

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	1
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Reef rescue - assessments		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	64 (9/2/10)		

**Senator IAN MACDONALD asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—All of the proposals were assessed against criteria in the 2009-10 business plan. I am really talking about the water management plan, as I understand it. How long did those assessments take and how many people were actually involved in those assessments?

**Ms Lauder**—I could not give you exact numbers of staff involved. We would have to take that on notice.

**Answers:**

The Reef Rescue program provides funding for water quality improvement projects, not water management plans as such. Reef Rescue projects were assessed as part of the integrated assessment of Queensland proposals under the 2009-10 Caring for our Country business plan. Records are not available of the actual time spent assessing the various sub-components. We estimate that eight staff (plus associated executive support) spent an average of 12 working days on the assessment of Queensland proposals.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	2
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts		
<b>Topic:</b>	Tilapia fish		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	66 (9/2/10)		

**Senator IAN MACDONALD asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—You are quite right; they were to Agriculture—rural and regional affairs. Tilapia is a huge problem. Is there any action being taken by the Commonwealth government to reduce tilapia infestation?

**Ms Colreavy**—I am afraid you would have to direct that to Agriculture. I am not aware of such programs.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD**—Unfortunately they usually say these programs are run by Environment, and it does seem to me that agriculture is taking less and less involvement in these sorts of Caring for our Country programs.

**Ms Colreavy**—We could take it on notice and I could talk to my agriculture colleagues to get an answer for you, if you like.

**Answer:**

The Australian Government contributes funding to the Invasive Animals CRC, which has two projects looking at the long-term options for managing Tilapia infestations. These are “Determining environmental and life-history vulnerabilities for management of Tilapia” and “Development of management strategies for control and eradication”. At completion these projects will make recommendations on appropriate management strategies for a range of scenarios.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	3
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Caring for our Country – Bilateral agreements		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	67 (9/2/10)		

**Senator SIEWERT asked:**

**Senator SIEWERT**—They are different to the sorts of bilaterals that were in existence previously where, for example, joint funding was required from the states for particular elements?

**Ms Colreavy**—Some of the requirements within the bilaterals are different from those under previous arrangements.

**Senator SIEWERT**—Is it possible to get copies of the bilaterals?

**Answer:**

Copies of bilateral agreements for Caring for our Country and previous programs are available on the web at [www.nrm.gov.au/publications/index.html#agreements](http://www.nrm.gov.au/publications/index.html#agreements).

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	4
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Tasmanian Freight Equalisation Scheme		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	73 (9/2/10)		

**Senator ABETZ asked:** I have just come from the estimates dealing with the Tasmanian Freight Equalisation Scheme and I forgot to ask whether the 600 fox scats that were imported into Tasmania, in fact, attracted freight equalisation scheme subsidies. Are you aware of whether that occurred? Are you aware that that has been alleged and, I understand, now confirmed?

**Dr Zammit**—No, I am not.

**Senator ABETZ**—And that, allegedly to keep tracker dogs up to speed, considerable money has been spent by the state department on this? I would imagine there is a huge cost associated with tracking a scat: making sure that it is placed down somewhere and then destroyed et cetera. It just seems a very cumbersome and very costly approach. Have you been provided with any confidential information from the state government that would suggest that any of the hundreds of baits that have been laid—and I do not know how many hundreds of baits there are—have resulted in a fox carcass being found?

**Dr Zammit**—I would have to take that on notice, because I do not know.

**Answer:**

The importation of scats would not be eligible for Tasmanian Freight Equalisation Scheme (TFES) and no claim under the TFES has been made or considered.

Since late 2007 fox scats have been imported into Tasmania by the Fox Eradication Branch of the Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment. The purpose of the importation of the scats was for training purposes for scat detector dogs. In excess of 600 scats have now been imported with the knowledge and approval of the State's Chief Veterinary Officer. The scats are imported through the post system and no freight forwarders or shipping firms are involved.

No fox carcasses have been found following baiting. Mainland experience shows that it is exceedingly rare to find a fox carcass, even after a successful round of baiting as measured by, for example, fox population surveys and stock losses. Broad-scale baiting remains the method which is consistently recommended by external eradication experts as the most appropriate and effective for the purposes of eradication.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	5
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Caring for our Country – 2009-10 projects		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator FISHER asked:**

1. How many approved projects funded under the 2009-10 Caring for our Country Business Plan that have commenced do not have the necessary planning, regulatory and other approvals, permits and permissions required?
2. What is the breakdown by state?

Under the projects funded for 2009-10:

3. How many jobs been created?
4. How many trees have been planted?

**Answers:**

- 1-2. Applicants developing proposals under the 2009-10 Caring for our Country business plan were required to certify on their application forms that they agreed to accept full responsibility for ensuring that all of the necessary planning, regulatory and other approvals, permits and permissions are obtained before commencing their proposals.
- 3-4. Caring for our Country does not operate as either an employment or tree-planting program, and general information on job creation and tree-planting associated with Caring for our Country is not collected.

However, various investments under Caring for our Country have incorporated an employment component, including the Australian Government's commitment to employ an additional 300 Indigenous Rangers in the first five years of Caring for our Country.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	6
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts		
<b>Topic:</b>	Caring for our Country		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator FISHER asked:**

1. Have any jobs been lost from Landcare and natural resource management groups since the implementation of the Caring for Our Country program?
2. What percentage of funding has gone to Catchment Management Authorities compared to grass-roots community groups?
3. Have there been any complaints or concerns registered about the Government's method of funding from any of the groups involved?
4. What steps have been taken to improve transparency and accountability since the implementation of the Caring for Our Country program?

**Answers:**

1. Landcare and natural resource management groups receive funding from a range of sources including the Australian, state and territory governments as well as investment secured from private corporations, philanthropic bodies and in some cases, banks. As the Australian Government is not solely responsible for providing funds to employ staff in Landcare and natural resource management groups, it does not have access to specific details relating to employment in these groups.
2. Regional Natural Resource Management (NRM) organisations, also known as Catchment Management Authorities in some states, will receive 79 per cent of multi-year funding approved (as at 23 February 2010) under the 2009-10 business plan.
  - 64 per cent of the funding approved is provided as regional base-level funding to the regional NRM organisations,
  - 15 per cent of the funding approved to these organisations was through the open, competitive funding process.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

Grass-roots community groups have been successful in receiving 6 per cent of the multi-year funding approved through the 2009-10 business plan.

A summary table is provided below showing the proportion of funds approved, as at 23 February 2010, through the 2009-10 business plan for base-level funding to regional NRM organisations, open competitive funding to regional NRM organisations, and to grass roots community groups.

	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>
Base level funding to Regional NRM orgs	64%	68%	51%	66%
Open competitive funding to Regional NRM orgs	16%	16%	20%	1%
Open competitive funding for grass roots community groups	7%	6%	7%	8%

It is expected that additional funding for grass roots community groups may be provided in 2009-10 as part of future approvals. Regional NRM organisations are expected to support community involvement in natural resource management. Accordingly, many regional NRM organisations provide a proportion of their base-level funding to grass roots community groups through devolved grants and other mechanisms.

3. The majority of payments made under the Caring for our Country initiative are made via an electronic transfer to the recipient's nominated bank account. This method of funding has received support from grant recipients as it results in significant time improvements in comparison to cheques being issued and mailed out.
4. The Government is committed to enhancing arrangements for Caring for our Country, including through improved transparency and accountability arrangements. Consultations with key stakeholders and responses to an on-line survey provided feedback on target areas. The Government has already responded to this feedback in the 2010-11 business plan through improvements to targets, greater clarity of funding available and by offering a range of investment approaches to applicants.

In May 2009 a Caring for our Country Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Improvement (MERI) Strategy was released which supports Australian Government requirements for accountability and transparency in the expenditure of public funds through reporting by outcomes. A Caring for our Country report card will be issued for each financial year of the initiative to communicate Caring for our Country's progress to the Australian public.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	7
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Stirling Coastcare Group		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator EGGLESTON asked:**

I refer to the article in the Stirling Times on 26/01/2010 regarding the \$20,000 boost for Stirling coastcare group.

I ask the following questions.

1. What persons are authorised to act as representatives for the government and present grants to community groups or projects?
2. Is it not the practice that all grants be presented by a Member of Parliament or Senator representing the relevant Minister or, if such persons are not available, a representative of the relevant government department?
3. Is it still the practice that endorsed candidates for political parties who are not members of Parliament have no official status in representing the Government for the presentation of grants?
4. Why did Louise Durack, the endorsed Labor candidate for the House of Representatives seat of Stirling, present a cheque of \$20,000 to the Stirling Natural Environment Coastcare under the Caring for Our Country program?

**Answers:**

- 1-3. It is government practice that government grants to community groups or projects are announced by a Minister or Parliamentary Secretary, a Member of Parliament or Senator representing the relevant Minister or, if such persons are not available, a representative of the relevant government department.
4. Louise Durack did not present a cheque to Stirling Natural Environment Coastcare on behalf of the Caring for our Country program. The Department will release funding of \$19,728 (excl GST) directly to Stirling Environment Coastcare for the Caring for our Country 2009-10 Community Action Grants project on acceptance of a signed funding deed.



**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	8
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Caring for our country – NRS grants		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator SIEWERT asked:**

1. How many grants have been agreed respectively with the governments of the priority states of Queensland, Western Australia, NSW and the Northern Territory and also with the non-government sector?
2. Are any grants for new protected areas outside of these target bioregions being made because the biodiversity values there are still high priority for protection, because priority states have not taken up national reserve system program, or because of changes in administration or a mixture of all these factors?
3. What is the cumulative area in hectares of all grant applications that exceeded the available budget allocation that nevertheless meet all Caring for Country criteria, in particular that they fall in the under-represented bioregions, for respectively a) NRS program grants or b) Indigenous Protected Areas program grants.

**Answers:**

1. The following response refers to grants for new protected area purchases in the 2009/10 financial year that have executed funding deeds as of 27 February 2010:

Queensland	3
Western Australia	3
New South Wales	0
Northern Territory	0
Non-government sector	1
2. Yes. Under the Caring for our Country initiative the priority is to add land to the National Reserve System in under-represented bioregions that have less than 10% of their remaining area currently protected in reserves. Opportunities to add properties with high biodiversity values that contribute to building an adequate and representative network of reserves but which are outside these bioregions may also be considered.
3. All National Reserve System and Indigenous Protected Area applications which met all the Caring for Our Country criteria were offered funding.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

**Outcome:** 1 **Question No:** 9  
**Program:** 1.1  
**Division/Agency:** Australian Government Land and  
Coasts Division  
**Topic:** Caring for our Country – Covenants  
**Hansard Page ECA:** Written Question on Notice

**Senator SIEWERT asked:**

1. What dollar quantum of Caring for our Country funding committed to date, apart from NRS and IPA programs, flows towards bringing land under new conservation covenants or toward management of lands already under conservation covenants?
2. What is the total area of lands under conservation covenants benefiting from this funding?
3. What proportion of these covenanted lands are considered part of the National Reserve System?

**Answers:**

The following table indicates spending and total covenants areas in each State and Territory:

<b>State/Territory</b>	<b>Amount of non-NRS, non-IPA Caring for our Country funding spent on covenanting (\$) +</b>	<b>Area under covenants (hectares) using non-NRS, non-IPA Caring for our Country funds</b>	<b>Proportion of this area considered part of NRS (hectares)</b>
ACT	0	0	n/a
New South Wales	169,000	50	To be determined
Northern Territory <sup>^</sup>	319,335	To be determined	To be determined
Queensland	0	0	n/a
South Australia	0	0	n/a
Tasmania	117,000	347	300 (86%)
Victoria #	5,840,326	6,440	3260 (61%)
Western Australia*	649,500	750	To be determined
National project**	870,000	660	To be determined
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,965,161</b>	<b>8,247</b>	

+ May compare funding across different years in different jurisdictions.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

^ The Northern Territory project design did not establish a target area (ha) for anticipated covenants – sites needing protection will be identified, followed by the area of land to be covered by a covenant.

# Victorian figures include Caring for our Country funding provided to regional NRM organisations for developing management plans for new acquisitions, and funding approved for regional NRM organisations to provide to the Trust for Nature to seek new covenants on behalf of regional NRM organisations in Victoria.

\*Western Australia figures are for a three year Caring for our Country project; the funding details provided above are only approximate and relate to establishing at least 250ha of new covenants, plus improving management of existing covenants on approximately 500ha of private land. The three year funding breakdown for this component is approximated as follows:

- Yr 1 2009-10: \$129,900;
- Yr 2 2010-11: \$324,750
- Yr 3 2011-12: \$194,850

\*\*National project figures are for a Caring for our Country project which operates in NSW, Victoria and Tasmania.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	10
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Caring for our country – business plan 2010-11		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator SIEWERT asked:**

1. Why is the department's database out of date as indicated by Map 2.2.7 in the recently released Caring for our Country Business Plan January 2010-11?
2. How old is the data used in the Caring for our Country Business Plan January 2010-11?
3. What was the data source?
4. Does this data represent the data being used for all planning and assessment for Caring for our Country programs in Western Australia?
5. Does the department acknowledge that parks and nature reserves have been omitted in the Caring for our Country Business Plan January 2010-11?
6. If the answer to question 5 is Yes, what area in hectares in Western Australia does the omission of these parks and nature reserves represent?
7. If yes, will the department correct this?

**Answers:**

1. Map 2.2.7 on the Caring for our Country website showed indicative distributions of threatened ecological communities and species to provide additional information to proponents interested in addressing the increasing native habitat target. This map also showed the locations of protected areas to provide proponents with a broader indicative context for the development of their proposals under the native habitat target. Map 2.2.7 was not designed to support detailed analysis of issues relating to protected areas.

The information shown on Map 2.2.7 that related to threatened ecological communities and species was correct. The protected area locations shown on this map were based on information from the earlier Collaborative Australia Protected Area Database 2004 (CAPAD 04), rather than the Collaborative Australia Protected Area Database 2006 (CAPAD 06).

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

2. Information included in the Caring for our Country business plan and its associated documentation is derived from a range of information sources, and these sources and their production dates are explicitly referenced in the business plan and associated documentation.
3. The data sources for Map 2.2.7 published on the Department web site when the Business Plan was released included: CAPAD 2004, Australian Government information on Indigenous Protected Areas, species and threatened ecological communities mapped for the purposes of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*, and information on natural resource management (NRM) regions. The information on NRM regions and CAPAD was compiled through cooperative efforts with Western Australian Government agencies. Data for species and threatened ecological communities was drawn from a range of sources including data provided by Western Australian Government agencies.
4. Map 2.2.7 is intended to provide an indicative guide to applicants rather than a detailed basis for planning and assessment.
5. When first published Map 2.2.7 was based on CAPAD 04. It has since been updated with CAPAD 06 data. It therefore did not reflect the true extent of reserves.
6. Approximately 3,050,000 hectares was added to the national reserve system across Western Australia between the publication of CAPAD04 and CAPAD06.
7. Map 2.2.7 was revised using CAPAD 06 data and this revision was published on the Caring for our Country website on 26 February 2010.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	11
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Reef rescue		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator WORTLEY asked:**

1. Can you provide an overview on progress with Reef Rescue?
2. What response has there been from farmers?
3. How many farmers have signed contracts to change practices?
4. How many farmers are you expecting to sign up over the life of the program?
5. From the response to date, do you think there will be any difficulty getting enough farmers to sign up?
6. Which farm industry organisations have become involved?

**Answers:**

1. A summary of the progress of Reef Rescue is provided by component:

*- Water Quality Grants and Reef Partnerships*

To date the Australian Government has approved more than \$74 million in water quality improvement projects that provide farmers with grants and technical support to undertake on-farm activities to improve the quality of water entering the reef lagoon. We expect that at least 2700 farmers will receive grants to improve their farming techniques and the quality of water leaving their properties.

*- Research and Development*

In 2008-09, \$1.021 million was spent under the Reef Rescue Research and Development program on activities specifically required to support Reef Rescue implementation, including remote sensing data acquisition, the Reef Rescue Multiple Criteria Analysis and research and development projects in the Wet Tropics.

Ministers have approved a Reef Water Quality Research and Development Program budget of up to \$9 million over four years from 2009-10 to 2012-13, subject to suitable project proposals being received. Expressions of interest for Reef Rescue Research and Development projects closed on 15 February 2010. 56 applications were received totalling \$26,121,745.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

*- Monitoring and Reporting*

In 2008-09, \$3.945 million was spent under the Reef Rescue Water Quality Monitoring and Reporting program on the following activities:

- Reef Rescue Land Management Baseline Survey
- Catchment to Reef Integrated Monitoring Framework (including sampling equipment)
- Reef Rescue Marine Monitoring Program

Ministers have approved a further budget of \$15.2 million over four years from 2009-10 to 2012-13 for:

- marine monitoring, implemented by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, to monitor water quality and ecosystem health in the marine environment.
- plot- and paddock-scale monitoring and modelling of water quality and measurement of the direct outcomes of Reef Rescue investments at the farm scale. Funding will be provided to Reef regional National Resource Management (NRM) organisations, CSIRO, and the Queensland Departments of Environment and Resource Management and Employment, Economic Development and Innovation.

*- Indigenous Land and Sea Country Partnerships*

In 2008-09, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority received \$1 million to deliver the Reef Rescue Land and Sea Country Indigenous Partnerships program. Ministers have approved a further budget of \$3.35 million over two years (2009-10 to 2010-11) for continuation of this work. Indigenous communities are being supported to undertake sea country management activities. These include the development of Traditional Use of Marine Resource Agreements relating to the management of vulnerable species such as dugong and turtle and Indigenous training programs.

2. There has been an overwhelming and positive response to Reef Rescue by land managers. In 2008-09, more than 700 farmers across the sugar, grazing, horticulture, dairy, grains and cotton industries undertook on-farm activities to improve the quality of water entering the Reef lagoon. In 2009-10 to 2011-12 Reef Rescue delivery partners have been engaged to contract an additional 2000 farmers to undertake improvements to the ways in which their properties are managed.

This year additional funding has been provided to regional bodies in priority areas and for priority activities to help meet demands. Funds include:

- \$720,000 in the Wet Tropics region – to be delivered by Terrain NRM; and
- \$1.2 million in the Mackay Whitsunday region – to be delivered by Reef Catchments NRM

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

3. To date 1378 farmers have been contracted to change practices. The following table identifies the number of farmers that have been contracted by region, to date.

<b>NRM Region</b>	<b>No. of farmers with contracts to change practices (to date)</b>	
	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10*</b>
Cape York	4	0
Wet Tropics	128	139
Mackay Whitsunday	227	261
Burdekin Dry Tropics	70	78
Fitzroy Basin	155	25
Burnett Mary	178	113
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>762</b>	<b>616</b>

\* Note – this is a not a final figure for 2009-10 as contracts are still being negotiated.

4. We are expecting at least 3000 farmers to sign up to change practices over the five year period of Caring for our Country's Reef Rescue program.
5. No, as the Reef Rescue water quality grants are heavily over-subscribed. There has been an overwhelming response by the farming community to date and based on current interest levels, it is expected that the Caring for our Country targets for farmers and pastoralists will be met.
6. The industry organisations that have become involved in Reef Rescue are the peak agricultural industry organisations in Queensland across the sugar cane, horticulture, grazing, grains, dairy and cotton industries.

The following agricultural industry organisations were contracted under Reef Rescue:

- Canegrowers
- AgForce (grazing)
- Growcom (horticulture)
- Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation
- Cotton Australia
- Queensland Farmers' Federation.



**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1.1	<b>Question No:</b>	12
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Environmental Stewardship Program		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator WORTLEY asked:**

1. Can you give us an outline of where the Environmental Stewardship program is currently operating, the vegetation communities being targeted, and what uptake there has been in the farming community?
2. Are there plans to expand the program in 2010-11?

**Answers:**

1. Environmental Stewardship targets specific matters of National Environmental Significance under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* for which an improvement in their quality and extent can be achieved through the actions of private land managers. Environmental Stewardship is currently targeting the white box, yellow box and Blakely's red gum grassy woodland and derived grasslands (box gum grassy woodland) ecological community.

The most recent land manager tender round under the Box Gum Grassy Woodland Project is currently being run in the Lachlan, Murrumbidgee and Central West natural resource management (NRM) regions in NSW.

Previous tender rounds have been delivered in the Border Rivers-Gwydir, Namoi, Lachlan, Murrumbidgee, and Central West NRM regions of NSW and the Border Rivers Maranoa-Balonne, South East Queensland and Condamine NRM regions of Queensland. To date 148 land managers have been contracted to manage over 15,500 hectares. Contract negotiations are underway with a further 4 land managers.

2. In 2010-11 Environmental Stewardship will deliver two new projects. A New South Wales project will target:
  - white box, yellow box and Blakely's red gum grassy woodland and derived grasslands ecological community
  - natural grasslands on basalt and fine-textured alluvial plains of northern NSW and southern Queensland
  - weeping Myall woodlands.

A South Australian project will target:

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

- peppermint box (*Eucalyptus odorata*) grassy woodland of South Australia
- iron-grass natural temperate grassland of South Australia
- swamps of the Fleurieu Peninsula.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	13
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Caring for our Country business plan		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator WORTLEY asked:**

What were the main issues raised by stakeholders over the design of the Caring for our Country Business Plan, and how have they been responded to in the 2010-11 Business Plan?

**Answer:**

Extensive consultations on the design of the 2010-11 Caring for our Country business plan, including a review of the Caring for our Country targets, were conducted with stakeholders and the public in 2009. The major issues raised in these consultations were:

- The level of information provided to applicants in the business plan and from related sources could be improved.
- The rationale for the selection, or non-selection, of specific targets could be better explained.
- Some targets could be better defined.
- Particular matters, such as fisheries and marine issues, should be specifically included in the Caring for our Country targets.
- The Caring for our Country application process should be simplified.

The design of the 2010-11 Caring for our Country business plan application process and investment cycle was informed by these consultations. Significant changes include:

- The level of information provided in the business plan and related sources has been improved. For example, the business plan details the notional budgets available for each priority area, and application forms contain embedded links to further information likely to be required by applicants.
- The business plan identifies the rationale for the selection of all investment targets.
- Targets are better defined in relation to issues such as: the time periods in which they may be addressed; specific geographic locations where these are applicable (such as for critical aquatic ecosystems and coastal hotspots); and through clear advice to applicants on how particular investment targets will be supported.

- The targets for the sustainable practices priority area now include marine and fisheries issues. The sustainable practices targets no longer identify priority regions for investment, in order to provide broader opportunities for farmers and fishers across Australia. Two new Indigenous participation targets have been introduced.
- The introduction of new investment approaches that are better tailored to the needs of stakeholders and achieving Caring for our Country targets and outcomes. Open call investments will be the major investment stream under the 2010-11 business plan. In addition, the business plan incorporates new co-investment and expression of interest approaches that focus on specified and significant environmental, agriculture and fisheries issues.
- The Caring for our Country application process has been extensively redesigned. A streamlined, fully automated online application process is now available for the majority of Caring for our Country components (open call, regional base-level and sustainable practices expression of interest). The remaining components have electronic application forms available through the Caring for our Country website ([www.nrm.gov.au/business-plan/10-11/apply.html](http://www.nrm.gov.au/business-plan/10-11/apply.html).) Improved support arrangements have been developed, including embedded help functions in the online forms, and links to further information.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	14
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Community Water Grants		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator BIRMINGHAM asked:**

1. What was the budgeted expenditure for each area of Community Water Grants for 2009-10?
2. How much has been spent to date?

**Answers:**

1. The 2009-10 budgeted expenditure for the Community Water Grants program is \$1.7 million.
2. As of 1 March 2010, Community Water Grants expenditure for the 2009-10 financial year is \$760,000. Expenditure relates to 28 milestone payments for large grant projects from Rounds 2 and 3.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	15
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Community Coastcare program		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator BIRMINGHAM asked:**

1. How much of the \$100 million Community Coastcare program promised by Rudd Labor at the 2007 election has been expended?
2. How many individual projects have been funded? Please provide a breakdown of project numbers and funding by electorate.

**Answers:**

1. As at 31 December 2009 \$41.5 million has been committed under the Community Coastcare election commitment. Of this, \$29.926 million has been expended.
2. A total of 466 Community Coastcare projects have been approved. Attachment A provides a breakdown of the number of approved projects and total approved funding in 2008-09 and 2009-10 by electorate for Community Coastcare projects only. Please note that some of the on-ground or community engagement activities being undertaken by the approved projects cross over two or more electorates. These projects have been reported separately.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

**ATTACHMENT A**

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>No projects 2008 - 2010</b>	<b>Total Funding Approved 08-09</b>	<b>Total Funding Approved 09-10</b>
Banks	NSW	1	\$ 149,777.27	
Barker	SA	7	\$ 597,000.91	
Barton	NSW	1	\$ 23,090.91	
Bass	TAS	7	\$ 336,538.18	\$ 71,890.00
Berowra	NSW	1	\$ 26,554.55	
Blair	QLD	1	\$ 44,818.18	
Boothby	SA	2	\$ 16,090.91	
Bowman	QLD	4	\$ 114,149.09	
Braddon	TAS	10	\$ 650,523.17	
Brand	WA	1	\$ 39,943.82	
Brisbane	QLD	8	\$ 760,713.61	
Canning	NSW	1	\$ 188,092.73	
Canning	WA	3	\$ 275,398.18	
Capricornia	QLD	9	\$ 575,222.28	
Charlton	NSW	2	\$ 51,535.06	
Charlton	TAS	1	\$ 24,672.73	
Cook	NSW	7	\$ 543,363.28	
Corangamite	VIC	19	\$ 562,522.50	\$ 185,500.00
Corio	VIC	3	\$ 38,590.91	\$ 141,497.00
Cowper	NSW	13	\$ 427,510.39	
Cunningham	NSW	7	\$ 147,503.65	
Curtin	WA	2	\$ 32,097.22	
Dawson	QLD	6	\$ 538,535.00	
Denison	TAS	5	\$ 242,426.18	\$ 385,320.00
Dickson	QLD	1	\$ 11,412.00	
Dobell	NSW	1	\$ 45,454.55	
Dunkley	VIC	2	\$ 6,545.45	\$ 21,186.00
Eden-Monaro	NSW	7	\$ 269,603.31	
Fairfax	QLD	2	\$ 29,500.00	
Fisher	QLD	2	\$ 31,450.27	
Flinders	VIC	33	\$ 1,477,050.41	\$ 158,200.00
Flynn	QLD	1	\$ 42,818.18	
Forde	QLD	1	\$ 226,416.36	
Forrest	WA	16	\$ 1,492,274.59	
Franklin	TAS	8	\$ 165,459.92	\$ 20,400.23
Fremantle	WA	1	\$ 15,035.91	
Gellibrand	VIC	1	\$ 41,142.18	
Gilmore	NSW	17	\$ 1,059,430.95	
Gilmore	SA	1	\$ 5,748.00	
Gippsland	VIC	4	\$ 92,382.11	
Grayndler	NSW	1	\$ 41,989.73	

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>No projects 2008 - 2010</b>	<b>Total Funding Approved 08-09</b>	<b>Total Funding Approved 09-10</b>
Grey	SA	19	\$ 467,680.92	
Herbert	QLD	7	\$ 254,101.08	
Hinkler	QLD	9	\$ 569,636.98	
Hughes	NSW	1	\$ 9,090.91	
Kalgoorlie	NSW	1	\$ 227,272.73	
Kalgoorlie	WA	11	\$ 707,762.10	
Kennedy	QLD	6	\$ 447,944.55	
Kingsford Smith	NSW	5	\$ 234,842.73	
Kingston	SA	1	\$ 39,340.45	
Leichhardt	QLD	9	\$ 273,979.94	
Lingiari	NT	8	\$ 476,338.19	
Longman	QLD	1	\$ 184,904.55	
Lyne	NSW	6	\$ 310,423.17	
Lyons	TAS	10	\$ 434,403.10	\$ 196,350.00
Mackellar	NSW	7	\$ 238,734.64	
Mayo	SA	15	\$ 881,196.80	
Mcmillan	VIC	8	\$ 627,997.27	\$ 49,000.00
Melbourne	VIC	5	\$ 282,536.19	\$ 42,576.93
Melbourne Ports	VIC	3	\$ 74,055.73	
Newcastle	NSW	1	\$ 18,200.00	
O'Connor	WA	8	\$ 164,381.17	
Page	NSW	10	\$ 284,383.24	
Paterson	NSW	9	\$ 520,249.02	
Pearce	WA	1	\$ 1,136.37	
Petrie	QLD	2	\$ 247,616.95	
Richmond	NSW	8	\$ 378,769.01	
Robertson	NSW	10	\$ 249,997.11	
Shortland	NSW	1	\$ 25,713.45	
Solomon	NT	2	\$ 267,836.36	
Stirling	WA	1	\$ 10,082.00	
Sydney	NSW	7	\$ 584,526.64	
Throsby	NSW	4	\$ 74,063.27	
Wakefield	SA	2	\$ 147,129.09	
Wannon	VIC	6	\$ 299,508.75	
Warringah	NSW	1	\$ 12,951.82	
Wentworth	NSW	1	\$ 33,572.73	
Wide Bay	QLD	10	\$ 444,247.59	



**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

Electorate	Jurisdiction	No projects 2008 - 2010	Total Funding Approved 08-09	Total Funding Approved 09-10
<b>Multi-Electorate Projects within one jurisdiction</b>				
Bass and Lyons	TAS	1	\$ 180,600.00	
Blair and Fairfax	QLD	1	\$ 193,090.91	
Cook and Gilmore	NSW	1	\$ 23,636.36	
Cunningham and Eden-Monaro	NSW	1	\$ 144,818.18	
Fadden and Moncrieff	QLD	1	\$ 18,045.45	
Blaxland and Fowler	NSW	1	\$ 34,454.55	
Leichhardt, Blair	QLD	1	\$ 45,000.00	
Leichhardt and Kennedy	QLD	1	\$ 41,851.82	
Longman and Fisher	QLD	2	\$ 224,111.36	
Lyne and Paterson	NSW	1	\$ 126,722.73	
Lyons and Braddon	TAS	1	\$ 44,615.27	
Lyons and Franklin	TAS	1	\$ 22,795.45	
Mackellar and Warringah	NSW	1	\$ 31,818.18	
Mcmillan and Gippsland and Flinders	VIC	1	\$ 227,013.95	
Paterson and Page	NSW	1	\$ 23,669.09	
Watson and Barton	NSW	1	\$ 45,454.55	
Wide Bay and Fairfax	QLD	1	\$ 217,588.18	
Banks, Barton, Bennelong, Berowra, Blaxland, Bradfield, Charlton, Chifley, Cook, Cowper, Cunningham, Dobell, Eden-Monaro, Fowler, Fraser, Gilmore, Grayndler, Hughes, Kingsford-Smith, Lindsay, Lowe, Lyne, MacKellar, Mitchell, Newcastle, North Sydney, Page, Parramatta, Paterson, Prospect, Reid, Richmond, Robertson, Shortland, Sydney, Throsby, Warringah, Watson Wentworth and Werriwa	NSW	1	\$ 45,207.27	
Flinders, Gippsland and McMillan	VIC	1		\$ 93,600.00
Corangamite, Corio, Flinders, Gippsland, McMillan and Wannon,	VIC	1		\$ 1,761,500.00
Corangamite and Corio	VIC	1		\$ 385,786.00

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>No projects 2008 - 2010</b>	<b>Total Funding Approved 08-09</b>	<b>Total Funding Approved 09-10</b>
Barton, Cook, Grayndler, Kingsford Smith and Watson	NSW	1		\$ 1,580,000.00
Newcastle and Paterson	NSW	1		\$ 1,470,000.00
Bass, Braddon, Denison, Franklin and Lyons	TAS	1		\$ 48,230.00
<b>Multi-Electorate Projects across multiple jurisdictions</b>				
Corio and Mackellar	VIC and NSW	1	\$ 26,090.91	
Grey and McMillan	SA and VIC	1	\$ 208,510.00	
Banks, Barton, Bennelong, Berowra, Charlton, Cook, Cowper, Cunningham, Dobell, Eden-Monaro, Fraser, Gilmore, Grayndler, Hughes, Kingsford-Smith, Lowe, Lyne, MacKellar, Newcastle, North Sydney, Page, Paterson, Reid, Richmond, Robertson, Shortland, Sydney, Throsby, Warringah and Wentworth	NSW and ACT	1		\$ 3,457,394.00
Durack, Kennedy, Leichhardt, Lingiari and Solomon	WA, NT and QLD	1		\$ 2,400,000.00
Durack, Kennedy, Leichhardt, Lingiari and Solomon	WA, NT and QLD	1		\$ 2,800,000.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>466</b>	<b>\$ 23,892,085.44</b>	<b>\$ 15,268,430.16</b>
<b>Total Approved Funding 2008-09 and 2009-10</b>				<b>\$ 39,160,515.60</b>

*\*Please note*

*A further \$2.3 million was also approved under Coastcare (non community projects) for the following:*

- *\$2.0 million for the restoration of oil spill affected Moreton Bay Wetlands and coastal environments (\$1.5 million in 2008-09 and \$500,00 in 2009-10)*
- *\$300,000 in 2008-09 for Landcare Australia Limited to support coastal community engagement activities.*

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	16
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Indigenous Rangers – election commitment		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator BIRMINGHAM asked:**

1. How much of the \$90 million Indigenous Rangers program promised by Rudd Labor at the 2007 election has been expended?
2. How many have been trained and employed?
3. Please provide a breakdown of ranger numbers and funding by electorate.

**Answers:**

1. Of the 5 year \$90 million Indigenous Ranger Program commitment, \$89.3 million had been approved for expenditure as at 26 February 2010. Of this, \$46.3 million has been contracted and there has been expenditure of \$10.8 million.
2. 124 Indigenous rangers have been contracted for the 2009/2010 financial year. Additional rangers will come on stream as the program proceeds.
3. A breakdown of ranger numbers and funding by electorate is provided in the following table.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

Breakdown of Indigenous ranger numbers and funding by electorate.

<b>Electorate</b>	<b>Rangers currently contracted 2009/10</b>	<b>Approved Budget 2008-2013*</b>
Barker	N/A	\$3,111,600
Dennison	N/A	\$1,953,900
Grey	9	\$2,367,298
Hinkler	4	\$1,689,577
Kalgoorlie	22	\$21,450,700
Kennedy	15	\$6,777,660
Leichhardt	43	\$28,258,233
Lingiari	18	\$19,301,096
New England	4	\$1,693,500
Page	9	\$1,707,356
Wannon	N/A	\$1,034,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>\$89,345,420</b>

Note: Rangers have not yet been contracted against all approved future funding

\* Exact project boundaries may go across more than one electorate. Budgets have been allocated against head office locations.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	17
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	Great Barrier Reef Rescue Plan – Election commitment		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator BIRMINGHAM asked:**

1. How many grants have been issued under the \$146 million Water Quality Grants Scheme promised by Rudd Labor at the 2007 election as part of the Great Barrier Reef Rescue Plan?
2. What is the value of these grants?
3. How much of the \$10 million funding for Water Quality Research and Development promised by Rudd Labor at the 2007 election under the Great Barrier Reef rescue plan has been expended?
4. Please provide a breakdown of projects funded.

**Answers:**

1. As of February 2010, 1378 farmers have signed contracts and are receiving Reef Rescue funding to undertake projects and relevant training to improve water quality.
2. The value of these grants range from approximately \$10,000 to \$40,000. To date the Australian Government has approved more than \$74 million in Reef Rescue projects that provide farmers with grants and technical support to undertake on-farm activities to improve the quality of water entering the Reef lagoon. We expect these funds will engage at least 2700 farmers (including those contracted to date) in activities to improve water quality.
3. In 2008-09, \$1.021 million was spent under the Reef Rescue Research and Development program on activities specifically required to support Reef Rescue implementation.

Ministers have approved a Reef Water Quality Research and Development Program budget of up to \$9 million over four years from 2009-10 to 2012-13, subject to suitable project proposals being received. The program was announced in the 2010-11 Caring for our Country business plan, 56 expressions of interest have been received.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

4. In 2008-09 the following research projects were funded under the Reef Rescue Research and Development program:

a. Remote sensing data acquisition (\$0.25 million)

Delivered by Griffith University, this project reviewed the spatial data available for Cape York to identify information sources that would underpin research activities within the Normanby and Endeavour River catchments aimed at identifying geographical areas and processes responsible for sediment generation. Data obtained included high resolution satellite imagery, topography imagery and aerial photographic images, and organisation of all data in a database.

b. Reef Rescue multiple criteria analysis process (\$0.234 million)

This project involved the design, construction and application of a multiple criteria analysis model to help the Australian Government prioritise Reef regions for Reef Rescue investment. Using the model, regions with high asset value and/or threat levels and/or threat solvability were given high investment priority.

The model was developed by the CSIRO in collaboration with the Australian Government and the Bureau of Rural Sciences. The project involved working closely with Reef scientists and Reef Rescue stakeholders to obtain their input on issues to consider and data sets to use. The results of the process were used to inform and assess Reef Rescue funding proposals for 2009-10.

c. Terrain NRM research projects (\$0.303 million)

Terrain NRM were funded to conduct three single-year research projects that were considered to be a high priority for efficient Reef Rescue implementation in the Wet Tropics:

- Determination of fertiliser requirements in paw paw crops
- Further field evaluation of Nitrogen Replacement as a potential means of reducing fertiliser surplus in sugar cane
- Further development of Nitrogen Fixation as a potential means of reducing fertiliser application rates in sugar cane

d. Cape York regional investment (\$0.234 million)

Delivered by Cape York Sustainable Futures, this was a capacity building project, pending the outcomes of research to identify major sediment sources and potential intervention strategies. Activities included establishing partnerships, delivery of training, conducting farm risk assessments and delivery of water quality grants to land managers.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Outcome:</b>	1	<b>Question No:</b>	18
<b>Program:</b>	1.1		
<b>Division/Agency:</b>	Australian Government Land and Coasts Division		
<b>Topic:</b>	National Cane Toad Plan – election commitment		
<b>Hansard Page ECA:</b>	Written Question on Notice		

**Senator BIRMINGHAM asked:**

How much of the \$2 million National Cane Toad Plan promised by Rudd Labor at the 2007 election has been allocated and expended on Cane Toad projects? Please provide a breakdown of all projects funded and their value.

**Answer:**

A total of \$2,348,740 has been allocated to Cane Toad projects as outlined in the table attached. As at 1 March 2010, over \$1,790,000 has been paid to the proponents.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts  
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

**Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio**

Additional Estimates, February 2010

<b>Project</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>2008-09 (\$)</b>	<b>2009-10 (\$)</b>	<b>2010-11 (\$)</b>
Managing the Cane Toad Menace	Riyala Association Inc	94,909 (100%)	23,727 (100%)	
Toad Muster and Cane Toad	Stop the Toad Foundation Inc	120,218 (100%)	30,055 (100%)	
Zero Toads	Darwin City Council	86,418 (100%)		
Enabling northern quolls to survive the cane toads invasion	University of Sydney	220,286 (100%)		
Catering for the Kimberley: An Integrated Approach to monitoring Impact of cane toads on Native Animals	Australian National University	143,409 (100%)		
Stop the Invasion: Enhancing effectiveness of trapping to control toads	James Cook University	115,597 (100%)		
National Cane Toad Plan	Invasive Animals Ltd	66,000 (100%)		
The Humane Control of Cane Toads	Invasive Animals Ltd	34,201 (100%)		
Reclaiming our country and protecting biodiversity from the cane toad using people power	Stop the Toad Foundation Inc		204,000 (60%)	
Cane Toads in Northern Remote Australia and Ramsar Wetlands	Kimberley Toadbusters Inc		200,000 (60%)	
Reducing the impact of cane toads	University of Sydney		621,000 (60%)	
National Cane Toad Plan	DEWHA		10,000 (0%)	
Regional base-level funding allocated to toad projects			327,120 (60%)	51,800 (0%)
<b>Total (\$)</b>		<b>881,038</b>	<b>1,415,902</b>	<b>51,800</b>

Note: Table figures indicate the approved funding figure, the % indicates proportion paid as at 1 March 2010.