extent is estimated to remain on the southern tablelands of NSW?	Written	SQ16-000594

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
131	1.5: ESD	Rice	EPBC Referral for Ellerton Drive Extension – Recovery Plan	In its concurrence report, the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage states that the Ellerton Drive Extension project would fail to meet two of five objectives in the national recovery plan for box-gum woodland. Why is this acceptable, particularly given the small extent of remaining box-gum woodland?	Written	SQ16-000595
132	1.5: ESD	Rice	EPBC Referral for Ellerton Drive Extension - Dumping	Is the department aware that one of the proposed ‘offset’ sites has been used to dump broken pipes lined with asbestos? If so, does the Department consider this appropriate?	Written	SQ16-000596
133	1.5: ESD	Rice	EPBC Referral for Ellerton Drive Extension – Squirrel Gliders	Is the department aware that the NSW Scientific Committee is investigating reported sightings of endangered squirrel gliders in the vicinity of the proposed alignment of the Ellerton Drive Extension? Has the department had any discussions with the NSW Government, including the Office of Environment and Heritage, about this matter? If so, what was the outcome?	Written	SQ16-000597
134	1.5: ESD	Rice	Outcome report of the thinning trial	What is the criteria for any interim or final outcome report of the thinning trial that would result in an end to ecological thinning and/or other logging activities?	Written	SQ16-000600
135	1.5: ESD	Rice	Ecological Thinning in National Parks	Could the Department please outline if there are any other plans to roll out ecological thinning and/or logging in any other national parks?	Written	SQ16-000603
136	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	Assessments	How many projects has the department assessed this financial year (2015/16)? Is that an increase or decrease on previous years? What is the trend?	Written	SQ16-000705
137	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	One Stop Shop	The “one stop shop” was intended to increase efficiency? Has this occurred? Are more projects being assessed? Is the time taken to assess projects increasing or decreasing?	Written	SQ16-000706
138	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	One Stop Shop	Has the process been reviewed? Do findings support an increase in efficiency?	Written	SQ16-000707
139	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	One Stop Shop	Have the results been communicated to stakeholders?	Written	SQ16-000708
140	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	Assessment Processes and Resources	Do the states have more resources than the Commonwealth? Are they able to do assessments more quickly than the Commonwealth?	Written	SQ16-000709
141	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	Assessment Processes and	Do you have confidence in State processes? How are the audited?	Written	SQ16-000710

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Resources			
142	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	Assessment Processes and Resources	What happens if a State continually underperforms in it's duties in regard to the EPBC Act?	Written	SQ16-000711
143	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	Assessment Processes and Resources	The Commonwealth focusses on specific things in the EPBC Act. How do you know the States have the correct level of knowledge and experience in these areas? Has this information been gathered? Audited?	Written	SQ16-000712
144	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	EPBC Act Review	Is the government planning to undertake a review of the EPBC Act? When will it start? Or has work started?	Written	SQ16-000713
145	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	EPBC Act Review	Has advice been provided to the Minister on the review and timing of the review?	Written	SQ16-000714
146	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	EPBC Act Review	Has advice on reforming the Act been provided to the Minister?	Written	SQ16-000715
147	1.5: ESD	Urquhart	EPBC Act Review	Has the government been contacted by stakeholders regarding reforming the Act? Which ones?	Written	SQ16-000716
148	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Salmon Farming Proposal in Oakehampton Bay, Tasmania – EPBC Approval	Does this proposal to undertake near-shore salmon farming have existing EPBC approval?	Written	SQ16-000441
149	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Salmon Farming Proposal in Oakehampton Bay, Tasmania – EPBC Approval	Will the proposal require EPBC approval? Has the Department been in contact with either the project proponent or the Tasmanian government about this proposal?	Written	SQ16-000443
150	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Salmon Farming Proposal in Oakehampton Bay, Tasmania	Are there matters of national environmental significance in the area proposed?	Written	SQ16-000445
151	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Salmon Farming in Giant Kelp Marine Forests	Is the Department concerned about the impact of salmon farming on the already declining Giant Kelp Marine Forests of South East Australia found in the area?	Written	SQ16-000446
152	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Salmon Farming Macquarie	Given the ongoing breaches of the existing Tasmanian Government approvals by the three salmon companies, does the Federal	Written	SQ16-000451

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Harbour, Tasmania – Approval Breaches	Environment Department consider that the existing EPBC exemption is still valid?		
153	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Salmon Farming Macquarie Harbour, Tasmania - Consultation	What consultation has occurred between the Tasmanian Government, the Federal Environment Department and the proponents about the existing EPBC exemption?	Written	SQ16-000457
154	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Matters of National Significance	What research or studies is the Department aware of about the impacts that these three salmon farms are having on Matters of National significance?	Written	SQ16-000458
155	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets Trial	At which beaches will the net trial take place and what type of nets will be used? Eg length, depth, where will they be sunk?	Written	SQ16-000460
156	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets Monitoring	How often will the nets be monitored for by catch?	Written	SQ16-000461
157	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets Monitoring	What kind of monitoring will be in place to record the numbers of bycatch (both dead and released) and will the data be released in a timely manner?	Written	SQ16-000463
158	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets Trials Commencement	When are the nets anticipated to go in the water? (this will depend on the what process they follow to get approvals)	Written	SQ16-000465
159	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets Trial	Is the net trial limited to 6 months?	Written	SQ16-000467
160	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets Drumlines	Has the use of smart drumlines on beaches in NSW been referred to the federal government for assessment and approval as a controlled action?	Written	SQ16-000468
161	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets Trial	The net trial has apparently been referred to the federal government under the EPBC Act. Can the written referral from Minister Baird to Minister Frydenberg be made public?	Written	SQ16-000469
162	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets Trial - Impact Assessment	Will the federal government be conducting a full environmental impact assessment of the net trial as a controlled action under the EPBC Act?	Written	SQ16-000471
163	1.5: ESD	Whish- Wilson	Shark Nets – EPBC Act	Has the NSW Government applied for an exemption under the EPBC Act for the 6 month net trial? If so, on what basis?	Written	SQ16-000472

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Exemption			
164	1.5: ESD	Whish-Wilson	Shark Nets Trial – EPBC Act	Will the net trial be assessed as an activity under Part 5 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> (NSW)? If not, how will it be assessed?	Written	SQ16-000473
165	1.5: Science	Urquhart	Office of the Supervising Scientist – Funding	Has your funding remained stable? Increased or decreased?	Written	SQ16-000697
166	1.5: Science	Urquhart	Office of the Supervising Scientist – Staffing Numbers	Have your staff numbers remained stable? Increased or decreased?	Written	SQ16-000698
167	1.5: Science	Urquhart	Domestic Radioactive Waste Storage	Have you provided information to the Government or State Governments on domestic radioactive waste storage? International waste storage? If yes, what type of advice?	Written	SQ16-000699
168	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Orica	What involvement does the Australian government have with the chemical manufacturer Orica with regard to shipping waste to Finland?	Written	SQ16-000660
169	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Amounts	If this shipment of waste goes ahead how much toxic material will be shipped to Finland?	Written	SQ16-000661
170	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Government Communication	What interactions has the government had with Finnish government with regard to sending intractable waste to Finland?	Written	SQ16-000662
171	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland - Disposal	In Finland will the waste disposal be undertaken by a private company or a public owned body?	Written	SQ16-000663
172	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Botany Site	If the shipment to Finland will all the intractable waste at the Botany site be shipped to Finland?	Written	SQ16-000664
173	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland	If this waste transfer goes ahead when will the first shipment leave Botany and how long will it take to reach Finland? How much	Written	SQ16-000665

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			– Timing	intractable toxic waste is stored at Orica’s Botany site?		
174	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – In country options	Has the government investigated treating the waste at Botany or other sites in Australia? If yes please detail what was considered.	Written	SQ16-000666
175	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Alternatives	What alternatives to shipping the waste to Finland for dealing with the waste has the government investigated?	Written	SQ16-000667
176	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Alternative Countries	Before Finland was chosen as the destination for the Orica waste what other countries did the government consider sending the waste to?	Written	SQ16-000668
177	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Conventions	What responsibility does Australia have to responsibility manage its own waste considering we are a signatory to the Stockholm and Basel Conventions?	Written	SQ16-000669
178	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Local Solutions	Has the government attempted to work with Orica to develop a local solution to safely destroy the waste? If yes what activities have been undertaken to achieve this and why was this approach abandoned? If no why was not attempt made to develop a local solution?	Written	SQ16-000670
179	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland - Amounts	How much intractable toxic waste is stored at Orica’s Botany site?	Written	SQ16-000671
180	1.6 ESD	Rhiannon	Export of toxic waste to Finland – Other storage sites	How much intractable toxic waste is stored at other sites in Australia? Please nominate the site of these other locations and how much intractable toxic waste is stored at these sites?	Written	SQ16-000672
181	2.1: DERD	Waters	2017 Review	Senator WATERS: Okay, thank you. Can I ask now about the 2017 review—but firstly the aspect of the NEO in that review. We have obviously got a bill before the House to amend the NEO in the manner described earlier. Will that bill and that issue be considered as part of the 2017 review? Dr de Brouwer: We will take that one on notice a bit, ...	Page 11 21 October 2016	SQ16-000540
182	2.1: DERD	Moore	2017 Review	Senator MOORE: Is it possible to get, on notice, a list of the series of tasks that you are talking about? Could we get a full list of the	Page 17 21	SQ16-000544

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>various work that is being done now leading into the review? Dr de Brouwer: Yes. Senator MOORE: We had evidence from the previous set of witnesses of various things that were done, and I think some of that crosses over with the things you are talking to me in theory about. Dr de Brouwer: It does, yes. Senator MOORE: Could we get who is doing what and when, and whether it is part of an ongoing process or whether its particular focus is the 2017 review? Dr de Brouwer: We will come back with that. Senator MOORE: That would be good. I have some questions about that review. We have talked about it a lot, and I am just wondering whether the questions about how it is going to operate have been asked before. Ms Wilson: As I think has been mentioned before, the government is yet to take decisions on the scope of the review or its process. I might just follow up on the secretary's comment. I think it is important to note that various work is already underway on future policies. There is the phase down of the hydrofluorocarbons. Light vehicle efficiency standards are already being investigated by the government. Measures are being developed under the National Energy Productivity Plan. As we know, ARENA and the CFC are supporting the deployment of renewable energy. So we will make sure these sorts of policies are on that list that we have just taken on notice. Senator MOORE: Wonderful, so it will be a list of that ongoing work? Ms Wilson: Yes.</p>	October 2016	
183	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Urquhart	Meetings with the Minister for the Environment	<p>Senator URQUHART: As you report directly to the minister, how many times since you were announced as the commissioner on 9 October 2015 have you met with the relevant minister to discuss your role and brief them on your work? Mr Dyer: I would probably want to give you a precise answer on notice. I have had two ministers—Minister Hunt and now Minister Frydenberg. I would say we would catch up in a face-to-face every two months and there is ongoing communication between that and</p>	Page 96 17 October 2016	SQ16-000495

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				obviously communication with the office of the minister. Senator URQUHART: But you will provide a bit more detail on notice? Mr Dyer: Yes, a precise answer.		
184	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Urquhart	National Wind Farm Commissioner's Travel Budget	Senator URQUHART: Can you confirm what the travel budget is for your office? Mr Dyer: I might have to either get advice or take that on notice. Dr de Brouwer: We will take it on notice.	Page 96 17 October 2016	SQ16-000496
185	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Urquhart	National Wind Farm Commissioner's Travel Costs	Senator URQUHART: Are you able to provide us with the details of the total costs of the office since the creation of the office? Mr Dyer: Again I would need to take advice. Dr de Brouwer: We will take that on notice. Mr Archer: Actually, sorry, I do have some. For the financial year 2015-16, we have employee expenses of just under \$217,000 and supplier expenses of just under \$179,000, which gives a total of about \$395,500. Senator URQUHART: Sorry, what was that broken down into? Mr Archer: Employee expenses—that is the staffing for the office—and supplier expenses, which is like the travel, office expenses, things like that. Senator URQUHART: You can provide some more detail of that, and the other one? Mr Archer: Certainly.	Pages 96-97 17 October 2016	SQ16-000497
186	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Urquhart	Wind Farm Commissioner's Office Costs	Senator URQUHART: Can I just clarify something. Mr Archer, I think you said that \$395,000 was for staff and the cost of travel et cetera, for staff. Are there other figures that are attached to that in terms of office rent—a whole range of things? What are the total costs? Do you have that there? Mr Archer: I would have to take that on notice. I have given you what I have.	Page 97 17 October 2016	SQ16-000498
187	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Hume	Number of Complaints Received - Victoria	Senator HUME: You were talking about the categories of complaints that you had, and one of them was community sourced complaints. Senator WATERS: Aren't they all community complaints? Senator HUME: Not necessarily.	Page 97 17 October 2016	SQ16-000499

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Mr Dyer: Community engagement.</p> <p>Senator HUME: Community engagement, yes.</p> <p>Mr Dyer: In total, of the 78 complaints we have received, 14 complaints have an issue with community engagement.</p> <p>Senator HUME: But there were 30-something that were from Victoria—33?</p> <p>Mr Dyer: I have not got the breakdown. I am happy to provide to you the Victorian breakdown of community engagement. Of the total universe of complaints, 14 of those complaints have issues about community engagement.</p>		
188	2.1: ICCEID	Chisholm	Coal-Fired Power Stations	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: I just wanted to ask about Australia's fleet of coal-fired power stations. In particular, I wanted to focus on their expected productive life.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: There are a number of coal-fired stations, as you would be aware, including four big brown coal stations in Victoria and then a number of black coal stations in both New South Wales and Queensland and some in Western Australia, not part of the NEM but part of the WA system. I know there are timelines of anticipated closure for a number of stations, but it might be best if we took that on notice.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Sure. Just specifically, then, do you know how many are due for retirement in the next 15 years?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: That will be in that information. I do not have the numbers here, but for most power stations companies nominate what the life of that asset is. That is what we would be collecting—the nominated life of the assets. Some of that is within the next 15 years, but I cannot recall which power stations. We will come back to the committee with that.</p>	Page 9 21 October 2016	SQ16-000538
189	2.1: ICCEID	Waters	Climate Policy Review	<p>Senator WATERS: Could you provide on notice some more information about that climate policy review?</p> <p>Mr Philp: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Heferen: Certainly.</p>	Page 12 21 October 2016	SQ16-000541
190	2.1: ICCEID	Chair	Renewable Energy Target	<p>CHAIR: To summarise that, you looked at, after the impact of the federal renewable energy process, what would then be needed for the</p>	Page 14 21	SQ16-000543

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Impacts	<p>states to do over and above that?</p> <p>Mr Archer: That is right. The Australian Energy Market Operator takes into account what existing policies are in place. In this case, in their 2015 report the Commonwealth renewable energy target is factored into that.</p> <p>CHAIR: So this is looking at what will be needed in addition to that?</p> <p>Mr Archer: That is right. We did that for each state and territory where there has been a specific renewable energy target announced or committed to. Then we applied an estimate of the cost of building the renewable power stations needed to meet those targets, after allowing for the fact that there will be some small-scale renewables that are likely to be invested in in the ordinary course of events.</p> <p>CHAIR: What have you found?</p> <p>Mr Archer: We arrived at a figure of \$41 billion for the additional capital cost that would be required to develop those renewable power stations to meet those state and territory targets.</p> <p>CHAIR: And that is across the nation?</p> <p>Mr Archer: In this case, our costs showed that there are only two jurisdictions where you would need additional renewables to meet those targets. In some other jurisdictions, those projections that AEMO has developed showed that those targets will be met without any further policy action from the states and territories. Where it was clear that you would need additional renewable generation capacity built was in Victoria and Queensland.</p> <p>CHAIR: Is there a split-up of the \$41 billion between Queensland and Victoria?</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes, that is right.</p> <p>CHAIR: Can you tell you what it is?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I may have to take that on notice.</p>	October 2016	
191	2.1: ICCEID	Chair	Renewable Energy Target modelling	<p>CHAIR: When you see an article or report like that, is that something that you would check the veracity of and see how they arrived at their methodology?</p> <p>Mr Archer: We certainly do our best to understand the different analyses that the major analysts issue. We do not have our own internal modelling capacity to assess, in fine detail, every number that</p>	Pages 14–15 21 October 2016	SQ16-000742

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>is reported on. We engage consultants to do modelling for us for a range of different purposes, and generally we will have something that has been done reasonably recently that we can draw on to help us understand those numbers.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: We will come back with those numbers you asked for this morning. We have got them.</p> <p>CHAIR: That would be great. Thank you.</p>		
192	2.1: ICCEID	Waters	Carbon Emissions National Target	<p>Senator WATERS: Yes, I know. But you count the carbon emissions to our national targets. That is my question.</p> <p>Ms Wilson: We do, and that is through the national inventory.</p> <p>Mr Archer: I am not sure if you are focusing on the projections or on the—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Both. What effect does it have on the carryover and what effect does it have on the projections to 2020?</p> <p>Mr Archer: To provide detailed numbers, I think we would need to take that on notice.</p>	Pages 19-20 21 October 2016	SQ16-000545
193	2.1: ICCEID	Waters	Queensland Land Clearing	<p>Senator WATERS: Given the shortness of time, can you provide me on notice as much detail about your calculations of the current implications of land clearing in Queensland? Could you also answer my earlier question about the proportion of carryover that was attributed to Queensland's averted emissions from our then strong land clearing laws and whether that has any implications for our ability to legitimately carryover that and deduct it from our present 2020 calculations; and secondly, the proportion of our calculations to date and projected to 2020 as a result of that land clearing? So there are three things, but two and three were sort of related.</p> <p>Mr Archer: Yes, we can do that.</p>	Pages 20-21 21 October 2016	SQ16-000546
194	2.1: ICCEID	Waters	ARENA and CEFC Funding Announcement	<p>Senator WATERS... Dr de Brouwer, can you take on notice, if you cannot answer me directly, when this issue of the change of structure was first discussed with the department and whether the department provided any advice into the implications of changing the source funding and on the overall reduction of money to clean energy.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I will take that on notice.</p>	Page 22 21 October 2016	SQ16-000547
195	2.1: ICCEID	Waters	Phase 2 CSG Fugitive	<p>Senator WATERS: Have you provided suggestions on—</p> <p>Mr Archer: We have provided some comments, yes.</p>	Page 24 21	SQ16-000548

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Emissions Draft Report	<p>Senator WATERS: What is the nature of those comments?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I do not have those with me.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you provide those on notice?</p> <p>Mr Archer: We will see what we can provide on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: This has been about a year delay. What is the cause of that delay?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I am not sure that there is any specific reason or explanation for the delay. But I can take that on notice to see if there is anything in particular.</p>	October 2016	
196	2.1: ICCEID	Waters	CSG Fugitive Emissions Report Phases 1 and 2	<p>Senator WATERS: Do we know as yet a scope for the timing of phase 3?</p> <p>Mr Archer: All I really have is advice from overseas that this has happened. We can seek to provide further details to you on notice. I just do not have the details here with me.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: And there is no-one else with those details? Because I did talk to CSIRO about this and they think they have funding for phase 3, but they were not clear on what the scope was.</p> <p>Mr Archer: Unfortunately, my inventory expert has been participating in these meetings internationally and is not here as a result. The best I can do is really to undertake to come back to you on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I understand the IPCC things happen this week, but that should be independent of your consideration of the scope and timing of phase 3.</p> <p>Mr Archer: No final decisions have been made on phase 3. We are still completing phase 2.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Can you confirm for me that, with phase 1 done and phase 2 almost done, we still have not looked at fugitives from water gathering and treatment infrastructure or from decommissioned wells?</p> <p>Mr Archer: I would have to take that on notice to see exactly where we are up to on those issues.</p>	Page 24 21 October 2016	SQ16-000549
197	2.1: DERD	Chisholm	2017 Climate Policies Review	There is a great deal of confusion regarding the government's planned 2017 review of climate policies. What will the 2017 review of climate policy actually cover? For example: Will it cover economy wide	Written	SQ16-000474

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				abatement policy post 2020. Will it cover post 2020 national support for renewable energy?		
198	2.1: DERD	Chisholm	2017 Climate Policies Review – Terms of Reference	When will the terms of reference for this review be released and will there be a process for stakeholders to express their view on what the terms of reference should be?	Written	SQ16-000478
199	2.1: DERD	Chisholm	2017 Climate Policies Review – Public Consultation	Will this review involve public consultations and hearings?	Written	SQ16-000479
200	2.1: DERD	Chisholm	2017 Climate Policies Review	Is there anything at all that you can say about the 2017 review; bearing in mind this is what will apparently determine Australia's climate policy and our ability to meet emission reduction targets?	Written	SQ16-000480
201	2.1: DERD	Chisholm	Carbon Farming Initiative (CFI) methodology	Why does the Government continue to delay the release for public consultation of a draft Carbon Farming Initiative (CFI) methodology for plantations?	Written	SQ16-000481
202	2.1: DERD	Chisholm	Paris Agreement	What does the department understand 'Just Transition' as specified under the Paris agreement, to mean? Can you give examples of specific policies (whether here, abroad or hypothetical), that would come under the Just Transition banner?	Written	SQ16-000493
203	2.1: DERD	Chisholm	Paris Agreement – Policy Options	Is the department actively developing policy options to give effect to commitments under the Paris Agreement for a Just Transition?	Written	SQ16-000494
204	2.1: DERD	Rice	Aviation Emissions Framework	<p>Given the International Civil Aviation Organisation's recently agreed Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA), has the Department investigated any domestic aviation emissions pricing scheme?</p> <p>1) If yes, which of following carbon policies have been investigated?</p> <p>a) Carbon offsets</p> <p>b) Emissions trading</p> <p>c) Carbon tax</p> <p>d) Has the outcomes of these investigations been discussed with the Minister?</p> <p>e) Did any official internal reports or documents result from this investigation?</p>	Written	SQ16-000598

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>f) Are these reports or documents able to be made available to the Senate?</p> <p>2) If no, are there any plans by the Department to investigate domestic aviation carbon pricing tools given our post 2021 international aviation offset responsibilities under ICAO?</p> <p>3) In the Department's view, would a failure to price domestic aviation emissions after the beginning of CORSIA lead to any market inefficiencies, including potential price incentives for travellers to change between domestic and international routes despite higher total costs and higher carbon emissions?</p>		
205	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Advice on noise impact provided to the Independent Scientific Committee	Referring to QON 9, dated 5 May 2016 which asked about the increase in noise impact from an increase in wind turbine size and referred to the Moller and Pederson study, the answer given referred to both preliminary advice and subsequent advice provided by the Independent Scientific Committee. Will you please provide a copy of the advice to the Committee?	Written	SQ16-000578
206	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Wind Farm records review	From the complaints you have received about currently operating wind farms, and your consequent visits to those wind farms, have you asked to review the maintenance and/ or operational records of the wind farms?	Written	SQ16-000579
207	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Independent Wind Farm experts	In dealing with complaints have you consulted with independent experts in the resolution of these complaints? Which experts have been used?	Written	SQ16-000580
208	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Industry Stakeholders – Meeting times	What involvement, including personal time and time with your personnel, have industry stakeholders had with your office since you were appointed as Commissioner? Please include dates and times.	Written	SQ16-000581
209	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Proportion of time spent with various stakeholders	What proportion of your professional time has been spent with wind farm developers, host landholders, industry representatives and state planning officials?	Written	SQ16-000582
210	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm	Back	Finalised complaints	You stated that 23 cases from operating wind farms have been closed. How many of these complaints have had satisfactory outcomes for the complainants?	Written	SQ16-000583

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
	Commissioner					
211	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Unresolved complaints due to resources	Are there any cases that you have closed as you do not have sufficient powers or resources to resolve these complaints? Would you please elaborate further on these outcomes?	Written	SQ16-000584
212	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Resolved complaints without resolution	How many complaints have been closed via a letter from your office without resolution of the excessive noise issues?	Written	SQ16-000585
213	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Accountability and quality assurance measures	What are the accountability and quality assurance measures that you have in place?	Written	SQ16-000586
214	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Meeting with residents	You state that you have visited wind farms and wind farm communities in Victoria including Cape Bridgewater, Macarthur, Waubra, Hepburn, Bald Hills and the proposed Moorabool wind farm, and in NSW Gullen Range, Gunning, Cullerin Range and the proposed wind farms at Collector and Jupiter. How many times did you meet with the residents who had complaints about each of the wind farms in each area?	Written	SQ16-000587
215	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Onsite visits to host landholders	What proportion of host landholders did you visit onsite? Were any of these visits in the company of the Wind Farm developer?	Written	SQ16-000588
216	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Operational Data	When you visited each of the wind farms were the turbines in full operation at that point in time and have you compared the operational data during your visit against normal daily operational/generation data?	Written	SQ16-000589
217	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Input to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment's Draft Wind Energy Planning Framework	Your input was referred to in the NSW Department of Planning and Environment's Draft Wind Energy Planning Framework. Will you please outline the extent of your input and level of involvement in the writing of the draft policy framework?	Written	SQ16-000590

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
218	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Consultation with independent noise experts	In contributing to the draft framework, did you consult with independent noise experts? Which experts have been used? Will you please provide a copy of all advice that you have received to the Committee?	Written	SQ16-000591
219	2.1: ICCEID - National Wind Farm Commissioner	Back	Criticisms of the Noise Assessment Bulletin	<p>Are you aware of a number of criticisms of the Noise Assessment Bulletin (Draft Wind Energy Planning Framework)? Namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The draft noise guideline will not protect the health and well-being of the people neighbouring the developments. Current wind turbine noise guidelines are not protecting 90% of the people 90% of the time. 2) The guideline only measures audible noise and does not include an acceptable measurement of low frequency noise, infrasound and vibration all of which are known to cause harm to health in neighbouring residents. 3) The guideline does not incorporate the important findings of the world first pilot study undertaken by accomplished acoustician, Mr Steven Cooper, on behalf of the developer, Pacific Hydro that has found that wind turbine noise has a unique sound signature which contains characteristics that have known adverse effects on human health. 4) The wording of the bulletin misrepresents the findings of the NHMRC's literature review. 5) The methodology to measure wind turbine noise and vibration is flawed. The only recourse for affected people will be through taking actions against the host landowner or through civil disobedience to stop the source of the disturbance/nuisance. <p>Please provide comment on each of these problems with the draft bulletin.</p>	Written	SQ16-000592
220	2.1: ICCEID	Chisholm	Land Sector Emissions	Have emissions from the land sector increased or decreased over the last three years?	Written	SQ16-000371
221	2.1: ICCEID	Chisholm	Ratification of the Paris Agreement	When will the Government ratify the Paris Agreement? Has there been a delay in ratification or the JSCOT inquiry process and if so, why?	Written	SQ16-000492
222	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Renewable Energy Produced	Isn't it the case that not all renewable energy produced by Hydro and the Snowy Mountain hydro is counted in the national RET.	Written	SQ16-000482

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			by the Hydro and Snowy Mountain Hydro			
223	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Renewable Energy Produced by Tasmania and Snowy Mountain Hydro	How much renewable energy from Tasmania and the Snowy Mountain Hydro Scheme is disqualified from the National RET? a) and if it were included what would the real RET be?	Written	SQ16-000483
224	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Tasmania – 100% renewable	Isn't it the case that Australia could be like Tasmania and become 100% renewable? a) and it would stop the world's climate from changing?	Written	SQ16-000484
225	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Pensioner Power Costs	On average, isn't it the case that the average aged pensioner is paying at least 4% extra on their power bills because of our RET?	Written	SQ16-000485
226	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Renewable Energy Cost Effectiveness	Which renewable energy is the most reliable, cheapest and cost effective out of large scale wind, solar and hydro?	Written	SQ16-000487
227	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Baseload Delivery Costs of Large Scale Wind	How much would it cost in cents per kilowatt per hour, to deliver baseload power from large scale wind? a) Would it be more than 30 cents per kilowatt per hour?	Written	SQ16-000488
228	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Hydro Renewable Investment	Do you agree that investment in hydro renewable delivers energy, water and food security when the same investment in wind delivers expensive and unreliable energy?	Written	SQ16-000489
229	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Large Scale Wind Generators	Do you believe that building large scale wind generators in Australia will really stop global climate change?	Written	SQ16-000490
230	2.1: ICCEID	Lambie	Overseas Ownership of Wind Production	What percentage of Australian wind production is owned by Chinese investment?	Written	SQ16-000491
231	2.2: DERD	Chisholm	The National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility	What are the priorities of the Facility?	Written	SQ16-000500
232	2.2: DERD	Chisholm	Climate Change Adaptation – Long Term Planning	Is Australia already adapting to climate change, or is your work about long term planning to adapt as the effects of climate change become worse?	Written	SQ16-000501

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
233	2.2: DERD	Chisholm	Climate Change Adaptation	Is there more work adaptation work to be done?	Written	SQ16-000502
234	2.2: DERD	Chisholm	Climate Change Adaptation Consequences	What are the consequences of not doing this adaptation work?	Written	SQ16-000503
235	2.2: DERD	Chisholm	The National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility	It's my understanding that funding for the The National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility ends next year, is that correct?	Written	SQ16-000504
236	2.2: DERD	Chisholm	The National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility - Funding	What funding is available for the Facility in the future?	Written	SQ16-000505
237	2.2: DERD	Chisholm	The National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility – Funding Impacts	Has uncertainty in funding impacted staffing levels?	Written	SQ16-000506
238	2.2: DERD	Urquhart	Ocean Pressures	Is the pressure on our oceans increasing or decreasing? Is ocean acidification a concern? Is climate change a concern?	Written	SQ16-000735
239	3.1: AAD	Whish- Wilson	Breakdown of the spend on the new icebreaker	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: In terms of the \$2.2 billion spend on the icebreaker, could you break that down into maintenance costs and fuel costs or what you are estimating, as a rough break-up, or could you take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Clark: I might ask Mr Bryson to go through some of those details, to a point, and then perhaps the remainder we could take on notice.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: The total cost being apportioned is \$1.9 billion for the icebreaker. That includes an up-front construction cost. That includes all the capital costs, project management and everything out of \$529 million. The remainder is used for the 30-year life of the vessel, which pays for 200 days a year of operation, including all maintenance and</p>	Page 49 17 October 2016	SQ16-000531

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>everything that goes with the ship for the 30 years.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Out of the \$1.9 billion, if we take away the \$529 million, we get a rough estimate of what you are budgeting for the next 30 years.</p> <p>Mr Bryson: That is correct.</p>		
240	3.1: AAD	Duniam	Seasonal Employee Numbers	<p>Senator DUNIAM: A little earlier on I did ask a couple questions with regard to the number of seasonal employees attached to the Antarctic program—specifically how many there are, what they are doing, where they are drawn from and where they are based. If that needs to be taken on notice, that is fine.</p> <p>Mr Clark: I can provide a broad overview—</p> <p>Senator DUNIAM: A broad overview is fine.</p> <p>Mr Clark: and perhaps take some of the detail on notice. To clarify: expeditioners, as you characterise them, are people who travel south with the Australian Antarctic program to Antarctica or the sub-Antarctic. Typically we take about 500 people to the continent and sub-Antarctic to participate in the program each year. Within that, obviously the staff of the AAD are a major component of that, and the staffing number within the Australian Antarctic Division ASL this year, as outlined in the PDS, is 380. That is the same as last year. To go back to the broader question of expeditioners and where they come from: it is probably important to point out that, although the majority of them are AAD staff, we also have staff from the Bureau of Meteorology and other government agencies such as Geoscience Australia, ARPANSA, as we talked about before, and the Department of Defence. This year will see personnel from the Army, Navy and Air Force participate in the Australian Antarctic program. Obviously in the summer period and latter part of the summer in particular the numbers within the program increase as they arrive in Hobart and undertake their training. Then, over the winter period, they decrease. On the station at the moment we have about 70 personnel across all of the stations. Once the first ship arrives and the first planes arrive for the season, those numbers will increase.</p> <p>Senator DUNIAM: Sure. Any detail you are able to provide about</p>	Page 53 17 October 2016	SQ16-000508

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				the roles they perform and where they are based I would appreciate if you could take on notice.		
241	3.1: AAD	McKim	Macquarie Island Station	What are estimated costs for clean-up and rehabilitation of the Macquarie Island Station site, and how were these costs used in the Australian Antarctic Division's initial decision to shut down the main station and switch to field camp based operations?	Written	SQ16-000692
242	4.1: Science	Waters	CSIRO Reports - Peer Review	<p>Senator WATERS: Is the feedback from those peer reviewers available, or can you make it available?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: I do not think it would be possible to make that available at this point, short of the reports themselves being made publicly available. The content that they cover covers the content of the report, so I do not think that would make sense.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Will you be releasing those peer reviewed comments after you have published, finally, the actual review?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: We will take that on notice. We have not given consideration to that yet.</p>	Page 28 21 October 2016	SQ16-000551
243	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Waters	Article 3.2	<p>Senator WATERS: ... I will ask about that article 3.2 process: who initiated that particular process? Was it the Victorian government? Was it the feds? Was it a community group? Was it the convention secretariat?</p> <p>Mr Papps: In terms of the formal process, it is the Victorian government through its agencies. Without going into excessive detail, the principal responsibilities around management and what flows from the management of the Ramsar site sit with the management agency and the government of the management agency. That is in nearly all cases.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Is that Parks Victoria or is that DELWP?</p> <p>Mr Papps: It is a combination of both of those. Parks Victoria manages most of the site, but it sits within a Victorian government framework with the broader department who also have broader Ramsar responsibilities themselves.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: The short version of that is: the Victorian government alerted the Ramsar secretariat and this article 3.2 process began. Is that right?</p> <p>Mr Papps: They work through the Australian government, because it</p>	Page 35 21 October 2016	SQ16-000553

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>is the Australian— Senator WATERS: Of course, the state party had made the representation. Mr Papps: It is the state party, that is right. Senator WATERS: When did that happen? How long has that been on foot for? Mr Papps: I would have to take that on notice because I do not have the exact date.</p>		
244	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Waters	Moreton Bay Ramsar Site Inspection	<p>Senator WATERS: So it might involve a site inspection. Is there anything you are able to give me at this quite early stage in the process about the input you have had on this substance, on the potential impact on Ramsar of the massive expansion at Toondah Harbour? Mr Papps: It has been very general advice because, as my colleague indicated, it is very early in the process. No decisions have been made, and there are discussions about the very nature of the proposal. It has been broad generic serve advice around the convention and adjustments to boundaries and the nature of development within Ramsar sites. Senator WATERS: Is that something that you would be able to provide to us? Mr Knudson: If we get to the point where we have made either a controlled action decision or not attempt a decision there will be an explanation of the basis for that decision at that time. Senator WATERS: I understand. Does that mean you are able to provide the structural advice about boundary redefinitions to us? Or was that a no? Mr Papps: We would be following the process that Mr Knudsen has outlined. There is generic information available through the convention around this that is in the public domain. We would be able to provide that.</p>	Pages 36-37 21 October 2016	SQ16-000554
245	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental	Rice	Ecological thinning trial in Barmah-Millewa forest	Will the ecological thinning trial in Barmah-Millewa forest continue into 2017?	Written	SQ16-000599

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
	Water Office (CEWO)					
246	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Rice	Barmah-Millewa forest – Impacts	What monitoring of impacts to endangered species is currently being done in the Barmah-Millewa forest?	Written	SQ16-000601
247	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Rice	Ramsar responsibilities	Could the department please outline how it is meeting its' Ramsar responsibilities by carrying out ecological thinning programs?	Written	SQ16-000602
248	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Urquhart	Murray-Darling Basin Plan - Funding	How much funding is allocated for implementation of the Basin Plan for future years? How long has this been known?	Written	SQ16-000718
249	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Urquhart	Murray-Darling Basin Plan - Funding	Are you expecting an announcement in MYEFO? So you have known that you require more funding for a number of years but the announcement will be made 6 months / 1 year before your funding ends?	Written	SQ16-000719
250	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Urquhart	Murray-Darling Basin Plan - Funding	When was the last budget allocation made? Why did the government not make a funding commitment earlier?	Written	SQ16-000720
251	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Urquhart	Murray-Darling Basin Plan - Funding	Is demand for implementation of the Basin Plan increasing or decreasing?	Written	SQ16-000721

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
	Environmental Water Office (CEWO)					
252	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Urquhart	Murray-Darling Basin Plan - Funding	Does this change in light of the proposed Water Act (SDL Adjustment) Bill that is currently being considered in Parliament? Will the department be assisting the MDBA on assessing projects? Will these cuts impact on water management actions and planning in any way? What projects or programs will be cut?	Written	SQ16-000722
253	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Urquhart	Murray-Darling Basin Plan - Funding	How is budget uncertainty affecting your organisation? Are you employing more staff? On an ongoing basis?	Written	SQ16-000723
254	4.2: Commonwealth Environmental Water Office (CEWO)	Urquhart	Cold Water Pollution	How does CEWH manage for cold water pollution and what should be done about it?	Written	SQ16-000725
255	5.1: Energy	Waters	AEMO Investment Opportunities	Senator WATERS: Just to pick up on the excellent questions already asked, whether it is ES00 or NTNDP, you were talking about investment opportunities that were specified by AEMO in either one of those documents. Does that include a consideration of proposals in either the CEFC or ARENA pipelines? Mr Heferen: I do not know. I will have to take that on notice. Senator WATERS: We were not able to bring AEMO before us, unfortunately, at these estimates, although I think we are going to try to rectify that for next time. So, if you could take that on notice, that would be great. Mr Heferen: I will take that on notice.	Page 10 21 October 2016	SQ16-000539
256	5.1: Energy Security Office	Waters	Biofuel Production in Australia	Senator WATERS: Could you provide some more detail on notice about the scope of how you are looking at meeting the 90-day requirement? And what proportion of that might be from biofuels?	Page 13 21 October	SQ16-000542

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Ms Sewell: I can tell you at the moment that biofuels comprise about two percent of our transport fuel in Australia, and, basically, the work of the office is not looking at anything to support or further expand the biofuels or ethanol sector in Australia.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Why not?</p> <p>Ms Sewell: We are at the other end of it in terms of ensuring we understand how much biofuel is produced, but we are not the area that would be looking at any support mechanisms.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Even though that is an energy security issue about fuel supply?</p> <p>Ms Sewell: It is an energy security issue insofar as domestic production means we do not need to import, but we do already, for example, import quite large quantities of biodiesel, so there is a trade-off between biofuels that might be produced in Australia and existing imports and how they would replace petroleum products.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I see. And imports do not count for a 90-day target—okay. Clearly, it is a new area for me. I would like to learn a bit more, so please send me anything you think would be useful.</p> <p>Ms Sewell: Certainly.</p>	2016	
257	5.1: Energy	Chisholm	Multiple Power Lines Loss	If the loss of multiple power lines causes a blackout, does the type of energy generation have any impact?	Written	SQ16-000511
258	5.1: Energy	Chisholm	South Australia - Electricity Blackout	The Prime Minister, Energy Minister and Deputy Prime Minister all made comments linking the blackout to South Australia's use of renewable energy, in particular the intermittancy of some renewable generation. Is there any evidence to support their claims?	Written	SQ16-000512
259	5.1: Energy	Chisholm	National Energy Market (NEM)	There have been many calls for reforming the National Energy Market (NEM)? What are the main challenges facing the NEM?	Written	SQ16-000513
260	5.1: Energy	Chisholm	National Energy Productivity Target (NEPT)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Government has set a National Energy Productivity Target of 40 per cent between now and 2030. This falls very short of doubling energy productivity which is fully supported by key business peak bodies such as the BCA, ACCI and AIG. What specific measures are being implemented to meet this target? 2. Are there any plans to increase to a more meaningful, effective target? 	Written	SQ16-000514

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
261	5.1: Energy	Chisholm	Government Buildings Energy Efficiency	Can you please outline what is being done to improve energy efficiency of Government buildings?	Written	SQ16-000516
262	5.1: Energy	Lambie	Household Electricity Costs	How much extra cost is added to the electricity bill of an Australian household because they are subsidising wind energy? a) A library study shows at least 4% is added onto everyone's account because of large scale wind and solar.	Written	SQ16-000486
263	5.1: Energy	Lambie	Australian Electricity Costs	Isn't it the case that the average cost of Australian Electricity is some of the highest in the OECD?	Written	SQ16-000509
264	5.1: Energy Security Office	Chisholm	South Australia - Electricity Blackout	The day after the severe storm that hit South Australia on 28 September and lead to a state wide blackout, AEMO released a statement that said 'the root cause of the event is likely to be the multiple loss of 275 kilovolt (kV) power lines'. Has this view changed over the last couple of weeks?	Written	SQ16-000510
265	Corporate: CSD	Waters	Efficiency Dividends	Dr de Brouwer: ... We cannot go back from a variable that is affected by three or four things and identify what the impact of the efficiency dividend itself is on the final number. The efficiency dividend is one aspect of why our numbers have come down, but it is hard to identify precisely what the numerical effect of that is. Senator WATERS: Has it been similarly hard in previous years? Dr de Brouwer: Yes. We have had the same response. Senator WATERS: Could you get me as much detail as you can in writing on notice as to the impact of the efficiency dividend and those other three factors which you say play into the situation.	Page 5 17 October 2016	SQ16-000418
266	Corporate: CSD	Waters	Updated projections of notional staff levels	Senator WATERS: On notice, could you please give an updated projection of notional staffing levels for the coming four years. If you have that to hand that would be great; otherwise on notice. Dr de Brouwer: We will see what we can come up with.	Page 6 17 October 2016	SQ16-000397
267	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Environment Programs Funding Allocation	Senator URQUHART: Can you tell me how much funding is allocated to the environment programs by the government? Mr Thompson: In 2016-17 we have an administered funding allocation of \$453.914 million. Departmental funding in 2016-17 is \$380.8 million. Dr de Brouwer: That is the departmental administered and the environment and energy department's departmental expenses. There is	Page 6 17 October 2016	SQ16-000398

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>also a range of funding through portfolio agencies. So that does not include, for example, the Emissions Reduction Fund run through the Clean Energy Regulator. It does not include the operations of the Bureau of Meteorology.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So that is what is allocated to environment programs?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: That is right.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you get us a breakdown of all those with the additional ones that you have just raised?</p> <p>Mr Thompson: We will get that on notice.</p>		
268	Corporate: CSD	Waters	Meeting with CEO Queensland Resources Council CEO	<p>Senator WATERS: I am interested in whether the minister or anyone from the department has met with former minister Ian Macfarlane in his new capacity as the Queensland Resources Council CEO.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: I would have to take that on notice. I am not aware of Minister Frydenberg's meetings.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Have any of the departmental staff met with former minister Ian Macfarlane?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Not that I am aware of.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you take that on notice as well.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: Yes. I think the answer is no, but I will come back and confirm if it is not.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. The same question, around when the minister was Mr Hunt: are you aware whether there were any meetings between Minister Hunt and the then head of the QRC? I think it was Michael Roche at the time.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: We do not have access to the minister's diary notes.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We can take that on notice and see if there is any information that can be provided in that regard.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you—and, likewise, if the department can check whether any of the departmental staff met with Mr Roche or accompanied the minister on any of the meetings that may or may not have happened at that level.</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: What normally happens in Queensland, especially around the reef, is that there are very wide-ranging stakeholder</p>	Page 10 17 October 2016	SQ16-000424

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>meetings. They involve, basically, business from all different businesses as well as community and environmental groups. It would be unsurprising if Mr Roche or the Queensland Resources Council were involved in those meetings, because that is a normal part of consultation. It is very broadly based across all of the interests in Queensland.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I, too, would find it unusual if they had not met, but I am keen to check the record. Are you aware whether there have been any either ministerial or departmental meetings with the head of APIA, who, of course, is former resources minister Martin Ferguson?</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: Mr Ferguson may be the chair of APIA. Again, I would have thought the same answers can hold—we can take it on notice in terms of checking, but I would have thought it fairly normal practice that APIA, whether at the chair or the chief executive level, would have engaged in some form of consultations with Mr Frydenberg, Minister Hunt or the department at some stage over recent years.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: If you could get me some dates on which those meetings would have occurred that would be very helpful.</p> <p>Senator Birmingham: We will do what is possible.</p>		
269	Corporate: CSD	Gallacher	Credit and Transaction Cards - Usage	What types of credit and transaction cards (including Cabcharge Fastcard and eTickets) does your department issue?	Written	SQ16-000520
270	Corporate: CSD	Gallacher	Credit and Transaction Cards – Total Expenditure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the total expenditure for each type of card over the last 3 financial years? 2. Can you break down the expenditure into categories 	Written	SQ16-000521
271	Corporate: CSD	Gallacher	Credit and Transaction Cards – Credit Limits	What is the highest and lowest credit limit for each type of card?	Written	SQ16-000522
272	Corporate: CSD	Gallacher	Credit and Transaction Cards – Credit Limits Review	How many times in the last 5 years has the credit limit been reviewed?	Written	SQ16-000523

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
273	Corporate: CSD	Gallacher	Credit Card - Usage	What are Credit Cards used for?	Written	SQ16-000524
274	Corporate: CSD	Gallacher	Credit Card – Governance / Probity Rules	What are the Governance/probity rules for employees to follow?	Written	SQ16-000525
275	Corporate: CSD	Gallacher	Credit Card – Cash Advances	Are cash advances allowed? a) Can you list the total amount of cash advances from credit and other transaction cards over the last 3 years? b) Can you provide details on the 10 largest cash advances in your department and provide particulars such as how much was accessed? c) Who approves cash advances in your department in the event of paying suppliers	Written	SQ16-000526
276	Corporate: CSD	Gallacher	Credit Card – Review of Transactions	Who reviews transactions in regards to all cards?	Written	SQ16-000527
277	Corporate: CSD	McAllister	Breakdown of Staffing Figures	Please provide a breakdown of staffing levels as at 30 June 2016, nationally and for each state and territory, by the following categories: a) Full time equivalent (FTE); b) Head count; c) Gender; d) Ongoing; e) non-ongoing; and f) classification level.	Written	SQ16-000675
278	Corporate: CSD	McAllister	Staffing Engagements	How many engagements occurred in the 2015-16 financial year, by: a) Classification; b) State or territory; c) Ongoing staff; and d) Non-ongoing staff.	Written	SQ16-000678

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
279	Corporate: CSD	McAllister	Staffing Separations	How many separations occurred in the 2015-16 financial year, by: a) Classification; b) State or territory; c) Ongoing staff; d) Non-ongoing staff; and e) Reason for separation.	Written	SQ16-000679
280	Corporate: CSD	McAllister	Expenditure on Contractors and Consultants	What was the total expenditure on contractors and consultants in the 2015-16 financial year.	Written	SQ16-000681
281	Corporate: CSD	McAllister	Contractors and Consultants	For each contract or consultancy in the 2015-16 financial year, please outline: a) The project or engagement; b) The value of the contract; c) The name of each firm or contractor engaged; and d) The purpose of the contract. e) Total payments made to each contractor or consultant.	Written	SQ16-000683
282	Corporate: CSD	McAllister	Labour Hire Agreements	For the 2015-16 financial year, please outline: a) How many staff were employed through labour hire arrangements; b) Total expenditure on labour hire staff; c) The contractors or labour hire firms engaged to supply these staff; d) Total payments to each of the organisations that provided staff through either a labour hire arrangement or other contractual arrangement; and e) The nature of the work performed by labour hire staff.	Written	SQ16-000689
283	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Total Program Funding	Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it: a) The total funding allocated for each in 2016-17, 2015-16 and 2014-15;	Written	SQ16-000400
284	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Organisations	Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it a) The number of organisations funded under the program in each in	Written	SQ16-000403

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
			Funded	those years, the name of each organisation funded and the dollar value of that funding		
285	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Program Services	Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it a) The number of individuals projected to be serviced or services to be delivered through each in 2016-17, 2015-16 and 2014-15;	Written	SQ16-000404
286	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Total Program Funding	Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it a) The total funding actually expended on each in 2015-16 and 2014-15;	Written	SQ16-000406
287	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Program Services	Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it a) The number of individuals actually serviced or services actually delivered through each in 2015-16 and 2014-15;	Written	SQ16-000408
288	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Aggregate Staff Budget	Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it a) The aggregate staff budget for each in 2016-17, 2015-16 and 2014-15 broken down by i) permanent APS staff and ii) contractors.	Written	SQ16-000410
289	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Staffing Breakdown	Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it a) The number of permanent APS staff responsible for delivering each in 2016-17; 2015-16 and 2014-15, the classification of these staff and their geographic location;	Written	SQ16-000411
290	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Cost of External Advice	Every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it a) The dollar value of external advice contracted to support each in 2016-17, as well as the number of contractors engaged, the APS-equivalent classification these contractors were engaged at and their geographic location.	Written	SQ16-000412
291	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio External Advisers Evaluation Reports	For every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it: a) Copies of any evaluation reports or program analysis prepared by external advisers in the last five years;	Written	SQ16-000414

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
292	Corporate: CSD	Urquhart	Departmental / Portfolio Departmental Evaluation Reports	For every program administered by the department and all portfolio agencies within it: a) Copies of any evaluation reports or program analysis prepared within the department in the last five years.	Written	SQ16-000416
293	Corporate: PAAI	Gallacher	Probity Governance and Fraud Control Reporting	Who provides assurance to the Minister in respect to probity governance and fraud control?	Written	SQ16-000528
294	Corporate: PAAI	McKim	Register of Environmental Organisations	What is the current status of plans to abolish the Register of Environmental Organisations (which would effectively remove tax deductibility for donations to environmental organisations)?	Written	SQ16-000693
295	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Urquhart	ARENA 2015-16 Spending	Senator URQUHART: Are you able to provide us with the final details of how much was spent by ARENA last financial year and on how many projects? Mr Kay: Yes. The spend in cash terms last year was \$130 million, and ARENA has commitments to projects from historic years. I can take on notice the actual amount of commitment that we made in the year, which will be different to the spend.	Page 67 17 October 2016	SQ16-000368
296	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Lambie	ARENA Breakdown of Projects	Mr Frischknect: ARENA has had great success in terminating projects that it inherited that were not proceeding according to plan—they were not succeeding in some way. ARENA was started in 2012. At the beginning, we inherited more than \$1 billion worth of commitments from nine separate Commonwealth programs. Some of the projects within those programs had been around for a long time, and many were not performing or going anywhere at all. We stopped those and we have actually recouped more than \$800 million in the process, which we have then recommitted into new projects. More recently, we have had a number of projects that have, for one reason or another, completed early, so we have terminated them for that reason—successfully. Some of them are research initiatives looking at	Page 70 17 October 2016	SQ16-000372

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>a particular avenue of research. If that is not panning out, we stop it before we spend all the money. Occasionally things do not go quite as planned and they stop midway for one reason or another.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Do you think I would be able to get a list or a break down of what you have just described there? A list of who has been successful, who has not finished the project—all of what you just mentioned there. Would I be able to get a list of the names of those companies?</p> <p>Mr Frischknect: Yes. It is not a very long list in terms of the ones that have started and not completed. The much longer list is of the ones that never really got going, but that, nevertheless, had a commitment of Commonwealth funding which has sat there for years, potentially.</p> <p>Senator LAMBIE: Okay, could I have a list of that. ...</p>		
297	Australian Renewable Energy Agency (ARENA)	Back	ARENA Employee Status	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will you please confirm whether ARENA has employed a Mr Ketan Yoshi, who was formerly employed by Infigen Energy? 2. Is ARENA aware that the above named person has repeatedly attacked reputable persons who have advocated for the Government's research into the health impact of wind turbines, including myself and other Committee members, on his twitter account prior to being employed by ARENA and then has continued to do so since becoming employed as a public servant? 3. If so, does ARENA consider this acceptable behaviour for him and your other staff? 4. If not what action has been taken or will be taken? 	Written	SQ16-000556
298	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Moore	BoM App	<p>Senator MOORE: For the people who get onto the app, do you have any idea about where they come from across the country? I am just always fascinated to see whether people in Western Australia will use a service like that more than people in Queensland. And I do not know whether there is a way of doing that.</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I cannot be certain whether we can track down to a particular geographic location. But, certainly, all of our media services have a capacity to look for trends in terms of where those sources are coming from. It helps us target more effectively and efficiently how we can deliver our services. But I do not have, on the</p>	Page 14 17 October 2016	SQ16-000532

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>top of my mind— Senator MOORE: Could I just put that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Webb: I am not sure what is not covered, to be honest. We do find the uptake in the app in those places where the weather is either severe or changing a lot.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: So Queensland?</p> <p>Mr Webb: Melbourne punches above its weight. Queensland, as well, punches above its weight. The rate of uptake depends on the time of year, as well. It would be interesting to see through the summer months just how busy it gets.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Can I put on notice: while not breaching privacy or anything like that, I am interested to see how you can get that data. I will just put that on notice.</p>		
299	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Chisholm	BoM Cyberattacks	<p>Senator CHISHOLM: Just in relation to the recent media reports on the cyberattacks on the bureau, how did you discover that the bureau's computers had been compromised?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Again, I think this is a matter of public record, but I just reaffirm for this committee that we work closely with the Australian Signals Directorate and other agencies across government. We were alerted to the incursion into the bureau's systems by ASD, and so that is the history of the incursion that has been reported in the media.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Is there any knowledge of what information was accessed?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: Again, I really do not want to go into too much detail other than what has been published publicly in the Australian Cyber Security Centre's report. I do not think it would be appropriate to do that here. What I can say is that, to the best of our knowledge, no personal information or sensitive data in our database has been accessed, but I stress that is to the best of my knowledge.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: In terms of the use of contractors, were these approved by the Australian Signals Directorate?</p>	Page 22 17 October 2016	SQ16-000378

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Dr Johnson: We engage with contractors in a whole range of activities in the bureau. Is there a specific issue with contractors you wanted to understand?</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: I suppose: has it led to a change in process around what contractors are used to ensure that they meet clearance?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: The bureau has very stringent standards in terms of its use of external labour and external technology. I would have to take that question on notice, but again I would be very surprised if that were the case. I think the standards that we have—the very high levels of security and risk assessment that the organisation has—would just continue to be enhanced, and that would include the way in which we engage with contractors.</p> <p>Senator CHISHOLM: Thanks.</p>		
300	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Lines	WA Wheatbelt BoM Coverage	<p>Dr Johnson: Possibly there is, based on this feedback, but, as I said in my previous response, we are working closely with the Western Australian government. We have entered into an agreement with the Western Australian department of agriculture to install and maintain three digital Doppler radars in the Wheatbelt. The sites where they will be located will be Watheroo in the northern Wheatbelt, South Doodlakine in the central Wheatbelt and at Newdegate in the southern Wheatbelt. Those are all at different phases of their evolution. The Watheroo site is currently in its design phase. We hope that that will be operational by April 2017. At the South Doodlakine site construction works are underway.</p> <p>Senator LINES: When will that one be operational?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: We are expecting that to be operational by December this year. At Newdegate site works are complete and my understanding is that the radar is operational at the moment, or if it is not fully operational it is certainly going through operational testing and will be online in the next few weeks.</p> <p>Senator LINES: What additional reach will those three sites give?</p> <p>Dr Johnson: I do not have the map right in front of me, but we are well aware of the gap that you have identified. I do not have the statistics in front of me as to what the maximum aerial extent of that new coverage will be.</p>	Pages 22-23 17 October 2016	SQ16-000379

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Senator LINES: Can you get them? Dr Johnson: We can certainly get that on notice, if that is your interest. ...</p>		
301	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Lines	Agreement with DAFWA	<p>Senator LINES: You said that you had an agreement with DAFWA. Is that agreement able to be tabled? Dr Johnson: I would hav`e to take that on notice. I do not know what the answer to that is. Senator LINES: Take on notice whether it can be tabled. Dr Johnson: I defer to others at this table, ...</p>	Page 24 17 October 2016	SQ16-000380
302	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Whish- Wilson	Tasmanian Rainfall	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Can you confirm whether it is official now that Tasmania has had its wettest year on record? I know it was very close when I last checked. Dr Johnson: I am not sure about Tasmania, but I know that in southern Australia it is certainly the wettest period from May to October that we have had on record. That obviously includes a number of the southern states. If it is of particular interest we are happy to take it on notice with respect to Tasmania, but certainly in South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania and southern New South Wales it is the wettest.</p>	Page 25 17 October 2016	SQ16-000385
303	Bureau of Meteorology (BoM)	Rhiannon	Weather radar for western NSW	<p>The Orana Regional Organisation of Councils (OROC) has unsuccessfully applied for a weather radar for western NSW a number of times, with a 2013 OROC report detailing the cost of having no weather radar in the region specifically covering the region west of Dubbo.</p> <p>Given the importance of accurate weather data to rural enterprises, and given the challenges posed by changing weather systems caused by climate change:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What are the specific reasons for not yet funding this important piece of agricultural infrastructure? What are the plans to ensure full weather radar coverage in the Central West of NSW? Has the department yet provided detailed feedback to OROC on its submission and why the proposal has not been successful yet? If not, why not? 	Written	SQ16-000738

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				d) What are the processes that would allow the OROC to be involved in the forward planning for the siting of a weather radar to provide full coverage of the region?		
304	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Moore	CEFC Total Commitments	<p>Mr Yates: ... Last year the total commitments of the CEFC were approximately \$837 million worth of commitments. That takes our current portfolio of commitments to around \$1.7 billion. That is the current commitment of total projects that we have. As I said, last year was \$837 million of additional commitments.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Can you give me how many projects that \$837 million was for?</p> <p>Mr Yates: I do not know the exact number for this year's projects, but in total we have done 60 transactions overall, and through our co-financing arrangements around 500 companies in Australia have benefited from it.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: So that would be 60 projects for the \$1.7 billion.</p> <p>Mr Yates: In total, that would include some that have actually repaid over that period. I can come back to you if you specifically want to know.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: That would be useful to know.</p>	Page 54 17 October 2016	SQ16-000386
305	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Moore	CEFC / ARENA relationship	<p>Mr Yates: ... We have a joint team. We have a joint pipeline. We have an investment committee, which is specialised in relation to the innovation fund, and that investment committee sits with representatives of ARENA and representatives of the CEFC to assess transactions and then put them up to the CEFC board, ultimately, for approval.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Is it possible to get some kind of graphic that shows how this operates?</p> <p>Mr Yates: Yes, we would be delighted to provide that.</p>	Page 56 17 October 2016	SQ16-000387
306	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Moore	CEFC Funding	<p>Senator MOORE: ... Was the CEFC consulted prior to the government's decision to transfer \$800 million from the fund following the agreement between Labor and the government on the omnibus bill?</p> <p>Mr Yates: From our perspective I cannot say, to be honest. From our own side, we were operating this jointly anyway. The money did not leave or come from the CEFC, it was just an allocation of the existing</p>	Page 57 17 October 2016	SQ16-000388

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>CEFC money as a recognition that we could do higher-risk activity—that there was an expectation of a high-risk position.</p> <p>I do not know whether the department has any particular view, but, certainly from my own recollection, I am not sure whether it was an area of significant concern to me, or an area of significant negotiation. We actually think that the strategy makes sense. It currently fits within the CEFC portfolio, and the extent to which we can work together and leverage ARENA's skills. And then from my perspective, whether it is \$200 million or \$800 million does not make any difference. It is very hard to deploy money sensibly, and if we need more then we will come around to the government and say, 'Well, we've done this with the \$200 million. This is how we've invested it. Do you think we should change that allocation? Would you like to make a higher allocation?' But at this stage we are only just starting.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: I know there has been a lot of discussion about the definition of consultation, and that will continue to happen. I just want to know whether you knew before it actually happened that there was going to be this transfer of \$800 million within the fund?</p> <p>Mr Yates: I cannot actually say whether or not I did know, so I do not think there was a lot of consultation in relation to the amount. But it was not something that I was particularly worried about. I was looking at the idea that this fund was actually a good part of an overall strategy, and even \$200 million to deploy in early-stage venture transactions is an effort. I am sure that if we started to show success we would be able to talk to the government about whether they wanted to do more.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: Allowing for that high risk element?</p> <p>Mr Yates: Yes.</p> <p>Senator MOORE: If you can find any more information about what you knew, that would be good.</p>		
307	Clean Energy Finance Corporation (CEFC)	Lambie	Tasmania to Victoria Fastcat	<p>Senator LAMBIE: I have asked the CEFC before about a fastcat service from Tasmania to Victoria and you have indicated that a fastcat service would qualify for funding. Do you still have the same view? If so, please explain why.</p> <p>Mr Yates: I am not sure where that project is up to, so I have to take</p>	Page 62 17 October 2016	SQ16-000389

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				that question on notice. It will depend on the emissions from fastcats as opposed to those from 'normal cats'. I think, from memory, when we were discussing it, there was a view that the fastcats could be more efficient than traditional ferries. But I do not have that answer for you at the moment. I am happy to take it on notice and come back to you.		
308	Clean Energy Finance Corporate (CEFC)	Waters	CEIF Changes	<p>Senator WATERS: Were there discussions with the CEFC regarding the change to the CEIF?</p> <p>Dr de Brouwer: I think that was raised on Monday. That is really a matter for the CEFC.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: They said it was a matter for you—the department or the minister.</p> <p>Senator Sinodinos: It does not sound like it was discussed with them. I do not know.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Would you take that on notice, please, Minister?</p>	Page 23 21 October 2016	SQ16-000741
309	Clean Energy Finance Corporate (CEFC)	Siewert	International Savanna Fire Management Initiative	<p>Is the Government advancing the International Savanna Fire Management Initiative (ISFMI)?</p> <p>a) If so, where is this up to?</p> <p>b) If not, why not?</p>	Written	SQ16-000740
310	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Waters	Queensland Land Clearing – Land Sector Applications	<p>Senator WATERS: ... In relation to land clearing, Queensland's land-clearing laws are yet to be reinstated, although they have been talked about for a very long time now. How does that affect the potential additionality were there to be any land sector applications from Queensland that would be presently legal under the Queensland laws but unlawful had the bill have passed but which may pass at some point? Has anyone worked that out?</p> <p>Ms C Munro: We have examined this matter in detail. It is worth saying that the methods to which I think you were referring would have avoided deforestation would require you to have had a land-clearing permit and then not to proceed to clear had a cut-off date in them. So that is no longer accessible, and I understand that is not accessible in Queensland either.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes, if you could elaborate on that?</p> <p>Ms C Munro: Yes, Mr Purvis-Smith can you give some more explanation.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: It bends my mind but I want to understand.</p>	Page 108 17 October 2016	SQ16-000390

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Ms C Munro: I think that is the main point of reassurance for you.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay.</p> <p>Mr Purvis-Smith: I think it is better that it is a question we take on notice, potentially to give some worked examples because there is a cut-off date. It is complex.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Do you know what the cut-off date is?</p> <p>Mr Purvis-Smith: No, I can find out. But that is why I would like to give some worked examples in a question on notice.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you trace that back through the number of scenarios where we had the initial laws? They were then repealed under the Newman state administration—mostly repealed. And can you give me a few examples under each of those time periods, so that I can understand that additionality question as it has flowed through in real time?</p> <p>Mr Purvis-Smith: We can do our best. We will try and be as fulsome as we can be.</p>		
311	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Waters	Calculated Baselines	<p>Senator WATERS: Could you go through now, or even on notice, the circumstances that would need to be in place for a polluter to be able to get a calculated baseline?</p> <p>Ms C Munro: Certainly. These are all legislated criteria so we can summarise those. We have had quite a discussion with industry about how they would demonstrate—because they have to have an audit report and have to demonstrate what the baseline would be. But we could certainly give you a summary of what bases on which they could apply for calculated baselines.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: That would be great.</p>	Page 115 17 October 2016	SQ16-000392
312	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Waters	Emissions Reduction Fund abatement to be delivered by 2020	<p>Ms Swirepik: Could I make a correction, for the record? I said 42 million tonnes, before, delivered by 2020. That was an estimate at a point in time before we were imagining committing all the funds. I think the modelling that has been put forward, imagining the commitment of all of the ERF funds into next year, is that 92 million tonnes would be delivered by 2020, if you project forwards.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: That is a projection though, whereas the 42—</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: That is projecting out, assuming that the full fund is committed.</p>	Page 112 17 October 2016	SQ16-000518

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>Senator WATERS: You have just established that we do not know if the fourth round will do that.</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: That is right. It is assuming that the purchasing will go on into next year, but some estimates were made earlier in the year—in fact, post auction 2, when we were projecting forward to look at what the future commitment might be.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: But is the 42 figure based on the funds that have been expended under the three auctions to date?</p> <p>Ms Swirepik: I was working from my memory. The 42 is based on what was after auction 2. We have had a third auction since then. I do not have the exact numbers to 2020 on me. At that time, we were assuming we would spend about half the fund and would then commit the other half and approximately—</p> <p>Ms C Munro: We can revert to a rough estimate of what that is, based on the—</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you? That would be very helpful. Sorry to butt in.</p> <p>Ms C Munro: I believe we have that number but it may not be in the folders.</p>		
313	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Lake Bonney Wind Farm Application	<p>Referring to the letter addressed to the Chair of the Committee of 4 May 2016 from the Chair of the Clean Energy Regulator which revised the answer to QON 217 regarding the legal person/s who signed the application for the accreditation of the Lake Bonney Wind Farm stages 1, 2 and 3, I note that the signature of the applicant is illegible on the new application for registration of Lake Bonney stage 1 dated 7 July 2004. I also note that the Lake Bonney Wind Farm (stage 1) has since then been issued with approximately 2,219,233 Large-scale Generation Certificates. These certificates have a market price today of some \$89 each (approximately \$200m in total).</p> <p>1. My office has received copies of documentation that would lead me to believe that the signatory on the application is either Mr Tim Flato, Mr Warren Murphy or Mr Miles George who are listed as directors of Lake Bonney Wind Power Pty Ltd at the time. These three gentlemen were responsible for, inter alia,</p>	Written	SQ16-000557

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>producing and signing the confidential landowner contracts for the Lake Bonney Wind Farm. Mr Murphy and Mr George were acting as executive officers of Babcock and Brown and Mr Tim Flato as a director of National Power Projects LLC, both major shareholders of Lake Bonney Wind Power Pty Ltd. Since the time of writing the aforementioned letter, has the CER been able to ascertain who signed the new application for registration lodged by Babcock and Brown in 2004 with the ORER?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. With reference to the aforementioned letter and the answer given to QON 223, the date given for the accreditation of Lake Bonney Wind Farm stage 1 is 24/07/2004. Will the CER please confirm that the ORER did not accredit the Lake Bonney Wind Farm stage 1 until the 24/07/2004? 3. The original application for accreditation from Babcock and Brown was dated 12 June 2002. If possible, will the CER please consult the ORER documentation to see if the delay in accrediting the Lake Bonney Wind Farm stage 1 was due in part to an order of the Environment Resources and Development Court on 24 January 2003? <p>Mr Flato recently created the company OneWind Australia and is currently a majority shareholder, owner and/or director of OneWind Australia. As a director of NP Power Pty Ltd, Mr Flato has recently transferred a number of development proposals for wind farms from NP Power Pty Ltd to OneWind Australia Pty Ltd. Within the letter referred to above, it was stated that the fit and proper person provisions in the Renewable Energy (Electricity) Regulations 2001 (Regulation 3L) came into effect on 12 December 2012. I would like the CER to note that after this regulation came into effect Mr Tim Flato has been corresponding with the Department of Environment in reference to his proposed wind farms and the EPBC Act. It is my belief that Mr Flato is a convicted criminal who was sentenced to six months home detention in 1996 in the USA for stealing money from his clients while acting as their lawyer and would not therefore meet the requirements of the fit and proper person provisions (Regulation</p>		

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>3L). Mr Flato, acting as an executive officer of National Power LLC, National Power Australia, NPP Projects I LLC, NPP Projects II LLC, NPP Projects VII LLC, NPP Projects VIII LLC, NPP LB2 LLC, NPP Group, NP Wind Investments Pty Ltd and related subsidiaries and controlled bodies corporate, as a former director and shareholder of Lake Bonney Wind Power Pty Ltd and Flyers Creek Wind Farm Pty Ltd and as owner/executive officer/director/majority shareholder of OneWind Australia has continued to progress wind farm development applications in a number of states and territories.</p> <p>4. Has the CER been corresponding with Mr Flato or executives officers and/or representatives of any of Mr Flato's companies and subsidiaries regarding any application(s) for accreditation of a power station with the CER?</p> <p>5. Will you please confirm whether the CER has yet received or entered into any preliminary correspondence regarding accreditation of projects proposed by any of the aforementioned companies?</p>		
314	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Global Investments Limited - Renewable Energy (Electricity) Regulations 2001	<p>With reference to the Renewable Energy (Electricity) Regulations 2001 (Regulation 3L) and QON 222:</p> <p>1. The board of directors of Global Investments Limited filed writs in the Supreme Court of Victoria and the New York County Supreme Court against Babcock and Brown and a number of its subsidiaries for, inter alia, false and misleading representations, breaches of fiduciary duties and breaches of duty and contract. Was the CER aware of the proceedings in the Supreme Court of Victoria against defendant Brad Hopwood, formerly executive officer of Babcock and Brown and currently the executive general manager of corporate finance at Infigen Energy prior to the date of this question?</p> <p>2. Has the CER undertaken any investigation to confirm if communities or individuals in Australia have been subject to similar false and misleading representations, breaches of fiduciary duties and breaches of duty and contract?</p> <p>3. Was the CER aware that the former Chief Executive Officer of Global Investments Limited at the time of the allegations was</p>	Written	SQ16-000558

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>recently appointed as a non-executive director of Infigen Energy in April 2016, at which time the proceedings against Mr Brad Hopwood were on-going?</p> <p>4. Has the CER had any communication with Infigen Energy relating to these allegations? If so, on what dates?</p> <p>5. Has the CER investigated the subsequent agreement between Global Investments Limited and Infigen Energy's General Manager of Corporate Finance to discontinue its action against him?</p>		
315	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Clean Energy Council	Referring to the answer given to QON 230, giving reason to undertake a targeted assessment of the Clean Energy Council (CEC), is the CER aware that on 28 August 2014, The Clean Energy Council's Media Manager wrote an email to the CEO of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI) and copied it to six journalists from major Australian newspapers using a fictitious alias, Matthew Murdoch?	Written	SQ16-000559
316	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Clean Energy Council	<p>It is my belief that Clean Energy Council resources were used to access the personal details of ACCI's Chief Economist earlier in the year. The email originated from the Clean Energy Council office. The content of the email effectively discredited the ACCI's chief economist on a personal matter. The time at which the email was sent coincided with the release of the <i>Renewable Energy Target Scheme Review – Report of the Expert Panel</i>. Importantly, one of the 'balancing voices' that was referred to in the Report of the Expert Panel was that of ACCI's chief economist. The result of the email being sent was that ACCI's Chief Economist was discredited in the media and stood down by ACCI's CEO that same day. The email is referred to in the following article in the Australian:</p> <p>http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/exchamber-of-commerce-economist-calls-cops-over-alleged-dirty-tricks/news-story/8b2a6876fcd58a050f173d70cbb38194</p> <p>1. Was the CER aware of the email sent by the Clean Energy Council on 28 August 2014, prior to the date of this question being asked?</p>	Written	SQ16-000560

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				2. If so, what action did the CER take to investigate the actions of the CEC in this instance?		
317	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	2014 Generation Data	Referring to the study of 2014 generation data by Dr Joseph Wheatley titled: <i>CO2 Emissions Savings from Wind Power in the National Electricity Market (NEM)</i> ; 1. As an economic regulator, has the CER investigated how wind farms operating within Tasmania can reduce emissions within the electrical sector in line with the objectives of the REE Act 2000 when Tasmania is already 99.5% renewable? 2. If new wind farms are constructed in Tasmania in the future, to what extent will they simply be offsetting the emissions savings achieved by renewable hydro generation? 3. How would accrediting new wind farms in Tasmania reduce emissions within the electrical sector as per the objectives of the REE Act 2000 when they are replacing hydro generated electricity? 4. Why are Tasmanian electrical consumers forced to pay the renewable energy surcharge on their electricity bills when Tasmania as a State has already met and exceeded the renewable target?	Written	SQ16-000561
318	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Renewable Energy Generation	How much is the total annual amount of renewable energy that is currently being generated throughout Australia including below the baseline and state based schemes? What is the breakdown of these amounts per generation type? For example: total amount of installed capacity; hydro, wind, solar panels, behind the metre solar, waste to energy etc. Please provide detail as to the amount above and below the baseline where applicable.	Written	SQ16-000562
319	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Renewable Energy Generation – Average Hours	What is the average hours per day, by month over the last year (per state) that wind farms did not produce any power (above their own consumption)? How does this equate on a per day, by month over the last year (per state), to each state's total generated electricity in percentage terms?	Written	SQ16-000563
320	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Renewable Power State Percentage Breakdown	Does the CER have a working definition of each state's percentage of renewable power - in the context of state targets?	Written	SQ16-000564

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
321	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Greenhouse Gas Abatement Costs	What is the average cost of one tonne of abatement of GHG emissions under the RET scheme?	Written	SQ16-000565
322	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Large Scale Generation Certificates	What percentage of a tonne of emissions reductions is achieved by a large scale generation certificate (or per MWh of generation)?	Written	SQ16-000566
323	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Cost of Abatement under the Emissions Reduction Fund	What is the cost of one tonne of abatement of GHG emissions under the ACCU scheme?	Written	SQ16-000567
324	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	ACCUs	What percentage of a tonne of emissions reductions is achieved by an ACCU (or per MWh of generation)?	Written	SQ16-000568
325	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	ACCU wind farms	Are there wind farms that are being issued with ACCUs?	Written	SQ16-000569
326	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Energy Certificates	What is the total number of RECs issued to date? What is the total number of LGCs issued to date?	Written	SQ16-000570
327	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	ACCUs issued	What is the total number of ACCUs issued to date?	Written	SQ16-000571
328	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	ACCU Renewable Energy Target	Can the renewable energy target be met by issuing ACCUs? If not, why not?	Written	SQ16-000572
329	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	ACCU / LGC savings	If the ACCUs and the LGCs were amalgamated/tradeable what would be the extent of the savings to the electrical consumer?	Written	SQ16-000573
330	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	RET Penalties	Does a penalty that is paid by some liable entities contribute towards the Federal Government's 2020 RET? Do these monies flow to consolidated revenues?	Written	SQ16-000574
331	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	RET Liable Entities	How many liable entities are currently paying the shortfall penalty charge to meet their obligation under the REE Act 2000?	Written	SQ16-000575

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
332	Clean Energy Regulator (CER)	Back	Consolidated Revenue from Liable Entities	What is the total value of the payments into consolidated revenue that have been received from liable entities paying the shortfall penalty charge?	Written	SQ16-000576
333	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – Report delay	URQUHART: What was the reason for the delay in the public release of the review? Ms Barnes: You would have to ask the minister. Senator URQUHART: Minister, can you shed any light on that? Senator Birmingham: I will have to take on notice the exact background there. I know there were a range of considerations in terms of the consultations being undertaken and the need to make sure that next steps were all well prepared and planned for. Senator URQUHART: It is quite a long time. Senator Birmingham: If there is something additional to what I have said there, we will take that on notice and see what we can provide.	Page 73 17 October 2016	SQ16-000431
334	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Coral Sea Science	Senator URQUHART: What science was different in the Coral Sea from the Labor planning process in the recent review on processes? Ms Barnes: I do not have that information with me now, but I can forward that to you out of session—take the question on notice. Senator URQUHART: Today? Ms Barnes: Probably tomorrow.	Page 73 17 October 2016	SQ16-000432
335	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Mutitjulu Essential Services	Ms Barnes: No. Mutitjulu's community association runs a lot of their in-town services. I work as I can to supply jobs and opportunity for employment, and work with them on managing the park. Senator URQUHART: What is the budget for this? Ms Barnes: For Mutitjulu essential services? I will have to get back to you.	Page 78 17 October 2016	SQ16-000447
336	Director of National Parks	Urquhart	Mutitjulu Upgrade Costs	Senator URQUHART: What has been the cost—how much for, say, the water? Ms Barnes: I would have to get back to you but in those remote areas, under those conditions, it is quite expensive. I can get the details back to you.	Page 78 17 October 2016	SQ16-000448
337	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review	In suspending Australia's 40 new Commonwealth marine reserves in December 2013 and instituting a review, the former Abbott Government committed that the review would be science based.	Written	SQ16-000726

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				<p>However, the Review's Bioregional Advisory Panel recommends the downgrading of zoning across many reserves in order to accommodate fishing practices that the Review's own Expert Science Panel finds are incompatible with the values of the marine reserves concerned (page X).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the Director of National Parks aware that the Expert Science Panel finds that pelagic longlining poses an unacceptable risk to the values in the Coral Sea marine reserve (page X), and yet the Bioregional Advisory Panel recommends a near doubling of the area over which pelagic longlining can occur in the reserve, including in the Queensland trough, the location of a globally significant black marlin spawning aggregation? - And that the Bioregional Advisory Panel recommends allowing demersal longlining to be allowed to operate on a number of seamounts in the same reserve, despite the Expert Science Panel advising that gear type should not be allowed to operate over seamounts (page X)? - And that the Bioregional Advisory Panel advises that the area open to demersal trawling in the Coral Sea marine reserve be increased by 700%, despite the Expert Science Panel recommending that demersal trawling be banned entirely from the Coral Sea marine reserve (page X)? - Or that the Bioregional Panel recommends weakening protection at one of the longest standing highly protected reef systems in Australia -Middleton Reef - to allow pelagic longlining, contrary to the assessment of the Expert Science Panel (page X)? - Or that demersal setlining be allowed in an aggregation area of critically endangered Grey Nurse Shark, in the Solitary Islands Marine Reserve at Pimpernel Rock (page X)? - What is the Director of National Park's view of the recommendations by the Bioregional Advisory Panel given these and other similar deviations from the science findings of the ESP? <p>In suspending Australia's 40 new Commonwealth marine reserves in December 2013 and instituting a review, the former Abbott</p>		

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				Government committed that the review would be science based. However, the Review's Bioregional Advisory Panel recommends the downgrading of zoning across many reserves in order to accommodate fishing practices that the Review's own Expert Science Panel finds are incompatible with the values of the marine reserves concerned. Are you aware of this contradiction? Can I put some specific questions on notice?		
338	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – Gross Value of Product	Do you know what the difference is between the impact on commercial fishing GVP ('gross value of product') from the Review's recommendations as to the GVP impact of the 2013 management plans? What is that figure?	Written	SQ16-000727
339	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – Gross Value of Product	Specifically – do you know what the GVP returned (the difference in GVP impact between the 2013 zoning and the Review's recommendations) would be to the following fisheries, and what are those figures? - the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery (ETBF) from the reductions proposed to the 2013 Marine National Park Zoning in the Coral Sea marine reserve? - the South Coast Trawl Fishery from the reductions proposed to the 2013 MNPZ in the Bremer marine reserve? - the ETBF from reductions proposed to the MNPZ in the Lord Howe Marine Reserve at Middleton Reef? - the WA Temperate Gillnet Fishery and Southern Rock Lobster Fishery from the reductions proposed to the 2013 MNPZ in the Twilight marine reserve?	Written	SQ16-000728
340	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – Bioregional Advisory Panels	Did any of the members of the Bioregional Advisory Panels have financial interests in activities in the reserves being reviewed? If so, who did and what was the nature of their interests? For instance, noting that (contrary to the advice of the Expert Science Panel) the Bioregional Advisory Panel recommended significant reduction on spatial restrictions on pelagic and demersal longlining in the Coral Sea marine reserve - did any member of the Coral Sea Bioregional Advisory Panel have financial interests that may benefit from rezoning in the Coral Sea which would allow a larger area for longlining to operate than that allowed in the 2013 management plan?	Written	SQ16-000729

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
341	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – Bioregional Advisory Panels	Why was the dive industry not represented on the Bioregional Advisory Panels?	Written	SQ16-000730
342	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – Recommended Changes	Is the Director of National Parks aware that the Review's recommended changes to zoning in the Coral Sea marine reserve which involve a very large increase in area open to pelagic longlining including over the black marlin spawning area, will compromise one of the important zoning outcomes achieved in the Coral Sea's 2013 management plan – the creation of what is effectively Australia's largest recreational fishing and artisanal commercial fishing zone?	Written	SQ16-000731
343	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – Budget	The 2016-17 Budget included an announcement that \$56.1m would be committed to the Commonwealth Marine Reserves over the next 4 years. This is significantly less than the \$100m committed when the reserves were declared in 2012. How was the \$56.1m derived? What is the breakdown of that figure?	Written	SQ16-000732
344	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – New Consultation Period	On Friday 7 October, you announced that the 1st consultation period for the redevelopment of the reserves' management plans would be extended to 31 October. Approximately how many submissions were received to that point? Were most of the submissions calling for more high level MNPZ protection? Approximately how many submissions received to that point were from recreational fishers? Why was the deadline for public comments extended?	Written	SQ16-000733
345	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Commonwealth Marine Reserves Review – New Consultation Period	Is the Director of National Parks aware of the following declarations that have occurred internationally since the 2012 declaration by Australia? 2015 – the Kermadec Ocean Sanctuary by New Zealand – 620,000km ² 2015 – the Palau National Marine Sanctuary by Palau – 500,000km ² 2015 – the Pitcairn Islands Marine Reserve by the UK – 834,334km ² 2015 – the Nazca-Desventuradas Marine Park by Chile – 297,518km ² 2015 – the Easter Island Marine Park by Chile – 496,570km ² 2016 – the Ascension Island Ocean Sanctuary by the UK –	Written	SQ16-000734

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				441,658km2 2016 – the extension of the North West Hawaiian Islands 'Papahānaumokuākea' Marine National Monument by the USA – to 1,508,870km2		
346	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Marine National Parks	Marine national parks are an established way to protect marine ecosystems, why would the committee recommend making them smaller?	Written	SQ16-000736
347	Director of National Parks (DNP)	Urquhart	Australia's Marine Environment	Noting the increasing incidence of coral bleaching, mangrove decline and loss of kelp forests as but three indications of pressure, what is the Director of National Parks' understanding of the state of Australia's marine environment – is it declining or improving?	Written	SQ16-000737
348	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)	Waters	Budget implications – staffing losses	Senator WATERS: If you would not mind taking on notice what staffing losses that diminishing budget apportionment entails and providing them, that would be very helpful. But like always, we do hope for additional funding for your agency. Can I ask about <i>Shen Neng</i> and the settlement. I understand that I may also need to ask other folk this too—AGS and perhaps the department—so just answer as you can. Dr Reichelt: Sure.	Page 32 17 October 2016	SQ16-000452
349	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)	Waters	Site Monitoring	Senator WATERS: Okay. Well, can you just advise what sort of site monitoring has occurred at the grounding site but also the surrounding areas over the last 6½ years. Dr Reichelt: Would that be something that we could summarise in a table and get back to the committee quickly? Dr Banks: That would be the best thing. There have been a number of reports prepared, and it is probably just getting that into a summary form that provides it. Senator WATERS: Okay, thank you. I will look forward to that, because obviously we need to know where to focus the rehabilitation. Dr Banks: Yes. Senator WATERS: If you have not done comprehensive monitoring because you have had no money, because the Commonwealth has been stingy, then it is hard to work out where to start. Dr Reichelt: We did do comprehensive work for the purpose of the trial, but we are happy to provide the background to the surveys.	Pages 35-36 17 October 2016	SQ16-000454

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
				Senator WATERS: Great.		
350	Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)	Waters	Coral Bleaching – Fishing Impacts	<p>Senator WATERS: ... What impacts on the fishing industry as a result of the bleaching are we likely to see?</p> <p>Dr Reichelt: I have not seen an assessment of that yet. In those regions there is a lobster fishery. I think the other fisheries are less dependent on coral. I do not have any reports specifically on fisheries' impacts.</p> <p>Mr Elliot: We do work closely with Fisheries Queensland, which monitors fishing effort. At this stage, we have not had any major issues identified. If fish disappear from an area, the fishing fleets tend to move to where the fish are. We are cognisant that that can increase fishing pressure in other areas. At this point in time, we have not had any major moves of fishing fleets that I am aware of; therefore, it is probably more things like the harvest fisheries, which tend to be more dependent on coral reefs, and they have agreed to not go to the areas most severely bleached. Because they are quite small fisheries, they can move more easily.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I see. So the industry has reached an agreement to voluntarily not fish for a time.</p> <p>Mr Elliot: In certain areas, yes. The harvest fisheries have done that, and we have been working with scientists so that the only scientists who are collecting coral up in those most damaged areas are those who are doing research around bleaching.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you provide on notice for me the financial impacts of that cessation of those industries, albeit voluntary? For the folk here who only think in money terms it would be good to quantify the impacts on the fishing industry.</p> <p>Mr Elliot: I can, Senator—but just to reinforce this, it is probably not a cessation; it is generally just moving their effort from one area to the other. But they are very small fisheries and therefore the impact is not great in terms of the areas they move to. But I will get those figures for you.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. I will await those figures. ...</p>	Page 37 17 October 2016	SQ16-000455
351	Great Barrier Reef Marine	Waters	Maintenance Dredging	Senator WATERS: Are there any moves within that maintenance dredging framework to place quantitative limits on how much	Page 38 17	SQ16-000462

Question No	Program: Division or Agency	Senator	Title	Question	Proof Hansard Page & Hearing Date or In Writing	PDR No.
	Park Authority (GBRMPA)		Framework	<p>maintenance dredging can be done?</p> <p>Mr Elliot: They were examined as part of dealing with the framework, but I would have to take on notice what the final outcome of that was.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Was GBRMPA asked to take a position on whether that was a good idea, and if so what was your position?</p> <p>Mr Elliot: It is probably on the record, but in the past we have advocated limits. A number of assessments were done by consultants who were engaged as part of the development of the maintenance framework, which identified some problems with the setting of limits, in terms of the management of limits, and so we accepted some of the rationales that were put forward in that. Our final position was that as long as they could manage in a way which had similar outcomes, we were reasonably satisfied. That is what we are looking for at the end of the process.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Does that mean there will not be limits in the framework?</p> <p>Mr Elliot: From my memory—which is why I am happy to take the question on notice—there will not be quantitative limits in terms of volumes.</p>	October 2016	
352	Legal	Whish- Wilson	Tarkine 4WD Tracks	What is the departments view of the impacts of the proposed re opening of 4Wd tracks in the Tarkine (subject of current supreme court action). Has this been assessed?	Written	SQ16-000475
353	Legal	Whish- Wilson	Tasmanian Government's Application for the Tarkine 4WD Tracks	What does the department consider the Tasmanian Government's application would need contain in order to satisfy the Minister that they (the reopening of the 4Wd tracks) would not cause a significant impact?	Written	SQ16-000476
354	Legal	Whish- Wilson	Tasmanian Government's Application for the Tarkine 4WD Tracks	Has the department provided any advice to the Tasmanian government on this issue (if so-can it be tabled or provided please)?	Written	SQ16-000477