

SENATE ECONOMICS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – 2015-16 BUDGET ESTIMATES – 3 AND 4 JUNE 2015
INDUSTRY AND SCIENCE PORTFOLIO

Q No.	Senator	Division/ Agency	Broad topic	Question	Hansard page & date or Written question	Date received by Secretariat	Date tabled
BI-1	Ketter	ANSTO	ANSTO Board	<p>Senator KETTER: I would like to talk about the board of ANSTO. I understand that there are currently two vacancies on the board. Is that correct?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: There are two vacancies.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: How long have those positions been vacant?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I think the board matters and the detail on them are handled by the department, but the vacancies in question have been in place for in the order of eight months.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: In terms of board meetings, how many attendees are required for a quorum?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: We have a full quorum and some ability to flex if board members are not available; so I think that from a quorum perspective we are well served.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: So there have not been any inquorate meetings this financial year?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: There have not.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Can you tell us how many members have attended each meeting this financial year?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I will take the detail of the question on notice, but my understanding is that for the current financial year's board meetings there was one absentee at one board meeting, and apart from that the current board members have been fully represented at the meetings.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: I would appreciate you taking that on notice.---</p>	Pages 73-74, 3 June 2015		
BI-2	Leyonhjelm	ANSTO	Defence White Paper - Submarines	<p>Senator LEYONHJELM: ANSTO made a submission to the Defence white paper earlier this year. It said that it is part of a team that 'would be well placed to support both the manufacture and maintenance of any submarine built and/or substantially maintained in Australia.' Would ANSTO be well placed to support the manufacture and maintenance of any submarine, which includes a nuclear powered submarine?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: We are lurching towards the hypothetical.</p> <p>Senator LEYONHJELM: We are not to hypothetical yet.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: My understanding—and we will take the balance of the question on notice—is that the reference was to conventional submarines</p>	Page 75, 3 June 2015		

				<p>and was the use of nuclear techniques to understand stresses in welds. For example, in the neutron scattering environment we have the Kowari-Strain scanner, which is used to understand residual stresses in welds. I imagine it would be issues like radiography and related matters that would allow us to support the develop of a national capability to support submarine manufacture.</p> <p>Senator LEYONHJELM: Okay.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: We will take the balance of the question on notice.</p> <p>Senator LEYONHJELM: Good. In that light, I remind you. What I am wondering is whether there is a difference between what you said in that white paper and how you answered a question I previously asked in estimates about whether Australia has the expertise to maintain nuclear powered submarines. You said ANSTO currently does not have expertise in the design and maintenance of reactors on nuclear powered submarines. It would seem to me that, based on your background and the backgrounds of the other gentlemen I referred to, we would go a fairly long way to having that expertise.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: I really think you are now expressing an opinion. Dr Paterson has taken it on notice, but he did frame it around those particular aspects of a construction, not the construction itself, if I understood what he was saying.</p> <p>Senator LEYONHJELM: I would like to hear Dr Paterson's answer please.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I think that what ANSTO seeks to maintain on behalf of Australia is an intelligent observer status rather than a direct engineering capability. Typically a nuclear project like the pebble bed modular reactor turns from being what I would call essentially a scoping and paper exercise when one has about 200 engineers deployed on the project. We certainly do not have that scale of activity. I believe it is absolutely essential—and I have regularly repeated this as something that is important—to understanding the global setting to have people who have experience of the international dimensions of nuclear projects globally. We seek to maintain on behalf of government the ability to assess what is happening globally, but I think that is distinctively different from directly contributing to a substantial engineering project. I want to make that distinction clear.</p> <p>Senator LEYONHJELM: Thank you for that.</p>			
BI-3	Ludlam	ANSTO	Synroc technology	<p>Senator LUDLAM: I might carry on in that vein because it is a really interesting line of questioning. When did ANSTO or your predecessor organisation begin the develop of Synroc?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: The Synroc technology was developed in the early eighties. It went through a number of stages of development within ANSTO which I would call mainly a demonstration of unit operations and core</p>	Page 77-78, 3 June 2015		

			<p>technologies. That continued really until 2009, when we decided to see whether the economics was real or not. It was when we did those tech and economic studies at the time that we found that it was really attractive relative to the other waste solutions.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: So a little over 30 years in total.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I think that is a good calculation.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: What is the present per-kilogram cost of isolating— isolating is the wrong word, I guess—encapsulating liquid reprocessing waste in Synroc?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I am unsure as to whether you are talking about kilograms of Synroc or kilograms of waste.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Kilograms of waste irrespective of how many kilos of Synroc that generates.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: I will take that on notice in terms of how we characterise the waste in terms of kilograms, because we do not really think of it in terms of kilograms but rather activity.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I am happy to take your per-activity metric.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: The per-activity metric is the comparison between cemented waste and Synroc, and the volume reduction is from about 3,000 litres of liquid down to 500 litres of Synroc pre final packaging. That compares with an increase in volume with cemented waste.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I understand that you have taken on notice to provide us with some cost estimates of various economies of scale, if you like?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: Yes. I think scale is the correct way to approach it.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: So what it costs at the moment at the pilot scale and what you anticipate it will cost on a commercial scale.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: This is not a pilot scale; this is a scale that would deal with our intermediate level liquid waste. That is why I say it is a commercial scale plant because it is not scaled to be a pilot plant. Certainly if we were doing something like an intractable waste in, say, parts of the United States, it would look like a pilot scale plant because the volumes are quite small.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I understand.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: If another nuclear medicine provider wanted such a plant, they would be looking at a full-scale plant.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: All right, just whatever you can provide us by way of estimates.</p>				
BI-4	Ludlam	ANSTO	Radioactive waste	<p>Senator LUDLAM: Are there any plans for community consultation regarding the new facility—which you have said has received its licences for receiving the French waste—at least? Can you tell us what consultation there has been regarding operation of that facility and transport to and from that facility; at least in the immediate environment in Sutherland</p>	Page 80, 3 June 2015		

				<p>Shire?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: There has been ongoing consultation with all of the stakeholders. ARPANSA has also conducted two requests for public engagement and consultation. The consultation has been extensive and we will continue to consult with all of the stakeholders.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Could you provide for us, on notice, details of what occurred and some sample copies of the materials that were distributed at those meetings? I appreciate that those have been done. I am sure they were valuable for residents. Finally, has ANSTO changed any security arrangements following the September 14 security incident where a number of—</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: Mr Paterson can take on notice material provided and distributed by them but not by others, clearly.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: That is fine—material by either ANSTO or ARPANSA, if you have got copies.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: We will consult with ARPANSA and, if they are happy for us to submit it, we will do that.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I am presuming that if it was distributed at a public meeting it is not going to be top-secret.</p> <p>Dr Paterson: The difficulty would be that I do not want to act on behalf of the regulator, because—</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I understand.</p>			
BI-5	Ludlam	ANSTO	Security at ANSTO	<p>Senator LUDLAM: I understand. Finally on security—and again on notice if you would prefer, or I could take this to the AFP I guess—have there been any changes to site security following that incident in September of last year where a number of men were intercepted by police on site?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: There have been some changes to the security arrangements on site. The previous safety supervisory function, which was called SOS, has been replaced with an outsourced function.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Since that event you have outsourced an element of your security?</p> <p>Dr Paterson: Correct. Our site control room has now got a different set of management arrangements. I think it is important to be very clear that the incident that you referred to was not on the ANSTO site; it was off the ANSTO site. And there was at no time a suggestion that there was an attempt to enter the ANSTO site.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I understand that. On notice, if there are any further details you would like to provide, particularly about the subcontracting arrangements—I will leave it there.</p>	Page 80, 3 June 2015		
BI-6	Ketter	CSIRO	CSIRO Board	<p>Senator KETTER: I would like to move on to consideration of the board of CSIRO. I understand there are two vacancies on the board at the moment; is that correct?</p>	Page 82, 3 June 2015		

				<p>Dr Marshall: Yes. We currently have two vacancies on the board.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: How long have those positions been vacant?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: I would have to refer to Mr Roy to give you the details on that. While he is doing that, I will point out that we currently have eight members serving on the board. The two vacancies are there. Our chairman will also end his term at the end of June. I will hand over to Mr Roy.</p> <p>Mr Roy: Of the two vacancies, one was Professor Peter Hoj, who stepped down on 6 December last year. Mary Boydell was the other member who stepped down—I think it was earlier this year, but we can take that on notice. Just pre-empting, if I may, some of the questions that I heard from the previous testimony: we have had a quorum at each of the meetings over the course of the last 12 months, and our annual report points out who attends and who does not. I cannot recall any of the board members not being available for any of those meetings over that period of time. There may be one or two instances where they have, but we have always had a quorum for those meetings.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: How many board members are due to expire this month?</p> <p>Mr Roy: Their positions are due to expire, Senator. We have three at the end of June.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: And how many before the end of the year?</p> <p>Mr Roy: We have another one before the end of the year.</p> <p>Dr Marshall: That would be one in October.</p> <p>Mr Roy: I took that as the end of the calendar year.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Yes. How many attendees are required for a quorum at the meeting?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: As embarrassing as it is, we will have to take that one on notice. We would be guessing.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Similar to the question I asked previously: can you tell us how many members have attended each meeting this financial year?</p> <p>Mr Roy: We will do that on notice, Senator.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Thank you.</p>			
BI-7	Ketter	CSIRO	Staffing	<p>Senator KETTER: At the last estimates I think it was Mr Roy who provided us with figures on voluntary turnover, which I think was about 4.3 per cent. Do you have an updated figure for this financial year?</p> <p>Mr Roy: I can get that for you, but our turnover is fairly consistent. Voluntary turnover is approximately 4.5 per cent. If we look at the long run over, say, five years or so, it is around the same sort of number.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Are you also able to provide me on notice with staff attrition numbers per week for the last six months?</p> <p>Mr Roy: Per week is going to be a real challenge for us there. We do not pull the numbers down per week. I can tell you where they were on 30 April and 1 January. I am happy to do that today or on notice, whatever</p>	Page 85, 3 June 2015		

				<p>works for you.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: That would be fine. I am not seeking to create a whole lot of additional work for you.</p> <p>Mr Roy: We will do the best we can there to pull those numbers down.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Thank you. And, if you are able to, could you break those down by resignation or retirement versus voluntary redundancy or forced redundancy?</p> <p>Mr Roy: Just to clarify, we only have one form of redundancy.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: That is the voluntary form?</p> <p>Mr Roy: We only have a redundancy where someone leaves the organisation through a redundancy. We do not have a redundancy scheme where people can opt in and go for a redundancy.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Okay.</p>			
BI-8	Whish-Wilson	CSIRO	RV Investigator	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: On that point of administrators, how many requests have there been to make use of the <i>RV Investigator</i> and how many days do those requests amount to now? Can you give us a figure now or on notice of the booking schedule going forward, including those who have not been able to access the boat?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: We have plenty of demand for the vessel, more than we can satisfy.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I would just like to get ratios on that or some sort of matrix.</p> <p>Dr Williams: It is four times oversubscribed. I will take it on notice to give you the exact figures but that is the magnitude of the oversubscription.</p>	Page 90, 3 June 2015		
BI-9	Canavan	CSIRO	Beef roads – CSIRO’s involvement	<p>Senator CANAVAN: I want to ask about the announcement last month on beef roads and CSIRO’s involvement with the transit tool developed. I have said previously I compliment you greatly on the development of that tool. It seems to be a fantastic innovation. What are your plans from here to use the tool? Are you still developing it and its methodology? Are you widening it away from just the beef industry? Or is it ready to go off-the-shelf to be used to start looking at where we need to build roads?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: It is not off-the-shelf; it is very advanced. It uses a lot of inputs that a traditional logistics and planning model probably would not use, including weather, environmental effects and so on. One of the interesting consequences of that tool, which, as you quite rightly pointed out, we use to figure out transport logistics for the cattle industry, is it has a much wider range of applications, surprisingly, we believe, including inside factories, for the transport and logistics of parts through the process of manufacturing a system. That was quite a surprise for us. It was an observation made by one of our commercial partners who was looking for just such a solution, so it was an unexpected benefit from that.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Back to my question, in terms of it being used to</p>	Page 91, 3 June 2015		

				<p>develop the government's spending of its \$100 million for beef roads—and this tool was specifically mentioned in the announcement of that—how is that going to work? How is it going to plug into the decision-making process?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: I cannot speak to the government's utilisation of that. But the notion from our side was to help provide some scientific input as to optimum routes. Because you have got this fundamental problem of getting the goods to market—keeping them healthy and refrigerated and so on—the shorter the distance can be, the better the quality of the product when it is delivered.</p> <p>Mr Roy: On the specifics of your question, I think we will have to take part of that on notice and engage with the scientists. We would be expecting that we would assess—obviously, it is fit for purpose—but whether it needs any modification or optimisation to apply to that particular challenge where we have to take it forward. I think that we would need to ask the scientists who run it for that. It sounds like you are well and truly aware that it has had a lot of success in the past. There is no reason it will not be very helpful in this particular case too.</p>			
BI-10	Canavan	CSIRO	Beef roads – CSIRO's involvement	<p>Senator CANAVAN: Is it a tool that—if a local government or an industry association wants to advocate for a particular road or investment under this \$100 million program—they could come to you and say, 'We're going to work to get the information from this tool to help us build our case to government'?</p> <p>Mr Roy: The importance here is that it provides an objective assessment as to the most optimal route to minimise the cost. We are open to approaches from any stakeholders in order to assist them with challenges that they have.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Would you charge them for that?</p> <p>Mr Roy: We would have to understand what outcome they were trying to achieve and who was going to benefit from that outcome, and then we would have a discussion about where the value is created and who should share that value.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: My understanding is that you used a lot of the NLIS data from the beef industry to build this model, and that was the intellectual property of the MLA or the data company of MLA. Have they got some equity in this? Do they have the ability to use this tool at no cost? How did that IP transfer—</p> <p>Mr Roy: I do not have that information.</p> <p>Senator CANAVAN: Could you take that on notice?</p> <p>Dr Marshall: We will take it on notice.</p>	Page 91-92, 3 June 2015		
BI-11	Waters	CSIRO	Phase 2 –	Prof. Barrett: Senator, there are two reports here. The first report that you	Page 93,		

			<p>Fugitive Emissions Report</p>	<p>are referring to was phase 2 of the GISERA methane seeps report. The report that you are referring to in terms of the 43 wells, that is a separate report done on fugitive emissions for the Department of the Environment.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: That you helped them to undertake, as I understand.</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: That is right, CSIRO undertook that work.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Is there a phase 2 of that report?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: There is more work happening in relation to the Department of the Environment contract, which could be regarded as phase 2 of that initial report. That is looking at well completions and hydraulic fracturing events associated with it.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could we focus in on that report? Thank you for the background on the other. That is also interesting and I will come back to that. I refer to that as phase 2—I am sorry if I used confusing language before. What is the time frame on that phase 2 report?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: At the present time that work is due to report at the end of June this year.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: And are you on track for that?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: Field work is underway. We are making progress. At this stage we are due to finish on time.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Okay—so, in just a few weeks?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: It is June this year?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: June this year, yes.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Staying with that report: what is the sample size for that one?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: I cannot give you an exact number of the wells that are being considered as part of that work, the reason being that it is logistically difficult to be in the location at the exact time that hydraulic fracturing operations are under way and where well completions are occurring. We need to coordinate with the industry to be able to access wells at that time. There are health and safety issues that we need to consider as well there.</p> <p>We will be doing as many as we can in the time period that we have allotted. I can give you an update as a question on notice as to how many wells we have visited thus far.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: On notice? Yes—okay, thank you.</p>	<p>3 June 2015</p>		
BI-12	Waters	CSIRO	<p>Phase 2 – Fugitive Emissions Report</p>	<p>Senator WATERS: Not yet? Okay. We will come back to that one next time. Just quickly on the funding between those two phases: I do not have a figure here for how much you spent on phase 1; how much have you got for phase 2?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: Funding for phase 1 was \$190,000, and I will need to take it on notice for phase 2. I think it is about the same quantum of funding.</p>	<p>Page 95, 3 June 2015</p>		
BI-13	Waters	CSIRO	<p>Methane</p>	<p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. We will check up on that again soon.</p>	<p>Page 96,</p>		

			emissions measurements	<p>There was an article recently that reported on a US study that was looking at the effectiveness of equipment used to measure methane emissions. There is something called the Bacharach Hi Flow Sampler. Are you familiar with that particular type of measurement technology?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: I am not familiar with that particular instrument but I am familiar with other instruments to measure concentrations of methane in the flow of sample gas through those instruments.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: This one sounds like it performs a similar function. It is described as 'allowing scientists to take instantaneous measurements of methane emissions from pipelines, storage tanks and other natural gas facilities'. The report says that this study finds that it in fact underreports emissions. So I am interested in whether anybody is using this equipment which has clearly been found to be a bit unreliable.</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: I am not aware of anybody using that equipment.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: All right. Could you take it on notice to let us know if anybody—in particular, you—is using it?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: That can be taken on notice to see whether we have any knowledge of its use.</p>	3 June 2015		
BI-14	Waters	CSIRO	Phase 2 – Fugitive Emissions Report	<p>Senator WATERS: This is my last question. It is an important one. It goes to how much stock we can place in the report.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: The officer just said to you before that this is part of an ongoing study, and therefore it is impossible for him to answer that question until that is resolved.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Phase 1 has been completed, so it is really in relation to phase 1.</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: What I can say is that the mathematical technique of combining the information from different types of measurements reduces the overall uncertainty.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Sure. I understood that.</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: That gives us the best possible outcome in terms of understanding definitively how much methane is coming from what sources.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: How much confidence can we have in the combined approach?</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: I cannot give you a number right now on what that confidence will be, whether it will be five per cent, 10 per cent or 20 per cent, but it will be world's best practice in terms of what we can achieve.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you take on notice to answer the confidence level question when you have the capacity. ---</p>	Page 97, 3 June 2015		
BI-15	Waters	CSIRO	CSG chemicals	<p>Senator WATERS: Could you take on notice to answer the confidence level question when you have the capacity.</p> <p>Could you also, on notice, give me an update on the deep groundwater impacts of CSG chemicals. I understand that nobody has started to look at</p>	Page 97, 3 June 2015		

				<p>that yet. I would love to be wrong about that. Also, if there is anything you have on the work that you are doing on geogenics.</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: I can give you a description of the work we are doing on geogenic chemicals—a description of the projects that are examining groundwater impacts.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I know about the shallow and surface one; I am interested in the deep groundwater.</p> <p>Prof. Barrett: Are you interested in confined aquifers?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: Take it on notice.</p>			
BI-16	Waters	AIMS	Oil and gas industry	<p>Senator WATERS: Last time, you talked to me about the National Sea Simulator program. You then also mentioned that you had had to deprioritise some of what you called 'strategic research' in favour of research for the oil and gas industry. You mentioned that one example of something you had had to deprioritise was your work on the natural and anthropogenic pressures on fish physiology and behaviour in that National Sea Simulator. Were there any other examples of work—perhaps work that was ecologically focused—that you have had to deprioritise in favour of research for the oil and gas industry?</p> <p>Mr Gunn: We have crossed wires a little there. The work for the oil and gas industry does not involve the National Sea Simulator. In answer to your question, there are no specific projects we have deprioritised other than the one I gave you previously.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: No others—that is good to hear. Has the funding stream from offshore oil and gas been impacted—the work you are being funded by them to do—given the oil price crash?</p> <p>Mr Gunn: I think that right across that sector there is pressure on expenditure. As usual, we are working pretty hard to make sure our work is relevant. At the moment we are still in negotiation on a number of projects. I am hoping it will not have too much impact on the research we do.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Have you been able to maintain the flow of work you anticipated from that sector so far?</p> <p>Mr Gunn: Yes, we are very heavily engaged with a number of the major players on the North West Shelf and in the Browse Basin oil and gas sector.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Could you please take it on notice to give me as much information as you can about the scope of those projects and where they are at—how far advanced they are?</p> <p>Mr Gunn: We can certainly do that, but I will make a quick comment. We do work with a range of companies. The broad focus is providing environmental baselines before they go and do any of their exploratory or production drilling. The type of work we have been doing in association with industry has been running for well over 20 years now. I think it was</p>	Pages 97-98, 3 June 2015		

				<p>last week that Woodside Energy won the APPEA environment award for the type of work we do with them.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Did you say there was an APPEA environment award?</p> <p>Mr Gunn: Yes, an APPEA environment award.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: That is a bit of a contradiction in terms.</p> <p>CHAIR: That is a comment.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I will leave that. I am sorry—I did not realise they had the audacity to give out environment awards. Pardon me for interrupting. Please continue.</p> <p>Mr Gunn: I was finished. I was just noting that Woodside had won the award—for the third time, I think—and cited in that award was the work they do with agencies such as AIMS, CSIRO and universities in Western Australia.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. I will look forward to some more detail on the projects you have either underway or in the pipeline—to the best of your ability.</p>			
BI-17	Waters	AIMS	Funding cuts	<p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. I will look forward to some more detail on the projects you have either underway or in the pipeline—to the best of your ability. On staffing matters, my recollection is that you managed to hold onto all of your staff after last year's budget. Have there been any redundancies since we last spoke or that you are anticipating as a result of this most recent budget?</p> <p>Mr Gunn: None that are related to funding.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: There do seem to be some cuts that are increasing. Please correct me if I am wrong, but there seems to be an additional \$100,000 cut on top of last year and I believe the cuts are projected to go to about an extra \$300,000 by 2016-17. Can you tell me first of all if I am accurate on those figures? Secondly, how will you cope with those cuts? What changes will you have to make to factor those in?</p> <p>Mr Gunn: I will leave my general manager to answer the first question.</p> <p>Mr Mead: I am not aware of any specific cuts other than changes to the appropriation funding indexation rate going forward. Those fluctuate up and down depending on CPI forecasts. I would have to take on notice whether your numbers are exactly correct.</p>	Page 98, 3 June 2015		
BI-18	Waters	AIMS	Letter from Britta Schaffelke – Courier Mail article	<p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. I will check on my figures and put on notice how we can explain that discrepancy. I am not sure how long you have been in Portugal, Mr Gunn, and thank you for phoning in from there. A couple of weeks ago—on Tuesday, 12 May—there was a front-page story in Queensland's <i>The Courier-Mail</i> that referred to some work of AIMS. My understanding is that the author of the report has since had some concerns about the fact that her work was misrepresented. I am not sure if you are familiar with this or if either Mr Souter or Mr Mead are.</p>	Pages 98-99, 3 June 2015		

				<p>Could you share whether or not you thought that coverage was a fair reflection of your work or, if not, what parts were not?</p> <p>Mr Gunn: I think you are correct. There was a report in <i>The Courier-Mail</i>. It is one of a series of articles they wrote, on the Great Barrier Reef, leading up to the UNESCO decision. The report was on the basis of quite an informal chat between Dr Britta Schaffelke, from AIMS, and a journalist from Newscorp., Brian Williams. He wrote an article. We were forced to have some commentary on that. Britta Schaffelke went into media the following day, basically trying to clarify the situation. I thought it might be worth reading a letter back from the journalist, Mr Williams, to my scientist, Britta Schaffelke.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Yes please; thank you.</p> <p>CHAIR: I would be very pleased to have you do that.</p> <p>Mr Gunn: It says:</p> <p>Dear Britta,</p> <p>I accept responsibility for the quality of my story. I wanted you to know that I did not write the headline or the material that appeared on the front page. I am sorry that you were upset about it. I did not write that the reef had recovered or that corals and seagrasses were blooming. My copy read that there were likely to be slight improvements.</p> <p>In fact, that is pretty much as we had discussed with him. It is a case of a journalist and a scientist having a factual conversation ending up in something that was less than factual on the front page of a newspaper.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Would you mind tabling that letter for us, Mr Gunn, so that we can have a bit of a closer look at that? Thank you. I appreciate that you have taken the chance to clarify that.</p>			
BI-19	Ketter	Resources	Correspondence to state and territory Ministers	<p>Senator KETTER: Can you talk us through the process of what you go through to encourage states or territories to confer their powers? Does that involve correspondence at a departmental level, or is the minister involved?</p> <p>Mr Smith: The department has a role to play; in fact, it is really the lead agency on the issue of conferral. So it is probably a question better directed to them. The minister, I suspect, also has discussions on occasions and certainly does through the COAG process. I attended the most recent COAG meeting where they discussed conferral, and Minister MacFarlane was active in that meeting and got a lot of support from the jurisdictions. I know the department has been meeting with relevant jurisdictions to discuss how conferral would work. We have attended some of those meetings as well, and it has been very cooperative. We also participate directly in discussions with each jurisdiction, and I have mentioned how I have met some of the ministers independently from the COAG process. I have been to the states and met with them. I have also met with officials in</p>	Pages 100-101, 3 June 2015		

				<p>those jurisdictions specifically to discuss conferral.</p> <p>Whilst we are not responsible for the policy, I want to reassure them that, if they choose to confer, NOPSEMA will be ready to support them and what level of support they can expect. For instance, we often discuss things in those meetings along the lines of how involved NOPSEMA would get in stakeholder engagement—and I will talk about how we already participate in public forums in relevant jurisdictions if there are issues in Commonwealth waters off their state or territory. We would expect to continue that and probably increase that sort of activity. We see it as important that we engage with local communities—not just big multinationals or the NGOs but also local communities, and that can mean being on the ground.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: My next question is probably directed more at the department. Would you be able to tell me how many times and what dates has the minister written to his state and territory counterparts regarding this issue?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take the exact details on notice. But I would just say that, from a departmental perspective, we are looking at streamlining processes and making it a lot easier for industry through NOPSEMA to undertake their regulatory activities. But I will take that on notice.</p>			
BI-20	Ketter	NOPSEMA	Operators under NOPSEMA jurisdiction	<p>Senator KETTER: My next series of questions relates to the offshore performance report. I note that there were zero fatalities in 2014 but there was an increase in the number of injuries on mobile offshore drilling units. Did your investigations point to any particular issues that may impact on safety on these types of facilities as opposed to other facilities?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: If these matters are before courts or are subject to other proceedings, we would need to be a bit careful, I suspect. Perhaps, bearing that in mind, Mr Smith can tailor his evidence accordingly.</p> <p>Mr Smith: We do have several matters before the courts at the moment. Where we have an upturn in incidents—whether in relation to matters such as drilling rigs or the other issue you will find in that report is an upturn in hydrocarbon releases—we tend to place a particular focus on that in our inspections and assessment. We also typically engage in discussions directly with the operators where the incidents are occurring or where we think there might be increased susceptibility to those things. So that is happening at the moment.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: What recommendations have you made in response to that issue of the uncontrolled hydrocarbon releases?</p> <p>Mr Smith: When you say 'recommendations', I am not quite sure what you mean.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: What is your response in addressing that issue of increased hydrocarbon releases?</p>	Pages 101-102, 3 June 2015		

				<p>Mr Smith: In terms of hydrocarbon releases, we have had an upturn for the last two years. That is certainly of concern. We have highlighted that with the industry and, this year, because of the upturn last year, it has been one of our specific areas of focus for inspections. I have also been in the media talking about this issue and speaking directly with the companies—as recently as yesterday. We have a focus, for instance, on the maintenance programs for the companies. That is partly because of the hydrocarbon releases but it is also due to another issue that we have been highlighting with the industry, and that is the falling oil prices—wanting to make sure that we do not see any drop-off in maintenance performance. That has been the case overseas in the past—not in Australia. The increased hydrocarbon releases in Australia are actually consistent with the experience overseas, where you have ageing facilities. In our report, for instance, there is a comparison with countries like Norway and the United Kingdom. In recent years they have had upturn in hydrocarbon releases. So we are also working at an international level to see what sort of action regulators should be taking and applying here. The North Sea has more ageing facilities and older facilities. So there are lessons from them that we can apply in Australia, and we have commenced those discussions with our international counterparts.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Can you tell us how many operators in 2014 fell under NOPSEMA's jurisdiction?</p> <p>Mr Smith: I think we have those numbers here. Perhaps if you would like to go onto the next question, Mr Grebe can look up those numbers while we are answering questions.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: Or we could just take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Smith: Or I could take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Yes, you can take it on notice.</p>			
BI-21	Ketter	NOPSEMA	<p>Exemption from APS Workplace Bargaining Policy</p>	<p>Senator KETTER: Is NOPSEMA subject to the Australian Government Public Sector Workplace Bargaining Policy?</p> <p>Mr Smith: To the extent that we have regard to it in terms of the common-law contracts, yes.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Do you believe your current arrangements are having an impact on morale?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: Which current—</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Your common-law contract arrangements.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: It was having a bad impact on morale with people on enterprise agreements, and now you are saying it is having—you cannot have it both ways.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: It depends what is in the contract, these contracts of employment.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: With these questions, if the question is, 'Has it been put to you that there is a staff and morale issue in the agency?' I think that</p>	Pages 104-105, 3 June 2015		

				<p>is one question. But the pursuit of the assumption, 'You have a staff and morale issue and you'd better explain what it is,' as opposed to the question, 'Have you been advised of a morale issue within the staff?' becomes a bit self-serving, I think, depending on how it is put.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Have there been any attempts to initiate enterprise bargaining within NOPSEMA?</p> <p>Mr Smith: No. Our staff seem satisfied with common-law contracts as the way to sort out their remuneration.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Do you have an exemption from the APS workplace bargaining framework?</p> <p>Mr Smith: I am not entirely sure of the background to the common-law contract, so can I take that one on notice.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Okay. Just in following up on that, if that is the case, could you advise when the exemption was applied for, what date it was provided and who provides the exemption. Thank you.</p>			
BI-22	Ketter	Geoscience Australia	Economic benefit of competitive geoscience information	<p>Senator KETTER: The next question goes to whether or not Geoscience Australia has ever attempted to quantify the economic benefit that it delivers to the nation through its provision of pretty competitive geoscience information.</p> <p>Dr Pigram: We did attempt to do that in 2010-11. It is one of those interesting subjects where we have worked through that process using what we believed at the time was an appropriate methodology, a Treasury methodology. It was done by one of the consulting firms around town.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Is that publicly available?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: Yes, it is. I can find a link for you, if you would like. I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Yes, please.</p> <p>Dr Pigram: It is a bit out of date, but that is the most recent study.</p>	Page 107, 3 June 2015		
BI-23	Ketter	Geoscience Australia	Enterprise Agreement	<p>Senator KETTER: I have a series of questions in relation to whether or not you are involved in enterprise bargaining—</p> <p>Dr Pigram: We are.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: What is the status of the negotiations at the present time?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: We have had a number of meetings with staff and with the unions through our workplace relations committee. We are yet to make an offer to staff. We are still negotiating with the Australian Public Service Commission to get approval for an offer. So we have yet to place an offer in front of staff.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Have staff undertaken protected industrial action?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: They have. Yes.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: What sort of action and how has it affected the organisation?</p> <p>Dr Pigram: We were notified of an intent for action to be taken in relation</p>	Page 107, 3 June 2015		

				to not answering emails in certain areas and taking time off and hours not working. Let me take this on notice and I will provide you with the details, but we understand that one individual has taken some action within the prescribed areas that were identified and formally approved by the Fair Work Commission.			
BI-24	Ketter	Corporate	Previous Energy and Resources staffing numbers	<p>Senator KETTER: Ms Beauchamp, I am interested in obtaining a high-level staffing profile attached to programs 2.4 and 2.5. I am interested in a comparison between the current staff profile and what applied in the old Department of Energy, Resources and Tourism. Are you able to—</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I can certainly give you an update—and I will ask the relevant people to come to the table—on the staffing profile for the resources and energy area. Comparing what we are doing now with what might have happened in a previous portfolio is probably not a fair comparison. Firstly, we have a very different and new policy agenda for this government. The other issue is that we share quite a few functions across the department—for example, setting up task forces which may not necessarily relate to the resources and energy area. We set up quite separately the task force on the energy white paper and drew people from within the department but also from other agencies. As we have just heard, we have quite a bit of work to do around radioactive waste and implementation of the energy white paper. I can go through the staffing profile of the resources and energy area, but I just want to reiterate that it is probably not fair to compare it to what was done previously.</p> <p>Mr Ryan: For example, one of the areas of the department—the economic analysis division—does a lot of work in the resources and energy area, but it would be hard to split precisely what the resources are in that period that they actually work on resources and energy. But we can certainly cover the two key divisions.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Are you able to do that now or are you saying you will take it on notice?</p> <p>Mr Ryan: We can do it now.</p> <p>Ms Weston: I can give you the figures towards the end of May for the resources and energy divisions. As to what they were prior to the merger of the two departments in the machinery-of-government change, we will have to take that on notice. I note, though, in giving you these numbers that we have made some structural changes in the department in that the corporate network, for instance, is managed centrally. So resources that may have sat in those divisions when they were in a separate department are now centrally located. That will have an impact and so we will be comparing apples with oranges.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: That was going to be my line!</p> <p>Ms Weston: Sorry about that, Senator! To give you the detail there, the energy division as at 20 May has 163.99 full-time equivalent staff. I am</p>	Pages 5-6, 4 June 2015		

				<p>going to give you the figures for the National Offshore Patrol Titles Administrator division separately to the resources division, but those two are related to each other. NOPTA at 20 May is at 34.14 FTEs and the resources division itself is at 93.4 FTEs.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would also add, just to confirm, that we have other parts of the portfolio working on the resources and energy area. For example, under the Office of the Chief Economist we have a resources and energy economics branch. With two of the growth centres we have resources and energy expertise as well. They are not actually located in those divisions, but they are located in other parts of the portfolio.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Was that the case prior to 20 May? Or has it happened only since 20 May?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Yes, since the formation of the new department. And I should say that since 2011 the portfolio has gone through up to 16 iterations. We have put together a portfolio and a department that is certainly centred around government policy. We make sure we have a flexible arrangement in terms of the allocation of resources. Just looking at the resources of those two divisions is obviously not a fair comparison, as I said earlier. We have other parts of the portfolio working on resources and energy functions.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: You have taken the question about the old department on notice.</p> <p>Ms Weston: We will try to do those pulling-apart bits, but that might be—</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I will just say that I do not think that is possible to do, given the change in policy priorities. But also things like corporate functions are combining back office functions and the like, so I do not think it is a fair comparison at all in terms of getting that information together, and obviously it would take a very long time to unpick. So, I would be reluctant to do that comparison.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Then perhaps just a comparison with the full-time equivalent numbers—</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Let us have a look and see what we can do.</p>			
BI-25	Ketter	Resources	<p>National Radioactive Waste Management Facility</p>	<p>Senator KETTER: My next series of questions relates to radioactive waste storage. How much funding has been allocated to finding a site for the National Radioactive Waste Management Facility?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: There was a budget allocation in 2014 for the overall project, and that allocation was \$22.6 million over three years. That was for the overall project, though. There are various elements of the project, including site identification and selection. There is also the development of the safety case, the business case, the engineering, the detailed business case work and lots of other aspects.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Could you take on notice the site allocation selection component of that?</p>	Pages 7-8, 4 June 2015		

				<p>CHAIR: I take it that there is a top line, which is the figure you have given, and there are all those line items broken up with various figures.</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: Yes. We would need to take that on notice.</p>			
BI-26	Ketter	Resources	National Radioactive Waste Management Facility	<p>Senator Ronaldson: To clarify, for the sake of completeness for Senator Ketter in relation to the EDI: it is a tax offset as opposed to a government grant program. So in some respects Treasury might not have that information until well after the end of the financial year for the tax offset. I do not know whether it had been properly explained or whether I have explained it properly. It is a tax offset, not a program in the normally accepted sense of the word.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: When will the site assessment process conclude?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: The site assessment process is multifaceted. There is the initial site assessment, which we are doing now on the nominations that were received. We have allowed two months to conduct that assessment, at which time the government will need to make a decision on which sites to progress with. Then there will be another period of site assessment where some more detailed work will be conducted on which site to take forward at that point—that sort of middle of 2016 time when a preferred site will be identified. Even at that time, though, work is required on the site around the approval process under the EPBC Act and ARPANSA to get to the actual site selection, which is, under the act, where the site is selected and that is a site on which constructions can occur. That time period is more than the next two months; it is over the next two or three years, possibly.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Who is the final decision maker on selecting the site? Is it the minister? Would it require cabinet approval under the act?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: That process is a long way off. It is not a matter for the officer to answer; it is for me. I assume it would be cabinet but I do not know that.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Could you take that—</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: I will take that on notice. Again, I ask anyone who is listening to go to radioactivewaste.gov.au. It is very comprehensive. It is constantly updated, from my understanding. It is a very significant resource. I encourage those who are listening or will be reading this, of whom I am sure there will be tens of thousands, to go to the website.</p>	Page 8, 4 June 2015		
BI-27	Ketter	Resources	National Radioactive Waste Management Facility – Advisory Panel	<p>Senator KETTER: Could you talk about the role of the independent advisory panel. First, when were members appointed to this panel and through what process?</p> <p>Mr B Wilson: I will provide an initial answer but Mr Sheldrick can provide more detail. As to the exact dates of the appointment of the panel, I do not have them with me but I could take that on notice. The membership of the panel was selected by the department based on the skills and experience of individuals. The panel is an advisory panel for the</p>	Page 9, 4 June 2015		

				<p>process; it is not a decision-making group as such. It is not meant to be either a representative or a stakeholder consultation process. These are individuals who have been selected on the basis of their knowledge and experience. There are two sub-groups in that advisory panel. One is a technical sub-group chaired by Dr David Klingberg. I can read out all the names or I could provide them on notice.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: On notice will be fine, thank you.</p>			
BI-28	Whish-Wilson	Sectoral Growth Policy	Joint Commonwealth and Tasmanian Economic Council Communique	<p>Mr Chesworth: So that is for the advisory board. There is the Joint Commonwealth and Tasmanian Economic Council.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: That is correct.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Its most recent meeting was on 13 March 2015. And the council has met four times—in December 2013, July 2014, November 2014 and, as I just stated, 13 March 2015.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Are minutes available from those meetings?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I am not sure. I will see what is available there.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Just looking at the website, I think communiqués may be put out after those meetings. And they are on the website.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: On the website now?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Yes.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I must admit I did look up the website and I found a fascinating array of 31 fact sheets including, I have to say, the Historic Shipwrecks Act of 1976. I am sure that is useful for companies somewhere along the line, but I would be interested, Ms Beauchamp, to know what time I could perhaps ask the question on—</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I do not think we put up the communiqué of the last meeting, so we will get that for you.</p>	Page 14, 4 June 2015		
BI-29	Ludlam	Resources	National Radioactive Waste Management Facility briefing	<p>Senator LUDLAM: Okay. I have a quick question on the tender process. I understand that there was an information session held here in Canberra on 15 May for possible tenderers to assist the department in building the facility, wherever it winds up being. Which companies attended that briefing and what follow-up communications have been held?</p> <p>Mr Sheldrick: Just a correction on the way you put that: it is not a tender for companies to help build the facility. The tender was let to identify companies that will work with us through the next phase, which is the detailed site characterisation—so the project management around site characterisation, the development of the detailed business case and the safety case. Much of the information from that will flow through into the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act approval processes and the ARPANS Act. The contract was not let around tendering for construction.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: That it is an important distinction. Thank you very much. Who attended that briefing and what follow-up communications have been held since then?</p>	Page 16, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Mr B Wilson: We would have to take that on notice. I think it was reasonably well attended. Of course, that briefing session is only part of the tender process, and we are obliged, I believe, to make the details of that session widely known on AusTender anyway, so what was discussed at that briefing session should be available on AusTender. I can certainly check that and take it on notice for you.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Yes, if you could, and also just who the attendees were. I am presuming that is not a state secret either.</p>			
BI-30	Ludlam	Resources	National Radioactive Waste Management Facility	<p>Senator LUDLAM: Yes, if you could, and also just who the attendees were. I am presuming that is not a state secret either. My final question regards continuing levels of confusion, some of it at quite high levels, about the nature of the project. Premier of Western Australia Colin Barnett asserted that the wastes were not radioactive. I think he subsequently amended that to claim that they were only low level. The Premier is not the only one guilty of mischaracterising what this facility will be for. Have the government or the department corrected that issue with the Premier? It is kind of important that people understand what it is that is in play.</p> <p>Mr B Wilson: Not that I know of, no.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I think that would probably assist if you are trying to get consent on something that has been—</p> <p>CHAIR: Are you going to verbal the officers now about what they should and should not be doing in their department or are you going to ask a question?</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I think it is not to anybody's benefit to have people at the level of a Premier of a state mischaracterising it.</p> <p>CHAIR: Are you going to ask a question?</p> <p>Senator Colbeck: I do not think it is necessarily the responsibility of a department to tell a Premier of a state what to do.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Chair, we will take it on notice.</p>	Page 16, 4 June 2015		
BI-31	Ludlam	Resources	National Radioactive Waste Management Facility	<p>Senator LUDLAM: Just finally, on notice, can you explain to us the operations of the proposed community benefit fund—whatever you can provide for us. I have used up enough time. Given that the Commonwealth and the host jurisdiction are proposed to be exempt from facility use fees, please just give us the estimated amount of annual income or contribution to the proposed fund—at least orders of magnitude at this early stage for what we would be looking at.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Much appreciated.</p>	Page 17, 4 June 2015		
BI-32	Waters	ARENA	Scale concentrated solar thermal plants	<p>Senator WATERS: Thank you. Does ARENA have a program, or have you considered a program, to have demonstration scale concentrated solar thermal plants connected to the NEM?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Yes, we actually do have a number of projects in the pipeline to do exactly that.</p>	Page 17, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Senator WATERS: Perhaps on notice, given the time, could you provide me with as much detail as you can about those plans and projects and their time frames and any effective recent policy decisions on your ability to continue that work. That would be great.</p>			
BI-33	Waters	ARENA	ARENA funding	<p>Senator WATERS: Perhaps on notice, given the time, could you provide me with as much detail as you can about those plans and projects and their time frames and any effective recent policy decisions on your ability to continue that work. That would be great. Moving now to funding issues, are you having to use any of your investment funds to cover operational expenses, or are you getting a separate provision from government for operational expenses?</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Under the ARENA Act the department is required to make staff available to ARENA for our operations, and in fact the department does do that. We effectively have a division from the Department of Industry and Science that works on ARENA. In addition, we have the ability and indeed the requirement to appoint specialists for very specialised work, and that comes out of the ARENA project funding bucket, if you like. Yes, we do appoint such people where necessary.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: Again, if you could take on notice for me the quantum of that. I am also interested in how the loss of the \$717 million from your funding due to the repeal of the carbon price has affected your operations and your investments.</p> <p>Mr Frischknecht: Just to clarify, there was a reduction of \$435 million and then there was a profiling of \$370 into the out years. The effect of those reductions was to reduce funding quite dramatically for two years—in fact, next year and the following year. Because of the rollover provision in our act, which allows unspent funding from prior years to roll over to future years, it actually has not had very much of an impact in terms of the projects that we can do.</p> <p>Senator WATERS: I am pleased to hear about that provision, then.</p>	Pages 17-18, 4 June 2015		
BI-34	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Aluminium cladding	<p>Senator KIM CARR: The question comes back to how you get a product on the prohibited imports list, and that requires this department, at the Commonwealth level, to take action. That is why I am raising the matter. A deliberative action has to be taken in this department.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I do not think it is just our department alone. Obviously these things come through fair trading departments from states and territories and the ACCC for products that may not meet consumer safety requirements and the like. I think, as has been said previously, the previous parl sec held a roundtable on this issue. The parliamentary secretary has written out to her counterparts in the states and territories. I think there is a commitment to look at how this might be addressed in a more whole of government way, and indeed with the states and territories as to what they need to do to address nonconforming products.</p>	Page 24, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Senator KIM CARR: I take it that it has not gone to COAG at all?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Not that I am aware of.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: This has not gone to COAG. The Building Ministers' Forum—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: That is the only intergovernment agency to raise this matter in?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You have not raised it as such?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: The Building Ministers' Forum involves states and territories. It does not sit under the COAG framework.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I understand that. Have you raised it through any other interstate body?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take that on notice. I am not aware it has been raised through the ACCC and fair trading departments and the like.</p>			
BI-35	Carr	Corporate	Attendance at political functions by departmental staff	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Did any departmental officers attend any Liberal or National or any Western Australian National or Liberal Party fundraisers—any political functions?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Not that I am aware of. I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Please do. That would include DLOs?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Indeed.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you.</p> <p>CHAIR: Are you suggesting they paid to go?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I am asking a question here. I am asking a number of departments. There have been reports that there were fundraisers on budget night for the government political parties, and I want to know whether any officials helped with any fundraising activities.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Are you asking whether they were representing the department in a departmental capacity?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I presume they were not representing the department. That would be an entirely different set of questions. I want to know whether any departmental officers attended any fundraising events and, if so, in what capacity.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I am not aware of—I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Take it on notice, thank you—and, if that is the case, any correspondence or request from any ministerial office.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Can I confirm exactly the second part of that question about correspondence?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The question is: did they attend any political functions or any fundraising functions associated with budget night? I have excluded the lock-up, which is a straight departmental role. I am asking whether they attended any other—fundraisers, for instance, dinners or—</p>	Page 27, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Ms Beauchamp: I am absolutely not aware of that, and I am sure officers would be aware if that happened.</p> <p>CHAIR: You have taken it on notice.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I will take it on notice, but I just want to confirm the second part of your question, about correspondence.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes—if there was any correspondence or any requests from the minister's office for people to attend.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Any requests from the minister's office for departmental officers to attend fundraising functions? Is that what you are asking?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No; I have said 'any political functions'. I have included fundraising as a political function.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: But whether the minister's office requested?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Okay. I will take that on notice, but not that I am aware of.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I trust the answer will be no and it will not be too difficult to respond to.</p>			
BI-36	Carr	Corporate	Provisions contained in the Enterprise Agreement	<p>Ms Beauchamp: Like I said, I don't know. What we were operating on was what we were told by staff through a staff survey back in July 2014. There were three things that they wanted us to address. There was the salary disparity for all officers. They did not want to reopen Christmas close-down. And they were pretty neutral about the removal of non-entitlement material from the agreement into policies.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What does that mean?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Things that were subject to policies and already subject to legislation. We were trying to strip out a lot of the things that did not belong in the enterprise agreement, that were not going to basic terms and conditions.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What things did not belong in the enterprise from your point of view?</p> <p>CHAIR: Senator Carr, you are quite entitled to ask questions, but we are really drilling down now, and it is almost like we are negotiating an enterprise agreement here now.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I am not negotiating anything. I am asking a question—what things did you want to strip out of the agreement?</p> <p>Ms Graham: An example would be the provision of long service leave where there is an act that already provides long service leave for employees. Where those things were replicated in the enterprise agreement, they were removed from the enterprise agreement because there was already legislation enshrining the entitlement.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What other things?</p> <p>Ms Graham: I cannot remember all of them. Maternity leave would be another one, I think. I would need to check on some of the other ones. It</p>	Page 29, 4 June 2015		

				<p>was only where there was legislation already providing the entitlement. Senator KIM CARR: Can you give me a list of things that you want to strip out of the agreement? Ms Graham: We can take that on notice.</p>			
BI-37	Carr	Corporate	Recruitment – Economic and Analytical Services	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I notice that there have been recruitments in the Office of the Chief Economist. I do not want to know the details. I do not want to know the individuals names. I would like to know the process by which appointments were made and the APS levels of the appointees. Ms Beauchamp: I might ask the Chief Economist to come to the table, but— Senator KIM CARR: You can take it on notice. I do not mind. Ms Beauchamp: We will take it on notice. In general terms, what I have been trying to do is seek secondments from other agencies so that we can get people coming into the department from outside. But also, if there is a permanent appointment, it is subject to the normal merit selection processes. Senator KIM CARR: I am particularly interested, in terms of the recruitment freeze, the exemption for the Office of the Chief Economist. How was the selection process managed for that appointment? Ms Beauchamp: For which position, sorry? Senator KIM CARR: I understand an SES position, Band 1, General Manager. Ms Beauchamp: There are a few positions in that area. I will have to take that on notice specifically in terms— Senator KIM CARR: If you would not mind. How was it managed and was there a selection panel? Ms Beauchamp: I will take that on notice. Senator KIM CARR: Were there any declarations of conflict of interest from members of the panel? Ms Beauchamp: I will take that on notice as well.</p>	Page 31, 4 June 2015		
BI-38	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	Innovation Australia Board	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Regarding board vacancies, there are currently six vacancies on the Innovation Australia board. Is that right? Ms Beauchamp: I think I would have to look at what the minimum and maximum amounts are for the Innovation Australia board. That is one of the boards that the minister has indicated he wants to reshape. I will just confirm that. The reason I have been a bit general is that you can have between four and 13 members on the Innovation Australia board. Senator KIM CARR: How many do you have at the moment? Ms Beauchamp: I will get to that in a moment, but this is one of the boards the minister definitely wants to reshape, acknowledging that it is a statutory requirement. But I think when he put together the advisory group for the growth centres—we are looking and he is looking at how we reshape the Innovation Australia board. So, it is probably not relevant to</p>	Page 35, 4 June 2015		

				<p>refer to the number of vacancies, because we are looking at between four and 13.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: There are currently eight on the board. Is that right?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: That is my understanding, yes.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: When you say you reshape, does that mean fill the vacancies?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I said that they were not necessarily vacancies, because the minister is having a good look at what he wants this board to do, sitting alongside the other boards that have been set up in the portfolio.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Within the act?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Within the act, indeed.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: When will the minister be making a decision with regard to the reshaping of the board?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: That is a decision for the minister, and I would have to take that on notice.</p>			
BI-39	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	Innovation Australia Board	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How many members have attended meetings this financial year? You can take that on notice if you like.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Thank you, yes, we will.</p>	Page 36, 4 June 2015		
BI-40	Carr	Corporate	Market Research	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What is the department's market research budget for this year?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How much did the department spend on market research last financial?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Again, I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you provide a breakdown of the subject of each market research contract in 2014-15, the value of each contract, the organisation or company engaged to do the work, any focus groups that were involved and the period covered by any contract?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: That is a lot of work, but I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I would like to know, in respect of each contract, the subject of the market research, what focus groups were involved, how many and on what dates, and the cities in which the focus groups were convened. Can you provide that one on notice as well? And what market research was undertaken to help inform advertising and communications campaigns? If there was any, what was the total budget for such campaigns and the breakdown of the various components, such as the media buy, the design, creative services, the website development and market research?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: We will take the question on notice, and those things that we are able to provide you with we will. You have a very long list there. They may have been sourced to others such that the information is not readily available to the department. We will give you what we have</p>	Page 36, 4 June 2015		

				knowledge of.			
BI-41	Carr	Corporate	Advertising	<p>Senator KIM CARR: As distinct from market research, what was the department's total spending on advertising in 2014-15—</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Does that include advertising for positions?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes, the advertising budget. And you may break that down, if you would, into the different categories of advertising. Have any of your advertising campaigns gone to the Independent Communications Committee?</p>	Page 36, 4 June 2015		
BI-42	Carr	Science & Commercialisation Policy	Japan research partnership	<p>Mr Medland: I am the chief financial officer. In the department portfolio budget statements on page 29 it outlines the funding for the Australia-China Science and Research Fund. In 2015-16 it is \$1.6 million, in 2016-17 it is \$3.7 million, in 2017-18 it is \$2.5 million and in 2018-19 it is \$2.2 million. For the Australia-India Strategic Research Fund in 2015-16 it is just over \$4 million, in 2016-17 it is \$2.5 million, in 2017-18 it is \$2.2 million and in 2018-19 it is \$1 million.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So it is about \$10 million, is it?</p> <p>Mr Medland: I think it is a bit more than that.</p> <p>Prof. Chubb: About that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is about \$10 million. For China, it is a little bit less than \$10 million.</p> <p>Prof. Chubb: It is bigger.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Yes, it is bigger.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How much is the total for the China fund?</p> <p>Mr Medland: It is a bit under \$10 million, but that is an ongoing program.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is an ongoing program; that is true. But we spend \$9.2 billion on research in this country and we are spending less than \$20 million in these two countries. What about Japan? What happened on the Japan one? Has that been renewed?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take that on notice.</p>	Page 42, 4 June 2015		
BI-43	Carr	Corporate	Cost of moving the CRC Section	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the cost of moving the CRC program administrative unit from Industry House to the Nishi building and back again in the space of 12 months?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Those sorts of costs were involved in machinery-of-government changes. As I mentioned, the vocational education and training officers are moving out of accommodation that we are leasing. So we are looking at not just the CRC unit but other units in consolidating all of our functions in Industry House, which will in fact save us money in the longer term.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So what was the cost of moving the CRC unit from Industry House to the Nishi building and back again?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to take the actual logistical costs on notice, because it is not just the CRC unit. There are other functions being moved</p>	Page 46, 4 June 2015		

				<p>as well, so they would be included in those types of moves. But can I just reiterate that, in the longer term, consolidating in one building is actually saving us a lot in leasing costs.</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: If I could just add that, if we are talking about the same group of people, as I think we are, they have not in fact moved back from Nishi. The CRC administrative unit, as part of AusIndustry, currently works out of the Nishi building.</p>			
BI-44	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	CRC Committee – date of decisions	<p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the date on which the CRC for innovative manufacturing was approved by the CRC committee?</p> <p>Mr Stirling: The CRC committee does not make decisions.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: No, but it recommended. Technically, they are ministerial decisions.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: You cannot ask when they made the decision. You have just been told they did not make the decision.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the date on which it was considered and agreed by the CRC committee for recommendation to the minister?</p> <p>Mr Stirling: There are a couple of dates here. On 2 June 2014, a proposal for the innovative manufacturing CRC was submitted. The proposal was subsequently assessed by the CRC Committee and subject matter experts. The CRC Committee subsequently recommended to the minister that the application was suitable for funding.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What date was that?</p> <p>Mr Stirling: I do not actually have that date on me. I can take that on notice. The decision in relation to whether or not the minister would fund that CRC was not made until post the CRC review being finalised.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I understand that. I would like to know the date on which the committee made the decision to recommend it and I would like to know the date on which that decision was transmitted to the minister's office.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: We will take that on notice; but, as Mr Hoffman mentioned—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: And then how long—</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: Please let the secretary finish.</p> <p>Mr Stirling: the minister wanted to consider that CRC in the context of the Miles report, which commenced about September last year. Whilst David Miles was undertaking his report, it was considered to wait for the outcomes of those recommendations before making any determinations.</p>	Page 47, 4 June 2015		
BI-45	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	CRC Funding	<p>Senator KIM CARR: How many CRCs are up for renewal?</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: In which year?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: For those years.</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: A large number of them will be up for renewal at any point in time in those years. Of course, we have to take into account the Miles recommendation, which the government has accepted, that 10 years should</p>	Page 49, 4 June 2015		

				<p>be the maximum term of a CRC.</p> <p>Mr Stirling: To give you some detail on that if it helps: in 2015-16 there are two CRCs that are due to finalise. At the end of 2016-17 there are a further five that are due to finish. At the end of 2017-18 there are a further six that are due to finish.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The tables I have worked from were in response to question on notice No. 63. When was that provided to the committee?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: If you have it there, it will have the date on it. Sorry, but it is very difficult to answer this question without knowing when the question was lodged and when it was answered.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It was the last round, from my recollection. What date was it provided? The question I put to you, though, is that you are saying to me that those answers you provided were incorrect.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: No, I think I have mentioned a couple of times that the commitments change from day to day. Without that question on notice in front of me, I am not sure what the as at date was. Of course it would change after that date.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: It was 2 March.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So it has changed in two months.</p> <p>Mr Stirling: It changes every day.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: It is three months, actually.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: And the information you provided is effective as of when?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Budget night.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: When will the next CRC funding round commence?</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: The government has not decided that as yet. To add to that: on 26 May the minister stated at the CRC Association conference that he wanted first to have the CRCs reviewed as per the Miles review recommendations. This process will probably take the balance of the year, and the commitment to the 18th round will be after that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What is the average amount provided to each CRC at the moment?</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: I will take the exact number on notice, but roughly I think it is about \$30 million or \$40 million.</p> <p>Mr Stirling: It is between \$20 million and \$40 million. It varies depending on the length of the CRC.</p>			
BI-46	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	CRC Funding	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Madam Secretary, can you take on notice to give us an explanation as to how the committed funds have gone down in the period from March through to budget night as outlined in question number 63? Could you give us an explanation of how that happens—how the committed funds goes down in each of the budget lines?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: As an initial answer: obviously that would depend on</p>	Page 50, 4 June 2015		

				<p>the funding profile of each of the CRCs. Looking at it just from year to year would not give you a good indication of the funding profile of a CRC that is going for 10 years. But, yes, I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you.</p>			
BI-47	Carr	Corporate	growNORTH contact	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Has the department been in contact with the growNORTH proponents since the CRC review was finalised?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I would have to ask and take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the nature of the engagement with growNORTH?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: It has been taken on notice.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Since the Miles report?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Again, I will take that on notice.</p>	Page 50, 4 June 2015		
BI-48	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	R&D Tax Incentive Programme	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you give an update on how the R&D tax incentive program is working.</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: Certainly. In terms of registrations, for the 2013-14 income year at 30 April we had had 11,362 registrations. That is an incomplete year for 2013-14. We would expect registrations through to the end of October for late balances.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Are you able to provide me with the terms of the claims—not the detail of individual claims but, in terms of your analysis of claims, the breakdown of each sector? My memory is that manufacturing was about 35 per cent and that scientific and other services were much smaller. There was a list provided that I have seen in the past. Do you have one of those contemporary lists that you could provide on notice?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: Certainly. I can give you some of those figures now.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I want a document on those things. Have there been any significant changes in recent years?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: Not that I—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The proportions have remained static. Is that right?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: We will take it on notice, but there is always some slight adjustment up and down between sectors.</p>	Page 51, 4 June 2015		
BI-49	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	R&D Tax Incentive Programme	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Of course. But it is basically consistent in the last few years. What is the total amount of moneys claimed under the R&D tax concession, and what is the growth rate in the claims?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: As I mentioned, for 2013-14 that is still incomplete—the figure I gave you before in terms of registrations. The expenditure claimed is \$14.94 billion for that incomplete year. For the 2012-13 year, which is complete, we had 12,133 registrations and it was just over \$20½ billion. On our estimates for this 2013-14 year we would say the number of companies registering is going up about eight to 10 per cent year on year, and the amount expenditure claimed looks to be probably on par, the same</p>	Pages 51-52, 4 June 2015		

			<p>as last year.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What is the growth rate in claims?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: As I said, for number of companies I would say it is between about eight to 10 per cent year on year. For the actual registered dollars expenditure it is an incomplete year, but our estimates would be that it is probably going to be if not the same, then roughly about the same. So there has been no growth in the expenditure of R&D, but the number of companies has gone up.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Have you done any analysis on the impact of the introduction of the \$100 million cap?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: In terms of analysis?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes.</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: In regard to?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Introduction of the \$100 million cap. What effect will that have? You have done no analysis?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: That is right.</p> <p>Ms Urquhart: Fewer than 25 groups of companies are expected to be affected by that measure, with no currently eligible companies excluded from the program. That is my understanding.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: If there are 25 groups of companies affected there must be an impact. Otherwise why do it?</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: Ms Urquhart was just confirming the anticipated scale of the effect on the number of groups of companies filing as a tax group. The actual impact is difficult, if not impossible, to identify until you get to the end of the relevant tax year for which they would have been submitting.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Mr Hoffman, what is the current Treasury estimate for the impact of that measure?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: You would have to ask the Treasury about that.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You must have that figure. I was disappointed that you were not in the Senate chamber, and I have no doubt that you have read the <i>Hansard</i> from that. But you must have the figure on what the projected impact of that measure was.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: It is a question for the Treasury. It is revenue forgone, and it is calculated at the end of each financial year. You would either have to direct that question to the Department of the Treasury, or we can take it on notice and refer it to them.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I will put it on notice: what is the projected impact of the introduction of the \$100 million cap?</p> <p>Ms Anton: I am informed that we are seeking that figure from the Treasury, to confirm what we had understood at the time it was brought in.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: You have taken it on notice. What do you think the projected impact of the reduction of the rate by 1.5 per cent would be?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: I think these are more Treasury matters, I have to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>say. The actual financial implications are a matter for Treasury. They should be directed to Treasury.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is a matter that is coming up before the parliament very shortly. Has the department any assessment of the effect of the 1.5 per cent reduction?</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: In the budget papers we have the forward estimates of the budget cost of the R&D tax incentive measure. The first order is to do a straight, first order effect of changing by 1.5 per cent. That is a relatively simple arithmetic saving.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Refresh my memory. If it is so simple, what is it?</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: It can be done relatively simply. I do not have that calculation to hand.</p> <p>CHAIR: It is just maths.</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: That is the point I was making. We have not done the second and third order effects at this stage. They are primarily a matter for Treasury, as the secretariat said.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: We will take this all on notice. These are matters for Treasury, and we will take them on notice.</p>			
BI-50	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	R&D Tax Incentive Programme	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Has the department received any expressions of concern about changes in this policy?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: From where?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: From people who use it.</p> <p>Ms Urquhart: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: People like you, or users or who?</p> <p>CHAIR: I am following the line of questioning, and I think it is the 25 groups of people or whatever, but if you could be more specific.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: There are two questions. Have there been any expressions of concern in regard to the \$100 million cap? The second area of concern is in regard to the 1.5 per cent reduction.</p> <p>CHAIR: They have taken that on notice.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The answer to the question presumably then is: it is not us; it is the Department of the Treasury. Is that the case? Did Treasury undertake the consultation?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: No, no. That is not what I said at all. Good try, Senator. What I have said to you is: they are unable to answer these questions; they are matters for Treasury and you should direct your inquiries to Treasury.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: If you are finding that question so difficult to answer, I will ask: has the department of industry undertaken any consultations in regard to charges to the R&D tax incentive, as outlined in the Tax and Superannuation Laws Amendment (2015 Measures No. 3) Bill 2015?</p>	Pages 52-53, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Senator Ronaldson: It took you four goes to get to something that—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is the same question. You are being facile again.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: No, no. This is your problem, you see.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: It is the same question.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: You do not start off well and then you have got to finish it off later on.</p> <p>CHAIR: We have got a question.</p> <hr/> <p>Mr Hoffman: We have not undertaken targeted, formal consultations on this matter, as the minister has explained. That having been said, on both the policy and the program sides of the department, we are regularly engaged with users of the incentive and with consultants and advisers about the incentive, so we are informed and engaged. But we have not undertaken formal, targeted consultations on this particular measure.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Have you raised concerns that have been raised with you in regard to these measures with Treasury? AusIndustry is the group that actually has to administer this program.</p> <p>Ms Urquhart: We took on notice whether concerns had been raised with us, because, in order to give you a complete answer, I would need to check. So, with what has occurred with those particular concerns—where and how they have been raised—I would need to take that on notice as well.</p>			
BI-51	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	Innovation Board – R&D Supply Chain	<p>Senator KIM CARR: At the last hearing, I asked whether the innovation board had asked about the effects of the measures on the R&D supply chain. In response to AI-20, it says: Yes, the Board ... has considered the impact on the supply chain of proposed changes to the R&D Tax incentive. Another response to question A1-19 says: ... the measures were discussed at many meetings— of the innovation board— ... during 2014 and 2015. Would you be able to outline to the committee the findings of the innovation board's consideration and the R&D Incentives Committee's with regard to the changes to the R&D tax incentive and the impact on the supply chain.</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: I think the best answer would be, as you mentioned before, that they had put a submission in to the public processes, and that is the record of their considerations and views.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So you have got nothing further to add from their submission?</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: I think their submission stands on it own.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: When did the innovation board consider the \$100 million cap?</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: That is one that we will have to take on notice.</p>	Pages 54-55, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Senator KIM CARR: What was the result of their deliberations? I do not recall there was a submission on that.</p> <p>Mr Hoffman: I do not recall it either. I can check but from memory—and you may well know better than I—it was a matter that was being worked on within the parliamentary process itself.</p>			
BI-52	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	R&D Tax	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I wonder if you could clarify something for me. In relation to the advanced findings—that is, in response to question number AI-63, the program cost sheets the department has provided—I asked for a breakdown on the number of firms that have sought preapprovals or advanced confirmation for this and future years. The spreadsheet indicates there were 193 cases of advanced confirmation in 2012-13; 241 in 2013-14; 213 cases in 2014-15. That is a total of 647. What is the difference between the 94 advanced findings and the 647 advanced confirmations? Can you explain the difference between those two figures for me.</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: Yes I can. In the question on notice AI-63, the spreadsheet you refer to includes the findings relating to overseas findings. For an overseas finding, a company must apply in their income year for a finding on their activities that they want to claim expenditure on for activities undertaken overseas. For each of those overseas findings, they must meet a number of conditions. The first condition is around the eligibility of the R&D, as well as then other conditions they meet. As the numbers point out, there has been around 500 of those overseas findings. Then there has been, as per question on notice 16, which lists the number of advanced findings, those which are specific and only relate to eligibility of R&D.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How many of those advanced confirmations involved expenditure or companies with expenditure over \$100 million?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: I do not have that in front of me. I will have to take it on notice.</p> <p>Ms Anton: I would note that we have to be careful where it might identify an individual company.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: But we do know there are 25 of them. You are not telling me which ones.</p>	Page 55, 4 June 2015		
BI-53	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	R&D Tax	<p>Senator KIM CARR: I understand what the legislative restrictions are on the program. The nub of the question I am trying to get to here is: what happens if you have given a preapproval and it involves an expenditure in excess of \$100 million? Does the retrospectivity of the legislation that has been carried impact on that preapproval?</p> <p>Mr D Wilson: I understand from my review of the <i>Hansard</i> from last time of my manager Mr Lewis that he explained that the advanced finding really relates to a decision by Innovation Australia regarding the eligibility of the R&D. It does not go to how much expenditure is associated with that R&D. The responsibility of Innovation Australia is to make a determination around: is this eligible according to the definition in the</p>	Pages 55-56, 4 June 2015		

				<p>legislation? And the advanced finding pertains to those activities. It does not go to: what is the associated expenditure with those activities?</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So what happens if you give the approval and the company has spent more than \$100 million?</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: We would have to get that advice from Treasury in terms of how they are rolling out that new measure.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: Yes, and we will refer it to the Treasury.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: We will refer it to Treasury.</p>			
BI-54	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Health Industries Forum	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Is this new body called the health and industry ministers forum?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: The health industries forum.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: When is it going to meet?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Fairly shortly. I do not have the date with me at the moment.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: This year?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Most certainly. I am sure it is in my diary in the next few weeks. If someone has the date handy I am sure they will pass it to me.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Will this be an all-in meeting involving the plastics industry and the food industry?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: That is what is intended.</p> <p>Mr Lawrence: The process for the meeting is that stakeholders will be invited to register once a date has been determined, and a range of issues will be discussed at that meeting.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Will medical instruments be there? Will the textile people be there?</p> <p>Mr Lawrence: That will be determined by the agenda.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: I see. So you only go to a meeting if you are on the agenda—is that how it works?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: You mentioned the textiles—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes, textiles. Medical instruments are made out of textiles. Given that science and chemistry is the thread that runs through all of this, I thought you would want to make sure we get the—</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: It is intended to be medical—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Not bandages? Health ministers are interested in bandages, I suppose.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Medical devices can range from a tongue depressor to an MRI machine. So it is a very broad—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: A tongue—</p> <p>CHAIR: Okay. We all know a lot about it—a lot more than I do. Let us just get back to it.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: So the people who will be attending will be determined by what is on the agenda? They will not register to attend?</p>	Pages 59-60, 4 June 2015		

				<p>How does it work?</p> <p>Mr Lawrence: Notification of the meeting will be sent to stakeholders and they will be—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Which ones?</p> <p>Mr Lawrence: They will be from the various sectors that we have discussed. They will be invited to register.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: How many plastics firms are there?</p> <p>Mr Lawrence: I would have to take that on notice.</p>			
BI-55	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	Manufacturing Transition Programme	<p>Dr Byrne: There has been one round of the Manufacturing Transition Program. My colleague Ms Peterson might like to add to that. But, yes, the announcements have been made.</p> <p>Ms Peterson: The announcement took place on 20 May.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Why did it take two years to get it up and running?</p> <p>Ms Peterson: The program was announced, as we said, as an election commitment. Round 1 of the program opened in September 2014 and closed on 21 October. There was an industry led advisory committee that met on 16 February this year to assess the applications and to determine funding recommendations to be put forward to the minister. While the total quantum of funds available was sufficient, the recommended projects could not be put forward for approval to the minister until necessary changes have been made to the funding profile to accommodate the proposed milestone payments. Within the requirements of the financial framework, funding decisions must of course consider whether or not there are sufficient uncommitted funds across the year. We put in a movement of funds request that was made and approved by the Minister for Finance on 2 April as part of whole-of-government processes. The grants were approved shortly afterwards.</p> <p>Dr Byrne: Perhaps I could add a comment because your question goes to timing. The program was announced as a measure over three years. The sorts of initiatives that are being progressed are large-scale. So the timing is actually appropriate within the context of what was announced by government—a three-year program.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: On the successful projects and the assessment process, how many projects have been announced?</p> <p>Dr Byrne: Nineteen.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you give me a breakdown of the projects in each state and territory?</p> <p>Ms Peterson: Certainly. There are eight in New South Wales, six in Queensland, three in Victoria, one in South Australia and one in Western Australia. I will note that across a number of the projects there will be activity across a number of states, but what I have just described to you indicates where the majority of project activity will take place.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Why was there only one in South Australia?</p>	Page 61, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Ms Peterson: It was a highly competitive program.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Highly. How many of the successful projects are actually in Liberal electorates?</p> <p>Ms Peterson: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: While you are there, can you give me a breakdown on which state and territory and which federal electorate each project is based in?</p> <p>Ms Peterson: Certainly. Again, I will take that on notice.</p>			
BI-56	Carr	AusIndustry – Business Services	Manufacturing Transition Programme	<p>Senator KIM CARR: We will come back to that. You have seen the article I have distributed—the report from the <i>Ranges Trader Mail</i>. The article talks about a recent visit by the minister for industry and Jason Wood MP to a manufacturer in Gembrook, Mountain Harvest Foods. It talks about a next generation manufacturing grants program and a manufacturing transition grants program and goes on to say that Mountain Harvest Foods hopes to double their employment in 18 months with the support of these government initiatives. Has the firm been awarded a grant under either of these schemes, or any other Commonwealth scheme?</p> <p>Dr Byrne: I might just make a comment while the minister or other colleagues are coming to the table: the Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program, which is part of the growth fund, has opened an application round, but the applications are still being assessed. So, in the case of the Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program, there was no decision of government in relation to any grants under that program. But for MTP I will pass to my colleague.</p> <p>Ms Peterson: In relation to the manufacturing transition grants program, I cannot verify if this company was actually an applicant, but it is certainly not a successful recipient. But I can take on notice whether or not they made an application.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Thank you.</p>	Page 63, 4 June 2015		
BI-57	Carr	Corporate	Grant programmes	<p>Senator KIM CARR: At least there is some departmental funding in this one. With both the manufacturing transition grants, which were announced recently, and the next generation manufacturing grants, who actually signs off on the grants?</p> <p>Ms Butler: The process is that the advisory committees make recommendations and the minister is the decision maker.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Yes. So the minister does not have to accept the recommendations.</p> <p>Ms Butler: The minister is the decision maker, correct. They are advisory committees who make recommendations to the minister.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: At the moment, how many other grants programs in the department work that way—that is, where there is an advisory committee and a minister sign-off?</p> <p>Ms Butler: One that I could say now would obviously be the Cooperative</p>	Page 64, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Research Centre's program minister.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: The minister's discretion is substantially limited in the CRC program. If my recollection serves me correctly, the CRC program, in terms of the list that is provided, you can only rate within that list; you cannot actually put another one in. Is that the case?</p> <p>Ms Butler: I will have to get the relevant officer back for that one. I would not like to mislead you around the process for that program.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: Well take that on notice.</p> <hr/> <p>Senator LUDWIG: Before we go to that, still on that original ministerial discretion, if the minister does not want one on the list, is there a process to determine—</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: One of the tranches to the grants program.</p> <p>Senator LUDWIG: Yes. If the minister does not want to choose one off the advisory list, is there a process—so it is not a hypothetical—to allow the minister to choose another one not on the advisory committee list?</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: I am not aware of what the minister has in mind for this, but I am happy to take it on notice.</p>			
BI-58	Carr	Anti-Dumping Commission	Guilin Group visit	<p>Senator XENOPHON: Last time, I referred to Olex Australia's allegations of the dumping of certain PVC flat electric cables exported from China. That is case No. 271, an investigation initiated under anti-dumping notice number 2014/118. I would like to talk about the trend within the commission to place verification visit reports on the public record only days before publishing a statement of the essential facts. Specifically, I refer to the Anti-Dumping Commission's investigation of Olex Australia's allegations of dumping. The commission issued a statement of essential facts, a SEF, in relation to the investigation on 25 May 2015 and the proposed recommendation to the minister was to terminate the investigation for negligible dumping. Is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Sexton: That is correct. A statement of essential facts was placed on the public record on 25 May.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I understand that interested parties have only 20 days to respond to the statement of essential facts.</p> <p>Mr Sexton: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: When did the officers of the Anti-Dumping Commission conclude their visit to allegedly the largest Chinese exporter of electrical cable to Australia, the Guilin Group in China?</p> <p>Mr Sexton: I do not have a particular date in front of me.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I suggest it was 23 March 2015.</p> <p>Mr Sexton: I cannot confirm that.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: We will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am just trying to help you, Minister, as always.</p> <p>Mr Sexton: I am new to the commission—I have only been there seven weeks— so that sort of information I do not have in front of me.</p>	Page 69, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Senator XENOPHON: I am not having a go at you. I am interested in some systemic issues that are very concerning. If you assume that the visit took place on 23 March 2015—I believe my information is quite reliable; and, if anyone wants to contradict it, feel free to chip in—</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: That is the trouble—I do not think we can. But let's see what happens anyway.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am suggesting to you, Minister, that the date was 23 March 2015, when the officers concluded their visit. I understand that the officers placed a report of that visit on the public record on 25 May 2015, which is two months after concluding the visit and the same day the commission placed a statement of essential facts on the public record.</p> <p>Mr Sexton: The information I have is that that visit report was placed on the public record on 15 May.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can you take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Sexton: I can confirm that for you.</p>			
BI-59	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Investigation statistics	<p>Senator XENOPHON: I have three questions to put on notice and I figure it may be helpful to put them on notice now. Could the department or the commission please outline firstly, the number of preliminary affirmative determinations of PADs published within 60 days from the date of initiation of an investigation, and the average number of days taken to publish PADs. Secondly, the number of times that the commissioner has accepted data from interested parties without conducting on-site verification of the data received, regardless of the nature of an investigation or inquiry—that is, a dumping investigation, review inquiry or a duty assessment. Thirdly, the average number of days taken for exporters to fully respond with a verifiable response to the commission's exporters questionnaire, and the number of responses to the commission's exporter questionnaire that exceeded the statutory compliance period of 37 days. Finally, the gross amount of duties collected and the net amount of duties collected following subsequent duty assessments. That is it. Thank you very much. I am sorry that we had a clash there, Minister.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: Senator, can we just go back a step. There is no reason why you cannot continue asking Mr Sexton about what is involved in the case you were raising. All I was saying was that he had said that he was uncomfortable about that particular question. There is no reason why you should not pursue this. I know your passionate interest. There is no reason why you should not pursue it, as long as the officer can say, 'I am uncomfortable about that part because it is ongoing'.</p>	Page 71, 4 June 2015		
BI-60	Carr	Anti-Dumping Commission	Steel imports	<p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you tell me about the increase in the volume of steel imports in the last six months? Do you have any advice for me on that?</p> <p>Mr Sexton: We do not have any information here about that.</p>	Page 72, 4 June 2015		

				<p>Senator KIM CARR: Could you take that on notice? I am particularly interested as to whether there has been an increase in the number of inquiries to the commission relating to steel dumping and whether those inquiries have led to a formal application.</p> <p>Mr Sexton: I do not have figures in relation to inquiries but more than 80 per cent of our applications relate to steel or aluminium dumping.</p>			
BI-61	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Electrical cabling imports	<p>Senator KIM CARR: In regard to the work of the commission, or the department, for that matter—this might be a question that Mr Ryan might be able to help me with—has any testing of imported products been carried out to ensure that they are in fact compliant with Australian standards?</p> <p>Mr Sexton: As far as the commission is concerned, that is outside our scope of activity.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: What about you, Mr Ryan? Can you help me here?</p> <p>Mr Ryan: I think this is outside the dumping specification issue.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: But the standards issue it is not.</p> <p>Mr Ryan: The standards issue is the building products one that we were talking about earlier today.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: But this is in regard to electrical cabling. Is there any work being undertaken on imported products, given that there is this matter here? It may not be directly associated with the commission, but is the department undertaking any work in regard to compliance with Australian standards?</p> <p>Mr Ryan: As far as I know, this issue has not been raised with us.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: Can you take that on notice, to establish whether or not—</p> <p>Mr Ryan: Yes. I am just being advised there may have been something with the ACCC.</p> <p>Mr Lawson: You may be referring to this. There was some non-compliant electrical cable that was being sold a while ago. I think the ACCC or Fair Trading put an end to that stuff being imported. It was being sold through major hardware stores, so there has been quite a lot of publicity about that issue.</p> <p>Senator KIM CARR: All right. You can take it on notice to see if there is any work being done in this department, the industry department, on standards issues.</p>	Pages 73-74, 4 June 2015		
BI-62	Wright	NOPSEMA	Protecting matters of national environmental significance	<p>Under a one-stop-shop agreement, approval powers for offshore oil and gas were handed over to NOPSEMA. In that agreement, NOPSEMA committed to protect matters of national environmental significance, including commonwealth marine areas. The commitment includes not approving activities inconsistent with the IUCN reserve management principles. These principles do not allow oil and gas activities in IUCN category II reserves such as Marine National Park Zones in</p>	Written Question, 11 June 2015		

				<p>commonwealth marine reserves. Can NOPSEMA explain the decision to approve a seismic survey by Spectrum Geo within marine national park zones?</p>			
BI-63	Xenophon	Anti-Dumping Commission	Guilin Group visit (BI-60)	<p>In regard to my question about why the Verification Report for exporter Guilin was placed on the public record on 25 May, the same day the Statement of Essential Facts was published and two months after the Commission visited Guilin:</p> <p>a) Why did the Anti-Dumping Commission advise that the Guilin Verification report was “placed on the public record on 15 May . . . I can confirm that to you” when the Anti-Dumping Commission’s Public Record for Dumping Investigation - Case 271 (http://www.adcommission.gov.au/cases/Pages/CurrentCases/EPR271.aspx) records that the Guilin Verification Report was published on 25 May 2015?</p> <p>b) Has the Anti-Dumping Commission sought to correct the evidence given?</p> <p>c) If not, will the Anti-Dumping Commission be providing a Letter of Correction to the Committee?</p>	Written Question, 11 June 2015		
BI-64	Conroy	Energy	Gas Markets	<p>1. Does the Government have any views on the Interconnector project, and its possible effects on the East Coast gas market?</p> <p>a. Has the Government contemplated providing a subsidy, underwriting, or otherwise providing support for the Interconnector?</p> <p>2. AEMO’s 2015 Gas Statement of Opportunities was released in April 2015, and forecast that there would be no gas shortfall in 2015 to 2019 in East and South East gas markets. What does the Department consider to be the implications of this report for Australia’s East Coast gas market?</p>	Written Question, 12 June 2015		
BI-65	Conroy	Energy	CBD Program	<p>1. With respect to the Commercial Building Disclosure program, it is understood that the review for this program has been completed. When will ACIL Allen’s review of the Commercial Building Disclosure be released?</p> <p>2. How much has this review cost? How much did the earlier Grosvenor Management Consulting review cost?</p> <p>3. Will a 2014 Mandatory Disclosure Report be published?</p> <p>a. Has there been a delay in reporting this? What is the cause for this delay?</p>	Written Question, 12 June 2015		
BI-66	Conroy	Energy	Energy White Paper	<p>1. Can the Department provide a final cost breakdown of the development of the Energy White Paper?</p> <p>2. Can the Department outline what activity has occurred to develop the National Energy Productivity Plan?</p> <p>a. What is the rationale behind the 40% by 2030 target?</p> <p>b. How does Australia rate internationally on energy productivity</p>	Written Question, 12 June 2015		

				<p>targets?</p> <p>3. Can the Department provide an update on the National Energy Security Assessment?</p> <p>a. What resources are being allocated to this?</p> <p>b. When will it be completed?</p> <p>4. Can the Department provide an update on plans to publish the Economic analysis of end-use energy intensity in Australia report which I understand is scheduled for mid-2015?</p> <p>a. Who is writing the report?</p> <p>b. Are you using external consultants to develop this piece of work?</p>			
BI-67	Conroy	Energy	AER	<p>It is understood that the AER has made final determinations which will see lower electricity bills for consumers in NSW and the ACT. What role does the Department and the Minister have regarding these determinations?</p> <p>a. Will the Department be involved or will the Government have a position on the NSW Government's challenge to these determinations?</p>	Written Question, 12 June 2015		
BI-68	Waters	Science & Commercialisation Policy	Minister meeting with Australian Academy of Science	<p>1. Has the Minister met with the head of the Australian Academy of Science? Please provide dates of any meetings.</p> <p>2. Has the head of the Australian Academy of Science requested a meeting with the Minister?</p> <p>3. Please provide the dates of the above requests.</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-69	Waters	CSIRO	Flawed methane equipment	<p>1. In a news article that surfaced on early May this year (http://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/flawed-methane-monitor-underestimates-leaks-at-us-oil-and-gas-sites-20150506-ggvuj5.html) about a US study which found potentially very serious flaws in a very commonly used piece of equipment used to measure the level of methane gas emissions from gas wells in the CSG and shale gas industries. The equipment is called a "Bacharach". Are you aware of that study?</p> <p>2. Quote from the SMH article in May 2015: "In one instance, the authors found that two separate Bacharach samplers recorded natural gas concentrations in the air of 1 to 6 per cent, when the actual concentrations were between 7 and 73 per cent" – do you know whether that equipment is widely used in Australia?</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-70	Waters	CSIRO	Groundwater and geogenics work	<p>1. Can you give us an update on your work on deep groundwater impacts of CSG chemicals, and your work on geogenics?</p> <p>2. Has the abolition of the Office of Water Science research program in the 2014 Budget had any impact on your proposed work program?</p> <p>3. When do you think you'll be in a position to publish work on geogenics?</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-71	Carr	Corporate	Information on	Please update the attached table and provide it in excel format, responding	Written		

			<p>Programme costings</p> <p>to the following questions: For the National Measurement Institute please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted For the Australia-China Science and Research Fund please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted For the International Education and Training (Australia-India Strategic Research Fund) please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted For Science for Australia’s Future please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted For the Square Kilometre Array Radio Telescope Project please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted For the Cooperative Research Centres please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 Number of ongoing CRCs o2009-2019 Number of new CRCs For the Innovation Investment Fund please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 number of customers assisted / payments administered o2009-2019 value of funds invested by licensed fund managers For Commercialisation Australia please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 number of grants awarded / payments administered (total) o2009-2019 number of Proof of Concept grants awarded o2009-2019 number of Early Stage Commercialisation grants awarded For the R&D Tax Incentive please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual</p>	<p>Question, 15 June 2015</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of registrations (total)</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of registrations for 45 per cent refundable offset</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of registrations for 40 per cent non-refundable offset</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of firms that sought pre-approvals/advanced confirmation sought from AusIndustry for eligible activities in future years</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of firms that sought advance confirmation</p> <p>o2009-2019 Percentage of registrations from manufacturing firms</p> <p>For Enterprise Connect please provide:</p> <p>o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual</p> <p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed</p> <p>o2015-2019 Contracted</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of client services provided / customers assisted</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of business reviews delivered</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of Tailored Advisory Service (TAS) grants awarded</p> <p>For the Researchers in Business program please provide:</p> <p>o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual</p> <p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed</p> <p>o2015-2019 Contracted</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of RiB placements / researchers engaged</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of businesses assisted</p> <p>For Expediting Clinical Trial Reform in Australia please provide:</p> <p>o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual</p> <p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed</p> <p>For Industry Innovation Precincts please provide the total cost of the program:</p> <p>o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual</p> <p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed</p> <p>o2015-2019 Contracted</p> <p>For the Industry Growth Centres program please provide the following against for the overarching program and a breakdown for each of the five individual Growth Centres:</p> <p>o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual</p> <p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed</p> <p>o2015-2019 Contracted</p> <p>For Buy Australian at Home and Abroad Initiative please provide:</p> <p>o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual</p> <p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed</p> <p>For the Australian Industry Participation measures please provide:</p> <p>o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual</p> <p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed</p> <p>o2009-2019 Number of AIP plans under the Australian Jobs Act 2013</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>o2009-2019 Number of AIP plans for Commonwealth procurement For the TCF Investment and Innovation Programs please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted <p>o2009-2019 Number of customers assisted o2009-2019 Number of BIC grants awarded o2009-2019 Number of TCF Small Business grants awarded For the Textile Clothing and Footwear - Strategic Capability Program please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted <p>o2009-2019 Number of grants awarded For the Textile Clothing and Footwear - Structural Adjustment Program please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted <p>For the Geelong Region Innovation and Investment Fund please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 Number of grants awarded o2009-2019 Number of participants <p>For the Melbourne's North Innovation and Investment Fund please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 Number of grants awarded o2009-2019 Number of participants <p>For the Steel Transformation Plan please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed <p>For the Automotive Transformation Scheme please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2019 Number of registrations o2009-2019 Budget estimate and actual (capped and uncapped) o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed (capped and uncapped) o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 Total ATS funds committed <p>For the Automotive New Markets Program please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual 			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 Number of grants awarded For the Entrepreneurs' Infrastructure Program please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 No. of business evaluations (actual & projected) o2009-2019 No. of evaluation growth grants (actual & projected) o2009-2019 No. of research connections services (actual & projected) For the Growth Fund please provide the total cost of the program: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted For the Automotive Diversification Fund please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 number of grants awarded (actual and projected) For the Automotive Industry Structural Adjustment Program please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 Number of workers who have accessed services (actual and projected) For the Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Program please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 number of grants awarded (actual and projected) For the Regional Infrastructure Program please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 number of grants awarded (actual and projected) For the Skills and Training initiative please provide: o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 number of workers who have accessed services (actual and projected)</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>For the Manufacturing Transition Grants Program please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o2009-2015 Budget estimate and actual o2015-2019 Budget estimate and committed o2015-2019 Contracted o2009-2019 number of grants awarded (actual and projected) <p>(See Attachment A: Information on program costings)</p>			
BI-72	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	R&D Tax Incentive	<p>In relation to the R&D Tax Incentive, please provide a breakdown based on registrations for the most recent income year, covering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The top ten sectors by R&D performing companies (based on registrations), including the number of R&D performing companies in each sector and their proportion as a percentage of total registrations. 2. The top ten sectors by R&D expenditure (based on eligible R&D expenditure), including the value of R&D expenditure in each sector and the proportion of expenditure as a percentage of total registered expenditure. 3. A breakdown of R&D performing companies based on their turnover (>\$20 million and <\$20 million), the total R&D expenditure for each of these two categories of R&D performing companies and the proportion of expenditure as a percentage of total registered expenditure. 	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-73	Carr	Science & Commercialisation Policy	Government’s Response to the Boosting Commercial Returns from Research discussion paper	<p>In relation to the Government’s Response to the Boosting Commercial Returns from Research discussion paper and the ‘Agenda for Action’:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the lead agency responsible for each action item? Please provide a breakdown against each of the items listed in the ‘Agenda for Action’. 2. What are the timelines for actions and outcomes against each action item? Please provide a breakdown against each of the items listed in the ‘Agenda for Action’. 3. How many submissions were provided in response to the discussion paper? Will there be any further documentation stating how the government will respond to the extensive recommendations made in these submissions? 	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-74	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Disability (Access to Premises) Standards 2010	<p>In relation to the Disability (Access to Premises) Standards 2010 and the legislated review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will the Department work with stakeholders (including state and territory governments, access consultants, the building and property sector, the disability community and human rights agencies) to ensure any proposed changes to the Premises Standards remain consistent with existing discrimination law and Australia’s obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities? 2. How will the Department collect data on new buildings and new building work on existing buildings and compliance with the Premises Standards? 	Written Question, 15 June 2015		

BI-75	Carr	Anti-Dumping Commission	Steel imports	<p>In relation to the Anti-Dumping Commission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has there been an increase in the volume of volume of steel imports in the last 6 months? If so, what is the nature of that increase? 2. Has there been an increase in the number of inquiries to the Anti-Dumping Commission relating to steel dumping? 3. What measures are being taken to ensure that any increase in applications to the Commission can be dealt with in a timely manner? 4. Does the Commission have any estimates of the extent of circumvention of existing duties? What is being done to tackle circumvention? 	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-76	Carr	Anti-Dumping Commission	Anti-Dumping system	<p>In relation to Anti-Dumping system:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the Department aware of any work undertaken by Customs and Border Protection on import data? If so, when will this work be discussed with users of Australia's anti-dumping system, for example through the International Trade Remedies Forum? 2. Is the Department aware that the lack of transparency around import data a concern for industry stakeholders? Has this issue been raised in any submissions or representations made to the government? 3. When will the next meeting of the International Trade Remedies Forum be convened? 4. Will import data be on the agenda for the next meeting of the International Trade Remedies Forum? If so, will any work undertaken by Customs and Border Protection on import data be made available prior to that meeting? 	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-77	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Building products, ABCB and Building Minister's forum	<p>In relation to building products, the Australian Building Codes Board and the Building Minister's Forum:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does the Department define non-conforming versus non-compliant building products? 2. What measures are used to determine the prevalence of non-conforming and non-compliant building products? Has there been an increase in the prevalence of such products in the last 12 months? Please provide a summary of the Department's analysis of these trends. 3. What action is the Australian Building Code Board taking regarding the use of non-compliant cladding on high rise buildings? What work is the Board doing with relevant state and territory authorities, like the Victorian Building Authority? 4. What date is the Building Minister's Forum meeting in July? 5. At the Building Ministers' Forum meeting in July, will the Minister recommend that audits are carried out in all states and territories on high rise buildings to determine the prevalence of non-compliant cladding products? 6. For what reason was the roundtable on non-conforming building 	Written Question, 15 June 2015		

				products held by Minister Baldwin on the 26 November 2014 (as referred to during the Budget estimates hearing) not mentioned in the written response received on the 12 December 2014 No: SI 66?			
BI-78	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Australian Industry Participation	In relation to Australian Industry Participation Plans: 1. The Australian Jobs Act 2013 states that the Government will create an Australian Industry Participation Authority. How is the creation of the Authority progressing? 2. The Portfolio Budget Statements 2014-15 for the Industry Portfolio referred to an evaluation of 'the costs, benefits, appropriateness and effectiveness of existing [Australian Industry Participation] policies and programmes' to be completed in 2014. What is the Government's response to the evaluation? 3. The "evaluation of Australian Industry Participation Policies and Programmes" which was conducted by Ernst and Young was received by Government on July 17 2014. Will this report, a redacted version, or a summary be tabled for the public to review? If so, when?	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-79	Carr	AusIndustry – Entrepreneur Development	Entrepreneurs' Infrastructure Programme	Can the Department please provide an explanation outlining why there is a funding cut of approximately \$27 million to the Entrepreneurs' Infrastructure Program in the 2015-16 Portfolio Budget Statements?	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-80	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Growth Centres	Has the Department engaged the services of Ernst & Young to deliver work on the Growth Centres Program? If so, please provide an outline of the nature of the work, including the value of the contract and the AusTender reference number.	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-81	Carr	IP Australia	Advisory Council on Intellectual Property	In relation to the statement issued by the Advisory Council on Intellectual Property (ACIP) on 1 June 2015 regarding Innovation Patents, specifically that "consider abolishing the system." How is the Government responding to this recommendation and what are the timeframes for a response?	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-82	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Clinical Trial Reforms	Have there been any cuts to funding for clinical trial reforms?	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-83	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Growth Fund	In relation to the Growth Fund and the Regional Infrastructure Program: 1. Is the Department of Industry and Science responsible for implementing and monitoring this program? If not, which Department is responsible and why? 2. When will successful projects for the Regional Infrastructure Program be announced? 3. In relation to the Growth Fund, when will successful projects for the Next Generation Manufacturing Investment Programme be announced? 4. In relation to the Growth Fund, please provide an updated outline the Department's promotional and educational activities in relation to this fund to date, including the total budget for promotion, advertising and educational activities, the relevant AusTender reference numbers and	Written Question, 15 June 2015		

				methods (i.e. print advertising, seminars, websites billboards, television, radio etc.).			
BI-84	Carr	Sectoral Growth Policy	Clothing and Household Textile (Building Innovative Capability) Scheme	How many applications has the Department received for the current round of the Clothing and Household Textile (Building Innovative Capability) Scheme?	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-85	Ludwig	Corporate	Non-Australian Citizens Employed by the Department/ Agency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the Department/Agency's policy with regard to hiring non-Australian citizens? 2. Does the agency have a Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) policy? If yes, please provide a summary. 3. How does the Department/Agency determine whether a person is a non-Australian citizen? 4. How many staff who were not Australian Citizens have been hired by the Department/Agency since the Federal Election in September, 2013? Please break the numbers down by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Levels at which they are employed. b) Immigration Status (Visa). c) Cultural Background. d) Linguistic Background. e) How many were hired to satisfy CALD targets? 	Written Question, 17 June 2015		
BI-86	Ludwig	Corporate	Departmental Dispute Resolution	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are disputes between departmental and/or agency staff mediated? 2. Are any outside firms contracted to assist with this process? If yes: please list them, please include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The structure of payments made to each firm (e.g. retainers, fees for each consultation etc). b) Amount paid to each firm since the last budget. c) When the contract with the firm commenced. d) When the contract with the firm will expire. e) Why the firm was selected to provide the service. f) Please provide a list of disputes referred to the firm, including a brief description of the dispute. 3. How are code of conduct violations by departmental and/or agency staff mediated? 4. Are any outside firms contracted to assist with this process? If yes: please list them, please include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The structure of payments made to each firm (e.g. retainers, fees for each consultation etc). b) Amount paid to each firm since the last budget. c) When the contract with the firm commenced. 	Written Question, 17 June 2015		

				<p>d) When the contract with the firm will expire.</p> <p>e) Why the firm was selected to provide the service.</p> <p>f) Please provide a list of disputes referred to the firm, including a brief description of the dispute.</p>			
BI-87	Carr	CSIRO	Samples from US Military Labs	<p>Does any CSIRO facility receive samples from US military labs for research purposes?</p> <p>a) If so, has CSIRO examined the possibility that it may have been a recipient of live anthrax in anthrax samples that were exported from the US and certified as inactive?</p> <p>b) Since the discovery that DSTO appears to have received one of these samples, has CSIRO been involved in identifying, handling or storing the sample? If so, please describe CSIRO's role.</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-88	Carr	CSIRO	Northern Australia CRC Bid Team	<p>Please describe CSIRO's role in the Northern Australia (agNorth) CRC Bid Team and provide an update on the status of the CRC bid and CSIRO's position in relation to it.</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-89	Carr	CSIRO	Australian Animal Health Laboratory	<p>Please provide an update on the proposed refit of the Australian Animal Health Laboratory in Geelong. How much capital funding is required to complete this project? What is the expected timeframe for the project?</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-90	Carr	CSIRO	CSIRO Staffing	<p>Please provide an update on CSIRO staffing numbers in terms of headcount and FTE by location.</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-91	Carr	Science and Commercialisation Policy	International Science Engagement Strategy	<p>In relation to Ms Urquhart's evidence on the development of a whole-of-government international science engagement strategy (page 43 of the Hansard), Ms Urquhart indicated there is currently a process underway to examine that.</p> <p>a) Has an IDC been established to consider a whole-of-government international science or research engagement strategy?</p> <p>b) If so, which agencies are represented on IDC, when was it established and how many times has it met to date?</p> <p>c) What is the timeline for this work?</p> <p>d) Is it expected that this process will involve external consultation? If so, when will this occur, who will be consulted, and what form will the consultations take?</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-92	Carr	AusIndustry - Business Services	CRC Program status	<p>In relation to Mr Hoffman's evidence on the current status of the CRC program, (page 49 of the Hansard), can the Department confirm that the next CRC round (the 18th round) is not expected to open before January 2016 at the earliest?</p> <p>a. When is it expected that the 18th round will be concluded and successful CRCs announced?</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Is it expected that a round of CRC Projects will be announced prior to or concurrently with the 18th CRC round? c. How often are CRC Project funding rounds expected to be run? d. Will the Minister be informing the business and research community about the amount available in future funding rounds for CRCs or CRC Projects? If not, why not? 			
BI-93	Carr	AusIndustry - Business Services	CRC Review	<p>How many CRCs will be subject to reviews as a result of the Government accepting Miles Review Recommendation 10?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. How will the reviews resulting from the Miles review recommendation differ from the standard mid-term CRC reviews? b. Will CRCs that have recently been subject to a performance review (for example, in the last 12 months) be exempt from the reviews resulting from the Government's acceptance of the Miles Review's Recommendation 10? c. How many of the CRCs that are expected to be subject to a review as a result of the Miles recommendation would have been subject to a performance review in any case in 2015-16? 	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-94	Carr	AusIndustry - Business Services	CRC Schedule	<p>How many reviews of existing CRCs were already scheduled to go ahead between May and August 2015?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Of these, how many are going ahead as planned and how many will be delayed? b. Who is conducting the reviews that have gone or are going ahead as previously planned? 	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-95	Carr	AusIndustry - Business Services	Industry Research Partnerships	<p>Given that the government has accepted the Miles recommendation that CRCs be restricted to a maximum of 10 years, is consideration being given to establishing a mechanism to transition successful industry-research partnerships to a more permanent arrangement?</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-96	Carr	AusIndustry - Business Services	Recommendation 18 from the Miles Review	<p>How is it envisaged that recommendation 18 of the Miles Review would be implemented? Would other Australian Government portfolios fund CRCs that are overseen by the Department of Industry and Science or would they establish their own selection and oversight mechanisms?</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-97	Carr	Science and Commercialisation Policy	Stawell Underground Physics Laboratory	<p>Have any Department of Industry and Science programs or Divisions provided or agreed to provide funding for feasibility assessment or the establishment of the Stawell Underground Physics Laboratory? If so, which program/Division, how much funding, and what are the terms of the funding agreement?</p>	Written Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-98	Carr	Science and	Square	<p>Further to the Department's response to question AI-69 from Additional</p>	Written		

		Commercialisation Policy	Kilometre Array	Estimates, what is the approximate quantum of funding expected to be required from Australia for the next phase of the SKA, and over what timeframe?	Question, 15 June 2015		
BI-99	Ketter	Resources	National Low Emissions Coal Initiative	<p>Mr Medland: Certainly the portfolio budget statement, the department's budget documents, seems to indicate a three-year period and a two-year period. We can certainly look at the budget papers.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Is there an inconsistency there?</p> <p>Mr Medland: I do not think so. Another year has passed and instead of being three years it is two years. Certainly in our portfolio budget statement everything seems to line up with the two-year and the three-year periods rather than the four-year period.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: There was a reduction in the 2013-14 budget.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: I do not have that. I am looking at the 2014-15 budget.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: I thought you said there was a reduction in the 2013-15 budget. It was 2014-15, was it?</p> <p>Senator KETTER: 2014-15, that is what the papers said. It is just a discrepancy in the number of years. That is what I am trying to get to.</p> <p>Ms Beauchamp: I think we will take it on notice to clarify but there certainly would not be a discrepancy in the budget papers. It may be that a year has dropped off in terms of actuals and there are the remaining two years. If you look at budget paper No.2 for this year, it is very clear in terms of the savings that have been taken and also the \$17.5 million over two years that remain in that fund. We will take that on notice and clarify if you can provide to us the references as well that you are referring to.</p>	Page 10, 4 June 2015	Answered during proceedings—Hansard, page.19.	
BI-100	Whish-Wilson	Sectoral Growth Policy	TMPAA projects	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Thank you, Chair. In relation to questions I asked at the last estimates on the TMPAA, the answer provided was that the Major Projects Approval Agency is working actively with three prospective tourism projects. I just wanted to check: is this still the case?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: There are a number of projects that the TMPAA is engaged with. As at 22 May, there were 49. I would have to go and check to see the number of those that are tourism projects, but certainly it is fair to say that there has been a steady stream of proposals coming through. So it could change at a particular point in time, but I could get you some quick information on that.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: It has jumped from three to 49 in the period since the last estimates?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: No. That is for all projects, not just tourism projects. You just mentioned—</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: My understanding was that was the only thing they were working on last time we discussed this.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I would have to go and check. I am quite sure that, if it</p>	Page 13, 4 June 2015	Answered during proceedings & Tabled Document No.12.	

				<p>was a recent question on notice, there were certainly more than three in the past three to four months.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: When was the question on notice, just out of interest?</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: It was asked at the last estimates.</p> <p>Senator Ronaldson: At estimates. We can get an update for you.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I am happy for you to clarify that. It could be my misinterpretation, so do not take it—</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: We will get a clarification on that.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Yes. Can you give me a rough breakdown of what industries those projects would be related to, then?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: There are a range. You have mentioned tourism. There are some things around infrastructure, but really the whole focus of it is for the agency to work with the state government on helping proponents to find a way through the regulatory barriers that they may face at all levels of government. That can be anything from Commonwealth regulation through to local government planning approvals. It is across a range of activities and sectors.</p>			
BI-101	Whish-Wilson	Sectoral Growth Policy	TMPAA projects	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: I would be very interested to know what they were. There are obviously a significant number of projects you are talking about here—49. Can I check that the cut-off for participation in the TMPAA is \$50 million?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: That is correct.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: So we are looking at 49 projects greater than \$50 million that you are working on.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I will go and check on that. We do not necessarily want to turn project proposals away if they come knocking and speaking with the people down there. There are the formal processes that they go through. There is a three-stage process in working with proponents, but I suspect that there are plenty of other issues that come knocking at the door, if you like, where the office down there is working with them. The \$50 million threshold remains, but I do not think necessarily that the work of the office is exclusively on those projects.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: So that would be separate, but there would still be 49 projects that you are working on.</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: That is right.</p>	Page 13, 4 June 2015	Answered during proceedings & Tabled Document No.12.	
BI-102	Whish-Wilson	Sectoral Growth Policy	Undersea cable	<p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could I ask whether one of them involves a third undersea cable, a digital cable network connecting Tasmania?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I will find that out for you.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: There has been recent discussion about a submarine cable company connecting Tasmania for around \$20 million, but they need to find stakeholders to finance and fund that project. It would be quite significant. I would be interested to know if your major</p>	Pages 13-14, 4 June 2015	Answered during proceedings & Tabled Document No.12.	

			<p>projects agency was actually working on that?</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: I will find that out for you. That information on the projects we currently have—I actually have a list here with the ones that I am able to talk about and the ones that I am unable to talk about. We should be able to get you this information fairly quickly. I will also find out about the submarine cable issue and whether there is any work going on there and whether we can disclose it.</p> <p>Senator WHISH-WILSON: Would you be able to do that today? If I came back later—</p> <p>Mr Chesworth: Certainly. I am looking at the camera, and there will be people working on it right now.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--