

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 252

Topic: Portfolio Wide – printing costs

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. How much was spent on printing 2011-12? Of this amount, how much was for printing documents?
2. How many documents (please include the amount of copies) were printed in 2011-12? How many of these printed documents were also published online?
3. Of the documents that were printed in 2011-12, where were they delivered and what was the cost?
4. How much has been spent on printing this financial year to date? Of this amount, how much was for printing documents?
5. How many documents (include the amount of copies) have been printed this financial year to date? How many of these printed documents were also published online?

Answer:

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

1. \$783,808.68. For the purpose of this response, a 'document' is defined as books, booklets, brochures, guides, flyers, and factsheets.

Of the above amount, \$674,413.10 was for printing documents.

2. 186 documents were printed in 2011/12, with print quantities ranging from 30 to 15,000. Only one document had a printing quantity of 15,000. Over 85 per cent of documents (160 documents) had a printing quantity of 2,000 or less.

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

3. The cost of each printed item includes delivery.
4. \$175,131.04. For the purpose of this response, a 'document' is defined as books, booklets, brochures, guides, flyers, and factsheets.

Of the above amount, \$85,118.00 was for printing documents.

5. 40 documents have been printed this financial year to date, with print quantities ranging from 50 to 7,500. Only one document had a printing quantity of 7,500. Over 90 per cent of documents (36 documents) had a printing quantity of 2,000 or less.

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

Bureau of Meteorology

1. \$216,561. This total amount was spent on printing documents.
2. 91 documents were printed in 2011/12. As a general policy, most externally-focussed publications are also published online.
3. The Bureau of Meteorology does not record the specific information required to answer this question. Publications are delivered to a broad range of stakeholders, including other agencies, regional Bureau offices and in response to requests from our stakeholders and the wider community.
4. \$47,392. This total amount was spent on printing documents.
5. 35 documents have been printed this financial year to date. As a general policy, most externally-focussed publications are also published online.

Director of National Parks

1. \$187,836.73. Of this amount, \$135,476.07 was for printing documents.
2. 21 documents were printed in 2011/12, with print quantities ranging from 200 to 100,000. The higher print quantities reflect Park brochures and guides which were necessary to support the operational function of the Parks to park visitors.
Five of the 21 documents were published online.

3. The documents were delivered to one of the following locations:

Parliament House, the Director of National Parks office in Canberra and various parks locations such as Australian National Botanic Gardens, Kakadu National Park, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, Christmas Island or Booderee National Park.

The cost of each printed document included delivery for 2011/12.

4. \$68,231.01. Of this amount, \$60,181.15 was for printing documents.
5. Seven documents have been printed this financial year, with print quantities ranging from 250 to 200,000. The higher print quantities reflect Park brochures and guides which were necessary to support the operational function of the Parks to park visitors.

Five of the seven documents have been published online.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. \$80,644.54. This total amount was spent on printing documents.
2. All of GBRMA's public documents were published online, excluding stationery items such as business cards.

17 documents were printed in 2011/12, with print quantities ranging from 500 to 220,450. Only one document had a printing quantity of 220,450, which was an insert for the Reef Guardians newspaper. The printing quantities for all other documents were 5,000 or less.

3. GBRMPA's publications are delivered to its head office in Townsville as well as regional offices in Cairns, Mackay, Rockhampton and Canberra. Printing costs are inclusive of delivery.
4. \$19,800. This total amount was spent on printing documents.
5. Five documents have been printed this financial year to date, with print quantities of 500, 300, 500 and 3,000 (2 documents).

All of GBRMA's public documents were published online, excluding stationery items such as business cards.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. \$411,667. Of this amount, \$303,065 was for printing documents.
2. 35 documents were printed in 2011/12, with print quantities ranging from 100 to 26,000. Only one document had a printing quantity of 26,000. Over 87 per cent of documents had a printing quantity of 2,000 or less.

All 35 documents were published online.

3. The bulk of the publications are delivered to the Authority head office or held in a warehouse for distribution. During 2011/12, 613 individual consignments of printed documents were delivered to different destinations:
 - various regional town halls across the Murray-Darling Basin for Murray-Darling Basin Plan based engagement meetings;
 - peak group meetings, conferences and workshops;
 - relevant State Government offices;
 - educational institutions; and
 - State, national, university and local libraries.

The cost of delivery was \$56,273.

4. \$34,516. Of this amount \$24,871 was for printing documents.
5. Four documents have been printed this financial year to date, with print quantities of 200, 250, 300 and 1,000.

All four documents were published online.

National Water Commission

1. \$189,829. Of this amount, \$185,882 was for printing documents.
2. 10 reports and miscellaneous documents, including fact sheets and conference papers were printed during 2011/12, with print quantities ranging from 200 to a maximum of 2,000 copies. All reports are published on the Commission's website.
3. Printed documents were distributed to parties to the National Water Initiative as per legislative requirement; through tabling requirements for the annual report; to contributing jurisdictions and steering groups, stakeholders; and through conferences, seminars and workshops. Total cost was \$14,900.
4. \$10,213. Of this amount, \$8,946 was for printing documents.
5. One report and miscellaneous documents have been printed to date, with print quantities varying from 50 to a maximum of 1,000 copies. The report was published on the Commission's website.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. \$138,312.96. Of this amount, \$20,104.75 was for printing documents.
2. Three documents were printed: *Annual report 2011-12* (500 copies); *Green Precincts Booklet* (10,000 copies) and *Boys of Cockatoo* (2,100 copies). The Annual Report was also published online.

The documents were delivered to the Trust's head office in Mosman.

3. The *Annual report* and *Green Precincts Booklet* delivery costs were built into the print cost. *Boys of Cockatoo* delivery cost was \$357.50.
4. \$14,225.64. None of this was expended on printing documents.
5. Nil.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 253

Topic: Portfolio Wide – media training 2011-12

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. In relation to media training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information for 2011-12:
 - a. Total spending on these services
 - b. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification
 - c. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (please provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - d. The names of all service providers engaged
2. For each service purchased from a provider listed under (d), please provide:
 - i. The name and nature of the service purchased
 - ii. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based
 - iii. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - iv. The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - v. The total amount spent on the service
 - vi. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package)
3. Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
 - a. The location used
 - b. The number of employees who took part on each occasion
 - c. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - d. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location

Answer:

Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities

No media training services were purchased by the department.

Director of National Parks

1. In relation to media training services purchased by the Director of National Parks:
 - a. \$13,910.
 - b. The number and classification of employees who received the service:

Staff Classification	Number of employees
Australian Public Service Level 2	12
Australian Public Service Level 3	6
Australian Public Service Level 4	8
Australian Public Service Level 5	2
Australian Public Service Level 6	4
Executive Level 1	2
TOTAL	34

- c. As above. No study leave was granted.
 - d. Ken Begg and Associates.
 2. The service purchased was:
 - i. Media Training.
 - ii. Group based.
 - iii. The number and classification of employees who received the service:

Staff Classification	Number of employees
Australian Public Service Level 2	12
Australian Public Service Level 3	6
Australian Public Service Level 4	8
Australian Public Service Level 5	2
Australian Public Service Level 6	4
Executive Level 1	2
TOTAL	34

iv. 238 hours at seven hours per employee.

v. \$13,910.

vi. \$2,200 a day for the complete package.

3. Nil. The service was provided on Director of National Parks' premises.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. In relation to media training services purchased by the Bureau of Meteorology (the Bureau):

a. \$53,900.

b. All employees who have media in their duty description are offered training.

c. 68 employees nominated. No study leave was granted.

Staff Classification	Number of employees	
	Workshop (7 Hours)	Tutorial (1 Hour)
Australian Public Service Level 3	4	4
Australian Public Service Level 4	13	13
Australian Public Service Level 5	5	5
Australian Public Service Level 6	16	16

Executive Level 1	14	14
Executive Level 2	16	16
TOTALS	68	68

d. Voice Coach.

2. The services purchased were:

i. Media training.

ii. Both, a workshop for small groups of 6 people, and an individual assessment and tutorial.

iii. 68, details given in table:

Staff Classification	Number of employees		Total Hours
	Workshop (7 Hours)	Tutorial (1 Hour)	
Australian Public Service Level 3	4	4	32
Australian Public Service Level 4	13	13	104
Australian Public Service Level 5	5	5	40
Australian Public Service Level 6	16	16	138
Executive Level 1	14	14	122
Executive Level 2	16	16	138
TOTALS	68	68	574

iv. As above.

v. \$53,900.

vi. \$2,500 per one day workshop, complete package. \$400 per one hour assessment and tutorial, complete package.

3. Nil. The services were provided on the Bureau's premises.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. In relation to media training services purchased by the Murray Darling Basin Authority (the Authority):

a. \$3,000.

b. The number and classification of employees who received the service:

Staff Classification	Number of employees
Chief Executive	1
Executive Directors	2
General Managers	2
TOTAL	5

c. As above. No study leave was granted.

d. Laurie Wilson & Associates Pty Ltd.

2. The service purchased was:

i. Media Training.

ii. Group based.

iii. The number and classification of employees who received the service:

Staff Classification	Number of employees	Total Hours
Chief Executive	1	6
Executive Directors	2	12
General Managers	2	12
TOTAL	5	30

iv. As above.

v. \$3,000.

vi. \$3,000 a day for the complete package.

3. Nil. The services were provided at the Authority's premises.

National Water Commission

1. In relation to media training services purchased by the National Water Commission:

a. \$6,804.

b. The number and classification of employees were offered these services:

Staff Classification	Number of employees
Commissioners	3
Chief Executive Officer	1
TOTAL	4

- c. Two Commissioners utilised the services. No study leave was granted.
- d. Corporate Media Services.

2. Service providers:

- i. Media training.
- ii. One on one.
- iii Two Commissioners.
- iv. Nine hours.
- v. \$6,804.
- vi. Complete package.

3. The service was provided at:

- a. The Australian Institute of Management.
- b. One Commissioner on each occasion.
- c. Nine hours.
- d. Nil.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

No media training services were purchased by the Trust.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

No media training services were purchased by GBRMPA.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD

Question No: 254

Topic: Portfolio Wide – board appointments

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Please list all of the boards within this portfolio, including: board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members.
2. What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?
3. Please detail any board appointments for this financial year to date.
4. Please list all of the boards within this portfolio, including: board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members for 2011-12.
5. What was the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio for 2011-12?

Answer:

1. In accordance with Senate Order 13, the details of the boards within this portfolio, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members, are tabled in the Senate prior to each Senate Estimates Hearing. Details for portfolio boards, in accordance with Senate Order 13, were tabled for Supplementary Estimates October 2012.
2. The gender ratio on each board across the portfolio is outlined in the table below:

Board	Gender Ratio F:M
Alligator Rivers Region Advisory Committee	5:19
Alligator Rivers Region Technical Committee	4:10
Antarctic Animal Ethics Committee	6:4
Antarctic Science Advisory Committee (Action commenced to fill positions)	0:0
Australia-Netherlands Committee on Old Dutch Shipwrecks	1:1
Australian Antarctic Names and Medal Committee	2:2
Australian Antarctic Program Human Research Ethics Committee	1:2

Australian Biological Resources Study Advisory Committee	5:8
Australian Heritage Council	4:3
Booderee National Park Board of Management	4:7
Fuel Standards Consultative Committee	6:17
Great Artesian Basin Coordinating Committee	3:16
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	1:4
Hazardous Waste Technical Group	2:6
Independent Expert Panel for Major Coal Seam Gas Projects	1:3
Indigenous Advisory Committee	3:8
Interim Independent Expert Scientific Committee on Coal Seam Gas and Coal Mining	1:5
Kakadu National Park Board of Management	3:9
Lake Eyre Basin Community Advisory Committee	8:9
Lake Eyre Basin Scientific Advisory Panel	3:4
Land Sector Carbon and Biodiversity Board	2:3
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	3:3
National Sustainability Council - new council, established after Senate Order 13.	3:5
National Water Commission	1:3
National Wildlife Corridors Plan Advisory Group	7:6
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	3:3
Threatened Species Scientific Committee	4:6
Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Board of Management	3:6
Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Advisory Group	3:5

National Sustainability Council

The Council was established in October 2012 to provide advice to the Australian Government on sustainability issues and produce public reports against a set of sustainability indicators.

Members:

- Professor John Thwaites, Chair.
- Mr Rod Glover.
- Dr Tom Hatton PSM.
- Professor Graeme Hugo AM.
- Mr Mark Joiner.
- Ms Romilly Madew.
- Ms Samantha Mostyn.
- Professor Susan Richardson AO.

All appointments are for three year terms.

3. Board appointments for this financial year to date are reflected in Senate Order 13 tabled in the Senate in October 2012, and as set out above for the National Sustainability Council.
4. In accordance with Senate Order 13, the details of the boards within this portfolio, including board title, terms of appointment, tenure of appointment and members, are tabled in the Senate prior to each Senate Estimates Hearing. Details for portfolio boards, in accordance with Senate Order 13, were tabled for Supplementary Estimates in October 2011, for Additional Estimates in February 2012, for Budget Estimates in May 2012 and for Supplementary Estimates in October 2012.
5. The gender ratio on each board across the portfolio for 2011/12 is outlined below:

Board	Gender Ratio F:M
Alligator Rivers Region Advisory Committee	5:22
Alligator Rivers Region Technical Committee	4:10
Antarctic Animal Ethics Committee	4:3
Antarctic Science Advisory Committee	3:5
Australia-Netherlands Committee on Old Dutch Shipwrecks	0:2
Australian Antarctic Names and Medal Committee	2:2
Australian Antarctic Program Human Research Ethics Committee	1:2

Australian Biological Resources Study Advisory Committee	5:8
Australian Heritage Council	4:3
Booderee National Park Board of Management	4:7
Fuel Standards Consultative Committee	4:12
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	1:3
Hazardous Waste Technical Group	2:6
Independent Expert Panel for Major Coal Seam Gas Projects	1:3
Indigenous Advisory Committee	3:8
Interim Independent Expert Scientific Committee on Coal Seam Gas and Coal Mining	1:4
Kakadu National Park Board of Management	3:9
Lake Eyre Basin Community Advisory Committee	6:9
Lake Eyre Basin Scientific Advisory Panel	3:4
Land Sector Carbon and Biodiversity Board	2:3
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	3:3
National Water Commission	2:4
National Wildlife Corridors Plan Advisory Group	7:6
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	4:3
Threatened Species Scientific Committee	4:6
Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Board of Management	3:6
Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards Advisory Group	3:6

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 255

Topic: Portfolio Wide – commissioned reports

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. How many reports were commissioned by the Government in the department/agency in 2011-12? Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, terms of reference and committee members.
 - a. How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost? How many departmental/agency staff were involved in each report and at what level?
 - b. What is the current status of each report? Did the Government report within the required timeframe? If not, when is the Government intending to respond to these reports?
2. How many reports have been commissioned by the Government in the department/agency this financial year to date? Please provide details of each report including date commissioned, date report handed to Government, date of public release, terms of reference and committee members.
 - a. How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost? How many departmental/agency staff were involved in each report and at what level?
 - b. What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to these reports?

Answer:

1. One.

Independent Verification Group for the Tasmanian Forests Intergovernmental Agreement

Commissioned: 21 September 2011.

Handed to Government: February 2012.

Date of Public Release: 23 March 2012.

Terms of reference: Meet the requirements of clauses 19 and 20 of the Intergovernmental Agreement, that is, to design and implement an independent and transparent verification process that will assess and verify stakeholder claims relating to sustainable timber supply requirements, available native forest and plantation volumes, and areas and boundaries of reserves from within the environmental non-government organisation-nominated 572,000 hectares of 'high conservation value' native forest. It is also to make recommendations on further legislative requirements for protection of new reserves if an agreement emerges.

Committee Members:

- Professor Jonathan West (Chair);
- Dr Robert Smith;
- Dr Michael Lockwood;
- Professor Brendan Mackey;
- Professor Mark Burgman; and
- Professor Ross Large.

a. *Estimated cost:* \$2.1 million.

Departmental Staff: 1 x SES; 1 x EL2; 1 x APS 6.

b. *Current status of the report:* Completed.

2. Nil.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 256

Topic: Portfolio Wide – community cabinet meetings

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. How many Community Cabinet meetings has the Minister attended this financial year to date? Please list dates and locations.
2. How many Departmental Officers travelled with the Minister for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date? What was the total cost of this travel? Please list travel type, accommodation and any other expenses. Which Community Cabinet meetings did the Departmental Officers attend? Please list dates and locations.
3. What was the total cost to the Department and the Minister's office for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date?
4. How many Community Cabinet meetings did the Minister attend in 2011-12? Please list dates and locations.
5. How many Departmental Officers travelled with the Minister for the Community Cabinet meetings for 2011-12? What was the total cost of this travel? Please list travel type, accommodation and any other expenses. Which Community Cabinet meetings did the Departmental Officers attend? Please list date and location.
6. What was the total cost to the Department and the Ministers office for the Community Cabinet meetings for 2011-12?

Answer:

1. The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities attended three Community Cabinet meetings this financial year to date (16 October 2012): Ipswich, Queensland, 10 July 2012; Brand, Western Australia, 5 September 2012; and Bass, Tasmania, 3 October 2012.
2. A total of three departmental officers from the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) attended Community Cabinet meetings to support the Minister in this financial year to date (16 October 2012). The total cost of the travel, including airfares, accommodation, taxis and travelling allowance, was \$8,665.03. Departmental staff attended three Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date (16 October 2012): Ipswich, Queensland, 10 July 2012; Brand, Western Australia, 5 September 2012; and Bass, Tasmania, 3 October 2012.

3. The total travel cost to the department and the Minister's office for the Community Cabinet meetings for this financial year to date (16 October 2012) was \$31,609.79. The amount for the Minister's office includes airfares and travelling allowance (including Motor Vehicle Allowance) claims. It does not include travel by taxis (due to the difficulties determining exact destinations using the electronic information as provided by Cabcharge), COMCAR (which is charged directly to portfolio agencies), or travel on Special Purpose Aircraft (which is administered by the Department of Defence).
4. For information regarding Community Cabinet meetings attended by the Minister in 2011-12, please refer to the response provided in question number 199, Budget Estimates, May 2012, as the data is unchanged.
5. For information regarding travel costs for departmental officers and Community Cabinet meetings attended by departmental officers for 2011-12, please refer to the response provided in question number 199, Budget Estimates, May 2012, as the data is unchanged.
6. For information regarding the total cost to the department and the Minister's office for the Community Cabinet meetings for 2011-12, please refer to the response provided in question number 199, Budget Estimates, May 2012, as the data is unchanged.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 257

Topic: Portfolio Wide – freedom of information

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Has the department/agency received any updated advice on how to respond to FOI requests?
2. What is the total cost to the department/agency to process FOI requests for 2011-12? How many FOI requests did the department/agency receive in 2011-12? How many requests were denied and how many were granted? Did the department/agency fail to meet the processing times outlined in the FOI Act for any requests? If so, how many? Do any of these requests remain outstanding?
3. What is the total cost to the department/agency to process FOI requests for this financial year to date?
4. How many FOI requests has the department/agency received for this financial year to date? How many requests have been denied and how many have been granted? Has the department/agency failed to meet the processing times outlined in the FOI Act for any requests? If so, how many and why? Do any of these requests remain outstanding? If so, how many and why?

Answer:

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

1. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) and its portfolio agencies follow the advice and protocols provided by the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (the OAIC) in line with the *Freedom of Information Act 1982* (the FOI Act) and Freedom of Information (FOI) Guidance Notes. The department also follows the FOI Guidance notes provided by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet on 28 July 2011 which are available at: http://www.dpmc.gov.au/foi/guidance_notes.cfm.
2. For the financial year 2011/12 (as reported in the FOI Act Annual Report 2011/12), the total cost to the department to process FOI requests was \$310,032.00. This figure does not factor in charges received from the applicant.

For the financial year 2011/12 (as reported in the FOI Act Annual Report 2011/12), the department received 120 FOI requests and had 12 carried over from the financial year 2010/11 (equating to a total of 132 FOI requests).

Of the total 132 FOI requests, 32 were granted in full, 25 were granted in part, eight were refused, 43 were withdrawn, nine were transferred to another agency for processing and 15 were still being processed.

For the financial year 2011/12, the department processed 25 FOI requests outside the statutory timeframe as provided by the FOI Act. As at 15 October 2012, the department does not have any outstanding FOI requests from the financial year 2011/12.

3. For the financial year 2012/13 to date (1 July 2011 to 15 October 2012), the total cost to the department to process FOI requests has been approximately \$87,856.00. This figure does not factor in charges received from applicant.
4. For the financial year 2012/13 to date (1 July 2012 to 15 October 2012) the department has received 35 FOI requests and had 15 FOI requests carried over from the financial year 2011/12 (equating to a total of 50 FOI requests).

Of the total 50 FOI requests, 10 were granted in full, five were granted in part, five were refused, 14 were withdrawn and 16 were still being processed.

For the financial year 2012-13 to date (1 July 2012 to 15 October 2012) the department processed three FOI requests outside the statutory timeframe provided by the FOI Act. All three matters were finalised as at 15 October 2012.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. See departmental answer for all agencies.
2. For the financial year 2011/12 the total cost to the Bureau of Meteorology (the Bureau) to process FOI requests was \$25,260.

For the financial year 2011/12, the Bureau received 16 FOI requests.

Of the total 16 FOI requests four were released in full, four were released in part, seven were refused due to Section 12(c) and one was withdrawn. All requests were processed within required timeframes. No requests remain outstanding.

3. For the financial year 2012/13 to date (1 July 2011 to 15 October 2012), the total cost to the Bureau to process FOI requests has been approximately \$13,500.
4. For the financial year 2012/13 to date (1 July 2011 to 15 October 2012), the Bureau has received five FOI requests.

Of the total five FOI requests, three were released in part and one was withdrawn. All three were processed within required timeframes. One request remains outstanding; processing time for this request has been extended due to third party consultation under Section 27(a).

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. See departmental answer for all agencies.
2. For the financial year 2011/12 the total cost to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) to process FOI requests was \$17,371.

For the financial year 2011/12 the GBRMPA received four FOI requests.

Of the total four requests, no requests were denied, one request was granted, two were withdrawn and one was transferred. All requests were processed within the required timeframes. No requests remain outstanding.

3. For the financial year 2012/13 to date (1 July 2011 to 15 October 2012), the total cost to GBRMPA to process FOI requests has been \$6,011.
4. For the financial year 2012/13 to date (1 July 2011 to 15 October 2012), GBRMPA has received three FOI requests.

Of the total three FOI requests, no requests have been denied and two requests have been granted, all requests have been processed within the required time frames. One request remains outstanding.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. See departmental answer for all portfolio agencies.
2. For the financial year 2011/12 the total cost to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority (the Authority) to process FOI requests was \$91,330.

For the financial year 2011/12 the Authority received 22 FOI requests.

Of these 22 requests, two requests were granted in full and 10 were granted in part. Eight requests were refused, three due to no relevant documents found, a further three due to legal professional privilege, and two due to documents being publicly available. Two requests were withdrawn. All requests were processed within required timeframes. No requests remain outstanding. Two further requests, received in 2010/11, were granted in full in 2011/12.

3. For the financial year 2012/13 to date (1 July 2011 to 15 October 2012), the total cost to the Authority to process FOI requests has been \$6,151.
4. For the financial year 2012/13 to date (1 July 2011 to 15 October 2012), the Authority received four FOI requests.

Of the four FOI requests, one request was granted in part and three requests were still being processed as at 30 September 2012. All requests were met within the processing times outlined in the FOI Act.

National Water Commission

1. See departmental answer for all portfolio agencies.
2. For the financial year 2011/12 the total cost to the National Water Commission (the Commission) to process FOI requests was \$3,951.

For the financial year 2011/12 the Commission received three FOI requests.

Of the three FOI requests, one was granted, one was denied and one request was withdrawn by the applicant. In relation to the denied request, the Commission held no documents within the scope of the request. All requests were met within the processing times outlined in the FOI Act. No requests remain outstanding.

3. There has been no cost to process FOI requests for the financial year to date.
4. The Commission has received no FOI requests for the financial year to date.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. See departmental answer for all portfolio agencies.
2. For the financial year 2011/12 the total cost to the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (the Trust) to process FOI requests was \$1,578.

For the financial year 2011/12 the Trust received one FOI request.

This request was granted in full. Due to an administrative oversight, but with the agreement of the applicant, this request was processed outside the specified timeframe. No requests remain outstanding.

3. There has been no cost to process FOI requests for the financial year to date.
4. The Trust has received no FOI requests for the financial year to date.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 258

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Government advertising 2011-12

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. What was the total cost of all advertising for 2011-12?
2. Is the advertising campaign or non-campaign advertising? Please provide details of each advertising, including the program the advertising was for, the total spend and the business that provided the advertising services.
3. Has the Department of Finance and Deregulation provided any advice about the advertising? Please provide details of each advertising item.
4. Has the Peer Review Group (PRG) and/or Independent Communications Committee (ICC) provided any advice about the advertising? Please provide details of each advertising item.
5. Did the advertising comply with the Guidelines on Information and Advertising Campaigns by Australian Government Departments and Agencies? Please provide the details for each advertising item.
6. Please provide details for any other communications program, including details of the program, the total spend and the business that provided the communication services, that was undertaken in 2011-12.

Answer:

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

1. \$1,120,275.
2. All advertising undertaken by the department during the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 was non-campaign advertising, including gazette and recruitment advertising, public information notices, request for tenders and expressions of interest.
3. The total expenditure includes advertising for the Water Efficiency Labelling (WELS) Scheme. Whilst such advertising was classified as operational by the Department of Finance and Deregulation (in its determination on 4 June 2010), it falls within the scope of the *Guidelines on information and advertising campaigns by Australian Government departments and agencies (March 2010)* and is listed in the 2011/12 annual report as campaign advertising.

4. No advice has been provided other than that outlined above.
5. No.
6. Yes, as outlined in the response to question 2.

Communication strategies are developed for each communication program and may include activities such as websites, publications, events, advertising, public relations and media liaison. These activities are not campaign advertising and are undertaken as part of broader stakeholder engagement to communicate the department's policies and programs.

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

Departmental expenditure on communication related activities for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 was \$922,773.93.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. \$146,776.
2. Non-campaign.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.

Director of National Parks

1. \$75,973.95.
2. The amount provided at question 1 is for non-campaign advertising. The Director of National Parks primarily uses the Australian Government non-campaign central advertising system provider, AdCorp to place its advertisements, but may directly place advertisements in local newspapers where AdCorp does not provide this service.

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

3. No.
4. No.
5. Not applicable.

6. The Director of National Parks utilises the department's panel arrangements for creative and printing services which are managed by the Department of Human Services. The communication activities are procured from various suppliers through this centralised arrangement. For the purpose of this response 'communications program' is defined as: the communication of a government message to the public, possibly by advertising (print, television, radio etcetera), possibly through the erection of signs, plaques etcetera, or through other mediums. Director of National Parks expenditure on communication related activities for the period 2011/12 was \$245,679.63.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)

1. \$559,562.
2. Non-campaign. The major components of the above advertising are noted below. Other smaller runs for individual activities were also supported with advertising but are not detailed here.

Improving the Outlook (Phase II): \$245,790

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

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

Zoning education: \$49,424

Non-campaign advertising was undertaken to raise awareness of the zoning rules in place in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. Mainstream television, press and radio advertisements ran during 2011/12.

Artwork was prepared in-house for these and the bookings were made through relevant suppliers.

Promotion of Reef HQ Aquarium: \$75,535

A range of advertising was undertaken for Reef HQ to promote its holiday programs and attractions, including mainstream and niche media.

Recruitment: \$39,131 (Adcorp)

Sea Country Grants Program: \$18,589 (Adcorp)

LMAC Committee recruitment: \$4,160 (Adcorp)

Reef Guardians: \$15,000 (QSIA Magazine)

Non-campaign advertising in *Queensland Seafood Magazine* advertising about the threats to the Great Barrier Reef and the Reef Guardian stewardship program participants who are undertaking environmental activities.

Other advertising was also placed to support operational activities such as 'order to remove' notice for public moorings, call for nominations for Local Marine Advisory Committees, advertising on consultation on the draft terms of reference for the Strategic Assessment, proposed plans of management, strategies etcetera.

3. Yes. The GBRMPA Communications Section sought guidance on *Improving the Outlook (phase two)* from the Department of Finance and Deregulation.
4. No.
5. Advice was sought on the *Improving the Outlook (phase two)* advertising, the major advertising program for 2011/12, to ensure it complied with relevant advertising requirements.
6. Included in the above overall advertising amount is advertising to support operational activities.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (the Authority)

1. \$157,181.
2. In 2011/12 Adcorp Australia Limited provided media placement services for non-campaign advertising. The majority of the costs related to advertising for:
 - information about public meetings related to the proposed Basin Plan;
 - seeking expression of interest for appointment to the Basin Community Committee; and
 - general recruitment.

The Authority did not undertake any campaign advertising (that is, \$250,000 or more, as defined in the Australian Government Advertising Guidelines), during 2011/12.

3. No.
4. Not applicable.
5. Not applicable.
6. No other communications program was undertaken in 2011/12.

National Water Commission

1. \$1,252.
2. Non-campaign.
3. No
4. No.
5. Yes.
6. Not applicable.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust

1. \$196,040.60
2. Non-campaign advertising. See **Attachment A** for detailed breakdown of advertising spend. 2011/12 advertising included advertising for tenders, general advertising of Sydney Harbour sites across community, metro and national publications and websites, advertising for Cockatoo Island Events, and advertising accommodation offerings across Cockatoo Island and Naval Cottages in Mosman.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Yes. Please see below breakdown (**Attachment A**).
6. Not applicable.

ATTACHMENT A

Details	FY1112
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd Commercial Standard Subscription - September 2012	
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd-Commercial Standard Subscription - Oct 2012	
Adcorp Australian Limited-Advertising - NH Childcare Centre EOI	\$ 4,013.32
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd Commercial Standard Subscription, April 2012	\$ 115.68
Invermay Investment P/L ATF The Invermay Investme - Advertising accommodation	\$ 731.82
Stayz Pty Ltd - Annual listing fee	\$ 149.09
Stayz Pty Ltd - Booking fee	\$ 999.45
Stayz Pty Ltd - Booking Fee - Nov	\$ 126.36
Stayz Pty Ltd -Fee for June 11	\$ 576.18
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd Commercial Standard Subscription, April 2012	\$ 115.68
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd Commercial Standard Subscription - February 2012	\$ 462.73
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd Commercial Standard Subscription - January 2012	\$ 462.73
Adcorp Australian Limited-Mosman Daily - MH Leasing EOI	\$ 1,325.11
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd Commercial Standard Subscription, April 2012	\$ 231.36
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - T1446 Emergency lighting	\$ 1,706.48
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Public board meeting	\$ 1,706.48
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd - Commercial standard subscription	\$ 462.73
Nationwide News Pty Ltd News advertisement	\$ 257.20
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Sydney Morning Herald Classifieds Saturday 9 June 2012 - Public Notices - Notice of Public Boa	\$ 1,594.79
ABG Pages Online advertising	
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Mosman Daily Thursday 23 August 2012 - Public Notices	
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Sydney Morning Heral Classified - Boating - 31 March 2012	\$ 1,651.63
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Sydney Morning Herald Classified Saturday 4 August 2012 - Tenders	
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - The Australian, Tuesday 10 July 2012 - Public Notices	
Adcorp Australian Limited Sydney Morning Herald Classified - Saturday 14 April 2012 - Tenders	\$ 1,653.55
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Australian; Australian Financial Review & Sydney Morning Herald Classified - Wednesday 6 Jun	\$ 5,621.26
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - T1440 Sleeving tender CI	\$ 1,590.61
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Tender - 27/8/11	\$ 1,541.01
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Tender	\$ 2,383.43
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Sydney Morning Herald Classified - Tenders Saturday 11 February 2012.	
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Tenders	\$ 1,700.61
Adcorp Australian Limited-SMH - Wharf repair Tender T1444	\$ 2,383.43
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Sydney Morning Herald Classified, Wednesday 6 June 2012 - Tenders	\$ 1,362.23
Adcorp Australian Limited - Tenders (modules) SMH 5.9.12	
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Request for Tender	\$ 2,438.43
Adcorp Australian Limited-Advertising - NH Childcare Centre EOI	\$ 4,013.32
Adcorp Australian Limited-Mosman Daily - MH Leasing EOI	\$ 1,325.11
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Proposed Development Aerial Adventure Park	\$ 1,651.00
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd - Subscription HWUPUM Sep and Aug	\$ 671.82
Hunters Hill Council - Hunters Hill 150th anniversary program advertising	\$ 450.00
Where Publishing Pty Ltd Half page ad - 2012 Northern Beaches Visitor's Guide	\$ 400.00
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - North Head Sanctuary - Proposed Development	\$ 627.05
Faircount Media Asia Pty Limited Quarter page advertisement Navy Outlook 2013	
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd Commercial Standard Subscription May 2012	\$ 498.62
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd-Commercial Standard Subscription	\$ 462.73
Manly Chamber of Commerce My Manly Plan Campaign - Winter 2012	\$ 750.00
Adcorp Australian Limited-Advertising fro Multiple outlets for outpost	\$ 69,405.95
Adcorp Australian Limited-Dailly Telegraph - Outpost	\$ 5,672.00
JC Decaux Australia Pty Ltd (ACN 078 716 793)-JC Decaux - providing advertising coverage in pedestrian and major traffic network	\$ 58,020.00
Present Company Pty Ltd. Facebook media buy and management fee covering the dates 19th September to 18th December 2011	\$ 5,000.00
Present Company Pty Ltd-Additional Facebook Media Units - Ouypost project - 11/10/11 to 2/12/11	\$ 3,000.00
Showtime Marketing (Christopher Campbell T/A). Distribution of 150 Outpost posters into targeted sites around Sydney (Project	\$ 750.00
Faircount Media Asia Pty Limited Quarter page advertisement Navy Outlook 2013	\$ 179.62
Avant Card Pty Ltd-OutPost Project Promotions	\$ 4,800.00
Avant Card Pty Ltd-OutPost Project Promotions	\$ 1,000.00
TOTAL	\$ 196,040.60

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 259

Topic: Portfolio Wide – Government advertising financial year to date

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

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

Answer:

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

1. \$346,125.15.
2. Between 1 July 2012 and 24 September 2012 the department undertook both campaign and non-campaign advertising. The total spend on non-campaign advertising for the reporting period is \$169,804.70. This includes gazette and recruitment advertising, public information notices, request for tenders and expressions of interest.

The *Recreational Fishers* advertising was classed by the Department of Finance and Deregulation as campaign advertising, developed to provide information about the impacts of the final proposed Commonwealth marine reserves.

The total spend on the *Recreational Fishers* campaign advertising is \$176, 320.48.

3. Due to new guidelines prohibiting recruitment advertising in print media from 1 July 2012, waivers were sought from the Department of Finance and Deregulation to advertise hard to fill positions in print media: Antarctic Medical Practitioners and Station Leaders (13 July 2012); Antarctic Electricians (20 July 2012); Program Leader, Wildlife Conservation & Fisheries, Australian Antarctic Division (30 July 2012); and Antarctic Expeditioners (24 September 2012 and 27 October 2012).

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

4. The *Recreational Fishers* advertising campaign was not subject to review by the Peer Review Group (PRG) or Independent Communications Committee (ICC) because the total spend was less than \$250,000.
5. Yes.
6. Communication strategies are developed for each communication program and may include such activities as websites, publications, events, advertising, public relations and media liaison. These activities are not campaign advertising and are undertaken as part of broader stakeholder engagement to communicate the department's policies and programs.

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

Departmental expenditure on communication related activities for the period 1 July 2012 to 24 September 2012 was \$107,561.94.

7. The *Recreational Fishers* advertising campaign is expected to end in early December 2012. At the time of writing, there were no further campaign advertising activities planned for the department.

Bureau of Meteorology

1. Nil.
2. Non-campaign.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.
7. Not applicable.

Director of National Parks

1. \$13,572.59.
2. The amount provided at question 1 is for non-campaign advertising. The Director of National Parks primarily uses the Australian Government non-campaign central advertising system provider, AdCorp, to place its advertisements, but may directly place advertisements in local newspapers where AdCorp does not provide this service.

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

3. No.
4. No.
5. Not applicable.
6. The Director of National Parks utilises the department's panel arrangements for creative and printing services which are managed by the Department of Human Services. The communication activities are procured from various suppliers through this centralised arrangement. For the purpose of this response 'communications program' is defined as: the communication of a government message to the public, possibly by advertising (print, television, radio etcetera), possibly through the erection of signs, plaques etcetera, or through other mediums. Director of National Parks expenditure on communication related activities for the reporting period was \$33,123.52.
7. The Director of National Parks is not undertaking or planning to undertake any campaign advertising.

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

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

1. \$9,439.
2. Non-campaign. The major components of the above advertising are noted below. Other smaller runs for individual activities were also supported with advertising but are not detailed here.

Zoning education: \$673

Non-campaign advertising through *NQ Reef and Boat* magazine was undertaken to raise awareness of the zoning rules in place in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. Artwork was prepared in-house for these and the bookings were made through relevant suppliers.

Promotion of Reef HQ Aquarium: \$4,348

A range of promotional advertising was undertaken for Reef HQ, including mainstream and niche media. Advertising for the June–July school holidays was placed through Universal McCann. Promotional advertisements were placed with *In Townsville and Magnetic Island Magazine*.

Recruitment: \$2,079

Reef Guardians: \$1100 (QSIA Magazine)

Non campaign advertising in *Queensland Seafood Magazine* advertising about the threats to the Great Barrier Reef and the Reef Guardian stewardship program participants who are undertaking environmental activities.

Other advertising was also placed to support operational activities.

3. No.
4. No.
5. Not applicable.
6. Included in the above overall advertising amount is advertising to support operational activities.
7. Zoning advertising will continue in 2012/13. Reef HQ will continue publicising its holiday programs and attractions. Other advertising is subject to approval.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (the Authority)

1. \$3,049.
2. Non-Campaign.
3. No.
4. Not applicable.
5. Not applicable.
6. No other communications program has been undertaken in 2012/13.
7. The Authority currently has no plans for any major spend on campaign advertising. The only non-campaign advertising planned is in relation to recruitment advertising.

National Water Commission

1. \$2,000.
2. Non-campaign.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Yes.

6. Not applicable.
7. At the time of writing there were no campaign, non-campaign or communication activities being undertaken or planned.

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (the Trust)

1. \$12,058.03.
2. Non-campaign advertising. See **Attachment A** for detailed breakdown of advertising spend. 2012/13 advertising to date includes advertising for tenders, general advertising across community, metro and national publications and websites, advertising accommodation offerings across Cockatoo Island and Naval Cottages in Mosman.
3. No.
4. No.
5. Yes. Please see below breakdown (**Attachment A**).
6. Not applicable.
7. The Trust is planning to undertake the following non-campaign advertising and communications:
 - Harbour Trust tender advertising.
 - Cockatoo Island accommodation advertising.
 - Cockatoo Island event advertising.
 - North Head tourism advertising.
 - Public relations and media activities.
 - Online advertising – social media, e-newsletters.
 - Brochures and collateral.

ATTACHMENT A

Details	FY1213
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd Commercial Standard Subscription - September 2012	\$ 509.09
Realestate.com.au Pty Ltd-Commercial Standard Subscription - Oct 2012	\$ 509.09
ABG Pages Online advertising	\$ 818.14
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Mosman Daily Thursday 23 August 2012 - Public Notices	\$ 514.25
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Sydney Morning Herald Classified Saturday 4 August 2012 - Tenders	\$ 1,653.55
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - The Australian, Tuesday 10 July 2012 - Public Notices	\$ 171.60
Adcorp Australian Limited Media - Sydney Morning Herald Classified - Tenders Saturday 11 February 2012	\$ 2,502.33
Adcorp Australian Limited - Tenders (modules) SMH 5.9.12	\$ 2,379.98
Faircount Media Asia Pty Limited Quarter page advertisement Navy Outlook 2013	\$ 3,000.00
TOTAL	\$ 12,058.03

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 260

Topic: Portfolio Wide – legal costs

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for 2011-12? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
2. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for 2011-12 from the Australian Government Solicitor? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
3. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for 2011-12 from private firms? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
4. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for 2011-12 from other sources? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
5. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services for this financial year to date within the department/agency? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
6. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from the Australian Government Solicitor? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
7. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from private firms? Please provide a list of each service and costs.
8. What sum did each portfolio department and agency spend on legal services this financial year to date from other sources? Please provide a list of each service and costs.

Answer:

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

Information about the legal services expenditure for the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department), the Director of National Parks, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, the National Water Commission and the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust for 2011/12 is available in the Legal Services Expenditure Reports for the department and those portfolio agencies. By way of summary, this information is outlined below along with information for the remainder of the portfolio agencies.

1. The total legal services expenditure during 2011/12 for the department and portfolio agencies is set out in the table below.

Department/Agency	Total Legal Services Expenditure for the portfolio from 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 (GST inclusive)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	\$12,429,880.54
Director of National Parks	\$496,971.54
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	\$2,047,971.79
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	\$1,027,575.56
National Water Commission	\$38,865.78
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	\$264,251.60
Bureau of Meteorology	\$543,317.00

2. The amounts spent on legal services from the Australian Government Solicitor by the department and portfolio agencies in 2011/12 are set out in the table below.

Department/Agency	Total amount spent by the portfolio on legal services from the Australian Government Solicitor from 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 (GST inclusive)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	\$3,717,215.99
Director of National Parks	\$65,740.74
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	\$985,790.14
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	\$206,693.58
National Water Commission	\$38,804.29
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	\$17,873.90
Bureau of Meteorology	\$153,772.00

3. The total amount spent on legal services from private firms in 2011/12, by the department and portfolio agencies is set out in the table below.

Department/Agency	Total amount spent by the portfolio on legal services from private firms from 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 (GST inclusive)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	\$4,274,017.00
Director of National Parks	nil
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	\$176,152.47
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	nil
National Water Commission	nil
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	\$200,360.89
Bureau of Meteorology	\$82,761.00

4. The total amount spent on legal services from other sources in 2011/12, by the department and portfolio agencies is set out in the table below.

Department/Agency	Description of other source	Total amount spent by the portfolio on legal services from private firms from 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 (GST inclusive)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	Briefs to counsel	\$201,255.78
Director of National Parks	Not applicable	nil
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	Attorney General's Department (Office of International Law)	\$8,934.79
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	Briefs to counsel	\$43,111.00
National Water Commission	Not applicable	nil
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	Briefs to counsel	\$34,292.50
Bureau of Meteorology	Not applicable	nil

5. The amount spent on legal services within the department and portfolio agencies for this financial year to date is set out in the table below. These are generally the staffing costs of the internal legal section for each agency.

Department/Agency	Total amount spent on legal services within the portfolio from 1 July 2012 to approximately 9 November 2012 (GST inclusive)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	\$591,724.73
Director of National Parks	\$104,002.99
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	\$106,299.00*
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	\$203,606.00
National Water Commission	nil
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	\$30,454.00
Bureau of Meteorology	\$155,015.00

* figures for the Murray-Darling Basin Authority are from 1 July 2012 until 30 September 2012.

6. The amount spent on legal services from the Australian Government Solicitor by the department and portfolio agencies this financial year to date is set out in the table below.

Department/Agency	Total amount spent on legal services from the Australian Government Solicitor from 1 July 2012 to 9 November 2012 (GST inclusive)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	\$1,221,034.50
Director of National Parks	\$54,188.08
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	\$81,631.34*
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	\$18,165.00
National Water Commission	nil
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	\$820.00
Bureau of Meteorology	\$93,646.00

* figures for the Murray-Darling Basin Authority are from 1 July 2012 until 30 September 2012.

7. The amount spent on legal services from private firms this financial year to date by the department is set out in the table below.

Firm	Total amount spent on legal services from 1 July 2012 to 1 November 2012 (GST inclusive)
Sparke Helmore Lawyers	\$13,281.52
Maddocks Lawyers	\$57,880.08
Ashurst Australia	\$16,095.40
Clayton Utz	\$183,044.50
Minter Ellison	\$94,580.34
DLA Piper	\$1,729.20
Norton Rose	\$180,968.70

The amount spent on legal services from private firms this financial year to date by portfolio agencies is set out in the table below.

Department/Agency	Total amount spent on legal services from private firms from 1 July 2012 to approx November 2012 (GST inclusive)
Director of National Parks	nil
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	nil
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	nil
National Water Commission	nil
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	\$29,634.00
Bureau of Meteorology	\$12,224.00

8. The total amount spent on legal services this financial year to date from other sources by the department and portfolio agencies is set out in the table below.

Department/Agency	Total amount spent on legal services from other sources from 1 July 2012 to November 2012 (GST inclusive)
Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities	\$103,554.18
Director of National Parks	nil
Murray-Darling Basin Authority	nil
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority	\$270
National Water Commission	nil
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust	nil
Bureau of Meteorology	nil

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 261

Topic: Portfolio Wide – media and communications staff

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following, by department or agency:
 - a. How many ongoing staff, the classification, the type of work they undertake and their location.
 - b. How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location.
 - c. How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location.

Answer:

- 1a. Departmental and agency communications (ongoing/non-ongoing/contractors) staff provide a range of internal and external communications services.

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

The following figures are expressed as full time equivalent ongoing staff and are current as at November 2012.

Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) (Canberra): 40

Senior Public Affairs Director Grade 2 (SPAO 2):	3
Senior Public Affairs Director Grade 1 (SPAO 1):	5
Public Affairs Officer Grade 3 (PAO 3):	18
Public Affairs Officer Grade 2 (PAO 2):	10

Public Affairs Officer Grade 1 (PAO 1): 4

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 4

PAO 3: 1

PAO 2: 1

APS 6: 2

Parks Australia (Canberra): 3

SPAO 1: 1

PAO 3: 1

PAO 2: 1

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 6

EL 2: 1

EL 1: 1

APS 6: 1

APS 5: 2

APS 2: 1

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 16

EL 2: 2

EL 1: 8

APS 6: 2

APS 5: 3

APS 4: 1

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 0

Nil.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 6

EL 2: 1

EL 1: 4

APS 6: 1

National Water Commission (Canberra): 2

EL 2: 1

PAO 3: 1

1b. See 1a.

The following figures are expressed as full time equivalent non-ongoing staff as at November 2012.

The Department (Canberra): 2

PAO 2: 2

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 1

APS 4: 1

Parks Australia (Canberra): 1

APS 6: 1

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 0

Nil.

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 6

EL 2: 2

EL 1: 2

APS 5: 2

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 1

APS 6: 1

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 1

APS 6: 1

National Water Commission (Canberra): 0

Nil.

1c. See 1a.

The following figures are expressed as contractors and are current as of November 2012

The Department (Canberra): 0.

Australian Antarctic Division (Tasmania): 0.

Parks Australia (Canberra): 0.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Townsville): 0.

Bureau of Meteorology (Melbourne): 3

EL 1: 1

APS 5: 2

Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Sydney): 0.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (Canberra): 0.

National Water Commission (Canberra): 0.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 262

Topic: Portfolio Wide – media monitoring

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. What is the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etc provided to the Minister's office for this financial year to date?
 - a. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - b. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2012-13?
 - c. What has been spent providing these services this financial year to date?
2. What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etc provided to the department/agency for this financial year to date?
 - a. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - b. What is the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2012-13?
 - c. What has been spent providing these services this financial year to date?
 - d. Media Monitoring
3. What was the actual total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etc provided to the Minister's office for 2011-12?
 - a. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - b. What was the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2011-12?
4. What was the actual total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etc provided to the department/agency for 2011-12?
 - a. Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - b. What was the estimated budget to provide these services for the year 2011-12?
 - c. Social Media

Answer:

1. The cost of the media monitoring services provided to the Minister's office is nil. The Minister's office uses the departmental media monitoring service.
 - a. Australian Associated Press Pty Ltd.
 - b. There is no additional cost for the Minister's Office as the department operates with a single account.
 - c. There is no additional cost for the Minister's Office as the department operates with a single account.
2. \$127,482 GST exclusive (as at the end of October 2012).
 - a. Australian Associated Press.
 - b. \$450,000 GST exclusive.
 - c. \$127,482 GST exclusive (as at the end of October).
 - d. The cost of media monitoring services provided to the Minister's office is nil. The Minister's office uses the departmental media monitoring service.
 - a. Australian Associated Press Pty Ltd.
 - b. There is no additional cost for the Minister's Office as the department operates with a single account.
5. \$381,340 GST exclusive.
 - a. Australian Associated Press.
 - b. \$450,000 GST exclusive.
 - c. Nil.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 263

Topic: Portfolio Wide – media training
financial year to date

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. In relation to media training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information for this financial year to date:
 - a. Total spending on these services.
 - b. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification.
 - c. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification).
 - d. The names of all service providers engaged.
2. For each service purchased from a provider listed under (d), please provide:
 - i. The name and nature of the service purchased.
 - ii. Whether the service is one-on-one or group based.
 - iii. The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification).
 - iv. The total number of hours involved for all employees (please provide a breakdown for each employment classification).
 - v. The total amount spent on the service.
 - vi. A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package).
3. Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
 - a. The location used.
 - b. The number of employees who took part on each occasion.
 - c. The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification).
 - d. Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location.

Answer:

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

1. Media training services purchased by the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) this financial year to date:
 - a. \$8,294.
 - b. 11:
 - Four Executive Level 2 officers – two Principal Research Scientists and two Senior Research Scientists.
 - Five Executive Level 1 officers – one Operations Officer, three Research Scientists and one Engineer.
 - One Australian Public Service Level 6 – Research Scientist.
 - One Australian Public Service Level 5 (Acting Executive Level 1 officer) – Chemist.
 - c. 11, see answer above. No study leave was granted.
 - d. Econnect Communication.
2. The service purchased was:
 - i. Training scientists to interact with the media.
 - ii. Group based.
 - iii. 11:
 - Four Executive Level 2 officers – two Principal Research Scientists and two Senior Research Scientists.
 - Five Executive Level 1 officers – one Operations Officer, three Research Scientists and one Engineer.
 - One Australian Public Service Level 6 – Research Scientist.
 - One Australian Public Service Level 5 (Acting Executive Level 1 officer) – Chemist.
 - iv. 82.30 hours made up of one full day for each participant as listed above.
 - v. \$8,294.
 - vi. Complete package.
3. Ten employees attended training on departmental premises. One employee attended at an offsite location.
 - a. Melbourne Cafe - Conference centre.
 - b. One employee.
 - c. One full day for the employee.
 - d. Nil.

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

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question 264**
No:

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

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Have any briefings been provided to the Australian Greens? If yes, please include:
 - a. How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - b. What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - c. Have any briefings requests been unable to proceed? If yes, provided details details of what the briefings were and why it could not proceed.
 - d. How long is spent undertaking briefings for the Australian Greens? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Please provide a breakdown for each employment classification.
2. Were any briefings been provided to the Australian Greens in 2011-12? If yes, please include:
 - a. How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - b. What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - c. Have any briefings requests been unable to proceed? If yes, provided details of what the briefings were and why it could not proceed.
 - d. How long is spent undertaking briefings for the Australian Greens? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

Answer:

1. Yes. The Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) has provided briefing to the Australian Greens on one single occasion this financial year to date.
 - a. The briefing was requested by the Minister's Office.
 - b. The department attended a verbal briefing on the Alpha coal mine and rail project. Written copy was not required or provided.
 - c. No. This is the only request for briefing received by the department this financial year to date.

- d. One briefing of approximately one hour in length, involving one Executive Level 1 officer and one First Assistant Secretary.
2. Yes. The department provided briefing to the Australian Greens on four occasions during financial year 2011/12.
- a. On three occasions the work was requested through the Minister and Parliamentary Secretary's offices.

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

- b. The department has provided verbal briefings to the Australian Greens on four occasions this financial year to date. No written briefing was provided.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA)

- 1. The GBRMPA has not provided any briefings to the Australian Greens this financial year to date.
- 2. Yes. The GBRMPA has provided one verbal briefing to the Australian Greens during the financial year 2011/12.
 - a. The work was requested through the Minister's office.

- b. The GBRMPA provided a verbal briefing on the GBRMPA's assessments of the health and risks to the Great Barrier Reef.
- c. No. This was the only request for briefing received by the GBRMPA.
- d. The Chairman of the GBRMPA provided a one hour verbal briefing at Parliament House. An adviser to the Minister was also present.

Murray Darling Basin Authority (the Authority)

- 1. The Authority has not provided briefing to the Australian Greens this financial year to date.
- 2. Yes. The Authority provided briefing to the Australian Greens on one occasion in 2011/12.
 - a. On 2 November 2011, Senator Hanson-Young was briefed by two officials from the Authority. The briefing was offered by the Authority in mid October to Senator Hanson-Young's office as part of the Authority's pre release briefing process and similar briefing offers were made to Senator Joyce, Senator Birmingham and Senator Xenophon.
 - b. The briefing was verbal only, no material was supplied.
 - c. No.
 - d. Two officials from the Authority, the Chief Executive and a principal advisor, provided a half hour verbal briefing.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 265

Topic: Portfolio Wide – provision of briefing to the Independents

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. Have any briefings been provided to Independents? If yes, please include:
 - a. How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - b. What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - c. Have any briefings requests been unable to proceed? If yes, provided details details of what the briefings were and why it could not proceed.
 - d. How long is spent undertaken briefings for the Independents? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.
2. Were any briefings been provided to Independents in 2011-12? If yes, please include:
 - a. How are briefings requests commissioned?
 - b. What briefings have been undertaken? Provide details and a copy of each briefing.
 - c. Have any briefings requests been unable to proceed? If yes, provided details of what the briefings were and why it could not proceed.
 - d. How long is spent undertaking briefings for the Independents? How many staff are involved and how many hours? Provide a breakdown for each employment classification.

Answer:

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

1. Yes. The Office of Water Science in the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) provided two briefings to the Member for New England, Mr Tony Windsor MP, and his office.
 - a. Two briefings were commissioned through a request from Mr Windsor's office via the office of the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities.

- b. Verbal briefings were provided to Mr Windsor and his office in a face-to face meeting on 27 September 2012 and via a teleconference on 3 October 2012. The briefings related to the NSW Government's Strategic Land Use Policy and its interaction with the New South Wales Protocol that is required under the National Partnership Agreement on Coal Seam Gas and Large Coal Mining Development.
- c. No. These were the only requests for briefing received by the department.
- d. The face-to face meeting on 27 September 2012 involved preparation time of two hours for one Executive Level 2 officer, the presentation lasted one hour each for two Senior Executive Service officers and one Executive Level 2 officer.

The teleconference on 3 October 2012 involved preparation time of two hours for one Executive Level 2 officer, the presentation lasted one hour each for two Senior Executive Service officers and two Executive Level 2 officers.

2. Yes. Briefing was provided to the Independents on three occasions in 2011/12.

- a. On one occasion, the briefing was requested through the Minister's Office. On the second occasion, the briefing was requested by Mr Windsor's office.

The third briefing was at the request of the office of the Parliamentary Secretary for Sustainability and Urban Water, Senator the Hon Don Farrell.

- b. The department provided three verbal briefings to Mr Windsor's office. One briefing was on the progress of implementation of the department's Clean Energy Future measures. The second briefing was an update on the status of the Namoi Water Study.

The third briefing took place during the debate on the National Water Commission Amendment Bill 2012. Senator Farrell's office met with staff of Mr Windsor's office. On request from Senator Farrell's office, two departmental officers attended. No material was prepared.

- c. No. These were the only requests for briefing received by the department.
- d. The verbal briefing on the implementation of the department's Clean Energy Future measures was approximately one hour and involved two staff members, one First Assistant Secretary and one Assistant Secretary. The verbal briefing on the Namoi Water Study was approximately one hour and involved one staff member, a First Assistant Secretary.

The briefing in relation to the National Water Commission Amendment Bill 2012 lasted approximately 20 minutes and involved one Assistant Secretary and one Executive Level 2 officer. Both officers were already present to brief the Parliamentary Secretary on the same issue.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority

1. The Murray Darling Basin Authority (the Authority) has not provided briefing to the Independents this financial year to date.
2. Yes. The Authority provided briefing to the Independents on one occasion in 2011/12.
 - a. On 21 November 2011, a briefing was provided to Senator Xenophon as part of the Authority's pre release briefing process.
 - b. The briefing was verbal only, no material was supplied.
 - c. No.
 - d. One official from the Authority, the Chief Executive provided a half hour verbal briefing.

National Water Commission

1. The National Water Commission (the Commission) has not provided briefing to the Independents this financial year to date.
2. Yes. The Commission provided briefing to the Independents on one occasion in 2011/12.
 - a. An informal request from the office of the Member for Lyne, Mr Rob Oakeshott MP.
 - b. The information provided is included at **Attachment A**.
 - c. No. This was the only request for briefing received by the Commission.
 - d. No record was kept of the time taken to prepare the information.

The National Water Initiative (NWI)

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

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

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

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

Mining

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

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

Town water supply

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

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

- achieve improved pricing for metropolitan water.

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

Trade

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

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

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

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

Urban Water in Australia: Future directions

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

Australian Water Markets Report 2009-10

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

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 266

Topic: Portfolio Wide - reviews

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Birmingham asked:

For this financial year to date:

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

For 2011-12:

10. How many reviews were undertaken?
11. Which reviews have been concluded and when?
12. For each of those reviews that are still ongoing, when are they expected to be concluded?
13. Which of these reviews has been provided to Government?
14. Did the Government respond to all reviews within the timeframe? If not, why not?
15. What was the estimated cost of each of these reviews?
16. For any ongoing reviews, when will each of these reviews be concluded?

Answer:

Consolidated responses to questions one through sixteen are given in the tables below:

For this financial year to date:

Name of Review	Estimated completion date	Provided to Government	Government Response	Estimated cost
Mid-term Review of Phase 3 of the Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative (commenced June 2012).	December 2012.	Not yet provided.	A timetable for the Government response has not been established.	\$74,102.
Review of the Great Artesian Basin Co-ordinating Committee.	December 2012.	Not yet provided.	A timetable for the Government response has not been established.	\$79,192.
Independent Review of Australian Government Environmental Information Activity.	December 2012.	Proposed December 2012.	To be determined.	\$107,254.
The Review of the Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Exports and Imports) Act 1989 and its associated regulations.	First half 2013 (conclusion of the public phase of review).	To be determined.	To be determined.	\$44,400.

For 2011-12:

Name of Review	Provided to Government/Authority	Government Response	Estimated cost
Review of the National Water Commission.	Provided to Minister December 2011.	No formal government response required.	\$155,000.
Technical Audit of the 5th Kakadu National Park Management Plan.	May 2012.	No formal government response required.	\$35,327.
The future role of the National Park Forestry Zone in a sustainable forestry sector for Norfolk Island.	May 2012.	Consultations with key stakeholders are underway.	\$7,110.
Review of the Bureau of Meteorology's capacity to respond to future extreme weather and natural disaster events and to provide seasonal forecasting services.	December 2011.	The Government's initial response to the review was announced in the 2012-13 Budget including spending to maintain essential frontline weather and flood forecasters in 2012-13. The government has indicated the review's findings will be considered to determine the most appropriate way forward.	\$315,280.
Review of Caring for our Country.	December 2011.	<p><i>Report on the Review of the Caring for our Country Initiative</i> publicly released on 18 April 2012.</p> <p>Government agreed to a further five years of funding for Caring for our Country in the 2012-13 Budget.</p>	\$192,354.

<p>Science Review of the estimation of an Environmentally Sustainable Level of take for the Murray-Darling Basin.</p>	<p>Review provided to Murray-Darling Basin Authority November 2011.</p>	<p>No formal government response required.</p>	<p>\$200,000</p>
<p>Review of the Murray Darling Basin Authority's Socio-Economic impact Modelling.</p>	<p>Review provided to Murray-Darling Basin Authority June 2012.</p>	<p>No formal government response required.</p>	<p>\$22,000</p>

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question No:** 267

Topic: Extension of the role of the Supervising Scientist

Proof Hansard Page and Date 13

or Written Question: (16/10/12)

Senator Ludlam asked:

Senator LUDLAM: Minister, on notice: could the environment minister provide us an update as to the current status of discussions regarding the potential extension of Mr Hughes's role and that of his office to cover uranium mining operations nationally?

Senator Conroy: I will take that on notice and see what the minister would like to add.

Answer:

Under the *Environment Protection (Alligator Rivers Region) Act 1978*, one of the functions of the Supervising Scientist is to provide advice to the Environment Minister in the assessment and compliance monitoring of any uranium mining operations in the Alligator Rivers Region. In addition, the Supervising Scientist has the function of giving to the Minister, on the Minister's request, scientific and technical advice on environmental matters outside the Alligator Rivers Region.

It is currently standard practice for the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (the department) to seek the advice of the Supervising Scientist on all uranium mining proposals, and in ongoing compliance monitoring for approved projects, including those outside the Alligator Rivers Region.

In its response to recommendation 63 of the independent review of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (the EPBC Act), the Australian Government committed to provide certainty as to the ongoing role of the Supervising Scientist by amending the EPBC Act to formalise the current standard administrative practice. Accordingly, amendments are proposed to both the EPBC Act and the *Environment Protection (Alligator Rivers Region) Act 1978* to implement this commitment.

The department has been working closely with the Office of Parliamentary Counsel to draft the amendments. The timing of the introduction of the Bill is a matter for the Australian Government.

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

Program: Division or Agency: Corporate: PCD **Question 268**
No:

Topic: DSEWPaC – potential fraud investigation

Proof Hansard Page and Date Written

or Written Question:

Senator Joyce asked:

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

Answer:

Case 1 of 3

This matter relates to the attempted sale of material purported to be from an historic shipwreck and was referred to the Australian Federal Police due to allegations that the supporting documentation was a forgery that had used the Commonwealth crest. The most recent correspondence from the Australian Federal Police indicates that the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions is reviewing the matter. As at 19 November 2012, there has been no further update.

Case 2 of 3

This matter relates to alleged misappropriation of Indigenous Heritage Program grant funding. The matter was referred to the Australian Federal Police; however the Australian Federal Police did not accept the matter for investigation. Based on legal advice the matter has been referred to the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations with the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and the confiscated Assets Taskforce within the Attorney-General's Department. As at 19 November 2012, there has been no update as to progress.

Case 3 of 3

This matter relates to alleged misappropriation of Community Water Grant Program funding. The matter was referred to the Australian Federal Police; however the Australian Federal Police did not accept this matter for investigation. Legal advice was sought and advice dated 22 June 2012 is that there is limited reasonable prospect of recovering the funds.