

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	1
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Australian Government Land & Coasts		
Topic:	Natural Heritage Trust		
Hansard Page ECITA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator Macdonald asked:

With regard to the response to question 25, which was asked in February Additional Estimates hearing:

“As I say, I would have an even money bet on your assessment as against the ANAOs....- could you indicate to me in actual dollar figures what the state governments in all of the states have contributed to the NHT,
(a) in cash terms and
(b) in –kind terms
and in relation to (b) could you indicate what in-kind work it was and who actually costed it? I will take your word that in the NAP they gave equal cash. You haven’t got those answers.”

In relation to part (b) could you provide the actual full list of all the in-kind work done.

Answer:

State and Territory Governments contributed a significant amount of cash and in-kind support to regional investment under the Natural Heritage Trust (NHT).

The Australian Government has been advised to date of at least \$638 million in in-kind contributions and \$79 million in cash contributions from all jurisdictions since the 2002-03 financial year. However, figures are not yet available in all jurisdictions for all financial years and the final total will be significantly higher. A state/territory and yearly breakdown is available in the attachment (Attachment A).

The type of in-kind work undertaken varies in each state. Examples include on ground work (such as revegetation, drainage, pest management baiting programs, and rearing and releasing of biological control agents), capacity building activities (such as providing education, increasing awareness, and providing access to information), administrative support, scientific support, and policy support.

In general, in-kind activities are identified following a request to state agencies and NRM bodies to identify projects which meet NHT objectives. The request is sent by the Joint Steering Committee (with equal representation from the Australian Government and the

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

relevant State/Territory). The Joint Steering Committee then determines which activities are suitable for in kind matching. Costings are done by the regional bodies or state agencies and in most cases returned to the Australian Government following state audit processes.

In South Australia, for example, state agencies and regional NRM bodies provide potential projects to the South Australian Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation. Projects considered to be suitable for state matching are then forwarded to the Australian Government for assessment. State agencies and regional NRM bodies provide the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation with quarterly financial reports for each project. The Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation then provides an audited financial acquittal certificate to the Australian Government identifying agreed matching funding investment.

Each state and territory has provided individual reports on their cash and/or in-kind matching contribution to the NHT. There was no standard national format for these reports, and so they were produced in a variety of styles and provide greatly different levels of information. The key objective in each case was to ensure that the requirements of their particular bilateral agreement were met. Some jurisdictions have provided evidence of in-kind contributions that greatly exceed the required level of matching. Others chose to report only to the required matching amount, even though they may have contributed significant amounts beyond this.

Examples of the types of reports received from each jurisdiction for 2005-06 are attached (Attachments B to I).

It is important to note that not all in-kind contributions listed in the attached reports have been formally accepted by the Australian Government as valid, however, in each case it has been accepted that the total matching contribution from the state or territory satisfies the terms of their bilateral agreement.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	62
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Australian Government Land & Coasts		
Topic:	Caring for our Country – World Heritage Funding		
Hansard Page ECITA:	102 (21 Oct)		

Senator Siewert asked:

Senator SIEWERT—Can you tell me how much funding was allocated under Caring for our Country against World Heritage? To save time, could you then table the projects that are being funded?

Ms Colreavy—Individual projects? I do not think I am able to do that at this stage because some of the projects that will be funded will be subject to proposals that have not yet been approved, so I might not be able to provide down to project level, but we have an overall budget for natural icons and World Heritage of \$14 million. That is not just for World Heritage, that is for a mix of activities.

Senator SIEWERT—How is that money going to be allocated against that expenditure item? In other words, how much is being allocated to World Heritage, how much is being allocated to icons and how are the decisions being made about those allegations?

Ms Colreavy—During the transition year 2008-09, ministers have taken a number of decisions about funding programs in order to maintain momentum and operations in the department. World Heritage sorts of activities subject to MOUs with state agencies for maintenance of World Heritage properties were quickly determined because there were existing commitments made for those. Other sorts of activities for which a decision had not already been taken needed to be weighed up against other competing priorities and decisions taken as to whether or not they would be funded. Proposals could be made from external proponents, say, through open grants as well, if that was seen as viable. I could go back to your question about budget allocation for particular areas and give you some level of detail at this stage.

Senator SIEWERT—That would be appreciated, thanks.

Answer:

\$71.8 million has been notionally allocated for ‘Natural icons and World Heritage’ under the Biodiversity and Natural Icons priority area for Caring for our Country over five years. In 2008-09, \$9.505 million has been approved to date under Caring for our Country for World Heritage projects. Table 1 below details approved expenditure on individual World Heritage projects.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Table 1: Approved expenditure under Caring for our Country for World Heritage projects in 2008-09

Project	Amount
World Heritage Area - Tasmanian Wilderness	\$3,400,000
World Heritage Area - Wet Tropics of Queensland	\$2,700,000
Activities in other World Heritage Areas	\$835,000
World Heritage Strategic Assessment for the Kimberly	\$350,000
World Heritage nomination for Ningaloo Reef	\$450,000
Macquarie Island Rabbit and Rodent Eradication Plan	\$1,770,000
Total	\$9,505,000

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	64
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Marine Budget – previous allocations		
Hansard Page ECITA:	103 (21 Oct)		

Senator SIEWERT asked:

Can you tell me how that relates to previous allocations, please.

Answer:

The 2008-09 funding was \$7,041,680, while the funding for 2007-08 was \$7,536,270, a variation of \$494,590.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	65
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Appointment – Whaling envoy – Ref Qon 94 May		
Hansard Page ECITA:	114 (21 Oct)		

Senator Birmingham asked:

Did this appointment go to cabinet, Minister?

Senator Wong—I will take that on notice.

...

Senator Birmingham—The department entered into a contractual arrangement with Mr Hollway on 5 October. Just for the minister's benefit, to step back a moment, as Senator Macdonald pointed out to me, question on notice No. 94, which I have looked at previously as well—which was a question that Senator Macdonald asked as to whether or not the appointment of the special envoy had been to cabinet—was answered: Yes, the issue of a special envoy on whale conservation has been considered by Cabinet.

That was a question asked on 29 May. I do not have the date on this that the answer was furnished, but nonetheless we take it that it had been to cabinet at 29 May. Was Mr Hollway's appointment confirmed at a cabinet meeting? As it was indicated it was discussed prior to 29 May, was it confirmed at that meeting?

Senator Wong—I do not think I have anything to add to the answer to the question on notice, and I told you I will take that issue on notice.

Answer:

The decision to appoint Mr Hollway was made by the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts and the Minister for Foreign Affairs. This appointment was made in line with the Cabinet's decision on the role of the Special Envoy on Whale Conservation.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	66
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Appointment – Whaling envoy		
Hansard Page ECITA:	115 (21 Oct)		

Senator BIRMINGHAM asked:

Right, and when did the department first make contact with Mr Hollway to discuss those terms of appointment?

Ms Petrachenko—We will take that on notice. I believe it was 29 September.

Senator BIRMINGHAM—When was the department advised to begin negotiations for the appointment of Mr Hollway?

Ms Petrachenko—I will take that on notice as well for the exact date.

Mr Borthwick—But it would have been around that time; in other words, it has only been recently.

Senator BIRMINGHAM—What advice did the department have from the minister or cabinet between providing its list of options on 9 January and the appointment or advice to negotiate terms and conditions on 29 September? When did the department become aware that Mr Hollway was the preferred choice of government?

Ms Petrachenko—I think I can refer back to previous questions on notice where we discussed in those answers the actual role of a special envoy and those answers were provided. In terms of the exact date the government decided to choose Mr Hollway, I will take that on notice. We entered into the contract with him on 5 October.

Answers:

Mr Hollway was briefed by officials from the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA), the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and staff from the office of the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts, the Hon Peter Garrett AM MP, on 26 September 2008, at which time DEWHA commenced contract negotiations.

DEWHA was advised on 25 September 2008 that Mr Hollway was the preferred candidate. Mr Hollway was appointed on 5 October 2008.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	67
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Whaling envoy – meetings in Japan		
Hansard Page ECITA:	117 (21 Oct)		

Senator Birmingham asked:

When did Mr Hollway hold talks in Japan?

Ms Petrachenko—It would have been the week of 5 October onto the 10th.

Senator BIRMINGHAM—When were those talks organised?

Ms Petrachenko—I was overseas myself at that point in time, so I cannot answer that question. I will have to take that on notice.

Senator BIRMINGHAM—Were they more than a week in advance?

Ms Petrachenko—I said I do not know, so I will have to take that on notice.

Answer:

Mr Hollway first held discussions with Japan, as the Special Envoy on Whale Conservation, in Tokyo on 6–7 October 2008. The Australian embassy in Japan was tasked with arranging these meetings by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade on 29 September 2008.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	68
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Whaling envoy – remuneration		
Hansard Page ECITA:	119 (21 Oct)		

Senator Ian Macdonald asked:

I accept that. Thanks for the answer, Minister, but I was asking if it was hypocritical, with the Prime Minister on one hand saying parliamentarians should lead by example—and we are all very happy to do that—but at the same time senior public servants getting increases of up to \$1,500, and Mr Hollway seems to be getting very well paid for a few months work.

Senator Wong—Perhaps I could ask Ms Petrachenko to indicate the basis on which that amount was determined.

Ms Petrachenko—Yes. We can take this on notice and do a comparative analysis of other per diems that we pay. I think that would be a fairer comparison, because we did look at that and our determination was that it was a competitive rate.

Answer:

Mr Hollway's remuneration package matched the conditions under which he was contracted as the Prime Minister's envoy to advance the protection of the Kokoda Track. The remuneration package offered to Mr Hollway under this previous contract was based on a comparative analysis of similar consultancies conducted by staff from the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, and was determined by them to be a competitive rate.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	69
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	IWC meeting – June 2008 - cost		
Hansard Page ECITA:	119 (21 Oct)		

Senator Birmingham asked:

Senator BIRMINGHAM—How many people were in the party to the IWC meeting in Chile in June?

Ms Petrachenko—I believe it was 16.

Senator BIRMINGHAM—It was led by the minister. What was the composition of the rest, broadly? Were they all public servants?

Ms Petrachenko—I believe I answered this at the previous estimates, but I can go through it again if you want.

Senator BIRMINGHAM—Sorry, I am looking at the June one. Very quickly, what was the total cost?

Ms Petrachenko—I will have to take that on notice in terms of total cost. It would be split between a number of departments...

Answer:

The total cost of Australian Government attendance to the annual IWC Commissioner's meeting in Chile in June 2008 was \$231,330.01. This covers the total cost of attendance of an Australian Government delegation of 15 to the IWC meeting, including travel, accommodation, and associated expenses. Two NGO advisers travelled with the Australian Government delegation however their costs were not covered by the Australian Government.

The total cost also includes flights by the Minister, an adviser and the Secretary of the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA) to the United States which occurred as part of their overseas visit and cannot be disaggregated.

Additionally this total includes the cost of attendance of one of the delegates to the IWC Scientific Committee meeting held immediately prior to the IWC Commissioner's meeting, again these costs cannot be disaggregated. Costs were shared between DEWHA and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

The Australian government delegation to IWC60 consisted of:

Ms Donna Petrachenko	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Mr Peter Garrett	Minister for the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Mr Andrew McNee	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Mr David Dutton	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
Mr David Borthwick	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Mr Crispin Conroy	Australian Ambassador to Chile, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
Dr Nick Gales	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Ms Lesley Gidding	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Mr Matt Levey	Adviser to the Minister for the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts
Mr Ben Pratt	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Ms Milena Rafic	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Mr Richard Wilson	Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.
Ms Clare Derrington	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
Mr James Yeomans	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
Ms Penelope Toledo-Ocampo	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	70
Output:	1.2		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division/DEWHA		
Topic:	Reef Rescue program		
Hansard Page ECITA:	128 (21 Oct)		

Senator IAN MACDONALD asked:

“I want to know, if I can, with the government’s new program of \$200 million for reef rescue, what is going to landowners through the various primary industry groups to actually do something concrete? There are no assessments, no studies, no conferences, no strategies. They all have to be done. I really want to know what actual money is going to go to taking back riparian areas, stopping fertilisers running into the sea et cetera—practical, on-the-ground stuff.

Ms Petrachenko—I will provide you on notice the details of the answer to the question—what was spent previously. I think Mr Taylor can provide you with some information on what is planned to get out on the ground now.

Mr H Taylor—Of the \$200 million, there is \$146 million earmarked for water quality grants, which are directed to go through industry bodies and regional bodies to on-farm practices that reduce sediment, nutrient and pesticide run-off from properties. This is targeting ground cover, reduced tillage techniques, improved grazing, riparian protection and activities of that nature. So \$146 million of the \$200 million is targeting that area.

Senator IAN MACDONALD—Okay. I really want to pin us all down. Can you, on notice, try and timeline how that money is going to be spent...

Answers:

The \$146 million Water Quality Grants component of the \$200 million Reef Rescue package will fund on-ground activities that reduce sediment, nutrient and pesticide run-off entering the Reef. Other components of the Reef Rescue package will support on-ground action, notably the \$12 million Reef Partnerships component, which will support extension, education and capacity building activities.

The Australian Government has announced \$23 million in funding for the 2008-09 financial year from the Water Quality Grants and Reef Partnerships components of Reef Rescue. Payments are expected to be made before the end of 2008.

Arrangements for subsequent years were considered by government in the context of the development of a *Caring for our Country* business plan, which was publicly released on 28 November 2008.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Reef Water Quality funding prior to Reef Rescue

Funding for Reef water quality related matters prior to Reef Rescue was provided through the Natural Heritage Trust, Coastal Catchments Initiative and Marine and Tropical Sciences Research Facility. Funding in 2006-07 and 2007-08, including funding for research, monitoring and wetland mapping activities, was as follows:

	2006-07 (\$M)	2007-08 (\$M)
Reef Water Quality Protection Plan	5.63	4.57
Great Barrier Reef Catchment Wetlands Protection Program	1.68	0.68
Reef Water Quality Protection Plan Monitoring Program	2.29	4.04
Marine and Tropical Science Research Fund*	2.07	2.09
TOTAL	11.67	11.38

* Estimated expenditure on water quality related projects.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	71
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Conservation of the coasts and oceans		
Hansard Page ECITA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator Siewert asked:

1. What are the expected dates for delivery of each of the major milestones in the development of BMPs for each of the Commonwealth Marine Regions (release of draft plans, consultation periods, release of final plans, declaration under EPBC).
2. How will the budgets for each of the plans be affected by the financial cuts suffered by the NOO recently?
3. How will this affect the planning processes and ultimately the plans themselves?

Answers:

1. The milestones delivery dates for each of the Marine Regions are as follows:

Marine Region	Draft Plan	Statutory Consultation	Final Plan
South-west	mid 09	mid 09	late 09
North	late 09	early 10	mid 10
North-west	early 10	early 10	mid 10
East	early 10	early 10	mid 10

Declaration of new Commonwealth Marine Reserves will be completed approximately 12 months following the release of each final Marine Bioregional Plan.

2. The National Oceans Office ceased as an Executive Agency in October 2004. The budget for Marine Bioregional Planning reflects departmental priorities.
3. Resources have been allocated to ensure Marine Bioregional Plans are developed to meet the timeframes indicated above.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	72
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Conservation of the coasts and oceans		
Hansard Page ECITA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator Siewert asked:

1. How are the bioregional planning processes taking into account the current and predicted rise in ocean acidity, and how is the natural variability of these impacts with depth and temperature being factored in to geographically-specific zoning decisions?
2. How are the planning processes taking into account the current and predicted temperature rises in our oceans and the subsequent ecosystem disruption and change in patterns of fisheries?

Answer:

- 1-2. Marine bioregional planning processes aim to gather the best available scientific knowledge and data and put it in a format appropriate to inform decision-makers. (For example, by developing administrative guidance in relation to referrals/assessments and strategic assessment of fisheries.) This includes information about predicted changes to the ocean's physical characteristics and the potential impacts on biological communities and ecosystem processes.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	73
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Conservation of the Coasts and Oceans		
Hansard Page ECITA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator Siewert asked:

1. Given that the Australian Government is developing a National Climate Change and Fisheries Action Plan, a priority action of the National Climate Change Adaptation Framework endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments which is due for completion this year, how will this feed into the BMPs currently being developed, and when is the Action Plan expected to be publicly released?
2. Does this Action Plan recognise the role of BMP's in delivering government policy, or is it operating in a silo?
3. Given that the objective of the Action Plan is to assist fishers from all fishing sectors to adapt to unavoidable impacts of, and, where relevant, mitigate the effects of their operations on, climate change, will effort displacement funds (or structural adjustment monies) be available as part of this process or any other processes?

Answers:

1. The draft National Climate Change and Fisheries Action Plan (the draft Action Plan) is now expected to be released in the first half of 2009.

The draft action plan provides high level guidance to fishers, governments and researchers, to assist the fisheries sectors adapt to climate change, and mitigate their climate impacts where relevant. It recognises that legal and management frameworks should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate spatial shifts in species distribution, and that fisheries management planning should consider the suitability and effectiveness of spatial management arrangements both now and in the future. These principles are part of the government's consideration of climate change adaptation responses in the context of marine protected areas, which are also a key mechanism for building resilience to climate change impacts.

2. The draft action plan was developed by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry on behalf of the Australian Fisheries Management Forum. It was developed in consultation with economists and scientists; the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts; the Department of Climate Change; the Australian Fisheries Management Authority; relevant state and Northern Territory government

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

departments; fishing representatives and other stakeholders.

As outlined above, the Action Plan will provide high level guidance to assist with adaptation and mitigation. The Marine Bioregional Planning (MBP) program was established by the Australian Government in pursuit of biodiversity conservation. MBP's will provide strategic guidance for government decision makers and marine users by describing each Marine Region's ecological processes and conservation values, identifying regional priorities for action and developing strategic guidance for proponents and decision makers.

During the MBP process relevant information and modelling pertinent to climate change will be included.

3. There are no effort displacement funds associated with the action plan.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	74
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Conservation of the Coasts and Oceans		
Hansard Page ECITA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator Siewert asked:

1. When will bioregional planning for the East Marine Region be commenced and completed?
2. When is it likely that potential marine protected areas for the East Marine Region be identified and announced?
3. Is it likely that separate and accelerated action to identify a Coral Sea MPA be undertaken?
4. What funding has been allocated in 2008- 09 for planning in the East Marine Region and identification for MPAs, including for the Coral Sea?
5. Given the recognised expertise of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority is it likely that the planning and management of a Coral Sea Marine Park be delegated to the Authority?
6. Given there is no oil and gas exploration or production in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park is it likely that this policy will be extended and represented in the adjacent Coral Sea waters?

Answers:

1. Planning for the East Marine Region began in early 2007. The Australian Government is committed to completing the marine bioregional planning process for the East Marine Region in 2010.
2. Marine Protected Areas (MPA) will be identified through the East marine bioregional planning process. The Draft Marine Bioregional Plan for the East Marine Region will identify representative areas to include in a marine protected areas network for the East Marine Region. The final East Marine Bioregional Plan will identify the proposed marine protected areas network, and trigger a further formal consultation process for declaration of the East marine protected areas network. Formal declaration of the marine protected areas network for the East Marine Region will therefore occur by 2012.
3. The Coral Sea within Australia's marine jurisdiction has long been identified as an area of outstanding conservation and cultural value. The work completed so far for the East Marine Region in which the Coral Sea is located establishes a strong case for

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

a greater level of protection than currently exists. As such, the department is giving focused attention to identifying conservation options for the Coral Sea, consistent with the marine bioregional planning process.

4. The East Marine Region has approximately \$230,000 for the 2008/09 financial year. The proposed budget for the Coral Sea work program is approximately \$202,000 for the 2008/09 financial year.
5. The department is investigating options for enhancing the protection of the Coral Sea and is consulting on possible management options. Through assessment of the conservation needs of the Coral Sea, suitable options for the coordination of planning and management of the region will be identified.
6. The department is currently considering issues such as management needs and impacts, natural values, potential socio-economic impacts of reserves, and stakeholder uses of the Coral Sea. The views of all stakeholders, including the oil and gas sector and community expectations around government commitment to protect the Coral Sea, will be considered in any decisions the government takes in relation to conservation measures. There are no current oil and gas exploration or production licences in the Coral Sea.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

Outcome:	1	Question No:	75
Output:	1.3		
Division/Agency:	Marine Division		
Topic:	Whaling Envoys		
Hansard Page ECITA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator Birmingham asked:

1. In its “advice to the Government about possible (whaling) envoys” provided in a brief to the Minister on 9 January 2008 did the Department provide a list of possible names to be considered for the position as whaling envoy?
2. On what basis were these names selected?
3. With whom did the department consult in the preparation of these names?
4. How many names of possible whaling envoys were contained in the brief provided to the Minister on 9 January?
5. In consideration of the whaling envoy by Cabinet:
 - (a) Did the Minister provide a list or shortlist of possible appointees?
 - (b) Did the Minister seek approval or endorsement of Cabinet for any recommended appointee?
 - (c) Did the Minister advise Cabinet of his decision to appoint Mr Hollway?
 - (d) If any of the above occurred, at what meeting or meetings of Cabinet did they occur?
6. When was Mr Hollway first advised that he was under consideration for the position as Whaling Envoy?
7. When was Mr Hollway first advised that he was the preferred appointee of the Minister or Cabinet?
8. What discussions or meetings did Mr Hollway have with the Minister, Prime Minister, other Ministers or departmental officials about the position of Whaling Envoy prior to his contract being signed?
9. When did these discussions take place and with whom?
10. Is there a right of renewal on Mr Hollway’s contract and, if so, under what terms and for how long?
11. Against what success factors or performance indicators will Mr Hollway’s work as Whaling Envoy be assessed?

Answers:

1. The department provided advice on a range of strategies available to the government to progress the envoy mission. The advice also identified a number of people that could be approached to serve as the Australian envoy for whales.
2. Individuals were nominated based on their fit with the particular strategies identified in the advice.

Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2008

3. The Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
4. A number of individuals were identified as potential envoys.
5. It is not appropriate to disclose the deliberations of the Cabinet.
6. Mr Hollway was approached regarding his availability for the role of Special Envoy on Whale Conservation prior to his appointment.
7. Mr Hollway was advised that he was the preferred appointee prior to his formal appointment.
8. Mr Hollway met with the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts prior to his appointment as Special Envoy on Whale Conservation.
9. As above, Mr Hollway met with the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts prior to his appointment as Special Envoy on Whale Conservation.
10. Yes. The government can choose to renew Mr Hollway's contract for up to an additional one year after the contract end date.
11. The success of the mission of the Special Envoy on Whale Conservation as set out in Mr Hollway's contract can be judged by:
 - attendance at meetings, as required, with key stakeholders;
 - consultation with government officials, including Commonwealth representatives abroad
 - the provision of advice relevant to the mission.