

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 189
Topic: Portfolio Wide – printing costs
Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

How many documents (include the amount of copies) have been printed this financial year to date? How many of these printed documents were also published online?

Answer:

The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department)

63 documents have been printed in the financial year to date, with print quantities ranging from 20 to 7,500. Fifty six of the 63 documents had a printing quantity of 2,000 or less.

For the purpose of this response, a 'document' is defined as books, booklets, brochures, guides, flyers, and factsheets.

All of the department's public documents are published online, excluding stationery items such as business cards or promotional materials such as banners.

Bureau of Meteorology

83 documents have been printed in the financial year to date, with print quantities for each publication ranging from 50 at the lowest end of the range to 69,000 for the Bureau Calendar, which was not published online.

As a general policy, most externally-focussed publications are also published online.

Director of National Parks

Eleven documents have been printed in the financial year to date, with print quantities ranging from 250 to 200,000. The higher print quantities are of park brochures and guides which are core communication vehicles to inform and educate park visitors on a range of natural and cultural values, walks, and other recreational opportunities in parks.

Nine of the 11 documents have been published online.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

Eight documents have been printed in the financial year to date, with printing quantities ranging from 70 to 99,450. Six of the eight documents had a print quantity of less than 1000.

Seven of the eight documents were published online.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

Twelve documents have been printed in the financial year to date, with printing quantities ranging from 200 to 5,150.

Nine of the 12 documents were published online.

National Water Commission

One document has been printed in the financial year to date, with a print quantity of 1,000. This document was published online.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

Ten documents have been printed in the financial year to date, with print quantities ranging from 250 to 30,000.

Five of the documents were published online.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 190
Topic: Portfolio Wide – government advertising
Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. What was the total cost of all advertising for the financial year to date?
2. Is the advertising campaign or non-campaign advertising? Provide details of each advertising, including the program the advertising was for, the total spend and the business that provided the advertising services?
3. Has the Department of Finance and Deregulation provided any advice about the advertising? Provide details of each advertising item.
4. Has the Peer Review Group (PRG) and/or Independent Communications Committee (ICC) provided any advice about the advertising? Provide details of each advertising item.
5. Did the Advertising comply with the Guidelines on Information and Advertising Campaigns by Australian Government Departments and Agencies? Provide the details for each advertising item.
6. Provide details for any other communications program, including details of the program, the total spend and the business that provided the communication services?
7. What advertising – Campaign and Non-Campaign – and other communications programs is the Department/Agency undertaking, or are planning to undertake?

Answer:

The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department)

1. \$411,709.26
2. Between 1 July 2012 and 31 January 2013 the department undertook both campaign and non-campaign advertising. The total spend on non-campaign advertising for the reporting period is \$197,680.52. This includes gazette and recruitment advertising, public information notices, requests for tender and expressions of interest.

Advertising for the Water Efficiency Labelling (WELS) Scheme during this period was \$37,708.23. Whilst such advertising was classified as operational by the Department of Finance and Deregulation (in its determination on 4 June 2010), it falls within the scope of the *Guidelines on information and advertising campaigns by Australian Government departments and agencies (March 2010)* and is listed in the department's annual report as campaign advertising.

The *Recreational Fishers* advertising was classed by the Department of Finance and Deregulation as campaign advertising. It was developed to provide information about the impacts of the final proposed Commonwealth marine reserves. The total spend on the *Recreational Fishers* campaign advertising during this period is \$176, 320.51.

3. Due to new guidelines prohibiting recruitment advertising in print media from 1 July 2012, waivers were sought from the Department of Finance and Deregulation to advertise a hard to fill Indigenous targeted position in print media: APS Level 1/ 2 – Indigenous Ranger, Specified, 22 January 2013, NT News.

The department also consulted the Department of Finance and Deregulation during the initial development of the *Recreational Fishers* advertising campaign.

4. No.
5. Yes.
6. Communication strategies are developed for each communication program and may include such activities as websites, publications, events, advertising, public relations and media liaison. These activities are not campaign advertising and are undertaken as part of broader stakeholder engagement to communicate the department's policies and programs.

The department utilises panel arrangements for creative and printing services which are managed by the Department of Human Services. The communication activities are procured from various suppliers selected through an AusTender process.

Departmental expenditure on communication related activities for the period 1 July 2012 to 31 January 2013 was \$261,876.59.

7. The *Recreational Fishers* advertising campaign ended in March 2012. At the time of writing, there were no further campaign advertising activities planned for the department.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. \$12,462.18.
2. Non-campaign.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.
7. None.

Director of National Parks

1. \$38,899.09
2. The amount provided at question 1 is for non-campaign advertising. The Director of National Parks primarily uses the Australian Government non-campaign central advertising system provider, AdCorp, to place its advertisements, but may directly place advertisements in local newspapers where AdCorp does not provide this service.

Expenditure on non-campaign advertising includes gazette and recruitment advertising, public information notices, request for tenders and expressions of interest. Providing specific details for each item would involve an extensive manual process.

3. No.
4. No.
5. Not applicable.
6. The Director of National Parks utilises the department's panel arrangements for creative and printing services which are managed by the Department of Human Services. The communication activities are procured from various suppliers through this centralised arrangement. For the purpose of this response 'communications program' is defined as: the communication of a government message to the public, possibly by advertising (print, television, radio etcetera), possibly through the erection of signs, plaques etcetera, or through other mediums. Director of National Parks expenditure on communication related activities for the reporting period was \$72,342.12.
7. The Director of National Parks is not undertaking or planning to undertake any campaign advertising.

In relation to other advertising, the Director of National Parks is likely to place notices (print, television, radio etcetera) alerting the public to activities that may occur in the Australian National Botanic Gardens and six Commonwealth national parks managed by the Director of National Parks.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)

1. \$44,102.00.
2. Non-campaign:
 - Zoning Education: \$2,123
 - Promotion of Reef HQ Aquarium: \$31,568
 - Recruitment: \$4,732
 - Reef Guardians: \$2,775
 - Other: \$2,904
3. No.
4. No.
5. Yes. The advertising was operational and non-campaign in nature and directly related to the agency educating the public about its programs and services.
6. Nil. GBRMPA does not outsource implementation of its communication programs.
7. GBRMPA is planning to undertake non-campaign advertising for:
 - Zoning Education
 - Promotion of Reef HQ Aquarium
 - Recruitment

- Reef Guardians
- Other: such as advertising proposed plans of management and other public consultations etc.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (the Authority)

1. \$5,947.
2. Non-campaign.
3. No.
4. No.
5. As the advertising was non-campaign, these guidelines do not apply.
6. There has been no communications program this financial year.
7. The Authority has no plans to undertake any advertising or communications programs, other than routine recruitment advertising.

National Water Commission (the Commission)

1. \$2,915.
2. Non-campaign.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Yes.
6. The Commission has no current communication programs.
7. The Commission is planning to undertake further non-campaign recruitment advertising.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (the Trust)

1. \$66,716.58.
2. Non-campaign advertising. 2012/13 advertising to date includes advertising for tenders, general advertising across community, metro and national publications and websites, advertising accommodation offerings, general government listing advertising and advertising for program activity.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Yes.
6. Not applicable.
7. The Trust is planning to undertake the following non-campaign advertising and communications:
 - Harbour Trust tender advertising.
 - Cockatoo Island accommodation advertising.

- Cockatoo Island event advertising.
- North Head tourism advertising.
- Public relations and media activities.
- Online advertising – social media, e-newsletters.
- Brochures and collateral.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 191
Topic: Portfolio Wide – board appointments
Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. List all of the boards within this portfolio, including: board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members?
2. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?
3. Please detail any board appointments for this financial year to date.

Answer:

1. In accordance with Senate Order 13, the details of the boards within this portfolio, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members, are tabled in the Senate prior to each Senate Estimates Hearing. Details for portfolio boards, in accordance with Senate Order 13, were tabled for Additional Estimates February 2013.
2. The gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio is outlined in the table below:

Board	Gender Ratio F:M
Alligator Rivers Region Advisory Committee	5:22
Alligator Rivers Region Technical Committee	3:11
Antarctic Animal Ethics Committee	5:4
Antarctic Science Advisory Committee (Action commenced to fill positions)	0:0
Australia-Netherlands Committee on Old Dutch Shipwrecks	2:0
Australian Antarctic Names and Medal Committee	2:3
Australian Antarctic Program Human Research Ethics Committee	1:2
Australian Biological Resources Study Advisory Committee	5:8
Australian Heritage Council	4:3
Booderee National Park Board of Management	4:8
Expert Panel for Major Coal Seam Gas Projects	1:3

Fuel Standards Consultative Committee	2:8
Great Artesian Basin Coordinating Committee	3:9
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	0:2
Hazardous Waste Technical Group	2:6
Iconic Sites Task Force	4:3
Independent Expert Scientific Committee on Coal Seam Gas and Coal Mining	4:4
Indigenous Advisory Committee	3:8
Kakadu National Park Board of Management	3:9
Lake Eyre Basin Community Advisory Committee	8:9
Lake Eyre Basin Scientific Advisory Panel	3:4
Land Sector Carbon and Biodiversity Board	2:3
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	3:3
National Sustainability Council	3:7
National Water Commission	1:4
Product Stewardship Advisory Group	5:5
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	2:3
Threatened Species Scientific Committee	3:3
Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Board of Management	3:6
Portfolio	86:160

3. Board appointments for this financial year to date are reflected in Senate Order 13 tabled in the Senate in January 2013.

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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question 192**
Topic: Portfolio Wide – freedom of information **No:**
Proof Hansard Page and Date Written
or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Has the department/agency received any updated advice on how to respond to FOI requests?
2. What is the total cost to the department to process FOI requests for this financial year to date?
3. How many FOI requests has the department received for this financial year to date? How many requests have been denied and how many have been granted? Has the department failed to meet the processing times outlined in the FOI Act for any requests? If so, how many and why? Do any of these requests remain outstanding? If so, how many and why?

Answer:

The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities includes the Director of National Parks

1. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) and its portfolio agencies follow the advice and protocols provided by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (the OAIC) in line with the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (the FOI Act) and Freedom of Information (FOI) guidance material. The department also follows the FOI guidance notes provided by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet on 28 July 2011 which are available at: http://www.dpmc.gov.au/foi/guidance_notes.cfm.
2. For the financial year to date (31 January 2013) the direct cost to the department to process FOI requests (based on the OAIC methodology), was approximately \$167,960. This figure does not factor in charges received from applicants or the department's broader costs of maintaining the systems and processes for the management of FOI work.
3. For the financial year to date (31 January 2013) the department received 65 FOI requests and had 15 FOI requests carried over from the financial year 2011/12 (equating to a total of 80 FOI requests).

Of the total 80 FOI requests, 22 were granted in full, 11 were granted in part, seven were refused, three were transferred to another agency for processing, 27 were withdrawn and 10 are still being processed.

For the financial year to date (31 January 2013) the department has processed four FOI requests outside the statutory timeframe provided by the FOI Act. All four matters were finalised as at 31 January 2013. In each case departmental delegates did not determine the FOI access decision within the statutory timeframe as provided by Section 15 of the FOI Act.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. See departmental answer for all portfolio agencies.
2. For the financial year to date the total cost to the Bureau of Meteorology (the Bureau) to process FOI requests was approximately \$42,937.
3. For the financial year to date the Bureau received 12 FOI requests. Two requests were refused and eight were granted. Two requests have not met the processing times outlined in the FOI Act and remained outstanding as at 31 January 2013. One of the requests was extended by the OAIC under Section 15AB of the FOI Act and the other request was extended with the consent of the applicant under Section 15AA of the Act.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. See departmental answer for all portfolio agencies.
2. For the financial year to date the total cost to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) to process FOI requests was \$14,086.
3. For the financial year to date GBRMPA received six FOI requests. One request was denied. Three requests were granted. GBRMPA has met all processing times outlined in the FOI Act. Two requests remain outstanding but are within processing times.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. See departmental answer for all portfolio agencies.
2. For the financial year to date the total cost to the Authority to process FOI requests was approximately \$23,416.
3. For the financial year to date the Authority received seven FOI requests. One request was granted in full, four requests were granted in part, one request was withdrawn and one request is still being processed. In addition, three requests received in the financial year 2011/12 were finalised in this financial year, of which all were granted in part. No requests failed to meet the processing times outlined in the FOI Act.

National Water Commission

1. See departmental answer for all portfolio agencies.
2. Nil.
3. No FOI requests have been received by the Commission in the financial year to date.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. See departmental answer for all portfolio agencies.
2. For the financial year to date the total cost to the Trust to process FOI requests was approximately \$306.
3. For the financial year to date the Trust received one FOI request. The request was granted with minor redactions from relevant reports. The Trust did not meet the 14 day acknowledgment of receipt timeframe due a technical problem where emails were not diverting to the secondary FOI officer whilst the primary FOI officer was on leave. This problem has now been resolved to prevent a reoccurrence. No requests are outstanding.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 193

Topic: Portfolio Wide – community cabinet meetings

Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. How many Community Cabinet meetings has the Minister attended this financial year to date? List date and location.
2. How many departmental officers travelled with the Minister for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date? What was the total cost of this travel? List travel type, accommodation and any other expenses. Which Community Cabinet meetings did the Departmental Officers attend? List date and location.
3. What was the total cost to the Department and the Ministers office for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date?

Answer:

1. The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the Minister) attended four Community Cabinet meetings this financial year to date (31 January 2013): Ipswich, Queensland, 10 July 2012; Brand, Western Australia, 5 September 2012, Bass, Tasmania, 3 October 2012, and Petrie, Queensland 14 November 2012.
2. A total of three departmental officers from the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) attended Community Cabinet meetings to support the Minister in this financial year to date (31 January 2013). The total cost of the travel, including airfares, accommodation, taxis and travelling allowance, was \$8,665.03. Departmental staff attended three Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date (31 January 2013): Ipswich, Queensland, 10 July 2012; Brand, Western Australia, 5 September 2012; and Bass, Tasmania, 3 October 2012.
3. The total travel cost to the department and the Minister's office for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date (31 January 2013) was \$34,635.85. This includes airfares and Travelling Allowance (including Motor Vehicle Allowance) claims. It does not include travel by taxis (due to the difficulties determining exact destinations using the electronic information as provided by Cabcharge), COMCAR (which is charged directly to portfolio agencies), or travel on Special Purpose Aircraft (which is administered by the Department of Defence).

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 194

Topic: Portfolio Wide - reviews

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

For this financial year to date:

1. How many reviews are being undertaken?
2. What reviews have concluded, and for those that are still ongoing, when will those reviews be concluded?
3. Which of these reviews has been provided to Government?
4. When will the Government be responding to the respective reviews that have been completed?
5. Has the Government responded to all reviews within the timeframe? If not, why not?
6. What is the estimated cost of each of these reviews?
7. What reviews are planned?
8. When will each of these reviews be concluded?

Answer:

For this financial year to date:

Consolidated responses to questions one through six are given in the table below:

Name of Review	Estimated completion date	Provided to Government	Government Response	Estimated cost
Mid-term Review of Phase 3 of the Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative (commenced June 2012).	The Review was concluded on 12 March 2013.	Not yet provided.	A timetable for the government response has not been established.	\$74,102.

Name of Review	Estimated completion date	Provided to Government	Government Response	Estimated cost
Review of the Great Artesian Basin Co-ordinating Committee.	The Review was concluded on 6 March 2013.	Not yet provided.	A timetable for the government response has not been established.	\$79,192.
The Review of the <i>Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Exports and Imports) Act 1989</i> and its associated regulations.	Mid-2013.	To be determined.	To be determined.	\$44,400.
Independent Review of Australian Government Environmental Information Activity.	The Review was concluded in November 2012.	December 2012.	No formal government response is planned. The review will inform the long term strategic direction of environmental information management.	\$129,805.

7. No reviews are currently planned.
8. Not applicable.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 195
Topic: Portfolio Wide – media monitoring
Proof Hansard Page and Date Written
or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Minister's office for this financial year to date?
2. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
3. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2012-13?
4. What has been spent providing these services this financial year to date?
5. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency for this financial year to date?
6. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
7. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2012-13?
8. What has been spent providing these services this financial year to date?

Answer:

Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities includes the Director of National Parks

1. The cost of the media monitoring services provided to the Minister's office is nil. The Minister's office uses the departmental media monitoring service.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.
5. \$272,185.26 (as at 31 January 2013).
6. Australian Associated Press Pty Ltd.
7. \$450,000.
8. See answer to question 5.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. Nil. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority does not provide this service.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.
5. \$17,596.
6. Media Monitors.
7. \$50,000.
8. \$17,596.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. Nil. The Authority does not provide this service.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable
5. \$76,319.
6. Media Monitors.
7. \$94,000.
8. \$76,319.

National Water Commission

1. Nil. The Commission does not provide this service.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.
5. \$37,090.
6. Media Monitors.
7. \$60,000.
8. \$37,090.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

No media monitoring services were purchased by the Trust.

Bureau of Meteorology

No media monitoring services were purchased by the Bureau.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 196
Topic: Portfolio Wide – commissioned reports
Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. How many Reports have been commissioned by the Government in your department/agency this financial year to date? Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, Terms of Reference and Committee members.
2. How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost? How many departmental staff were involved in each report and at what level?
3. What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to these reports?

Answer:

1. Two.

Report from the Expert Panel on a Declared Commercial Fishing Activity

Commissioned: 11 January 2013 (date of appointment of members to the panel).

Handed to Government: To be provided to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the Minister) by 22 October 2014.

Date of Public Release: Not specified.

Terms of reference: The Expert Panel will assess the Declared Commercial Fishing Activity, particularly the potential for the activity to result in adverse environmental impacts.

The Expert Panel will assess and advise on:

- the likely nature and extent of direct interactions of the Declared Commercial Fishing Activity with species protected under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (the EPBC Act), particularly seals;
- the potential for any localised depletion of target species (arising from the Declared Commercial Fishing Activity) to result in adverse impacts to the Commonwealth marine environment, including the target species' predators protected under the EPBC Act;

- actions that could be taken by operators of the Declared Commercial Fishing Activity or relevant regulatory authorities to avoid, reduce and mitigate adverse environmental impacts of the activity;
- monitoring or scientific research that would reduce any uncertainties about the potential for adverse environmental impacts resulting from the Declared Commercial Fishing Activity;
- any other matters about the environmental impacts of the Declared Commercial Fishing Activity that the Expert Panel considers relevant to its assessment; and
- other related matters that may be referred by the Minister.

Members:

- Ms Mary Lack (Chair).
- Professor Peter Harrison.
- Dr Cathy Bulman.
- Associate Professor Simon Goldsworthy.

2. *Estimated cost:* \$865,080.

Departmental Staff: 1 x Executive Level 1.
1 x APS 6.

3. *Current status of the report:* Early planning stages.

The natural attributes for World Heritage nomination of Cape York Peninsula, Australia.

Commissioned: 10 October 2012.

Handed to Government: Final Draft Report 25 February 2013.

Date of Public Release: To be determined.

Terms of reference: On 9-10 October 2012, the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) convened an independent scientific panel in a workshop to identify potential natural world heritage values of Cape York Peninsula.

Panel members were required to:

- prepare an independent report on the potential outstanding universal values of Cape York Peninsula, including a summary of international comparative places for each value identified and discussion of the integrity of those values; and
- produce maps identifying the potential natural world heritage values and their extent on Cape York Peninsula.

Members:

- Peter Valentine (editor).
- Brendan Mackey (editor).
- Peter Hitchcock (editor).

- Bruce Leaver.
- Peter Stanton.
- John Woinarski.
- Bruce Wannan.
- Eric Vanderduys.
- Warwick Willmott.
- Mark Kennard.

2. *Estimated cost:* \$28,960.

Departmental Staff: 1 x Executive Level 1.

1 x APS 6.

3. *Current status of the report:* Final draft delivered to the department. The report will contribute to the development of a world heritage nomination for appropriate areas of Cape York Peninsula, subject to Traditional Owner consent.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 197
Topic: Portfolio Wide – legal costs
Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for this financial year to date within the department/agency? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
2. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from the Australian Government Solicitor? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
3. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from private firms? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
4. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from other sources? Please provide a list of each service and costs.

Answer:

Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

The Australian Government does not disclose the content of its legal advice without fully considering the implications of disclosure from a legal professional privilege perspective. It is important for any government to be able to make fully informed decisions based on comprehensive and confidential legal advice. As such, **only total figures for legal services** paid for have been provided.

1. \$1,539,584.
2. \$1,711,387.
3. \$2,791,547.
4. \$118,086.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. \$293,772.
2. \$274,843.
3. \$18,929.
4. Nil.

Director of National Parks

1. \$231,153.
2. \$58,207.
3. Nil.
4. Nil.

Great Barrier reef Marine Park Authority

1. \$367,171.
2. \$109,857.
3. Nil.
4. \$426.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. \$216,349.
2. \$596,823.
3. \$ 44,009.
4. Nil.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. \$111,054.
2. \$6,025.
3. \$105,029.
4. \$103,824.

National Water Commission

No legal costs were incurred by the National Water Commission.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 198
Topic: Portfolio Wide – media training
Proof Hansard Page and Date Written
or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Total spending on these services?
2. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification?
3. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)?
4. The names of all service providers engaged?

For each service purchased from a provider listed under (4), please provide:

- a. The names of all service providers engaged?
- b. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based?
- c. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)?
- d. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)?
- e. The total amount spent on the service?
- f. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package)?

Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:

- i. The location used?
- ii. The number of employees who took part on each occasion?
- iii. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)?
- iv. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location?

Answer:

Media Training services purchased by the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities including the Director of National Parks:

1. \$10,494.

2. 17.

- Five Executive Level 2 officers – two Principal Research Scientists, two Senior Research Scientists and an Acting Director.
- Nine Executive Level 1 officers – one Operations Officer, three Research Scientists, one Engineer and four Assistant Directors.
- One Australian Public Service Level 6 – Research Scientist.
- One Australian Public Service Level 5 (Acting Executive Level 1 officer) – Chemist.
- One Australian Public Service Level 4.

3. As above. No study leave was granted.

4. ***Econnect Communication:***

a. Training scientists to interact with the media.

b. Group based.

c. 11:

- Four Executive Level 2 officers – two Principal Research Scientists and two Senior Research Scientists.
- Five Executive Level 1 officers – one Operations Officer, three Research Scientists and one Engineer.
- One Australian Public Service Level 6 – Research Scientist.
- One Australian Public Service Level 5 (Acting Executive Level 1 officer) – Chemist.
- No study leave was granted.

d. 82.3 hours made up of one full day for each of the 11 participants listed above.

e. \$8,294.

f. Complete package.

Kenn Begg and Associates:

a. Media training.

b. Group based.

- c. Six:
 - One Acting Executive Level 2 officer.
 - Four Executive Level 1 officers.
 - One Australian Public Service Level 4 officer.
 - No study leave was granted.
- d. 36 hours made up of three quarters of one day for each of the six participants listed above.
- e. \$2,200.
- f. Full package.

For the Econnet package:

- i. Ten employees attended training on departmental premises. One employee attended at an offsite location.
- ii. Melbourne Cafe - Conference Centre.
- iii. One full day for one employee.
- iv. Nil.

For the Kenn Begg and Associates package the training was conducted at a departmental office.

No media training services have been purchased by the portfolio agencies (Murray-Darling Basin Authority, Bureau of Meteorology, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Sydney Harbour Federation Trust and the National Water Commission) during the financial year to date.

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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 199

Topic: Portfolio Wide – provision of briefing to the Australian Greens

Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Have any briefings and/or provision of information been provided to the Australian Greens? If yes, please include:
 - a. How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - b. What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing?
 - c. Provide details of what information has been provided and a copy of the information?
 - d. Have any briefings request been unable to proceed? If yes, provide details of what the requests were and why it could not proceed?
 - e. How long is spent preparing and undertaking briefings/information requests for the Australian Greens? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

Answer:

Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

1. Yes, the department provided briefing to the Australian Greens on three occasions.

Written information was provided by the Supervising Scientist Division on one occasion.

 - a. The briefing was requested by letter.
 - b. Senator Scott Ludlam wrote to the Supervising Scientist on 22 November 2012 requesting a briefing on cracking in the wall of Pit #3 at Ranger Uranium Mine. The Supervising Scientist wrote to Senator Ludlam on 21 December 2012 providing the requested information.
 - c. Information provided was consistent with the response to Senate Question No. 2568 – Ranger Uranium Mine tabled on 25 February 2013.
 - d. First Assistant Secretary (0.25 hours) and Executive Level 1 (1 hour).

Briefings were provided by the Australian Antarctic Division on two occasions.

- a. The briefings were requested by the Minister's office.
- b. The division provided verbal briefing on the Australian Antarctic program to:
 - : Senator Christine Milne on 19 November 2012; and
 - : Senator Larissa Waters, in her capacity as a member of the Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories, participated in a round trip flight from Hobart to Wilkins Runway in Antarctica in December 2012.
- c. Verbal briefings were provided.
- d. Senator Christine Milne: the briefing was approximately one hour in length, involving one First Assistant Secretary and one Assistant Secretary.

Senator Larissa Waters: the visit consisted of pre-flight briefings and tours at the Australian Antarctic Division at Kingston, Tasmania, prior to the scheduled flight the following day. Verbal briefings occurred on the flight to Antarctica, as well as briefings in Antarctica. The time and staff involved in briefing Senator Waters specifically was not recorded.

- e. No briefing requests to the department have been unable to proceed.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 200

Topic: Portfolio Wide – provision of briefing to the Independents

Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Have any briefings and/or provision of information been provided to Independents? If yes, please include:
 - a. How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - b. What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - c. Provide details of what information has been provided and a copy of the information?
 - d. Have any briefings request been unable to proceed? If yes, provide details of what the requests were and why it could not proceed?
 - e. How long is spent preparing and undertaking briefings/information requests for the Independents? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.
 - f. Which Independents have requested briefings and/or information?

Answer:

Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

1. Yes, the department provided briefing to the Independents on five occasions.

The Environment Assessment and Compliance Division (EACD) held one meeting each with the Member for Lyne, Mr Robert Oakeshott MP, and the Member for New England, Mr Tony Windsor MP.

 - a. Both briefings were requested through the office of the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities.
 - b. Briefing for Mr Oakeshott was via a videoconference at Parliament House on 22 January 2013. A face to face meeting was held with Mr Windsor at Parliament House on 19 November 2012. Both briefings related to AGL's Gloucester Coal Seam Methane Gas Project.
 - c. Briefing with Mr Windsor was verbal only and no material was supplied. Background information for the videoconference with Mr Oakeshott is attached.
 - d. No briefing requests to the department have been unable to proceed.

- e. No record was kept of the time taken to prepare the information.

The video conference with Mr Oakeshott lasted one hour and was attended by the First Assistant Secretary, EACD, and one Executive Level 2 officer.

The meeting with Mr Windsor lasted 30 minutes and was attended by the First Assistant Secretary, EACD, and the First Assistant Secretary, Office of Water Science.

- f. As above.

The Office of Water Science provided briefings on two occasions to the Member for New England, Mr Tony Windsor MP, with one briefing also involving the Member for Lyne, Mr Robert Oakeshott MP.

- a. Both briefings were requested through the office of the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities.
- b. The briefings were to discuss the implementation of the National Partnership Agreement on Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mining Development, the Namoi Water study and implementation of bioregional assessments. One briefing was a face-to-face meeting held on 1 November 2012 and the other briefing was a teleconference held on 20 November 2012.

Mr Windsor invited Mr Oakeshott to participate in the teleconference on 20 November 2012. During this briefing, Mr Oakeshott was briefed on the National Partnership Agreement on Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mining Development and the implementation of bioregional assessments.

- c. The briefings were verbal only and no supporting material was provided.
- d. No briefing requests to the department have been unable to proceed.
- e. The meetings involved preparation time of approximately two hours for one Executive Level 2 officer, one hour each for the First Assistant Secretary and two Executive Level 2 officers, and 30 minutes for one Deputy Secretary.
- f. As above.

**TELECONFERENCE WITH MR ROBERT OAKESHOTT MP – 22 JANUARY 2013
GLOUCESTER COAL SEAM METHANE GAS PROJECT (EPBC 2008/4432)****Key Points:**

- The department is preparing advice to the Minister regarding a final decision on approval of AGL's Gloucester Coal Seam Methane Gas Project, under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). The proposal has also been considered by the Independent Expert Scientific Committee on Coal Seam Gas and Coal Mining (IESC).
- The final decision on approval, and any conditions, will be published on the department's website. Advice provided by the IESC will also be published. National environmental law also provides for the provision of full reasons for approval decisions to interested parties upon request.
- The Minister's delegate has extended the timeframe for a final decision on approval until 7 February 2013, in order to fully consider all information and comments received. Notice of this extension is being published on the department's website.
- The department is carefully considering all relevant impacts, including any cumulative impacts, on nationally protected matters. The EPBC Act also allows for the consideration of social and economic matters in making approval decisions.
- The action referred under the EPBC Act relates to Stage 1 only, whereas the New South Wales assessment considered further Stages 2 to 5. The EPBC Act assessment and any decision on approval is confined to this first stage only, and any further stages may require separate consideration under the EPBC Act if they are likely to significantly impact nationally protected matters.

Background:

- The proposal referred by AGL Upstream Infrastructure Investments Pty Ltd (at the time, Lucas Energy) on 29 August 2008 for consideration under the EPBC Act is for a coal seam gas project consisting of:
 - up to 110 gas extraction wells and associated infrastructure around the town of Stratford, in the Gloucester Valley;
 - a central processing facility at one of two locations near Stratford;
 - a 92 kilometre underground gas transmission pipeline from Stratford to Hexham, near Newcastle; and
 - a gas delivery station at Hexham for domestic distribution.
- The main potential impacts of the proposal on matters protected under the EPBC Act are on surface water habitats for two listed threatened frog species and on the Hunter Estuary wetland of international importance (Ramsar site). A population of vulnerable small-flower grevillea will also be impacted.
- The proposal was assessed by the New South Wales Government under an accredited assessment process, which concluded with the approval of the proposal by New South Wales on 22 February 2011. Note that the New South Wales assessment considered further Stages 2 to 5, while the action referred under the EPBC Act relates to Stage 1 only.

- The department received advice on the proposal from the IESC on 20 December 2012. This has been considered by the department and the Minister, and will inform the Minister's final decision whether to approve the proposal.
- The Minister has consulted the proponent and relevant Commonwealth ministers on a proposed decision, as required under the EPBC Act. The department is currently considering comments received on the proposed decision prior to making a recommendation whether to finally approve the proposal. The EPBC Act does not require public consultation on a proposed approval decision as a mandatory process.
- Departmental representatives attended community meetings regarding the project at Gloucester and Taree in December 2012, at which Mr Oakeshott was present.

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 201

Topic: Portfolio Wide – media and communications staff

Proof Hansard Page and Date or Written Question: Written

Senator Birmingham asked:

For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following by department or agency:

1. How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location?
2. How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location?
3. How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location?
4. How many are graphic designers?
5. How many are media managers?
6. How many organise events?
7. Do any departments/agencies have independent media studios? If yes, why?
 - a. When was it established?
 - b. What is the set up cost?
 - c. What is the ongoing cost?
 - d. How many staff work there and what are their classifications?

Answer:

1. Departmental and agency communications staff provide a range of internal and external communications services.

These skills contribute to the presentation and communication of policy and program materials. The work of communications staff includes development of material to communicate policies and programs, the development of communication strategies and plans, stakeholder engagement activities, media and social media liaison, monitoring and engagement, liaison with the offices of the Minister and Parliamentary Secretary, public relations, issues management, events management, sponsorship management, publication development and advertising advice.

The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities' (the department) public relations work is undertaken by Public Affairs Officers in the Public Affairs Unit, Communications and Ministerial Services Branch. Portfolio agency staff have a combination of Public Affairs Officers and APS classified staff to deliver public relations work.

Unless otherwise indicated, the following figures are expressed as full time equivalent ongoing staff and are current as at March 2013.

The department (Canberra): 35

Senior Public Affairs Director Grade 2:	2
Senior Public Affairs Director Grade 1:	4
Public Affairs Officer Grade 3 (5 part time):	15
Public Affairs Officer Grade 2 (1 part time):	9
Public Affairs Officer Grade 1 (1 part time):	5

The department (Darwin/Jabiru): 5

Executive Level 1:	1
APS 6:	1
APS 6 (part time):	1
APS 5 (part time):	2

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 8

Executive Level 2*:	1
Public Affairs Officer Grade 3:	1
Public Affairs Officer Grade 2:	1
APS 6:	3
APS 5:	1
APS 4:	1

* EL 2 position manages other staff not directly involved in public relations and media.

Parks Australia (Canberra): 5

Senior Public Affairs Director Grade 1:	1
Public Affairs Officer Grade 3 (1 part time):	2
Public Affairs Officer Grade 2:	1
APS 6 (Australian National Botanic Gardens):	1

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 6

Executive Level 2:	1
Executive Level 1:	1
APS 6:	1
APS 5:	3

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 16

Executive Level 2 (2 acting):	4
Executive Level 1:	7
APS 6:	2
APS 5:	3

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 0

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 8

Executive Level 2:	1
Executive Level 2 (part time):	1
Executive Level 1:	4
APS 6:	2

National Water Commission (Canberra): 2

Executive Level 2:	1
Public Affairs Officer Grade 3:	1

2. Unless otherwise indicated, the following figures are expressed as full time equivalent non-ongoing staff and are current as at March 2013.

The department: 1

Public Affairs Officer Grade 2:	1
---------------------------------	---

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 2

APS 4:	2
--------	---

Parks Australia (Canberra): 1

APS 6:	1
--------	---

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 3

APS 6:	1
APS 4:	1

APS 3: 1

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 6

Executive Level 1: 3

APS5: 2

APS4: 1

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 1

APS 6: 1

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 0

National Water Commission (Canberra): 0

3. Unless otherwise indicated, the following figures are expressed as full time equivalent contractors and are current as at March 2013.

The department: 0

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 0

Parks Australia (Canberra): 0

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 0

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 0

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 0

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 1

Executive Level 2* 1

* Short-term contract.

National Water Commission (Canberra): 0

4. Unless otherwise indicated, the following figures are expressed as full time equivalent graphic designers and are current as at March 2013.

The department (Canberra): 1

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 3

These are not additional to the positions provided in question 1 and also support video and other digital media. Graphic design tasks comprise up to one third of the workload. One of the positions is non-ongoing.

Parks Australia (Canberra): 0

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 1

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 2

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 0

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 1

National Water Commission (Canberra): 0

5. Unless otherwise indicated, the following figures are expressed as full time equivalent media managers whose core responsibility is media management. These figures are current as at March 2013.

The department (Canberra)

Departmental communications staff provide a range of internal and external communications services, which may include media management and liaison as part of their duties. The figures for departmental communications staff are provided in the response to question 1.

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 2

These positions are not additional to the figure provided in question 1.

Parks Australia

The figures for communications staff are provided in the response to question 1. In addition, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park has one APS 5 and one APS 4 processing film and photography permits and accompanying film crews on the ground and Kakadu National Park has a part time APS 4 who processes media permits and facilitates film crews on the ground.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 0

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 3*

* These positions are not additional to the figures provided in question 1. Media management is considered to be part of their overall duties.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 0

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 1*

* This position is not additional to the figures provided in question 1.

National Water Commission (Canberra): 0

6. Unless otherwise indicated, the following figures are expressed as full time equivalent event managers whose only responsibility is event management. These figures are current as at March 2013.

The department: 0

Departmental communications staff provide a range of internal and external communications services, which may include event management as part of their duties. The figures for departmental communications staff are provided in the response to question 1.

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 0

Parks Australia (Canberra)

The figures for communications staff are provided in the response to question 1.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 0

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 7*

Event management is considered part of responsibilities for seven staff. The actual commitment varies between 10 and 30 per cent of their total duties.

* These positions are not additional to the figures provided in question 1.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 0

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 1*

* This position is not additional to the figures provided in question 1.

National Water Commission (Canberra): 0

7. The department does not have an independent media studio, but has an in-house resource for video graphic work.

- a. Not applicable.
- b. Not applicable.
- c. Not applicable.
- d. The department has a videographer at the APS 6 level.

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): No

Parks Australia (Canberra): No

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): No

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): No

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): No

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): No

National Water Commission (Canberra): No

**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 2013

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 202
Topic: Suspected fraud cases
Proof Hansard Page and Date Written
or Written Question:

Senator Joyce asked:

1. Can you provide details of the three suspected fraud cases referred to the Australian Federal Police in 2010-11?
2. Have any charges been laid as a result of these referrals? If so, what are the details of these charges?

Answer:

1. **Case 1 of 3**

This matter relates to the attempted sale of material purported to be from an historic shipwreck. The case was referred to the Australian Federal Police due to allegations that the supporting documentation was a forgery that had used the Commonwealth crest.

Case 2 of 3

This matter relates to the alleged misappropriation of Indigenous Heritage Program grant funding. The matter was referred to the Australian Federal Police; however the Australian Federal Police did not accept the matter for investigation. Based on legal advice the matter was referred to the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations (ORIC) within the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, and the Confiscated Assets Taskforce within the Attorney-General's Department.

Case 3 of 3

This matter relates to the alleged misappropriation of Community Water Grant Program funding. The matter was referred to the Australian Federal Police; however the Australian Federal Police did not accept this matter for investigation.

2. **Case 1 of 3**

The most recent correspondence from the Australian Federal Police indicates that the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions is reviewing the matter. As at 7 March 2013, there has been no further update.

Case 2 of 3

As at 7 March 2013, the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) has been advised that ORIC is unable to pursue this matter as the referral information is outside the scope of its jurisdiction. The department is awaiting an update as to progress in relation to the referral to the Confiscated Assets Taskforce.

Case 3 of 3

Legal advice indicated there was limited reasonable prospect of recovering the funds. Based on this advice this matter has now been finalised and the case closed.