

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 001  
**Topic:** Environmental impact on the Alpine National Park  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:** 21-22 (14/2/12)

**Senator McKenzie asked:**

Senator McKENZIE: I know that we commented earlier, in relation to Senator Joyce's questions, on impact studies and the amount of data that you collect so that you can make good decisions about how to manage our ecological communities. With particular reference to the ecological communities that this decision was made about, what research has been done on the environmental impact of the 50,000 to 100,000 deer that are currently in the Alpine National Park.

Ms Dripps: I do not believe analysis of the impact of the deer was germane to this referral decision.

Senator McKENZIE: Can I take that as more of a comment on the department to have—

Ms Dripps: We can take the question on what the department has done in that regard on notice if you would like.

Senator McKENZIE: That would be great. Thank you.

Senator JOYCE: You could perhaps look at the feral pigs and rabbits and tell us what they do, as well.

...

Senator McKENZIE: ...Similarly to the research on the 50,000 to 100,000 deer could you—on notice if you cannot provide it today—provide us with any data that the department has around the environmental impact of the 8,000 brumbies in the Alpine National Park.

Ms Murray: Certainly I will take that on notice.

**Answer:**

The Australian Government's primary role in the management of the Australian Alps National Parks is one of policy coordination, with the operational matters such as pest management being the responsibility of State and Territory agencies.

The Victorian Department of Sustainability and Environment is funding a \$1,100,000 project in the Victorian Alpine National Park to, amongst other things, examine the current and potential distribution of deer and horses and to plan the rehabilitation works where the environment has already been significantly degraded. Caring for our Country has contributed \$100,000 to this project.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 002  
**Topic:** Native vegetation management on private land  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 94-95  
**or Written Question:** (13/2/12)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Are you aware of a survey of land managers done by ABARES for which case studies were conducted to increase understanding of the drivers of and barriers to native vegetation management on private land?

Mr Sullivan: I am not aware of that. Given that I am very new to the position, one of my colleagues may be aware of it.

Mr Flanigan: Not that particular reference. It may well be one of the pieces of work that have been commissioned through the Australian government land and coasts division as part of our monitoring and evaluation work. But I am not personally familiar with that particular piece of work or its current findings.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Is there anyone here who would be familiar with the area of the department that you just mentioned might be involved?

Mr Flanigan: That is us. It potentially comes under our monitoring, evaluation and review work, but I am not au fait with that particular report at this point in time. So I would have to take any questions about it on notice.

**Answer:**

ABARES has undertaken the project 'Drivers and barriers to better management of native vegetation on private land'. Funding for the project has been provided through the Australian Government's Caring for our Country Initiative from the Monitoring Evaluation Reporting and Implementation investment.

The project focuses on the drivers and barriers to native vegetation management on agricultural land. The project tested landholder perceptions and attitudes regarding the effectiveness of existing regulatory, stewardship and incentive programs for native vegetation management, and considered extension services and private action. It also drew lessons from the literature and through consultation with key experts, the Australian and state and territory governments and landholders from across Australia. We are advised by ABARES that the paper is scheduled to be finalised shortly.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 003  
**Topic:** Alpine National Park – Sambar Deer  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 95  
**or Written Question:** (13/2/12)

**Senator McKenzie asked:**

Senator McKENZIE: What work is done by the department in managing pests in national parks?

Mr Sullivan: Thank you for the question. We have a number of programs that work within the Caring for our Country portfolio of projects that deal with pests, but, with respect to pests in national parks, I am not aware of any specific projects, unless one of my colleagues is. In part, management of pests in that context is a primary responsibility, I think, of the agriculture portfolio, but I can take that on notice and look at any of the specific projects that have been funded under Caring for our Country that deal with pest management with respect to national parks.

Senator McKENZIE: My question specifically goes to Sambar deer, in the Alpine National Park.

Mr Flanigan: Sorry, we would have to take that on notice.

**Answer:**

The primary responsibility for pest management in National Parks lies with the designated land manager – generally a State or Territory Government Agency.

The *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* provides for the development of national recovery plans and conservation advice for specific threatened species – some of which identify the impacts of feral animals, including Sambar Deer, as ongoing threats to the recovery of the species. Control and management of these threats may be considered for funding through Caring for our Country and other programs.

There are no current Caring for our Country projects for the management or control of Sambar Deer in the Alpine National Park.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 004  
**Topic:** Environmental Stewardship Program  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 95-96  
**or Written Question:** (13/2/12)

**Senator Singh asked:**

Senator SINGH: Would you be able to update the committee on any changes to the Environmental Stewardship Program?

Dr Zammit: The Environmental Stewardship Program kicked off in 2007-08, and the first four years of funding progressed through a model which involved competitive tenders for 15-year payments for the successful tenderers to protect matters of national environmental significance—in particular, nationally endangered ecological communities. For the first three years the program focused on a single very large endangered community, the box gum grassy woodlands in western New South Wales and southern Queensland. That program delivered about 27,000 hectares of protected woodland through about 200 contracts. In 2010-11 we expanded the program to do more than one community; we expanded it to do multiple ecological communities in South Australia and, again, western New South Wales. That has now run for about 18 months, and we have protected another 20,000 hectares through another 70 contracts.

In the funding last year, the program was renewed for four years. We are revising the program model. We are continuing to use competitive tenders in the market, but rather than focusing on single or multiple communities we are now focusing on habitat that supports many matters of NES. By that I mean endangered species, endangered communities, migratory species, Ramsar wetlands and the like. By broadening the program in this way we can target more parts of the country, engage more landowners and effectively make the program more efficient by not constraining it to one, two or three particular community types but choosing habitats that target multiple sorts of areas that might be threatened.

Senator SINGH: How was that change brought about? What has been the take-up since the new changes occurred?

Dr Zammit: We have been consistently oversubscribed. My recollection is that, over the seven auction rounds we have run, we have had in the order of 800 or so expressions of interest. We have contracted 270 landowners over the life of the program so far, so we are well subscribed.

Senator SINGH: Are you able to provide the committee with a state-by-state breakdown? I am obviously interested in Tasmania, so that state would be a good start if you have that on you. It is just out of interest, because obviously the biodiversity is different across the country, so I presume the applications would be vastly different as part of that tender process.

Dr Zammit: I can give you the breakdown. We have run auction rounds only in New South Wales and South Australia—no, in fact also in Queensland. I can give you numbers of contracts and areas if you would like. For Queensland we have had a total of only nine contracts, for a total of about 2,000 hectares. For New South Wales we have had a total of 201 contracts, for a total of 46,000 hectares. For South Australia we have had 27 contracts, for a total of 4,900 hectares. Those are the competitive grants. In relation to discretionary funded projects, I do not have the most recent allocations for the announcements just of last week, but I can give them to you on notice.

**Answer:**

The discretionary Environmental Stewardship funded projects announced by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, the Hon Tony Burke MP on 8 February 2012 are listed by State in the table below:

State	Project Name	Funding (GST incl.)
Tasmania	Long Term Protection and Management of the Lowland Native Grasslands	\$880,000
South Australia	Recovering Grey Box Grassy Woodlands in Adelaide and Mt Lofty Range	\$605,000
New South Wales	Whole of Paddock Rehabilitation pilot Program – Extending and Restoring	\$335,500

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 005  
**Topic:** Caring for our Country budget  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:** 99 (13/2/12)

**Senator Fisher asked:**

Senator FISHER: Could you, presumably on notice, provide us with a one-pager of all budgeted future Caring for our Country programs and moneys on a year-by-year basis?

Mr Sullivan: Hopefully I can answer that without having to provide the one page. In the 2012-13 business plan there is a notional budget that is out there in terms of the open call which has just closed. That is for next year. It is a smaller amount of money because the money has been diminishing because of multi-year funding projects taking up a large chunk of the money early in the program cycle. So the amount of money has been decreasing. The forward estimates for Caring for our Country are really subject to the review process and decisions for government about what that tranche of funding will look like. So there is forward estimates because Caring for our Country is an ongoing program. We can give you a quick breakdown, but it will really replicate what is in the budget papers in terms of the breakdown across the program items: what is in the environmental stewardship program, what comes from the special account—

Senator FISHER: It will essentially pull it all together, though, and that is what we would appreciate.

Mr Sullivan: Okay.

**Answer:**

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
('000)	Budget	Forward year 1	Forward year 2	Forward year 3
Annual administered expenses:				
Caring for our Country:				
Natural Heritage Trust <sup>1</sup>	202,015	199,122	332,009	360,556
Treasury <sup>1</sup>	144,576	144,717	-	-
Landcare	37,123	37,127	37,177	37,177
Working on Country	52,148	57,540	47,105	51,833
Environmental Stewardship Program	13,970	16,151	19,065	23,871
<b>Total program expenses</b>	<b>449,832</b>	<b>454,657</b>	<b>435,356</b>	<b>473,437</b>

<sup>1</sup> Part of Caring for our Country funding has been transferred to the Department of the Treasury to enable payments required under the *Federal Financial Relations Act 2009*.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

<b>Program: Division or Agency:</b>	1.1: AGLC	<b>Question No:</b>	006
<b>Topic:</b>	Native vegetation protected from coal seam gas or mining exploration		
<b>Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:</b>	101-102 (13/2/12)		

**Senator Waters asked:**

Senator WATERS: My question goes to the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy, so I am not sure who is the best person to answer that. One of the targets is that by 2015 we will have a national increase of 600,000 square kilometres of native habitat managed primarily for biodiversity conservation, which is wonderful. How is that progressing? How much of that target have we got to go and how much have we achieved to date?

Dr Zammit: The national Biodiversity Conservation Strategy is a cross-government strategy. It is agreed by the ministers from all the jurisdictions in the country, so it is not a Commonwealth commitment; it is a national commitment. With the formation of the new ministerial council, we have established an implementation working group to take forward how we might collectively, across jurisdictions, implement all the targets in that strategy. We have just started work on that group in the last month, so I cannot give you any more advice except to say that there is a body of work in place for governments to work together and to take back to the ministerial council by the end of this year an implementation framework which will allow us to report against the targets across governments.

Senator WATERS: I will watch that space. What proportion of existing native habitat is on a tenure or under an arrangement that protects it from coal seam gas or mining exploration?

Mr Sullivan: No, I cannot.

Senator WATERS: Could you take that on notice, please?

Mr Sullivan: I will do my best to take that on notice and see what we can do.

Senator WATERS: Thank you. I would be very interested in that. Obviously it goes to the effectiveness of the scheme.

**Answer:**

Regulation of the coal seam gas industry is primarily the responsibility of the relevant State or Territory Government in which the industry is located. The relevant State or Territory Government is also responsible for making decisions in relation to the licensing of mining and extractive industries, including for coal seam gas and mining exploration.

The question of what proportion of existing native habitat is on a tenure or under an arrangement that protects it from coal seam gas or mining exploration is subject to the specific regulatory systems of each government and therefore is likely to vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction across Australia. Nationally consistent and aggregated statistics of this sort are not currently available.



The Queensland and New South Wales governments have recently announced policies in relation to the planning of coal seam gas operations. For details please refer to the following State Government websites:

- [www.derm.qld.gov.au/land/planning/strategic-cropping/index.html](http://www.derm.qld.gov.au/land/planning/strategic-cropping/index.html) (Queensland)
- [www.planning.nsw.gov.au/StrategicPlanning/StrategicRegionalLandUse/tabid/495/language/en-AU/Default.aspx](http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/StrategicPlanning/StrategicRegionalLandUse/tabid/495/language/en-AU/Default.aspx) (New South Wales)

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 007

**Topic:** Caring for our Country – budget and staffing

**Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:** Written

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

1. What is the total budget for the Caring for our Country program?
2. How much of the budget has been spent?
3. How many staff are currently employed in this program area?
4. What is the number of permanent and contracted staff?

**Answer:**

1. The total budget for Caring for our Country over the first five years is \$2,182.4 million.
2. \$1,542.8 million of this budget was spent as at 29 February 2012.
3. The budgeted average staffing level for Caring for our Country is 329 in 2011-12.
4. The staffing budget is used to fund staff and a range of related staffing costs. The actual number of permanent and contracted staff will vary over the course of the financial year.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 008  
**Topic:** Landcare – budget and staffing  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

1. What is the total budgeted funding for Landcare?
2. How much of the budget has been spent?
3. How many staff are currently employed in this program area?
4. What is the number of permanent and contracted staff?

**Answer:**

1. The total budget for Caring for our Country - Landcare over the first five years from 2008–09 to 2012–13 is \$187.7 million.
2. \$128.6 million of this budget was spent as at 31 January 2012.
3. The budgeted average staffing level for Caring for our Country - Landcare is 16.5 in 2011-12.
4. The staffing budget is used to fund staff and a range of related staffing costs. The actual number of permanent and contracted staff will vary over the course of the financial year.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 009  
**Topic:** Lake Innes - update on progress  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Williams asked:**

1. I want to revisit the Lake Innes issue on the mid north coast of NSW. This is the lake where some wanted it reverted to freshwater but the fishermen are dead against it.

When I last asked about it I was told it was the preliminary stage and it was just scoping.  
Can you give me an update as to what has happened since October?

**Answer:**

1. The details of the contract have been finalised and contracts were signed with the Northern Rivers Catchment Management Authority on 25 January 2012.

Following processing of the signed contract, the first payment of \$110,000 was made to the Northern Rivers Catchment Management Authority on 30 January 2012.

A tender process was undertaken and a project manager has been selected to coordinate the project.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 010

**Topic:** Lake Innes – contract to conduct the feasibility study

**Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:** Written

**Senator Williams asked:**

1. Did the Northern Rivers Catchment Management Authority get the contract to run the study?

**Answer:**

1. Yes. The Northern Rivers Catchment Management Authority is the contract manager.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 011  
**Topic:** Lake Innes - budget  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:** Written

**Senator Williams asked:**

1. How much of the \$220,000 budgeted for this financial year has been spent, and what on?

**Answer:**

1. To date \$5,700 has been expended on initial project management tasks.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 012

**Topic:** Lake Innes – community consultations/feedback

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** Written

**or Written Question:**

**Senator Williams asked:**

1. Have there been any community consultations?
2. Have you had any unsolicited feedback from the public about the freshwater reversion program?

**Answer:**

1. No community consultations have yet been undertaken as the project is in the initial stages of development.
2. An email request for information on the timing of the study was received from the Lake Cathie Progress Association Inc. The request was originally made to NSW Parks and Wildlife Service who passed it on to the Northern Rivers Catchment Management Authority for response.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 013  
**Topic:** Carp numbers in the Murray-Darling Basin  
**Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:** Written

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

1. What action is being taken in light of the explosion of carp numbers in the Basin?

**Answer:**

1. The Native Fish Strategy for the Murray Darling Basin was approved in 2003 by the former Murray–Darling Basin Commission as a 50-year plan to rehabilitate native fish populations in the Murray–Darling Basin. The Strategy provides guidance for investing funds, and assigning priorities, responsibilities and evaluation procedures for fish research and development programs; on-ground implementation programs; construction programs for fishways; and community education and awareness programs. Approximately \$70 million from the federal and state governments has been spent on the implementation of the Strategy to date.

The recently completed ‘Sea to Hume Dam’ program of restoring fish passage along the Murray River – a core component of the Strategy – has been the vehicle for both developing a better understanding of the behaviour of carp and for constraining its movement through the Murray Darling system. In particular, the ‘William’s carp separation cage’ was trialled and found to be a highly effective way to separate and capture carp whilst avoiding capture of native fish. This technology replaces labour intensive and less humane trapping methods.

Caring for our Country has provided resources to some projects with carp management elements, including:

- Rehabilitation of the Pike Mundic Wetland complex floodplain (South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management; \$666,894). The project includes the development of a carp control strategy for the wetlands complex.
- Enhancing native flora and fauna through feral pest removal (Kooma Traditional Owners Association Inc. \$20,000). The project focuses on carp and feral pig control.
- Investments by Regional natural resource management bodies may be used for carp management through their base-level funding – for example, the approved baseline funding for the NSW Murray Catchment Management Authority includes provision for expenditure of \$120,000 for community engagement and education, scoping commercial use of carp, and scoping works required to prevent carp movement into new river reaches and impacting on the Southern Pygmy Perch.



The Invasive Animals Cooperative Research Centre is coordinating research into novel methods of carp management and control, including:

- daughterless carp technology in which the gender balance of wild carp populations is manipulated through genetic means, potentially leading to population crashes and reduced environmental impacts; and
- Koi herpes virus as a biological control agent – while not yet having presented in Australia, the virus has devastated carp populations in the US, Israel, Europe and China, and is being assessed for possible application in Australia.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 014

**Topic:** Native habitat managed for biodiversity conservation

**Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:** Written

**Senator Waters asked:**

1. Regarding native habitat in Australia that is currently managed primarily for biodiversity conservation, please advise:
  - a. How much of Australia is currently managed for this purpose? (in square kilometres)
  - b. What types of tenure arrangement apply to this habitat?
  - c. Of these tenure types, please advise which cannot be subject to mining or exploration for coal, coal seam gas or other mineral resource exploitation?

**Answer:**

- 1a. The National Reserve System (NRS) is Australia's network of protected areas that are formally managed primarily for biodiversity conservation. The formal reserve system includes more than 9,400 protected areas covering nearly 14 per cent of the country - almost 106 million hectares. It is made up of Commonwealth, State and Territory reserves, Indigenous lands and protected areas on private land administered by non-profit conservation organisations, through to habitats protected by farmers on their private working properties.

Information about terrestrial protected areas is collected in the Collaborative Australian Protected Area Database (CAPAD) which can be found at:  
<http://www.environment.gov.au/parks/nrs/science/capad/2008/index.html>

There are also private (leasehold or freehold) lands managed for biodiversity conservation purposes in Australia under a variety of administrative arrangements that are not part of the NRS. The Australian Government has collected some information about these lands in its National Conservation Lands Database. This Database is not yet complete.

- 1b. Commonwealth, State and Territory governments are responsible for the administration of legislation which governs the various types of conservation tenure that provide for biodiversity conservation in their jurisdictions. There is a variety of tenure arrangements for land with existing native habitat managed primarily for biodiversity conservation; this information rests with each jurisdiction.

1c. Regulation of the coal seam gas industry is primarily the responsibility of the relevant State or Territory Government. The relevant State or Territory Government is also responsible for making decisions in relation to the licensing of mining and extractive industries and for matters relating to rural land use planning and property rights. The question of which land tenures cannot be subject to mining or exploration for coal, coal seam gas or other mineral resource exploitation is subject to the specific regulatory systems of each jurisdiction and therefore varies across Australia.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications**  
**Legislation Committee**  
Answers to questions on notice  
**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**  
Additional Budget Estimates, February 2012

<b>Program: Division or Agency:</b>	1.1: AGLC	<b>Question No:</b>	015
<b>Topic:</b>	Impacts of invasive species on biodiversity		
<b>Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question:</b>	Written		

**Senator Waters asked:**

The State of the Environment 2011 report found that biodiversity is in decline, including from invasive species. The impacts of invasive species on biodiversity ('very high'), the trend ('deteriorating') and the management effectiveness ('ineffective') received the worst possible ratings.

1. Has SEWPaC undertaken an assessment of what reforms in its biosecurity functions will be needed to achieve a more positive report card for invasive species by the 2016 State of the Environment report? Please outline what measures the Government intends to take beyond existing measures and programs to stop and reverse the threats of invasive species on biodiversity?
2. In relation to Target 7 of Australia's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy 2010–2030 and the Foreword of the strategy which indicates that the goal by 2030 is to reduce the impacts of invasive species "so that their impact on biodiversity is negligible".
  - a. Please advise what planning and/ or implementation the Department has undertaken to date in order to ensure the biodiversity 2015 target and 2030 goal will be met.
  - b. Has the Department undertaken or contributed to a baseline assessment against which the 2015 target will be assessed? Where is that assessment? If it has not been done, when and how will it be done?
  - c. What resources are needed for Australia to meet its 2015 invasive species target and 2030 goal? Has any assessment of resource needs been undertaken? Has the Department undertaken or contributed to an assessment of the resources needed for addressing biosecurity threats to biodiversity?
  - d. Recognising that the biodiversity targets are a joint commitment of national and state/territory governments, has the Environment Minister and the Environment Department through their involvement in joint government processes initiated or been involved in any processes to determine how the 2015 biodiversity target and 2030 goal for invasive species will be met? What has this activity involved to date?

**Answer:**

1. It is important to note that the independent State of the Environment Report addresses a number of issues that are not the primary responsibility of the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department). In this context, within the Australian Government, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) has primary responsibility for undertaking biosecurity activities to protect the economy and the environment.

The states and territories are responsible for regulation of biosecurity within their borders and for activities to control or manage established pests and diseases on government owned and managed land. Landowners are responsible for the management of pests and diseases on their land, in accordance with state laws.

The department:

- provides advice and expertise (primarily about matters of national environmental significance) to support DAFF's decision-making on behalf of the Australian Government;
- participates on the National Biosecurity Committee and other subordinate committees under the Primary Industries Standing Council, to promote development of national policy in line with its statutory, regulatory and portfolio related responsibilities;
- regulates the movement of wildlife into and out of Australia;
- develops threat abatement plans where appropriate for invasive species-related key threatening processes under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* and provides limited funding for research and other actions to implement threat abatement plans; and
- provides significant funding through Caring for our Country for on-ground actions to address invasive species that affect biodiversity and natural icons.

Some programs related to invasive species are conducted under shared arrangements between the department and DAFF. Caring for Our Country is one such initiative. Under this program, over the period 2008–09 to 2011–12 more than \$81.6 million was invested in projects with a significant component of weed and pest animal management and \$11.2 million was provided for Community Action Grants with a similar focus.

- 2a. Implementation of Australia's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy 2010-2030 is shared jointly between all of Australia's governments. Within that shared responsibility, the department is participating in Council of Australian Governments (COAG) consultations relating to various environmental issues including through the Ministerial Standing Council on Environment and Water. Under this Council, the department is chairing the National Strategies Implementation Working Group. The Working Group is to develop an Implementation Plan for the national strategies relevant to landscape and ecosystem scale biodiversity including *Australia's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy 2010-2030*. Through the development of this Implementation Plan, the department along with the states and territories will identify opportunities to reduce threats to biodiversity including the impacts of invasive species and what actions are required to achieve the 2015 target and 2030 goal for invasive species.

- 2b. The Working Group is considering means to harmonise and coordinate the collection and reporting of environmental information across jurisdictions for the purposes of monitoring and reporting on the outcomes of the national strategies. This work is necessary in order to establish a baseline against which to report and to ensure that reporting is made on a consistent basis across Australia.
- 2c. Working Group members will consider the resource implications of activities identified during the development of the Implementation Plan, including in relation to the relevant target and goal for invasive species. Each State and Territory is responsible for addressing the impacts of invasive species in its jurisdiction and will be aware of the resource commitments required. Given the distributed responsibility for biosecurity actions, the department has not conducted its own review of the resources needed to achieve the target and goal for invasive species in Australia's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy 2010-2030.
- 2d. As indicated above, the department is actively involved in COAG consultations and, more specifically, chairs the National Strategies Implementation Working Group which is developing an Implementation Plan for the national strategies relevant to landscape and ecosystem scale biodiversity. This Implementation Plan is due to be delivered to the Standing Council on Environment and Water by the end of 2012.