

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 1

**Topic:** Review of Caring for our  
Country

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 48 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

Senator BIRMINGHAM: ... On the external assistance you are seeking for this review, what consultants have been engaged and what work are they undertaking?

Mr Flanigan: I do not think I have a full list of those, but I can give you a sense of them. We have been working with the ANU, through the HC Coombs Policy Forum, to look at questions around the role of natural resource regional planning in these types of programs and how that might be improved into the future. We had a couple of consultancies around issues to do with Indigenous stakeholders. We have one which is surveying Indigenous people and people who are engaging in Indigenous projects to get input from them, and we have another which is looking into issues around trying to get a handle on the social and economic benefits that may flow from the Indigenous ranger programs, just so that we can get a handle in that space. The Australian Bureau of Statistics has been doing surveys on our behalf, including them within their surveys, so that we can make a judgment about the take-up rates around best practice, particularly in sustainable farming activities and those types of things. We have a survey that has been contracted to test how community groups prefer to receive their information—are the existing systems that we have in the program working or are there things that people would like to see changed? They are some of the types of things we have that are being undertaken by non-government contractors.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Could you take on notice to provide us with a detailed list of all of those and the budget et cetera that applies to each of them.

Mr Flanigan: Certainly.

**Answer:**

To date the department has commissioned the following specifically to inform the review:

- Bang the Table to develop and monitor an interactive online forum [www.caringforourcountryreview.com.au](http://www.caringforourcountryreview.com.au). Cost to date \$27,500 (GST inclusive).
- Eberhard Consulting to explore the Reef Rescue model and determine whether it can be adopted for other large scale investments. Cost \$27,225 (GST inclusive).
- Markwell Consulting to facilitate a national forum of key stakeholders engaged in Indigenous land and sea management. Cost \$6,500 (GST inclusive).
- O'Brien Rich Research Group to revise framing and wording of survey questions specific to Indigenous natural resource management. Cost \$4,950 (GST inclusive).
- Smyth and Bahrtdt Consultants to conduct interviews with participants from the Working on Country and Indigenous Protected Area programs. Cost \$21,120 (GST inclusive).

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

In addition, the department is drawing on existing studies and surveys to inform the review at no additional cost to the department, that is:

- HC Coombs Policy Forum (Australian National University) research to explore integrated natural resource management planning.
- 2007/08 & 2009/10 Australian Bureau of Statistics' Agricultural Resource Management Surveys, commissioned by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, biennial reports on land management practices used by Australian farmers.
- Inovact Consulting's survey of natural resource management stakeholders on natural resource management regional performance and how community groups prefer to receive natural resource management information.
- Workshop on Managing Biodiversity at Landscape Scale, coordinated by Professor Ted Lefroy, University of Tasmania.
- National Wildlife Corridors Plan Advisory Group workshop to develop policy options for planning wildlife corridors and connectivity in the landscape, facilitated by Dr Mark Stafford-Smith.
- The Allen Consulting Group Pty Ltd assessment of the Economic and Employment Outcomes of the Working on Country program. The assessment involves assessing the economic and employment outcomes of the program and complimentary natural resource management programs, as well as their contribution to the Government's Closing the Gap initiative.
- The Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies review of research into the benefits associated with Indigenous people caring for country.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 002

**Topic:** Fox Eradication Program

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 49 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Abetz asked:**

Senator ABETZ: ... But the federal taxpayer does help to subsidise what is called the Tasmanian fox task force?

Dr Zammit: The eradication program, yes.

Senator ABETZ: Yes. Do you take any responsibility for how the money is spent?

Dr Zammit: We are members of the steering committee for that program. It is a program that is equally funded by both governments. We are also members of technical advisory groups, so we are involved at both the strategic level and the technical and scientific level.

Senator ABETZ: During those consultations, did it ever spring to anybody's mind that this idea of importing fox scats into Tasmania might in fact bring in disease and hydatids?

Dr Zammit: I do not recall an exact conversation around it. I know there was broad conversation around what would happen were this to arise, and we were reassured and continue to be reassured by the state regulators that they have the appropriate procedures in place for managing it.

Senator ABETZ: So you were told that right from the beginning?

Dr Zammit: I would have to check the records.

Senator ABETZ: Because they are now claiming that by freezing these things at minus 80 degrees Celsius et cetera or using fox scats from foxes in captivity—

Dr Zammit: I would need to check the record, because these conversations happened several times.

Senator ABETZ: Please take that on notice. And can you take on notice for me as well when the program of introducing fox scats commenced, how many we believe were introduced into Tasmania prior to the new restrictions being imposed, and exactly when those new restrictions were imposed.

Dr Zammit: We can take those on notice.

**Answer:**

The program of importing fox scats into Tasmania commenced in November 2007, for the purpose of training fox scat detector dogs. From November 2007 to May 2008, scats were bulk weighed, and not individually counted. Since May 2008, 763 scats have been imported for training purposes and are registered, catalogued and numbered for tracking purposes. This register is audited on a regular basis.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

An additional 469 scats were imported during 2010-11 for research into scat degradation in Tasmanian conditions. All scats are destroyed after they have been used for research and training purposes, except for those returned to the mainland for further analysis, for example for the Scat Degradation research trial. Scats are disposed of via registered commercial environmental and quarantine waste disposal services.

In November 2010, amendments to the Tasmanian *Animal Health Act* declared fox and dog scats to be restricted material, in order to prevent uncontrolled introduction of scats by the public.

The department is advised that well before fox scats were imported into Tasmania there were numerous discussions between Tasmanian staff managing the Fox Eradication Program (FEP), the FEP Technical Advisory Committee, mainland and Tasmanian research scientists and the Tasmanian Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO), in regard to the risks of introducing hydatids through the importation of fox scats. The program administrators have worked closely with the Tasmanian CVO to identify the measures that would prevent, or minimise, the risk of hydatids being transmitted into the State.

The CVO's consistent advice to the Tasmanian managers of the program was that the risk was extremely low and provided that the standard operating procedures continued, it would remain low.

Based on scientific research, imported scats intended for research from 'wild' populations are immediately stored at -80°C for at least 48 hours to ensure there was no risk of the introduction of hydatids. Scats sourced from captive foxes that have been treated for hydatids do not need be stored at -80°C. Additionally, as a matter of policy, the Fox Eradication Program always advises Quarantine Services Tasmania when the Program imports scats.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 003

**Topic:** Working on Country funding

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 52 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

Senator IAN MACDONALD: The agriculture department, when we were talking about Caring for our Country, indicated that the rangers program was entirely your management responsibility. Is that correct?

Mr Flanigan: That is true.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: There is new money in this budget for Working on Country?

Mr Flanigan: It is not technically new money. Working on Country—that is the Indigenous rangers activity—was funded through a number of appropriations that have been put into there over time (Hansard record: ‘their overtime’). The government took a decision to consolidate those appropriations into one. So we have moved money around to put them into one appropriation.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Was the previous appropriation just from your department and the agriculture department or was it from others as well?

Mr Flanigan: No. There was appropriation from the old Natural Heritage Trust and there are also appropriations from other government programs like the CDEP reforms—the Community Development Employment Program projects.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Is it easy for you to give me a list of where the money came from that was consolidated in this program?

Mr Flanigan: We can do that.

**Answer:**

Working on Country consolidated funding was originally appropriated from a combination of the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Communities (SEWPaC), Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) and the Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) Special Account.

Following the Indigenous Expenditure Review, Working on Country funding was consolidated to one appropriation for enhanced administrative efficiency. This took effect in the 2011-12 budget.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 004

**Topic:** Working on Country projects

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 53 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator MacDonald asked:**

Page 53

Mr Flanigan: Senator, you asked last night for a distribution of the projects. We have five projects. The vast majority of them are in the north. We have five projects in New South Wales, 20 in Queensland, 23 in the Northern Territory, seven in Western Australia, eight in South Australia, two in Victoria and three in Tasmania.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Thank you. Would I find these somewhere that you can refer me to, or can you get them to me on notice—just on what the 68 projects are?

Mr Flanigan: What the host agencies are?

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Yes, and how much is involved in each case.

Mr Flanigan: We would have to take that on notice but we would be able to provide that.

Ms Fraser: Much of it is up on the website, though. It is publicly available. But we could give you a more detailed list.

**Answer:**

Please refer attached table.

**Distribution of Working on Country projects**

<b>State</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Organisation Name*</b>	<b>Total Funding to June 2013 (GST Exclusive)</b>
NSW	Githabul Rangers	Border Rangers Contractors Pty Ltd	\$ 3,357,700.08
NSW	Indigenous Field Officers in the Willandra Lakes World Heritage Area	Dept of Environment and Climate Change on behalf of Willandra Lakes Elders Council	\$ 814,861.60
NSW	Mid North Coast Aboriginal Rangers (Working on Country Regional)	Taree Indigenous Development and Employment Ltd (TIDE)	\$ 2,066,638.00
NSW	Ngulingah - Nimbin Rocks - NSW	Ngulingah Local Aboriginal Land Council	\$ 1,821,559.24
NSW	Wattleridge & Tarriwa Kurrukun - NSW	Banbai Land Enterprises Incorporated	\$ 2,356,312.68
VIC	Budj Bim Environment and Heritage Rangers and Indigenous Protected Area Management Project	Winda Mara Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 2,606,971.40
VIC	Yorta Yorta Caring for Country Ranger Program	Parks Victoria	\$ 1,877,508.80
QLD	Bunya Mountains Murri Ranger Project	Burnett Mary Regional Group for Natural Resource Management Inc.	\$ 2,033,931.00
QLD	Gidarjil Working on Country	Gidarjil Development Corporation Ltd	\$ 2,211,091.40
QLD	Girringun Rangers	Girringun Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 4,220,150.00
QLD	Implementing land and sea management initiatives on Mabuiag Torres Strait	Torres Strait Regional Authority	\$ 1,388,329.00
QLD	Improved Management of Mt Croll Nature Refuge on TOOLKA Land Trust	Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation	\$ 2,587,716.00
QLD	Kaanju Ngaachi Wenlock and Pascoe Rivers Working on Country Project	Chuulangun Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 2,517,691.00
QLD	Kalan Ranger Services	Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation	\$ 192,048.60
QLD	Lama Lama Rangers - Improved Management of Running Creek Nature Refuge	Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation	\$ 3,434,558.00
QLD	Land and Sea Natural and Cultural Protection	Lockhart River Aboriginal Shire Council	\$ 2,594,600.51
QLD	Mandingalbay Yidinji Rangers: Implementing People, Country and Culture Programs	Djunbunji Limited	\$ 2,779,757.00
QLD	Mapoon Land and Sea Centre	Mapoon Aboriginal Shire Council	\$ 2,380,277.00
QLD	Napranum Ranger Program - Cape York - Qld	Napranum Aboriginal Shire Council	\$ 2,473,620.20
QLD	Northern Peninsula Area - Northern Cape York - Qld	Northern Peninsula Area Regional Council	\$ 3,271,301.20
QLD	Nyungkal Ranger Service	Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation	\$ 3,364,893.44
QLD	Queensland Murray-Darling Basin Community Rangers Program	Queensland Murray-Darling Committee Inc.	\$ 3,519,055.50
QLD	Southern Gulf Fire and Weed project for Wellesley Islands	Carpentaria Land Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 1,036,166.00
QLD	Southern Gulf Fire and Weed project on Gangalidda	Carpentaria Land Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 2,771,572.00
QLD	Supporting sustainable incomes and environment for Kowanyama Aboriginal lands	Kowanyama Aboriginal Shire Council	\$ 3,104,950.00
QLD	The Torres Strait Indigenous Ranger Program	Torres Strait Regional Authority	\$ 609,170.00
QLD	Thuwathu/Bujimulla Rangers - Wellesley Island - Qld	Carpentaria Land Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 3,691,537.00
QLD	Torres Strait – Qld:	Torres Strait Regional Authority	\$ 14,846,000.00

State	Project Title	Organisation Name*	Total Funding to June 2013 (GST Exclusive)
QLD	Yuku-Baja-Muliku Caring for Country Program	Yuku-Baja-Muliku (Archer Point) Land Trust	\$ 1,835,185.00
WA	Kimberley Land Council - Karajarri Rangers - Bidyadanga - WA	Kimberley Land Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 2,310,600.00
WA	Kimberley Land Council - Ngurrara Rangers - Djugerari - WA	Kimberley Land Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 2,602,000.00
WA	Kimberley Rangers: Working on Country	Kimberley Land Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 14,091,023.00
WA	Martu Ranger Program, Western Desert	Kalyuku Ninti - Puntuku Ngurra Limited (Trading as Karnyirninpa Jukurrpa)	\$ 7,539,628.00
WA	Miriuwung Gajerrong (MG) Rangers	Department of Water Western Australia	\$ 2,189,566.00
WA	Ngaanyatjarra Working on Country Project	Ngaanyatjarra Council	\$ 4,534,530.78
WA	Nyul Nyul Land and Sea Rangers	Kimberley Land Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 2,575,446.00
SA	Aboriginal Employment in protected area management in the Gawler Ranges Native Title Claim Area, South Australia	South Australian Native Title Services Ltd (SANTS)	\$ 1,765,257.26
SA	Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Ranger Programme	Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY)	\$ 2,287,847.00
SA	Caring for Waru on the APY Lands - Umuwa SA	Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara	\$ 2,746,900.00
SA	Ngarrindjeri Working on Ruwe (Country)	Ngarrindjeri Lands and Progress Association Inc.	\$ 3,849,212.20
SA	Raukkan Natural Resource Management Project	Ngopamuldi Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 2,510,078.40
SA	Riverland Rangers Program - Protecting Significant cultural and environmental sites on the River Murray, SA	South Australian Murray Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board	\$ 1,574,930.40
SA	Working on our Yarta in the Northern Flinders Ranges of SA (Nantawarrina Indigenous Protected Area)	Nipapanha Community Incorporated	\$ 2,103,262.00
SA	Yalata IPA Ranger Program	Yalata Community Incorporated	\$ 695,798.00
TAS	milaythina pakana	Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre Inc.	\$ 1,964,961.04
TAS	Tasmanian Aboriginal Trainee Rangers	Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment	\$ 1,309,562.50
TAS	Working on Country: Protecting and Enhancing Land Manged by the Tasmanian Aboriginal Land and Sea Council	Tasmanian Aboriginal Land and Sea Council Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 1,739,639.52
NT	Anangu Rangers on Angas Downs	Lisanote Pty Ltd	\$ 1,998,757.00
NT	Combined Jawoyn Ranger Program	Jawoyn Association Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 2,186,278.00
NT	Dhimurru Working on Country	Dhimurru Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 3,863,345.00
NT	Djelk Land Management Extension	Bawinanga Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 6,338,171.00
NT	Implementing NRM priority actions identified in Central Land Council's Regional Resource Condition Plan for North-West, Tennant Creek, Western and Central regions	Central Land Council	\$ 8,844,920.40
NT	Implementation of immediate and high priority actions from the Laynhapuy Indigenous Protected Area Management Plan	Laynhapuy Homelands Association Incorporated	\$ 4,702,134.94
NT	Ingkerreke Natural Resource Management	Ingkerreke Outstations Resource Services	\$ 1,951,903.00
NT	Laynhapuy IPA Management by the Yirralka Ranger men's program	Laynhapuy Homelands Association Incorporated	\$ 4,727,930.00
NT	Li-Anthawirriyarra Sea Ranger Unit	Mabunji Aboriginal Resource Assocation Inc.	\$ 3,244,669.00



State	Project Title	Organisation Name*	Total Funding to June 2013 (GST Exclusive)
NT	Li-Anthawirriyarra Sea Ranger Unit Salaries	Mabunji Aboriginal Resource Association Inc.	\$ 359,434.00

State	Project Title	Organisation Name*	Total Funding to June 2013 (GST Exclusive)
NT	Managing Identified Natural and Cultural Resources across the Central Land Council Region (Working on Country Northern Territory Program) - Anmatjerr Rangers (Ti Tree)	Central Land Council	\$ 6,838,543.00
NT	Northern Land Council	Northern Land Council	\$ 419,088.00
NT	Northern Territory Top End Aboriginal Land and Sea Management	Northern Land Council	\$ 26,722,070.00
NT	Protecting country, supporting land management workers for the Warddeken Indigenous Protected Area	Warddeken Land Management Limited	\$ 3,243,982.00
NT	Real Jobs for Anindilyakwa Rangers	Anindilyakwa Land Council	\$ 3,768,103.98
NT	Real Jobs for Anindilyakwa Rangers Extension	Anindilyakwa Land Council	\$ 1,001,193.00
NT	Thamarrurr Rangers - Land and Sea Management Project	Thamarrurr Development Corporation	\$ 7,296,218.83
NT	Tiwi Islands Land and Sea Management - Milikapiti Nursery	Tiwi Land Council	\$ 1,179,728.00
NT	Wairuk Community Ranger Program	Yilli Rreung Housing Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 280,000.00
NT	Warnbi Aboriginal Corporation	Warnbi Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 1,844,090.00
NT	Werenbun Aboriginal Corporation	Werenbun Aboriginal Corporation	\$ 618,078.00

\* In some cases there is more than one contract with a proponent due to different Working on Country funding streams

\* Total funding figures are adjusted during annual contract/work plan negotiations.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 005

**Topic:** Indigenous Ranger Programs

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 55 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator MacDonald asked:**

Senator IAN MACDONALD: The reporting on these Indigenous ranger programs is all audited regularly, is it?

Ms Fraser: Yes.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: How are they audited?

Ms Fraser: They have to undertake independent audits from accredited auditors, and that occurs annually.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: And they are all A-okay? You do not have any problems with any of them across Australia?

Ms Fraser: Occasionally we have questions about the audits and we tend to liaise with the proponents and get answers to those questions, as you would expect with any program.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: None of the Working on Country programs have been unsatisfactorily managed from the Commonwealth point of view?

Ms Fraser: I would have to take that on notice. Not to the extent that we have had to, for example, pull funding from a project.

Mr Flanagan: We will take that on notice, Senator.

**Answer:**

The department monitors and reviews the performance of Working on Country projects against a set of performance indicators that are negotiated with project proponents.

One contract has been terminated following significant attempts at remediation between project partners, facilitated by relevant governments and the local Land Council.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 6

**Topic:** Funding for Friends of Sceale Bay

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 57 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator MacDonald asked:**

Senator IAN MACDONALD: I have a copy of the application but I do not have it in front of me. Did it indicate how much of the almost \$1 million they received was going to be for the documentary and how much for Indigenous employment and so on?

Mr Flanigan: I do not think it was \$1 million. It was \$779,000 including GST. I would have to check whether there was a breakdown in their budget as to the documentary.

**Answer:**

The project, Indigenous and Community Partnerships Restoring the Chain of Bays, was approved through the Open Call of the 2010-11 Caring for our Country Business Plan. The total budget for the approved project is \$779 403 (GST exclusive).

All Open Call projects were assessed first by a state-based Preliminary Screening Panel, then the independent National Moderating Panel, prior to funding being recommended.

The project aims to restore a number of important sites within the Chain of Bays high conservation value aquatic ecosystem on South Australia's Eyre Peninsula and to strengthen community partnerships.

A component of the overall budget presented in the application was for production of two documentary films:

- a Wirangu Traditional Knowledge Revival Pathways documentary film that will record Indigenous cultural and environmental knowledge of the area, and includes training for indigenous people in film production and interview techniques.
- a Friends of Sceale Bay multi-media record that will record project activities and outcomes, to demonstrate the impact Caring for our Country has had on the environment, and to raise public awareness of, and highlight, community partnerships in restoring the Chain of Bays.

The project's activities are designed to, amongst other things, increase indigenous participation and their capacity to manage the environment effectively. Of the total budget in the application, approximately \$142 525 was specifically allocated for Indigenous participation and includes \$45 000 for employment of two Indigenous supervisors and \$30 000 for the Wirangu Traditional Knowledge Revival Pathways documentary film.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

The remaining funds supported further works to enhance a total of 560 ha of the Chain of Bays. This included: upgrading of nursery infrastructure; development and implementation of habitat restoration plans; seed collection and propagation; revegetation; pest animal and weed control; installation of interpretive signage; improved management of public access; provision of devolved grants; development and delivery of training modules and workshops; and recruitment and retention of volunteers.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

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

**Topic:** South Australian assessment  
panel - Caring for our Country

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 59 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Yes, of course. And can you, perhaps on notice, indicate to me whether those three were in the panel of people you offered to the ministers for appointment?

Mr Flanigan: Whether they were in the list we suggested to the minister?

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Yes.

Senator Conroy: I do not think you can ask them to provide information that they have forwarded to the minister. That goes to the content of the communication, Senator Macdonald. I think that is slightly outside the remit. But we can take it on notice if you like and see whether there is any information the minister would like to add.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: I would not want to go outside the requirements of the Senate, Minister. You put forward a panel of people to the ministers and say, 'We need three and these three seem to be the most qualified.' I was just asking whether these three names appeared in the group of people you suggested to the ministers might be—

Mr Flanigan: I will take that on notice, Senator, but my recollection is that the ministers have never stepped outside the list we have recommended.

**Answer:**

The Australian Government Land and Coasts Division provided a list of recommended panel members for each preliminary screening panel to the then Minister for Environment Protection, Heritage and the Arts, and the then Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry for consideration and approval.

The three panel members selected by Ministers for the South Australian preliminary screening panel were on the recommended panel list provided by Australian Government Land and Coasts Division.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 008

**Topic:** Regional NRM base level  
funding

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 61 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Cameron asked:**

CHAIR: For instance in New South Wales there is \$2.6 million roughly for the Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment Management Authority. Is that what you describe as base level funding?

Mr Flanigan: That is correct.

CHAIR: What types of projects would the Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment Management Authority be allocating to the open funding?

Mr Flanigan: They would be running a range of projects, probably principally across the biodiversity conservation type areas. Hawkesbury-Nepean is not a coastal environment but they would probably be doing some aquatic habitat projects, repairing vegetation—those types of things. I imagine they would be running sustainable farm practice projects and they would have a range of community skills and engagement activities. Beyond that, how any particular region has broken down its expenditure is something I would have to take on notice.

**Answer:**

The Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment Management Authority's annual regional base level funding is \$2,917,000.

Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment Management Authority regional base level funding allocated under the 2009/10 and 2010/11 business plans through to 30 June 2013 can be broken down as follows:

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Biodiversity and Natural Icons	Increasing Native Habitat	\$3,600,300
	Reducing the impact of weeds	\$1,037,500
	Managing World Heritage Areas	\$2,227,000
Sustainable Farm Practices	Improving land management practices	\$1,250,000
	Increasing landscape scale conservation	\$1,726,000
Coastal Environments and Critical Aquatic Habitats	Increasing coastal community engagement	\$ 552,850
Community Skills, knowledge and engagement	Increasing participation in Natural Resource Management	\$ 135,150
Monitoring, evaluation, reporting and improvement		\$1,139,200
<b>Total Regional Baseline Funding</b>		<b>\$11,668,000</b>

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

The table does not include funding for Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment Management Authority approved through the open call competitive process under the 2010-11 business plan. To date, one open call project totalling \$300,000 is being funded. The project is '*Demonstrating the use of Organic Compost in Rehabilitation and Production*' which is delivered against the sustainable farm practices outcome.



**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 009

**Topic:** Dingos and other wild dogs  
programs

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 63 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Are there any programs funded by the federal government dealing with dingoes and other wild dogs?

Mr Flanigan: I am not aware of any specific program in relation to Caring for our Country. I would have to take on notice whether any of our partners are involved in wild dog activities.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: I appreciate that CRCs are not this department, but do you have an input into the CRC program in relation to entities that deal specifically with environmental issues like dingoes and eradication?

Mr Flanigan: Not within the Caring for our Country program.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: I am really asking the department. If you did have anything it might be related to Caring for our Country, but my question was broader.

Mr Tucker: There certainly has been some engagement with CRCs in the past and there are some CRCs that we have a strong connection with—for example the Antarctic CRC. In relation to that specific one nothing comes to mind but we can take it on notice and ask further.

**Answer:**

The Australian Government has provided funding to deal with wild dogs.

Under the Caring for our Country initiative, the Australian Government funds projects to mitigate the impact of wild dogs. Wild dogs were a priority target in the 2010-11 business plan open call, which supported projects like Cape York Sustainable Futures Inc.'s *large scale control of feral pigs and wild dogs to save Cape York's sea turtles* in Queensland (\$100 000). Funding is also provided under Caring for our Country to community and regional groups for these activities. Examples include the regional base line funding to the Central West Catchment Management Authority in 2010-11 which included an allocation of \$1.29 million to reduce the impact of vertebrate pests, including wild dogs. In 2008-09, part of the \$120 000 allocated to the Western Catchment Management Authority for pest management was for the reduction of wild dogs in co-operation with the Bourke Rural Lands Protection Board.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry supports a National Wild Dog Facilitator, through the Australia Pest Animal Research Program administered by the Australian Bureau of Agriculture and Resource Economics. This project aims to promote and build capacity in developing and implementing strategic management approaches to control wild dogs. As part of his activities, the *Guardian Dogs Best Practice Manual for the use of Livestock Guardian Dogs* was published in 2010 by the Invasive Animals Cooperative Research Centre (CRC).

In addition, the Australian Government, through the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research, also funds strategic research activities, like the development of new tools and toxins to reduce the impacts of wild dogs, through the Invasive Animals CRC. One of the goals of the Invasive Animals CRC is to reduce fox and wild dog impacts.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

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

**Topic:** Feral camels

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 64-65 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

Senator IAN MACDONALD: The comment was made—and these are just comments that you get—that whilst there was a fair bit of money spent last year the return in actual camels culled was practically minimal but the expenditure on air fares, travel costs and administration was quite large. If this has not been asked by Senator Back of the other department, could you indicate just what has been spent in the last 12 months on the program and what results we have to show for that?

Mr Flanigan: I will take that on notice...

...

Dr Grimes: I may be of some assistance to you around the camels program. As luck has it, I do have some figures on the first year of the program.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: What year is that?

Dr Grimes: That was 2009-10. The target was 15,000 camels. In the end 23,340 camels were removed in that year. As Mr Flanigan pointed out to you, it is true that with the wetter conditions there has been dispersal of camels across the countryside and that has made meeting targets in the second year much more difficult.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Thanks for that. Obviously it was a good program in the first year, but I will get the details of the expenditure and the results for the current financial year.

Dr Grimes: I am sorry; I do not have those.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: No, we will get those on notice.

**Answer:**

To date, project expenditure for the management of feral camels in the 2010-11 financial year has been assessed at \$3.191 million. This expenditure includes funding to establish and support harvesting and culling activities, infrastructure, program delivery and monitoring activities, and capacity building for local camel management.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 011

**Topic:** National Wildlife Corridors  
Plan advisory group

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 67 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

Dr Zammit: I can run through the list of names for you again. They are Kym Cheatham from Ecotourism Australia; Professor Steve Dovers from the ANU; Debra Goostrey from the Urban Development Institute of Australia; Melissa George from the Indigenous Advisory Committee; Brett de Hayr, who is the National Landcare Facilitator; Judy Henderson, who is the chair of the Northern Rivers CMA; Doug Humann, who is the CEO of Bush Heritage Australia; Angus Hume, who is an independent agriculture and NRM adviser; Vicki-Jo Russell, who is on the South Australian NRM board and the Australian Landcare Council; Paul Sinclair from the Australian Conservation Foundation; Felicity Wishart from the Wilderness Society; and Deb Kerr from the NFF. That is the composition of the advisory group.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: It is a cast of thousands. They were selected on the department's recommendation to the minister?

Dr Zammit: There was a process of our providing a range of names, and the minister took the judgment on his preferences for this particular group.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Is the advisory group paid or voluntary?

Dr Zammit: It is paid under the Remuneration Tribunal arrangements. The standard Remuneration Tribunal arrangements apply to this group. So they get a per diem and travel expenses, as committees typically get.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: On notice could you provide details of the relevant tribunal categories et cetera for that group? That would be appreciated. The duration of appointments to the advisory group—is that for—

Dr Zammit: It would be for the first three years, I would anticipate. It is a good question. I imagine it would be for the full three years but I can take that on notice as well.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: If you could check on that and confirm to us it would be appreciated.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Answer:**

The department remunerates Advisory Group members at the Category 3 rate as set out in clause 2.3 of the Remuneration Tribunal Determination 2010/11. The fees to be paid at the Category 3 rate are \$641 per day for the chairperson and \$570 per day for a member. Office holders whose fee has been determined at this category are entitled to a travel allowance within Australia at the Tier 2 rate as set out in Determination 2010/08.

The duration of appointment for Advisory Group members is not specified. However, the Advisory Group was appointed by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities to provide advice on the design and approaches to implementing the three year National Wildlife Corridors Plan, so the duration of these appointments would, in the first instance, be three years.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

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

**Topic:** Local environmental initiatives  
from the mid-North Coast of  
New South Wales

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 67, 68 and 69 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

(page 67)

Senator BIRMINGHAM: 'These projects have come through the budget process' is a bit amorphous. Where did these projects come from? It is a very unusual budget line—'Local environment initiatives mid-North Coast New South Wales'. I know I would be happy to see a budget line of 'Local environmental initiatives west coast of South Australia', which we were discussing earlier, but we do not often see budget lines of this ilk.

Dr Grimes: These projects, as Mr Flanigan indicated, have been considered through the budget process. As you would appreciate, we do not go into the details of the budget process. But they were matters that were considered through the budget.

...

(page 68)

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Senator Conroy, do feel free to tell me where the Big Swamp project at Cattai Wetlands, the Lake Innes freshwater reversion program and a feasibility study into prevention of further erosion of the Old Bar Beach happened to miraculously appear in the budget process.

Senator Conroy: I am happy to inquire on your behalf and see what information I can get from the minister.

...

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Indeed—it is amazing. These three projects of \$3 million over three years have just morphed into the department's in-tray during the budget process—and the department does not know who is going to be delivering the projects, aside from the fact that the department is in charge of the money in present, how they are going to be delivered or what the comparative environmental benefits of them are.

Senator Conroy: I am happy to take on notice the thrust of your stream of consciousness and see if there is anything the minister would like to add.

...

(page 69)

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Can you provide on notice details of any analysis that has actually been undertaken as to the worthiness of these projects, and whether these projects meet any of the existing criteria for Caring for our Country or any of the programs that fit within the broad Caring for our Country headline. That would be appreciated.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Answer:**

Through previous studies, the Australian and New South Wales governments have established that Lakes Cathie and Innes, Big Swamp and Old Bar Beach have important environmental values that are under increasing threat.

Lakes Cathie and Innes are significant environmental assets. Lake Innes was once New South Wales' largest freshwater lake and provided important bird and fish habitat. Lake Cathie is an important breeding area for fish and prawns and this habitat is being impacted by coastal erosion and sediment. Stage One of a Coastal Zone Management Plan has recommended four management options for this area which require further investigation.

The Big Swamp area includes the State listed Cattai wetlands, historically important as a bird breeding area. The draining of the area associated with farming practices in the early 1900s has caused significant acid sulphate soil problems and remediation of these problems would have a significant positive impact on the environmental assets of this area. Project works will draw on the recommendations of the Cattai Wetland Plan of Management.

Old Bar is located in an area with important coastal habitat remnants including fragile dunal vegetation which is being severely impacted by coastal erosion. This erosion has also damaged public and private infrastructure, which has had an impact on the economic as well as environmental values of this coastal landscape. It is timely to explore options through undertaking a study which will determine whether it is feasible to mitigate or manage significant erosion at this and other beaches along the coast.

The outcomes of these projects will contribute to the Coastal Environments and Critical Aquatic Habitats priority area of the Australian Government's Caring for our Country initiative.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: AGLC **Question No:** 13

**Topic:** Tarkine - Regional Forest Agreement

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

**Senator Brown asked:**

The original Tasmanian RFA suggests that the regulation of mining proposals in the Tarkine will primarily be a matter for the Tasmanian Government. Relevantly, clause 78 of the RFA states, *“The Parties agree that Forest uses other than timber production will be determined in accordance with Tasmanian legislation with due regard to protection of Environment and Heritage Values.”* There are equivalent provisions in the other RFAs signed in other states.

The Supplementary Tasmanian RFA signed in 2005 includes a slight modification of this provision. Clause 8 of this agreement states: *“The Parties agree that all additional protected areas on public land will remain available for mineral exploration and mining under the Mineral Resources Development Act 1995 in accordance with clause 79 of the RFA and subject to any requirements under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.”*

In relation to these provisions:

- (a) is there an understanding between the Commonwealth and the Tasmanian Government on how mining projects in the Tarkine (and other areas of Tasmania) will be regulated under the EPBC Act so as to give effect to the intent of the original RFA, or are mining projects in the Tarkine treated like any other project under the EPBC Act?
- (b) does the Commonwealth believe it would be acting consistently with the RFA if it rejected, under the EPBC Act, a mining proposal in the sections of the Tarkine that are available to mining under the RFA?
- (c) does the Commonwealth believe it would be acting consistently with the RFA if it imposed strict conditions, under the EPBC Act, on a mining proposal in the sections of the Tarkine that are available to mining under the RFA?
- (d) given that the Tasmanian RFA has been amended to explicitly note the role of the EPBC Act in regulating mining proposals in the Tasmanian RFA area, does the Commonwealth intend to make similar amendments to the RFAs in other states; or is there already an understanding between the Commonwealth and the states that all mining proposals in RFA areas are subject to the EPBC Act and that they will be treated like any other proposal?



**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Answer:**

- a. Mining proposals which are likely to have a significant impact on matters protected by the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) are subject to the environment assessment and approval requirements of Part 3 of the EPBC Act. All mining proposals in Tasmania, including in the Tarkine region, are subject to this requirement irrespective of whether the proposed mining site is inside the area covered by a Regional Forest Agreement or not.
- b. Yes, if that mining proposal is determined likely to have an unacceptable impact on matters protected by the Act. As stated in Clause 8 of the Supplementary Regional Forest Agreement, the Australian and Tasmanian governments agree that mineral exploration and development remains subject to the requirements of the EPBC Act.
- c. Yes, for the reasons provided in response to a) and b) above. The imposition of strict conditions as part of a decision to approve an action is common practice under the EPBC Act, in order to ensure the protection of matters of national environmental significance. The Regional Forest Agreement does not affect this.
- d. The Australian Government has no plans for such amendments. Mining proposals on all tenures which are likely to have a significant impact on matters protected by the EPBC Act are subject to the environment assessment and approval requirements of Part 3 of the EPBC Act. The location of a mining operation within an RFA region does not affect this requirement.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: PAD

**Question No:** 014

**Topic:** Feral pests and invasive species

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 43 (24/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

Senator BIRMINGHAM: In your KPIs for this year and the forward years you have no net increase in the distribution or abundance of significant invasive species.

Mr Cochrane: Correct.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Have you been meeting that KPI?

Mr Cochrane: We are assembling the report for this financial year. We do address that in the annual report that was tabled in parliament last October. I think we said that, on the most significant species, we are covered. We said:

“We are monitoring 20 significant invasive species across our six major reserves. Of those populations five are increasing. Three are remaining steady, four are decreasing and for eight we still do not have enough information to be able to conclude clearly.”

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Of the five that are increasing, what are those species and in which of the reserves are they most predominant?

Mr Cochrane: I would have to take that on notice. I would say Christmas Island and Kakadu are probably the ones that are most likely to have the increases in population. They are the most challenging for us.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Could you take it on notice and give us that detail?

Mr Cochrane: Sure.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Perhaps across all 20, so we get a fair picture of those that are reducing as well.

Mr Cochrane: In association with the annual report, we publish every year what we call the State of the Parks reports, which have a lot more detail than the summary that is in the annual report. That is on the website. That information may already be published. If it is, I will refer you directly to it. I think we provide that level of detail.

**Answer:**

Information on the 20 significant invasive species the Director of National Parks monitors in our reserves can be found in the 2009-10 State of the Parks report. This is located on our website at

<http://www.environment.gov.au/parks/publications/annual/09-10/stateofparks0910.pdf>

For ease of reference, the relevant pages are provided at Attachment A.



Australian Government  
Director of National Parks



Director of National Parks | **State of the Parks Report**

Director of National Parks Annual Report 2009–10 Supplementary Information

*Managing the Australian Government's protected areas*



**PBS Target – No net increase in distribution/abundance of significant invasive species**

- Park managers have nominated 20 significant invasive species across the six terrestrial reserves to identify changes in overall distribution and abundance. Of the selected species, the populations of 5 species are increasing; 3 species are remaining steady; 4 species are decreasing; and for 8 species population data are deficient.

**Booderee National Park**

Species	Monitoring	Actions	Trend	Flag
European red fox <i>Vulpes vulpes</i>	Utilising fauna surveillance cameras, fox bait take and sand plot monitoring to monitor residual fox populations.	Continue to undertake fox control activities with an emphasis on removing residual, bait-shy individual foxes and introducing alternative fox control methods.	Fox numbers very low and alternative fox control techniques are proving effective for controlling residual foxes.	→ Numbers steady
Bitou bush <i>Chrysanthemoides monillifera</i>	Aerial survey undertaken. Density and distribution mapped and recorded on GIS. Annual aerial spray efficacy mapped and recorded on GIS. Post treatment enclosure trials to assess vegetation recovery.	500ha of bitou bush sprayed in June 2010.	90% reduction in the area of high density infestation and 75% reduction in the area of medium density infestation since 2004. Post treatment recovery slow due to high levels of preferential grazing by native species.	↓ Numbers falling

**Christmas Island National Park**

Species	Monitoring	Actions	Trend	Flag
Yellow crazy ant <i>Anoplolepis gracilipes</i>	Biennial biodiversity survey to determine supercolony density. Survey has used consistent methodology since 2001. Last survey occurred in 2007.	90 hectares of yellow crazy ant supercolonies treated.	Significant decline in supercolony numbers occurred in 2002 after successful aerial baiting program. Since 2002 supercolonies have slowly increased.  Aerial baiting program conducted in 2009, 784 ha supercolonies baited. Ongoing monitoring indicates aerial baiting has been successful in reducing ant numbers in former supercolonies.	↓ Numbers falling
False curry bush <i>Clausena excavata</i>	Initial survey to be conducted as part of 2009 island wide survey.	Weed eradication project undertaken.	No baseline data to date so no trend can be detected. Increasing numbers and distribution under intact rainforest canopy is of significant concern.	Data deficient
Feral cat <i>Felis catus</i>	Determining feral cat numbers is extremely difficult. Still investigating approaches to monitor effectively.	Island wide cat management plan developed to undertake collaborative approach to cat and rat management. Shire of Christmas Island has proposed new by-laws to control cats in settled areas and conducts a de-sexing program in collaboration with Director of National Parks and Christmas Island Phosphates.  Trial conducted to test effectiveness of a new cat bait and toxin with delivery system appropriate to Christmas Island was successful.	No baseline data to date so no trend can be detected. Anecdotal evidence suggests that numbers appear to be rising.	Data deficient

## Kakadu National Park

Species	Monitoring	Actions	Trend	Flag
Mimosa <i>Mimosa pigra</i>	Mimosa stands have been mapped and there is an annual monitoring program.	Integrated eradication program conducted.	Under control, virtually absent from the park	→ Numbers steady
Para grass <i>Brachiaria mutica</i>	Ongoing monitoring as part of integrated weed program. Species is subject to several current research projects.	Opportunistic control.	The range of this species is increasing.	↑ Numbers rising
Salvinia <i>Salvinia molesta</i>	Ongoing monitoring as part of integrated weed program.	Introduction of biological control agent and minor mechanical and chemical control in key sites.	Extent of infestations varies greatly between locations and over time.	→ Numbers steady
Water buffalo <i>Bubalus bubalus</i>	Major survey conducted in 2008-09.	A major control exercise was conducted in 2008-09 -opportunistic control measures were conducted in 2009-10.	Buffalo numbers increasing.	↑ Numbers rising
Feral pig <i>Sus scrofa</i>	Major survey conducted in 2008-09.	A major control exercise was conducted in 2008-09 -opportunistic control measures were conducted in 2009-10.	Feral pig numbers are increasing.	↑ Numbers rising

## Norfolk Island National Park

Species	Monitoring	Actions	Trend	Flag
Black rat <i>Rattus rattus</i>	Monthly survey of presence/absence of rats. Trapping and baiting program provides an indication of presence/absence.	Commenced upgrade of rat stations to modern bait/trap boxes. 1,100kg of bait taken by rodents. Over 250 rats caught in traps.	Numbers of rodents trapped and bait take similar over many years indicating stable population despite program.	Data deficient
Feral cat <i>Felis catus</i>	Trapping program provides a presence/absence indication. Continued gut analysis to determine prey composition (eg native birds, rats).	17 wild cats controlled in the park.	Unable to quantify population size. Uncertain whether rodent control program on park is impacting on feral cat numbers in the park.	Data deficient
Red guava <i>Psidium cattleianum</i>	No monitoring program at present.	Completed weed control in 6 of the 19 coups identified in the rehabilitation strategy. 6 ha weeds controlled.	Unable to determine. No trends at present.	Data deficient
African olive <i>Olea europaea africana</i>	No monitoring program at present.	Completed weed control in 6 of the 19 coups identified in the rehabilitation strategy. 6 ha weeds controlled.	Unable to determine. No trends at present.	Data deficient

## Pulu Keeling National Park

Species	Monitoring	Actions	Trend	Flag
Yellow crazy ant <i>Anoplolepis gracilipes</i>	Island wide survey conducted in June 2008. Survey methodology will be updated to include detection of 'scale insects'	Continued monitoring program. Planning for control programs using chemical. Successful funding application to undertake major invasive species management programs from 2009–11.	Colonies fairly widespread, with some sites recorded at 'supercolony' density.	↑ Numbers rising
Coral berry <i>Rivina humilis</i>	Ongoing mapping activities since 2008.	Successful funding application to undertake major invasive species management programs from 2009–11.	Increased distribution and density observed in western part of the park.	↑ Numbers rising

## Uluru–Kata Tjuta National Park

Species	Monitoring	Actions	Trend	Flag
Buffel grass <i>Cenchrus ciliaris</i>	Monitoring of native biodiversity following buffel removal around Uluru.	Prioritised buffel grass control activities including the Uluru base and areas of high conservation value.	Distribution throughout the park decreased due to an increase in control activities.	↓ Numbers falling
Feral cat <i>Felis catus</i>	10 satellite tracking collars (lasting 8 months) have been fitted to determine range, microhabitat use and potential prey risk. Currently trialling roadside monitoring of feral cat tracks.	Continued feral cat trapping program.	Unable to establish trend with current monitoring approach.	Data deficient
European wild rabbit <i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i>	Annual monitoring of active burrows has been undertaken since 1989.	Calicivirus released around resilient burrows.	Active burrows have reduced significantly since 1989. 93% decrease in active burrows over 18 years.	↓ Numbers falling
European red fox <i>Vulpes vulpes</i>	Monthly vertebrate pest monitoring in borefields area of Park commenced Sept 2008	Completing vertebrate pest strategy for the park which documents new control techniques for foxes. Trials will begin early in 2011.	Baseline data only. No trends at present.	Data deficient.



**Senate Standing Committee on Environment and Communications  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio**

Budget Estimates, May 2011

**Program: Division or Agency:** 1.1: PAD

**Question No:** 015

**Topic:** Camping fees

**Proof Hansard Page and Date** 44 (25/5/11)  
**or Written Question:**

**Senator Birmingham asked:**

Senator BIRMINGHAM: So entry fees, camping fees, those types of fees, are not part of that review? Is it more of a review of fees that relate to the commercial operation of the parks?

Mr Cochrane: We would keep camping fees under review. As they change in similar parks run by other agencies or in the same region, we would look to make sure that we maintained some sort of parity with those. The other opportunity for us is that, if we improve the investment in some of our camp grounds and upgrade them, we have a better chance of charging something more for them. We have a three-level fee at Kakadu. If we improve the facilities at a number of our camp grounds—for example, by moving from pit toilets to ablution blocks—then we can increase fees. They also become more popular and there is increased visitation.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Do you undertake comparisons of those fee structures between camping options in your parks and others—entry fee options, et cetera?

Mr Cochrane: From time to time but probably not in the last year or so. We have certainly received and commissioned some excellent studies looking at comparative rates just to make sure. We are benchmarking ourselves.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: If there is some data that you are—without blowing any commercial sensitivities—able to provide on notice on comparisons, that would be appreciated. ...

**Answer:**

The Director of National Parks price structures take account of comparable attractions and facilities in the regional markets within which we operate. Entry and camping fees directly contribute to maintaining park-wide facilities and conservation activities in our national parks. The camping fees in our national parks are comparable with state/territory government, council operated or private camping areas located near our parks.

The consultant's reports are commercial-in-confidence.