

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE – BUDGET ESTIMATES – 27 May 2013

CLIMATE CHANGE (Outcome 4, CCA and CER - IICCSRTE PORTFOLIO)

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
1	Outcome 4	International Climate Change Division	Birmingham	Climate Change Conference	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Thank you. Regarding Mr Combet's travel to the Towards a Global Carbon Market conference, did the department develop his official program or visits to Paris, Brussels and Berlin?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The department contributed to the minister's program. It also worked, of course, with DFAT and relevant posts in Europe to develop an appropriate program. But, yes, it made that contribution to his program.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> How many days was this trip?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I can tell you when the minister left the country and returned to the country. He left the country on Friday, 5 April and returned on Sunday, 14 April. So he would have arrived in Europe on the Saturday and left on Friday evening.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> In addition to the minister's official program, did the department assist in the preparation of Ms Phillips's official program?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The department would have worked with the relevant DFAT posts to contribute to a program for Ms Phillips.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Are you able to tell us what the official engagements that the department contributed to for Ms Phillips were please?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I can note a couple. I note from memory that Ms Phillips was invited by the German minister for climate change to attend the climate change conference that the minister was speaking at and a reception that evening. I cannot provide any more details about the rest of the program. That, as I said, was worked up in consultation with DFAT. I can consult with my colleagues in DFAT and take on notice other aspects of the program for you. But I can note those climate change dimensions.</p>	Page 7, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	
2	Outcome 4	Carbon Price & Marketing Price	Birmingham	Australian and European Union schemes	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Did you seek to be informed by the Europeans about prospective changes to their scheme to inform your advice and information that this department was providing to Treasury as part of this forecasting?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I probably have to be a little careful here. We are in the early stages of having discussions with Europe about both the current, if you like, one-way link and then the subsequent two-way link, which will be backed by a treaty. It would not be appropriate for me to go into those international discussions. To be frank, the interplay of the potential policy measures and</p>	Pages 11-12, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>what they might mean for prices is a discussion that is being had in the public domain and is as much informed by market watchers and market experts into how the different mechanisms that are also in the public, which Miss Wilkinson spoke about, would impact price. With Treasury forecasting and then developing their projection methodology, really it is about the known proposals to changes in the European schemes and what impact they likely to have on price. I do not think that there is much more to it than that.</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> The European debate about these structural measures has been a very open debate. It was back in November of last year that they released this discussion paper, which really elaborated on each of the options which could be considered if they wanted to withdraw some of their allowances from the market. I think Dr Kennedy is absolutely right: we would rely as much on other analysts in Europe and the information that they are pulling together about likely outcomes as we would from direct discussions with the commission.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> So at no point do you sit down with the European policymakers and say, 'Hey, look, your policy decisions here are going to impact on pricing in Australia, which has a direct impact on our budget in Australia. Can you give us a heads-up beyond what is in the public domain of where your thinking is at, what the likelihood of things are and so forth'?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> As I said, we do have good discussions with the European Commission around developments in their scheme, as they do with us around developments in our scheme. We seek to understand how changes might affect the price. But, to refer back to Ms Wilkinson's earlier answer, the commission, as far as I am aware, does not publish its own forecasts of price. It simply works to ensure its mechanism continues to be appropriately implemented, and through these reforms is looking at the possibility of increasing ambition in the light of the fall in emissions. We do not, if you like, have competing price forecasts which we confront. In fact, they explicitly do not go down that route. That is something that is left to the markets.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> So they do not budget their forward revenue at all?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> It is a somewhat more complicated arrangement in Europe because they will in the future and maybe now—but I will ask my colleagues to clarify that in a moment—distribute revenue from carbon price auctions back to member states. So certainly member states would have an interest in what the likely carbon price might be in the future for what it means for their revenue implications. But it would be no different from the arrangements that we have here. They would know the allocation based back to them on units, and in terms of the prices they would be looking in the very short instance in markets and</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>using their own budget-based estimates for the longer term estimates.</p> <p><b>Mr White:</b> In phase 3 of the European emissions trading scheme there is a progressive move to auctioning a far greater proportion of emissions units than has been the case in the past—that is, through the first two phases where the majority of those units were grandfathered under national allocation plans. There is public information that there has been a series of auctions in the European emissions trading scheme this year. Most of the parties are on a common auction platform and three parties are operating an independent auction platform. The revenue from the emissions trading scheme goes back to the member states. There are certain conditions on how the revenue can be used. I think more than 50 per cent of it needs to be used on climate change measures, but presumably the member state treasuries would make some assessment of what that revenue amount might be and where it will be allocated.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> So the European Union itself may not be forecasting what the overall revenue from its scheme is. But the Germans, the Spanish or others would presumably, in their budgetary context, see that they have an allocation of x number of permits in 2015–16 and would make their own estimates as to what the price is likely to be there?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I presume so, but I should say at this point that it is not something I have discussed with the member states. So there is a bit of presumption going on here about how it would be built into their budget estimates. We could seek further information in this area if you are interested in how the member states are preparing their estimates in the light of carbon price forecasts and those future options. Beyond these sorts of framing comments I have made, I cannot offer you any more detail on that. But certainly we could seek it for you, if you are interested.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Perhaps if you are able to for the big countries—Germany, Spain, France and Italy—and how they account for it, and also to check as to whether any of that has been taken into consideration in our own assessments of forward prices. It would seem surprising, if European member states are making assessments of forward prices for their budgetary purposes, that we would not at least be considering those, given the impact they have on our forward estimates of prices. If you can take that on notice, that would be great.....</p>			
3	Outcome 4	Carbon Price & Marketing Price	Birmingham	European Price Loading	<b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> .....Coming back to the policy changes that would need to be made to sustain a higher European price, given the deferral or failure of the European Parliament to successfully implement those changes to	Pages 12-13, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>date, what chance does the department think that there is of those measures being approved, firstly. Secondly will there be any back loading of those measure.?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> The first thing to note is that when you look at the analysts projections of carbon prices out to 2020 in the European scheme, even without back-loading and without any cancellation of units, it is still the case that the European carbon price is projected to pick back up again. For example, Bloomberg's forecast for carbon prices in Europe at 2019-20, without back loading and without cancellation, are still sitting at A\$45. That is because there is an expectation that in the normal course of events, as European economies improve and there is therefore an economic recovery and a recovery in emissions growth, you would expect there to be increasing demand for allowances. That is also wrapped up in the fact that by the time you get towards the end of the decade there will be much more clarity about what the post-2020 arrangements will be. In order for Europe to be on track to meet their 2050 targets, it is going to require further significant reductions in emissions. While the debate over the structural measures is a really important debate, I think it is worthwhile keeping in mind that the sorts of carbon prices that analysts have in mind at 2020, even without these structural measures, are significantly above the current spot prices in the European emissions trading scheme.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> That is all driven based on presumptions and hopes of economic recovery. If Europe is currently 17 per cent below 1990 emissions levels and their commitment to 2020 is to be 20 per cent below, if they do not have a big economic recovery then they will meet that in a canter and the price will stay low.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> It will not just depend on 2020. It will also depend on what future targets are for Europe beyond 2020, because these schemes allow units to be banked, if you like, to meet future liabilities. So the market is forming an expectation of not only that target of 2020 but the trajectory beyond. Secondly, on the analysts' expectations, they are the analysts' expectations for the markets. This is not to quibble with your earlier language, but it is not on a hope of recovery and that things turn out okay. It is based on their best expectations of what is likely to unfold, so they can advise their clients appropriately of how they should be preparing for future carbon prices. So I would call it at the very least a sober assessment of what future carbon prices might be.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Okay. Can I go back to my previous question and single out issues of back-loading. How live is the option of back-loading of measures in terms of the debate occurring in Europe, and what is the impact</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>should that back-loading not occur?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> The proposal to backload 900 million allowances remains the proposal which is on the table. It has gone back, as I said, to the environment committee, and they need to come back to the European Parliament again to vote on that or to take further instructions before the European Council would decide what action it wanted to take. But the European Council has expressed support for backloading and the environment committee of the parliament continues to express support for backloading, so that is a matter which remains a live option.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> But when it was put to the European Parliament it was sent back to the environment committee.</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> So at that time there clearly was not support to pass it.</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> It was not supported in the European Parliament but it was still, at that point, supported in the council. Any legislative changes have to get the support of both the parliament and the council. The European Parliament could have actually rejected the backloading proposal entirely when it was brought forward on 16 April, and they did not do that. They sent it back to the committee and they asked the committee to continue to consider ways in which this proposal could be modified, but it could still give effect to backloading.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Do Australia's price estimates make any assessments or judgments on whether this backloading is or is not likely to occur?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> As I said earlier, carbon price forecasts are a matter for Treasury and should be rightly addressed to them. As I said, they rely on the market for the first two years for market forecasts and thereafter use a projection methodology. Beyond that, really, further questions about the specifics of the carbon price forecasts should rightly go to Treasury; they prepare them.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Is there any assessment of what would happen were the backloading not to occur?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Treasury prepares those price forecasts with the full knowledge of the range of outcomes. Ms Wilkinson has outlined analysts' expectations with and without backloading. I do not think there is much more that we could add to that.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Sorry, I missed the last part of what you said.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Ms Wilkinson, for example, gave you Bloomberg's estimates with backloading and without backloading. All of that information is publicly</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>available. It all would have formed part of the considerations in preparing any forecasts.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> In terms of this department's understanding of how Treasury has done the assessments, to 2020 it is still the \$38 per tonne figure that is and was based entirely on the previous modelling—clean energy or whatever it is called.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Its approach is outlined in the budget papers, yes, and I believe that it refers to the \$38 in 2020.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Working backwards, what is the earliest year for which estimates have been set, in terms of pricing as against revenue?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I will just go to what is in the budget papers and again ask that further questions go to Treasury. Treasury have set a projection methodology after the first two years, so that is from the third year of the forward estimates onwards. They have used a methodology that moves from the prices in the forward market, as I understand it, to the price that you just outlined—the \$38 in 2020.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> So they are using the 2013-14 forward market as a base to then get to a price of \$12.10 in 2015-16, and they get to that purely by drawing a straight line from five bucks in the forward market to the \$38 that had been assessed a couple of years ago.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Their projection methodology is, as I understand it, a straight line methodology. To be frank, when one is making projection assumptions, one will use trends, some sort of average or some sort of anchor point. But, again, that is a question that you should really ask Treasury. They developed that methodology and I would not like to be answering questions on the pros and cons of it; it should go to them.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Sure. I will desist on that. In terms of the revenue impact of the decision, though, what is the revenue write-down for carbon pricing revenue that has been experienced?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Again, I fear that I am about to disappoint you. The revenue estimates are, again, Treasury's responsibilities. We can certainly tell you what they are as published in the budget, but questions around the details of the revenue estimates should rightly go to Treasury. Ms Wilkinson, do you want to note the numbers published in the budget?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> Yes. I can note the numbers that were published at the time of the budget, which is that the revised permit price reduces carbon price revenue relative to those numbers published at MYEFO by around \$6 billion over the four years to 2015-16. I would also note that, given that a large part of the</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>expenditure funded by the carbon price revenue is provided in three permits, the cost to the budget of industry assistance programs fell commensurately. Those together fell by about \$3.9 billion as a result of the change in the carbon price assumptions.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Are you able to give me the year-by-year reduction in revenue?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Is it published in the budget?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> Those are published in the budget. If we can come back to that, we can give them to you.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We will find the relevant table for you.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Thanks,</p>			
4	Outcome 4	International Climate Change Division	Cameron	Speech by the Hon. Greg Hunt MP	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> I am looking at a speech by the Hon. Greg Hunt MP on 18 April 2013. Are you aware of that speech?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We are aware of the speech.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> In this speech, Mr Hunt describes the carbon price as a 'complex, punitive, money churn'. He says they will use the classic market mechanism of a reverse auction. Is there any evidence, first of all, that a reverse auction is a classic market mechanism when it comes to government subsidising or paying for a carbon price reduction?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> When economists typically talk about these issues and about broad based carbon prices, they talk about a price applying broadly across the economy or, in the manner that Ms Wilkinson described earlier, around emissions trading schemes. I will be careful about going any further than that. I do not want to be seen to be interpreting in one direction or another the comments Mr Hunt has made publicly. For example, to go back to my earlier comment about the Productivity Commission's report, typically economists conceive of a broad based market mechanism in the form of either a tax or a cap-and-trade system applied broadly across the economy, which is consistent with the government's current arrangements.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Mr Hunt quotes the Productivity Commission in his speech. He says: ... my view is that the Productivity Commission will still be right about there being no comparable system and impost to that in Australia. I think that is being a bit cavalier with the Productivity Commission report. What did the Productivity Commission report say on that issue?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I apologise; we do not have that in front of us.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Would you take that on notice so you can put it in the context of what the Productivity Commission said.</p>	Pages 23-25, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We would be very happy to. We will get that for you.			
5	CER	Clean Energy Regulator	Birmingham	Inspection programs with the RET	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> What are the steps that are then taken specifically in regard to those who were in charge of the installation?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> I will get my notes on the steps because it is quite a process. When we shut them down we notify the homeowner straight away. We also notify the local state electricity regulator. We inform the Clean Energy Council. They have a point score system whereby if an installer gets more than a certain number, they lose points. At some point they lose their accreditation. It is not like 'first strike and you're out'. You have to lose a number of a certain type. We also talk to the agents and so on. The homeowner has to then rectify it. We go through quite a process.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Aside from the installer losing some points with the Clean Energy Council through their accreditation process, what responsibility does the installer have to rectify the issue themselves?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> That would depend on the nature of the warranty. I can say anecdotally that our feedback is that when installers are notified they are very prompt in getting back to fix these things. That is part of their electrical licence. If they do not, they might lose their livelihood. The response of the installers has been good. Again, we do not keep statistics on that. This is only anecdotal evidence from the householders who talk to us at our call centre and so on. On the shutdown, the homeowner can then contact the person who installed it. The installers then typically fix them as part of their ongoing warranty, just as any installer will do with anything in your house, whether it is a PV, a fridge or anything that a tradesman does.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> If it is part of the 19 per cent that are substandard—so, of the 7,000, that has to be around 1,300 homes—what happens then?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> The same thing applies.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> They are not shut down?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> They are not shut down. The same thing applies. There is a period whereby the installer has to go back and remedy the fault. They generally do. I am not saying they all do, because there are some 1.8 million households with these things on them, but largely they are fixed. If the installer will not do it, the homeowner then will have to find an alternative installer to repair the damage.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Is there a follow-up to those 19 per cent of substandard installations to check whether they have been brought up to standard? Obviously the four per cent that are unsafe, presumably, need to be inspected to be switched back on.</p>	Pages 29-31, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	



Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> That is right.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> What about the 19 per cent?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> We do not do a follow-up on the 19 per cent. That would fall with the state and territory regulators. We inform them of the ones that are substandard. These are usually little safety issues. That is handled by the state and territory regulators so it would be a question for them. Our role is to inspect, because we are not a safety regulator; we are a market regulator.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> You tell them that it is substandard and they either do something about it or they do not?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> In terms of those who have done the installations and, in most instances, in terms of the way the system works, of course, they have gone on to take the certificates off the hands of the householder and have been able to on-sell them themselves. Is there any financial penalty that they face, especially if they say to the householder, 'It's not covered in the warranty so you fix it up yourself'?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> It depends on the case. Typically, where they have been created by an agent we will say to the agent, 'These certificates have been created improperly, because clearly the installation did not meet all the guidelines.' If the system is not rectified by the installer we then require the agent who has created the certificate to surrender those certificates. There would be a financial penalty. Typically, it might be 100 certificates on a system, so \$35. That would be a \$3,500 loss to the agent. There is a strong incentive for these things to be fixed. Earlier on with the DC isolators, some of the agents were the driving force behind getting these households brought up to standard where the installers were not around anymore. There are financial costs to people who create certificates if they are not fixed.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> In terms of the targeting of inspections, you have undertaken 7,000 inspections and you found four per cent to be unsafe but, as you have rightly highlighted, there are 1.8 million households with solar systems installed. If the four per cent were to hold true across those households, that is 72,000 households --</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> The 1.8 is solar PV plus solar hot water. There are over a million solar PVs, not 1.8. You have got the two together.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> One million solar PVs, so that would be about 40,000 houses, should the four per cent hold true. How does the workmanship and who undertook the workmanship in relation to the four per cent impact on your targeting of future inspections?</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> The inspection program itself remains a random program. That is one thing we do. In addition to that we can choose outside that program to target audit inspections independently. If we see any trends in the random data, we can then choose a particular store, a particular agent or a particular brand. We have chosen to do additional inspections over and above that which are not published in that random set, because then the set would not be random. These are clearly targeted.</p> <p>I should point out that, just because we say it is unsafe, it is unsafe by our criteria. For example, in the ACT every solar PV is inspected by ACT Electricity and Water before they turn them on and they are safe in their eyes. We then come along later and say, 'We think the standard is not quite up to scratch; this is unsafe by our criteria.' We have got a quite tight bar on the actual safety of these things.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Of the targeted inspections, how many of those have been undertaken?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> I do not have that number on me right now. These are very small numbers. We are talking 50 or so.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Fifty or so of the targeted inspections?</p> <p><b>Mr Livingston:</b> I do not have that. I will find out.</p>			
6	CER	Clean Energy Regulator	Birmingham	Liabile entities	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Let us turn to those who have to be the auction participants. How many liable entities have now been registered?</p> <p><b>Mr Carter:</b> As of Friday, we had 378 liable entities on the Liable Entities Public Information Database.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Are there any entities that the regulator believes to be liable entities that have not completed their registration?</p> <p><b>Mr Carter:</b> A small handful of entities are still sorting out the point of liability within their commercial arrangements. That means between, for example, the subsidiary that has operational control of a facility versus a controlling corporation. So we have a couple that are still working that through. We are hoping to have those resolved in the next few days.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> But there are none where you are not aware of what the issues are and why there is a delay in that regard.</p> <p><b>Mr Carter:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Do you have a breakdown now of how many of those entities are public entities, private companies et cetera?</p> <p><b>Mr Carter:</b> I do not have it broken down to that extent. We have 41 local councils that are liable entities. But, in terms of whether there are public utilities or other categories, we have not broken that number down. We can</p>	Pages 35-36, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					certainly take that on notice. <b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Okay.			
7	Outcome 4	AusIndustry	Birmingham	Bowls Australia Grant	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> In relation to these grants, let us take the largest first, being to Bowls Australia for \$225,000. What are Bowls Australia specifically doing to explain the carbon price to the bowling public?</p> <p><b>Ms Launder:</b> The intention of this partnership is to work in collaboration with an organisation that has, I guess, a broad footprint across Australian society. There are a number of bowlers right across the country. So it is about being able to work with an organisation like that that is able to spread the message, to educate about things that flow from the initiatives that have been implemented by the previous department. Colleagues from the former climate change department have been working specifically with them and educating ambassadors that are identified within Bowls Australia to spread that message. Part of the initiative is to have particular days actually launched with the national competition earlier this year and particular days where you also have young people who are coming in and participating in a bowls event or competition. So you have a cross-generational mix talking to each other about the impacts of climate change. There is also capacity in that you have a lot of buildings, obviously, right across the country that might benefit from taking on some efficiency measures in the way that they actually run their clubs or fit out their clubs. So I guess it is a multifaceted approach.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> So in terms of specific deliverables that Bowls Australia is expected to undertake as a result of getting this grant, they are appointing some ambassadors. There will be some public awareness type days. Are they expected to distribute information to all of their member clubs or all of the individual members? In a specific sense, are there any deliverables for them beyond educating and appointing some ambassadors to talk about climate change to the lawn bowls community?</p> <p><b>Ms Butler:</b> The program does have a range of interconnected activities. It does include national information seminars. We will also include some online engagement and some media activity. So that is the nature of that particular engagement strategy.</p> <p><b>Ms Launder:</b> So I understand that there would be some brochures that would be distributed or would be available at some of those seminars.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> What media activity is envisaged?</p> <p><b>Ms Launder:</b> I might end up clarifying this by taking this on notice. My understanding is that they would be engaging with local media, perhaps to tell them that there is going to be a particular event being held at a bowling club on</p>	Page 41, 27 May 2013	16/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					that particular day. It certainly mostly would be individual clubs engaging with their local media			
8	Outcome 4	AusIndustry	Birmingham	Carbon Tax	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> On what basis was the department aware that there was a lack of understanding within the bowls community of how the carbon tax would operate?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> That was on the basis of qualitative and other market research which would identify certain demographic groups. Clearly, for Bowls Australia, many of the people involved are of a certain demographic group where the research had shown that there was a lack of understanding of the policy.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Was the Sustainable Living Foundation also a direct approach?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> On my own recollection, I am not sure. I would need to go and check that, Senator. But we can do that and get back to you. I believe it was, but I just want to check that because I want to make sure I am giving you the right information.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Or NITV or the Davidson Institute?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> Again, I think it is best if I check that and get back to you. We can try to get that during the afternoon.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> That would be great if you could, please. Noting that \$795,000 of the \$2 million has been allocated and/or expended thus far, are there any entities that were approached by the department to be participants in this public information campaign who declined to do so?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> I would simply note that in some cases potential applicants approached the department with an idea or concept and were provided with a criteria to respond to. In other cases, the department approached the organisations directly, again, where there was an alignment with our knowledge of those organisations, audiences or capabilities and those audiences that our research had revealed had a particular lack of awareness of the clean energy future package. So it was a combination.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> I missed the start of your answer, Ms Jensen. There were other organisations approached?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> In some cases, potential applicants did approach the department with an idea or concept.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> In some cases, potential applicants did approach the department. Did the department approach any potential applicants who said, "Thanks, but no thanks"?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> Yes. There were some organisations who did approach us with an</p>	Page 42, 27 May 2013	16/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>idea or concept. In other cases, we approached the organisation, such as in the case of Bowls Australia, where we knew that they had capabilities that would help to target particular audiences. So it was a combination.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> And how many organisations did the department approach?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> I think there would have been at least one we approached which we did not go forward with. Again, I just need to check if that is your particular question. You want to know how many were approached who did not in the end go forward?</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Correct, yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> We can find that out for you, yes</p>			
9	Outcome 4	AusIndustry	Birmingham	Research Carbon Pricing policies	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> I want to go to the research that helped the department decide to target the likes of Bowls Australia for funding because it provides a linkage to a demographic who apparently need more information from the government. How much has the department spent in total on such market research?</p> <p><b>Ms Butler:</b> I think we will have to get that information for you, Senator, and come back, because AusIndustry can really only speak to the parts that were transferred to it, which was the public information campaign. So we will once again endeavour to do that during this sitting period and come back to you.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> If you could, that would be great. I note that Ms Kelly and Ms Jensen are frantically flicking through papers.</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> It depends on the time period, really, which is why it would be good to come back to you. Obviously, the department over time has done different sets of research that inform its general approach to its communication. Is there a particular time period that you had in mind, Senator, that you would like that to relate to? The most recent?</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> I would quite like totals and, in that sense, really the previous three years is probably valid. But, if you have information to hand over a shorter period of time, that will at least help us to get on our way.</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> In the most recent period, the department has undertaken qualitative market research. The total contract value for that research, which is JWS Research, is \$196,700. We would need to take on notice to get you the full three-year period total, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> What is the \$200,000 that is sitting in JWS Research?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> That is the total contract. We just need to double-check that that was all expensed. I am pretty sure it was close to.</p>	Pages 43 and 53, 27 May 2013	16/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Do Hall &amp; Partners continue to do market research work for you as well?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> No. They do not. Not in the most recent period.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> If you could come back with totals, that would be great.....</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> I am a man always of hope. Very quickly, Ms Jensen, I turn to the market research that you were referring earlier. You were going to go and look for how much had been expended. Are you also able to table for the committee a copy of the latest JWS Research report please?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> I believe that I would need to look into whether there are any market intellectual property issues relating to that. I will look into it and take it on notice, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> If you could, Ms Jensen. Given you referred to it earlier, it would be wonderful to have that information for committee members to be able to ask questions.</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> We will get that earlier information relating to the expenditure. If we can today, we will certainly endeavour to do that, Senator.</p>			
10	Outcome 4	Adaptation and Science	Milne	Adaptation to Climate Change	<p><b>Senator MILNE:</b> How many people in the federal bureaucracy now work on adaptation to climate change?</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> Well, I can say in our department there are around 28 full-time-equivalent people in the department. Obviously, in terms of the whole of the Commonwealth, we do not have information on the other portfolios.</p> <p><b>Senator MILNE:</b> I would be interested to see if you can get me an estimate of the number of people who are working full time equivalent on adaptation to climate change since it is one of the major areas of focus in the century, I would have thought, not just until June. Thank you, Chair.</p> <p><b>Ms Jensen:</b> We will take that on notice.</p>	Page 45, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	
11	Outcome 4	Adaptation and Science	Cameron	Professor Flannery	<p>.....</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Can you take on notice, then, what Professor Flannery has been paid in the last financial year, what work he has actually done, how many of his predictions have turned out to be accurate, and how many have been outrageously over the top? These are the sort of questions I would have asked him if he had abided by what I understood was the committee's very firm instruction that he was to be here. But, in his absence, could those questions be taken on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Kelly:</b> We will take them on notice, Senator.</p> <p>.....</p>	Page 53, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	
12	CCA	Climate	Heffernan	Coal-Fired	<p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> Dr Russell, you surely would know. I asked about</p>	Pages 56-57,	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
		Change Authority		Emissions	<p>this earlier. It would be interesting to know what proportion is from coal-fired power stations. We hear about it all the time. It would be one of the major emitters globally, would it?</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> It is certainly a major source of emissions. Energy is the sector accountable for the largest single share of human induced greenhouse gas emissions. Most of the emissions from energy are from the consumption of fossil fuels. That would include both coal as well as gas and oil.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> I was going to be specific about coal. With the algae technology, I understand there are MOUs in Australia—I have followed this for some years—to commercialise. There are two or three techniques to commercialise algae technology. Do we know what proportion of emissions under most models comes from coal-fired stacks? Would it be 85 per cent roughly?</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> Senator, I do not have that information at hand, but I could—</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> Is there anyone in the room? I understand that up to 85 per cent, depending on the technology, of the gross emissions can be filtered out and then, depending on what you want to grow with the algae, fed to an algae farm. I asked this question three or four years ago and got some answers. The technology is advancing, as we know. If that commercialises, would that not completely alter the global emissions debate?</p> <p><b>Ms Penrose:</b> Senator, the caps and targets review that the authority is currently conducting will look at potential emissions reduction technologies and solutions for the future. At this stage, I do not believe we have undertaken specific research on algae technology.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> But is there not someone in the department watching that would know the proportion of coal-fired emissions?</p> <p><b>Ms Penrose:</b> Senator, I can take that on notice, but I am unable to answer further at this time, sorry.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> Could we try to get the answers so I can come back to it?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The proportion of global emissions related to coal?</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> The emissions that are coal-fired sourced. Most of that would be power generation.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We will do our best for you, Senator, and try to come back with an answer.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> I would like to model the difference in those forecasts for, as Senator Milne is pointing out, what is going to happen in our obligations to look after dear old Mother Earth. We can absolutely turn what is now a</p>	27 May 2013		

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>garbage disposal issue into an asset.</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> Senator, I would like to clarify. Are you referring to algae technologies where the algae is used as a biofuel to generate power?</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> There are two ways. You can use the algae without sun with that high-rise technology to do plastics or you can do it for fuel generation, which in itself, I suppose, is a second emitter. But the by-product, of course, is a food source for intensive animal farming. It is a double reward for what is at the moment a problem. It is a garbage disposal issue. I thought you would probably have your heads around that. If we can commercialise that, it is going to completely alter the debate, as far as I am concerned.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Certainly, Senator, we will come back with a break-up of global emissions so you can get a sense of coal-fired power. I do not pretend to be an expert on the algae technologies, but we will also look for officials who might be able to talk to you about those issues as well.</p> <p><b>Senator HEFFERNAN:</b> Thanks.</p>			
13	CCA	Climate Change Authority	Birmingham	Kyoto Protocol	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Has the board of the Climate Change Authority considered at all the impact of Australia signing on to the second commitment period and what impact that has had on accounting rules and the like?</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> We have not done any specific analysis of Australia's signing on to the Kyoto protocol yet, although it is certainly an important consideration for us, as I said earlier. Our advice will hopefully inform the government's decision about what final target to lock down under the second commitment period in the Kyoto protocol. That review is coming up. The main thing for us is to come back to the core inquiry of this review, which is to determine what Australia's appropriate level of emissions reduction ambition should be. Things like the Kyoto protocol accounting rules are a consideration in that, including because they define the emissions and emission reductions that count towards our international commitments. So it is certainly something that the authority will have regard to in this review. Something that we have invited comments on with regard to this accounting issue is whether the authority ought to limit its recommendations to the kinds of emissions and emission reduction activities that are currently covered by Australia's international commitments or whether it ought to be looking more broadly at a wider set of emissions and emission reduction activities and making comments or recommendations relating to them as well.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> We heard earlier today and were discussing how essentially a redefinition of activities has shifted certain emissions from the uncovered emissions into the covered emissions framework. As a result, we</p>	Pages 60-61, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	



Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>now have a higher cap in place than had previously been expected to be the case. Will any aspect of this review in the setting of the cap look at appropriate coverage issues in terms of industries, emitting sectors that should be in or should be out and how they should be treated, or will it simply be looking at what the reductions are and where the cap should be set?</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> This review is focussed very squarely on the ambition for emission reductions and so what Australia's goals should be. We are doing our analysis on the basis of current policy settings. In pulling together its recommendations, particularly for how to translate the targets and trajectories and budgets into caps for the carbon pricing mechanism, we will be taking account of coverage as it currently stands, if you are referring to coverage of the carbon pricing mechanism. I take it you are?</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> We will be taking a very detailed look at Australia's emissions outlook under the current policy settings and assessing the likely level of emissions from covered and uncovered sectors. On the basis of that analysis and all the relevant considerations, we will be translating that national ambition reflected in the budget and target through to caps for the emissions trading scheme. In that analysis we will be taking account of the new arrangements and what Australia plans to count towards its Kyoto protocol commitments.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> In assessing covered sectors, will you purely be assessing those sectors that are covered by current legislation, or will there will be an assessment of the policy statements of the government which project to include the on-road heavy vehicles beyond July next year?</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> As we flag in our issues paper, that is certainly an issue we need to have regard to. There are some policy commitments which are not yet reflected in legislation. One of the things we have flagged in our issues paper is that we will need to think about how we recommend caps given that situation. It might be resolved in the course of our review or it might not. At this stage, we have made no final decisions on how we will be recommending caps, but I think it is fair to say that our analysis will very clearly set out the basis of our reasoning for the cap recommendations. Where there are important factors and where there is a clear policy intent that is perhaps not yet reflected in legislation, it will be clear where those numbers land. If the legislation changes, it would be easy enough to be able to adjust off the back of that. But, as I say, we have not come to a landing on any of these issues yet. They are still very squarely in the process of consideration.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Page 11 of the discussion paper has a nice little</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>table which indicates that transport emissions account for about 15 per cent or thereabouts. Are you able to break that down further in terms of what contribution heavy on-road vehicles make?</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> I do not have those numbers to hand.</p> <p><b>Ms Penrose:</b> We can get back to you with those.</p> <p><b>Ms Rowley:</b> We could certainly take that on notice and get back to you.</p>			
14	Outcome 4	International Climate Change	Rhiannon	Kalimantan Forests and Climate Partnership	<p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> I have some questions about the Kalimantan Forests and Climate Partnership, which is in the budget for this financial year. I could not find it in the budget papers—how much has been allocated for the KFCP?</p> <p><b>Dr Lee:</b> I have a figure on how much has been allocated. The Australian government has committed \$47 million to the KFCP as part of the \$100 million broader IAFCP, the Indonesia-Australia Forest Carbon Partnership. Again, I should say that the administration of that program is also managed by AusAID and questions related to that should be directed to AusAID.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Would you explain what your involvement is with these projects. What level of engagement do you have?</p> <p><b>Dr Lee:</b> We are more involved in the policy settings in the negotiation of REDD+ programs more generally in the UNFCCC negotiations—the broader policy around what international principles should govern REDD+ programs or programs in the forestry sector. But the actual implementation of these programs, which may be guided by a broader REDD+ principles, is done by AusAID.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Considering that you have identified that you are looking at it in terms of the policy settings, and there has been some controversy with these projects, do you look at the challenging situation that these projects have found themselves in to help inform what the policy settings should be?</p> <p><b>Dr Lee:</b> In the discussions on REDD+ more broadly in the UNFCCC negotiations, it would have its own specific agenda to be looking at what issues are appropriate for those international discussions around the REDD+ agenda. I am not aware that specific lessons coming from the IAFCP or the KFCP are part of those broader agenda discussions on REDD+ in the UNFCCC.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> I would like to explore that further. The KFCP was originally aimed to protect 70,000 hectares of peat forests, re-flood 200,000 hectares of dried peat land and plant 100 million trees in central Kalimantan, but the reports coming out suggest that this goal was not achieved; in fact, much less was achieved. If your work is around policy settings and the policy settings in place are not being achieved, at what point do you make a</p>	Pages 74-75, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>reassessment? I have given that as an example: it seems as though we are running into problems; do you look at practical things to reassess your policy settings?</p> <p><b>Dr Lee:</b> I should say that I think there is an appreciation broadly that programs in the forestry sector are complex and that there are a range of complex examples that would be considered in the REDD+ negotiations internationally. In the negotiations internationally at the moment, a large part of the discussion between countries which have forestry and countries which have large forest areas with emissions is around MRV—monitoring, reporting and verification—and the types of methodologies that might be used in that area. There is certainly a lot of experience between those countries that have forestry sectors that needs to be taken into account. The critical issue, as I understand it at the moment, is getting within the UNFCCC negotiations about common understanding around what are some of the principles that will guide REDD+ projects and getting those common understandings between developing countries with large forestry sectors and other countries.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Have you received any complaints and, if so, how do you respond to complaints about projects—again in terms of your interactions with REDD?</p> <p><b>Dr Lee:</b> We have not received any complaints about REDD more generally, but if you are referring to KFCP then that would be directed to AusAID.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> If AusAID is doing the work, what is your interaction with AusAID? Policy is about driving better outcomes. If you are not getting good outcomes, does a point come where you make a reassessment? I have heard your answer that AusAID does this work but if the project runs into problems is there any point of interacting, of coming back? Can you give us an example where you have reassessed and changed the policy in light of what has been learnt in the field?</p> <p><b>Dr Lee:</b> It would perhaps be most useful if I could explain in more detail what the UNFCCC agenda is on REDD+ and some of the issues they have dealt with. A large number of issues have been achieved there, and the types of things which countries are having to address under REDD+ more generally include: discussing the technical details of MRV and safeguard systems for an international REDD+ mechanism—REDD+ developing countries are those with forest areas; developing national plans on how to implement REDD+; learning lessons from early REDD+ initiatives so there would be scope for learning from lessons that have occurred previously and projects that have occurred previously; and paying for the results of REDD+. This is looking at</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>mechanisms where you can potentially reward performance, which is a step towards trying to develop a REDD+ market mechanism. Those are some of the issues that are being dealt with in the REDD+ negotiations, and they would be drawing on lessons from the field as well from those countries that have forestry sectors that would be applicable.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Your first point was about safeguards. As we have learnt, these projects, KFCP being one of them, ran into problems. Have you then assessed that the safeguards that were in place were not working, and were new safeguards adopted in light of the problems?</p> <p><b>Dr Lee:</b> KFCP is a matter for AusAID. I am not aware of any assessment that AusAID may have done and how it might intend to report that if it had done any assessment up to the broader REDD+ discussions.</p> <p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Your third point was learning lessons from REDD+ plans. Could you give some examples of what lessons have been learnt?</p> <p><b>Dr Lee:</b> I cannot give specific examples from the negotiations themselves. I would have to take that on notice and speak to some of our negotiators who would be particularly involved in any specific examples that might have come forward. Speaking more generally and not in relation to any particular projects, I think one of the issues that occasionally comes up, given the importance of the MRV sector, which we have been highlighting in the negotiations, has been around the difficulty of MRV—monitoring, reporting and verification—in rural areas and in forest areas. Clearly, with REDD+ as well, in forestry projects there are all those issues with local communities. Also, from being aware of the broader discussions, there have been some issues around the cost of particular projects as well. So those would be some of the lessons but, again, that is speaking broadly and not in relation to any particular project.</p>			
15	Outcome 4	International Climate Change	Rhiannon	ODA	<b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> Could you take on notice to provide the committee with an itemised breakdown of what is ODA-eligible climate financing, and any climate-financing programs which are outside of ODA spending. Thank you.	Page 75, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	
16	Outcome 4	International Climate Change	MacDonald	International Emissions Reductions	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> I suppose this raises the argument that really we should do nothing here, because it is meaningless in the global emissions reduction scheme of things, because China is so big and so emissions-intensive at the moment. What is the argument on that? What should we be doing?</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Is that your argument?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> No, that is an argument from governments all over the world. It is an argument that we hear a lot from the climate change deniers here.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Okay; carry on, have fun.</p>	Page 81, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> That is a conversation that has been had with this committee in the past, and it has been noted that there are a number of countries that have a similar level of emissions to Australia, such as the UK. Again, clearly, if countries like the UK and ourselves chose not to be part of that broad global solution, then quickly a global solution becomes very difficult to develop. So, in solving this global coordination problem, it is clearly the case that all countries need to be involved. And, as Mr Cowan was identifying earlier, that is the direction in which the international climate change agreement process is moving. Of course, countries like China and the US, and possibly India in the future, do tend to dominate, if you like, when one writes down the table of emissions. But, as I said, that does not take away from the fact that solving global coordination problems requires all countries to make their fair contribution to such a solution.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> So, a global solution for a global problem.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Mr Cowan:</b> Senator, I have those numbers now. China's CO2 emissions per unit of GDP decreased 5.02 per cent in 2012. The target it had set itself within its five-year plan was 3½ per cent, so it overachieved against that target, and its emissions in 2010 were in the order of 11.2 gigatonnes.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> So you are saying that in 2012 their emissions reduced by five per cent of 11.2 gigatonnes.</p> <p><b>Mr Cowan:</b> Also, their pledge is in terms of emissions intensity per unit of GDP. So, they have not at this point set themselves an absolute tonnage reduction. What they have said is that they will have GDP that is much less carbon intensive. So, their 2020 pledge, if you like—</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> So you do not have a figure.</p> <p><b>Mr Cowan:</b> I do not have a tonnage figure for you, no, but just in terms of the decrease in carbon intensity, in 2012—that one year—it was five per cent.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> One day, when we have more time, you can explain to me what 'carbon intensity' means as opposed to raw tonnes of emission, but I do not think tonight is the night.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Maybe you could take it on notice and provide the committee with a little briefing paper on exactly what is happening in China: what China's achievements are in terms of emissions reduction. I think there is a lot of information and lack of information that drives the debate in this place and more widely. So let's see what China is doing. Is that possible as a question on notice?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Absolutely.</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> To make it a bipartisan question, perhaps I could just ask, rather than indications that a sub-regional or sub-jurisdictional trading scheme is being trialled, that any answer include some details of the price, scope and nature of any such schemes.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We would be happy to do that, and maybe elaborate on some of the remarks Mr White was making earlier. We can detail the developments, if you like, of the current schemes, the questions Senator Macdonald was asking about overall tonnes and emissions intensity targets.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> I was just after raw figures. If someone can give me them, well and good. If not, I think we are over time on this.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> We are going okay. Nobody is too worried about going over time on such an important issue.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> If you want it, that is fine. I just wanted the raw figures.</p>			
17	Outcome 4	International Climate Change/ Carbon Pricing and Markets	Cameron	Australia's emissions	<p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> I am now able to provide the figure for Australia's current emissions. Our last quarterly update showed that the emissions for the year to December 2012 were 551.9 million tonnes.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> And that was a decline?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> Yes, that was in fact a 0.2 per cent reduction on the previous year.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Maybe in your answers to the questions on notice you could also give us a little bit of an update on those two groups, the Asian group and the other broader group that is meeting—on what outcomes have been achieved out of those two meetings. That would be helpful as well. I think the more we know about this the less there will be misinformation. So, thanks very much. I think we are finished with you for the night. We will now move to outcome 4.4, program support.</p>	Page 81-82, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	
18	CER	Clean Energy Regulator	MacDonald	NGER System	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> I took a trailer load of tree clippings down to the dump, but nobody weighed me; nobody measured the trailer. So how do councils do it? Do they just look at it and say, 'That is about a tonne of green waste'?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> That is right. They generally have reporting for a range of reasons, including to the state government, about the waste that is going into their landfills. They are generally well placed to estimate the types of waste that go into the landfill. The NGERS approach that Mr Sturgiss is outlining has different calculation factors for the different amounts of waste that go into the landfill.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> So there is a calculation for green fill that I</p>	Pages 83-84, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>have used, but for ordinary household rubbish—rotten tins of cat food or something—there is another—</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> Absolutely. So all of those different types of waste streams are laid out in the NGER measurement determination and there are methods for estimating what the different compositions of waste deliver in terms of the emissions that go into the atmosphere.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> I assume this is a computer program—is that right? They key in: today, so many tonnes of green fill, so many tonnes of household waste, so many tonnes of carpets et cetera.</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> The calculator is a web based tool where people can enter their waste tonnes and do the estimation about what their admissions will be, and thereby work out to the extent they could be liable under the carbon price.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> You rely on them looking at my waste and everybody else's and saying, 'That's about 10 tonnes today, but because I know it is my rates we might make it five tonnes.'</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> The NGER system does rely on people self-assessing as to whether or not they are going to be liable. As I said, both the Clean Energy Regulator and the officers from my division have done some quite extensive outreach with local government over the last two years. We have had roundtables in every state capital in which we have invited people from local government and hear about how the carbon price liability and the benefits from the Carbon Farming Initiative and the renewable energy target could be made available to them. We have put them in touch with the Clean Energy Regulator officers, who have also been operating these sorts of outreach activities to assist local government.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> If they get it wrong, what is the fine? Are they penalised? Who audits their assessments?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> That is probably a question that is best posed to the Clean Energy Regulator because they are the body that is charged with assessing who is liable.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> We are still living in an Australian democracy we know who is liable, there must be legislation that says this.</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> There is and there is a database that the Clean Energy Regulator—</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> I am sure I voted for it—well, voted against it—but I am sure I made an informed decision as it went through. I do not remember the section of the act and which act it was that actually provided for this. There are penalties for inaccuracies?</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> As I am endeavouring to explain, the Clean Energy Regulator assesses the liability of liable parties and then considers whether any compliance activity is necessary. I am sure that we would be very happy to forward the committee's question on to the Clean Energy Regulator for a response.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Unfortunately, I missed him. I had the impression he was coming back at this time. All right, if he could provide that written response.....</p>			
19	CER	Clean Energy Regulator	MacDonald	Cassowary Coast Regional Council	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> So I think you confirmed this last year that Cassowary Coast are not likely to—Darwin City is on your list, I take it?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> So it is not actually the department's list; it is the Clean Energy Regulator's list.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Okay. But someone would have that list.</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> Again, I am sure the committee would be very happy to take that on notice, and the regulator would be very happy to provide you with an answer.</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> We can confirm that Darwin City Council would be on the Liable Entities Public Information Database.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Okay. Do you have there in that list what the assessed emissions from their landfill is?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> No, I don't. But in order for them to be on this list they have annual emissions above 25 kilotons.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> So they would have made the that assessment? Or the Clean Energy Regulator would have made that assessment?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> Again, this is a question for the Clean Energy Regulator.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> No, but what does the law say; what does the act say about it?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> The Clean Energy Regulator has to make an assessment of the likelihood that they would be liable under the scheme. But then they consulted with all of the liable parties before they placed them on the database.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Do they have a right of appeal?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> They certainly have engagement with a lot of liable parties through this process.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> But, if the Clean Energy Regulator makes an assessment, can the relevant council appeal that assessment?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> In the end, the fact that you are listed on the liable entities database does not mean that you are liable. This just is the Clean Energy Regulator's assessment that you are likely to be a liable entity under the carbon</p>	Pages 84-85, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	



Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>pricing mechanism. The responsibility for assessing whether you actually have liabilities is left to the operator. It is based on the data which is actually available for the financial year you are talking about; whether they meet the thresholds, which in this case is being above 25 kilotons.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> So it is up to the council to say, 'I don't think we've reached that, so I am not going to put in a return'?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> And then is a range of penalties which the Clean Energy Regulator—</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> So he then comes in and makes his own assessment using the council's records, which they may or may not give him—or I guess he has got power to demand them.</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> There is a range of powers to ensure the integrity in the scheme.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> If you could let me have the answers to those questions that you have offered on those, that would be helpful.</p>			
20	Outcome 4/CER	Carbon Price & Marketing Price	MacDonald	Recovered Carbon Tax Payments	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Okay and what do the budget figures say for the assessment on what would be paid on 15 June 2014? Can someone find that figure that I am incapable of finding in the budget papers?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> This is for?</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> What do you anticipate recovering in carbon tax by the payments to be made on 15 June 2014, which is in the next or the immediately coming financial year? There would be some figure in the budget papers on just what you are anticipating would be recovered.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> There will be, Senator, revenue estimates associated with the revenues for the carbon price mechanism. They are Treasury's revenue estimates, not this department's. We will do our best to find them.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> The Treasury must surely have got them from you.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> They will have consulted with us. They will be cash estimates.</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> That is right. For which year is this? This is until?</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> You tell me that the first payments to be made by any council will be the 15 June 2014, which is in the financial year for the budget that we have just had delivered in May. I am just wondering what the figure is. What is the anticipated revenue, that you are—</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Senator, to be clear, we cannot break out the revenue estimates for councils, in particular. They are not in the budget. The numbers that are in the budget are the overall revenue estimates for the entire carbon price mechanism. So if you are asking—</p>	Pages 85-86, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Just one figure—no breakdown.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Not by type of liable entity, no.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Dr Kennedy, you are not suggesting to me that the Treasury made this assessment without reference to the department?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> No, I am not suggesting that at all, Senator. I am simply telling you what number is published in the budget, and the number that is published in the budget is the revenue estimate for the carbon price mechanism.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Where would I find that figure? Perhaps I can trace it through and see if it is split somewhere in the papers, if you give me the first figure.</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> The carbon price, and other receipts that would be delivered to the government in 2013-14, is 6.266.088 thousand.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Sorry? Six million?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> Six billion.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Billion? Billion or million?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> Six billion two hundred and sixty-six million.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> \$6.266 billion—that is close enough for me—was anticipated to come in from this. Is there anywhere I can find how that is calculated? What contributes to that?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> No, there is no breakdown of that.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I think we should add, that is a net number—is it not, Ms Wilkinson—the cash number?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> That is the cash that the government will receive in 2013-14. That is correct.</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> That reflects the cash that the government would receive in that year, net of free permanent allocations which are provided.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Okay. And you are saying it is not your department that would have put together the different elements of the carbon pricing that reaches to the \$6.2 billion figure. Treasury would have done that. The department of climate change does not have that figure?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> No, Senator. I apologise if I may have inadvertently mislead you. We do work with Treasury, as with the Clean Energy Regulator, on providing data for them to build their revenue estimate. I was simply trying to point out that the Treasury is responsible for revenue estimates and we usually speak to them. But certainly we are involved in providing them with our estimates of emissions to be covered under the scheme and then how much revenue would flow from those emissions.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> You have got that but you cannot give it to me</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>now?</p> <p><b>Ms Wilkinson:</b> We can take that question on notice. That level of detail is not published in the budget numbers.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> That is correct; we would have to take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> But we have established that you would have given the Treasury the figures, which is your estimate of what would come from the various elements, one of which would be what I call landfill tax. Someone must have given it to Treasury. They did not just get it out of thin air, and you are the obvious—</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We will have given the numbers on emissions to Treasury, Senator; but whether we prepare them with the breakdown that you have exactly in mind I will take on notice, and whether we can provide those figures.</p>			
21	Outcome 4	Land	MacDonald	Emissions from Landfills	<p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> .....Do you have the figures of your estimate of emissions from landfills, which Treasury would then have applied a price to and got a figure?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I do not have an estimate of landfills. We will generate an aggregate estimate.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> But someone must know, surely. You do not just pick figures out of the air and say, 'Let's pretend that this is what Treasury can assess this on'. Someone must be giving them a bit of a guide.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Senator Macdonald, do you have many more questions on this?</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Like you, Mr Chairman, I was just getting too close to the bone, but this will be my last question. You are telling me that your department has no idea of what landfill emissions which will attract a tax or levy are going to be?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We publish detailed emissions projections and we provide estimates of emissions for the Treasury to use in their budget estimates. I do not have all the details and breakdowns used in preparing those estimates in front of me. I am happy to provide that to you on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Thank you. If, on notice, you could give me what your estimate of emissions from landfills is, that would be great. If, just as an extra assistance, you could add a footnote telling me how the Treasury then uses the volume or capacity to get a revenue figure, that would also be great.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Okay.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> Thank you very much.</p>	Page 86-87, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	
22	CER	Clean Energy Regulator	Cameron	Waste Forums	<p><b>CHAIR:</b>.....The USQ—their Centre for Sustainable Business and Development—found that metropolitan and coastal councils in Queensland are more carbon ready than their smaller rural</p>	Pages 87-88, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>counterparts. Would that make sense given what the department has done?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> I think that the degree of readiness, as you say, varies somewhat, but I am unsurprised to hear the findings of that report.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> This is work by Associate Professor Heather Zeppel and Ms Christina James-Overheu. I certainly would like you to have a look at this work that has been done. Senator McDonald was saying the local councils do not know what is going on and have difficulty in assessing a carbon payment that they have to make. This was commissioned by the local government infrastructure services in Queensland. This is a local government initiated analysis. The survey was completed by 32 councils including city, regional, shire and Aboriginal shire councils. It is an important piece of work and I think that you should have a look at it. The survey found that 13 councils had already assessed their carbon emissions and five planned to do so. The results of the carbon survey were forwarded to all 73 Queensland councils and local government associations within Queensland, and it was presented at an LGIS waste forum in Rockhampton and Brisbane. Was the department involved in this LGIS waste forum in Rockhampton or Brisbane?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> I am not sure. We would need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Take that on notice. This carbon survey was done there, so obviously there is a recognition by local government associations in Queensland that carbon pricing is an issue. They have done surveys and they have forwarded the results to all Queensland councils, and if some Queensland councils have got no idea about what is happening and how it works then we should actually focus on those councils in Queensland. Could you advise whether there has been any contact by any individual local councils in Queensland to the department seeking advice and help?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> There was some contact towards the end of 2011 and last year, but I would like to take that on notice, to provide you with a precise answer.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> If you are a small local council, the chances of your having a liability are pretty remote, are they not?</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> As a very broad rule of thumb, we have estimated that local governments that serve catchments of more than 20,000 people should examine whether they might potentially have a carbon price liability. The answer is that you are correct: smaller councils are less likely to have a carbon price liability.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> It does not matter how many six by four box trailers of green stuff go in there; they may not have a liability.</p> <p><b>Ms Thompson:</b> That is right.</p> <p><b>Senator IAN MACDONALD:</b> There would be 20,000 in my shire. But I do</p>			

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>not think they would be liable.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Maybe you could have a look at this research and you could have a look at the waste forum in Rockhampton and Brisbane, and maybe you could find out for me who attended the waste forums in Rockhampton and Brisbane, so that we can identify areas that are not understanding this. I would really like to help Senator Macdonald on this issue.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I would be happy to pass the issue through to the Clean Energy Regulator in addition to providing our own answer to the Clean Energy Regulator. As was noted earlier, they have had an extensive outreach program with local councils across Australia, so it is a shame they are not here to speak to that. We will pass that on.</p>			
23	Outcome 4	Carbon Price & Marketing Price	Birmingham	Australia's Emissions – Heavy Road Vehicles	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> What is the contribution to Australia's emissions of heavy on-road vehicles?</p> <p><b>Mr Power:</b> If you are happy to give me a minute, we will see if we can find that number for you.</p>	Page 90, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	
24	Outcome 4	AusIndustry	Birmingham	Carbon Pricing	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> The committee will now resume. Senator Birmingham.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Are there any further public relations activities or otherwise surrounding carbon pricing that the department has planned in the coming budget? We discussed the \$2 million earlier today that will not quite be expended. Is there any continuation of that program?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I apologise, Senator, I misunderstood the arrangements, and I excused the person who was answering those questions. Our understanding is that the answer is no, but I will have to confirm it for you on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Thank you.</p>	Page 92, 27 May 2013	16/10/13	
25	Outcome 4	Energy Markets & Policy Coordination	Birmingham	Emissions Intensity	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> So nine entities received assistance. What is the threshold for emissions intensity?</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> I should know the answer. I must admit it has been some time since I looked at it. I think it is one tonne, but we will need to confirm that.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> I can confirm that nine facilities received cash payments and the threshold was one tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent per megawatt hour.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> I do not suppose the information that you have gleaned there provides any details in terms of the actual emissions intensity of the least emissions intensive of the nine and the most emissions intensive of the final one to move out.</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> No. The only information that has been made available is in relation to those that were eligible. The cash amounts reflect that combination of emissions intensity and output that we have already referred to.</p>	Pages 93-94, 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> What is the range of emissions intensity among the nine?</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> I do not have the emissions intensity figures in front of me. I only have the cash payment amounts. I can take it on notice to give you the emissions intensity figures.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Yes, if you could. Obviously I am conscious of asking for a range so as not to be seeking the specifics of any one entity—though I guess it does not matter terribly much seeing as the cash amounts that they have all got are all there and you could probably back-calculate it if you wanted to.</p> <p><b>Mr Archer:</b> I think there is a legitimate question about what can be made available on the basis that some of that information is based on data which companies have provided under the NGER system, around which there are laws about what can be made publicly available and under what circumstances.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> If you could provide the range of emissions intensity for the nine as well as, if possible, the highest level of known emissions intensity for a power station that misses out, it would be greatly appreciated.</p>			
26	Outcome 4	Corporate	Birmingham	DCCEE – Senate Order responsibility	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> With the abolition of the DCCEE, I want to know where some of the legacy matters stand and who takes responsibility over the longer term for different information. In particular, I note that the department has provided a response to the Senate standing order that seeks grants, board appointments and those sorts of things on a standing basis. Right at the end there is a footnote that says, 'Grants for climate change divisions are provided from 25 March 2013 onwards, following the transfer of this function to the department.' Of course, the last time this information was tabled in the Senate the grants were provided up until 21 January 2013. There is obviously a gap between 21 January and 25 March. Whose responsibility is that?</p> <p><b>Ms Graham:</b> It is true that we provided the grants since 25 March, but I think the gap would certainly be provided on the Climate Change website because all the grants are required to be published within seven days on the website as well. But certainly we could take it on notice to provide the gap.</p>	Page 94, 27 May 2013	16/10/13	
27	Corporate	Corporate	Macdonald	CSD Staffing Reductions	<p>In answer to written questions regarding a 15.07 per cent reduction in staff at the Department, it has been indicated that the indicative salary savings per annum of the reduction is \$2,078,120.90.</p> <p>The total cost of the redundancies was \$2,278,717.00.</p> <p>The answer provided also indicated that 58 of the effected employees were re-distributed into different positions in the department, and that another 14 found</p>	Written question Thursday 13 June 2013	16/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					work in other APS positions. Q1. How many staff in total is represented by the 15.07% figure? Q2. What is the annual cost of salaries and disbursements for the 58 personnel who were re-distributed within the department?			
28	Outcome 4	Land	Edwards	Carbon Farming Initiative	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In light of the new Kyoto 3.4 and the review of the CFI are there any expected changes to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Permanence' and 'Additionality' or common practice test?</li> <li>The likelihood of a retrospective practice baseline to 1990?</li> <li>Land sector reporting requirements</li> </ul> </li> <li>Where changes to the rules are likely, what impact will this have on the CFI research priorities via the Filling the Research Gap and Action on the Ground.</li> <li>Where changes to the rules are likely, what impact will this have on the CFI process that land managers must adhere. If changes are likely, what is the value of the current "Extension and Outreach" program given that there may be great uncertainty with respect to the CFI process and possibly to the CFI research priorities.</li> <li>How does the Department anticipate it will inform land managers about the new rules?</li> <li>Has the Department provided any information thus far to land managers about the new rules?</li> <li>Do the Departments have any plans in place to inform land managers about the new rules?</li> </ol>	Written question Thursday 13 June 2013	24/10/13	
29	Outcome 4	Carbon Pricing & Markets	Macdonald	Carbon Tax – Northern Impacts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the department studied the financial impacts of the Carbon Tax on rural communities?</li> <li>Does the Minister/department accept that due to the distances involved the impacts on fuel prices alone cause compounded cost-of-living increases on rural and remote communities?</li> <li>Does the Department currently have any proposals or programs to assist these communities with these additional costs?</li> </ol>	Written question Thursday 13 June 2013	24/10/13	
30	Outcome 4	Land	Macdonald	Carbon Farming Initiative/Fuel reduction burns	<p>In answer to questions at previous estimates the department advised a \$9.1 million program of investment had taken place across Northern Australia from 2008-2012 through the North Australian Indigenous Land and Sea Management Alliance (NAISMA) to expand on "traditional fire management regimes" across 200,000km<sup>2</sup> of North Australian Savannas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How much of the \$9.1 million was spent in Queensland?</li> <li>How much of the \$9.1 million was spent in the Northern Territory?</li> <li>How much of the \$9.1 million was spent in Western Australia?</li> </ol>	Written question Thursday 13 June 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. How were the outcomes (success/failure) of the program measured?</li> <li>5. Does the Department have data that indicates that there were fewer and/or less severe uncontrolled fires, and that there was less Carbon generated across the period since the program commenced/the \$9.1 million was spent?</li> <li>6. Did the amount of carbon produced in the area studied reduce appreciably across the four years)?</li> <li>7. What on-going programs – other than the deployment of dry-season fire management by Indigenous Working on Country rangers – are addressing fire management as a function of the Carbon Farming Initiative?</li> <li>8. Was the entire \$9.1 million spent?</li> <li>9. How much of the \$9.1 million remains unallocated?</li> </ol>			
31	CER	Clean Energy Regulator	Macdonald	Biochar	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What exemptions or rebates will the Clean Energy Regulator be providing to entities that utilise Biochar technologies for carbon sequestration?</li> <li>2. Is the Clean Energy Regulator providing subsidy to support the deployment of Biochar technologies for farming, forestry and local government authority entities?</li> </ol>	Written question Thursday 13 June 2013	24/10/13	
32	CER	Clean Energy Regulator	Macdonald	Carbon Farming in FNQ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Carbon Farming Initiative has assisted in giving new Carbon farming technologies visibility in Far North Queensland however what financial assistance has been provided to assist producers to “tool up” with these new technologies?</li> </ol>	Written question Thursday 13 June 2013	24/10/13	
33	Outcome 4	International Division	Rhiannon	Climate Financing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Which of the DIICCSRTE climate financing programs reported under its budget had funding originating from the DFAT-Defence (ODA) or DFAT-Aid budgets, or that were also reported in those DFAT budgets? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. May I have the description of each such program being funded, the funding details, and under which portfolio budget each is being reported?</li> <li>b. Which DIICCSRTE funded climate change financing programs would have been eligible for DFAT-ODA funding but were not funded through that portfolio or program?</li> <li>c. Will such projects, if any, be counted as ODA eligible at any future stage? What would be the criteria where that happens?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. How much has the government spent on climate financing that crosses the DIICCSRTE and Aid budget each year since 2010, and what are the forward projections? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. May I have itemised funding and details about the programs and projects that have been so funded, with the proportions of DFAT and DIICCSRTE funding spent on each project?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written question Thursday 13 June 2013	24/10/13	



Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p>3. Of Australia's climate financing how much will be disbursed bilaterally and how much will go to multilateral funds? What amount of Australia's climate financing has been allocated to adaptation? How much has been spent on REDD related projects since the 2007 election and what have been the benefits or outcomes of this expenditure?</p> <p>4. How much of Australia's climate finance for climate change adaptation and low carbon development in overseas countries comes from our Aid budget? That is, what dollar figure will be reported to the UNFCCC as our contribution towards the goal of jointly mobilising \$100bn by 2020?</p>			
34	Outcome 4	Carbon Pricing & Markets	Birmingham	Heavy-on road vehicles – Clean Energy Future Plan	<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> So in terms of implementing this government policy of expanding the carbon price regime into other vehicles, Treasury will be the ones who take a submission to cabinet; Treasury will be the ones who bring legislation to the parliament.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Treasury is responsible, presuming it is implemented through the excise arrangements as we understand it would be, but that needs to be confirmed by Treasury. We would anticipate being involved through those submission processes as we have been in the past, but responsibility would be with Treasury.</p> <p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Whose responsibility is it to see that the policy as announced by the government is delivered? Is it the Treasurer's responsibility, or the minister for climate change's responsibility?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The Clean Energy Future Plan as announced by the government had a significant number of departments responsible for different aspects of the plan. The former department, and now this department, does have a role in understanding how various parts of the plan come together, but each department and each minister is responsible for those bits that they are implementing in the normal way that government implements a whole- of- government program. Certainly, this department has a responsibility in advising our minister over how these policies are working and working together to achieve the emissions reduction targets and goals, with the emissions trading scheme obviously being the centrepiece of all of that. So I am not meaning to be difficult or anything in this, Senator: the department clearly has a role, we clearly talk to our colleagues—as we have discussed across the course of the day—in ensuring policies are implemented, and all parts of government do their best in coordinating implementation. We are simply trying to point out who is responsible, and in the typical course of estimates, who would take questions on these matters. In this case, any questions around changes to the excise arrangements would be taken by Treasury.</p>	Pages 89 and 90 27 May 2013	24/10/13	

Q No.	Program	Div	Senator	Broad Topic	Question	Proof Hansard Page or Written	Date Rec'd	Date Tabled
					<p><b>Senator BIRMINGHAM:</b> Has the department undertaken any research planning or assessment of the impact of the policy or preparatory work in relation to the policy to expand into heavy on-road vehicles?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> From memory, the Treasury modelling had as one of the reporting on results the government's full anticipated policy arrangements, including this arrangement. But I will confirm that by taking it on notice, if that is okay—I do not have the modelling in front of me—but from memory it included modelling that covered the entire policy arrangements as put down by the government through the clean energy plan.</p>			