

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question 192
No:

Topic: Grants to Voluntary Environment,
Sustainability and Heritage
Organisations – 2012-13 funding
allocation

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Wright asked:

1. What amount has been allocated for this grant program in 2012-13 and then across the forward estimates?

Answer:

1. \$1.5 million has been allocated to Grants to Voluntary Environment, Sustainability and Heritage Organisations for the 2012-13 funding round. The grants are not specifically identified in the forward estimates as the funding source is departmental funds.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question 193
No:

Topic: Grants to Voluntary Environment,
Sustainability and Heritage
Organisations – Basis for funding

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Wright asked:

1. Since the GVESHO program began back in 2007, the proportion of funding allocated to heritage organisations as compared to environment and sustainability organisations has been reduced from 20.9% down to 12.1%. The actual amount of funding allocated to heritage organisations has also fallen, from roughly \$205,000 in 2010-11 to \$160, 000 in 2011-12. Is greater priority being given to funding for environment organisations as compared to funding for heritage organisations?
2. Funding under the GVESHO program used to be provided on a triennial basis. As of last year, funding is now being provided on an annual basis. The advice we are receiving from stakeholders is that this is very disruptive to forward planning, particularly when some organisations are yet to receive their funding for the 2011-12 financial year. What is the reason for moving from triennial to annual grants & also for the delay in payments?

Answer:

1. No.
2. The 2011-12 round did not allow for multi-year funding because of the addition of the new sustainability stream. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities wanted to get an indication of the response to the grant call from this sector.

The assessment of applications under the 2011-12 Grants to Voluntary Environment, Sustainability and Heritage Organisations round took longer than anticipated due to a departmental review of the assessment process. This resulted in grants being paid later than anticipated.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 194

Topic: DSEWPaC – Advertising

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Please detail all advertising expenditure in financial year 2011-12 to date by campaign, including the campaign's purpose, total cost (including campaign research and design) and media (i.e. print, radio, TV etc) involved. In each case, if the campaign was part of a broader strategy, what other communications activities were undertaken and at what cost? Please provide a similar breakdown on budgeted future spending.
2. Please detail all advertising related contracts entered into, specifically their costs, duration and key deliverables under each contract.

Answer:

1. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) has not undertaken any campaign advertising to date in 2011-12. At the time of writing, there were no campaign advertising activities planned for the department.
2. Not applicable.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 195

Topic: DSEWPaC – Market research

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Please detail all market research expenditure in financial year 2011-12 and identify the campaign(s) to which the expenditure relates. Please provide a similar breakdown on budgeted future spending.
2. Please detail all market research related contracts entered into, specifically their costs, duration and key deliverables under each contract.

Answer:

1. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) spent \$57,519 in 2011-12 on research to provide input to policy development. This was not related to a campaign. The department is not planning any market research expenditure in 2012-13.
2. The contract with Colmar Brunton was to undertake desktop research, structured interviews and a written analytical report to provide policy input to Australia's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy 2010-2030. The work was undertaken between March and June 2012.

The contractor was required to explore how behaviours in the financial services sector could potentially be influenced in a voluntary way that would encourage a shift towards economic activity that is 'biodiversity-benign' or has reduced adverse consequences for biodiversity.

The scope of the contract included exploring the views of companies operating within the sector and also those government agencies and peak bodies they interact with on a policy and regulatory 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 2012

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 196

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Advertising

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher 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

1. \$1,014,676.61.
2. All advertising undertaken by the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) during the period 1 July 2011 to 31 May 2012 was non-campaign advertising. Providing specific details for each item would involve an extensive manual process and an unreasonable diversion of the department's resources.

The department is covered by a whole-of-government contract with Adcorp Australia Limited for media placement of non-campaign advertising.

3. No.
4. No.

5. Yes. Providing specific details for each non-campaign advertising item would involve an extensive manual process and an unreasonable diversion of the department's resources.
6. 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 2011 to 31 May 2012 was \$894,286.62.

Details about the department's expenditure on printing for the period 1 July 2011 to 31 May 2012 is provided in the response to Question on Notice Number 190, Budget Estimates, May 2012.

7. At the time of writing, there are no campaign advertising activities planned for the department.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. The total cost of all advertising for the period 1 July 2011 to 31 May 2012 is \$85,267.
2. The Bureau of Meteorology has not undertaken any campaign advertising, as defined in the Australian Government Advertising Guidelines, in the financial year to date.

For non-campaign advertising the details of spending are:

Unimail	\$1,800
GradConnection	\$4,000
Adcorp	\$46,396
APS Public Service Gazette	\$28,347
APS Commission	\$4,724

3. No.
4. No.
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.
7. Not applicable.

Director of National Parks

1. The total cost of advertising for the period 1 July 2011 to 31 May 2012 is \$70,016.04.
2. The Director of National Parks has not undertaken any campaign advertising, as defined in the Australian Government Advertising Guidelines, in the financial year to date.

The amounts provided at question one are 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 ads 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. Director of National Parks expenditure on communication related activities for the period 1 July 2011 to 31 May 2012 was \$130,006.
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

1. Total cost year to date to May 2012: \$310,498.
2. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) has not undertaken any campaign advertising, as defined in the Australian Government Advertising Guidelines, in the financial year to date.

The major components of the non-campaign advertising are noted below.

Improving the Outlook (phase two): Non-campaign advertising about the threats to the Great Barrier Reef and the Reef Guardian stewardship program participants who are undertaking environmental activities. Advertising included one 30 second overview advertisement about the Reef, and seven supporting advertisements (30 seconds each). The television advertisements were produced by Digital Dimensions and placed through Universal McCann.

Reef Guardians: \$95,175 through Universal McCann; \$5,794 through Digital Dimensions; \$25,621 through Townsville Bulletin; and \$16,611 through Fishing/Boating Magazines.

Zoning education: Non-campaign advertising was undertaken to raise awareness of the zoning rules in place in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. Mainstream television, press and radio advertisements ran during 2011-12. \$34,240 through Universal McCann and \$3,807 through Fishing/Boating Magazines.

Promotion of Reef HQ Aquarium: A range of promotional advertising was undertaken for Reef HQ, \$66,962.

Recruitment: \$34,896 through Adcorp.

Sea Country Grants Program: \$18,589 through Adcorp.

3. Yes. The GBRMPA Communications Section sought guidance on *Improving the Outlook (phase two)* from the Communications Advice Branch within the Department of Finance and Deregulation.
4. Not applicable.
5. Yes. Advice was sought on the *Improving the Outlook (phase two)* advertising.
6. Included in the above overall advertising amount is advertising to support operational activities.
7. Non-campaign advertising will continue in 2012-13.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. The total cost of advertising for the Murray-Darling Basin Authority (the Authority) from 1 July 2011 to 30 April 2012 was \$127,152.
2. The Authority did not undertake any campaign advertising during the period 1 July 2011 to 30 April 2012.

The non-campaign advertising cost includes:

- recruitment advertising (Adcorp Australia Limited - \$44,134);
 - advertising in key regional and major papers within the Basin states and the ACT to seek the expression of interest for Basin Community Committee membership (Adcorp Australia - \$19,882);
 - advertising in key regional and major papers within the Basin States and the ACT for information about public meetings and inviting submissions on the draft Basin Plan (Adcorp Australia - \$ 56,318); and
 - advertising in '2012 NSW Recreational Fishing Guide' to promote conservation of aquatic systems by recreational fishers (Black Hawk Publishing Pty Ltd - \$6,818).
3. No.
 4. No
 5. Not applicable, the Authority did not undertake any campaign advertising activities during the period 1 July 2011 to 30 April 2012.

6. The Authority did not undertake any other communications program during the period 1 July 2011 to 30 April 2012.
7. Non-campaign advertising in relation to normal recruitment advertising.

National Water Commission

1. The total cost of advertising for the period ending 30 April 2012 was \$1,377.20 (GST inclusive).
2. Expenditure year to date relates to non-campaign staff recruitment advertising.
3. No.
4. No.
5. The Commission has not undertaken any information and advertising campaigns.
6. The Commission has not spent funds in 2011-12 to date on communication activities ('communication activities' for the purpose of the response is defined as: *the communication of a government message to the public*).
7. Some staff recruitment advertising is planned to be undertaken in the next six months.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. The total cost of all advertising for the financial year to date was \$169,890.
2. The Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (the Trust) has not undertaken any campaign advertising, as defined in the Australian Government Advertising Guidelines, in the financial year to date.
 - Non-campaign activity = \$169,890.
 - Advertising general = \$6,978 includes general advertising relating to board meeting notifications, proposed developments for community engagement, and other general non-campaign advertising.
 - Advertising tenders and EOIs = \$20,681 includes advertisements relating to requests for tenders and expressions of interest proposals.
 - Advertising accommodation = \$2,583.
 - Advertising relating to Cockatoo Island's 2011 art exhibitions and events = \$139,648.
 - Advertising includes print, JC Decaux (outdoor pedestrian posters), online advertising, avant card postcards and street posters.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Yes. Please refer to **Attachment A** for individual advertising expense descriptions.
6. Please refer to **Attachment A** for businesses that supplied the advertising and communication services.

7. The Trust has plans to undertake:

- Harbour Trust tender/EOI, general advertising.
- Cockatoo Island accommodation advertising and communications.
- Cockatoo Island event-related advertising and communications.
- North Head tourism advertising and communications.

Detailed Spend Breakdown: Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

Sum of TaxExclusiveAmount	
Row Labels	FY1112
Advertising - general	\$ 6,977.83
Nationwide News Pty Ltd	
Nationwide News Pty Ltd News advertisement	\$ 257.20
Adcorp Australian Limited	
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - North Head Sanctuary - Proposed Development	\$ 627.05
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Proposed Development Aerial Adventure Park	\$ 1,651.00
Adcorp Australian Limited - Parking Notice at Mosman Daily	\$ 179.62
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Public board meeting	\$ 1,706.48
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - T1446 Emergency lighting	\$ 1,706.48
Hunters Hill Council	
Hunters Hill Council - Hunters Hill 150th anniversary program advertising	\$ 450.00
Where Publishing Pty Ltd	
Where Publishing Pty Ltd Half page ad - 2012 Northern Beaches Visitor's Guide	\$ 400.00
Advertising - tenders and EOIs	\$ 20,681.13
Adcorp Australian Limited	
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Request for Tender	\$ 2,438.43
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Sydney Morning Heral Classified - Boating - 31 March 2012	\$ 1,651.63
Adcorp Australian Limited Sydney Morning Herald Classified - Saturday 14 April 2012 - Tenders	\$ 1,653.55
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - T1440 Sleeving tender CI	\$ 1,590.61
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Tender	\$ 2,383.43
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Tender - 27/8/11	\$ 1,541.01
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Tenders	\$ 1,700.61
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Wharf repail Tender T1444	\$ 2,383.43
Adcorp Australian Limited-Advertising - NH Childcare Centre EOI	\$ 4,013.32

Adcorp Australian Limited-Mosman Daily - MH Leasing EOI	\$ 1,325.11
Advertising relating to Cockatoo Island art exhibitions and events	\$ 139,647.95
Adcorp Australian Limited	
Adcorp Australian Limited-Advertising for multiple outlets for art exhibitions (print, online, street posters)	\$ 69,405.95
Adcorp Australian Limited-Daily Telegraph print advertising	\$ 5,672.00
Avant Card Pty Ltd	
Avant Card Pty Ltd- Promotions	\$ 4,800.00
Avant Card Pty Ltd-Promotions	\$ 1,000.00
JCDecaux Australia Pty Ltd	
JC Decaux Australia Pty Ltd (ACN 078 716 793)- providing advertising coverage in pedestrian and major traffic networks across Sydney	\$ 58,020.00
Showtime Marketing	
Showtime Marketing promotion/advertising via Street Posters. Distribution of 150 posters into targeted sites around Sydney (Project 10.34). Ref: 2000.8./2011	\$ 750.00
Advertising accommodation	\$ 2,582.90
Invermay Investment P/L ATF The Invermay Investme	
Invermay Investment P/L ATF The Invermay Investme - Advertising accommodation	\$ 731.82
Stayz Pty Ltd	
Stayz Pty Ltd - Annual listing fee	\$ 149.09
Stayz Pty Ltd - Booking fee	\$ 999.45
Stayz Pty Ltd - Booking fee - Nov	\$ 126.36
Stayz Pty Ltd -Fee for June 11	\$ 576.18
Grand Total	\$ 169,889.81

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 197

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Board appointments

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher 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 Supplementary Estimates in October 2011, for Additional Estimates in February 2012 and for Budget Estimates in May 2012.
2. The Gender ratio on each board 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	4:10
Antarctic Animal Ethics Committee	4:3
Antarctic Science Advisory Committee	3:5
Australia-Netherlands Committee on Old Dutch Shipwrecks	0:2
Australian Antarctic Names and Medal Committee	2:2
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	4:7
Fuel Standards Consultative Committee	4:12
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	1:3
Hazardous Waste Technical Group	2:6
Independent Expert Panel for Major Coal Seam Gas Projects	1:3
Indigenous Advisory Committee	3:8
Interim Independent Expert Scientific Committee on Coal Seam Gas and Coal Mining	1:4
Kakadu National Park Board of Management	3:9
Lake Eyre Basin Community Advisory Committee	6:9
Lake Eyre Basin Scientific Advisory Panel	3:4
Land Sector Carbon and Biodiversity Board	2:3
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	3:3
National Water Commission	2:4
National Wildlife Corridors Plan Advisory Group	7:6
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	4:3
Threatened Species Scientific Committee	4:6
Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Board of Management	3:6
Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Advisory Group	3:6

For the following boards the Australian Government co-appoints the chair but is not involved in other board appointments.

Australian Fossil Mammal Sites (Riversleigh) World Heritage Area Community and Scientific Advisory Committee
Fraser Island World Heritage Area Community Advisory Committee
Fraser Island World Heritage Area Indigenous Advisory Committee
Fraser Island World Heritage Area Scientific Advisory Committee
Gondwana Rainforests of Australia World Heritage Advisory Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee
Gondwana Rainforests of Australia World Heritage Area Community Advisory Committee
Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Advisory Committee
Shark Bay World Heritage Advisory Committee
Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Consultative Committee
Willandra Lakes Region World Heritage Property Community Management Council/Technical and Scientific Advisory Committee

3. Board appointments for this financial year to date are reflected in Senate Order 13 tabled in the Senate in October 2011, February 2012 and May 2012.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 198

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Freedom of Information requests

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher 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?
4. How many conclusive certificates have been issued in relation to FOI requests for this financial year to date?

Answer:

The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

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 Notes. 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 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the department estimates that the total cost of processing FOI requests has been approximately \$369,434.
3. For the financial year 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the department has received 110 FOI requests and had 12 FOI requests carried over from the financial year 2010-2011 (equating to a total of 122 FOI requests).

Of the total 122 FOI requests, 31 were granted in full, 20 were granted in part, eight were refused, 42 were withdrawn, six were transferred to another agency for processing and 15 were still being processed.

For the financial year 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012), the department processed six FOI requests outside the statutory timeframe as provided by the FOI Act. The delays in this small number of cases were a result of competing workloads and limited availability of key officers.

4. None. Conclusive certificates were abolished in 2009.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. The Bureau of Meteorology (the Bureau) follows the advice and protocols provided by the the OAIC in line with the FOI Act and FOI Guidance Notes. The Bureau 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 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the total cost to the Bureau to process FOI requests has been approximately \$25,098.
3. For the financial year 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the Bureau received 16 FOI requests.

Of the 16 requests, four have been released in full, four released in part, seven refused due to Section 12(c) and one was withdrawn.

All requests were processed within required timeframes.

No requests remain outstanding as at 21 May 2012.

4. None.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) follows the advice and protocols provided by the OAIC in line with the FOI Act and FOI Guidance Notes. The Authority 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 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the total cost to the GBRMPA to process FOI requests has been approximately \$1,340.
3. For the financial year 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the GBRMPA received four FOI requests.

Of the four requests, one was granted, none have been denied, two were withdrawn and one was transferred.

All requests were met within the processing times outlined in the FOI Act.

No requests remain outstanding.

4. None.

Murray Darling Basin Authority

1. The Murray Darling Basin Authority (the Authority) follows the advice and protocols provided by the the OAIC in line with the FOI Act and FOI Guidance Notes. The Authority 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 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the total cost to the Authority to process FOI requests has been approximately \$57,576.
3. For the financial year to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012), the Authority has received 20 FOI requests, four were granted in full, seven were granted in part, six were refused (three due to no relevant documents found), two were withdrawn and one request was being processed.
4. None.

National Water Commission

1. The National Water Commission (the Commission) follows the advice and protocols provided by the OAIC in line with the FOI Act and FOI Guidance Notes. The Commission 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 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the total cost to the Commission to process FOI requests has been approximately \$3,951.
3. For the financial year 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the Commission has received three FOI requests.

Of the three requests received, one was granted and one request was withdrawn by the applicant.

In relation to the third request, the Commission held no documents within the scope of the request.

All requests were met within the processing times outlined in the FOI Act.

No requests remain outstanding.

4. None.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. The Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (the Trust) follows the advice and protocols provided by the OAIC, in line with the FOI Act and FOI Guidance Notes. The Trust 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 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the total cost to the Trust was \$1,578.

3. For the financial year 2011-12 to date (1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012) the Trust received one FOI application.

This request was granted in full. Due to an administrative oversight, this request was processed outside the specified timeframe, but with the agreement of the applicant.

No requests are outstanding.

4. None.

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

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

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Community Cabinet meetings

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher asked:

1. What was the cost of Ministers travel and expenses for the Community Cabinet meetings held this financial year to date?
2. How many Community Cabinet meetings has the Minister attended? List date and location.
3. How many Ministerial Staff travelled with the Minister for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date? What was the total cost of this travel? Which Community Cabinet meetings did the Ministerial Staff attend? List date and location.
4. 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, accommodate and any other expenses. Which Community Cabinet meetings did the Departmental Officers attend? List date and location.
5. 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. For this financial year to date (as at 19 June 2012), the Department of Finance and Deregulation has paid \$3,508.47 for travel and expenses for the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities to attend Community Cabinet meetings.
2. The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities attended three Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year: Kingston, Tasmania, 3 October 2011; Werribee, Victoria, 9 November 2011; and Parramatta, New South Wales, 4 April 2012.
3. The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities was accompanied by two ministerial staff members to each of the Community Cabinet meetings he attended this financial year to date at a cost of \$6,400.42. Ministerial staff attended three Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year: Kingston, Tasmania, 3 October 2011; Werribee, Victoria, 9 November 2011; and Parramatta, New South Wales, 4 April 2012.

4. A total of four departmental officers from the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) attended Community Cabinet meetings to support the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities in this financial year to date at a cost of \$3,364.22. Departmental staff attended three Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year: Kingston, Tasmania, 3 October 2011; Werribee, Victoria, 9 November 2011; and Parramatta, New South Wales, 4 April 2012.
5. The total cost to the Minister's Office and the department for Community Cabinet meetings held this financial year to date was \$13,273.11.

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

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

Topic: Portfolio Wide - Reviews

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher 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. What is the estimated cost of each of these Reviews?
6. What reviews are planned?
7. When will each of these reviews be concluded?

Answer:

Consolidated responses to questions one through seven are in the tables below.

Current reviews this financial year to date

Name of Review	Estimated completion date	Provided to Government	Government Response	Estimated cost
Independent Review of Australian Government Environmental Information Activity.	December 2012.	Proposed December 2012.	April 2013.	\$107,254.
The Review of the <i>Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Exports and Imports) Act 1989</i> and its associated regulations.	December 2012 (conclusion of the public phase of the review).	Yet to be determined.	Yet to be determined.	\$46,550 (may vary depending on issues raised and analysis required).

Concluded reviews:

Name of Review	Provided to Government/Authority	Government Response	Estimated cost
Review of Caring for our Country.	December 2011.	<i>Report on the Review of the Caring for our Country Initiative</i> publicly released on 18 April 2012. The Australian Government agreed to a further five years of funding for Caring for our Country in the 2012-13 Budget.	\$192,354.
The future role of the National Park Forestry Zone in a sustainable forestry sector for Norfolk Island.	May 2012.	Consultations with key stakeholders are underway.	\$7,110.
Technical Audit of the 5 th Kakadu National Park Management Plan.	May 2012.	The Kakadu Board of Management considered the audit at their June 2012 Board Meeting. Recommendations will be considered during the development of the 6 th Kakadu National Park Management Plan during 2012-2014.	\$35,327.
Science Review of the estimation of an Environmentally Sustainable Level of Take for the Murray-Darling Basin.	Review provided to Murray-Darling Basin Authority November 2011.	No formal government response required.	\$200,000.
Review of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority's Socio-economic Impact Modelling.	Review provided to Murray-Darling Basin Authority June 2012.	No formal government response required.	\$22,000.
Review of the Bureau of Meteorology's extreme weather and seasonal forecasting capacity.	Review provided to the Australian Government December 2011.	The Australian Government has indicated the review's findings will be considered to determine the most appropriate way forward.	\$315,280.

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

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

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Media monitoring

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher asked:

1. What was 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?
 - a. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - b. What is the estimated budget to provide these same services for the year 2012-13?
2. 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?
 - a. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - b. What is the estimated budget to provide these same services for the year 2012-13?

Answer:

The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities including Sydney Harbour Federation Trust and the Bureau of Meteorology

- 1-2. The total cost to the department for media monitoring services for this financial year to date was \$330,680 GST exclusive. There is no additional cost to the Minister's Office as the department operates with a single account.
 - a. Australian Associated Press.
 - b. \$450,000 GST exclusive.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. Not applicable. GBRMPA does not supply this service to the Minister's office.
 - a. Not applicable.
 - b. Not applicable.
2. \$38,247.
 - a. Sentia Media.
 - b. \$45,000.

Murray Darling Basin Authority

1. Not Applicable. The Authority does not supply this service to the Minister's office.
 - a. Not applicable.
 - b. Not applicable.
2. \$94,578.
 - a. Sentia Media.
 - b. \$100,000.

National Water Commission

1. Not Applicable. The Commission does not supply this service to the Minister's office.
 - a. Not applicable.
 - b. Not applicable.
2. \$128,632.
 - a. Sentia Media.
 - b. \$60,000.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 202

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Commissioned reports

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher asked:

1. How many Reports have been commissioned by the Government in your portfolio 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:

No new reports have been commissioned by the Australian Government in the Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio in this 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
Budget Estimates, May 2012

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: CSD

Question 203
No:

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Travel costs

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher asked:

1. For the financial year to date, please detail all travel for Departmental officers that accompanied the Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals).
2. For the financial year to date, please detail all travel for Departmental officers. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals).
3. Are the Government's Lowest Practical Fare travel policy for Domestic Air Travel (Finance Circular No. 2009/10) and Best Fare of the Day for International Air Travel (Finance Circular No. 2009/11) guidelines being followed? How is this monitored? If the guidelines are not being followed, please explain why.
4. Are lounge memberships provided to any employees? If yes, what lounge memberships, to how many employees and their classification, the reason for the provision of lounge membership and the total costs of the lounge memberships.
5. When SES employees travel, do any support or administrative staff (such as an Executive Assistant) travel with them? If yes, provide details of why such a staff member is needed and the costs of the support staff travel.

Answer:

The Department of Environment, Water, Sustainability, Population and Communities

1. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) does not record travel data in a way that would readily allow answers to be provided to these questions without substantial diversion of departmental resources.
2. Please see **Attachment A** for travel data for Financial Year to date noting that:
 - We are unable to provide a breakdown of type of fares, except to say that: all officers are entitled to travel business class to and from international destinations; Senior Executive Service (SES) officers are entitled to travel business class domestically except the Canberra to Sydney route; and the Secretary and the Director of National Parks are entitled to travel first class internationally (there is no domestic first class).

- Accommodation is only accurate for domestic non-SES officers. As international accommodation and domestic SES officer accommodation is usually paid by credit card, these expenses are not captured in the SAP travel module.
 - Other expenses include fares (excluding air), meals, incidentals, car hire, mileage allowances and other non-standard expenses.
3. Yes. Where the lowest priced airfare, as defined by Australian Government policy, is not accepted, an alternate booking cannot be made until the reason for not selecting the lowest priced airfare is provided to the department's Travel Management Company (TMC). The TMC records these reasons and reports accordingly to the department. It should be noted that the lowest priced fare is not necessarily the Lowest Practical Fare nor the Best Fare of the Day.
 4. Lounge memberships are provided to SES officers as an entitlement, and to other officers who undertake frequent travel as part of their official duties.

Qantas Lounge Memberships	
Costs \$260 per membership per year	
Classification	Number
Senior Executive Service	49
Executive Level	13
Australian Public Service	2

Virgin Australia Lounge Memberships	
Costs \$249 per membership per year	
Classification	Number
Senior Executive Service	2

5. The department is unable to provide a definitive response as our records system does not support or capture this information, but it is not departmental practice for Executive Assistants to accompany SES officers on their travel.

Australian Antarctic Division

1. The department does not record travel data in a way that would readily allow answers to be provided to these questions without substantial diversion of departmental resources.
2. Please see **Attachments B1** (travel costs) and **B2** (detailed international) for travel data for Financial Year to date. Please also refer to the explanations supplied with the department's answer above.

3. Yes. Where the lowest priced airfare, as defined by Australian Government policy, is not accepted, an alternate booking cannot be made until the reason for not selecting the lowest priced airfare is provided to the department's Travel Management Company (TMC). The TMC records these reasons and reports accordingly to the department. It should be noted that the lowest priced fare is not necessarily the Lowest Practical Fare nor the Best Fare of the Day.
4. Lounge memberships are provided to SES officers as an entitlement, and to other officers who undertake frequent travel as part of their official duties.
5. The department is unable to provide a definitive response as our records system does not support or capture of this information, but it is not departmental practice for Executive Assistants to accompany SES officers on their travel.

Director of National Parks

1. The department does not record travel data in a way that would readily allow answers to be provided to these questions without substantial diversion of departmental resources.
2. Please see **Attachment C** for travel data for financial year to date. Please also refer to the explanations supplied with the department's answer above.
3. Yes. Where the lowest priced airfare, as defined by Australian Government policy, is not accepted, an alternate booking cannot be made until the reason for not selecting the lowest priced airfare is provided to the department's Travel Management Company (TMC). The TMC records these reasons and reports accordingly to the department. It should be noted that the lowest priced fare is not necessarily the Lowest Practical Fare nor the Best Fare of the Day.
4. Lounge memberships are provided to Senior Executive Service officers as an entitlement, and to other officers who undertake frequent travel as part of their official duties.

Qantas Lounge Memberships	
Costs \$260 per membership per year	
Classification	Number
Senior Executive Service	1

5. The department is unable to provide a definitive response as our records system does not support or capture of this information, but it is not departmental practice for Executive Assistants to accompany SES officers on their travel

Bureau of Meteorology

1. Not applicable.
2. For the financial year to date (as at 14 June 2012), the travel cost incurred by the Bureau of Meteorology (the Bureau) is \$9,696,717.81 as detailed below.

Food, Accommodation and Beverage details are not available as the Bureau pays a travel allowance to employees.

Domestic	
Airfares	
Economy	\$1,944,757.74
Business	\$148,337.59
Total	\$2,093,095.33
Ground fares	\$601,218.68
Vehicle hire	\$109,916.35
Total	\$711,135.03
Travel Allowance	\$4,050,130.78

International	
Airfares	
Economy	\$867,934.95
Business	\$759,064.71
First Class	\$4,870.72
Total	\$1,631,870.38
Travel allowance	\$1,205,982.32
Passports and Visas	\$4,503.97
Total Travel allowance and Passports and Visas	\$1,210,486.29
Total travel for the Bureau as at 14 June 2012	\$9,696,717.81

3. The Bureau complies with Lowest Practical Fare and Best Fare of the Day policies. Compliance is monitored through reports from our travel management company (HRG Australia), provided to the Australian Government Travel Manager and to the Bureau, and outlining reason codes for travellers not choosing the lowest priced fares when making a booking.
4. The Bureau of Meteorology has airline memberships as shown in the following tables:

Qantas Club Table

Staff Classification	Total Memberships	Membership paid by staff member	Platinum/Gold (complimentary)	Membership paid by Agency at \$485.00 per person
APS 2	0			0
APS 3	0			0
APS 4	1			1
APS 5	11	4	1	6
APS 6	29	9	6	14
EL 1	54	15	8	31
EL 2 (lower)	47	12	11	24
EL 2 (upper)	34	3	8	23
SES	12		7	5
	188	43	41	104

Koru Club Membership at \$322.00 per person per annum	
EL1	2
Total	2

5. Not applicable.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. No Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) staff have accompanied the Minister or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel this financial year to date.
2. \$551,160 for the period 1 February 2012 to 31 May 2012

Airfares	
Business	\$92,939
Economy	\$217,706
Accommodation	\$89,607
Allowances	\$111,934
Other expenses	\$38,974
Total	\$551,160

3. Yes. This is managed at the approval and booking process and monitored by reports from the TMC.
4. Yes, to facilitate working arrangements for frequent travellers. Annual renewal is \$260 per annum.

Classification	Number of employees
APS	11
EL1	9
EL2	2

5. No support or administrative staff have accompanied SES officers on travel.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. Nil
2. The expenditure on travel undertaken by Murray-Darling Basin Authority (the Authority) officers from 1 April 2011 to 30 April 2012 was as follows:

Domestic	
Airfares	
Business	\$145,295
Economy	\$731,266
Accommodation	\$258,564
Land based travel (including taxi, mileage etcetera)	\$236,220
Travel allowance	\$371,380
International	
Airfares	
Business	\$4,245
Economy	\$-
Accommodation	\$-
Travel allowance	\$2,434
Total	\$1,749,404

3. Yes. Travel is monitored via reports from the travel service provider.
4. As at 30 April 2012, a total of 43 Authority employees held Qantas Club airline lounge memberships. Of these, ten were SES Officers; 19 were Executive Level 2 Officers; 11 were Executive Level 1 Officers and three were APS 6 Officers.

SES officers are entitled to membership with one airline lounge membership as a condition of their contract of employment.

Non-SES officers are provided membership when they are required to travel on official business frequently and where such membership will assist the staff member in effectively performing their duties.

The first year cost of a Qantas Club airline lounge membership is \$460 with subsequent yearly renewals costing \$260.

5. Support staff travel with SES officers when required to effectively conduct business. There have been no instances where an Executive Assistant has travelled with an SES officer in the current financial year.

National Water Commission

1. No National Water Commission (the Commission) staff have accompanied the Minister or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel this financial year to date.
2. The Commission does not record travel data in a way that would readily allow an answer to be provided to complete this question. To attempt to provide this level of detail would involve an unreasonable diversion of agency resources.

The Commission does not provide staff who travel with a travelling allowance (accommodation and meal costs are paid using a staff corporate credit card).

The Commission does not record entertainment separately (part of official hospitality) or link gifts to particular trips. The following information is provided on travel expenditure to 30 April 2012 (GST exclusive):

Domestic	
Airfares	
Total	\$310,707
International	
Airfares	
Total	\$31,924
Taxis, car hire and parking	\$47,543
Accommodation and subsistence	\$111,690
Total	\$501,863

3. All employees are travelling within the Australian Government's lowest practical fare policy. The policy is monitored when expenditure approval is provided for the travel by the delegate and also when reporting monthly to the Commission's executive committee.

4. All SES officers are entitled to Commission-sponsored membership of a lounge club. Non-SES staff who are estimated to travel at least on 12 occasions in any year may be allowed Commission-sponsored membership of a lounge club for that year where the staff member is required to access business facilities. The cost of membership is \$459 per employee. In the financial year to 30 April 2012 the Commission has paid for 13 memberships (APS 6: 2; EL 1: 6; EL 2: 5).
5. No support or administrative staff have accompanied SES officers on travel.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. No Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (the Trust) staff have accompanied the Minister or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel this financial year to date.
2. The Trust does not record travel data in a way that would readily allow answers to be provided to these questions without substantial diversion of resources.

Domestic	
Airfares	
Total	\$11,910
International	
Airfares	
Total	\$2,441
Travel allowance/accommodation	\$12,651
Motor vehicle allowances	\$3,119
Taxis	\$5,752
Total	\$35,873

3. Yes these guidelines are being followed. Monitoring is done through the online booking system that is used to make bookings for staff.
4. No lounge memberships are provided to employees.
5. No support or administrative staff travel with SES equivalent employees when they travel.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 204

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Legal costs

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher 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:

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

1. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) spent \$1,546,765 on the salaries and on costs of internal lawyers in the Legal Section, Governance and Legal Branch for the period 1 July 2011 to 15 June 2012. In addition, the Director of National Parks spent \$202,382 on the salaries of internal lawyers in their Legal Section for the period 1 July 2011 to 15 June 2012.

Internal lawyers within the department provide legal advice and services across a range of issues including government, administrative, corporate and commercial matters.

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 government to be able to make fully informed decisions based on comprehensive and confidential legal advice. As such, only the totals for the costs of the lawyers in the legal sections have been provided.

2. The Australian Government Solicitor is treated the same as all other Legal Service Providers on the department's Legal Services Panel. Please see the response to Question three below.

3. The Legal Services Directions 2005 require the department, the Director of National Parks, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and the Murray-Darling Basin Authority to report annually on their legal services expenditure. This information must be provided to the Office of Legal Services Coordination within 60 days of the end of financial year. These reports are also published on the agency websites each year (reports being accessible at <http://www.ag.gov.au/Commonwealthlegalservicesexpenditure/Pages/default.aspx>).

The data for this financial year will be compiled at the end of the 2011/2012 financial year and made available at the above internet address. Compiling these figures outside of the regular reporting cycle would duplicate this process and involve an unreasonable diversion of resources.

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.

4. Save for a few services provided by the Office of International Law valued at around \$20,000 and which is the subject of confidential legal advice, the department's legal spend is captured in the information above.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. \$526,844.*
2. \$149,876.
3. \$82,761.
4. Not applicable.

* This includes \$264,443 in salary costs that do not attract GST, and \$262,401 in sourced legal staff cost which does include GST. This staff member is seconded from the Australian Government Solicitor and is working as a staff member of the Bureau of Meteorology (the Bureau), but the Bureau is being charged the staff member's costs as a contractor.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. \$544,689.
2. \$176,285.
3. Not applicable.
4. \$10,777.

Murray Darling Basin Authority

1. \$345,856.
2. \$1,132,855.
3. \$722,697.
4. Not applicable.

National Water Commission

1. Not applicable.
2. \$22,326.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. Not applicable.
2. \$16,244.
3. \$179,540.
4. \$31,175.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 205

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Media training

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher asked:

In relation to media training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information for this financial year to date:

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 name and nature of the service purchased
 - b. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based
5. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
6. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - a. The total amount spent on the service
 - b. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package)
7. Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
 - a. The location used
 - b. The number of employees who took part on each occasion
 - c. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - d. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location

Answer:

Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

1-4. All media training provided to departmental officers to date this financial year has been provided in-house.

5. Not applicable.

6. Not applicable.

7. Not applicable.

Director of National Parks

1. \$13,910.

2. 34 employees. Details of their employment classification is given below;

Classification	Number of employees
APS 2	12
APS 3	6
APS 4	8
APS 5	2
APS 6	4
EL1	2
TOTAL	34

3. The number of employees and their classification is outlined at Question 2 above. Each employee undertook training for seven hours.

4. Ken Begg and Associates.

a. Media training.

b. Group based.

5. 34 employees received the service. Details of their employment classification are given in the table above.

6. 238 hours.

a. \$13,910.

b. Fees were charged at \$2,200 a day for the complete package.

7. All training was provided at Director of National Parks locations.

Murray Darling Basin Authority

1. \$3,000.
2. Five employees (one at Chief Executive level; two at Executive Director level; two at General Manager level).
3. Five employees (one at Chief Executive level; two at Executive Director level; two at General Manager level). No study leave was required.
4. Laurie Wilson & Associates Pty Ltd.
 - a. Media training.
 - b. Group based.
5. Five employees (one at Chief Executive level; two at Executive Director level; two at General Manager level).
6. Six hours per employee.
 - a. \$3,000.
 - b. Complete package. Daily fee is \$3,000.
7. Not applicable, training was provided on the Authority's premises.

National Water Commission

1. \$6,804.
2. Four. Three Commissioners and the CEO.
3. Two. Two Commissioners. No study leave was granted for the training.
4. Corporate Media Services.
 - a. Media training.
 - b. One on one.
5. Two. Commissioner-level.
6. Nine hours.
 - a. \$6,804.
 - b. Complete package.
7.
 - a. Australian Institute of Management.
 - b. One Commissioner on each occasion.
 - c. Nine hours.
 - d. Nil.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. \$24,500.
2. 31 employees.
3. 31 employees (for the period 1 July 2011 to 21 May 2012).
4. Voice Coach.
 - a. Media training: small group (6 people) one-day workshop; and individual assessment and tutorial.
 - b. Combined group workshop and one-on-one.
5. 31 employees:

Workshop (7 Hours)	Tutorial (1 Hour)	Classification
2	2	APS 3
10	10	APS 4
9	9	APS 6
7	7	EL 1
3	3	EL 2

6. Eight hours.
 - a. \$24,500.
 - b. \$2,500 per one day workshop, \$400 per one hour assessment and tutorial.
7. Not applicable, all training was provided on the Bureau's own premises.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. Not applicable.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.
4. Not applicable.
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.
7. Not applicable.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 206

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Provision of information to the Australian Greens

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher asked:

Does the department/agency provide any information and/or undertake any requests for the Australian Greens? If yes, please provide the following information:

1. How is such work and/or information requests commissioned?
2. What work/information requests have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each work produced.
3. Has any such work and/or information requests been unable to proceed? If yes, provide details including what the work and/or information requests were and why it could not be undertaken.
4. How long is spent undertaking work and/or information requests for the Australian Greens? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

Answer:

The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

Yes, the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) has provided information to the Australian Greens on four occasions this financial year to date.

1. On three occasions the work was requested through the Minister and Parliamentary Secretary's offices.

The fourth occasion was as a result of *Circular 11 of 2010 from the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet* that requires departments to prepare briefing on new Bills proposed to be tabled in Parliament.

2. The department has provided verbal briefings to the Australian Greens on four occasions this financial year to date.

Two of the verbal briefings were on the progress of implementation of the department's Clean Energy Future measures.

The third verbal briefing to the Australian Greens was on the Packaging Impacts Consultation Regulation Impact Statement.

The fourth verbal briefing to the Australian Greens was on the importance of the *Antarctic Treaty (Environment Protection) Amendment Bill 2011*.

3. No. These briefings are the only requests for information that were received by the department.
4. Three of the verbal briefing sessions were approximately one hour in each instance. The fourth briefing, on the *Antarctic Treaty (Environment Protection) Amendment Bill 2011*, was a 10 minute face-to-face briefing.

For the two briefings on the department's Clean Energy Future measures, two staff members were involved in the meeting, one Assistant Secretary and one First Assistant Secretary.

For the briefing on the Packaging Impacts Consultation Regulation Impact Statement, three staff members were involved in the meeting, one Director, one Assistant Secretary and one First Assistant Secretary. There was no record made of the time taken.

For the briefing on the *Antarctic Treaty (Environment Protection) Amendment Bill 2011* approximately two hours work was involved. The written material was prepared by one Executive Level 1 officer, with the oral briefing provided by one SES Level 1 officer.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

Yes. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) has provided one verbal briefing to the Australian Greens this financial year to date.

1. The work was requested through the Minister's office.
2. On one occasion this financial year, the GBRMPA provided a verbal briefing on the GBRMPA's assessments of the health and risks to the Great Barrier Reef.
3. No. This was the only request for information received by the GBRMPA.
4. The Chairman of the GBRMPA provided a one hour verbal briefing at Parliament House. An adviser to the Minister was also present.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 207

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Provision of information to the Independents

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Fisher asked:

Does the department/agency provide any information and/or undertake any requests for the Independents? If yes, please provide the following information:

1. How is such work and/or information requests commissioned?
2. What work/information requests have been undertaken? Provide details, including who the work/information was for and a copy of each work produced.
3. Has any such work and/or information requests been unable to proceed? If yes, provide details including what the work and/or information requests were, who they were from, who they were for and why it could not be undertaken.
4. How long is spent undertaking work and/or information requests for the Independents? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

Answer:

The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Community

Yes. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) has provided information to the Independents on two occasions this financial year to date.

1. On one occasion, the briefing was requested through the Minister's Office. On the other occasion, the briefing was requested by the Office of the Member for New England, Mr Tony Windsor MP.
2. The department provided two verbal briefings to the Office of the Member for New England, Mr Tony Windsor MP. One briefing was on the progress of implementation of the department's Clean Energy Future measures. The other briefing was an update on the status of the Namoi Water Study.
3. No. These briefings were the only requests for information received by the department.

4. The verbal briefing on the implementation of the department's Clean Energy Future measures was approximately one hour and involved two staff members, one Assistant Secretary and one First Assistant Secretary.

The verbal briefing on the Namoi Water Study was approximately one hour and involved one staff member, a First Assistant Secretary.

National Water Commission

Yes. The National Water Commission (the Commission) has provided information to the Independents on one occasion this financial year to date.

1. An informal request was made by the office of the Member for Lyne, Mr Rob Oakeshott MP.
2. The information provided is included at **Attachment A**.
3. No. This was the only request for information received by the Commission.
4. No record was kept of the time taken to prepare the information.

The National Water Initiative (NWI)

The NWI is a policy commitment by all state and territory governments and the Australian Government through the Council of Australian Governments (COAG). It maps out Australia's water use and management objectives and agreed actions to achieve a more cohesive national approach to the way Australia manages, measures, plans for, prices, and trades water.

Established through an intergovernmental agreement in 2004, the NWI is a joint policy commitment to achieve a 'nationally compatible, market, regulatory and planning based system of managing surface water and groundwater resources for rural and urban use that optimises economic, social and environmental outcomes'. The implementation of the NWI occurs primarily through state and territory NWI consistent legislation and policies.

Under the NWI jurisdictions are obliged to manage interception risk to existing entitlement holders, from activities such as stock and domestic, forestry, mining and farm dams. Jurisdiction set threshold volumes above which the user must hold an entitlement to that water. The 2011 Biennial Assessment noted that the commitment to manage interception has not been fully implemented by the parties.

The Commission's Australia-wide assessment of water reform progress was released recently. The report, *The National Water Initiative - securing Australia's water future: 2011* (web address given below) addresses mining on pages 13-14 and 41-44; town water supply on pages 6 and 12, and pages 122-128, and water markets on pages 61-77.

Mining

Clause 34 of the NWI recognises that there may be special circumstances facing the mineral and petroleum sectors that will need to be addressed by policies and measures outside the scope of the NWI. In that recent assessment, the Commission expresses concern that this exemption has been applied as the norm, not as the exception, and has called for greater coordination and alignment between the regulatory settings of water management and the minerals and extractive sectors.

Water use by Coal Seam Gas (CSG) is not specifically identified under clause 34 of the NWI. However, a number of states have taken steps to manage the impact of CSG, for example regulatory reforms in NSW to bring water use from CSG activities under the *Water Management Act 2000*.

Town water supply

The National Water Initiative refers to town water supply and use with outcomes related to clause 90 Urban water reform including:

- providing healthy, safe and reliable water supplies;
- increase water use efficiency in domestic and commercial settings;
- encourage the re-use and recycling of wastewater where cost effective;
- facilitate water trading between and within the urban and rural sectors;
- encourage innovation in water supply sourcing, treatment, storage and discharge; and
- achieve improved pricing for metropolitan water.

The Commission has recently found that the urban water sector is now more sophisticated in its approach to supply and demand management and that Australians continue to have access to high quality and safe drinking water supplies in the vast majority of communities.

Trade

In relation to water trading, the Commission has noted in its 2011 Biennial Assessment that communities in urban and regional areas (such as Adelaide, Bendigo and Ballarat) have used water markets to purchase entitlements to secure water during periods of droughts. The Commission has also made a series of recommendations in its *Urban Water in Australia: Future directions* report (web address given below) to promote institutional arrangements to facilitate urban-rural water trading, and increase the use of market-based mechanisms to help determine urban bulk water prices.

In March 2011, the Commission released the third annual Australian Water Markets Report 2009-10 (web address given below). This report identifies the size of the market and participation rates during the 2009-10 year.

The National Water Initiative - securing Australia's water future: 2011

<http://www.nwc.gov.au/water-reform/assessing-progress/biennial-assessments/the-national-water-initiative-securing-australias-water-future-2011-assessment>

Urban Water in Australia: Future directions

<http://www.nwc.gov.au/publications/browse-publications-on/urban-water-publications/future-directions>

Australian Water Markets Report 2009-10

<http://www.nwc.gov.au/water-markets/market-performance/water-markets-report-december-2010>

- No. This was the only request for information received by the Commission.
- No record was kept of the time taken to prepare the information.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 208

Topic: 2010-11 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? Have any charges been laid as a result of these referrals? If so, what are the details of these charges?

Answer:

Case 1 of 3

This matter relates to the attempted sale of material purported to be from an historic shipwreck and was referred to the Australian Federal Police due to allegations that the supporting documentation was a forgery that had used the Commonwealth crest. Correspondence from the Australian Federal Police indicates that the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions is reviewing the matter and as at 20 June 2012 there has been no further update.

Case 2 of 3

This matter relates to 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 will be referred to the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations 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 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 and legal advice is pending.